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PREFACE

The present work was submitted as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Cambridge in 1970, and the text is reproduced here without revision, apart from the addition of indexes. I am conscious of the drawbacks this entails. No subject, not even that of LXX lexicography, stands still for ten years: references to more recent work could certainly be added. In addition, like most dissertations, this would in any case benefit from revision or expansion in a number of places. Nevertheless I believe it has a useful contribution to make in its present form, and to delay publication until a thorough revision could be undertaken seemed certain to mean that it would remain unpublished.

In two places the existing discussion has been superseded by a fuller treatment I have published elsewhere: ἀποσκευή (pp. 101-7) is dealt with in JTS XXIII (1972) 430-7, and μέρος (pp. 72-6) in Antichthon VI (1972) 39-42.

It remains to repeat the thanks expressed in my original preface, first to those scholars in Cambridge who so readily welcomed and advised an unknown Australian with out-of-the-way interests: Barnabas Lindars S.S.F., my supervisor, patiently guided me throughout; Dr. J. Chadwick gave valuable advice on many matters, especially lexicographical methods; Dr. S.P. Brock kindly shared with me his unrivalled knowledge of the LXX; and Mr. S.J. Papastavrou gave assistance with Modern Greek.

Thanks are due also to Pembroke College, for general support and encouragement during my years in Cambridge.

Finally I owe my greatest debt to the late Professor G.P. Shipp (1900-1980), of the University of Sydney. He set me an example of scholarship which, though an unattainable goal, has been constantly before me. More especially, it was he who, in 1964, introduced me to Koine Greek and provided the basis of all my later work.

J.A.L. LEE
University of Sydney
December, 1981
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Names of ancient authors and their works, books of the LXX and NT, and titles of papyrological and epigraphical publications are abbreviated as in LSJ and Suppl., with a few minor variations. Attention may be drawn to one or two of LSJ's abbreviations that are perhaps liable to confusion, or not easily recognized: A. = Aeschylus, Ar. = Aristophanes, Arist. = Aristotle; Hdt. = Herodotus, Herod. = Herodas; Hp. = Hippocrates, Hyp. = Hyperides. Petr. is mostly cited by volume and text.
number, not, as in LSJ, by volume and page number. In refer­
ences to PCair.zen. the digits 59(00) are omitted, as in LSJ: thus 2 = 59002.

In references to papyri and inscriptions the following are to be noticed: (i) The line cited for a given word is usually that in which the word itself occurs or begins, though the passage actually quoted may extend over a number of surrounding lines (as MM, p. xxx). (ii) Dates given to texts are strictly those assigned by the editors. (iii) Symbols used in the published text (brackets, dots, etc.) are not always reproduced in full: I have omitted them where the reading seems beyond doubt or where they have no bearing on the point under discus­
sion. For these symbols see E.G. Turner, Greek Papyri 179-180.

In giving dates, lower-case Roman numerals indicate the century, Arabic numerals the year: e.g. iii B.C. = the third century B.C.

The LXX text cited and quoted is that of Rahlfs (Stutt­
gart, 1935). Rahlfs' numeration alone is given. Rahlfs is followed in the matter of accents and breathings on proper names.

In giving the original Hebrew the sign ' =' has been avoided. Occasionally the swung dash (~) is used, as an abbrevi­
atlon for 'corresponds to'. The portion of MT quoted is usually only that to which the Greek word under discussion corresponds, not the whole MT passage corresponding to the whole LXX passage quoted.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTORY

The chief purpose of this study is to demonstrate as far as possible the affinities, in the sphere of vocabulary, between the language of the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch and the vernacular Koine Greek of its time. It is intended that in so doing it should form a contribution specifically towards (i) the solution of the general problem of LXX language, i.e. the question of its relation to the Greek language proper; and (ii) the lexicography of the LXX.

The language of the LXX is plainly not normal Greek in many places. The question whether it is nevertheless to be regarded as belonging to the main stream of the Greek language has still not been satisfactorily settled. Deissmann, followed by Thumb, Thackeray, Moulton, and other older scholars, considered, and gathered evidence to show, that the language of the LXX translators was essentially the Greek of their time. According to this view the peculiarities of LXX Greek are to be explained chiefly as a result of the translation-techniques employed. This view was and still is accepted by many, probably by most, scholars. It has however been maintained by others that we have in the LXX a specimen of a form of Greek actually spoken by the Jews in Egypt, a Greek so extensively contaminated by Semitic usage as to be an entity separate from the normal Greek of the time. The case for this has recently been argued afresh especially by H.S. Gehman, with support from N. Turner.

It is to this debate that the present study is designed to contribute, in support of the earlier view. The general question of the nature of LXX Greek will first be discussed in more detail, in Chapter II. There the main arguments already advanced, and certain new points, will be considered. The bulk of the study will consist of a detailed examination of certain portions of the Pentateuch vocabulary. The words and uses selected for study are chiefly those that are new in the Koine and are attested in documents contemporary with the translators.
My purpose in examining them will be to support the thesis that the language of the LXX translators was essentially the Greek of their time. The study will thus be in the main a continuation of Deissmann's work and methods. Since his time a large quantity of papyrological evidence has accumulated and has been little explored for the light it throws on LXX vocabulary. The present study aims at making the fullest possible use of this material.

My main concern will be with the everyday, non-theological vocabulary of the Pentateuch, but in attempting to show affinities between it and the vocabulary of 'secular' Greek I have no wish to deny the distinctive character of some parts of the LXX vocabulary, notably its religious terminology. It is hardly possible to doubt that the translators, and the Alexandrian Jews generally, introduced some novel features into their vocabulary, in all three ways available to them: by borrowing words from Hebrew or Aramaic, by forming new words in Greek, and by giving special significations to some current Greek terms. Similarly no-one would wish to deny that the translators' Greek has been strongly influenced in every respect by the Hebrew of the original text.¹

As is well known, the lexicography of the LXX is a subject that has been seriously neglected for some time. The only lexicon of the LXX is that of Schleusner, dating from the 1820s. This work, though in some respects still valuable, is now definitely obsolete. The gap is only partially filled by the more modern lexicographical tools, LSJ, Bauer, and MM, which give little more than incidental treatment to the LXX.

There have of course been numerous studies in the field of LXX vocabulary apart from what is found in the lexicons, but only a small part of the whole vocabulary has yet been adequately treated. All these studies (of which more will be said

¹. I see no reason to disagree with C.P.D. Moule's 'word of caution', *Idiom Book* 3f.: 'The pendulum has swung rather too far in the direction of equating Biblical with "secular" Greek; and we must not allow these fascinating discoveries to blind us to the fact that Biblical Greek still does retain certain peculiarities, due in part to Semitic influence...'.

below) have been limited in extent, and the important older ones by Deissmann and Anz are now in need of re-appraisal and supplementing with new evidence. Much recent study has been limited, especially in that it has tended to concentrate on words of theological interest, and then often with the chief object of elucidating the language and ideas of the NT.

The evidence of the papyri, although generally recognized as important for LXX lexicography, has yet to be thoroughly investigated. As many of the examples in this study will show, there is still a great deal to be discovered about LXX usage from this source. Much that is important for the LXX vocabulary has not been noted by any of the standard dictionaries.

An up-to-date lexicon of the LXX, embodying the results of a thorough re-examination of its vocabulary and taking full account of the papyrological evidence, is clearly a pressing requirement. There is at the present time an increased interest in providing such a work, but the task will be a difficult and lengthy one, and it is clearly desirable that as much preliminary study as possible should be undertaken for it.

It is intended that the present study should make a contribution in this direction, not only by its examination of individual words and uses but also by offering a number of observations relevant to LXX lexicography generally. In particular we shall observe how important a full investigation of the non-Biblical evidence can be in deciding the meaning of a word in the LXX.

In any study of the LXX one encounters at the outset the problem of the uncertainty of our text. We may distinguish three separate questions on which there is still some measure of uncertainty. They are: (i) Is it possible to speak of a single original LXX translation? (ii) To what extent is an ancient translation preserved in our MSS? (iii) If such a translation does survive, at what date was it made? The present study is not directly concerned with solving these problems. It will

proceed on the hypothesis that it is possible to speak of a single original version of the Pentateuch; that this version is preserved essentially unchanged in our major MSS; and that it dates from around the middle of the third century B.C. The opinion of most scholars today appears to be in agreement with this view. Certainly it is generally accepted that, as Aristeas relates, a translation of the Pentateuch was undertaken in the third century; and on the other points the present position of LXX textual study suggests that there is every likelihood of recovering an original Alexandrian version. This is especially so in the case of the Pentateuch, which presents fewer problems than other parts of the LXX.

This study is not, however, seriously affected by these uncertainties. Lexical study of the LXX can, and indeed ought to, proceed alongside of textual study, even though many textual problems remain unsolved. Deissmann was clearly right in saying that 'the knowledge of the lexical conditions is itself a preliminary condition of textual criticism'.

Nevertheless, lexical study itself affords evidence that may be used to test the age of our text. To begin with, of course, the fact that the Pentateuch is written in Koine Greek is an indication of date. But this allows too wide a span of time to be useful. It is possible however to find evidence for dating within this range by studying particular features of vocabulary. Some of these will be examined in Chapter VIII. The conclusion to which they lead is that our text must be older than about the middle of the second century B.C. Although this is not as narrow an indication of date as we should like, it is nevertheless of some value. Moreover, it is of interest to establish such a method of dating. It could, I believe, be usefully applied to other parts of the LXX. And there is a possibility of making it more accurate by investigating more features of the same kind as those that will be studied here.

Rahlfs' text of the LXX will be taken as a basis on which to work. Variant readings (in the notation of Brooke-McLean)

3. BS 73 n.3. Daniel, Recherches 12, makes the same point.
will be noticed where they seriously affect the point under discussion. I have however tried as far as possible to avoid using examples that might be vitiated by uncertainty of the text. In the majority of cases the words examined occur without important variants and more than once. If it should turn out that some of my examples must be set aside because of the faultiness of the text used, the bulk of them is nevertheless sufficient to ensure that the general picture is not affected. In some instances the lexical study itself provides evidence that will be helpful in choosing between variants.

Previous study of the LXX vocabulary

It is natural to begin with the fundamental researches of Deissmann. As is well known, it was he who made the discovery of the similarities between the language of the papyri and that of the NT and LXX, a discovery that has been of the greatest significance for subsequent study. Deissmann’s detailed studies of examples are also valuable today. Many of these can be supplemented with papyrus evidence that has since come to light, but in only a few cases does it substantially alter the picture. However, Deissmann dealt with only a small part of the LXX vocabulary. He was concerned more with the NT than the LXX, and in any case was not attempting to examine more than a sample of their vocabulary. The examples he considered were those that most clearly illustrated his point.

For the NT vocabulary Deissmann’s researches have been taken to their natural conclusion by Moulton and Milligan, but no such systematic enquiry into the papyri has so far been


undertaken for the LXX.  

One work published before Deissmann's discoveries, that by Anz, is still worth attention today. Anz treated the LXX as a useful source for furthering our knowledge of the Koine generally. He examined 289 verbs in Genesis and Exodus, tracing their occurrences elsewhere in Greek, primarily in order to see what conclusions could be drawn about the origins of the Koine vocabulary and the various elements in it. In carrying out this examination he collected a good deal of useful and accurate material from Koine writers and the limited documentary evidence then available.

Other older works are for the most part of little value now. Although they may contain useful observations on one point or another, they were unable to take account of the evidence which, as Deissmann discovered and as I hope further to demonstrate, is of such importance for the study of the LXX vocabulary.

In the years since Deissmann's work appeared there have been numerous studies of particular words or groups of words in the LXX. Mme Daniel's examination of the cultic vocabulary, which recently appeared, is one of the most important, both for the detailed study of the words and for the general conclusions that emerge. Also important is Repo's exhaustive examination

6. Attention has been drawn to the links between the two by Orsolina Montevecchi, 'Continuità ed evoluzione della lingua Greca nella Settanta e nei papi', Actes du Xᵉ Congrès Internat. de Papyrologues, 1964, 39-49. This is a general survey, with extensive lists, but no detailed study of examples. My material has been gathered independently.


8. H.A.A. Kennedy, Sources of New Testament Greek, Edinburgh, 1895; E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, Oxford, 1889; H. Guil. J. Thiersch, De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina, Erlangae, 1841. There is much good sense in F. Guil. Sturz, De dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina, Lipsiae, 1808; even at that early date Sturz made use of the small amount of documentary evidence available. I have been unable to see K. Hartung, Septuaginta-Studien, Bamberg, 1886, which, according to Helbing, Gramm. p. ii, contains a certain amount of lexical material.

of ρήμα in the Greek of the LXX and NT.  

There are many minor studies, especially of words of theological interest. For example, ἴλασκεσθαι and related words have been examined by Dodd, ἄγιος by Gehman, verbs of praise by Ledogar, ψυχή and related words by Lys. In many other instances an investigation of the LXX evidence forms the background to a study of some aspect of the NT vocabulary. The outstanding work of this kind is the well known Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by G. Kittel.

Most of the works just mentioned deal with words that are significant theologically. Indeed, this applies to the majority of studies of the LXX vocabulary. This preoccupation is understandable, but it has meant that much of the ordinary vocabulary has been neglected. Moreover, it is unfortunately true that many studies concerned with theologically significant terms are marred by unsound linguistic methods. On the whole, as Mme Daniel remarks, 'les recherches proprement philologiques ont été jusqu'à maintenant plutôt négligées'.

There are, however, one or two other works to be noticed. There is useful incidental treatment of vocabulary in the studies of Helbing and Huber, and in Thackeray's Grammar.

15. A recent example of the same type of study is D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, Cambridge, 1967.
16. J. Barr's far-reaching criticisms of TWNT in this respect are well known.
17. Recherches 8.
Ziegler's examination of the LXX of Isaiah includes a comparison of the book's vocabulary with that of the papyri.\(^{20}\) Also to be noted is Barr's discussion of words for time, which includes a valuable study of these words in the LXX.\(^{21}\)

In an article published in Textus, Gehman deals briefly with a number of LXX words and uses.\(^{22}\) The contribution of these notes to LXX lexicography is however very limited. Gehman examines only Hebraistic uses, many of which have been noted before,\(^{23}\) and the discussion of them is sketchy, and unreliable in some points of detail.

Further mention must be made of the standard lexicons, which of course also form contributions to the study of the LXX vocabulary.

LSJ includes a large amount of LXX material, but as is mostly well known, is often in error.\(^{24}\) A particular fault is its tendency to equate the LXX word with the Hebrew it translates when there is no good reason to do so. In some instances the meaning given seems to be adopted directly from one of the English versions of the OT. Less obvious, but just as serious, is its frequent omission of important matter.

Bauer's excellent lexicon of the NT is of course of great value for the study of the LXX. It can be relied on for accurate and up-to-date treatment of the NT vocabulary, and it also

\(^{20}\) J. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen XII 3), Münster, 1934.
\(^{22}\) H.S. Gehman, 'Adventures in Septuagint Lexicography', Textus V (1966) 125-32. Gehman says, ib. p.125, that he began some years ago to compile a dictionary of Septuagint Greek, with the help of his graduate students, and that most of the work completed is now deposited on microfilm in the Speer Library of the Princeton Theological Seminary. I have no knowledge of this material. Nor have I been able to accompany Gehman on his 'Ramblings in Septuagint Lexicography', Ind. Journal of Theology XIV (1965) 90-101.
\(^{23}\) See e.g. Thackeray, Gramm. 39ff.
gives frequent references to the LXX. However, the vocabulary that the LXX and NT have in common is less than is often supposed. In particular it is to be noted that words common to both often vary considerably in regard to their uses.

In the same way MM, although an indispensable storehouse of information, does not treat all LXX words and uses. It can moreover be supplemented even in the case of a number of those it does treat.

As to Schleusner, there is little to be added to what was said above. It is true that Schleusner's work is 'sober and learned throughout', and from time to time offers suggestions that are still useful today. But from a lexicographical point of view it must be regarded as quite obsolete.

It is convenient to mention here certain other lexicons and indexes that are not directly concerned with the LXX, but are essential tools for the study of the Greek vocabulary.

For the papyri there is the well-known Wörterbuch of Preisigke. This work however is out of date, a fact that seems often to be forgotten. The last part appeared in 1927, but it does not cover much papyrological material later than about 1921. A supplement by Kiessling, itself rapidly going out of date, reached Eἰρ- in 1966. Kiessling has recently published (1969) a further supplement for the whole alphabet in the form of an index, which apparently covers material published between 1940 and 1966. Although these works cover the bulk of the material, the only sure way to investigate the papyri is to check the indexes of the individual papyrus publications themselves. I have drawn attention to these points because they may not be generally known to students of the LXX, and it is important that none of the available papyrus evidence should be

26. Jellicoe, *SMS* 335, 359, seems to me to overrate Schleusner.
27. For the full titles of Preisigke and other works mentioned see Abbreviations and Bibliography.
28. Jellicoe, *SMS* 335, discussing the tools available for lexical study of the LXX, lists Preisigke without comment, and does not mention Kiessling's supplements either there or in the Bibliography.
overlooked in LXX lexicographical study.

Indexes to Greek authors, which are indispensable adjuncts to LSJ, are too numerous to mention individually here. Would draw attention however to the lexicon to Polybius now in progress. This author has, I believe, much to contribute to the understanding of the LXX vocabulary.
CHAPTER II

THE NATURE OF LXX GREEK

It is evident that the Greek in which the books of the LXX are composed contains many features that cannot be normal Greek. It is clear moreover that these features are due principally to the influence of Hebrew. They are usually spoken of as 'Hebraisms', or 'Semitisms'. Examples of such constructions and uses have long been noted, and are familiar to all readers of the LXX.\(^1\) We need only observe one or two well-known examples: υἱός of age, corresponding literally to Hebrew יְהוָה, as in Σημ υἱός εκατόν ετών (Ge.11.10); τις δώσει or τις δώσῃ translating מְלֹא - מָלַא, 'would that ...'; δίδωμι in the sense of 'make' (燔). In such cases it cannot be doubted that there is an abnormality from the point of view of Greek and that it is due to the influence of Hebrew.

There are of course a number of difficulties which at once arise. These we shall notice briefly, but not go into here. To begin with, there are many uncertainties involved in the use of the terms 'Hebraism' and 'Semitism'. Precisely how they are to be defined and applied is a very difficult matter. Also, it is practically impossible to arrive at a quantitative assessment of their extent. Another difficulty is that LXX Greek is not homogeneous. The type of Greek used and the extent of Hebrew influence vary from book to book. Strictly speaking, therefore, the term 'LXX Greek', implying the consistent use of a certain type of Greek, is unsatisfactory. But for the purpose of discussion the term will be used here, it being understood that there is considerable variety within LXX Greek. The main point however is clear. It is beyond question that the majority of the books of the LXX exhibit, to a greater or lesser extent, features that are abnormal for Greek and must be due to the

---

1. See the examples collected e.g. by Thackeray, Gramm. 29-55, Psichari, Essai 193ff., Huber, Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griech. Leviticus 98ff., Gehman VT I (1951) 81ff., VT III (1953) 141-8. Cf. also Helbing, Kasussyntax IXf.
influence of a Semitic language. On this there is general agreement.

Where opinions differ is over the explanation for the presence of these foreign elements. We have a choice between two main types of explanation. On the one hand it can be argued that the Hebraisms of LXX Greek have arisen chiefly because the work is a translation of a Hebrew original, executed according to methods which frequently led to the reproduction of Hebrew idiom in the translating language. According to this view the Greek spoken by the translators was by and large the vernacular Egyptian Greek of the time.

This, as is well known, was Deissmann's opinion. For him the fact that the LXX is a translation is of fundamental importance in understanding its linguistic character. In attempting to turn a Semitic text into Greek the translators undertook a difficult and unprecedented task. "Over the Hebrew, with its grave and stately step, they have, so to speak, thrown their light native garb, without being able to conceal the alien's peculiar gait beneath its folds. So arose a written "Semitic-Greek" which no one ever spoke, far less used for literary purposes, either before or after" (BS 67). The Hebraisms of the version "permit of no conclusions being drawn from them in respect to the language actually spoken by the Hellenistic Jews of the period" (ib. 69). In this view Deissmann has been followed by the majority of scholars.

On the other hand, it may be argued that the peculiarities of LXX Greek are largely independent of the fact of translation. The Greek spoken by the translators, and by the Egyptian Jewish community generally, was (it is said) already extensively

2. See especially BS 66ff; also Philology of the Greek Bible (transl. L.M. Strachan), London, 1908, 48ff.
influenced by a Semitic language before the translation was made; when the translation came to be made the translators used an already-existing form of Greek. In other words, according to this view, the LXX is a specimen of a living dialect of Greek, an Alexandrian 'Jewish-Greek'.

This view is an old one, but in the years following Deissmann's discoveries was seldom advocated. It has however been put forward again recently by Gehman, with support from Turner. Gehman's argument, which we shall return to later, is essentially as follows: since the LXX presumably 'made sense' to its audience, the language used in it must have been a form of Jewish-Greek already familiar to them. 'If the LXX made sense to Hellenistic Jews, the translation was understood because its idiom corresponded to a familiar Denkart.' And again: 'if the LXX made sense to Hellenistic Jews, we may infer that there was a Jewish Greek which was understood apart from the Hebrew language.' The existence of a 'Jewish-Greek' in some sense in NT times is also accepted in the Grammar of Blass-Debrunner-Funk, and by some other NT authorities.

The question of the nature of LXX Greek is of course a complex one, involving many factors. There is an extensive literature on it and on matters that have bearing on it, and

---

5. H.S. Gehman, 'The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek', *VT* I (1951) 81-90.
9. §4: 'there was certainly a spoken Jewish-Greek in the sense that even his secular speech betrayed the Semitic mind of the Jew.'
there are many differing shades of opinion. It seems to me, however, that the central issue involved is as I have outlined above. Essentially the question that faces us is: in order to account for the undoubted peculiarities of LXX Greek, is it sufficient to refer to the fact that the LXX is a translation, or is it necessary to assume the existence of a living 'Jewish-Greek' dialect?

It must be said at the outset that we do not have sufficient evidence to establish beyond doubt the answer to the question. Various arguments can be brought to bear on it, but after a certain point further argument is fruitless and the answer remains a matter of opinion. In my view, however, the available indications are definitely against the existence of an Alexandrian 'Jewish-Greek' dialect.

We may begin by noticing one of the arguments put forward by Deissmann and Thackeray. They pointed to the contrast that can be seen between Jewish writings composed originally in Greek and those that are translations of Semitic originals. The extreme form of Semitic Greek is confined to the latter. This is difficult to explain if one maintains (as Gehman does) that Hellenistic Jews spoke a 'Jewish-Greek' like the Greek we find for example in the Pentateuch. If that was the language they spoke we should expect it to be used more consistently than it is. Why is 'Jewish-Greek' not used by the writers of 2-4 Maccabees and the Epistle of Jeremiah, for example? Especially difficult to explain is the difference between the prologue to Sirach and the translation itself. As Deissmann said, 'whoever counts the Greek Sirach among the monuments of a "Judaic-Greek", thought of as a living language, must show why the translator uses Alexandrian Greek when he is not writing as a translator.'

This argument is on the whole a sound one, though certain points of difficulty must be noticed. A large amount of evidence is involved, and it is difficult to generalize. The evidence of the NT is particularly complicated. There are some 'Semitisms',

11. BS 69 n.1, 76, cf. 296.
13. BS 69 n.1.
and other features peculiar to Biblical Greek, in the books originally composed in Greek, as well as in the parts that are thought to be translated from Aramaic originals. Moreover, the Semitic originals of those parts of the NT generally supposed to be translations are not extant. The evidence for regarding them as translations consists chiefly of presumed examples of Semitic influence occurring in them. The same difficulty is found with certain books of the LXX, such as Tobit and 1 Maccabees. In addition there are problems both in deciding exactly what constitutes a Semitism and in estimating the extent of the Semitic element in a given book.

It seems to me, however, that the essential point remains. The kind of Greek found, for example, in the Pentateuch is confined to books that are known to be translations, or are generally thought to be translations. Jewish works composed originally in Greek show nothing like the same degree of Semitic influence. Clearly this leads to the conclusion that the supposed 'Jewish-Greek' is a result of translation, and did not exist as a spoken language.

This argument has not, as far as I know, been answered by advocates of 'Jewish-Greek'.

A more serious objection to the hypothesis of a spoken 'Jewish-Greek' is that it does not take into account the fact that there are two Semitic languages involved in the question, not one.

It is quite clear that the Greek of the LXX translation is heavily influenced by Hebrew idiom and usage; and according to

16. In addition Deissmann, BS 68, pointed to a number of Jewish papyri, whose language shows none of the peculiarities seen in the LXX. Similarly Bickerman, PAAJR XXVIII (1959) 24 n.53. A systematic study of this evidence would be valuable.
Gehman's hypothesis it was that kind of Greek that was spoken by Egyptian Jews. In other words, if there was a 'Jewish-Greek', it was a form of Greek that has been influenced by Hebrew.

But it is generally agreed that the everyday language of the Egyptian Jews before they adopted Greek was Aramaic, not Hebrew. Papyri, ostraka, coins, and grave inscriptions all witness to this. There are, besides, a number of indications to this effect in the LXX itself. Certain words appear in forms that must be derived from Aramaic; e.g. νεώρας from Aramaic אניורא , not Hebrew רח; πάσχα < ἡμέρα πάσχα < הכמה סֵבָּאָּתָא < שֶׁבָּא. It is especially significant that the words for the Sabbath and the festival of the Passover, terms which must have been in constant use among Jews, are Aramaic in form. Also, the translators occasionally take a word in its Aramaic sense instead of its Hebrew sense.

It follows that if the Greek spoken by Egyptian Jews was affected by the idioms of a Semitic language, that language must have been Aramaic. Although Hebrew was the language of the OT and was no doubt still understood by some, it had never been the spoken language of Egyptian Jews generally. It is therefore unlikely that it could have exerted a significant influence on their Greek at any stage. 'Jewish-Greek', if it existed, would

17. See e.g. L. Fuchs, Die Juden Ägyptens in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit, Wien, 1924, 114ff.; F. Büchsel, ZAW XIX (1944) 133-8; R.A. Bowman, JNES VII (1948) 80f., 86; V. Tcherikover, Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum I 30; L. Delekat, VT VIII (1958) 225ff.

18. For a summary of the evidence see Delekat, ib.

19. Thackeray, Gramm. 28, Büchsel, op.cit. 137, Bickerman, op. cit. 22, L.H. Brockington, ZAW XXV (1954) 84, Bl. DF §141.3; cf. already Thiersch, De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina, Erlangæ, 1841, 29. But Bl. DF, ib., following Schwyzer, KZ LXII (1935) 10f., take סֵבָּאָּתָא as Hb. יָאשׁ + α 'to make it pronounceable in Greek': this I find unconvincing.

20. Examples have frequently been noted. See e.g. Brockington, loc.cit.; J. Ziegler, Beiträge zur Jeremia-Sephtuaginta (MSU VI), Göttingen, 1958, 18f.; J. Barr, Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament, Oxford, 1968, 54f., and references there.
have been a form of Greek that had been influenced by Aramaic.²¹

It is to be remembered that, although they have much in common, Hebrew and Aramaic are different languages.²² To take a particular example: in Hebrew there is a construction combining the 'infinitive absolute' of a verb with another part of the same verb. In LXX Greek this idiom is often imitated by the use of the finite verb with its participle (φευγόν φεύγω) or with the dative of the cognate noun (φευγή φεύγω).²³ It is clear that the translators' Greek is influenced at this point by Hebrew idiom²⁴ (though it is worth noticing that these constructions have some links with normal Greek).²⁵ Yet the 'infinitive absolute' construction is not usual in Aramaic.²⁶ It is difficult to see, therefore, how this idiom could have been current in the Greek spoken by Jews, since it could not have been derived from the Semitic language that they had spoken prior to the adoption of Greek. It is much more likely that this 'Semitism' in LXX Greek arose through the translators' attempt to reproduce an idiom found in the Hebrew text they were translating.²⁷

The conclusion is clear: Gehman's hypothesis cannot stand. It is impossible to explain how a type of Greek like that found in the LXX, a Hebraic Greek, could have arisen as a spoken language when Aramaic, not Hebrew, was the Semitic language that had lately been in use among Egyptian Jews.

It is no answer to refer to the 'Semitic mind' or 'Semitic

²¹ Büchsel, op.cit. 138f., makes the interesting point that if Aram. speakers who learnt Gk. showed peculiarities in their use of the new language (as is quite probable), this would be so of non-Jews as well as Jews. Aram. had been the language of many non-Jews. The 'Aramaic Greek' spoken by Jews is unlikely to have differed much from that spoken by others.

²² Cf. Moule, Idiom Book 172.

²³ Thackeray, Gramm. 47ff.

²⁴ Gehman, VT I (1951)84, includes it among his examples of 'Jewish-Greek' usage.

²⁵ Bl. DF §§198.6, 422, Moule, Idiom Book 178, Bauer p.xx for an example in Polyaeus.

²⁶ Moulton-Howard, Gramm. II 443, Moule, Idiom Book 177.

²⁷ Another example of a Hb. idiom imitated in the LXX but not usual in Aram. is εις in emphatic denials: Moulton-Howard, Gramm. II 468f. Cf. also τος c.acc. in place of predicative nom. or acc. = Hb. ² τος predicative, probably not in Aram., ib. 462.
mode of thought' of the Jew. It is quite unsatisfactory to suppose that speakers of Hebrew and Aramaic had the same 'Semitic mind', to which any feature of either language can be attributed. (This 'Semitic mind' would also have to be shared by speakers of all the other Semitic languages.) I am not suggesting that one cannot speak of a 'Semitic mind', or that there is no relationship of any kind between thought and linguistic structures. But such matters are irrelevant to the linguistic question we are dealing with. Any given feature of LXX Greek must be accounted for first of all on the linguistic level, not by reference to the 'Semitic mind' of the Jew.

In addition to the above objections to the hypothesis of a 'Jewish-Greek', we must notice that there are serious weaknesses in Gehman's line of argument. He argues that 'if the LXX made sense to Hellenistic Jews, we may infer that there was a Jewish Greek which was understood apart from the Hebrew language'. There are two difficulties here. To begin with, the basic assumption is precarious. It is unlikely that all the oddities of LXX Greek were intelligible to the Egyptian Jews. The translators often had difficulty both in understanding their original and in turning it into Greek. They frequently produced neologisms and unnatural usages in their effort to express what they took to be the sense of the original. In some passages, as is generally agreed, they resorted to mechanical, word-for-word representation of the Hebrew, with little concern for the over-all result. It is doubtful that the meaning of what they wrote was always clear to others.

We cannot, then, make the bald assumption that 'the LXX made sense to Hellenistic Jews'. It may however be agreed that the LXX was intelligible to its audience in the sense that a person hearing or reading it could make out, in the majority of

28. Cf. Bl. DF §4 (quoted above p.13 n.9), and Gehman's reference to 'a familiar Denkart' (above p.13).
29. VT I (1951) 90.
instances, the meaning intended. But — and this is the second difficulty in Gehman's argument — it does not follow even from this that the peculiarities of LXX Greek were current in the spoken language of Egyptian Jews. The fact that one can understand a certain locution does not prove that one uses it in one's own speech. Take for example the LXX renderings of the Hebrew 'infinitive absolute'. έκδέχομαι, χάρισμα, χάρισμα, and the like were no doubt intelligible, or if you will, 'made sense', to Egyptian Jews, but it does not follow that such expressions were normal in their own speech. These expressions would also have been intelligible to non-Jewish speakers of Greek, but one would scarcely maintain that they must therefore have been normal Koine Greek. Similarly, no one would suppose that because we can understand the English of the AV its idioms must be a normal feature of the English we speak.

The whole subject of the LXX translators' techniques of translation is clearly involved here. What methods and principles did they apply to their task? Why did they produce the kind of Greek they did? Did they in fact expect that the Greek of their version would seem normal to their audience? These are questions that Gehman has not properly faced. Yet it is essential to take them into account in considering the nature of LXX Greek.

It is not possible to go into this subject at any length here, but attention may be drawn to certain points.

30. This itself is a simplification. The meaning discerned by the readers of the LXX must often have differed from that intended by the translators; in numerous instances the translators' rendering has one meaning when read simply as Greek and another when the original is taken into account (See e.g. ἐκδέχομαι, p.59.) Also, in some passages the translators themselves do not seem to have had a clear idea of the meaning they intended.

Writers on the LXX have frequently pointed out, but it is worth repeating, that translation is an extremely difficult art. The problems involved have by no means been solved even today, when they are so much better understood.\textsuperscript{32} The question of the general principles to be applied has long been and still is controversial. Moreover, in the translation of a religious document the difficulties are especially acute.

The task the LXX translators undertook was, then, a difficult one in any case, but, in addition, it was entirely without precedent.\textsuperscript{33} They had no theories to guide them, or any of the aids which a modern translator takes for granted. They did the best they could, but the techniques they employed were inadequate. It is clear that they failed to overcome many of the problems of translation. Although some conventions were developed,\textsuperscript{34} we find that different translators (or groups of translators) used widely differing methods: the LXX exhibits a variety of styles of translation, from the free and paraphrastic to the painfully literal. In cases of difficulty the translators from time to time resorted to a mechanical, and practically meaningless, rendering, leaving the reader to make what he could of it.\textsuperscript{35}

All this goes to show that the supposition underlying Gehman's argument is unfounded: that is, the assumption that the translators always used the kind of Greek that would seem normal

32. See on the whole subject E.A. Nida, Toward a Science of Translating, with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating, Leiden, 1964, esp. 2ff.; cf. Rabin, op.cit. 4f., where the fundamental reasons for the difficulty of translation are brought out very clearly.


Rabin suggests (21) that the translators found a model for their task in the 'day-to-day oral translation activity of the commercial and court dragoman'. A similar suggestion was made by Bickerman, op.cit. 16.

34. Some of these are examined by P. Katz, 'Zur Übersetzungs-
\textsuperscript{technik der Septuaginta', Die Welt des Orients II.3 (1956) 267-73 It has often been noted that the Pentateuch seems to have been used as a guide by later translators, see e.g. I.L. Seeligman, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, Leiden, 1948,45; cf. Rabin, op.cit. 22

35. Cf. Rabin, op.cit. 23f. Flashar, Rabin notes, coined for such renderings the term 'Verlegenheitsübersetzung', 'a mechanical translation of embarrassment'.

to their audience. Not only were they unable to do so, given the methods with which they worked, but what is more, it is probable that they often did not even try.\footnote{36} In many of the books it seems that the translators deliberately chose to produce a version that preserved the flavour of the original. Certainly it is generally agreed that in most books fidelity to the original was their primary aim. We ought not to assume that the peculiar Greek which resulted was felt to be normal either by the translators or by their audience. In sum, as Barr has said, "to make sense" in an ancient biblical translation meant something different from making sense in daily language.\footnote{37}

It is relevant to notice that other, more recent translators of the OT also did not succeed in avoiding Hebraic uses and constructions. In the AV, as is well known, there are numerous instances of Hebrew influence.\footnote{38} Similarly, attention has been drawn to the Hebraisms in the German Bible,\footnote{39} and in a Modern Greek translation of the Pentateuch made in 1547.\footnote{40} These parallels show that it is at least unnecessary to posit the existence of a living Hebraic Greek in order to account for the Hebraisms of the LXX version.

So far I have spoken mostly of Gehman's argument for a 'Jewish-Greek', but mention must also be made of Turner. As was noticed earlier, he has supported Gehman's view.\footnote{41} He is apparently in full agreement with Gehman's main argument, and offers

\footnote{36. Cf. Moulton's remark, Gramm. II 17, that 'the Hebraisms of the LXX were very often conscious sins against Greek idiom, due to a theory that words believed to be divinely inspired must be rendered so that every detail had its equivalent'. Similarly Bickerman, \textit{op.cit.} 26.}

\footnote{37. J. Barr, 'Common Sense and Biblical Language', \textit{Biblica} XLIX (1968) 379 (criticizing Hill's acceptance of Gehman's argument).}


\footnote{39. Deissmann, \textit{BS} 177.}

\footnote{40. Psichari, \textit{Essai} 194.}

\footnote{41. Above p.13 and n.6.}
in addition a variety of subsidiary arguments. These, in my opinion, are quite unconvincing, and in no way provide an answer to the objections we have been considering. We cannot go into all of Turner's points in detail, but one or two call for special mention.

One of Turner's arguments is as follows. Having stated his opinion that the language of the OT translators and the NT writers was 'a living dialect of Jewish Greek' (p.45), he goes on to observe some of the distinctive features of Biblical Greek. He notes the specialized Christian meanings of words like 'brother', 'fellowship', 'worship', 'truth', etc. The change in use in many words is due (he remarks) to the Greek OT. 'Thus, Christians and Jews made "opinion" mean splendour, "to bind" mean to forbid, "languages" mean nations, "to confess" mean to praise, ... "to regret" mean to repent (religiously)' (p.47).

He then goes on: 'All such words are important. By contrast, the light shed by the papyrus finds is negligible, almost restricted to words such as milk and ideas such as accountancy, wills, receipts, deposits, and beggars' collecting-bags.'

Now no one would dispute that there are many Biblical terms upon which the papyri shed little light, and that these are in many instances terms which one would call 'important'. It is quite true that the papyri are concerned with everyday matters such as accountancy and with comparatively humble objects like beggars' collecting-bags. But to conclude from this that the language of the Biblical writings is a separate dialect is false logic, depending on the deceptive use of the word 'important'. Of course 'worship', 'truth', 'splendour', and the like are important words, but in what way? Clearly, they are important from the religious and ethical point of view. But for the linguistic question we are dealing with their importance in that respect is irrelevant. For determining the relationship between the 'secular' Koine and the Greek of the LXX and NT no word is intrinsically more important than any other. It is as if one were to say that for the purpose of establishing the affinities between British and American English it is useless to point to

42. ET LXXVI (1964-5) 44-8.
the fact that 'milk' occurs in both, because 'milk' is not an 'important' word. And it is to be remembered that the greater part of any language is made up of words for rather insignificant ideas and objects. No language, not even that spoken by the Jews, consists solely of theologically important terms. The Jews, too, had occasion to speak of milk, wills, receipts, and deposits.

On another occasion Turner supports his contention that 'there was a distinguishable dialect of spoken and written Jewish Greek' with this statement: 'Certainly it was not artificial. Biblical Greek is so powerful and fluent, it is difficult to believe that those who used it did not have at hand a language all ready for use.\(^{43}\) It is plainly useless to enter into discussion about this. One can only express the opinion that a subjective argument of this sort is of no value whatever for our question.

Finally, a point to which Turner keeps returning: the hypothesis that the Koine had itself been extensively influenced by Semitic idiom and that this explains why so many 'Semitisms' can be paralleled in the papyri.\(^{44}\) Turner clearly favours this idea, even though he admits the force of Moulton's objections to it. In Turner's opinion 'the question of Jewish influence on the Koine ... has not yet been met'.\(^{45}\) To my mind, however, Moulton has long since convincingly refuted this extraordinary theory.\(^{46}\) It is of course not to be denied that some words, and perhaps uses and expressions, were borrowed into Hellenistic Greek from one or other of the Semitic languages. But there is not the slightest evidence that the Koine as a whole had been subject to extensive Semitic influence. Turner's approval of this theory seems to be based on the wish that it might be so,

\(^{43}\) Grammatical Insights 183.
\(^{44}\) NTS I (1954-5) 222ff., ET LXXVI (1964-5) 47, Grammatical Insights 184.
\(^{45}\) Grammatical Insights 184.
not on any satisfactory evidence for it. The only argument he can offer in its support is the improbable assertion that 'the Greek Bible and the synagogues of the Dispersion had a great influence on the world of Hellenism, not solely in Egypt and not on Jews and proselytes exclusively'.

That the LXX translators frequently reproduce Hebrew idiom by literal rendering of their original is, as we have seen, well known. It is natural that such Hebraisms should have been emphasized, since they are the most noticeable characteristics of LXX Greek. But this is in fact only one side of the picture. The other is that the translators also fail to reproduce the idiom of the original in many places. I am not referring to instances in which this is due to misunderstanding, interpretation, or free paraphrase, in all of which the sense as well as the idiom of the original is altered. The examples I mean are those in which the translators avoid rendering a Hebrew use or expression by the obvious literal equivalent, rendering instead, but without changing the sense, into idiomatic Greek; in other words, examples in which they avoid using a Hebraism where one might have been expected. The extent of this avoidance of Hebrew idiom and its significance for our question have not, I believe, been fully appreciated.

47. Grammatical Insights 184; similarly NTS I (1954-5) 223, where T. adds the extravagant claim that 'the Bible has always and everywhere exerted the greatest influence, not on thought only, but also on language'.

48. The argument presented here has been anticipated to some extent by Deissmann. He noted, BS 164f., that the translators do not always imitate Hb. idioms with ρ, and saw that this was a strong argument against supposing that they had a Semitic 'genius of language' lying behind their use of Greek. He did not, however, observe the wide extent of the phenomenon. Deissmann's remarks here seem to have been generally overlooked.

It has of course often been noticed that the translators render the same Hb. word in a great variety of ways (see e.g. Swete, Introd. 328f., Gooding, The Account of the Tabernacle 8f., 20), and that there is much variation between free and literal rendering (see e.g. Gehman himself, Textus V [1966] 125), but the relevance of these features to the question of 'Jewish-Greek' has not been brought out.

Moule, Idiom Book 187f., interestingly notes some 'obvious "Semitisms"' that are not represented in the NT, but draws no conclusion.
A good example to begin with is

\textbf{Ge. 43.27} ἡρώτησεν δὲ αὐτοὺς Πῶς ἔχετε;

The expression found in MT is of course a common Hebrew idiom. It could easily have been rendered literally.\(^{49}\) Yet the translators turn it into idiomatic Greek. I find it difficult to see how anyone who spoke a Hebraic Greek, in which this Hebrew idiom would surely have been current, could have refrained from a literal rendering here.

Other examples of this phenomenon are to be found throughout the Pentateuch. Indeed, they are so numerous that we can notice only a small selection here.

A literal rendering of \(τὸ \\) is also avoided in

\textbf{Ge. 43.23} εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς "Ἰλεως ύμῖν, μὴ φοβεῖσθε

\begin{align*}
43.27 \text{ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς } & \text{Εἰ ύπαίνεις ὁ πατήρ υμῶν . . . ;} \\text{καὶ εἴπετε αὐτοῖς } & \text{εἰ ύπαίνεις ὁ πατήρ υμῶν . . . ;} \\
43.27 \text{ καὶ εἴπεν αὐτοῖς } & \text{Εἰ ύπαίνεις ὁ πατήρ υμῶν . . . ;}
\end{align*}

\textbf{Ex. 4.18} Βάδιζε ύπαίνων

αὐτοῖς

\begin{align*}
18.7 \text{ καὶ ἡσπάσαντο ἀλλήλους } & \text{ρωσταὶ ζῆν -φυλήν ς \ θεόν . . . ;} \\
18.7 \text{ καὶ ἡσπάσαντο ἀλλήλους } & \text{ρωσταὶ ζῆν -φυλήν ς \ θεόν . . . ;}
\end{align*}

In this last example we see that the translators also avoid the Hebrew idiom used for describing reciprocal action. There are other instances of this:

\begin{align*}
\textbf{Ex. 14.20} \text{ καὶ οὐ συνέμιζαν ἀλλήλους } & \text{λογίας -κριν \\ τὸ -ἔλεγον . . . ;} \\
\textbf{Ge. 42.28} \text{ καὶ ἔταραχθέντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες } & \text{τιθέρας αὐτοῖς \ ἐκὰτερ . . . ;} \\
\end{align*}

Similarly \textit{Ge. 15.10, Ex. 25.20, 26.3,5.}

---

\(^{49}\) As it is e.g. in \textit{1 Kii. 25.5 καὶ ἐρωτήσατε αὐτοῦ . . . εἷς ἐξ ἐπίθουν (but note that even here the translator has refrained from a literal rendering of \(γ防水\)). Other examples of literal rendering of this idiom: Thackeray, \textit{Gramm. 40}.\)
Similarly Ex. 16.15, 26.17.\(^{50}\)

Hebrew expressions involving νῦν are, we know, often rendered literally, but not always. Consider for example

Ge. 19.8 χρησασθε αύταις, καθά ἂν ἀρέσκῃ ύμίν

Similarly Ge. 16.6.

De. 4.19 καὶ μὴ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν

Similarly Ge. 33.5.

Ge. 48.17 βαρύ αὐτῷ κατεφάνη

45.5 μηδὲ σιλήρον ύμῖν φανήτω

In the same way νῦν in expressions of age is often not translated literally. καὶ-νῦν is rendered some 25 times by ἐνιαύσιος, as e.g. in Nu. 6.12 ἀμνὸν ἐνιαύσιον - καὶ κατόρθωσεν. καὶ-νῦν is rendered ten times by μηνιαίος (Le. 27.6, Nu. 3.15, etc.). In other instances the translators use a compound of a numeral and -ετας,\(^{51}\) as e.g. in

Le. 27.3 ἄπο ἐκκοσαετοῦς ἕως ἐκκοσαετοῦς

Other similar examples are found in Le. 27.5,6,7, Ex. 30.14, Nu. 1.3, 14.29, Ge. 17.17.\(^{52}\)

---

50. For full details of LXX renderings of Hb. reciprocal expressions see Johannessen, Präpositionen 374ff.
51. Such formations are normal Gk., attested since Class. time
52. Cf. Deissmann, BS 164f.
Out of the many other examples of non-literal rendering of a Hebrew phrase or expression I mention only the following:

**Nu. 24.1** κατα το ειωθος
κοιμηθηκα

**Ex. 5.13** συντελειτε τα έργα τα καθηκοντα καθ' ημεραν
κελι μετακειτε βρει-τα ημεραν

**Ge. 19.14** έδοξεν δε γελοιαζειν
για κοιμηθηκα

**Le. 13.23** έαν δε κατα χώραν μεινη το τηλαυγημα

**De. 29.10** άπο δυσκολοποιου υμων και εως υδροφορου υμων
μετα αναθεναι τους μηδενες

The renderings of individual words are equally significant. Take, for example, the way παρη is translated in the following:

**Nu. 14.40** άνεβησαν εις την κορυφη του ορους
δονοι αλ-ρα-χα-ρα

Here, and in about 15 other instances where the context requires it, the translators render παρη by the normal Greek word for 'summit'.

**Le. 5.24** και άποτεισσει αυτο το αεσφαλαυν
ωλθη αλ-χα-ρα

Similarly **Nu. 4.2, 5.7, 31.26,49.**

**Nu. 1.16** χιλιαρχοι Ισραηλ
ρα-ζη-ιρ-ιρ-ιλ

**Ex. 30.23** το ανθος σμυρνης εκλεκτης
ρα-ζη-μα-μα

**Nu. 10.10, 28.11** έν τας νουμηνιας (υμων)
ντας τας νουμηνιας

53. An established Gk. idiom for 'remain in place', see below p.35.
Other examples, selected at random, are:

**Ge. 28.11** ἐδυ γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος

Similarly **Le. 22.7, De. 23.12**.

**De. 25.13** οὐκ ἔσται ἐν τῷ μαρσίππῳ σου στάθμιον καὶ στάθμιον, μέγα ἢ μικρόν

**Ex. 21.18** [έαν] πατάξῃ τις τὸν πλησίον ..., καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ, κατακλιθῇ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην

κατακλίνω pass. is idiomatic Greek for 'take to one's bed' (see LSJ s.v.I).

I would draw attention finally to a type of rendering that is slightly different from those we have noticed, but no less significant. Let us take as an example

**Ge. 19.20** οἶδο; ἡ πόλις αὕτη ἐγγύς τοῦ καταφυγεῖν με ἕκει

Why have the translators used καταφεύγω, instead of the more literal equivalent φεύγω? The latter could easily have been used (ὅτι is of course often rendered by φεύγω); no Hebraism would have resulted. The explanation is found in the fact that καταφεύγω, rather than φεύγω, is the idiomatic Greek word for 'flee for refuge'. The translators, instead of rendering mechanically, have used exactly the 'right word' for this context. This clearly suggests that the idiom they were accustomed to was that of normal Greek.

Some other examples of the same kind are as follows:

**Ge. 22.3** παρέλαβεν δὲ μεθ' ἐαυτοῦ δύο παιδάς

παραλαμβάνω, not λαμβάνω, is idiomatic Greek for 'take (someone)
along’. 55 ἕνεκα is rendered in the same way in eight other instances.

Ge. 29.33 καὶ προσέδωκέν μοι καὶ τοῦτον
καταβάω is idiomatic Greek for 'complain' (against a person),
'appeal for help'.

De. 31.8 καταβαθήσεται κατά σοῦ πρὸς κύριον
καταβάω is idiomatic Greek for 'complain' (against a person),
'appeal for help'.

De. 24.15 καὶ οὖ καταβαθήσεται κατά σοῦ πρὸς κύριον
καταβάω is idiomatic Greek for 'complain' (against a person),
'appeal for help'.

Ex. 4.12 καὶ συμβιβάσω σε ὃ μέλλεις λαλῆσαι
The last two examples are particularly instructive. μέλλω
would scarcely have been used here, where it is not required by
the Hebrew, by anyone not at home in normal Greek.

55. See e.g. Hdt. 6.73, 9.5, and Bauer.
56. A number of others, but by no means a complete list, are
collected in Appendix I, p.150.
accidentally, as it were, fell into normal Greek in those places. But there can be no doubt that idiomatic renderings are much too common to be explained in this way.

My examples have been taken only from the Pentateuch. But the argument cannot be seriously affected by this limitation. It is very likely that similar examples are to be found elsewhere in the LXX. But even if this should not be so, the fact that there are such examples in the Pentateuch is a serious obstacle to the hypothesis of a 'Jewish-Greek' dialect. If it is admitted that the translators of the Pentateuch did not speak such a dialect it becomes difficult to maintain its existence at all.

It is clear from the arguments we have considered that a satisfactory case for regarding the LXX as a specimen of 'Jewish-Greek' has not been made out. To answer the question as put at the beginning of this chapter: in order to account for the peculiarities of LXX Greek it is sufficient to refer to the fact that the work is a translation, and unnecessary to posit the existence of a living 'Jewish-Greek' dialect.

I would emphasize, however, one final point. That there were some features peculiar to the Greek of Hellenistic Jews is not to be denied. Without doubt their Greek included a number of terms for specifically Jewish ideas and objects. Loan-words like σάββατα and πάσχα are obvious examples, and others of various kinds could easily be added. Moreover, it is probable that the 'translation language' which resulted from translation of the OT into Greek exerted an influence on the spoken language of Jews, particularly in regard to religious terminology.57 The special uses of words like διαθήκη and δόξα, and terms like ἱλαστήριον and κιβωτός are likely to have become current in their speech. They may also have used certain Semitizing expressions or idioms found in the LXX. What I would deny is that such features were anything like extensive enough to justify regarding the language of the Jews as a dialect separate from ordinary Greek.

57. Cf. Rabin, op.cit. 10f.: 'In the receptor language, the translated text is a piece of literature like any other ... and its particular usages ... have the average chance of becoming part of the language'. Cf. Moulton, Proleg. 13, Deissmann, BS 69f.
CHAPTER III
THE VOCABULARY OF THE PENTATEUCH:
A GENERAL SURVEY

There are, we have seen, good reasons for not accepting the view that the Greek of the LXX was a living 'Jewish-Greek' dialect. We can now turn to the consideration of evidence on the positive side; that is, the evidence for regarding the Greek of the Pentateuch as essentially the Greek of its time. To assemble this evidence in full would require a detailed study of the entire vocabulary (and ideally morphology and syntax would be examined as well). It is clearly not possible to undertake such a complete examination here. Nor indeed is it necessary. A study of selected examples of various kinds provides as strong an indication of the affinities of the Pentateuch vocabulary as an exhaustive study. The parts of the vocabulary to be examined will be explained as we proceed.

In this chapter, however, I propose to make a brief survey of the whole vocabulary. The words and uses will be grouped on the basis of their attestation, and examples representative of each group will be discussed. A general picture of the Pentateuch vocabulary will thus be given, before we proceed to the detailed study of particular parts of it.

Our knowledge of the affinities of the Pentateuch vocabulary is governed primarily by attestation. We are dependent on whatever remains of the Greek vocabulary happen to have survived from widely differing periods and places. This evidence necessarily gives an incomplete picture. We do not have what, ideally would be needed for a full understanding of the Pentateuch vocabulary: that is, a large body of evidence of the language from the same time and place as the Pentateuch.

It is best, then, to begin by grouping the words and uses of the vocabulary on the basis of their present attestation. We can then go on to consider what inferences need to be made about their currency in Egyptian Greek of the third century B.C.
For many words, of course, to discover what attestation is available is not an easy matter, since we are largely dependent on the often incomplete material assembled by the dictionaries. More will be said of this later. Here I have necessarily had to rely on Bauer, MM, and above all LSJ. Though the limitation must be borne in mind it is not likely to vitiate the main results of this survey.

The words and uses comprising the vocabulary of the Pentateuch fall naturally into two major groups, depending on whether or not they are attested outside Biblical and related literature. Among 'related literature' I include not only the apocryphal books, the Apostolic Fathers, and the like, but also the writings of Aristeas, Philo, and Josephus. In fact an occurrence of a word or use in any of these last three authors may be as good attestation as any, depending on the circumstances in which it is used. For this brief survey, however, it is best to include them with the Biblical literature, since it is always possible to argue that they have adopted the word or use from the Greek Bible. In some cases they have obviously done so.

The two main groups will in turn be divided, so that the whole scheme is as follows:

I. Words and uses attested outside Biblical and related literature
   (a) attested first in Classical Greek, with or without later attestation
   (b) attested only in Hellenistic Greek

II. Words and uses attested only in Biblical and related literature
   (a) likely to be normal Greek
   (b) likely to be peculiar to Biblical Greek

I. (a) A considerable part of the Pentateuch vocabulary consists of words and uses that go back to Classical Greek. Obviously, many of these will be everyday words that occur frequently in all periods and whose history is easy to trace. Words such as ἔχω, ὄνομα, μέγας, οὐδος, and ὅτι remained part of the ordinary post-Classical vocabulary and are naturally common in both the Pentateuch and documents contemporary with it. It
would be superfluous to illustrate this well-known, basic element at any length.

There are also a large number of less common words and uses that are attested first in Classical Greek. The later attestation of these varies greatly from word to word. Frequently the only post-Classical examples so far recorded are in Koine writers, sometimes two or three centuries later than the Pentateuch. This is the case for example with ἄγροικος, Ar., Pl., et al., then D.H. (i B.C.); δασύτιους, Cratin. and other comic poets, Arist., then Babr. (ii A.D.), Plin. (i A.D.), Eutecnius (?); λιμαγχονέω, Hp., Antisth., then Gal. (ii A.D.); μετάφρενον, Hom., Pl., Arist., then Luc., Ruf. (both ii A.D.), Hld. (iii A.D.).

In other instances there is evidence from authors closer in time to the Pentateuch, but as yet nothing from papyri or inscriptions. So for example with ἄφρασται in the sense of 'retinue', Hdt., X., then Plb. (ii B.C.) (also N.T., Ph., J.); σποδιά, Hom., etc., then Call. (iii B.C.), and later writers.

It is common also to find that what evidence there is from papyri and inscriptions comes from much later than iii B.C. Examples are ἁναίδης, Hom., Ar., etc. in Classical Greek, Diph. (iv/iii B.C.), then in an inscription of i A.D. and a papyrus of ii A.D.; Ἀμφάσιος, Hom., Hes., etc., papyri and inscriptions of i A.D. and later (also Aristeas, Ph.); κύμα, Hom., etc., Thphr., Luc. and other Koine writers, papyri of ii A.D. and later (also Aristeas, Ph., J.).

There are also some instances of a word or use apparently not attested elsewhere at all in post-Classical Greek, though such examples are uncommon. Thus e.g. ἄνυος in the sense of 'trough' (for watering cattle) has been found apart from the Pentateuch only in h. Merc.; οἰκέτης in the sense of 'household slave' only in Hp., S., E.; τερατοσκόπος only in Pl., Arist.

Unless there is a special reason for thinking otherwise, examples of this kind ought to be assumed to have formed part of the vocabulary of third century Greek. Though they may not have been in everyday use (some certainly were not), there is every likelihood that they were part of the Greek vocabulary of that

1. The exact references are to be found in LSJ and Bauer.
time and could just as well be used by the Pentateuch transla-
tors as by anyone else. Many of them are words for uncommon
ideas and it need cause no surprise that their attestation is
somewhat meagre. Certainly it is not surprising that many old
words do not appear in our iii B.C. documents, whose range of
subject-matter is limited.

However, many of the somewhat less common words and uses
found in the Pentateuch and attested first in Classical Greek
are in fact attested in iii B.C. papyri. The number of examples
in this category is considerable and it is worth while noticing
them at some length. In Appendix II (p.152) I have collected as
many as possible, though the list is not meant to be exhaustive.
It is quite certain that a full investigation, such as might be
undertaken by a lexicon, would bring to light many other ex-
amples. There is also much scope for illustrating from contem-
porary documents the various Classical phrases and constructions
used in the Pentateuch. I mention only γάμον ποιέω, διαβαίνω
εἶς, διατελέω + participle, ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχω, ἰλεως γίνομαι,
καταχέω + gen., δοῦς βασιλική, παύομαι + participle, στερεά
πέτρα, συμβαίνω + acc. and inf. and other constructions, ὑπακούω
+ gen., + dat., all of which are attested in iii B.C. documents.

Examples of this kind are clearly important evidence for
the close connexion between the Pentateuch vocabulary and that
of contemporary Greek.

Of special interest in that part of the vocabulary which
goes back to Classical Greek are the many idiomatic expressions
and uses with which the translators show familiarity. These
have not received much notice in discussions of the nature of
LXX Greek. Yet they give, I suggest, an important indication of

---

2. The question of poetic words is rather difficult, and it is
wise to be very cautious in labelling any word as 'poetic'.
Many words that were apparently poetic in Attic appear in ordi-
nary usage in the Koine and it seems clear that they came into
the Koine from other dialects, esp. Ionic. One must, above all,
not assume that the use by a Koine writer of a 'poetic' word is
a reminiscence of a Classical author. Cf. in general Thumb,
Hellenismus 216 ff.

3. These examples are taken from LSJ and MM, in which the
exact references may be seen.
the translators’ intimacy with Greek idiom, an intimacy that
accords badly with the view that they spoke and wrote a dis­
tinguishable dialect of Semitized Greek.

In Le. 13.23, for example, the translators write ἐάν δὲ κατὰ χώραν μείνῃ τὸ τηλαύγημα καὶ μὴ διαχέηται, rendering MT
κατὰ κατὰ τὴν διαρκείαν τὴν ἡλικίαν—καὶ κατὰ χώραν μένω, 'remain in
place', is an established Greek idiom, attested for example in
Hdt. 1.169, 8.108, Th. 4.26, Ar. Eq. 1354. As can be seen, it
is far from a word-for-word rendering of the Hebrew, though it
reproduces the meaning of the Hebrew perfectly. The translators
can have used such an expression only because it was familiar to
them in the language that they were accustomed to speak. Simi­
lar remarks apply to Ge. 31.35 μὴ βαρέως φέρε, κύριε, MT
βαρέως φέρω, 'take (something)
ill', 'become annoyed', is idiomtic Greek, found also e.g. in
Hdt. 3.155, Plb. 15.1.1.

Many of the examples are adverbial phrases, such as διὰ
κενῆς, 'to no purpose', Le. 26.16 (MT ἡκτὶ ), often in Classical
Greek, e.g. Ar. V. 929, and also iii B.C. papyri, e.g. Phib.
66.5 (228 B.C.); κατὰ μόνας, 'alone', Ge. 32.17 (MT ἒρι ), e.g.
Th. 1.32, Is. 7.38, Men. Fr. 722.1; ἴσον ἴσω, 'in equal propor­
tions', Ex. 30.34 (MT ἔστιν ἴσα ), e.g. Ar. Pl. 1132, Hr. Epid. 2.5.1.

Among idiomtic uses of words, the following may be men­
tioned: ἀλίσκομαι in the technical legal sense of 'be convicted',
D., Pl., etc., found in Ex. 22.8 καὶ ὁ ἀλοῦς διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποτείσει διπλούν τῷ πλησίον (MT μήλα καὶ ἦρι Θεοῦ Ῥωμαίοις , al.; τελέω pass., 'be initiated',
'have oneself initiated' (into the mysteries of a god, dat.),
Ar., Pl., Hdt., etc., Nu. 25.3 καὶ ἐτελέσθη Ἰσραὴλ τῷ Βεβαλφεγωρ
(MT ἔστιν ), similarly 25.5.

The translators' handling of verbs compounded with prepo­
sitions, whose senses tend to be varied and idiomatic, is
similarly indicative of their familiarity with Greek usage. A
good example is ἀφίστημι. This is used in the Pentateuch in a
variety of senses, all of which are established in Classical
Greek. I. trans.: 'cause to revolt', e.g. De. 7.4 ἀποστήσει
γὰρ τὸν υἱὸν σου ἀπ'έμοι, καὶ λατρεύσει θεοὶς έτέροις. II.
intrans.: (i) 'stand back, aloof' (from), Nu. 16.27 ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς Κορε κύκλῳ (ii) 'withdraw', 'depart' (from a place), e.g. Ge. 12.8 καὶ ἀπέστη ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος (iii) 'withdraw' (from an activity), Nu. 8.25 καὶ ἀπὸ πεντηκονταετοῦ ἀπόστησεται ἀπὸ τῆς λειτουργίας (iv) 'rebel', 'revolt', e.g. Ge. 14.4 εἶτα ἐδούλευον τῷ Χοδολλογομορ, τῷ δὲ τρισκαί- δεκάτῳ ἐτεί ἀπέστησαν (v) 'shrink, abstain (from), Ex. 23.7 ἀπὸ παντὸς ρήματος ἀδίκου ἀπόστηση. Classical examples of these uses can be seen in LSJ. It is to be noted that the translators' use of this word has nothing to do with systematic representation of any Hebrew word or words: in each of the examples quoted here ἀφίστημι renders a different Hebrew word.

A particularly good illustration of the translators' familiarity with idiomatic Greek is afforded by verbs for washing. As is well known, Greek has three words for the idea, λούω, νίπτω (earlier νίζω), and πλύνω, each being used in a different way. It is generally said that λούω is used of washing the whole body, νίπτω of parts of the body, especially the hands and feet, πλύνω of clothes. This description, though not incorrect as far as it goes, is inadequate, as we shall see. Before turning to the Pentateuch it will be worth while to try to describe their usage more accurately.

λούω presents no difficulty. It is used of washing the whole body, especially in the middle voice: 'wash oneself', 'bathe'.

νίπτω mostly describes washing of parts of the body, but it is also used of things: a table (with sponges) Hom. od. 1.112 οἱ δ’ αὐτὲ ὀπόγονοι ... τραπέζας νίζον καὶ πρότιθεν, a brick Theoc. 16.62 ὅθαι νίζειν δολεράν διαειδέει πλίνθον, a wooden

4. Viz. ὕπ τι hi., ἥπ τι ni., κῆρτ τι hi., בּשׁ qal, רֵם qal, קַשׁ qal, respectively.
5. See e.g. LSJ under all three words; TWNT IV 295 (Oepke). The description goes back to the ancient lexicographers: see e.g. Ammon. Diff. 274. Cf. Stephanus, Thes. Gr. Ling. s.v. πλύνω.
6. Noted by LSJ, s.v. fin., 'νίζω is sts. used of things', quoting Od. 1.112, ll. 16.229, and Theoc. 16.62.
statue E. το βρέτας νίψαι, σού δυγάντος ὤς, ἑρώ, a cup Hom. 11. 16.229 [δέπας] ἐνιψ᾽ ὑδατος κολήσσι δρόμου (compounds of νίπτω are also used of washing cups: Eub. 56.5 ἐκ-, Pherecr. 41 ἀπο-). In addition there is an instance in which this verb describes the washing of cattle in the sea: E. το 255 βούς ἱδρομεν νίψοντες ἐνάλια δρόσῳ. Finally, it is worth noting that νίπτω is the word used for washing something (blood, salt, etc.) off one's body, e.g. Hom. 11. 11.830 ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ δ᾽ αἶμα κελαινὸν νίζ᾽ ὑδατι λυαρὶ.

In the same way I find that πλύνω is by no means confined to the washing of clothes. It is in fact applied to a wide variety of objects, as follows: entrails Ar. eq. 160 τι μ', ὕγαθ', οὑ πλύνειν ἐὰς τὰς κοιλίας πωλείν τε τοὺς ἀλλάντας; Pl. 1168 καὶ πλύνε γε αὐτὸς προσελθόν τοὺς τάς κοιλίας, the tail and mane of a horse X. eq. 5.7 καὶ οὐρὰν δὲ καὶ χαίτην πλύνειν χρή (cf. 5.6 υδατι δὲ καταπλύνειν τὴν κεφαλὴν χρή), sand Arist. Mir. Ausc. 833 b.25 ταύτην [τῇν ἀμμον] δ᾽ οὶ μὲν ἀπλώς φοιλ πλύναντος κοιλίνυειν, 26, Thphr. Lap. 58, sesame Pcair. Zen. 562.19 (253 B.C.), flax PST 599.7 (iii B.C.), wool PEnt. 2.5 (218 B.C.), nets EV. Luc. 5.2, squill (the plant) Porph. νφ 34 (iii A.D.).

It is clear both that the traditional description is incomplete and misleading, and that it is unsatisfactory to try to distinguish νίπτω and πλύνω in terms of the objects washed. The distinction between them is to be sought rather in the type of washing each describes. I suggest that the above examples are adequately accounted for if we define the words as follows: νίπτω is 'to cleanse, rinse, by pouring, splashing, or wiping water upon', πλύνω 'to cleanse by agitating or rubbing in water'. The actions involved are different. νίπτω suggests merely the

7. The application of the verb to objects other than clothes is also implied by the use of πλυτός in Ἰπ. Ἀρτ. 36 τῷ ἀλήτῳ ... τῷ πλυτῷ, 'washed meal', Gal. 6.494 πλυτός ἄρτος, and πλύμα e.g. in Arist. Ηλ. 534b27 τῷ πλύμα τῶν ἰχθύων, 'water in which fish have been washed' (other examples in LSJ).

8. Hauck’s more comprehensive description in the same terms, TWNT IV 946, is still not satisfactory: 'Gk. πλύνειν applies to the washing of inanimate objects, νίπτειν to the partial washing of living persons, and λούειν or λούονται to full washing or bathing'.
application of water to the object washed; we think of cloths, bowls, and pouring from jugs. With πλύνω, on the other hand, a thorough scrub is implied. The action required to wash entrails sand, grain, and so on is essentially the same as that employed in washing clothes. The instance of νίπτω of the washing of cattle in the sea does not seem to me to be an exception. The cattle, I imagine, would be washed down by having the sea-water splashed, or perhaps poured, over them. When, however, one wants to describe the washing of a horse's tail and mane, πλύνω is the appropriate word, because they require the same sort of rubbing or kneading action as would be applied to clothes.

All three words occur in the Pentateuch, and are used for the most part in accordance with the traditional description. 

A convenient illustration is found in Le. 15.11 καὶ ὅσων ἐὰν ἄψηται ὁ γονόρυχος καὶ τὰς χεῖρας οὗ νένιπται, πλυνεῖ τὰ ἰμάτια καὶ λουσταὶ τὸ σῶμα ὑδατι.  

This fact by itself is a valuable indication of the translators' adherence to Greek usage. But there are also certain examples that are not accounted for by the usual description:

Le. 15.12 καὶ σκεῦος ὀστράκινον, οὗ ἄν ἄψηται ὁ γονόρυχος, συντριβήσεται· καὶ σκεῦος ἐξόλινον νιφήσεται ὑδατι καὶ καθαρὸν ἔσται  

Ex. 29.17 καὶ τὸν κριόν διχοτομήσεις κατὰ μέλη καὶ πλυνεῖς

9. This has of course been noticed before, e.g. by Hauck, TWNT IV 946.  

10. For other examples see Ex. 2.5, Nu. 19.7, De. 23.12 (λούομαι); Ge. 18.4, Ex. 30.18,19ff. (νίπτω); Ex. 19.10, Le. 14.8, Nu. 8.7 (πλύνω).  

11. νιφήσεται BA Fioa] πλυθησεται ek αρτ: πληθησεται d: νυφηςεται Mk*rell. (Brooke-McLean). It is difficult to know what value to attach to the reading of ek αρτ (and d, since πληθησεται can only be a mistaken spelling of πλυθησεται). I have assumed for the purpose of discussion that the majority reading νυφηςεται is the correct one. A.V. Billen, JTS XXVI (1924-5) 276, evaluated the groups dpt and ejsvz as 'of all the MSS least likely to give us the LXX in its earlier forms'. It is hard to explain how πλυθησεται might have arisen. Perhaps changes in the usage of νίπτω and πλύνω in the later Koine are behind it. In Mod. Gk. the latter has invaded the other's territory considerably (e.g. πλένω τὰ χέρια μου), see Swanson and AELEX., s.v. wash.
Our re-examination of νίπτω and πλύνω shows, however, that there is no reason to regard these examples as in any way contrary to Greek usage. They are clearly in accordance with the definitions I have proposed, but even if my definitions are not accepted, the examples noticed earlier provide satisfactory parallels to the Pentateuch examples. The use of νίπτω of the washing of a σκεύος ξυλινον (probably 'wooden vessel') may be compared with its use of washing a cup; and the examples of πλύνω, which are all alike, are closely paralleled by the two examples of πλύνω τάς κοιλίας in Aristophanes.

The translators, then, express the idea of 'wash' in strict accordance with idiomatic Greek. But we have still to consider how Greek usage compares with that of Hebrew in the expression of this idea. Greek divides up the field into three parts; does this division correspond to a similar division in Hebrew? If so, there would clearly be the possibility that the translators' careful observance of Greek idiom was encouraged, perhaps even brought about, by the similar structure of the Hebrew vocabulary. In fact, however, Hebrew and Greek usage do not coincide here, as is clear from a consideration of the Hebrew words and their renderings. Hebrew יָטֵל, usually of washing garments, is, as would be expected, uniformly rendered by πλύνω (c. 40 times). But the more general term יָטֵל , used of washing parts of the body, parts of sacrificial victims, and of bathing, is rendered at different times by all three Greek words: by λούω, λούομαι c. 29 times, by νίπτω c. 12 times, and by πλύνω 5 times (Ex. 29.17, 12. σκεύος is of course a vague word, like Heb. וּכ, which it here translates; it can be 'implement', 'utensil', or just 'thing', but the parallelism with σκεύος ὁστράκινον suggests that we should take it here as 'vessel'.

12.
In addition νίπτω twice renders ἕνω, 'rinse', 'wash off' (Le. 15.11,12). Although there are three Hebrew words involved, there is no exact correspondence between each of the Hebrew words and each of the Greek. Even the correspondence between πλύνω and ἁπατάω is not exact: πλύνω covers part of the area of ἕνω as well as that of ἁπατάω. It is therefore apparent that systematic representation plays no part in the way the translators use the three Greek words. They employ the word that is 'correct' according to Greek idiom independently of the underlying Hebrew.

The above is only a sample of the established idiomatic expressions and uses that appear in the translators' Greek. Others could certainly be added.

What gives added point to these examples is the fact that they are independent of Hebrew idiom. In none of them is there any possibility that the usage is due to literal rendering. It is of course possible to mention instances in which that is the case. For example, κάθημαι in Ex. 18.14, in the Classical sense (e.g. Pl. Ap. 35c) of 'sit as judge', renders Hebrew קנה. In cases of this kind literal representation of the Hebrew may be suspected, although in my view it is likely that the translators were quite familiar with the Greek use.

Old words and uses, then, formed an important element in the vocabulary of the Pentateuch translators. They were familiar with a wide range of words and uses that had been current since Classical times, including idiomatic uses and expressions. Although the attestation of such words and uses in post-Classical Greek varies greatly and it is often necessary to assume their currency in the translators' time, evidence in documents of the third century B.C. is in fact available for a substantial number of them, and these give a definite indication of the affinities between the translators' vocabulary and that of contemporary Greek.

(b) As is well known, in the transition from Classical

---

13. Note too that this Hb. word is not rendered consistently by one Gk. word: in its one other occurrence in the Pentateuch, Le. 6.21, ἕνω is translated by ἐκκλύζω, 'wash out' (only here in Pent.).
to Hellenistic Greek a large number of changes occurred in the language. Not the least of these changes were in vocabulary. Innovations in this respect were of two main types. Old words frequently developed new senses (not necessarily to the exclusion of earlier senses), and many new words, in the shape of new formations on existing stems and borrowings from outside Greek, came into use. Developments of the same kinds had of course taken place from time to time in the language throughout its history, but in the early Koine period they were especially numerous. Since these were the changes that had occurred in the Greek vocabulary of the translators' time, it is natural to find in their vocabulary a large number of words and uses attested only in Hellenistic Greek. Words and uses so attested do in fact form as important an element in the Pentateuch vocabulary as those going back to Classical Greek.

It must be remembered, of course, that attestation only in post-Classical Greek does not automatically establish that the word or use concerned is a new development in the Koine. The random nature of our evidence, especially for words we know would not be frequently used, makes it likely that a fair number of words and uses attested only late are in fact old; it is quite possible for an old word for an uncommon idea to have been preserved by chance only in a late author or document. In a number of cases it is not difficult to deduce that this must be so. στοιβάζω, for example, has been found, apart from the LXX, only in Lucian (ii A.D.) and a papyrus of ii/iii A.D.; yet διαστοιβάζω is found in Herodotus.

For the most part, however, words and uses so attested are undoubtedly new developments. We can often see some other indication, apart from the attestation, to this effect. Thus for example it may be observed that a particular sense is a natural semantic development from earlier senses, or that a certain formation is a more regular equivalent of an earlier form with an irregular, or for some other reason 'difficult', conjugation or declension. Similarly, where a given word is synonymous with an old one which shows signs of dropping out of use, it is likely that the former is a newcomer. There remain, of course, many doubtful cases. It is at times quite impossible to decide definitely whether a word or use is new in the Koine.
To distinguish new words and uses from old is not essential. After all, the distinction would have been felt in few cases by the ordinary speakers of the language. But it is a useful practical one for us. It is the neologisms of the Hellenistic period that are often most in need of analysis and illustration, whether one's main interest is the LXX vocabulary alone or the wider subject of the development of the Greek language as a whole.

The type of attestation outside Biblical and related literature of words and uses in this category varies greatly from one instance to another. As would be expected, in many cases we do not have the extensive evidence from the contemporary vernacular that is desirable.

Frequently the only parallels recorded are separated from the time of the Pentateuch by some centuries. Thus e.g. ἴχνος in the sense of 'route' has so far been recorded elsewhere only in a papyrus of ii A.D.; the formation ἁγαθοποιεῖτω, apart from Aristeas, only in S.E. (ii A.D.), Plot. (iii A.D.), and other late writers; βηρύλλιον only in D.S. (i B.C.); ὀλεθρεύω only in Vett. Val. (ii A.D.).

Other words appear once or twice in literature about the time of the Pentateuch or a little earlier and then not again until much later: e.g. γελοιάζω, Aristarch. (iii/iiv B.C.), then Plu. (i/iiv A.D.) and later writers; βρούχος, Thphr. (iv/iiv B.C.), Herod. (iii B.C.), then writers of iv A.D. and later; ἐκτρωμα, Arist. (iv B.C.), then Phryn. (i B.C.) (also Ph. and NT).

Some words are at present attested only once in a rather out-of-the-way text of uncertain date: e.g. χρατιζω once in Schol. Theocr. (LSJ Suppl.), ἔκτανθεύω once in the Greek Anthology (AP 7.618).

Moreover, as these examples illustrate, documentary evidence is often lacking. This makes it difficult to judge the currency of the word or use in the vernacular language. γελοιάζω, for example, is possibly a literary rather than vernacular word, if we are to judge by the examples so far known. When, on the other hand, documentary evidence is available it is often of later date than the Pentateuch. This is so for example with ἴχνος noted above, and κηνοτρόφος, subst., recorded in
Clearly, each example raises its own questions and will need individual attention for a final assessment of the relation of the Pentateuch vocabulary to the language of its time. Much will always remain uncertain. In some cases it may be that the translators were the originators of a certain word or use, which then found its way into the common vocabulary; or that they adopted and used frequently, because it was convenient for rendering a particular idea, a term that was not in fact as frequently used in contemporary Greek; or that the translators and some other writer independently created a certain formation, or put a word to a new use. These and perhaps other possibilities will sometimes have to be considered. But, on the whole, any attestation, even if rather remote, is likely to be an indication that the word or use concerned was a normal part of the Greek vocabulary of the translators' time. Usually no other interpretation is possible. The fact that a word or use was also employed by some other writer strongly suggests that both he and the translators knew of it from its currency in the language.

There are, however, in addition to examples like those we have just considered, a good many new Koine words and uses found in the Pentateuch that are well attested in contemporary documents. These examples are valuable for my purpose and it is upon them that attention will be concentrated in the next three chapters. There as many as possible will be examined in detail, with such contemporary evidence as I have been able to discover.

This selection has been made first of all for practical reasons: clearly the field of study has had to be limited in some way. This being so, there are two reasons for choosing this section of the vocabulary. First, that it illustrates better than almost all other sections the place of the Pentateuch vocabulary in the Greek language of its time. The words and uses concerned are recent innovations whose currency in the vernacular of the same time and locality as the Pentateuch can be demonstrated beyond doubt. The papyri, from which the main evidence comes, are almost all of Egyptian origin and can
mostly be accurately dated. Some are perhaps contemporary even to the year, since the bulk of our iii B.C. papyrus evidence dates from around the middle of the century. Although, as I have suggested, any attestation outside Biblical and related literature is useful, this evidence is clearly the best that could be hoped for, and makes the first claim on our attention.

Secondly, words and uses that are recent innovations of the Koine are for the most part more in need of elucidation than those whose usage is familiar from Classical Greek. The study of the former is therefore likely to be a more useful contribution to LXX lexicography, at least at its present early stage.

To limit the field of detailed study in this way does not mean that other parts of the vocabulary have been ignored. The purpose of this chapter is to give due weight to all parts of the vocabulary, including the evidence that might point in the opposite direction to my general thesis. It is this evidence that we have now to consider.

II. The second major group of words and uses in the Pentateuch consists of those that are not attested outside Biblical and related literature. The question naturally arises whether these were in fact peculiar to the Biblical vocabulary. As we shall see, there are reasons for thinking that many were not. But first it would be useful to consider certain limitations that affect any study of the Greek vocabulary, and are particularly important for this question.

The material collected by the standard dictionaries is incomplete. This is mostly well recognized, but needs emphasizing. LSJ's material, in particular, must be used with caution in any study of LXX vocabulary. It often happens that an occurrence that is important for the LXX has gone unnoted. Thus for example I have myself noted ἔτασμός, recorded by LSJ

---

14. These remarks are not intended as criticism of LSJ (though there is much in it that is open to criticism). A dictionary of its kind obviously cannot make an exhaustive collection of examples, or treat all the material that would appear in a dictionary specializing in the LXX. I wish only to make the point that it is essential for students of the LXX not to regard LSJ's collection as final.
only in the LXX, in *Antiatt.* 96 ύτασμόν: τόν ἔξετασμόν. μέρος in the sense of 'side', again noted by LSJ only in the LXX, is to be found not only in documents of iii B.C. and later but even in Herodotus (see pp. 74 f.). Similar examples are provided by the recent Supplement to LSJ, which now records other attestation for a number of words hitherto known only in Biblical and related literature: for example ἄτεκνόω, formerly only LXX and later versions, περιχαλκόω *Ex.* 27.6, σανιδωτός *Ex.* 27.8, all now attested in inscriptions. Cf. ἁφόρισμα, διάλευμα.

Again, my own investigations have brought to light a number of previously unrecorded occurrences of words in iii B.C. papyri. See for example γόμος (p.62), καταφυτευω (p.57), σύγμα (p.84), σιτομετρέω (p.98). Often such examples are not recorded even in Preisigke or Kiessling, and can be found only by systematic checking of the indexes to various papyrological publications.

Similarly, I find that ληνός in the sense of 'wine-press', which to judge by the examples mentioned by LSJ and Bauer is post-Classical, is in fact attested for Classical times by Is. Fr. 24 (ap. Poll. 7.151).

Of course some of the examples I have mentioned were not available for inclusion in the latest (9th) edition of LSJ, completed in 1940. But this does not affect the point that we must always allow for the possibility that information important for the LXX vocabulary is not recorded in LSJ. This applies to a lesser extent to Bauer's dictionary, which aims at completeness and is more recent (1957). However, its usefulness for the LXX is limited because many LXX words and uses (perhaps more than is generally realized) do not appear in the *NT*.

There is, then, always the possibility of finding parallels that have been previously overlooked. But in addition to this, we must bear in mind the possibility that texts as yet unpublished, and indeed undiscovered, may yield information of importance for a number of words. Professor E.G. Turner has pointed out that 'at least as many papyrus texts still await an editor as have been published', and, furthermore, that 'papyri are still being discovered in Egypt faster than scholars can
transcribe and edit them'. We cannot expect any startling discoveries affecting the LXX vocabulary in these documents, but there are likely to be at least some examples that will extend our knowledge of it.

Clearly we must be wary of placing too much confidence in what the dictionaries at present record. Nor is this all. Even when all the available evidence has been found, we have still to remember that chance has played an important part in the survival of evidence of the Greek language. As Bauer has put it (p.xvii), 'due allowance must be made for the chance which has preserved one word while allowing another to disappear', and he goes on to mention the case of προσευχή 'prayer', which is common in the Biblical literature but by 'pure accident' has come to light in only one pagan papyrus. 'If this had not turned up, we would have had another "vox biblica".'

Another instructive example is ὀρθρίζω. This word is used a number of times in the LXX and later versions, and once in the NT, but has not been found anywhere else except in the grammarians Moeris (p.272) and Thomas Magister (p.256). But the way in which they refer to it shows that its present attestation gives a quite inaccurate indication of its currency. Thus Moeris' remark is: ὀρθρεύει Ἄττικώς. ὀρθρίζει Ἑλληνικώς. It must be entirely due to chance that we have no other non-Biblical examples of the word, since Moeris would scarcely describe it in this way if it were confined to Biblical Greek.16

The point is well illustrated also by the many words that we know must have been in continuous use but yet are attested seldom and only at intervals. Take for example ζύμη, the word for 'yeast'. This is attested first in Aristotle, then apart from LXX and NT, only in papyri and writers (Plu., Ph., J.) of i and ii A.D. Clearly the word must have been more widely used in the Koine period than this attestation would suggest. But not only that: it is likely that it was established in Greek well before the time of Aristotle; it is probably fortuitous that there are no examples in any earlier remains of Greek.

These, then, are basic points to keep in mind in dealing with the part of the LXX vocabulary that is not at present attested outside Biblical and related literature. Before deciding that any word or use is peculiar to the Biblical vocabulary we must make allowance for the gaps in our knowledge of the Greek of the translators' time.

(a) Let us now look at some examples of words and uses that are likely to have been part of the normal Greek vocabulary, despite their present lack of attestation outside the Biblical writings. Although clearly each example is different and requires individual attention, a few examples of each of the main types will give a general idea of the words and uses that fall into this category.

A very common type is that in which the word concerned is a normal formation belonging to a well-attested group. Consider for example the noun πλινθεία, 'brickmaking', found so far only in the Pentateuch and Josephus. This belongs to a very large group of derivatives of πλίνθος, itself attested since Alcaeus (vii/vi B.C.). πλινθεύω and πλινθείον are both old words and are well attested also in iii B.C. There is therefore no reason to doubt that πλινθεία was normal Greek. Similarly διασάφησις (only LXX) is a normal formation from the verb, which is well attested in iii B.C. papyri.

It is probably accidental that these two words, and others like them, have not turned up elsewhere. But even if we had all the evidence and could see that διασάφησις, for example, had not been used anywhere else in Greek, it must be borne in mind that the form could have been used by any Greek speaker without his being conscious of coining a new term. Nor would his hearers have felt it as such. Any Greek speaker who needed a noun from διασάφεω would be likely to have employed διασάφησις.

17. Apart from an occurrence in Suidas in a different sense.
18. Cf. MM's comment on βδέλυγμα, which they were unable to parallel outside Biblical literature: 'The verb having appealed to the LXX translators as an excellent rendering of יִבְדָלְהָ and other Hebrew verbs, it was inevitable that when a derived noun was wanted the regular formation should have been adopted or coined. Probably any Greek writer who wanted to express the idea of τὸ ἐβδέλυγμένον would have done the same without hesitation.' How right they were is shown by the fact that the word has since been found by Bauer in Vit. Aesopi.
same applies to examples like καταδυναστεία, ἀσφαλίζω, λαξεύω, all of which are regular formations belonging to established groups. There is no reason to think that any of them gives an indication that the Pentateuch translators spoke an isolated form of Greek.

Naturally this argument must be used with caution. It is not applicable if there is any reason to think the translators (or the Alexandrian Jewish community) created the formation in order to describe a specifically Jewish idea or object; in other words, if the form appears to have been coined as a technical term. We shall presently see instances in which there can be no doubt that that is the case.

Somewhat similar considerations apply to words formed by composition. If a word so formed belongs to a common type, and there is nothing to suggest that it was created by the translators as a technical term, then it ought, in my view, to be accepted as normal Greek. A number of preposition compounds are obviously in this category. ἐκκαθαρίζω, for example, found only in the LXX, is the sort of compound that any Greek speaker might have used. καθαρίζω, equivalent to earlier καθαιρώ, is well established in the Koine (see Bauer, MM), and compounds with ἐκ- are of course readily formed in Greek. In addition, ἐκκαθαρίζω is analogous to ἐκκαθαίρω, which is as old as Homer. Similar remarks apply for example to διανήθω, ἐπικαταράομαι, and καταπρονομεύω.

In the same way a number of compounds of other types show signs of being normal Greek. Compounds with ἀρχι-, of which there are several found as yet only in the LXX, are a clear case: e.g. ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ, found only in Genesis. Considering the readiness with which compounds of this type were formed in Hellenistic Greek, and the fact that δεσμοψυλαξ is well attested from iii B.C. onwards, we can hardly regard the word as the property of the Genesis translator alone. Any writer wishing to express the idea of 'chief gaoler' would be likely to have used it. Indeed, it is probable in my opinion that this word was often used in the Greek of the translators' time, but has by

19. See MM s.v. ἀρχι-, Mayser, Gramm. I.iii 160f.
accident not been preserved outside the Pentateuch.\textsuperscript{20}

Sometimes it happens that the word for which we have no outside attestation is presupposed by a related formation that is so attested. For example the word λώμα, 'hem', 'fringe' (of uncertain origin) is not known apart from some half dozen occurrences in Ex. Yet the diminutive λωμάτιον is found in AP 11.210 (Lucill., i A.D.), implying a wider currency for λώμα than its present attestation suggests.

A number of uses as yet unattested outside Biblical and related literature are also likely, for one reason or another, to have been part of the normal Greek vocabulary.

One type is that in which the semantic development concerned is paralleled, and well attested, in another formation of the group. For example ὀλιγοψυχία, originally 'swooning' (Hp.), is found only in the LXX in the sense of 'faint-heartedness'. But the semantic development from 'be faint' to 'be dispirited' is amply attested in the verb (see p.76). It is therefore quite improbable that this use of the noun was peculiar to the translators' Greek. Similarly the use of παροίκως in the sense of 'sojourning', 'temporary residence', unattested outside the LXX, is parallel to the Koine usage of πάροικος with the meaning 'temporary resident', and παροικέω 'inhabit (a place), dwell, as a πάροικος' (see p.61).

The intransitive use in the active of certain verbs normally transitive is another, fairly common, type. For example, φλογίζω has so far been found (S. +) only with a transitive function in the active ('set on fire'); in Ex. 9.24 it is used intransitively ('burn', 'blaze') τὸ πῦρ φλόγιζον (MT ἐνάπηδον τῷ). Clearly this use of φλογίζω is not brought about by literal representation of Hebrew idiom; but more important, it is in accordance with a fairly widespread tendency in Greek for verbs originally used only transitively in the active to appropriate an intransitive function from the middle-passive voice.\textsuperscript{21} In the case of φλογίζω, moreover, the

\textsuperscript{20} Other ἀρχι- formations found in the Pentateuch but not attested outside Biblical literature are ἀρχι-δεσμώτης, -οινοχοία, -σιτοποιός, -στρατηγός (also J.), -φυλος.

\textsuperscript{21} Bl. DF §309.2.
development is analogous to that in the older word φλέγω, the intransitive use of which is found as early as Pindar. It would be incorrect, therefore, in my opinion, to regard this use of φλογίζω as peculiar to the translators' Greek. The same is true of a number of other words used in this way in the Pentateuch, such as καταψύχω, σκιάζω, σπερματίζω, and ύγιάζω.

Some unattested uses are natural semantic developments unconnected with Hebrew idiom that could have occurred almost at any time in Greek. For example, σκεπάζω is apparently used in the sense of 'conceal' in Ex. 2.2 (see p.77), a sense not attested outside the LXX. Yet the development from 'cover' to 'conceal' is a natural one and is paralleled in καλύπτω. Another example is the use of ἀλογος in the sense of 'not counted' in Nu. 6.12 αἱ ἡμέραι αἱ πρότεραι ἀλογοὶ ἔσονται (MT 19b). This use is not known elsewhere, but the etymology would lead us to expect such a sense in this word; and compare the sense 'unexpected' (i.e. 'not reckoned upon') in Th. 6.46 (LSJ s.v. III.1).

It is clear, then, that a number of the words and uses not attested outside Biblical and related literature are likely to have been part of the normal Greek vocabulary. The examples considered above are of necessity only a selection, representing the main types; many more could certainly be added. The total number of such examples forms a significant proportion of all the words and uses that would seem to be peculiar to Biblical Greek if we judged by their present attestation alone.

(b) Nevertheless, when all the examples like the above have been allowed for, there remain many words and uses that are undoubtedly peculiar to Biblical Greek. Although there is difficulty in deciding in some instances, those that are likely to be of this kind are for the most part easily recognized, and no one would wish to argue that they could be anything other than neologisms created by the Alexandrian Jewish community or the translators themselves in the course of their work.

22. Cf. the fluctuation in Eng. 'burn'.
23. Note the idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew.
24. These have not been systematically studied, but many examples have been noted before: see the works referred to above p.11, n.1.
Such neologisms mostly take the form of new uses. The most familiar type is that due to 'literalism'. Examples such as the Hebraistic use of ὀφθαλμός, στόμα, χείρ, πρόσωπον are well known. Others are οδόν as preposition 'towards' (~ ἄτυχος), οἰκοδομέω 'fashion', 'form' (~ ἄρχον), εὐρίσκω 'befall' (~ καυσώ), ἀρχή 'sum', 'total' (~ προέ),(ποιέω 'prepare' food (~ ἱεροτεύτω), σκέπτομαι 'select' (~ προέ, προε); and literal renderings of Hebrew expressions, such as πληρόω τας χείρας 'dedicate', 'consecrate', ἐπαιρώ πρόσωπον 'show favour', ζητέω τὴν ψυχὴν τινος 'seek to kill'.

Some new uses result from 'etymologizing' rendering of a Hebrew word, as e.g. κλητή subst. 'assembly' (~ κατακλή), πάν τὸ ἄνάστημα 'everything that had grown' (Ge. 7.23, ~ μόκος), ἀλήθεια (~ θεός), δήλωσις (~ Ω'-ΙΙ). Certain words undergo an extension or alteration of meaning through application to specifically Jewish objects: e.g. ἐπωμίς 'ephod', κιβωτός 'ark', μίτρα head-dress of the high priest, κράσπεδον 'tassel'. Similarly there are a number of theological terms that have acquired special 'Biblical' significations, as e.g. πίστις, δόξα, δικαιόω and derivatives, πονηρὸς and related words.25

The overdoing of a possible Greek use is another type that belongs here.26 A well-known case is ἰδοὺ (~ ἰδοὺ); similarly (ἐγ-)κάθημαι in the sense of 'dwell' (~ ἐγκαθιστά), and apodotic καί.

In a few instances the new use seems to be due to rendering by means of a word with a phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew word: e.g. μῶμος in the sense of 'defect' in a sacrificial victim, translating דָּם.27

The number of new formations that are likely to be peculiar to Biblical Greek is much smaller. Most formations unattested outside the Biblical literature are like the examples we have considered in the preceding section; i.e. they belong to well-attested groups or common types and do not seem to have

26. Moulton, Proleg. 11, Thackeray, Gramm. 29
27. Cf. Thackeray, Gramm. 37f.
been created as technical terms.

There are however some clear cases of formations that are likely to have been confined to the Biblical vocabulary. θυσιάστήριον 'altar', and θυσιάστηριον subst., of the lid on the ark of the covenant, were clearly coined as technical terms. Other possible examples of the same kind are ὀλοκάρπωσις, ὀλοκάρπωμα, θηριάλωτος, παράθεμα, άγιαστήριον.

In a number of instances it seems fairly clear that the formation has been created on the spot by the translators to meet a particular need. So e.g. ἀποκιδαρόω 'take the κίδαρις off' Le. 10.6, 21.10, σκληροκαρδία 'hardness of heart' De. 10.16. Some words of this type are plainly 'nonce-formations' unlikely to occur again: e.g. παράτης translating ναυ Ge. 14.13, πρωτοτοκεύω 'grant rights of first-born' (to) De. 21.16.

Finally there are a number of loan-words from Hebrew or Aramaic: the familiar σάββατα and πάσχα, and a few others such as γειώρας, γομορ, and χερουβ.

In this survey I have tried to bring into perspective all parts of the Pentateuch vocabulary. It has been possible only to consider a selection of examples, but these do give a fair indication of the various elements in it. It is clear that a very considerable part of the vocabulary is made up of well-attested words and uses, whether new in the Koine or surviving from Classical Greek. Although there are undoubtedly numerous words and uses peculiar to Biblical Greek, they must be considered in relation to the vocabulary as a whole. They in fact form only a small proportion of the total vocabulary.  

28. On this word see esp. Daniel, Recherches 367f.
29. For what it may be worth, an estimate of their extent may be given. I have counted roughly 450 words and uses unattested outside Biblical and related literature. Of these not more than half could be considered peculiar to the Biblical vocabulary. (The total number of words and uses in the vocabulary must be well over 6,000.)
The use of many old words in new senses is a well-known characteristic of the Koine. It is the purpose of this chapter to show that the vocabulary of the Pentateuch is in close agreement with many of the developments of this kind that had taken place by the third century B.C. The examples selected are those for which adequate evidence exists from the translators' own time.

Some words are examined in detail, others more briefly, with a note merely of the new sense, its occurrences in the Pentateuch, and one or two examples close in time and place to the Pentateuch. This briefer treatment has been given especially to the more straightforward examples and to those that are well known or have been considered fully by others. It has however been necessary to notice in this way some examples of which a more detailed treatment would be useful.

The words have been grouped as far as possible according to subject-matter. We begin with a number of agricultural terms. Such terms are often required in the Pentateuch, and are also of course very common in documents of the time.

παράδεισος

Originally a borrowing of a Persian word appears first in Greek in Xenophon, who uses it specifically of the parks or pleasure-grounds of the Persian kings and nobles. The two features of a παράδεισος mentioned by X. are trees of all kinds, ἀν. 2.4.14 ἑγγύς παραδείσου μεγάλου καὶ καλοῦ καὶ δασέος παντοίων δέντρων, cf. Oec. 4.14, and wild animals for hunting,


An. 1.2.7 ἐνταύθα Κύρῳ βασίλεια ἡν καὶ παράδεισος μέγας ἄγρίων
θηρίων πλήρης, ἃ ἐκείνος ἐθήρευεν ἀπὸ ἵππου, cf. e.g. Ἡ 4.1.15.
Presumably it also had, as the etymology suggests, a surrounding
wall, though X. never mentions one.

The word is used in a similar way in Thphr. Ἡ 4.4.1.

In the third century B.C. it had become an ordinary
agricultural term like κήπος, ἀμπελών, etc., having lost its
earlier restricted application. From the papyri of this time,
in which it is very common, its usage appears somewhat as
follows.

It is clear first of all that a παράδεισος was composed
chiefly of fruit-trees of various kinds, though it might, as the
following example shows, also contain vines. In PCair.zen. 33
(257 B.C.) the writer explains to Apollonius, who had sent men
to obtain fruit-trees, that he showed the men around the
παράδεισοι, (1.3) ... περιαγαγών πάντας τοὺς παραδείσους ἔδειξα,
and they took away with them a selection of fruit-trees and
vines. A detailed list of what they took is added. This names
fig-trees of six kinds, pomegranate, apricot, apple, and eleven
varieties of vine. Elsewhere olives also are frequently men-
tioned in connexion with παράδεισου, e.g. PCair.zen. 184.2
(255 B.C.) τὰ φυτὰ τῶν ἑλαών λαβέ ἔκ τε τοῦ παραδείσου τοῦ
ἡμετέρου καὶ ἐκ τῶν κήπων τῶν ἐμ Μέμωτε, cf. 125.2 (256 B.C.).

In addition trees other than fruit-trees might be planted
in a παράδεισος: in PCair.zen. 157.2 (256 B.C.) Apollonius
gives orders that firs are to be planted in the παράδεισος (and
elsewhere) on his estate: τῶν στροβίλων φύτευσον ἐξ ὅλου τοῦ
παραδείσου καὶ περὶ τὸν ἄμπελον καὶ τοὺς ἑλαώνας, and in
125.2 (256 B.C.) he commends Zenon's action in planting bay-
trees there. It is clear however that παράδεισοι were culti-
vated primarily for their produce rather than for decoration.
Cf. e.g. ppetr. 1.16.2.7(230 B.C.) τὰ γενήματα τῶν ὑπαρχόντων
μου παραδείσων, and OGI 90.15 (196 B.C.), PTeb. 5.53 (118 B.C.),
both quoted in MM.

παράδεισοι are mentioned frequently in the papyri and
were clearly a common feature of agriculture in Ptolemaic Egypt. 3

3. They were however not confined to Egypt: see PDura 15.1 (ii B.C.)
Thus the word no longer describes something owned only by the few. From the PPetr. example above we see that one person might own, or at least have under his control, more than one παράδεισος.

As to the possibility of a wall surrounding the παράδεισος the papyri give no clear information and it is impossible to say whether or not a wall was an essential feature. It is reasonable to suppose, however, that the valuable crop contained in a παράδεισος would often have been protected in this way. That παράδεισοι needed protection is clear from the mention of παραδεισοφύλακες in PCair.Zen. 690.22 (iii B.C.).

A παράδεισος, then, may be defined as 'an area of cultivated ground containing chiefly fruit-trees, at times also other types of trees, vines, and possibly other plants, and perhaps protected by a wall'. There is no exact equivalent to this term in English. 'Orchard' is probably the nearest to it. 'Garden' is unsatisfactory, suggesting an area planted mainly or only with vegetables or flowers, and a παράδεισος was clearly not a 'garden' in that sense. The usual word in iii B.C. for that type of garden seems to have been κήπος, from which παράδεισος is distinguished e.g. in PPetr. 3.26.6 (iii B.C.) εὰν ἐμβη βοῦς ἡ ὑποζύγιον ... εἰς ἄλλο τοιού δέντον ἢ παράδεισον ἢ κήπον ἢ ἀμπελώνα ... Cf. also PCair.Zen.184 quoted above.

It is this word that the translators used (13 times altogether) to render ι in the story of the Garden of Eden in Ge. 2 and 3, and the reason for their choice is clear. The Garden of Eden is exactly what would have been called in iii B.C. Egypt a παράδεισος. The description shows that its main feature was fruit-trees, with possibly a number of trees of other types as well.

---

4. In PCair.Zen. 825.13f. (252 B.C.) a quantity of bricks is referred to as coming, so it seems, from a παράδεισος. Perhaps they were taken from the wall surrounding it.

5. There is definite evidence for walls surrounding vineyards, Schnebel, Landwirtschaft 242ff.

6. So MM. π. is always an 'orchard' also for Rostovtzeff, A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C., Madison, 1922, e.g. 42.

7. There is no mention of a wall anywhere in the Genesis account.
Ge. 2.8-9 καὶ ἐφύτευσεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς παράδεισον ἐν Εδεμ...(9) καὶ ἐξανέτειλεν ὁ θεὸς ἐτί ἐκ τῆς γῆς πάν ξύλον ώραιον εἰς ὁρασίν καί καλὸν εἰς βρῶσιν καί τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς ἐν μέσῳ τῷ παράδεισῳ καί τὸ ξύλον τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστόν καλὸν καί πονηροῦ.

Compare

2.16 Ἀπὸ παντὸς ξυλοῦ τοῦ ἐν τῷ παράδεισῳ βρῶσει φάγη, (17) ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκετιν καλὸν καί πονηρόν, οὐ φάγεσθε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ

The word is similarly used twice elsewhere in the Pentateuch, again translating μι:

Ge. 13.10 εἶδεν πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδανοῦ ὅτι πᾶσα ἦν ποτιζομενή ... ὡς ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ θεοῦ.

Nu. 24.5-6 ὡς καλοὶ σου οἱ οίκοι, Ἰακώβ, αἱ σκηναί σου, Ἰσραήλ· (6) ὥσεὶ νάπαι σκιάζουσαι καί ὥσεὶ παράδεισοι ἐπὶ ποταμών. 8

παρίστημι

In addition to its numerous other uses, this word had developed in iii B.C. a specialized sense as an agricultural term, viz. 'be ripe', 'be fully grown' (intrans.), of crops. 9

8 J. Jeremias, ῬΩΝ V 766, considers that the LXX use of the word of God's garden involves a change of meaning: 'In Jewish-Gk., from the LXX on, it is used esp. for the garden of God in the creation story ... More exactly God's garden as distinct from secular parks is ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ θεοῦ ... or ὁ παράδεισος τῆς τρυφής ... This involves a notable shift in meaning; the LXX has moved the term from the profane sphere to the religious.' This seems to me quite mistaken. The mere fact of using a word in a religious context - and that is all the Pentateuch translators have done with παράδεισος - does not change its meaning. Is there a shift in meaning in the word 'garden' when used in the phrase 'God's garden'? There is no change in the meaning of μ. until it is used as the technical term for a particular religious idea, and J. himself notes that this step came later: 'Test.L.18.10 was then the first to give the simple word the technical sense of "Paradise".' Cf. Barr's remarks on the supposed semantic change in ἀλήθεια and the like in NT Gk., Semantics 249.

LSJ similarly classify the Ge. use as a separate sense, s.v. 3, giving the meaning as the garden of Eden, a manifest impossibility.

9. Its connexion with the other senses of the word is not obvious. Perhaps it derives from the sense of 'to be here', 'to have come' (LSJ s.v.II), the expression 'the crop has come' being practically equivalent to 'the crop is ripe'. Similarly Conybeare-Stock, ad loc.
So clearly in OGI 56.68 (Egypt, iii B.C.) ὅταν ὁ πρώτισμος σπόρος παραστήσῃ, ἀναφέρειν τὰς ἱερᾶς παρθένους στάχυς τοὺς παρατεθέντους τῷ ἀγάλματι τῆς θεού. PETR. 3.43(3).14 (241 B.C.) οὐκ ἄγνοεῖς ὡς σοι διελέγην περὶ τοῦ σπόρου καὶ κρότωνος ὁτι παρέστηκεν.

This must be what is meant also in PHIILE 8.5 (iii B.C.) γεωργῶ γῆν βασιλικὴν (ἄρουρων) ἁ, καὶ ἡ γῆ παρέστηκεν. (ἡ γῆ = the crop on it, by a common figure of speech, cf. Eng. 'mow a field'.) The writer of this letter asks for certain draught animals to be returned to him, so that, he explains, he can pay the assessment on the produce of his land (paid in kind): 11. 13f. ὅπως δύνομαι ἀναπληρῶν τὰ ἐκφόρια τῆς γῆς. In other words, so that he can begin harvesting his crop.

No other examples outside the LXX are recorded except 1 EPC. 23.4 = 2 EPC. 11.3 σταφυλὴ παρεστηκυία, in a quotation of unknown origin (Bauer). There is however a very similar use in Thphr. CP 6.14.10 ὁ οίνος τὸτε μάλιστα παρίσταται 'improves, becomes fit for drinking', LSJ (s.v., B.V.3.a); perhaps 'is mature'.

The Pentateuch provides a clear example of this use:
Ex. 9.31 τὸ δὲ λίνον καὶ ἡ κριθή ἐπλήγη· ἡ γὰρ κριθή παρεστηκυία, τὸ δὲ λίνον σπερματίζον. (32) ὁ δὲ πυρὸς καὶ ὁ ὀλύρα οὐκ ἐπλήγη· ὃψιμα γὰρ ἦν.

MT יִקְנָא הַנַּשָּׁה , 'the barley was in the ear', RSV.

The translation is an accurate yet fully idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew original. 10

καταφυτεύω

This compound is attested first in a letter of Darius of the early fifth century B.C., SIG 22.13, with the meaning 'transplant', τὴν ἑμὴν ἐκπονείς γῆν, τοὺς πέραν Εὐφράτου καρποὺς ἐπὶ τὰ κάτω τῆς Ἀσίας ὑπὲρ καταφυτεύων. So probably also in Posidon. 58 M (ii/i B.C.), Str. 15.3.11.

10. It may be noted in passing that the use of πλήσσω of the devastation of crops, although of course here a literal rendering of the Hb. (Ḥ薄膜), was not unfamiliar in the translators' time, cf. PRETR. 2.23(1).2 (iii B.C.) καὶ ἡ ζέη ὡς δὲ κριθῆ ἐπλήγη. It is not recorded otherwise outside LXX.
In the Pentateuch, however, it is found in the sense of 'plant', being synonymous with the older word φυτεύω (itself used seven times). Le. 19.23 καταφυτεύσετε πάν βρώσιμον, De. 6.11 άμπελώνας και έλαίωνας, ούς ού κατεφυτεύσας, Ex. 15.17. Cf. φυτεύω e.g. in De. 28.30,39 άμπελώνα φυτεύσεις. Both words render MT yoj in all their occurrences.

This use of καταφυτεύω, previously noted elsewhere only in Pi. cim. 13, Luc. νη 2.42, can now be quoted from papyri contemporary with the Pentateuch. E.g. Pcairo.zen. 157.1-3 (256 B.C.), where it is interchanged with φυτεύω:

τῶν στροβίλων φύτευσον δι'όλου τοῦ παραδείσου ..., καὶ ὅπως πλείονα μᾶλιστα μὲν φυτά, εἰ δὲ μῆ, μὴ ἐλάσσω τῶν καταφυτεύσεις.

Also PCol.zen. 42.2 (254 B.C.), 75.38 (c.248-6 B.C.).

Other words of the group are attested only in post-Classical Greek: καταφυτεία ii B.C. pap., καταφύτευσις LXX, κατάφυτος Plb. +.11

κουρά, 'fleece', De. 18.4 τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τῶν κουρῶν τῶν προβάτων σου δώσεις αὐτῷ, Pcairo.zen. 433.26 (iii B.C.) ἔχουσιν τὰ τε πρόβατα καὶ τὰς κουράς.

πεδίον, 'land or piece of land appropriated to pasture or tillage', 'field', Ge. 37.7 ὡσπερ ἡμᾶς δεσμεύετεν δράγματα ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ πεδίου, Le. 25.12 ἀπὸ τῶν πεδίων φάγεσθε τὰ γενήματα αὐτῆς. Ex. 9.3, al., Phib. 63.10 (265 B.C.) ἐφε καθέξιν τὸν χόρτον μου τὸν ἐν τῶ πεδίῳ, Pcairo.zen. 362.23 (242 B.C.) ή δὲ τοιαύτη ἐστὶν διὰ πάντων τῶν πεδίων, others in Preisigke. (This sense is not noted by LSJ).

χλωρόν, τό, subst., 'plant', a general term covering all types of green plant; esp. in pl. 'green-stuffs', 'green fodder', Nu. 22.4 ... ὡς ἐκλείξαι ὁ μόσχος τά χλωρά ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου, Ge. 2.5, De. 29.22 (both sing.), often papyri, e.g. PSI 400.14

11. The example illustrates the well-known fondness of the Koine 'for composite verbs where the classical language was content with the simple forms', Bl. DF §116.1.
(iii B.C.) ὅσα δ' ἄν χλωρᾶ τὰ κτήνη ἐξανηλώσῃ σου ἀνυπόλογόν σοι οἶσο, Phib. 112.9, 117.4 (both iii B.C.).

In the next group are a number of legal and other technical terms.

ἔκδέχομαι

The use of this word in iii B.C. in the non-Classical sense of 'stand surety for', or more precisely 'make oneself responsible for, guarantee, the due appearance or payment of' (a person, sum of money), is definitely established. Thus e.g. in PcAIR.ZEN. 36.26 (257 B.C.) a sum of 3000 drachmae comprising a στέφανος is advanced on the guarantee of Apollonius to Epikydes: ... ὁ στέφανος τῶι βασιλεί, ὅν ἔξεδέσατο Ἀπολλώνιος Ἐπικύδει. Similarly in 636.4 (iii B.C.) the writer, interceding on behalf of an arrested person, guarantees his not absconding if released: ἔαν σοι δῷξηι ἀφεῖναι αὐτόν, ἔγδεχομαι αὐτόν μονής. Cf. 323.4 (250–249 B.C.), P Petr. 3.64.b.6 (iii B.C.).

In the papyrus example cited by LSJ (s.v. I.7) the construction is slightly different: PSI 349.1 (254/3 B.C.) καλῶς ἀν ποιήσαις ἔγδεχόμενος ἕμας πρὸς τὸν τελώνην ζήνωνα τοῦ κίκιος. Here the acc. after ἔγδεχομαι is not the object guaranteed (the castor-oil), but the person on whose behalf the guarantee is given. Similarly PCOL.ZEN. 121.3 (181 B.C.) ... σὺν οἷς ἔξεδέσατο ὑμᾶς Ἀρπαλος, (τάλαντα) ἵγ, 'along with the amounts for which H. has become surety on your behalf, 13 talents'.

The existence of this sense is demonstrated also by ἐκδοχή 'giving of security', ἐκδοχος 'surety', cited by LSJ (and Suppl.) from iii B.C. papyri.

---

12. Cf. Schnebel, Landwirtschaft 213ff.; D. B. Bagiakakos, 'Αθηνα LVIII (1954) 100ff., with details of this use and others like it in Mod. Gk. dialects.
   The same use is found with ἀναδέχομαι in Class. and later Gk.
14. For ἐγ = ἐκ see Mayser, Gramm. I.i 226.
The usual Classical word for the idea was ἐγγυάω, found also in later Greek (but not in the Pentateuch or NT).

In Ge. 43.9 ἐκδέχομαι is found in exactly this sense. Judas makes himself responsible for bringing Benjamin back safe and sound from Egypt:

ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκδέχομαι αὐτὸν, ἐκ χειρός μου ζήτησον αὐτόν· ἐάν μὴ ἀγάγω αὐτὸν πρὸς σέ καὶ στήσω αὐτὸν ἐναντίον σου, ἡμαρτησόμεθα ἐς σοι ... ἐκδέχομαι renders Hebrew יַע, 'go surety for' the safety of, BDB.

The other occurrence in the Pentateuch, Ge. 44.32 raises a typical problem of LXX lexicography.

ὁ γάρ παῖς σου ἐκδέδεκται τὸ παιδίον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός λέγων Ἐάν μὴ ἀγάγω αὐτὸν .. (as in 43.9).

If the Greek is considered alone, it seems necessary, with παρὰ τοῦ πατρός following, to take ἐκδέδεκται as 'received', a possible sense of the word. A comparison of the original, however, shows that the construction is due to mechanical rendering of the Hebrew and that ἐκδέχομαι represents Hebrew יַע as before: MT יַע יַע יַע יַע.

Therefore it would seem that the translators did intend ἐκδέδεκται in the sense of 'stand surety for' despite the indications of the immediate context, and that we must translate in some such way as 'your servant became surety for the boy to my father'. Whether the sentence would have been understood in this way by those who read it without knowledge of the original is another matter.

dιακούω, 'conduct a hearing', 'hear a case', De. 1.16 καὶ ἐνετειλάμην τοῖς κριταῖς ὑμῶν ... λέγων Διακούετε ἀνά μέσον τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν καὶ κρίνατε δικαίως ἀνά μέσον ἀνδρός καὶ ..., papyri, inscriptions, e.g. PYale 42.31 (229 B.C.) ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶς καθήμενος διακούει, OGI 335.30 (ii/i B.C.), cf. Kiessling, MM, s.v.

πάροικος, ο, 'stranger', 'temporary resident', 'resident alien',

---

Ge. 23.4, Ex. 2.22, etc., often inscriptions from iii B.C. onwards, e.g. OGI 55.29, SIG 398.37 (both iii B.C.). Deissmann, BS 227f., MM.

παροικέω, 'inhabit (a place, acc.) as a πάροικος', 'dwell as a πάροικος', Ge. 12.10, 17.8, etc., PSI 677.2 (iii B.C.), SIG 709.9 (ii B.C.).

πρεσβύτερος as the designation of an official, or person in authority, 'elder', Ge. 50.7, Ex. 17.5, 18.12, etc., often papyri, inscriptions, see LSJ, MM, Deissmann, BS 154ff.

The translators likewise show their familiarity with a number of new commercial terms that were current in the Greek of their time.

ἀπέχω

The very common Hellenistic use of this word with the meaning 'to have received', especially as a technical term in receipts, has been often noted and discussed.16 Typical examples are PHib. 209.6 (263/2 B.C.) ὁμολογεῖ Λυσικράτης ... ἄπεχειν παρὰ Δημητρίου ... τὰ ἐκφόρια, Wilcken ostr. 1027.3 (Ptol.) ἀπέχω παρὰ σοῦ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μὴ ἐκφόριον.

An early, non-technical, instance of it is found in Aeschin. 2.50 ἄπεχετε, ἕφη, τὴν ἀπόκρισιν, καὶ λοιπὸν ὑμῖν ἔστι βουλεύσασθαι, 'you have your answer ...', but this appears to be isolated. Normally in Classical Greek the uses of ἄπεχω are quite different, the most usual words for 'receive' (a sum of money) being ἐκλαμβάνω and ἀπολαμβάνω (the latter also in later Greek). Note also that ἀποχή, 'receipt', is only late (iii B.C. papyri +).

The Pentateuch has two examples of this use; both are present tense (not past), in full accordance with contemporary usage. In Ge. 43.23 Joseph's steward replies as follows to Joseph's brothers, who, on their second visit to Egypt, have

16. Deissmann, BS 229, LAE 110ff.; Mayser, Gramm. I.i 487, with references to other discussions there. Examples especially in MM, Kiessling.
offered to return the money they found in their sacks after the first visit:

"Ιλεως ύμιν, μη φοβείσθε· ο θεός ύμων ... ἐδώκεν ύμιν ἑθσαυροὺς ἐν τοῖς μαρσίπποις ύμων, τὸ δὲ ἄργυριων ύμων εὐδοκιμοῦν ἀπέχω.

'I have received your money, which was quite genuine', that is to say, I have received payment for the grain purchased on the first visit; there is no need to return the money found in the sacks.

Nu. 32.19 οὐκέτι κληρονομήσωμεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ιορδάνου καὶ ἐπέκεινα, ὡς ἀπέχομεν τοὺς κλήρους ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦ Ι. ἐν ἀνατολάς.

In both cases the LXX rendering neatly paraphrases the idiomatic Hebrew of the original: γόμος καὶ σκηναὶ in the former, γόμος γάλακτος ποικίλας in the latter.

γόμος

Originally γόμος was used specifically of a ship's load, 'cargo' (Hdt. 1.194, D. 32.4), only in later Greek of any load. The development runs parallel to that in γεμίζω, at first used of loading ships, only later of animals, etc.

The later use appears in the one example of the word in the Pentateuch:

Ex. 23.5 έάν δὲ ἴδης τὸ ὑποζύγιον τοῦ ἐχθροῦ σου πεπτωκός ὑπὸ τὸν γόμον αὐτοῦ ... (MT ἵπποι)

A contemporary example of this use, which was previously not known before i A.D. apart from the LXX (examples in MM, LSJ), is now available:

PCol.Zen. 2.8 (259 B.C., an account of earnings of a camel caravan) ἀπὸ τῶν ζηνήων εἰς Ἁγουπτὸν γόμων δ φοινίκων καμήλων δ μισθός (δραχμαί) ἑβ.

'From the Tents to Egypt, 4 loads of dates, 4 camels, pay, 104 dr.' (ed.).

ὅλη

In Classical Greek the main meanings were 'drawing',

- 'drawing', 'cargo'
'dragging'; 'inhalation'; 'attraction' (LSJ). The new use, in the sense of 'weight', is attested first in Arist., *Mir.* 833b 10 λέγουσι δ'έν τῇ Παιονία οὕτω χρυσίζειν τὴν γῆν ὡστε πολλοὺς εὑρισκέναι καὶ ὑπὲρ μνάν χρυσοῦ ὀλκὴν. Then *Men.* 325 (Körte), Thphr. *HP* 9.16.8. For this idea the usual Classical word was σταθμός.

To the examples in inscriptions noted by LSJ can be added numerous instances in Egyptian papyri of iii B.C., e.g. *Pcair. Zen.* 327.102 φιάλη οὗ ὀλκὴ σξ, 774.4 ἔχει Νικάνωρ πόκους λα ὅν ὀλκὴ τά(λαντον) α. Similarly 851.9,16, *PMich. Zen.* 120.6,7.

The word is used in the same way in the Pentateuch:

*Ge.* 24.22 ἔλαβεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐνώτια χρυσά ἀνὰ δραχμήν ὀλκῆς καὶ δύο ψέλια ἐπὶ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, δέκα χρυσῶν ὀλκῆ αὐτῶν.

'... golden ear-rings each a drachma in weight and two bracelets (he put) on her hands, their weight ten χρυσοί.'

*Nu.* 7.13-79 passim τρυβλίον ἀργυροῦν ἐν, τριάκοντα καὶ ἐκατόν ὀλκῆ αὐτοῦ.

In all instances ὀλκῆ renders γρῶμ 'weight'.

χρυσοῦς

The ordinary adjectival use of χρυσοῦς is of course common in later Greek and occurs frequently in the Pentateuch. The use that concerns us here is that of ὁ χρυσοῦς as the name of a measure of value and weight,18 attested from iii B.C. onwards, both in Egypt and elsewhere. A χρυσοῦς was equivalent to 20 silver drachmae, though it appears that, at least in Ptolemaic Egypt, there was no actual gold coin of that value and weight minted. The term derives from earlier στατήρ χρυσοῦς (a stater = 20 drachmae), e.g. *Ar. Pl.* 816, cf. στατήρ χρυσοῦ *Pl. Euthd.* 299e, Hdt. 1.54, but in iii B.C. it had become simply ὁ χρυσοῦς,

---

17. The idiomatic use of ἀνὰ (Class. and later Gk., LSJ s.v. C.III, MM) is noteworthy (ἀνὰ δρ. ὀλκ. ~ γρῶμ γρ.)

and στατήρ is not to be thought of as always 'understood'.

Examples of the χρυσούς as a sum of money are PMich.Zen. 28.11 (256 B.C.) εἰς ζ τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἄρ(τάβας), 'at the rate of seven artabs to the χρυσούς'; P Cair. Zen. 194.10 (255 B.C.) [ἔστιν δὲ ἡ τιμὴ τῶν νυ] εἰς Β τοῦ χρυσοῦ 290 = 'the value of the 410 (jars), at 12 (jars) to the χρυσούς, is 683 drachmae 2 obols'. It is attested also in inscriptions (see LSJ, and index to SIG), Plb., and later papyri (Preisigke, MM). In reference to weight it is found in Plille 6.13 (iii B.C.) ἀφείλοντό μου κρόκης καί στήμονος όλκήν μνάς τρεῖς χρυσών ἐλάσσω, 'they took from me wool (literally woof and warp) in weight three minae less one χρυσούς'.

It is interesting to find that the translators have made use of this term a number of times in the Pentateuch. As a sum of money it occurs in

Ge. 37.28 καὶ ἀπέδοντο τὸν Ἰωσήφ τοῖς Ἰσμαήλιταις εἰκοσὶ χρυσῶν MT ηθοποιούσα

Ge. 45.22 καὶ πᾶσιν ἐδωκεν [Ιωσήφ] δισσας στολάς, τῷ δὲ Βενιαμίν ἐδωκεν τριακόσιοις χρυσούς MT ηθοποιούσα

The use of χρυσούς as a rendering of ηθοποιούσα is unexpected, but in the case of Ge. 37.28 it is possible to suggest a particular reason for it. If ηθοποιούσα were rendered as the ordinary silver coin, δραχμή, the sum paid for Joseph would seem abnormally low. Prices of slaves in iii B.C. Egypt of course vary considerably, but a price less than 100 drachmae for a male slave would be unusual, and figures between 100 and 300 drachmae are more often mentioned.19 In PSI 406 (iii B.C.) 300 drachmae are paid for a girl slave. The same difficulty would be felt with δίδραχμον, which was also available and is used by the translators elsewhere (though usually as a rendering of ἄργυριον), and with ἄργυριον, which in any case was not normally used as the name of a specific coin or sum of money in the translators' time. These were, as far as I know, the only terms available to the

translators if they wished to render ηοο literally. It would seem therefore that they avoided a literal rendering in order to make the sum for which Joseph was sold a more realistic one, viz. 400 drachmae.

No such reason can be offered for the rendering in Ge. 45.22. We can only suppose that the translators felt justified in interpreting ηθ3 freely in order to enhance the value of the gift to Benjamin.

In the remaining examples, fourteen in all, χρυσούς is used as a measure of weight, rendering Hebrew מֵבַד.

_ge_. 24.22 καὶ δύο ψέλια ἐπὶ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, δέκα χρυσῶν ὀλίκη αὐτῶν.20

MT משל חרב הב דוה נ firebase

_nu_. 7.13-14 καὶ προσήνεγκεν τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ τρυβλίον ἀργυροῦν ἐν, τριάκοντα καὶ ἐκατὸν ὀλίκη αὐτοῦ, φιάλην μίαν ἀργυράν ἐβδομήκοντα σίκλων ...· (14) δυίσκην μίαν δέκα χρυσῶν πλήρη δυμιάματος.

The same words are repeated eleven times in vss. 20-80. Then in 7.86 the total weight of the twelve censers is given:

δυίσκαι χρυσαὶ δώδεκα πλήρεις δυμιάματος· πάν τὸ χρυσίον τῶν δυισκόων εἴκοσι καὶ ἐκατὸν χρυσόί

The translators' use of this term illustrates very well their familiarity with the business terminology and practice of their time. It shows also their concern for producing an up-to-date version of the Hebrew text. They have taken care here to use a term with which their audience would be familiar. It seems also that they have tried to render realistically according to current monetary values, even though this has meant departing from the literal meaning of the original.

The next examples are two words used idiomatically in 20. Ten χρυσόι = approx. 25 oz (1 drachma being equivalent to 3.63 grams: David and van Groningen, Papyrological Primer 33*). Presumably this is the weight of both bracelets together, so each weighs 12½ oz. They are thus fairly heavy, but certainly not impossible.
the sense of 'be ill'.

ένοχλέω

The Classical senses were 'trouble', 'annoy', 'be a bother', and these continue in the Koine. But we find in addition an interesting semantic development in the passive. ἐνοχλοῦμαι, 'be bothered', comes also to mean 'be unwell, ill'. For this sense MM cited PPetr. 2.25(a).12 (iii B.C.) εἰς ἵππον ἐνοχλούμενον. To this can be added a clear example of the use applied to persons, Pcair.Zen. 812.5 (257 B.C.) Μένης περὶ τοῦ ἁγοραζομένου μέλιτος τοῖς ἐνοχλοῦμενοῖς (note on the verso of a letter), and this is almost certainly the meaning in numerous other places where the word could be, and has usually been, taken as 'be busy, occupied': e.g. 816.7 (257 B.C.) ἔπει [οὖν] αὐτὸς οὐ δεδύνημαι παραγενέσθαι διὰ τὸ ἐνοχληθάαι, 396.2, 516.8, PCol.Zen. 6.1 (all iii B.C.).

The word quite clearly has this sense in its one occurrence in the Pentateuch:

Ge. 48.1 ἀπηγγέλη τῷ Ἰωσήφ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ σου ἐνοχλεῖται.

The context shows that Joseph's father is ill and about to die (his death is described in 49.33); moreover, the translators could not have failed to know the meaning of ἐνοχλεῖται.

καλακίζομαι also develops the sense of 'be ill' in the Koine (though from a quite different starting-point, 'be soft, weak'): Ge. 42.38, Arist. HA 605a 25, PSI 420.16 (iii B.C.), Sammelb.

---

22. Cf. Edgar's note on Pcair.Zen. 812: 'perhaps the latter meaning ["to be indisposed"] is more common than has been recognized'.
23. This use is no doubt due to euphemism, which is common in words for illness. Eng. disease shows exactly the same semantic development as the Gk. word: orig. 'lack of ease', 'uneasiness', 'trouble' (cf. Ullmann, Semantics 187).
24. The same use is found elsewhere in LXX, e.g. 1 Ki. 19.14, but not in NT, and has not survived into Mod. Gk. It probably fell out of use in the later Koine. No pap. examples later than iii B.C. are known to me, and Pollux, Onom. 3.104, listing words for the idea, does not mention it.
158.2. Anz, Subsidia 347f. (μαλακία and μαλακός show parallel developments.)

Two words connected with imprisonment are also conveniently grouped together.

έξάγω

In iii B.C. this was the word commonly used for 'release' from prison. More precisely, two uses may be distinguished: (a) 'lead out', 'release', of the action e.g. of a gaoler; (b) 'cause to be released', of the action of any person instrumental in getting a prisoner released. The former, though not actually attested before iii B.C., is merely a particular application of the basic sense of the verb and could be old. The latter, also not found before iii B.C., may reasonably be regarded as a new development. έξάγω in this sense forms a pair with its opposite ἀπάγω, the usual word in Classical and later Greek for 'arrest', 'put in prison'.

The literal sense of έξάγω is felt e.g. in PHid. 73.11 (243-2 B.C.) ο φυλακίτης παραγενόμενος εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον τὸ ἐν Σινάρῳ έξήγαγεν τὸν Καλλίδρομον [ἐκ τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου], cf. Pcol. zen. 155(f).2 (250 B.C.). But in Pcair.zen. 619.5 (iii B.C.) the more developed sense is found. The writer explains that he had been imprisoned, and continues: Ζήνων δὲ ἀκουόσας έξήγαγεν ... ἐξήγαγεν is not 'led me out', but 'got me released', since Zenon was an important official, not the gaoler. Cf. PPetr. 2.4(7).5 (c. 255 B.C.).

The examples in the Pentateuch are:

Ge. 40.14 μνησθήσῃ περὶ ἐμοῦ Φαραώ καὶ έξάγεις με ἐκ τοῦ ὀχυρώματος τούτου. MT ἑξαγεῖν

The use of έξάγω here is closely paralleled by the example in Pcair.zen. 619 above. 'Make mention of me to Pharaoh and secure my release from this prison'.

Ge. 41.14 Φαραώ ἐκάλεσεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ έξήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀχυρώματος καὶ έξύφησαν αὐτὸν ...

ΜΤ ἐξήγαγον Ραχλ, with DEM etc.; έξήγαγεν A.
Attested first in Xenophon, *HG* 3.2.3. οί δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐτιτρώσκοντο μὲν καὶ ἀπέδνῃσκον, ἐποίουν δ’ οὐδὲν κατειρμένοι ἐν τῷ σταυρώματί ὡς ἀνδρομήκει ὅντι, διασπάσαντες τὸ αὐτῶν ὀχύρωμα ἔφέροντο εἰς αὐτούς. Here the meaning of the word is as the etymology would lead us to expect, namely 'fortification', the reference in this context being to a palisade. It is not recorded again until iii B.C., when it is found in the sense of 'prison' (as well as 'fortification', 'fortress'), the line of development to this meaning being quite straightforward: a fortress would naturally have been often used as a prison.

Thus e.g. PPetr. 2.13(3).2 (258-3 B.C.) τὸ πρὸς νότον τοῦ ὀχυρώματος τείχος μέρος μὲν τι αὐτοῦ πεπτωκός ἐστιν. The remainder of the document shows clearly that a prison is meant; δεσμώται are mentioned in 1.9. Cf. also PPetr. 2.13(4).3,5,10 (same date).

In the Pentateuch ὀχύρωμα occurs four times, always in the sense of 'prison':

*Ge. 39.20* καὶ λαβὼν ὁ κύριος Ιωσήφ ἐνέβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὀχύρωμα, εἰς τὸν τόπον, ἐν ὧν ὁ οἶκος τοῦ βασιλέως κατέχονται ἐκεῖ ἐν τῷ ὀχυρώματι. *MT* רָשַׁהְוָהֵי bis

Similarly 40.14 (MT ḫבֵּי), 41.14 (MT ḫבֵּה).

The near synonymity of ὀχύρωμα with the usual older word δεσμωτήριον (also in papyri) is clear from the alternation of the two words in this passage: the latter occurs in 39.22 bis 23; 40.3,5, rendering MT רָשַׁהְוָהֵי in all.

The remaining examples cover a wide variety of subjects. Most are the words for everyday activities such as 'ask', 'decide', 'speak', and common ideas such as 'side', 'here', 'owner'.

ἀξιόω

From iii B.C. onwards the most common use of this word is in the sense of 'request', 'ask', a natural development from the Classical senses of 'consider fitting', 'expect, require,
insist that'. Examples verging on the later use may be found in Classical Greek, especially in Xenophon, e.g. *HC* 3.4.7 ἄτε γιγνώσκοντες πάντες τὸν Λύσανδρον, προσέκειτο αὐτῷ ἀξιούντες διαπράττεσθαι αὐτὸν παρ' Ἀγησιλάου ὃν ἐδέοντο, cf. 1.6.8, *An.* 5.6.2; Pl. *Phdr.* 255e.

This use may be illustrated from the translators' time by:

*PCol.Zen.* 41.2 (c. 254 B.C.) προσήλθαν τίνες ἡμῖν τῶν γνωρίμων ὑπὲρ Μητροδότου ... ἀξιούντες γράψαι πρὸς σέ.

*PTeb.* 772.11 (236 B.C.) ἄξιω ὃν σε, εἴ σοι φαίνεται, γράψαι...

Cf. the numerous examples in Preisigke and especially Kiessling.

ἀξιάω occurs twice in the Pentateuch, once clearly as in the papyri, viz.

*Nu.* 22.16 καὶ ἠλθὼν πρὸς Βαλααμ καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·Τάδε λέγει Βαλακ ὁ τοῦ Σεπφωρ ἀξιῶ σε, μή οκνήσῃς ἔλθειν πρὸς με.

The other example is quite different, but will be examined here for its own interest. It is found in the words spoken by Laban, Jacob's father-in-law. Jacob, having departed in secret with his family, has been pursued and overtaken by Laban, who now reproaches him:

*Ge.* 31.27-8 καὶ εἶ ἀνήγγειλάς μοι, ἐξαπέστειλα ἂν σε μετ' εὖφροσύνης καὶ μετὰ μουσικῶν, τυμπάνων καὶ κιθάρας. (28) οὐκ ἠξιώθην καταφιλήσαι τὰ παιδία μου καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας μου.

It is difficult to decide precisely what is meant by ἀξιάω here. 'I was not considered worthy to kiss my children ...' may at first sight seem correct, and although this old sense of the word is rare in the vernacular in iii B.C. compared with the new one, it is possible to cite at least two examples, *PTeb.* 703.277, *Sammelb.* 5942.13 (both iii B.C.). There seem to me, however, to be two difficulties with this. The first is that

of explaining the rendering in relation to the Hebrew. οὐκ ἑξιώθην renders ἔναρξας ἄνα, 'and you did not allow me'. Although ἑξιώθην is found only here in the sense of 'allow', its usual senses being 'leave', 'let alone'; 'forsake', 'abandon', this is unlikely to have caused the translators difficulty. The context shows how ἑξιώθην is to be taken, and they were clearly familiar with the normal uses of the word, since they render it accurately in its three other occurrences in the Pentateuch, Ex. 23.11 ἀνίημι, Nu. 11.31 ἑπιβάλλω, De. 32.15 ἐγκαταλείπω. It is hard to see, therefore, why they would have taken the Hebrew as 'you did not think me worthy'.

Secondly, the meaning 'I was not considered worthy' (in its literal sense) seems to me unsatisfactory in the context. How does worthiness come into it at all? What is required is, I suggest, 'I was not permitted, I was not given the opportunity', and this would of course be almost the same as the meaning of the Hebrew. There is as yet no evidence of such a sense for ἄξιόω in the translators' time, but later Greek provides a number of examples which seem close to it. *Poxy.* 1837.16 (vi A.D.) ὁ θεός ἄξιόω ημᾶς προσκ (υνεΐν) ἐν οἰγί, 'God grant that we may make our salutations to you in health', edd., similarly 1857.3, *PSI* 238.11 (both vi-vii A.D.); *Ep.I.Mag.* 2 ἐπεί οὖν ἑξιώθην ἵπτείν ὑμᾶς διὰ Δαμά, similarly 14. In both these, though it is possible to translate ἄξιόω as 'find worthy', it is very close to just 'permit', 'give an opportunity to'. The same use is found also in Modern Greek, e.g. in δὲν ἄξιόθηκε να ἵπτε τὰ παιδιά του μεγάλα, 'he was not permitted to see his children grow up'. It is not impossible, therefore, that such a use was current in iii B.C. Greek.

ἔναρχομαι

In Classical Greek (E. +) a sacrificial technical term, e.g. Ε. Ἰα 1470 κανά δ' ἔναρχεσθω τις. In the Koine from iii B.C. onwards it is found in the sense of 'begin' generally, hardly differing from ἀρχομαι. Thus e.g. *Sammelb.* 4369 b. 23 (iii B.C.) μὴ οὖν ἄλλως ποιήσης, ὑπομένω γάρ σε ὡστε ἐνάρχασθαι σε, *PTeb.*

25. I am indebted to Mr. Papastavrou for this example.
Similarly in the Pentateuch:

(a) abs.

Ex. 12.18 έναρχομένου τῇ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μήνὸς τοῦ πρώτου ...
Similarly Nu. 9.5.

Nu. 17.12 καὶ ἤδη ἐνήρξε τῇ θραύσει ἔν τῷ λαῷ.

(b) c. inf.

De. 2.31 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς μὲ Ἰσαάκ ἢργημαι παραδούναι πρὸ προσώπου σου τὸν Σαμσάλα τῆς Βασσίλειας Ἑσσαβών τοῦ Αμορραίου καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ· ἐναρξῆται κληρονομῆσαι τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ.
Similarly De. 2.24, 25.

In De. 2.31, where ἢργημαι and ἐναρξῆται both render ʾḥn hiph., the latter appears to be merely a variation for the sake of style. So also in Nu. 17.12 above: cf. the preceding verse ἐξῆλθεν γὰρ ὀργὴ ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου, ἥρκεται θραύσει τὸν λαόν. Again both words render ʾḥn hiph.

κατατείνω

In Le. 25.39ff. certain provisions are made regarding the treatment of a fellow-Israelite (ὁ ἀδελφός σου) reduced to servitude. These stress that whether he is sold into one's own household (39-46) or into that of a stranger or sojourner (47-55) he is not to be treated as if he were a slave, but a hired servant: 39 οὐ δουλεύσει σοι δούλειαν οἰκέτου (40) ὡς μισθωτὸς ἡ πάροικος ἔσται σοι. Provisions for his release in the year of the ἀφεσις follow here, and then in 43 οὐ κατατείνω αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ μόχθῳ καὶ φοβηθήσῃ κύριον τὸν θεόν σου. Similarly in the provisions regarding an Israelite sold to a stranger or sojourner: 53 ὡς μισθωτὸς ἐνιαυτὸν ἐξ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἔσται μετ᾿ αὐτοῦ· οὐ κατατείνω (1. κατατείνω? MT יָפָה) αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ μόχθῳ ἐνώπιόν σου. The verb occurs in the same expression once more in this passage: vss. 44-46 explain that slaves are to be purchased from among non-Israelite peoples, but, 46 goes on,
τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ ἐκαστὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ οὗ κατατείνει αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς μόχθοις.

The most suitable meaning for κατατείνω in this context seems to be 'overwork', 'strain'. The implication of these regulations in the Greek then is that one must not exact from an Israelite in servitude the same amount of work as could be expected from an actual slave. To do so would be to overwork him. The Hebrew original is somewhat different, the word rendered by κατατείνω in these three instances being ἡ τῆς 'rule', 'dominate' (so KB, BDB).

This is a new use of κατατείνω, though its development from earlier senses is easy. (In Classical Greek, Homer +, the main senses are 'stretch', 'stretch out'; 'rack', 'torture'; and intrans. 'extend'; 'strive'.) A good parallel to it is provided by the following example from the second century B.C. (noted by LSJ).

PTest. 61b 197 (118-7 B.C.) = 72.115 (114-3 B.C.), both land surveys, with the same wording in both places: ... ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀπολογίζεται οἱ κωμογραμματεύς εἰναι τὴν προσεξευρεθείσαν ὑπὸ Ὀσοροήριος τοῦ γενομένου βασιλικοῦ γραμματέως ἐν τοῖς ἔμπεσθεν χρόνοις κατατείνειν τοὺς γεωργοὺς.

The editors translate '[the land] ... regarding which the komogrammateus reports that it is the land which was found by Osoroëris ... to have put in former times too heavy a tax upon the powers of the cultivators'. The piece of land concerned is thereby registered as unproductive.

The use is not as yet known elsewhere (not NT or elsewhere in LXX).

μέρος

In the Pentateuch, as also in other parts of the LXX, this

26. Cf. Schleusner, s.v.: 'non conficies illum labore'.

I note as a curiosity the meaning given to it by N.H. Snaith, Leviticus and Numbers (Century Bible) 167: 'hold down tight' (due to confusion with Lat. teneo?).

27. LSJ's examples under I.7.a 'metaph. strain, exert' are not the same as the Pent. use.
The word is frequently to be found in contexts where the only possible meaning for it is 'side'. E.g.

ex. 32.15 πλάκες λίθιναι καταγεγραμμέναι ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν μερῶν αὐτῶν, ἐνθὲν καὶ ἐνθὲν ἡσαν γεγραμμέναι

Clearly 'part' will not do here. The meaning is 'written on both their sides'. (ἐνθὲν καὶ ἐνθὲν is normal Greek for 'on this side and on that', see LSJ s.v. I.1.)

nu. 8.3 καὶ ἐποίησεν οὕτως Ααρών· ἐκ τού ἐνὸς μέρους κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς λυχνίας ἔξηψεν τοὺς λύχνους αὐτῆς

ex. 26.22 καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀπίσω τῆς σκηνῆς κατὰ τὸ μέρος τὸ πρὸς θάλασσαν ποιήσεις ἐξ στύλων

The meaning of this phrase, found also in 22.36, is evidently 'on the edge of', 'beside'.

It is clear that in none of the above examples can the use of μέρος in the sense of 'side' be attributed to Hebraism.

This use receives meagre treatment in the dictionaries, particularly LSJ, who fail even to classify it as a separate sense. The only examples they record of it are three LXX occurrences of ἐκ μέρους τινὸς, 'by the side of', noted with other uses of μέρος with prepositions (IV.2.b). Bauer too gives the impression that it is confined to Biblical and related

---

28. Cf. Johannesson, P r ä p o s i t i o n e n 291 n.1: 'ἐκ μέρους c. gen. Reg. I 6.8, 23.26 = για "von [der] Seite" (d.h. neben)'.

This phrase has other meanings when used without gen. following: see Bl. DF §212.

The use of ἐκ in the examples quoted above is of course normal Gk.: cf. Class. ἐκ δεξιάς, ἐξ ἀριστερᾶς, and the examples below. See Bauer s.v. ἐκ 2, Mayser, G r a m m. II.ii 384.
literature, though he does actually note a non-Biblical example, *PGM* 13.438, but under a different heading (1.c). MM's otherwise thorough collection of parallels throws no light on it at all.

Investigation shows, however, that μέρος in the sense of 'side' is not only attested in iii B.C. and later, but is even to be found in Herodotus, as follows: 29

2.121α βουλόμενον δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν ἁσφαλείᾳ τὰ χρήματα ἑξατρίζειν ὀικοδομέομαι οἰκήμα λίθον, τοῦ τῶν τοίχων ἕνα ἔγα τὸ ἔξω μέρος τῆς οἰκίης ἔχειν.

'... a stone chamber, one of its walls abutting on the outer side of the palace.'

4.101 ἔστι δὲν τῆς Σκυθικῆς ὡς ἕως τετραγώνου, τῶν δύο μερῶν κατηκόντων ἐς δᾶλασαν, πάντη ἵσον τὸ τε ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέρου καὶ τὸ παρὰ τὴν δᾶλασαν.

'Scythia, then, being a four-sided country, whereof two sides are sea-board, the frontiers running inland and those that are by the sea make it a perfect square' (Godley, *Loeb*). Cf. 4.99.

In the following examples from iii B.C. and later the meaning 'side' for μέρος seems to me indisputable.

ουτ. 56.52 (Canopus, iii B.C.) καὶ ἡ ἀναγωγὴ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πλοίου τοῦ ὁσεῖρος εἰς τοῦτο τὸ ἱερόν καὶ ἐνίαυτόν γίνεται ... τῶν ἐκ τῶν πρώτων ἱερῶν πάντων θυσίας συντελούντων ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερωμένων ὑπ’ αὐτῶν βωμῶν ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου ἱεροῦ τῶν πρώτων ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν μερῶν τοῦ δρόμου.

'... on both sides of the δρόμος', i.e. the avenue leading up to the temple ('ante introitum templi', Dittenberger, *ad loc*).

πΠτερ. 3.43(2) verso IV.11 (247/6 B.C.) καὶ π[αρά]ργυγανίσαι τὸ κόμη καὶ ἀνοῦχι ἔξ ἐκατέρου μέρους ἐπὶ πάν τὸ μηκὸς εἰς ὕψος

Despite the fragmentary nature of this document (a contract for

work to be done on bridges, dykes, etc.) it is difficult to see how εξ εκατέρου μέρους can be anything but 'on each side', i.e. of the χώμα, 'dyke'. The phrase occurs again in PPetr. 3.42 F(b).1 = (c).5 (252 B.C.). 30

 _PHib_. 200.5 (iii B.C.) ... πλατείας ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς λίβα μέρους ἐξόμενον τυχ[άν]ηι [...

'... a disturbance ... coming from the room which] happens to be adjacent to the street on its south side', ed.

 _BGU_ 999.4ff. (99/8 B.C.) ἀπέδοτο Εὐνοῦς ... ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπαρχούσης αὐτής οἰκίας (1. οἰκίας) ὕποδειμένης ... τῆς οὐσίας ἐν τῷ ἀπὸ νότου καὶ ἀπηλιώτου μέρει τῆς ἐν Παθύρει κρήνης τὸ ἐν τῷ ἀπὸ λιβός μέρει ὑπερῶν α καὶ τὸ ... I take this to be: 'Eunous has sold, of the house ... which is on the south-eastern side of the spring in Pathyris, the upper room [ὑπερῶν = ὑπερώον] on the western side and the ...'

There are also many instances where the context will permit μέρος to be taken both as 'side' and as 'region' or 'part'. Though these cannot be used as evidence here, we can note that there is a possibility, since 'side' has been established as a possible sense of the word, that μέρος was in fact intended thus in these instances also. E.g.

 _BGU_ 994.II.12 - III.2 (113 B.C.) ... ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος αὐτῆς ψιλοῦ τόπου τοῦ ὄντος ἐν τῷ ἀπὸ λιβός μέρει Παθύρεως πήξεις στερεοῦ ε

Cf. _PGrenf._ 2.25.9 (103 B.C.), 2.35.7 (98 B.C.), _Archiv_ I 63.12 (123 B.C.), _SIG_ 495.98 (c. 230 B.C.).

μέρος in the sense of 'side' is also found in Modern Greek, ad e.g. in the phrase ἀπὸ τὸ ἑνά μέρος, 'on one side'. 31 Cf. also μεριά, one of the normal vernacular words for 'side' (Swanson).

The semantic development from 'part' to 'side' is one

31. I am indebted to Mr. Papastavrou for this example. Others can be seen in _ÆLex_. s.v. 'side'. 
which can be paralleled in other languages. Cf. e.g. Lat. pars, Eng. part itself (SOED s.v. A.III.2), Ital. parte, Fr. part.

όλιγοψυχέω

Recorded first in Isoc. 19.39 in the sense of 'be faint': τετρωμένον αὐτόν καὶ βαδίζειν οὐ δυνάμενον ἀλλ’ οἶλιγοψυχοῦντα ἀπεκόμισ’[α]. The noun οἶλιγοψυχία is similarly found early only in the sense of 'fainting', 'swooning' (Hp.).

Later οἶλιγοψυχέω has the meaning 'be discouraged, dispirited', e.g. in PPetr. 2.40(a).12 (iii B.C.) μὴ οὖν οἶλιγοψυχήσητε άλλ’ ἀνδρίζεσθε, οἶλιγος γάρ χρόνος ύμίν ἐστιν ἐτοιμάζεται γάρ ή διαδοχή, UPZ 78.10 (ii B.C.) ὁρα μὴ οἶλιγοψυχήσαι, cf. 63.1 (ii B.C.).

It is so used in the Pentateuch in

Nu. 21.4 καὶ ὄλιγοψυχήσεν ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ ὠδώ* (5) καὶ κατελάλει ὁ λαὸς πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ κατὰ Μωυσῆ ...

MT γη-ψω χρη 32

σκεπάζω

In Classical Greek (Hp., X., Arist.) in the sense of 'cover', but already on its way to the later use in many contexts, where the notion of protecting as well as covering is clearly felt. E.g. X. Eq. 12.8 πάντων δὲ μᾶλιστα τοῦ ἵππου τὸν κενεώνα δεὶ σκεπάζειν, cf. cyr. 8.8.17. This development is of course a natural one, since the object that covers something frequently also protects it (cf. e.g. L. protegere).

In iii B.C. we find the further development to 'protect', 'shelter', without any idea of covering in the literal sense. Thus e.g.

PHib. 35.10 (c.250 B.C.) καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν χρόνοις ὑπὸ ύμῶν σκεπάζομεθα.

PCair.zen. 491.30 (iii B.C.) Πάτις οὖν αὐτοῦς σκεπάζει διὰ τὸ συνδιαιρεῖσθαι αὐτῷ τὰς λείας

32. Note that the rendering is an idiomatic translation of the Hb. idiom but at the same time reproduces, in a fashion, the word-for-word meaning of the Hb: όλιγο-: ἐμπροσθεν ('be short'), ψω-: χρῆ . The translators no doubt appreciated this.
'Patis is protecting them [certain robbers] because they have shared the stolen goods with him.' Cf. 451.14 (iii B.C.), PSI 440.14 (iii B.C.).

The word occurs as follows in the Pentateuch:

1. (a) 'cover', literally: Nu. 9.20 ... ὁταν σκεπάση ή νεφέλη ἡμέρας ἄριστῳ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς. Similarly Ex. 40.3,21.
   (b) 'cover' or 'protect' (by covering): Ex. 33.22 ἤνικα δ' ἀν παρέλθη μου ἡ δόξα, καὶ θάσω σε εἰς ὑπὸ τῆς πέτρας καὶ σκεπάσω τῇ χειρί μου ἐπὶ σέ, ἐως ἀν παρέλθω, De. 32.11.

2. 'protect', without the idea of covering:
   De. 13.9 οὐ φείσεται ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἐπ' αὐτῷ, οὐκ ἐπιποθήσεις ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐδὲ οὐ μὴ σκεπάσῃς αὐτόν.

Here, as in the PCAIR.ZEN. example above, σκεπάζω is used of protecting a guilty person.

3. 'conceal':
   Ex. 2.2-3 ... καὶ έτεκεν ἄρσεν· ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸ ἀστείου ἐσκέπασαν αὐτὸ μήνας τρεῖς. (3) ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἦδυναντο αὐτὸ ἐτι κρύπτετεν, ...

'Protect', as in sense 2., is possible here, but 'conceal' suits the context better. Moreover ἐσκέπασαν αὐτὸ renders MT יָהָנָן ( יאך 'hide'); and the same Hebrew verb is rendered by κρύπτετεν in the next sentence. Though there is as yet no contemporary evidence for this further development in meaning, it is a natural one and is paralleled e.g. in καλύπτω, 'cover'>'conceal'.

---

33. Elsewhere in LXX there are a number of probable examples of σκεπάζω 'conceal', especially 1Ki. 26.1 ἵδον δαινοῖ σκεπάζεται μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ βουνῷ τοῦ Εχέλα ( γνω hithp.).

In Mod. Gk. 'cover' is the usual sense (Papastavrou), though in some expressions signs of a development from 'cover' to 'conceal' are apparent: cf. Lex. Pr. s.v.: 'συγκαλύπτω πρᾶξιν ἐνοχον, ἀποκρυπται, ἵδον ἐν τῇ φο. << tα σκεπάζω >>', AELex. s.v. 'hide': σκεπάζω σκάνδαλον.
The earlier senses are 'bring together', 'combine', 'compare' (Hp., Pl., Arist., etc.). From iii B.C. onwards it is commonly found in the sense of 'decide', both of judicial decisions proper, and more generally of any decision, but especially one made by a person in authority. E.g. PMagd. 24.12 (iii B.C.) ὅπως ... τῇ χεὶ ἔχιασ, ὅς ἦν ὁ στρατηγὸς συγκρίνηι, PCair.zen. 371.14 (239 B.C.) παραγενού, ὅπως ὑποστώμεν ('offer', 'bid') καθά ἄν συγκρίνηις, PLille 1 verso. 27 (259-8 B.C.) ὠς τέρον δὲ ἐπισκοποῦμεν τὸ περίκλιμα συνέκρινεν τὰ χῶμα ποῆσαι [...].

Cf. σύγκρισις, in the sense of 'decision' attested first in iii B.C. papyri (examples in LSJ s.v. III.2).

This use is found in the Pentateuch in Nu. 15.33-34 καὶ προσήγαγον αὐτὸν [a man found gathering wood on the Sabbath] πρὸς Μωϋσῆν καὶ Ἀαρών καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν οὐν Ἰσραήλ. (34) καὶ ἀπέθεντα αὐτὸν εἰς φυλακὴν, οὕτως συνέκριναν, τι ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν.

συγκρίνω is also used in the Pentateuch in the quite different sense of 'interpret', 'explain' (a dream), e.g. 40.8 ἑνύπνιον εἰδομεν, καὶ ὁ συγκρίνων οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτό, similarly 16,22; 41.12,13,15 bis (in all ~ θαν.). This use is not yet satisfactorily paralleled outside Biblical literature, the example in Plb. 14.3.7 cited by Bauer, LSJ, being rather uncertain: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοὺς κατασκόπους ἀνακαλεσάμενος ... συνέκρινε καὶ διηρεύνα τὰ λεγόμενα ... 'Compare' is just as possible here as 'interpret'. There is however no reason to doubt that 'interpret' was normal Greek. κρίνω is old in this sense, e.g. Hdt. 1.120 ... τοὺς αὐτούς τῶν μάγων οἷ τὸ ἑνύπνιον οἷ ταῦτη ἔκριναν, 7.19 bis, and the same semantic development is attested later in διδάχως (cited by LSJ, s.v. V, from Ph., Junc.; cf. διδαχή 'interpretation' in Ph., Paus., LSJ s.v. II).

συγκυρέω (-κύρω)

The older meanings (Homer + ) were 'meet by chance';

34. Further examples in MM, LSJ.
'happen', 'occur'. From iii B.C. onwards we find it used in the sense of 'adjoin', 'be attached to', 'belong to', 'pertain to'. More than one sense could be distinguished here, but it is difficult to do this with accuracy. The differing uses shade into one another, and in some of the examples it is not possible to say whether one sense rather than another is intended.

The Koine usage of the word may be illustrated by the following:

PYale 46.11 (246-221 B.C.) ό δέ ... πέπρακεν τό [τρίτο]ν ἀπό τοῦ συνκύροντος τῇ οἰκίᾳ [τόπου] Πετήσιε Πετήσιος οἰκοδομεῖν ... '... one third of the land adjoining, belonging to, the house.'

Similarly

PLond. 604.2 (47 A.D.) παρά ... Σωτηρίχου κωμογραμμ(ατέως) Κροκοδείλων πόλεως καὶ τῶν συνκυροισῶν κωμῶν.

Compare

PYale 46.5 ὑπαρχούσης γάρ μοι οἰκίας καὶ τῶν συνκυρόντων τῶν πατρικῶν ἐν τῇ προγεγραμμένῃ κώμῃ ...

PPettr. 3.57(a).12 (iii B.C.) ... πρὸς ἃ ὑπόπτες τῆν ὑπάρχουσαν μοι οἰκίαν καὶ αὐλήν καὶ τά συνκύροντα ἐν Εὔφρεττῳ

In these two examples, though the value of συνκύρω itself is clear, it is not easy to tell whether τά συνκύροντα refers to the 'appurtenances', 'accessories' of the house (and courtyard), or the adjoining ground (sc. e.g. χώρα). OGI 52.1 (Ptolemais, iii B.C.) is similarly ambiguous.

The purely local sense, 'adjoin', is clear however e.g. in Plb. 3.59.7 ... τήν ἐξωθεν ταύταις ταῖς χώραις συγκυροῦσαν ὑδαταν.

For the sense of 'pertain, relate, to' we may quote

PREv. 43.14 (iii B.C.) καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ φορτία τὰ συνκύροντα εἰς τήν ἐλαίικήν.

'And the other kinds of produce pertaining to the oil-monopoly.'
The examples in the Pentateuch, which are fully in accordance with contemporary usage, are as follows:

**Nu. 21.25** καὶ κατῴκησεν Ἰσραήλ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν τῶν Ἀμορραίων, ἐν Εσεβων καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς συγκυρούσαις αὐτὴ

Here the verb has the same rather vague sense as in *PYale 46* and *PLond. 604* above. We could translate 'all the cities belonging to it' (sc. πόλεσιν or κώμαις). The turning of the Hebrew idiom into ordinary Greek is noteworthy.

**Nu. 35.4** καὶ τὰ συγκυρούντα τῶν πόλεων, ἀς δώσετε τοῖς Λευίταις, ἀπὸ τείχους τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐξ οἰκισμῶν πῆχεις κύκλω.

τὰ συγκυρούντα, rendering Hebrew שְׁכֵרוֹת 'common-land', BDB, refers to the farm-land lying around and belonging to these cities, and may be translated 'the adjoining ground', 'the outskirts'. 'Suburbs', now suggesting a residential area, is less satisfactory. In vs. 3 it is clearly stated that this land is for the pasturing of the Levites' cattle.

**De. 2.37** πλὴν εἰς γῆν υἱών Αμμων οὐ προσήλθομεν, πάντα τὰ συγκυρούντα χειμάρρου [−ω Α] Ιαβοκ καὶ τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐν τῇ ὀρεινῇ, καθότι ἔνετείλατο ἡμῖν κύριος ὁ θεός ἡμῶν.

'All the parts bordering on wady Jabok.'

As to the form, the word fluctuates between -έω and -ω (cf. aor. -έκυρσα, Homer, dram., etc.) throughout its history.

---


As Thackeray notes, *ib.*, the translators use no less than four different words to render שְׁכֵרוֹת in 35.2-7, a good illustration of their conscious effort to make their version more readable by the use of stylistic variation.

36. **De. 3.4** πάντα τὰ περίχωρα Αργοβ Β; πάντα τὰσ συγκυρούντα Β†: dl. Rahlfs (*ex 2.37*).
as does κυρ-έω, -ω (and cf. προσκυρ-έω, -ω). However, συγκύρω
is usual in the Ptolemaic papyri. The fact that our text of
the Pentateuch shows the other form has no particular signifi-
cance. Original -κύρω could have been altered to -κυρέω in the
course of transmission, or alternatively the -έω form may
have been more common in the translators' time than our present
evidence indicates. It was certainly used by Polybius (2.20.8,
6.6.5, and probably therefore 3.59.7 quoted above) and is
attested, though infrequently, in later papyri, e.g. posy. 907.9,
13 (iii A.D.), PSI 698.6 (iv A.D.), 705.8 (iii A.D.).

In Classical usage the meanings of ώδε were 'thus' (etc.),
and 'hither'. Its use in the sense of 'here' appears first in
iii B.C., Herod. 2.98, 3.96, in papyri e.g. P Cair Zen. 376.11
(iii B.C.) δτε ο γλάυκος ἵππος ἔμενεν ὄδε, ..., Philb. 46.15
(258/257 B.C.) ἐδει δὲ πάλαι τα ἐνέχυμα αὐτῶν ὄδε ἴναι καὶ
πεποδόθαι. It continues to be used also in the sense of
'hither', e.g. PSI 599.3 (iii B.C.), but 'thus' becomes very
rare.

The translators of the Pentateuch frequently use the word
in the new sense. To classify the examples fully:

1. 'hither', Ge. 15.14,16; 42.15; 45.5,8,13; Ex. 3.5. The
phrase ώδε καὶ ὃδε, 'this way and that', found also in AP 5.128,
Call. Epigr. 30.2, occurs in Ex. 2.12 περιβλεψάμενοι ὃ δὲ ὃδε καὶ
ὡδε οὐχ ὀρφ οὐδένα.

37. Mayser, Gramm. I.i 348.
38. There is however no sign of -κύρω in the MS tradition
(Brooke-McLean).
39. There is no case for treating συγκυρέω and συγκύρω as separate words, as LSJ's separate entries (with different senses)
suggest. (They further confuse the matter by proceeding to add,
at the end of the entry under συγκύρω, 'also -κυρέω ...').
On the fluctuation between -έω and -ω generally see Thack-
eray, Gramm. 243f., Schwyzier, Gramm. I 720f.
The distinction between place where and place whither in
adverbs of place, not always maintained even in Class.Gk., tends
to disappear altogether in the Koine. Other examples are πογοι for
both 'where?' and 'whither?', with ποι lost; ἐκεί 'there' and
'thither', ἐκεῖος frequently 'there'. Cf. Bl. DF §103, Jannaris,
Gramm. §435. Mod.Eng. has also abandoned this distinction.
2. 'here', Ge. 19.12 ἐστιν τῆς σοι ὅδε, γαμβροὶ ἡ υἱόι ἡ
θυγατέρες; 31.37; 38.22 (ἐνταῦθα Α) 40.15; 42.33; Nu. 14.23
οὐκ ὁψονται τὴν γῆν ... ἀλλὰ ἦ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, ἡ ἐστὶν μετ’ ἐμοῦ
ὁδε, 23.29 bis; 32.16; De. 5.3; 12.8; 29.14 bis; 31.21.
Ge. 22.4-5 Ἀβρααμ ... ἐίδεν τὸν τόπον μακρόθεν. (5) καὶ
ἐίπεν Ἀβρααμ τοῖς παισίν αὐτοῦ Καθίσατε αὐτῶν μετὰ τῆς
όνου, ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὸ παιδάριον διελευσόμεθα ἐξὸς ὅδε καὶ
προσκυνήσαντες ἀναστρέψωμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς.
The Greek here is a literal rendering of ἐν-τῷ υἱῷ, literally
'we shall go as far as here', and is probably to be taken,
like the Hebrew (see BDB), as accompanied by a gesture indicat­ing
the place in the distance.
ἀναστρέφω, 'return', 'come, go, back', Ge. 8.11 καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν
πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἡ περιστερά, 18.14, etc., PMich.Zen. 55.7 (240 B.C.)
... ἵνα ταχέως πρὸς με ἀναστρέψῃ, PCair.Zen. 815.4 (257 B.C.);
others in Kiessling. (Pass. in this sense already in Pl. Plt.
271 a.)
ἀντίκειμαι, 'resist', 'oppose', 'be an adversary', Ex. 23.22
ἐχθρεύσω τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου καὶ ἀντικείσομαι τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις
σοι, UPZ 69.6 (152 B.C.) ὅρω ἐν τῷ ὑπνῷ τῶν δραπέτων Μενέδημο
ἀντικείμενον ἡμῖν.
διαφωνέω (a) 'be missing', 'be lost', 'go astray', often in
papyri, e.g. PSI 527.15 (iii B.C., a list of items) διαφωνήκεν
ἰδρώια γ, 666.7,17, PCair.Zen.787.65, PCol.Zen. 81.7, 90.6
(all iii B.C.), Plb. 21.42.23. Hence euphemistically (as in
English, e.g. '100 men were lost'): (b) 'perish', 'die', of
plants BGU 530.31 (i B.C.), books D.S. 16.3, persons Agatharc. 84,
SIG 611.10 (ii B.C.), and probably PPetr. 2.13.3.4 (iii B.C.)
(quoted in MM). In the two Pentateuch examples, Ex. 24.11, Nu.
31.49 (see the whole context), either sense is possible, owing
to the ambiguity of the word.41
δοχή, 'entertainment', 'feast', Ge. 26.30 καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς

LSJ's entry under this word is a muddle, only made worse by
the Supplement's alteration.
δοχήν, καὶ ἐφαγον καὶ ἐπιον, 21.8, PSI 858.10 (iii B.C.)

ήμιταινίδια ... τὰ δοθέντα εἰς τὴν δοχὴν τὴν Κρίτωνος, PCasir.
zen. 87.7 (iii B.C.); others in Kiessling. (The same semantic
development is seen in Eng. 'reception'.)

ἔντρέπομαι, 'be ashamed', 'feel shame', Le. 26.41, Nu. 12.14,
VPZ 62.29 (161/160 B.C.).

ήγεμονία, a military unit, 'regiment', 'company', Nu. 1.52 καὶ
παρεμβαλοῦσιν οἱ νιψ Ισραὴλ ἀνὴρ ἐν τῇ ἐαυτοῦ τάξει καὶ ἀνήρ
κατὰ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ἠγεμονίαν σὺν δυνάμει αὐτῶν, 2.17 B, Sic 374.23
(c. 287/6 B.C.) τοὺς μὲν βουλομένους στρατεύεσθαι διὰ λύκησεν
ὅπως ἂν καταχωρισθῶσιν ἐν ἠγεμονίαις, Prein 9.13 (112 B.C.).

καιρός, generally 'time', 'period of time' (synonymous with
χρόνος), Nu. 22.4, De. 1.9,16,18, etc., Arist., papyri, inscrip-
tions, Plb., evidence in J. Barr, Biblical Words for Time

κατατρέχω, 'pursue', 'assail', Le. 26.37 ὑπερῴηται ὁ ἄδελφος
τὸν ἄδελφον ὡσεὶ ἐν πολέμῳ οὐδὲνος κατατρέχοντος, VPZ 68.6
(152 B.C.) ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐνύπνια ὥρῳ πονηρά, βλέπω Μενέδημον
κατατρέχοντα με.

κύριος, 'owner', Ex. 21.28 ὁ δὲ κύριος τοῦ ταύρου ἄθροι ἔσται,
29,32,34, al., Prib. 34.3 (243-2 B.C.) ἐπαναγκάσαι ... τὸ
ὑποζύγιον ἀποδοῦναι τῷ κυρίῳ, PCol.Zen.30.8 (256 B.C.).

λαλέω, 'speak', often in Pentateuch, Arist., Men., Herod.,
papyri e.g. PSI 412.1, PPetr. 2.13.6.9 (both iii B.C.); often
already in Ar. Anz, Subsidia 309f.

παρακαλέω (i) 'comfort', 'cheer up', De. 24.67 καὶ παρεκλήθη
Ἰσαὰκ περὶ Σαρρας τῆς μητρός αὐτοῦ, 37.35, 38.12, 50.21, now
Praun. 10.28 (end iii B.C.) ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑπάρχων ὑμῖν οὐθέν κακὸν
οὐ μὴ πάντες. ὡσεὶ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς. (ii) 'Beseech', 'entreat',
'request', De. 13.7 ἐὰν δὲ παρακαλέσῃ σε ὁ ἄδελφος σου ... λάθρᾳ
λέγων Βαθύσωμεν καὶ λατρεύσωμεν θεοῖς ἐτέροις, commonly papyri,
inscriptions, from ii B.C. onwards, see MM, Bauer. Add, s.v.l.,
PCol.Zen 11.6 (257 B.C.) τὰρακαλοῦμεν σὲ τὴν τε ἐπιστολὴν ... ἀποδοῦναι.
περίβλημα, 'garment', Nu. 31.20 πάν περίβλημα καί πάν σκεύος δερμάτινον ... ἁφαγνεῖτε, cf. Pcair.zen. 92.2 (iii B.C.) περίβλημα λινοῦ πεπλυμένον α.

περιδέξιον, τό, 'bracelet', Ex. 35.22, Nu. 31.50, PPetr. 2. p.22.24 (iii B.C.). Deissmann, BS 150.

πλεονάζω intrans., 'be more', 'be in excess', Ex. 16.23 πάν τὸ πλεονάζον καταλίπετε αὐτὸ εἰς ἀποθήκην εἰς τὸ πρωί, 26.12, al., PRev. 57.13 (iii B.C.) τὸ πλεονάζον τοῦ προκηρυχθέντος ἐξάγωμεν σῆμα τὸ κρότωνα, ..., PLille 1 verso. 16 (iii B.C.).

προσνοέω, 'observe', 'perceive', Nu. 23.9 ἀπὸ κορυφῆς ὀρέων ὑψομεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπὸ βουνῶν προσνοήσω αὐτόν, Penteux. 30.3 (iii B.C.) προσνοήσας ἰμάτιον μου ... αὐτὸ ἔρχετο ἐξω.

σάγμα, 'saddle-bag', Ge. 31.34 ἔλαβε τὰ εἰδώλα καὶ ἐνέβαλεν αὐτὰ εἰς τὰ σάγματα τῆς καμήλου, now PARI. 562.30 (251 B.C.) ἔρσεν σῶν σάγματα (δραχμαί) κη ('for a male donkey with saddle-bags 28 dr.').

συναντάω, 'befall', 'happen' (to a person, dat.), Ex. 5.3 ... μήποτε συναντήσῃ ἡμῖν θάνατος ἢ φόνος, De. 31.29 A, PSI 392.1 (242/1 B.C.) εἰ ἔρρωσαι καὶ τὰλλά σοι κατὰ τρόπον συναντάται, ... 10, Plu., Plb., al.

σώμα, 'slave', Ge. 34.29, probably 36.6, very common in papyri, e.g. Pcair.zen. 698.3,7,23 (iii B.C.). Deissmann, BS 160.
CHAPTER V
NEW FORMATIONS

In addition to new semantic developments, such as those just considered, we find in the Koine vocabulary a large number of new formations; that is, words newly formed on existing stems. These are the subject of the present chapter. Here too it will be seen that the Pentateuch vocabulary is in close agreement with many developments that had taken place by the third century B.C. The formations examined are those that are new in the Koine and are attested in documents of the translators' time. They are of a wide variety of types, including not only formations by means of suffixes, but also compounds formed with prepositions and in other ways.

As before, some examples are less fully treated than others. In many cases it is necessary only to notice that the word occurs in the Pentateuch and contemporary documents. If it is not expressly stated it is to be assumed that the word under discussion is or appears to be a new formation of the Koine.

Compounds with prepositions

Among new compounds of verbs with prepositions an important group is that formed by compounds of πορεύομαι. Apart from διαπορεύομαι (Th., Hdt. + ), συμπορεύομαι (Th. + ), and of course έμπορεύομαι ('be a merchant', 'trade'), the compounds of this verb are not usual in Classical Greek. In the Koine, as will become clear from the examples dealt with below, they come into use as the main replacements for the earlier compounds of -έρχομαι, which tend to drop out.1 The new compounds usually

---


It is worth mentioning that ἔρχομαι becomes obsolete only in compounds. The simplex continues in use in the Koine, but with a restriction in meaning: it now has the sense of 'come' only, not 'come' and 'go' as in Class. Cf. Bl. DF §101 s.v.
supply the present and imperfect, the future and aorist being supplied as before by compounds of -ελεύσομαι (Attic -ειμι), and -ηλθον. In the perfect -πεπορευμαι and the older suppletive -ελήλυθα seem to be equally normal. This pattern, though usual, is affected in some cases by compounds of other verbs, notably -βαίνω, which overlap with the main suppletives. In the case of words for 'go away', it is remarkable that, the present tense being provided by ἀποτρέχω, the -πορεύομαι compound is uncommon (see pp. 125 ff.).

εἰσπορεύομαι

Apart from an example of the active in the sense of 'lead in' in E. εἰ. 1285, the word appears in Classical times only in Xenophon, who in this, as so often, foreshadows Koine usage: cy.hr. 2.3.21 οὕτω δ' εἰσαγαγόν κατέκλινεν ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον ὥσπερ εἰσπορεύοντο.

In the third century B.C. we have PCair.Zen. 15 verso. 18 (259 or 258 B.C.) ἡμῶν εἰς Ἀίγυπτον εἰσπορευομένων, o.g. 56.4 (Egypt, 239/8 B.C.) ... καὶ οἱ εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον εἰσπορευόμενοι πρὸς τὸν στολισμὸν τῶν θεῶν, pcol.Zen. 6.10 (257 B.C.) ... τοῦ ἀώστρου μηνός οὗ εἰσπορεύεται Ἡρόφ(ντος) πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 81.14.

Later examples are found e.g. in roxy. 717.7, 744.4 (both i B.C., 2. G.D. Kilpatrick, JTS XLVIII (1947) 61-3, observed this feature in the vocabulary of Evv. Marc., but, since he made no comparison with the Koine generally, thought it was peculiar to Mark, and found it hard to explain. It is clear that Mark simply reflects current usage. The fact that Evv. Matt. and Luc. do not conform to the pattern, as K. notes (p.63), is almost certainly due to their tendency towards more literary Greek.

3. Cf. Mod.Gk. vernac. βγαίνω (< ἐκβαίνω), μπαίνω (< ἐμβαίνω), κατεβαίνω, ἀνεβαίνω, the usual words for 'go out, in, down, up', respectively (Swanson).

4. An interesting detail is the way compounds of εἴμι, which are in general lost in the Koine vernacular, as is the simplex (Bl. DF §99.1), hang on in certain forms, notably the participle. 'The participle and the inf. of a few compounds seem to have been the last to go', Thackeray, Gramm. 257. In the Pentateuch άπ-, εἰσ-, ἕξ-, and ἐπ-εἴμι all occur only in the participle: Ex. 33.8; 28.29, 35; 28.35; De. 32.29. Likewise in iii B.C. papyri almost all occurrences of compounds of εἴμι are participial in form (exceptions are PPetr. 2.16.6 εἰσελήνα, 2.38(b).12 εἰσολαστὶς, s.v.t.): see Preisigke, Kiessling and Suppl., Mayser, Gramm. I. i 355, and cf. exx. quoted in MM s. vv.
and pres. tense), quoted in MM, and in the NT (c.18 times, always pres. or impf.).

The word is very common in the Pentateuch, occurring over fifty times, usually as a rendering of Hebrew קִין. Its usage is straightforward: it has the same sense as Classical εἰσέρχομαι, 'go in, into', 'enter', in various constructions. E.g. with εἰς Ex. 28.30 ... δὴν εἰσπορεύνηται εἰς τὸ ἄγαλμα ἐναντίον κυρίου, 34.12 ... τῆς γῆς, εἰς ἢν εἰσπορεύη εἶς αὐτήν, abs. De. 28.6 εὐλογημένος σὺ ἐν τῷ εἰσπορεύεσθαι σε, νῦ. 4.47 πᾶς ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος πρὸς τὸ ὄραμα τῶν ἔργων.

Most of the examples in the Pentateuch are in the present tense, four in the impf. (Ge. 6.4 Ex. 33.8, 34.34, Le. 33.40). Conversely εἰσέρχομαι is not found in the pres., and in the impf. only once (Ge. 38.9, without apparent justification). For the future εἰσελεύσομαι is usual (over 40 times), εἰσπορεύομαι occurring only in De. 1.22 B (εἰσπορευόμεσαι A, al.); similarly the aor. is normally εἰσῆλθον (very common), with εἰσπορεύσον only in De. 1.8 B (εἰσελθόντες A, al.). In the pf. we find both εἰσελήλυθα, De. 26.3, and εἰσεπορεύωμαι, Ex. 1.1, 14.28.

The synonymity of εἰσπορεύομαι with the verbs supplying the other tenses is well illustrated by Ge. 7.16 καὶ τὰ εἰσπορεύμενα ἄρσεν καὶ θήλη ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκὸς εἰσῆλθεν, καθά ἐνετείλατο ὁ θεός τῷ Νῶε.

The available evidence suggest that the above pattern is in accordance with contemporary usage. In papyri of the third century B.C. εἰσερχόμαι is, as we have seen, usually present tense; εἰσέρχομαι occurs only in PST 418.16 ὡς ἄν εἰσερχόμεθα. I do not, however, know of any example of εἰσεπόρευμαι (εἰσελήλυθα is found in Pleph. 13.6). In the NT εἰσέρχομαι is confined to the more literary gospels and Ep. Hebr., whereas Mark uses for the pres. and impf. only εἰσπορεύομαι.

5. See also Anz, Subsidia 332.

6. Εἰσήρχετο A D E and various cursive, εἰσῆλθεν abcdfikmorxcr, εἰσπορεύετο hīt. In view of the above evidence perhaps εἰσῆλθεν or εἰσπορεύετο is to be preferred here. (Either aor. or impf. is possible in the context: see Bl. DF §367 on the construction.)
In each of the compounds of πορεύομαι discussed below we find the same agreement between the pattern of suppletion in the Pentateuch and in contemporary Greek. I have not repeated the details of the papyrus evidence each time: as far as I am aware, in each case the πορεύομαι compound is usual in the present and imperfect, while the έρχομαι compound is attested rarely or not at all in those tenses.

έπιπορεύομαι

There are occasional examples of the word in Classical times, but not as a synonym of έπέρχομαι.⁷ From iii B.C. onwards it is common in the present tense in the same senses as έπέρχομαι.⁸ Thus e.g. 'visit', 'go the rounds of', PLille 3.78 (iii B.C.) συντετάχαμεν Μιύσει τώι τοπ[ογρ(αμματεί)] ἐπὶ τούτους ἐπιπορεύεσθαι τούς τόπους, PHib. 249.2 (iii B.C.) (= έπέρχομαι III, LSJ); 'take legal action' (against) PSorb. 15.5-12 (c. 266 B.C.) ἄλλ' ὅταν ὁποτερσοῦν αὕτων ἐπιπορεύηται ..., ἢ τε ἐφοδὸς ἀκυρος ἑστω καὶ προσαποτεισάτο ῆ ἐπιπορευόμενος ἔφ' ὅν ἄν ἐπιπορεύηται δραχμᾶς χιλίας, and often elsewhere (= έπέρχομαι I.1.d).

The synonymy of the various suppletives is well illustrated by an example such as PAdler 2.10-14 (124 B.C.), where we have first the future ἐπελευσομένους, then present ἐπιπορεύεσθαι, and then aorist ἐπέλθηι, all in the sense of 'take legal action'. Similarly PHib. 96.10, PHamb. 190.7 (both iii B.C.).

The word occurs once in the Pentateuch:

Le. 26.33 καὶ διασπερῶ ύμᾶς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἐξαναλώσει ύμᾶς

---

⁷ Those known to me are Heraclit. 45 (Diels) (vi/v B.C.) ψυχῆς πεῖρατα ἰῶν σύκ ἀν ἐξεύροιο, πάσαν ἐπιπορευόμενος δδόν. Clearly this must be '... though you travelled over the whole road', with πορεύομαι having its original sense (cf. MM s.v.). Ephor. Fr. 5 (Jac., = 70 Müller) (iv B.C.) αἱ πάλαι γυναικεὶς ἔστωσαι ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐπιπορευόμεναι τὸν ἑστὸν, 'plying the loom', = ἐποίχομαι II.4, LSJ.

⁸ Cf. LSJ s.v. έπέρχομαι I.1.d: 'ἐπιπορεύομαι (q.v.) is more common in the pres. in the Hellenistic period'. But this note seems to refer to only one sense of έπέρχομαι, viz. 'take legal proceedings'.

The translators evidently did not recognize "προσπορεύομαι" in the sense of 'draw' (a sword), and attempted to render its other sense 'empty out'. "ἐπιπορευομένη" is a paraphrastic addition rather than a literal rendering of any of the Hebrew words.

"ἐπιπορεύομαι" here has the sense of 'come upon', with the idea of surprise, hostility, or violence. Cf. *Ppetr.* 2.10(1).11 (c. 240 B.C.) Ισχύριας ο οικονόμος ἐπιπορεύεται ἕμιν συντάσσων διδόναι ἐς τά ξένια χήνας ιβ ἡμῶν οὐ δυναμένων, 'I. descends on us and ...'; *Pyale* 53.11 (mid ii B.C.) ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπιπορευομένοις ἐπὶ τὸν κεκομμένον ὑπʼ ἐμοῦ χόρτον καὶ ἐκβιασάμενος τὸν φύλακα ἀπενήνεκατε ἐις Λ. This is an old established use of ἐπ-ἐρχομαι -ἐλεύσομαι -ῆλθον: see *LSJ* s.v. I.1 and 2, Bauer s.v. 2. In the Pentateuch cf. e.g. *Ge.* 42.21 ἐνεκεν τούτου ἐπῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἡ ἀλήψις αὐτῆ. There are no occurrences of ἐπέρχομαι present tense in the Pentateuch.

"προσπορεύομαι"

The earliest examples are in Arist., *HA* 625a 13, *Oec.* 1353 bl. Then from the third century B.C. onwards it is common: e.g. *PSI* 403.16 (iii B.C.) έαν προσπορεύηται η ἐνοχληί σε, ἐγχείρησαν αὐτόν, *SIC* 338.15 (Rhodes, iv/iii B.C.) θέμειν δέ τὰς στάλας μίας μέν ἐπὶ τὰς ἐσόδου τὰς ἐκ πόλιος ποτιπορευομένοις, μίαν δὲ ... For other examples see MM and below.

In the Pentateuch it is found about ten times, usually in the sense of 'go, come, to', 'draw near', 'approach' (in space), as in the examples just quoted. Thus *Ex.* 28.43 οταν προσπορευομαι κατευρυγείν πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, 30.20, *Le.* 10.9 etc.; *Nu.* 1.51 καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐξαίρεσιν τὴν σκηνὴν καθελούσιν αὐτὴν οἱ Λευίται ... καὶ ὁ ἀλλογενῆς ὁ προσπορευομένοις ἀποδανέτο, 9

9. *LSJ*’s classification of this example under 'II. attach oneself to ...; of proselytes' is simply wrong. *Ex.* 30.20 is also mistakenly classified here. (The whole entry under this word is in need of reorganization.)
similarly 18.7.

In two instances we find idiomatic uses that are paralleled in the papyri.

In Ex. 24.14 Moses and Joshua leave the camp, saying to the elders

\[ \text{Ἡσυχάζετε αὐτοῦ, ἔως ἀναστρέψωμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· καὶ ἱδού Ἀαρών καὶ ὁ μεθ' ὑμῶν· ἐὰν τίνι συμβῇ κρίσις, προσπορεύεσθαι αὐτοῖς} \quad (\text{MT ψι}) \]

Compare \textit{PMich.Zen.} 46.5 (251 B.C.): Pyron writes to Zenon that although he has long wanted to ask him for money, \textit{διαισχυνόμενος καὶ πλεῖους προσπορευομένους ἀπείρημαι, 'I have refrained until now, being ashamed to see so many others applying to you' (ed.). In both cases the sense of \textit{προσπορεύομαι} is not simply 'draw near' in space, but rather 'apply to', 'address oneself to' (a person for a purpose).\textsuperscript{10} \textit{PMich.Zen.} 60.9 (248/7 B.C.) is I think another example of this use: Pais recommends that Zenon's boat, of which P. is captain, be repaired so that it may find work, \textit{νυν! γὰρ δντος παλαιοῦ οὐθεὶς προσπορεύεται, 'no-one applies (to hire it)'}. Cf. \textit{PCair.Zen.} 393.2 (iii B.C.) \textit{προσήλθέν μοι ὡνητῆς περὶ τοῦ ἵππου τοῦ μεγάλου,}

In the other instance we find the word in the sense of 'apply oneself to', 'proceed with' (an activity):

\textit{Ex. 36.2 καί ἕκάλεσεν Μωυσῆς Βεσελεηλ καὶ Ελιαβ ... καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐκουσίως βουλομένους προσπορεύεσθαι πρὸς τὰ ἔργα ὥστε συντελεῖν αὐτά} \quad (\text{MT παρθ}) \]

Compare \textit{PCair.Zen.} 60.6 (257 B.C.) \textit{προσπορεύεται δὲ καὶ πρὸς [ταῦτα] καὶ πρὸς τὰ λοιπὰ μαθήματα, 'he is proceeding with this and his other studies; 132.4 (256 B.C.) \textit{où προσπορευόμεθα πρὸς τὰ γενήματα τὰ ἐκ ταύτης τῆς γῆς, ἀλλὰ συμβαίνει καταφθείσεσθαι,}

\textsuperscript{10} Cf. Eng. 'go to' in the sense of 'have recourse, appeal to', \textit{SOED s.v. go III.4 Lat. adeo, 'to go to for help, redress, etc., appeal or apply to'}, \textit{OLD s.v. 7.}
'we are not getting on with (the harvesting of) the crops...'

In both the above instances προσπορεύομαι can also be taken as a literal equivalent of the Hebrew, in the sense of 'draw near'. This raises a problem, often encountered elsewhere. In which sense are we to understand the word? In my opinion we are justified in taking it in the sense it would normally have in these contexts. The translators must have been conscious of the sense their rendering would have as Greek. Indeed, I think it possible that they welcomed the opportunity of using a word which, while a literal equivalent of the Hebrew, also gave a sense more appropriate to the context. (A merely literal rendering could have been achieved by the use of ἐγγίζω, which often translates וּסַשׁ in the Pentateuch.)

προσπορεύομαι is always present tense in the Pentateuch. Conversely προσέρχομαι does not occur in the present (or imperfect), and προσελεύσομαι and ἔλθον are common.

The remaining compounds of πορεύομαι I note more briefly, giving only the essential points.

ἐκπορεύομαι
First in Critias (25.36, v B.C.), then Xenophon (An. 5.1.8, 5.6.33, 6.6.37, Ages. 2.26), but not common until the Koine. There are as yet no examples in iii B.C. papyri, Prein. 109.13 (131 B.C.) being the earliest, but from the inscriptions we have SIG 1219.15 (Gambrea, iii B.C.), and also 700.12,26 (117 B.C.). It occurs 19 times in Plb., then in later papyri (see MM), and in NT. In the majority of these occurrences it is used in the present tense.

11. Similarly 531.2 (iii B.C.) 'μὴ προσπορεύεις πρὸς τὰ [ἔργα ...]', 16 ταύτα δ[ε γέγραψα σοι] ἵνα εἰδῆς στι[προσπορεῦο] μα[ πρὸς τὰ ἔργα. (The restorations may be regarded as certain.) Note the similarity with the Ex. example. This is all the more significant in that the pl. τὰ ἔργα in Ex. 36.2 is independent of the original (as often elsewhere in the Pentateuch): MT -אֶ תָּרָב הַנְּפָשׁ גִּבֵּה. The pl. can have been used here only because it was the more idiomatic Gk. PAmh. 33.17 (ii B.C.), quoted in MM and LSJ, could also be classified as an example of this use.

See also the use of προσέρχομαι in this sense, LSJ s.v. I.6. Lat. adeo once again shows a parallel semantic development: see OLD s.v. 10.
The word appears often in the Pentateuch (over 40 times), almost always in the present and imperfect. The perfect occurs in the B text of Nu. 31.28,36, De. 11.10, while A has the present in each case. ἐξέρχομαι, on the other hand, is used only in the future, aorist, and perfect.

παραπορεύομαι

Found first in Arist. ΗΑ 577b 32, then in Plb. and other Koine writers (see LSJ and Anz, Subsidia 348); in papyri PPetr. 2.13.5.3 and PSI 354.13 (quoted in MM), and now also PSorb. 33.3 (all iii B.C.). It is also found in the NT. In most instances it is present tense.

In the Pentateuch there are 10 occurrences (counting Ge. 32.22, where Rahlfs reads it with 911 against A etc.). The present and imperfect are usual, but we also find the future in De. 2.18 B (present A), and aorist in 2.14 (stylistic variation? παρήλθον precedes and follows). παρέρχομαι is used only in the future and aorist.

Another group is formed by compounds in which the preposition adds little or nothing to the sense. The new compound is usually synonymous with the earlier uncompounded verb (which may continue in use). The Koine shows a distinct fondness for such formations.12

ἐκτοκίζω ('lend at interest')

The simplex is old in this sense (e.g. D. 45.70). The compound has so far been recorded only in the third century B.C.: BGU 1246.24 οὐχ οτοί ἐίσον τὴν ἀφάλειαν μοι δοῦναι τῶν κερμάτων ὅν ὁ πατήρ λαβὼν παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξετόκισεν τῶν Βιήχει, 'they are not able to give me an assurance regarding the money my father took from me and lent on interest to Bienchis'. Similarly in

De. 23.20-1 οὐκ ἐκτοκιείς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου τόκον ἀργυρίου καὶ τόκον βρωμάτων καὶ τόκον παντὸς πράγματος, ὅδε ἐν ἐκδανείσῃς.

12. BI. DF §116.1
Cf. ἐνάρχομαι and καταφυτεύω discussed above, pp. 70 and 57.
(21) τῷ ἄλλοτρῷ ἐκτοκιεῖς, τῷ δὲ ἀδελφῷ σου οὐκ ἐκτοκιεῖς

The first example here is a little awkward, with the cogn. acc., but ought nevertheless to be taken in the same sense, rather than as 'exact interest'. We may translate: 'you shall not lend to your brother charging interest on money or ...'

ἐκδανεῖζω ('lend')

De. 23.20 (quoted above), Ex. 22.24, IG. 4.841.16 (Calauria, iii B.C.) οἵτινες τὸ τε ἀργύριον ἐκδανεῖζουντι κατὰ δραχμὰς τριάκρντα, and other inscriptions of the same date (LSJ). Equivalent to δανεῖζω.

ἐκτρυγάω ('gather' fruit, crop)

Le. 25.5 τὴν σταφυλὴν τοῦ ἁγίασματος σου οὐκ ἐκτρυγήσεις. ἐνιαυτὸς ἀναπαύσεως ἐσται τῇ γῇ, PGurob 8.10 (210 B.C.) ἔξετρυγάσαν ... ἀμπέλους ἓ, and now also Sammelb. 9209 Inv. E. 7154.2,5 (iii-ii B.C.).

Essentially the same phenomenon is seen in the following example of a verb compound with two propositions.

ἐξαποστέλλω

Except for an occurrence in Ep. Philipp. ap. D. 18.77, no doubt a late insertion, this compound is first found in the third century B.C. It has the same senses as Classical ἀποστέλλω, and is clearly just a more vigorous form of the older word. The latter continues in use alongside the new formation.

ἐξαποστέλλω is frequently found, both in papyri and Koine writers.13 E.g. FYale 39.12 ἐξαποστέσαν ἅντων πρὸς ἡμᾶς, PCair.Zen. 93.7, 578.2 (all iii B.C.). It occurs over 200 times in Plb. (Mauersberger).

The Pentateuch translators have used the word some 80 times, mostly as a rendering of παραπί.* It has several senses.

1. 'send away', 'dismiss', e.g. Ge. 45.1 'Εξαποστέιλατε πάντας ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, Ex. 18.27, Nu. 5.2, 3, 4.

2. 'send', 'dispatch' (to a destination, on a mission), e.g. Ge. 32.14 ἔλαβεν ὃν ἔφερεν δώρα καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν Ἰσαύ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, 8.10, Le. 26.25.

3. 'allow to leave', 'release', e.g. Ex. 4.23 Ἐξαπόστειλον τὸν λαόν μου, ἵνα μοι λατρεύσῃ, and so commonly elsewhere in Ex.; cf. Le. 14.7, al., of releasing an animal. This use is not found outside the LXX and must be due to literal rendering of the Hebrew word. The extension is however a fairly natural one (cf. the same development earlier in ἀφίημι).

4. 'give a send-off to', e.g. Ge. 31.27 ἐὰν ἀνήγγέλῃς μοι ἐξαπέστειλα ἂν σε μετ' εὐφροσύνης, 26.31. This too is a Hebraistic use.

ἀποστέλλω is also used in the Pentateuch, occurring, as in the Koine generally, more often than the double compound.

The remaining examples in this section are of various types. They are all straightforward and will be noticed only briefly.

ἀνθυφαίρέω ('deduct in turn')
Le. 27.18. LSJ cite the word from Plond. ined. 2361V (iii B.C.) (still unpublished). It is not attested again until much later.

διοδεύω ('travel through')
Ge. 12.6 διώδευσεν τὴν γῆν εἰς τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς, similarly 13.17. Arist. Mir. 832a 28, Plb. and other Koine writers, NT, and PAmh. 36.13 (ii B.C.). It can now be quoted also from iii B.C. papyri: BG U 1273.56 (222/1 B.C.) διοδευόμενοι διὰ τῆς προοπαρχούσης ἐκ τοῦ πύργου εἰς τὴν ρύμην διόδου, Pcair.zen. 367.33 (240 B.C.) διοδεύ[ειν]. For the use with acc. as in Ge. cf. Plb. 2.15.5.

14. LSJ, MM, Anz, Subsidia 344. Helbing, Kasussyntax 82, notes 'dass die Komposita von διοδεύω erst in der Κοινή häufiger sind'.

14. LSJ, MM, Anz, Subsidia 344. Helbing, Kasussyntax 82, notes 'dass die Komposita von διοδεύω erst in der Κοινή häufiger sind'.
This word, synonymous with αύριον, (the) 'next' (day), is found in the Koine from the third century B.C. onwards: e.g. Phamb. 1.27.4 (250 B.C.) τὴν δὲ ἑφαύριον αὐτὸν ἐπεζήτουν, Pliille 15.2 (242 B.C.). It also occurs in Plb. (3.53.6, etc.), and the NT. In the Pentateuch it is found a number of times: e.g. Ge. 19.34, Ex. 9.6 τῇ ἑπαύριον, Le. 23.11 τῇ ἑπαύριον τῆς πρώτης.

αύριον nevertheless remains the usual word (for examples in iii B.C. papyri see Kiessling), and is the commoner of the two in the Pentateuch.

καταγίγνομαι ('dwell')

Ex. 10.23 πᾶσι δ' τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ ἦν φῶς ἐν πάσιν, οἵς καταγίγνοντο, Nu. 5.3, De. 9.9. First in Test. ap. D. 21.22, Teles p. 19.3,5 (Hense). In papyri e.g. PMagd. 9.3 (iii B.C.) ὑπάρχει ἐμοὶ Ἰσαίαν ..., δ ὑπερβαθεὶκεν πεπονεκέναι καὶ διὰ τούτῳ μὴ δύνασθαι ἐν αὐτῷ καταγίνεσθαι, Pteb. 5.175 (118 B.C.). Cf. Anz, Subsidia 354.

περίζωμα

A type of garment, though its precise nature is uncertain. It presumably refers to an apron-like undergarment, fastened around the waist. UPZ 121.12 (iii B.C.) περί τὸ σῶμα χλαμύδα ('mantle', 'cloak') καὶ περίζωμα, Prev. 94.7 (iii B.C.) (broken context). It is used of a cook's apron in Hegesipp. Com. 1.7 (iii B.C.). Cf. also Plb. 6.25.3, where it describes a light undergarment contrasted with a cuirass. The word is found in the Pentateuch in Ge. 3.7 ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς περιζώματα (~ παλτό). The translators probably based their rendering on the etymology of the Hebrew word.

συλλαλέω ('converse with')

The word is not found before the third century B.C., and was obviously formed after λαλέω had become established as the ordinary word for 'speak'. It is common in papyri of the

---

15. On the origin of it see Bl. DF §§12.3, 233.3.
translators' time: e.g. *PCair.zen.* 315.2 (250 B.C.) ἐπίστητι δὲ ὅτι συνελάλησά σοι περὶ τῶν ..., 428.9, *PCol.zen.* 11.3 (both iii B.C.). In the Pentateuch it is found in Ex. 34.35 περιέθηκεν Μωϋσῆς κάλυμμα ἐπί τὸ πρόσωπον ἑαυτοῦ, ἐως ἃν εἰσέλθῃ συλλαλεῖν αὐτῷ.

συντίμησις ('valuation')

Le. 27.4 τῆς δὲ θηλείας ἡ συντίμησις τριάκοντα δίδραχμα, 27.18, Nu. 18.16. Cf. *PCair.zen.* 300.3 (250 B.C.) ἵνα ἐξ συντίμησεως καθά καὶ πρότερον τὸ ἡμίσευμα τάξωνται, *PRev.* 24.11 (iii B.C.).

*Other compounds*

ἄρχιοινοχόος

Found in Ge. 40.1,2,5,9,20,21,23. LSJ record it elsewhere only in Plu. Alex. 74, but ἄρχιοινοχόος found in the following is the same word: *PTeb.* 72.447 (114-3 B.C.) παρά Διονυσίου τοῦ γενομένου ἄρχιοινοχόου, *IG* 9(1).486.19 (ii or i B.C.) ἄρχιοινόχους: Κάλλιππος. 16

έργοδιώκτης

The word is used in the Pentateuch of the overseers of the children of Israel in Egypt: Ex. 5.6 συνέταξεν δὲ Φαραώ τοῖς ἐργοδιώκταις τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῖς γραμματεύσιν λέγων ..., similarly 3.7, 5.10,13 (MT ἕως in all). Cf. *PPetr.* 2.4(1).2 (c. 255 B.C., a complaint from certain quarrymen) ἀδίκουμεθα ὑπὸ Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ ἐργοδιώκτου ἐμβαλών ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν στερεάν πέτραν. To this can be added much later examples in papyri of v and vi A.D.,

16. See Mayser, *Gramm.* I.i 81, iii 160f., on ἄρχ-, ἄρχε-, ἄρχι- compounds in general. Mayser (I.i 81) seems to regard ἄρχ- as usual before vowels though he notes some exceptions, as ἄρχιερευς *PPetr.* 3. (p).2 (iii B.C.). Bl. DF 5124 note that in the Koine hiatus in composition is often not avoided (as it is generally in Attic). Similarly Thackeray, *Gramm.* 130. Thackeray may be right in suggesting (131) that assimilation is usual in earlier exx., hiatus in the later (though the whole question needs re-examination). The form in our MSS in Ge. 40 need not be original. (Brooke-McLean note v.l. only in Ge. 40.5: <ἀρχοινοχόου 76>.)
It is to be noticed that the word does not have an unfa­vourable connotation, but the neutral sense of 'foreman', 'overseer'. 'Taskmaster' (LSJ), which now has the suggestion of harshness, is unsuitable.

The example is an instructive one. Without the occurrences in papyri it would be easy to suppose that the word was created by the translators. (ἀργοδιωκτέω, the only other word of the group, is confined to the LXX.)

έτερόζυγος

Le. 19.19 τὰ κτήνη σου οὐ κατοχεύσεις ἕτεροζυγω (~ δικαίο), 'you shall not make your cattle breed with one of a different kind'. A similar use is found in P Cair. zen. 38.12 (257 B.C.) 'Αντιπατρίδια (type of vase) ἕτεροζυγα δῦο καὶ ψυκήριον καὶ κύαθον ('not pairs', LSJ). The word is found elsewhere later in slightly different senses (see LSJ).

εὐδοκέω

A common Koine verb, found from the third century B.C. onwards. It is used in a number of slightly differing senses, not easily distinguished, but all derived from the basic sense of 'be well pleased'.

In the Pentateuch we have: (a) abs. 'be pleased', 'be content', Ge. 24.26 εὐδοκήσας ὁ ἄνδρωπος προσεκύνησεν κυρίῳ, similarly 48; (b) c. acc. 'be pleased with' Ge. 33.10 εὐδοκήσεις με, 'enjoy' Le. 26.34 bis εὐδοκήσει ἢ γῆ τὰ σάββατα αὐτῆς, cf. 41. With these examples may be compared P Rev. 29.8 (iii B.C.) ἐὰν μὲν εὐδοκῆ ὁ τελώνης, συγγραφὴν προϊστάμενον αὐτῶι, SIG 672.27 (162/0 B.C.) καθιστάντων δὲ καὶ ἐγγύους ὁ δανειοδόμοις θύς καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληται εὐδοκέωντι.

17. See Anz, Subsidia 358, LSJ, and the numerous papyrus examples in MM. It occurs 57 times in Plb. (Mauersberger).
νευροκοπέω ('hamstring')

De. 21.6 τῆς δαμάλεως τῆς νευροκοπημένης, 21.4, Ge. 49.6. Cf. FCairZen. 462.4 (iii B.C.) τήν τε ὅν νυκτὸς ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ἐξέβαλε... φάμενος νευροκοπήσειν. Also in Koine writers (see Anz, Subsidia 359).

σιτομετρέω

The whole group of words formed on σιτομετρ- is new in the Koine. The verb is condemned by Phrynichus (360). In addition to the examples from inscriptions and authors noted by LSJ and Anz (Subsidia 360), a papyrus example contemporary with the translators can now be cited: PColZen. 69.52 (c. 257-249 B.C.) ἃς κατὰ μῆνα σιτομητροῦμεν. It is used in the Pentateuch in Ge. 47.12 ἐσιτομέτρει Ἰωσήφ τῷ πατρί καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ ... σίτου κατὰ σάμα, 14.

tοπάρχης

In Ge. 41.34 Joseph advises Pharaoh about preparations for the coming famine: καὶ ποιησάτω Φαραώ καὶ καταστησάτω τοπάρχας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. The word τοπάρχης, which is not found before the third century B.C., was a technical term of the Ptolemaic administration. It was the title of the official in charge of a τόπος or τοπαρχία, a sub-division of the nome. From among the numerous examples we may cite PRevLaws 41.7 (iii B.C.) ὁ τε νομάρχης καὶ ὁ τοπάρχης καὶ ὁ οἰκονόμος ...

The translators have aptly used a term of their own time in the Egyptian context of the story of Joseph. The choice of such a word (more specific than τοπαρχής of the original) shows very clearly their familiarity with the affairs and terminology of their time, and that they expected their audience to be similarly familiar with them.

Noun formations

In -μα

18. See e.g. E. Bevan, A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty, London, 1927, 143. For examples of the word see Preisigke vol. III, Abschnitt 8 s.v.
γένημα ('produce')

A new formation of the Koine, not attested before iii B.C. and not connected with Classical γέννημα, 'that which is produced or born' (of living creatures). γένημα is formed from γεν- of γίγνομαι, γέννημα from γεννάω (though the two are often confused in MSS). 19

The word is common in the papyri from iii B.C. onwards, being the normal term for vegetable produce of all kinds: see e.g. PCair.Zen. 179.11,17, PCol.Zen. 16.7 (both iii B.C.), and examples quoted in Deissmann 20 and MM. It is used often throughout the Pentateuch: e.g. Le. 26.4 ή γη δώσει τα γενήματα αὐτῆς, καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων ἀποδώσει τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν (MT ἄννα), Ge. 47.24, De. 16.15. Note the use of the plural, as often in the papyri.

κατάλυμα

This word, whose meaning may be defined as 'accommodation for rest at night' ('lodging'), is the Koine equivalent of Attic καταγωγίαν. 21 It appears first in the third century B.C. E.g. PSI 341.8 (256 B.C.) σύνταξον δέ Νικίατ δούναι ἡμιν κατάλυμα, PCair.Zen. 847.1 (iii B.C.) ἐν τῷ καταλύματι τοῦ βασιλέως, 830.16 (248 B.C.), UPZ 120.5,10 (ii B.C.). It is also found in Plb., NT, and elsewhere (see Bauer).

It occurs in the Pentateuch in Ex. 4.24 ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐν τῷ καταλύματι ( ~ ἐκατσύ ), 15.13 παρεκάλεσας [τὸν λαόν σου] τῇ ἰσχύι σου εἰς κατάλυμα ἅγιόν σου ( ~ ἡμί ).

πλεόνασμα ('excess', 'surplus')

Νυ. 31.32 τὸ π. τῆς προνομῆς, cf Pteb. 78.7 (110-8 B.C.) τοῦ ... ἐκβεβηκότος πλεονάσματος, 81.27 (ii B.C.), Ostr. Bodl. 1.97.5 (134 B.C.).

20. BS 110
χόρτασμα ('fodder'; usually pl.)

Ge. 24.32 ἔδωκεν ἄχυρα καὶ χορτάσματα ταῖς καμήλοις, 24.25 42.27, 43.24, De. 11.15 (all pl.). Similarly in iii B.C. papyri, e.g. PSI 400.15 ὄστε καὶ τὰ κτήνη σου ἔχειν χορτάσματα δωρεάν, 334.5 (quoted in MM).

In -μα formations on primary verbal stems (e.g. ἀνδρομα) the Koine normally has the short stem vowel where Classical Greek had the long.22 Thus εὐρεμα, κρίμα, χυμα, and the like are the normal Koine forms. Hence the following formation:

δόμα ('gift')

Undoubtedly new in the Koine. The Classical words were δόσις and δώρον. *δώμα 'gift' is not found, probably because of its homonymity with δώμα 'house'.23

To the example of δόμα in PPetr. noted by MM and LSJ can be added PCair.Zen. 825.3 (252 B.C.) Προτομάχων δόμα ἀναπόδοτον τι, UPZ 2.8 (ii B.C.). It is also found in [Pl.] Def. 415b, Aristeas, Plu., NT.

In the Pentateuch it occurs some 14 times. E.g. Ge. 25.6 τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν Αβραὰμ δόματα, Le. 23.38, Nu. 3.9.

In -σμός

ἀγορασμός ('purchase')

Ge. 42.19 ἀπαγάγετε τὸν ἄγορασμόν τῆς σιτοδοσίας υμῶν, 33. The whole group is old (ἀγοράζω etc.), and this formation could also be old. It is however not attested before PCol.Zen. 5.34 (c. 257 B.C.) Σώσωι εἰς ἄγορασμόν σίτου. For examples of ii B.C. and later see Kiessling.

ἐμπυρισμός ('burning')

Le. 10.6 κλαύσονται τὸν ἐμπυρισμὸν, ὅν ἐνεπυρίσθησαν ὑπὸ κυρίου, Nu. 11.3, De. 9.22. Commonly in papyri, e.g. PSI 560.7

22. See Thackeray, Gramm. 79, Mayser, Gramm. I.i 65, Bl. DF §109.3.
23. Chantraine, Formation 179.
σώματα καὶ εἰς ξυλοκοπίαν καὶ ἐμπυρισμόν, 500.5, 338.15, 339.7 (all iii B.C.). Phrynichus, 313 (R), censures Hyperides' use of the word, saying he ought to have used ἐμπυρισμός.

ἰματισμός (collective, 'clothing')

George, 24.53 ἱματισμόν ἐδωκεν Ρέβεκκα (≈ שׂר), similarly Ex. 3.22, 11.2, 12.35, 21.10 (all sing.). Frequently in papyri of iii B.C. and later: e.g. PHib. 54.16 (c. 245 B.C.), quoted in MM, PCair.Zen. 28.1 (iii B.C.). Also found in inscriptions, authors, and NT (see LSJ, Bauer).

In -ῆ 

ἀναζυγῆ ('breaking camp', 'setting-off')

Ex. 40.37-8 εἴ δὲ μὴ ἀνέβη ἢ νεφέλη, οὐκ ἀνεξεύγυναν ... (38) νεφέλη γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἡμέρας ... ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἀναζυγαῖς αὐτῶν. Similarly Plb. 3.44.13, and I now find it also in PHamb. 91.8 (167 B.C.) τῆς δὲ ἀναζυγῆς ἐνστάσεως.

ἀποσκευή

This word is, like the other examples we have been considering, a new formation attested first in the third century B.C. It is chiefly of interest, however, for the remarkable semantic development it undergoes. As we shall see, this example illustrates very clearly the importance of investigating the Pentateuch vocabulary in conjunction with the vocabulary of its time.

The word occurs frequently in Koine authors, and a number of times in papyri. This evidence, which is rather complicated, has been discussed at some length by others. In what follows I shall attempt to summarize what has been established.


LXX usage is not dealt with in any of these discussions.
The primary sense is, as the etymology leads us to expect, 'movable property', 'baggage' (both sing. collective, and pl.). This is seen in Plb. 1.68.3 προέμενοι τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὰς γυναίκας οὖν τούτως τὰς ἄποσκευάς, and elsewhere in Plb. (e.g. 1.70.5, 2.3.8). It is probably the meaning also in PCair.Zen. 93.9 (257 B.C.)

The important step in meaning is that the word comes to include persons as well as inanimate objects. The context in which this development originally took place was, as Holleaux shows (18ff.), a military one. Each soldier had his ἄποσκευή, which included not only his baggage proper, but also his wife and children, and other persons attached to him. This is clearly seen for example in Plb. 1.66.7-9: the Carthaginians request their mercenary troops to leave Carthage and withdraw to another town until they can be paid off. The mercenaries agree, καὶ βουλομένων αὐτοῦ καταλιπεῖν τὰς ἄποσκευάς καθάπερ καὶ τὸν πρῶτον χρόνον ὑπήρχον. At this the Carthaginians demur, fearing μὴ ὅτι ἕξιν τέκνων, ἐνιοὶ δὲ καὶ γυναικῶν ἱμείροντες, οἱ μὲν οὐκ ἐκπορευθῶσι τὸ παράπαν, οἱ δ’ ἐκπορευθέντες αὐθίς ἀνακάμπτωσι πρὸς ταύτα ('lest, longing to be with their wives or children after their recent protracted absence, they might in many cases refuse to leave, or, if they did, would come back again to their families'). Consequently the Carthaginians compel the mercenaries to take τὰς ἄποσκευάς with them.

The word is also used in the singular of the baggage-train of an army, comprising all the persons attached to the army as well as the baggage. So e.g. in Polyacen. 4.6.13 Ἀντίγονος δέ τῶν Εὔμενειών στρατιωτῶν εἰδὼς ἐπομένην τὴν ἄποσκευήν, ἐν ἡ γυναικῶς ἄλλως αὐτῶν καὶ τέκνα καὶ παλαιάς καὶ οἰκέται καὶ χρυσός καὶ ἄργυρος καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἐκτήσαντο .... Similarly in D.S. 19.42.2, 43.7, and probably also in Plb. 2.3.7, 11.18.10.


26. A similar example is found by Wilcken, op.cit. 89, in D.S. 20.47.4. For further examples of the word in the pl. see Holleaux 19 n.3.
In a number of examples in Egyptian papyri we find a further development, though a slight one: the word is used exclusively of persons, viz. the family (wife and children especially, but also other household members) left behind by a soldier on active service. Most of the occurrences are in legal contexts: in Ptolemaic Egypt the families of soldiers in the field were accorded certain privileges in legal proceedings. Thus in PHal. 1.128-44 (iii B.C.) the word is found six times in regulations concerning the treatment of cases involving soldiers' families: e.g. 134-6

\[\text{έαν δὲ τινες φάσκωσιν εἶναι τῆς ἁποσκευής, οἱ δικασταὶ περὶ τούτου διαγνωσκότωσαν καὶ έάν γνωσθῶσιν δυντες τῆς ἁποσκευής καὶ ...}\]

Compare PBaden 48.9 (126 B.C.), a letter from a wife to her husband:

\[\text{έλεγε γὰρ μήτε σε στρατεύεσθαι μήτ' ἐμὲ εἶναι ἁποσκευὴν.}\]

Other similar examples are found in UPZ 110.199 (164 B.C.) πάλιν ἡμῖν ἐνετεύχασιν οἱ ἐν τῇ πόλει μάχιμοι προσφερόμενοι καὶ ταῖς ἁποσκευαῖς αὐτῶν ἐπιγεγράφασε γῆν, 'the troops in the city have again petitioned me claiming that land has been registered also for their families', 90, 206, Sammelb. 8009.3 (i B.C.).

In these examples ἁποσκευή refers specifically to a soldier's family. Whether it could be used more generally of any man's family is not indicated by our evidence.

The senses of the word, then, according to the available evidence, are:

1. 'baggage';
2. (a) 'the baggage-train of an army, comprising baggage and persons attached to the army';
   (b) 'a soldier's baggage, family, and other persons attached to him';
3. 'a soldier's family (wife, children, and other household members)'.

In the Pentateuch there are some 16 occurrences of

αποσκευή, usually as a rendering of ἴφ. Before looking at these there are two points we ought to notice.

'Children', 'little ones', given by BDB, is not the only sense of ἴφ. As BDB themselves note in their Addenda et Corrigenda, the word refers in a number of passages to women as well as children (e.g. Ge. 47.12, Ex. 10.10,24). It seems clear that the meaning in these places is in fact 'family', 'dependents' (wives and children, and probably others as well).

Secondly, the places where the translators render ἴφ by some other word than αποσκευή have something to tell us about their understanding of the Hebrew word. These other renderings are: τέκνα (De. 2.34, 3.19), ἔκγονα (De. 29.10, 31.12), παιδία (Ge. 45.19 and elsewhere), συγγένεια (Ge. 50.8), οἰκίαι (Ge. 50.21), ἀπαρτία (Nu. 31.17,18; the meaning of this word is uncertain), and in Ge. 47.12 ἴφ is rendered κατὰ σώμα. It is clear that the translators took ἴφ as having not only the sense of 'children', but also a more general sense, namely 'family', 'household'.

The usage of αποσκευή in the Pentateuch closely resembles that found in contemporary Greek. In certain passages the word is clearly used in the sense of 'a man's family (wife, children, and other members of the household)'. Thus in Ex. 10.8ff. Pharaoh agrees to let the Israelites go and offer worship, and asks who are to go. Moses replies that they wish to take young and old, sons and daughters, sheep and cattle. Pharaoh objects, saying (10) καθότι ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς, μή καὶ τὴν ἀποσκευὴν ὑμῶν; ... (11) μὴ οὖτως· πορευόσθωσαν δὲ οἱ ἀνδρεῖς, καὶ λατρεύσατε τῷ θεῷ. The plague of locusts follows; then the three days of darkness. Pharaoh relents, and says: (24) Βαδίζετε, λατρεύσατε κυρίω τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν· πλὴν τῶν προβάτων καὶ τῶν βοῶν ὑπολίπεσθε· καὶ ἡ ἀποσκευή ὑμῶν ἀποτρεχέτω μεθ' ὑμῶν. (The sing. here is of

28. See also Skinner, Genesis (ICC), on Ge. 47.12.
Cf. KB s.v., who give the basic sense as 'those of a nomadic tribe who are not (or in small extent) able to march'.
29. ἀποσκευή renders ἴφ in all the places cited unless otherwise indicated.
I leave out of account Ex. 27.19, 39.22, Nu. 32.16, where the major MSS disagree on the reading.
course used collectively.)

Similarly in Ex. 12.37 it is clear that the word refers to all persons apart from the full-grown men; i.e. the men's families, and all the other persons attached to them:

άπάραντες δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραήλ ... εἰς ἑξακοσίας χιλιάδας πεζῶν οἱ άνδρες πλῆν τῆς ἀποσκευῆς (38) καὶ ἐπίμικτος πολὺς συνανέβη αὐτοῖς καὶ πρόβατα καὶ βόες καὶ κτήνη πολλὰ σωόδρα.

Other examples of the same kind are found in Ge. 43.8, Nu. 32.17,24.

In certain other instances the sense is probably the original one of 'baggage', 'movable property': Ge. 15.14 μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἑξελεύσονται διὰ μετὰ ἀποσκευής πολλῆς (~ ὕδρ ); similarly 31.18 (~ ψτρ ).

In Ge. 14.12 ἔλαβον δὲ καὶ τὸν λωτ ... καὶ τὴν ἀποσκευὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον (~ ψτρ ) the word seems to have its most general sense of 'baggage and family, etc.' (cf. sense 2.(b) above). Later, when Lot is rescued (vs. 16), mention is made of the recovery also of τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς γυναίκας καὶ τὸν λαόν. The last-mentioned are presumably the miscellaneous crowd of relatives and slaves which formed part of Lot's ἀποσκευή.

We have finally to notice certain instances in which ἀποσκευή occurs together with αἱ γυναίκες. E.g.

Ge. 46.5-6 ἔλαβον οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραήλ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἀποσκευὴν καὶ τὰς γυναίκας αὐτῶν ἔπι τὰς ἁμάζες ... (6) καὶ ἀναλαβόντες τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῶν καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν κτήσιν ... ἐσῆλθον εἰς Αἴγυπτον.

De. 20.13-14 καὶ πατάξεις πάν ἄρσενικόν αὐτῆς [a city] ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας, (14) πλὴν τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τῆς ἀποσκευῆς καὶ πάντα τὰ κτήνη ...

Similar examples are found in Ge. 34.29, Nu. 31.9, 32.26,30.

What is the meaning of our word here? Is it 'children'?^30

30. So LSJ Suppl.: 'children, little ones', LXX Ge. 46.5, al. 'This is plainly based on the supposed meaning of the Hb. word (note the rendering 'little ones').
Clearly this is a possible sense, and at first glance may seem the right one. I suggest, however, that we are not justified in taking it in this way. Nothing ought to be based on the meaning of the Hebrew word. There is no certainty that the translators intended their rendering in the same sense as ηυ. Moreover I do not think it has been satisfactorily established that ηυ itself means 'children' here. Despite the tautology, I think ἀποσκευὴ in these passages is intended in the sense of 'family'. There is no compelling reason for seeing a new sense here.

This argument is strongly supported by the one remaining example, Nu. 16.27, where ἀποσκευὴ is plainly tautological (as is ηυ):

καὶ Δαθαν καὶ Αβίρων ἐξῆλθον καὶ εἰστήκεισαν παρὰ τὰς θύρας τῶν σκηνῶν αὐτῶν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ἀποσκευὴ αὐτῶν.

Here the word must be vague and general, and include the women and children just mentioned. (It cannot, of course, mean 'baggage'.)

We have seen, then, that the usage of ἀποσκευὴ in the Pentateuch is closely linked with that in the Greek of the time. There is, however, a slight difference. As we saw, the word is used outside the Pentateuch only in reference to soldiers' families, in some instances as a technical legal term. In the Pentateuch, on the other hand, it is used in a more general way of any man's family. It is difficult to tell whether this was an innovation in the translators' Greek. The extension is such a slight one that it could easily have occurred already in the Greek of the time; and it can hardly be due to Hebraism. Nevertheless there is a possibility that the translators themselves extended the usage of this convenient term. The extension would have been helped by the fact that many of the contexts in which such a word is needed are quasi-military ones: see e.g. Nu. 31.9, where the Israelites defeat the Midianites in battle and plunder their property, and Ex. 12.37, where the...

31. In some of them, Ge. 46.5, Nu. 31.9, 32.30, it might also be taken as 'baggage', but this seems less likely.
men are actually called πεζοί.

At any rate it is certain that the translators were familiar with the current usage of this term. We have seen moreover that a knowledge of the current usage helps considerably in understanding the meaning of the word in the Pentateuch.

In -ών

This suffix, though old, was especially productive in Hellenistic Greek. It was used for forming words that designate places, especially places where plants grow.32

άμπελόν

Surprisingly the word is not attested before the Koine period, except for an uncertain reading in Aeschin. 2.156 (άμπελουργείον Teubner).33 It is extremely common in the papyri from iii B.C. onwards, as e.g. PCAir.zen. 236.8 (254/3 B.C.) το άνυριον παρά τών οίνοκατηλών οίνοι οὔ ἔλαβον ἐκ τοῦ άμπελώνος.34 In the Pentateuch it occurs some 18 times, mostly rendering θύμ. E.g. Ge. 9.20 ἐφύτευσεν άμπελόνα, De. 6.11 ... άμπελόνας καὶ ἐλαίωνας, οὔς οὔ κατεφύτευσας.

σιτοβολόν ('granary')

This word, along with the related words σιτοβολ-είον, -ιον, -ον (all with the same meaning), is attested first in the Koine. To the examples noted by LSJ, PSI 358.9 (252-1 B.C.) and an inscription from Delos, also of iii B.C., can now be added PCol.zen. 53.2 (250 B.C.) νυκτός ἐκ τοῦ σιτοβολῶνος ἀπόλωλεν σήσαμον. It is used in the Pentateuch in Ge. 41.56 καὶ ὁ λιμός ἦν ἐπὶ προσώπου πάσης τῆς γῆς· ἀνέφεξεν δὲ Ἰσαχαρ πάντας τοὺς σιτοβολῶνας καὶ ἔπώλει πάσι τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις.

32. See BP 247f., Palmer, Gramm. 120, Mayser, Gramm. I.iii 86ff., B. Olsson, Aegyptus XIII (1933) 327-30, and MM s.v. ἔλαιον.
33. If it had been in use in Class.Gk. we should expect to find at least some examples of it, since the idea is such a common one. Yet it is difficult to discover what word was used instead.
34. For other examples see MM and Kiessling.
Ex. 23.11, De. 6.11, very commonly in papyri, e.g. P<em>Cair.</em> zen. 157.2 (256 B.C.) τῶν στροβίλων φύτευσον ... περί τὸν ἀμπελώνα καὶ τοὺς ἑλαιώνας. Deissmann, BS 208ff.

πυλῶν ('gateway')

<em>Ge.</em> 43.19 ἐλάλησαν αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ πυλῶν τοῦ οἴκου, often in papyri and inscriptions from iii B.C. onwards: e.g. P<em>Cair.</em>zen 193.9 (255 B.C.) συνετάγη δὲ τῷ ἀρχιτέκτονι ... τὸν πυλῶνα ... μεταθέτω, P<em>Ent.</em> 74.3 (iii B.C.). Cf. Moeris 88 αὐλία θύρα Ἀττικῶς, πυλῶν Ἐλληνικῶς.

Various

ἀμνάς ('ewe-lamb')

Often in the Pentateuch, as e.g. Nu. 6.14 προσάξει ... ἀμνάδα ἐναυσάν ἀμωμον μίαν, Ge. 21.28, Le. 5.6. It is attested elsewhere only in P<em>Cair.</em>zen. 576.3 (iii B.C.) ... τὴν χίμαιραν καὶ τὴν ἀμνάδα, 406.6 (iii B.C.), and Theoc. 8.35, J. AJ 7.7.3.

ἐλεημοσύνη ('mercy', 'pity')

De. 6.25 καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη ἐσται ἡμῖν, ἐὰν φυλασσομεθα ποιεῖν πάσας τὰς ἑντολὰς ταύτας (ὡς ἀνθρωπος), Ge. 47.29 (ὡς πᾶν). As LSJ and Bauer record, the word is found in Call. 4.152 (iii B.C.); to this can be added P<em>Cair.</em>zen. 495.10 (iii B.C., a letter to Zenon) πρὸς σέ οὖν καταφυγγάνομεν, ἵνα ἐλεημοσύνης τύχωμεν.

It also occurs in the Pentateuch in De. 24.13, where the sense is not quite clear. It is perhaps 'kind deed', from which comes the later sense, as in NT, of 'alms', 'almsgiving' (cf. Bauer).

μοσχάριον ('calf')

Nine times in the Pentateuch, e.g. Ge. 18.7 ἔλαβεν

35. On the formation see esp. BP 411ff. The use of this suffix for names of animals is old.
μοσχάριον ἀπαλὸν καὶ καλὸν, and commonly in iii B.C. papyri: e.g. PCair.zen. 326.141 (c.249 B.C.) Ἰσιδώρας τιμήν μοσχαρίου, PSorb. 22.6. The older word μύκος continues to be common in the Koine (and so also in the Pentateuch).

πυρράκης ('of ruddy complexion')

Ge. 25.25 ἔξηλθεν δὲ ὁ υἱός ὁ πρωτότοκος πυρράκης, ὅλος ὄσι ὀσφά σασός (~ ἀπολογήτης). The word is known, apart from the LXX, only in iii B.C. papyri, where it is found a number of times in personal descriptions. Thus e.g. PPetr. 3.6(a).9 (237 B.C.), the remains of a will, ώς ΛΕ πυρράκης οὐλή μι... 'about 60 years old, of reddish complexion, a scar ...'. Similarly 3.1.1.19, PCair.zen. 76.11, 374.5 (all iii B.C.).

Adjective formations

ἀρσενικός and θηλυκός

These two words, which form a pair, are conveniently treated together. They both appear in the third century B.C. as synonyms of Classical āρσην (ἄρρην) and θήλυς, and are examples of the tendency towards replacement of third declension forms by first and second declension. They pass into Modern Greek as the normal vernacular words. Nevertheless āρσην and θήλυς are still common in the third century B.C. and remain so until late in the Koine.

ἀρσενικός occurs about 40 times in the Pentateuch, as e.g.

36. For a number of other formations of this uncommon type see BP 4; cf. Mayser, Gramm. I.i 455.

πυρράκης is strictly a noun (like μανιακής, ἵππακης, αἰτάκης, etc.) used attributively.

37. Cf. Thackeray, Gramm. 140.

On -ικός formations see BP 636ff., Palmer, Gramm. 35. Palmer notes that 'such formations often replace earlier adjectives of a different type'.

38. Thumb, Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular 72, Swanson.

39. Examples in MM, Preisigke, and Kiessling. Only the older words are found in NT.
Nu. 3.43 πάντα τά πρωτότοκα τά ἀρσενικά, Ge. 17.10, Ex. 13.12, and θηλυκός twice, Nu. 5.3 ἀπὸ ἀρσενικοῦ ἐως θηλυκοῦ ἐξαποστείλατε, De. 4.16. The older words are also common, ἀρσην occurring some 40 times, θήλυς 26.  

Examples from the translators' time are found in PCair. zen. 166.2 (255 B.C.) ζεύγη θηλυκά καί ἀρσενικά, PLille 10.5, PPetr. 3.93.7.11, and often elsewhere in PCair.Zen. 

The next two words similarly form a pair of parallel formations related to the same object.

δειλινός ('in the afternoon')

Recorded first in Diocles Med. Fr. 141 p.180.12 (iv B.C. acc. to Bauer), then Men. Kon. 7. From iii B.C. papyri can be quoted an example not noted by LSJ and Bauer: PCair.Zen. 207.37 (255/4 B.C.) τό γάρ πρωινόν δείλιζουμεν και τό δειλινόν. It is also found in Koine authors (see LSJ).

In the Pentateuch it occurs in Ge. 3.8 τοῦ θεοῦ περιπατοῦντος ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τό δειλινόν, Ex. 29.39,41, Le. 6.13, all τό δειλινόν adv.

πρωινός ('in the morning')

First in Thphr. CP 3.24.2, then PCair.Zen. 207.36 quoted above. Otherwise only later examples are known (NT and late writers: see LSJ and Bauer).

The word is found four times in the Pentateuch: (a) adj. Ex. 29.41 κατά τήν δυσίαν τήν πρωινήν, Le. 9.17, Nu. 28.23; (b) adv. Ge. 49.27.

ἔσπερινός, 'in the evening', may also be mentioned here, although it has not yet been found in early documents. It occurs in X. Lac. 12.6, AP 5.201.4 (Asclep. or Posidipp., both iii B.C.), papyri of iv/v A.D. (see MM), and in the Pentateuch in Le. 23.5.

The remainder are of various types.

40. On the suffix see BP 261, Palmer, Gramm. 19.
41. δειλινόν is of course just an alternative spelling.
42. Cf. Thackeray, Gramm. 90.
αναφάλαντος

This word, meaning 'bald on the forehead', is common in iii B.C. papyri in personal descriptions. See e.g. PCair.Zen. 347.1 (c. 245 B.C.), PPetr. 1.19.4,5,7,23 (225 B.C.). The translators use it in Le. 13.41.

ἀπερίτμητος ('uncircumcised')

Ge. 17.14, Ex. 12.48, Le. 26.41, and often elsewhere in the LXX and in the NT. Even Deissmann thought it probable that the word was coined by the Alexandrian Jews. But an example has turned up that makes this very unlikely. In PCair.Zen. 76 (257 B.C.) Toubias, 'a great hereditary chief in Transjordania', writes to Apollonius that he has sent him a gift of a eunuch and four boy slaves: (1.5) ἀπέσταλκα ο. . . παιδάρια ... τέσσαρα, ὃν [ἔστιν] ἀπερίτμητα δύο. A detailed description of the slaves follows (1.14): two are described as ἀπερίτμητος, two as περιτετμημένος. There is no reason to think that Toubias's Greek (or his scribe's) was in any way influenced by Jewish terminology. ἀπερίτμητος is moreover the formation we should expect for expressing this idea: περιτέμνω is old in the sense of 'circumcise' (Hdt.).

κόκκινος ('red', 'scarlet')

This formation appears first in the third century B.C., as a replacement for Classical ἔρυθρός, and continues on into Modern Greek as the normal word for 'red' (Swanson). It has been noted in Herod. 6.19 (iii B.C.), but not again until writers and papyri of i A.D. and later, and NT. I now find

43. BS 153. Deissmann goes uncharacteristically astray here: he suggests that ἀσημος may have been the word for the idea among the Greek Egyptians, then adds: 'the more definite and, at the same time, harsher ἀπερίτμητος corresponded to the contempt with which the Greek Jews thought of the uncircumcised'. How is the latter word 'harder'? In any case the meaning of ἀσημος is much more general, viz. 'without distinguishing mark'.

44. Recorded by Bauer, s.v.

45. Edgar, Selected Papyri no.84 (= PCair.Zen. 76).

46. LSJ, MM,Kiessling Suppl.
it also in *Inscr. Del*. 1416 Α i 58 (ii B.C.) σαγγαλικόν βεβαμένον κόκκινον ἐν κιβωταρίῳ, ἀνάδεμα Ἡρακλείας, and *BGU* 1300.24 (iii/ii B.C.) a list of items (combs, ear-rings, and the like) κόκκινα β, 'two scarlet garments', or 'two pieces of scarlet cloth'.

The word is common in the Pentateuch, being the usual rendering of יִשְׂרָאֵל and נָעַר. (a) adj., e.g. Nu. 4.8 יִתְמוּנִי κόκκινוν, (b) subst., e.g. Ex. 28.5 λήμψονται ... τὸ κόκκινον καὶ τὴν βύσσον. For the substantival use cf., in addition to the *BGU* example above, the examples in Epict. and NT noted by Bauer.

ἔρυθρός in the Pentateuch, as in the Koine generally, is confined to the set phrase ἔρυθρὰ ἡλασσα.

μίσθιος

Usually as a substantive, 'hired labourer'. It is found first in papyri of the third century B.C., *PCair.Zen*. 378.14, and now *PCol.Zen*. 75.19 (c. 248-6 B.C., an account of salary expenditures) μίσθιοι β (δραχμαί). For later examples see LSJ, MM. It occurs in the Pentateuch in Le. 25.50 ἔσται τὸ ἀργυρίον τῆς πόλεως αὐτοῦ ὡς μισθίου.

παρεπίδημος ('temporary resident')


σανιδωτός ('of boards')

*Ex*. 27.8 κοίλον σανιδωτόν ποιήσεις αὐτό [τὸ θυσιαστήριον]. Previously not known elsewhere, but now recorded by LSJ Suppl. in *Inscr. Délos* 1417 Α ii 55 (ii B.C.) κλίνας σανιδωτάς, 1403 Bb ii 33 (ii B.C.).

Another formation of the same type is:

δικτυωτός ('net-like', 'latticed')

*Ex*. 27.4 ... ἔσχαραν ἔργῳ δικτυωτῷ, 38.24. In addition to the examples in D.S. and Plb. (LSJ), cf. now *PMich.Zen*. 38.18 (iii B.C.) τοῦ κοιτώνος θυρίδας δικτυωτῆς ἢ, 'in the bedroom, 8 latticed windows' (ed.).
Verb formations

άροτριάω

This Koine word is one of a whole new group of formations on the stem ἀροτρ- (from ἀροτρον). They tend to replace the words of the older group based on ἀρο-. ἀροτριάω takes the place of Classical ἀρόω, which is rare in the Koine except in literary writers.

ἀροτριάω is attested first in Thphr. HP 8.6.3, then in various authors (Call., Babr., see LSJ, Bauer), and in NT. In iii B.C. papyri we have PPetr. 3.31.7 τοῦ ζεύγος τῶν βοών μου πορευομένου ... ὥστε ἀροτριάν, P Cair. Zen. 729.5, PSI 661.5.

The word is found in the Pentateuch in De. 22.10 οὐκ ἀροτριάζεις ἐν μόσχῳ καὶ ὄνω ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. (ἀρόω is not used in the Pentateuch, or at all in the LXX.)

ἐμπυρίζω ('burn', 'set on fire')


κυριεύω ('be master of', 'rule', 'control')

A common Koine verb, which appears first in X., then Arist., Men. In the translators' time we have e.g. Sammelb. 8545.13 κυριεύσας δὲ τῆς τε ἐντὸς Εὐφράτου χώρας πάσης καὶ..., P Rev. 3.2, 46.9 (all iii B.C.). For further examples, in authors and later papyri, see LSJ and MM.

It occurs in the Pentateuch in Nu. 24.7 κυριεύσει ἐθνῶν πολλῶν, 21.18, Ex. 15.9, Ge. 3.16, 37.8.

47. Cf. Moeris 22 ἀροῦν Ἄττικῶς, ἀροτριάν Ἑλληνικῶς.
In this chapter we have to consider a third type of innovation in the Koine vocabulary, namely new words other than those created by formation on existing stems. These are mainly loan-words from outside Greek, but there are also some words that came into the Koine from dialects other than Attic. We shall see that here too there are links between the Pentateuch vocabulary and that of the time.

βουνός

The word appears first in Hdt. (4.192,199), who says it was Cyrenaean. Phryn. (333) tells us it was used by Syracusan poets. At any rate it seems clear that it was a Doric word, but whether originally borrowed from outside Greek is unknown. It was still a strange word for Philemon (49, 142) at the end of the fourth century. In the Koine it becomes common, and continues on into Modern Greek as the usual vernacular word for 'mountain' (Swanson, Jannaris).

From inscriptions and papyri can be cited e.g. Schwyzer, DGE 289.169 (200-190 B.C.) καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου παρὰ τὸν βουνὸν ἐστε καὶ τὰν φάραγγα ἐθήκηκας ἄλλον ὄρον, Archiv I 63.15 (123 B.C.), PTheb.Bank I.1.3, 32 (131 B.C.), BGU 1216.19 (ii B.C.). It is also used by Plb., e.g. 3.83.1, 5.22.3, and by other Koine writers.

In the Pentateuch the word occurs as follows:

(a) 'hill' or 'mountain', Ex. 17.9 ἐστηκα ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ βουνοῦ, 10, Nu. 23.9, De. 33.15 (in all ~ ἄγω ).

(b) 'mound', 'heap', Ge. 31.46 συνέλεξαν λίθους καὶ ἐποίησαν βουνόν, similarly 46 bis, 47 bis, 48 ter, 52 (mostly ~ βλ ).

1. See Mayser, Gramm. I.i.8, Bl. DF §126.1b, Thumb, Hellenismus 224, Frisk s.v., and most recently Chantraine, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque s.v. ΒΟΥΝΟΣ is found in A. Supp. 117,129.

2. Others in MM; and for later pap. exx. see Preisigke and Kiessling.
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This latter use is paralleled in *Plut.* 58.12 (iii A.D.) βουνόν σετού (LSJ, MM).

**γογγύζω**

This verb is attested first in the third century B.C., but γογγυσμός in Anaxandr. *Comicus* 31 (iv B.C.) implies it earlier. According to Phryn. 336, both are Ionic.³ The etymology of this group of words is uncertain.⁴

In iii B.C. papyri we have *Ppetr.* 3.43(3).20 (241 B.C.) το πλήρωμα γογγύζει φάμενοι ἀδικεῖσθαι, 'the gang are grumbling ...'. It is next recorded in *NT* and later Koine writers.⁵

The translators use the word seven times (Rahlfs): *Ex.* 17.3 ἐγόγγυζεν ἐκεί ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Μωυσῆν λέγοντες ..., *Nu.* 11.1, 14.27, etc.

**θίβις**

The meaning of this loan-word⁶ is apparently 'basket', though precisely what kind of basket is unknown. It is attested only in the Pentateuch and Egyptian papyri of iii/ii B.C. In the latter we have *PCair.* 69.5 (257 B.C.) ἐν θίβει νάρδου μαρσίππαι ἐσφρα(γι,σμένα) ε, *UPZ* 149.21 (iii B.C.) θηβις τῶν ἄρτων, *Ppetr.* 3.51.4,13 (iii B.C.), *PGrenf.* 1.14.10 (ii B.C.).

It is used in the Pentateuch of the basket in which Moses was placed: *Ex.* 2.3 ἔλαβεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ θίβιν καὶ κατέχρισεν αὐτήν ἀσφαλτοπίσσην, 5,6 ( ~ ἦν).

**κάρταλλος**

Another word for a kind of basket.⁷ It seems not to be a

---

5. See Anz, *Subsidia* 368f.
6. From Hb. *יִבֵּן*, Mayser, *Gramm.* I.i 42, LSJ. The Hb. word itself was apparently a loan-word from Egyptian (BDB, KB). Could θίβις have been borrowed from Egyptian rather than Hb.?
7. 'Basket with pointed bottom', LSJ.
loan-word, and may in fact be old in Greek. At any rate it is not attested before the third century B.C. It is found in papyri in Sammelb. 6801.4 (iii B.C.) ἐχω παρὰ θεοδώρου, ἀνθ’ ὁν ἐδωκα φτινεῖ τῷ 'Ἀραβι εἰς καρτάλλους χαλ(κού)ρ β, and the diminutive occurs ib. 26; otherwise only in LXX, Ph., and Hsch. (LSJ).

There are two examples in the Pentateuch: De. 26.2 λήμψη ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς σου ... καὶ ἐμβάλεις εἰς κάρταλλον, 4 (in both ~ NJD).

κόνδυ ('cup')

The word appears first in Comedy, Hipparch. Com. 1.6, Men Kol. fr. 2.2 (Koerte), then in papyri and inscriptions, e.g. PPetr. 2.32.1.23 (iii B.C.) κύαθον κόνδυ Λί, PLong. 402.II.13 (ii B.C.). It occurs in the Pentateuch seven times in Ge. 44: e.g. vs. 2 καὶ τὸ κόνδυ μου τὸ άργυριον ἐμβάλατε εἰς τὸν μάρσιππον τοῦ νεωτέρου.

κόρος (a dry measure)

A loan-word from Semitic (cf. Hebrew לב), found in the LXX, NT (once), J., and Eupolem. ap. Euseb. Pr. Ev· 9.33, where it is clearly meant as a Semitic term: it occurs in what purports to be a letter from Solomon, and the writer explains its meaning.

I find it also, however, in PSI 554.14 (259-8 B.C.) ἱμένου κόρων καὶ β εἰς τὸ συναγαγεῖν ώς ἐκ τού γενομένου ἀποτείσαι αὐτούς ἐκ κόρ<ων>τ. Whether the writer of this was Jewish and to what extent this measure was in use in Egypt are unclear.

8. 'Technisches oder volkstümliches Wort aus -άλλος ..., letzten Endes auf ein Verb 'drehen, flechten' zurückgehend, aber im einzelnen dunkel', Frisk.
9. 'Wie viele andere Wörter auf -υ ... offenbar entlehnt', Frisk. Its origin is however unknown.
10. LSJ add, in ref. to this example, 'as a measure': as Caird notes JTS XX (1969) 22, this comment is quite gratuitous. (44.5 shows plainly that a drinking-vessel is meant.)
11. Frisk s.v.
The word occurs in the Pentateuch in Nu. 11.32 συνήγαγον τὴν ὀρτυγομήτραν, ὃ τὸ ὀλίγον συνήγαγεν δέκα κόρους, Le. 27.16. Curiously, in both places κόρος renders נַעַ, not רָכַ, though κόρος is the usual rendering of רָכַ elsewhere in the LXX.

No firm conclusion can be drawn from this example, but there is clearly a possibility that κόρος was not confined to Jewish circles in Ptolemaic Egypt.

μάρσιππος ('sack')

An old word, but not in Attic. It is found in Χ. An. 4.3.11, and in the diminutive form in Hp. Acut. 21, Apollod. Car. (Comicus) 13 (iv/iii B.C.). It perhaps entered the Koine from Ionic. It is common in papyri of iii B.C., e.g. PSI 427.1 γραψή σάκκων καὶ μαρσίππων, PCair.zen. 69.14 (257 B.C.); the dimin. is found e.g. in PLille 6.15 (iii B.C.) μαρσίππιον ἐν ὀι χαλκοῦ ἢ ζ.

It occurs some 19 times in the Pentateuch, e.g. Ge. 44.2 quoted above under κόνδυ, 44.11, De. 25.13 (mostly καὶ μαρσίππιον, 'sack', BDB).

12. 'Fremdwort unbekannten Herkunft', Frisk.
Moeris 96: Βαλλάντιον, Ἀττικὸς, μαρσίππιον, Ἑλληνικῶς.
CHAPTER VII
INNOVATION AND OBsolescence

In the three preceding chapters we have been considering innovations in the Koine vocabulary. It is however a well-known characteristic of language that the intrusion of new words and uses does not take place in isolation from other words in the vocabulary. It is frequently the case that the intrusion of one word is related to the obsolescence of another. As a certain word for an idea comes into use the existing word for the idea drops out; or, put the other way, as one word becomes obsolete another appears and takes its place. The two processes, the intrusion of one word and the obsolescence of another, are complementary to each other.

There were many such changes in the Koine vocabulary. For a variety of reasons, many earlier words and uses had become obsolete and been replaced by new ones. In this chapter three examples of this phenomenon will be examined in detail. We shall consider what changes had taken place in the manner of expressing certain ideas in the Greek of the third century B.C., and a comparison will be made with the usage of the Pentateuch. It will be seen that the translators' vocabulary is in agreement with contemporary developments in these areas.

'Give a drink to';
'Irrigate'

In Classical Greek ἀρδεῖ, which is first attested early (Homeric Hymns, Pi., etc.; cf. ἀρδεύομαι in Homer), was the normal word for 'give a drink of water to', 'water' (an animal), and 'water', 'irrigate' (plants, land). It is common in these senses in Attic up till Arist., and in Hdt. It would appear, however, that it was not normally used of giving a drink to a

human being; the only such example is in the highly poetic...
... όχέτους, "Ιππαρις [a river] οίσιν άρδευ στρατόν, Pi. o. 5.12.
It was also not normally used of any liquid other than water (in Ar. Eq. 96 ἐξένεγκέ μοι ταχέως οίνου χόα, τὸν νοῦν ἐν' άρδω
it is of course used to give a comic effect; similarly in 114).
It thus appears to have had much the same range of usage as the Eng. verb 'water', being applicable to animals, plants and land, but not human beings. If used with a person as object it suggests pouring water over him, not giving him a drink: so Ar. Lys. 384 άρδω σ', ὅπως ἄν βλαστάνης.

Much less usual was άρδεύω, 'water', 'irrigate', attested first in Aeschylus (Pr. 852), but not again until Arist. and Thphr.

The word ποτίζω also appears in Classical times, with the meaning 'give (a person or animal) water (or something else specified) to drink'. Liquids other than water are specified in Pl. Phdr. 247 ε τοὺς ἰπποὺς ... νέκταρ ἐπότισεν, Hr. Lys. 7.46 ἀρχητον ποτίζως, Arist. Phr. 199 a 34 ἐπότισεν ... ο ιατρός τὸ φάρμακον, but in X. Smp. 2.25 we find it in the sense of 'give a drink of water to': δοκεῖ μέντοι μοι καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν σώματα ταύτα πάσχειν ἀπέρ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐν ὑφισιομένων. καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνα, ὅταν μὲν ὁ θεὸς αὐτὰ ἀγαν ἀνεφορίζεται ποτίζω, οὐ δύναται ὀρθοῦσθαι ... ὅταν δ' ὅσω ἠδεία τοσοῦτο πίνη, καὶ μάλα ὅσα τε αὐξηται, '
... for when God gives the plants too much water all at once to drink, they cannot stand up straight ..., but when they drink only as much as they enjoy, they grow up very straight'. It is clear that Xenophon uses ποτίζω, πίνω and ἠδομαι metaphorically here, describing plants in human terms.2

These examples give only an incomplete picture of the usage of ποτίζω in Classical times, but it would seem that although the word may have been initially used only of liquids other than water, it was quickly extended to water as well. The two uses are in any case so close that they are perhaps not to be distinguished at all. Thus ποτίζω began early to overlap with άρδω. At the same time it had a wider usage in that it was applicable to human beings as well as animals. It was not however used of watering plants and land.

---
2. X. still uses άρδω for 'irrigate', e.g. An. 2.3.13.
In the Koine we find that ποτίζω had developed further in meaning: from the third century B.C. onwards it is common in the sense of 'water', 'irrigate' (plants, land). This extension is to be found already in [Arist.] de Plantis 821 αἰ ροιαὶ ('pomegranates') ... δὲ ὅδατος γλυκός καὶ ψυχροῦ ποτίζομεναι βελτιώνται (not noted by LSJ). In the papyri the term occurs frequently: e.g. PPetr. 3.44(iii B.C.) άνοιξθήτω οὐν ἡ ἑώρᾳ ὡς ἐν θευγένιδι γῇ ποτισθῇ τὸ τάχος, PCAir.zen. 155.3, 4 (256 B.C.) εὐθέως πότισον τὴν γῆν ἀπὸ χερῶς, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ δυνατὸν ἢ, κηλώνεια ἐπιστήσας πλείονα οὕτω πότιζε. (For other examples see MM, Preisigke.)

The earlier sense, 'give (a person or animal) water (or something else specified) to drink' continues in use, though it is not as well attested. Applied to animals it is found in Theoc. 1.121 (iii B.C.) Δάφνις ὁ τῶς ταῦρως καὶ πόρτιας ὀθεν ποτίσον, ogi 483. 169 (ii A.D.) μηθενί δὲ εξουσία ἐστω ἐπὶ τῶν δημοσίων θηρών ἢ τῆς κτήνος ποτίζειν, μὴ δ' ιμάτια πλύνειν, but for the application to human beings we have (apart from LXX and NT) only ogi 200.16 (iv A.D.) ποτίζοντες αὐτούς ἐν τῷ ὑδραγωνίῳ καὶ οἶνῳ καὶ υδρεύμασιν.

ἀρδῶ, on the other hand, has dropped out of ordinary use in the Koine. It is found occasionally in literary writers (Ph., Ath., see LSJ), but no examples are known in the papyri. ἀρδεύω also is mainly confined to the literary Koine (Plb., M. Ant., etc.), though a number of examples are found in papyri of ii-vi A.D. (see Preisigke, Kiessling). Neither word appears in the LXX or NT.

ποτίζω continues into Modern Greek as the normal word for 'give a drink to'; 'water', 'irrigate' (Lex. Pr., Swanson). ἀρδῶ has disappeared altogether, and ἀρδεύω is confined to the καθαρεύουσα. 3

It is clear, then, that in vernacular Greek of the third century B.C. ποτίζω had taken over altogether from ἀρδῶ (and ἀρδεύω). 4

3. Confirmed by Mr. Papastavrou.
4. It is worth noticing that the incoming word is 'fuller-sounding' than ἀρδῶ (cf. Bl. DF §126): it is also more 'transparent' (cf. Ullmann, Semantics 91).
This development is reflected in the vocabulary of the Pentateuch, where we find only ποτίζω (28 times), never ἄρδω or ἀρδεύω. ποτίζω is used in the following ways:

1. (a) 'give (a person) a drink' (of something specified):
   wine Ge. 19.32 ποτίσωμεν τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν οἶνον, 33, al.;
   water 24.17 πότισόν με μικρὸν ύδωρ έκ τῆς ύδριας σου, 43, al.;

   (b) 'give a drink of water to': a person Ge. 21.19 ἔπλησεν τὸν ἀσκόν ύδατος καὶ ἐπότισεν τὸ παιδίον, 24.18,45, Nu. 20.8;
   animals Ex. 2.19 ἤντλησεν ήμιν καὶ ἐπότισεν τὰ πρόβατα ἡμῶν, al.

2. 'water', 'irrigate', Ge. 2.10 ποταμὸς δὲ ἐκπορεύεται ἐξ ἔδεμ ποτίζειν τὸν παράδεισον, 6, 13.10; De. 11.10 ἔστιν γάρ η γῆ, εἰς ἣν εἰςπορεύθη ἐκεί κληρονομήσαι αὐτήν, οὐκ ἤσπερ ἢ γῆ Ἀγύπτου ἔστιν, ἄλλον ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐκείθεν, ὅταν σπέιρας ἐπὶ τὸν ἄσκον καὶ ποτίζειν τοῖς ποσίν ὅσει ἥπερ λαχανεῖας.5

The translators' use of the word is in close agreement with current usage, except possibly in one respect: as we have seen, the sense 'give a drink of water to' applied to human beings is not directly attested, though it is implied by the example in Xenophon and the other very similar uses. It may be that in this the translators have extended the usage of ποτίζω beyond what was usual. This would have come about readily through mechanical representation of the Hebrew, the equivalence ἄσκον - ποτίζω having once been established.

The expression ποτίζειν τοῖς ποσίν in De. 11.10 is of special interest. Although the wording of the Greek of course derives from the Hebrew original (MT נְפָרָה תַּלְתָּר רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶпֆּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה רֶпֶּה R.5

The expression ποτίζειν τοῖς ποσίν in De. 11.10 is of special interest. Although the wording of the Greek of course derives from the Hebrew original (MT נְפָרָה תַּלְתָּר רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה רֶפֶּה R.5), there is reason to think that the translators and their Egyptian readers would have seen here a reference to a familiar practice. Compare the similar expressions in PFior. 369.7 (ii A.D.) μέχρι τού ἐσομένου ἀπὸ ποδός ποτισμοῦ, and PRyl. 5. ποτίζω renders ἄσκον hiph. in all instances except Ge. 24.17, where it translates μετά hiph.

As far as I know no other words for these ideas are found in the Pentateuch. ἄσκον is rendered by ποτίζω except Ge. 40.13 οἰνοχοέω ( ~ ποτισμός), 40.20 ἀρξιοοισχόος ( ~ σφήσεις ἃ), and 24.18-19, where a literal rendering is abandoned in favour of more idiomatic Gk.: καὶ ἐπότισεν αὐτὸν, ἐγὼ ἔπαυσα ὑπὸ πόσιν MT : ἐπότισεν πόσιν ἢ οἰνοχοέω μετά hiph. occurs only in the place noted. There are no compounds of ποτίζω, ἄρδω, or ἀρδεύω in the Pentateuch.
157.20 ff. (135 A.D.) εἰ χρεία γείνοιτο [ποτίσαι ἐ]ν ἀναβάσει ἀπὸ ποδός τὴν αὐτὴν νοτίνην μερίδα, παρέξει ἢ λαβοῦσα τὴν βορρίνην μερίδα τὸ ύδραγωγεῖσθαι δι' ἀυτῆς. Though these examples are several centuries later than the Pentateuch, it is probable that the method of irrigation referred to had been in use for a very long time (the Hebrew original itself probably alludes to the same method). 7

'Send rain', 'it rains'

The way in which the older word for this idea is replaced in the Hellenistic vernacular has often been noticed. 8 The Classical word, ὕω, though still found e.g. in Herodas (7.46) and in writers of the literary Koine (Thphr., Str., Plu., etc.), is not known to occur in the papyri. It is used in the LXX only in two instances shortly to be considered, and not at all in the NT.

In its place we find βρέχω, which in Classical times was normally used only in the sense of 'wet', 'drench'. According to Phrynichus, βρέχω as a synonym of ὕω occurred early in a comedy doubtfully attributed to Telecles (v B.C); 9 and in X. Oec. 17.2 οἱ ἀνθρώποι πρὸς τὸν θεόν ἀποβλέπουσιν, ὡσπέτε.

6. Both examples are noted by MM, LSJ and Suppl., s.v. πούς. (LSJ’s Stud. It. 13 (1905) 366 = PFlor. above).
7. Just what was meant by watering 'with the foot' is not definitely known, but a practice observed in modern times in Egypt and described by Driver, Deuteronomy (ICC, 3 ed. 1902), p.XXI (cf. p.129), suits the case very well: '... each plot of land is divided into small squares by ridges of earth a few inches in height; and the water ... is conducted into these squares by means of small trenches. The cultivator uses his feet to regulate the flow of water to each part, by a dexterous movement of the toes raising or breaking down small embankments in the trenches, and opening or closing apertures in the ridges (Manning, The Land of the Pharaohs, 1887, p.31).' Cf. HDB s.v. 'irrigation'.
8. See e.g. Kennedy, Sources of New Testament Greek 39,155, Thackeray, Gramm. 262, B1. DF §129.
βρέχεσαι τὴν γῆν ἁφέσει αὐτοῦς σπείρειν it is probable that βρέχω is to be taken as 'send rain upon' (cf. ὦ with direct object of the place on which rain falls, LSJ s.v. I.3). But apart from these isolated examples, βρέχω 'rain' does not appear until the Koine, and was clearly not established until then. Xenophon elsewhere uses ὦ (e.g. ἹC 1.1.16), and in Aristotle ὦ is still normal (about a dozen examples), while βρέχω is used only in its ordinary Classical sense (Bonitz, s. vv.).

Instances of the new use of βρέχω from rather late in the Koine have long been noted, e.g. Ῥoxy. 1482.6 (ii A.D.) ὦ Ζεὺς ἐβρεχές, Arr. Epict. 1.6.26 (ii A.D.) οὐ καταβρέχεσθε, δίκαι, βρέχη; NT e.g. Ep. Jac. 5.17 προσηύξατο τοῦ μη βρέξαι, καὶ οὕκ ἐβρεξεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, but it can also be quoted from a papyrus contemporary with the Pentateuch, PCornell 1.152 (256 B.C.) διὰ τὸ τὴν νύκτα βρέχειν, 'because it rained during the night'. This example satisfactorily establishes what might otherwise have been open to doubt, namely, that the use was current in the third century B.C.

βρέχεσαι passes into Modern Greek as the ordinary word for 'it rains', ὦ being confined to archaizing Greek (Lex. Pr.).

In the Pentateuch βρέχω occurs as follows, in each place rendering ὅ ὦ hiph.:

(a) 'send rain', Ge. 2.5 οὐ γὰρ ἐβρεξεν ὦ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

(b) 'cause (something) to fall like rain', Ge. 19.24 κύριος ἐβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα θείον καὶ πῦρ, Ex. 9.23 ἐβρεξεν κύριος χάλαζαν ἐπὶ πᾶσαν γῆν Αἰγύπτου. (For this latter sense cf. PMag. 36.301 οὐ εἶ τὸ θείον, ὦ ἐβρεξεν ὦ θεός. ὦ had been used in the same way: see LSJ s.v. I.4.)

In regard to βρέχω, then, the translators' usage is in accordance with the contemporary development. But there are also, unexpectedly, two examples of ὦ, which as we have seen is likely to have been unusual in the vernacular Koine. The examples are:

ex. 9.18 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὦ ταυτὴν τὴν ὧραν αὐριον χάλαζαν πολλὴν σφόδρα.

10. See Anz, Subsidia 305f., LSJ, Bauer.
16.4 ιδού εγώ υω υμίν άρτους.

In both places υω renders ρηυ hiph., the same word as is rendered by βρεχω in three other instances (above). The variation in the renderings therefore cannot be due to a variation in the words used in the original.

A special explanation for the appearance of the obsolescent word in these two places may be put forward. It is noticeable that it occurs only in the first person singular in words spoken by God, and that βρεχω is not so used. This contrast is particularly marked in Ex. 9, where God's own words in vs. 18 are ιδου εγώ υω ταύτην την ώραν αύριον χάλαζαν, while the narrative a few verses later has (vs.23) έβρεξεν κύριος χάλαζαν. The explanation, I suggest, is that antiquated υω, having a dignified tone, was deliberately chosen because it was felt to be more appropriate to the speech of God than βρεχω, which no doubt had a colloquial ring.

In view of this it is probably not accidental that in the only other place where ρηυ hiph. is not rendered by βρεχω the words are again spoken by God, with the verb in the first person: Ge. 7.4 εγώ επάγω υετόν επί την γήν. The periphrasis has no foundation in the original, which reads ανενεργείει έκχειν γάζαν. Thus it seems that βρεχω has been avoided here, too, though it is twice used elsewhere in Ge., in the third person (2.5, 19.24).

11. There are a number of parallels to this phenomenon in the NT: βοάω, which had been largely replaced by κράζω, is used in the more vernacular gospels only once, of Jesus, Ev. Marc. 15.34; similarly δακρύω, milder and more dignified than the usual κλαίω, occurs in NT only in Ev. Jo. 11.35 έδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς; obsolescent βούλομαι, whose meaning had been taken over by θέλω, is found only occasionally in the gospels, in passages of an official, legal, or otherwise solemn nature. These examples are taken from G.P. Shipp, 'Some Observations on the Distribution of Words in the New Testament', in: Essays in Honour of G.W. Thatcher, Sydney, 1967, 135,137f.

I do not know of any parallels in the LXX, but it is likely that there are some to be found. Cf. G.B. Caird, JTS XIX (1968) 464: 'The LXX, as I hope to show at a later date, can provide many instances of deliberate archaising'. A curious feature noted by Katz, Th.Z. IX (1953) 229f., is possibly relevant in some way: in De. 28.7-36 the aor. opt. with, according to K., a future sense, is used when God is subject, the fut. ind. when men are.
'Depart', 'go away'

The developments in the ordinary words for this idea in the early Koine have seldom been noticed, but are of considerable interest. They afford good evidence of the agreement of the Pentateuch vocabulary with the Greek of its time.

The innovation here is the semantic development in ἀποτρέχω. In Classical Greek (Ar., Hdt., Pl., al.) this word normally had the sense of 'run away', 'run off', literally, as e.g. in X. Oec. 11.18 ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ μὲν βάδην τὰ δὲ ἀποδραμὼν οἶκαδε ..., but in the third century B.C. and later it is commonly found in the sense of 'depart', 'leave', without any suggestion of running or even haste. This is clearly seen e.g. in PMich. zen. 55.10 (240 B.C.): Philon asks Zenon to settle a certain matter with Philon's brother ἵνα ταχέως πρὸς με ἀναστρέψῃ καὶ μὴ ἐπικωλύωμαι ἐὰν δὲν ἀναπλεῖν. συντόμως γὰρ δεὶ ἀποτρέχειν ἑντεύθεν ('... I must be off from here shortly', ed.) Similarly Pcair.zen. 409.8 (iii B.C.) ἵνα ἀποτρέχω εἰς τὸ τεταγμένον, 'if you do not need me, let me go away to my assignment'.

In its five occurrences in Polybius the word has the same sense, e.g. 21.42.9 τοῖς δὲ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ τοῖς συμμάχοις εἰ τίνες εἶν <ἐκ τῆς Ἀντιόχου βασιλείας>, εἶναι τὴν ἐξουσίαν καὶ μένειν, εἰ βουλοῦνται, καὶ ἀποτρέχειν. Compare also Aristeas 273 ... κἀν ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν ἀποτρέχωσιν.

The use is also seen in a fixed expression familiar in manumissions, ἀποτρέχω ἐλεύθερος, or simply ἀποτρέχω, 'go free'. E.g. GDI 2038.9 (Delphi, 186 B.C.) εἰ δὲ κα πάθη τι Μενέστας, ἀποτρέχετω ἐλευθέρα γνωσιφίλα ὑπάλληλον δέπα κα θέλητ, 1899.5 (ib., ii

12. Signs of this development can be seen already in Xenophon and Comedy. See X. An. 7.6.5, Ar. Av. 1162, Lysipp. Com. 7.3 (Kock), Men. Dysc. 918. The word is however not used by Arist.

13. Other iii B.C. examples of the word are quotable, but in contexts too broken to be clear: Pcair.zen. 563.5, PEnt. 78.7 (both pres. tense). In PEnt. 23.8 τεξτάχαι ἀποτρέχειν ἐξο Σαμαρείας the meaning is almost certainly 'had been ordered to leave S..'. Another example is found in PHal. 1.179 (iii B.C.), quoted below p.128 n.21.

14. The other examples are at 3.22.7, 3.24.11, 21.42.18, 31.20.3 (all pres. tense).
We may note further the use in the sense of 'decamp', 'abscond', of the action of workers, e.g. PST 421.8 (iii B.C.), a complaint about wages, εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀποδραμούμεθα. Cf. PCol.Zen. 66.11 (iii B.C.).

The change in meaning in ἀποτρέχω is interestingly paralleled later in φεύγω, Classical and Hellenistic 'flee', now in Modern Greek 'leave', 'go away' (Swanson). Cf. English 'run away' e.g. in 'run away from home'.

In the Pentateuch ἀποτρέχω is quite clearly used in the new sense in all ten occurrences. It renders יָנָה, כָּעָה, and בִּשְׁנָ, never a word meaning 'run away'.

Ex. 3.21 καὶ δώσω χάριν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ ἐναντίον τῶν Αἰγυπτίων. δὲν ἀποτρέχητε, οὐκ ἀπελεύσεσθε κενοί
MT ἰθι εἶναί ὑμᾶς ἡμᾶς

10.24 βαδίζετε, λατρεύσατε κυρίω τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν. πλὴν τῶν προβάτων καὶ τῶν βοῶν ὑπολίπεσθε· καὶ ἡ ἀποσκευή ὑμῶν ἀποτρεχέτω μεθ' ὑμῶν
MT ἐὰν

Similarly Ge. 12.19, 24.51. Followed by εἰς:

Ge. 32.10 κύριε ὁ εἶπας μοι ἁπότρεχε εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς γενεσεώς σου καὶ εἰς σε ποιῆσω
MT ἠρένδρον

Similarly Le. 25.41, Nu. 24.14; cf. 22.13, with πρός. This construction is common with ἀπέρχομαι in Classical Greek (LSJ s.v. I.2); in it there is often the suggestion of going away back to a place (see e.g. Hdt. 1.22,68).

In two places the translators employ the formulaic expression found in manumissions:

Ex. 21.5 ἐὰν δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπη ὁ παῖς ἣν ἡγατής τῶν κυρίων μου καὶ τὴν γυναίκα καὶ τὰ παιδία, οὐκ ἀποτρέχω ἐλεύθερος
MT ῥηθα κακῷ

21.7 ἐὰν δὲ τις ἀποδώται τὴν θυγατέρα οἰκέτην, οὐκ ἀπελεύσεται ὑπὲρ ἀποτρέχουσιν αἱ δούλαι
MT σύρεται πολυτ οὐ πολυτ οὐ
It is to be noted that this must be deliberate. The literal rendering would have been ἐκπορεύομαι. Only here is άποτρέχω rendered by άποτρέχω. These two examples strikingly illustrate the translators' adherence to contemporary terminology.

Άποτρέχω, then, has in the Koine the same sense as the earlier word ἀπέρχομαι. The latter, moreover, is rarely found, and it is clear that ἀποτρέχω has taken its place. 15 This applies, however, only to the present (and impf.) tense. In the other tenses the suppletives remain the same as before, i.e. άπ-ελεύσομαι, -ήλθον, -ελήλυθα. 16 Thus in iii B.C. papyri I find άπ-ελεύσομαι and -ελήλυθα once each, -ήλθον 27 times, but no examples of -έρχομαι. On the other hand, ἀποτρέχω is as we have seen quite common, but in the present tense. Even in Plb. there are no examples of -έρχομαι, only -ήλθον. 17

Similarly in the Pentateuch άπ-ελεύσομαι and -ήλθον are common, but there are no examples of -έρχομαι. 18 ἀποτρέχω, which we have just seen occurs ten times, is present tense in all except one instance, i.e. 25.41 καὶ ἀπελεύσεται εἰς τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὴν κατάσχεσιν τὴν πατρικὴν ἀποδραμεῖται (MT ἁψ... ἂς). 19

15. As far as I know this has been observed only by Meecham, The Letter of Aristeas 297: 'ἀποτρέχω takes, in general, the place of ἀπέρχομαι' in Koine Gk. Thackeray's remark, Gramm. 287, is somewhat astray: 'ἀποτρέχω now replaces ἀπειμι= "depart", especially in imperat. ἀπότρεχε = ἀπίθε' (sic). (I think it is accidental that about a third of the LXX examples of ἀποτρέχω are imper.)

16. Cf. the way in which ὀρῶ is replaced in pres. and impf. by βλέπω, while ὅψομαι, εἶδον, ἔφακα remain unchanged (pp.133 ff.).

17. In the NT άπ-ελεύσομαι, -ήλθον, -ελήλυθα are still usual, and -έρχομαι occurs rarely and only in the more literary books: Eev. Matt. 8.19, 25.10, Luc. 9.57, Act. 23.32 (in all except the first there is a v.l. with a different verb). ἀποτρέχω, however, is not found (Bauer cites in this period only Herm. Vis. 3.3.1). One might well ask why this is so. The explanation, I suggest, is that by NT times it had been eclipsed by ὑπάγω, often 'go away', as well as just 'go'. Cf. Th. Mag. 368.11 τὸ ὑπάγω μὴ εἶπης ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπέρχομαι. ὑπάγω occurs only in pres. and impf. (Bauer; cf. Bl. DF §101 s.v. ἄγειν).

This use of ὑπάγω seems not to have become established until the time of the NT (MM cite no examples earlier than 1 A.D.). In the LXX it appears only in το. S, e.g. 8.21, and Je. 43.19 S*. The Pentateuch has the word in the older trans. use in Ex. 14.21.

18. Nor does -έρχομαι occur elsewhere in the LXX.

19. ἀπο-δραμεῖται B, -θανεῖται A, but A's reading is scarcely possible (Grabe emends it).
It is noteworthy that in this one place where ἀπελεύσομαι occurs it follows ἀπελεύσομαι, and may therefore have been resorted to for reasons of style. Clearly the normal use of ἀποτρέχω is as present to ἀπελεύσομαι, -ῆλθον, as is well illustrated by Ex. 3.21, 21.7 quoted above (see also Ge. 31.13 ἀπελεύσει compared with 32.10 ἄποτρέξει).

Other verbs do not seriously affect this pattern. ἀπειμι, like other compounds of εἰμι, is of course rare in the Koine. In the Pentateuch it appears once, in the participial form, Ex.33.8 κατενοούσαν ἀπλόντος Μωσῆ (see above p.86 n.4.). ἀποίχομαι is found occasionally, especially in the impf. So e.g. PCair.zen. 753.66 (iii B.C.); Ge. 14.12, 26.31, 28.6. ἀποβαίνω usually has the senses of 'disembark' and 'turn out' (of events), and is therefore not involved.

The changes in words for 'go away' form part of a whole series of developments in words for 'go out, in, towards', etc. In the present and imperfect the older compounds of ἔρχομαι tend to drop out. In their place, as was noticed earlier (p.85), new compounds of πορεύομαι generally appear, while in the other tenses the earlier suppletives continue unchanged. In the case of words for 'go away', however, the πορεύομαι compound is comparatively uncommon. The reason is clearly that the place it would have occupied has already been filled by ἀποτρέχω. There are no examples of ἀποπορεύομαι in the Pentateuch (or elsewhere in the LXX, or in the NT).

20. For other instances of stylistic variation see above pp.71,80 n.35, and cf. Gooding, The Account of the Tabernacle 8f.
21. The examples are: X.HG 4.1.15 ἀυτὸς ἐπὶ Δασκυλείου ἀπεπορεύετο ('he himself set off for D.'): perhaps πορεύομαι in its sense of 'march', 'travel' is intended here, and the meaning would not have been the same if X. had written ἀπήειν. Arist. Oec. 1350a 33 τῶν στρατιωτῶν... ἔν χερσὶν τοὺς ἔκεισθαι οὖσας ἀποπορεύεσθαι. StG 546 B.18 (Melitaia, iii B.C.)... καὶ ἔχοντες ἀποπορεύεσθαι βουλευτάν ἥνα. Plb. 24.7.6 ὅ δε χαίρων... τοῦτον ἀποπορευόμενον ἡμέρας ἐκ βάλανε οὕς προσπέμψας τινὰ ἐξεκέντησεν (for no reason that I can see LSJ give the meaning here as 'go back' 'return').

In the papyri the only example so far known is PHal. 1.177 (iii B.C.), where it occurs in the same context as ἀποτρέχω: Ptolemy instructs that when soldiers leave their billets they are not to make improper use of them, καθάπερ νύν ἀκούομεν γίνεσθαι, ὅταν ἀποπορεύονται, ἀπομισθοῦν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀπο[...]μένους τὰ οἰκήματα ἀποτρέχειν (for possible restorations see ed., and David & van Groningen, Papyrological Primer, no.5).

Quite separate is the technical use, of machinery (zurückfahren', ed.), in Hero Aut. 6.3, 19.5.
CHAPTER VIII

LEXICAL EVIDENCE FOR
THE DATE OF THE
PENTATEUCH TEXT

The major importance in LXX studies of the problem of establishing the text is well known. The great complexity of the textual history of the LXX and subsequent recensions creates difficulties which have occupied scholars' attention for several generations and are even now only in the process of solution. These difficulties have also given rise to two fundamentally opposed types of approach to the study of the text. Kahle, on the one hand, maintained the impossibility of recovering an original LXX version, since in his view there arose, in the same way as the Aramaic Targums, not one but a number of Greek translations, and the 'LXX' as we know it was the end product of a long process of assimilating different versions and isolated fragments of translation.¹ The opposite view, represented notably by Rahlfs and other Göttingen editors and by Katz and Orlinsky, is that an original, 'official', LXX version does lie behind the Christian recensions and that by analysing the mass of variants and isolating secondary recensions it is possible to recover it.²

Kahle's view now finds few supporters. Indeed, as Jellicoe has put it, 'the very data adduced by Kahle have been increasingly turned against him in vindication of the Lagardian hypothesis'.³ In particular, Kahle's claim that the recently discovered Dodekapropheton fragments support his position has

---

³. SMS 62.
been strongly contested by Barthélemy, who has argued, in the opinion of many scholars convincingly, that these fragments represent not an independent translation but a recension of the LXX text bringing it into closer agreement with MT.

The general opinion today, then, is that there is every hope of recovering an original Alexandrian LXX. Nevertheless this task remains a difficult one. It is clear that most if not all of our MSS contain some recensional elements, which the textual scholar must attempt to analyse. In some books the MS tradition presents a number of quite different texts deriving from different recensions, and to identify and evaluate these recensions can be a complex matter. In Kingdoms βγ for example, if Barthélemy is right the so-called 'Lucianic' text of certain minuscules often alone preserves the original LXX translation, and the whole of the rest of the MS tradition represents a text that has undergone revision. Similar problems arise with the task of identifying the recensions witnessed to by OT quotations in ancient authors and by daughter versions of the LXX.

Although the Pentateuch raises fewer problems than other books, it is still of some interest to look for confirmation, outside of purely textual evidence, that the text presented by the major MSS does date from the time when it is generally agreed the translation of the Pentateuch was made, i.e. about the middle of the third century B.C. If this could be found, though it would of course not disprove Kahle's view, it would at least demonstrate the reliability of these MSS as witnesses to an early text of the Pentateuch, and increase our confidence in the possibility of establishing the elusive LXX Urtext.

6. Barthélemy, Devanciers 126ff.; cf. Brock, op.cit.j 177. Cross, op.cit. 295, disagrees, however; in his opinion the 'Old Gk.' of Ki. βγ is lost.
7. See e.g. P. Katz, Philo's Bible. The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible, Cambridge, 1950.
In the present chapter an attempt will be made to obtain an indication of this kind from an examination of certain features of vocabulary. It is of course already clear, from the evidence examined in the preceding chapters, that the vocabulary of the Pentateuch would suit very well a date in the third century B.C. But that evidence is of little value for establishing such a date, since it consists of words and uses which for the most part continued in use in the language long after the third century B.C. What I shall attempt to assemble here is evidence that points to an early terminus ante quem for the text of the Pentateuch.

The features of vocabulary which will be considered are the everyday words for the ideas of 'see' and 'donkey'. I hope to show that in vernacular Greek certain developments in the ways of expressing these ideas took place not long after the third century B.C. and thus provide us with the evidence we require. It must be emphasized, however, that linguistic changes of this kind are by their nature incapable of being accurately dated. They are gradual developments which take place over a fairly long period of time. At best, therefore, we cannot expect to date our text more accurately than to within a century.

It is a prerequisite for our investigation that the vocabulary of the Pentateuch should be known to be predominantly that of vernacular rather than literary Greek. The reason for this is that the literary vocabulary tends to retain features obsolete in the living language, and these would vitiate any attempt at dating by the method proposed here. I take it that the generally vernacular character of our text has been sufficiently demonstrated by the evidence already considered.

We begin with the examination of developments in words for 'see'.

In Classical Greek the ordinary word for 'perceive visually', trans., was ὁράω pres., ἔωρον impf., ἔωρακα perf., with aor. supplied by ἔιοον, and the other tenses by the root ὀπ- (ὁςώμαι, etc.).

βλέπω was used chiefly in the sense of 'look' (in a
specified direction). It also had the sense of 'have the power of sight'; and a further use is found in the set phrase βλέπειν φός (with φός sometimes omitted), equivalent to 'be alive'. It does occur a number of times as a synonym of ὧραω in the sense of 'perceive visually', but investigation shows this use to be confined mainly to poetry. There are some twenty examples in Sophocles, e.g. Tr. 594 τόνδε γὰρ βλέπω θυραίον ἡδη, Ph. 357, and a smaller number in Euripides, e.g. Ion 925 οἰκτου σῶν βλέπων ἐμπλημαὶ πρόσωπον, Hec. 681. It occurs once in Aristophanes, Pax 208 ἵνα μὴ βλέποιεν μαχομένους ὑμὰς ἐπὶ, but not at all in Demosthenes, Herodotus, Xenophon, Andocides, Lycurgus, or Aristotle. In Plato there are three examples: Ti. 51c ταύτα ἀπεκ βλέποιεν ὡσα τε ἄλλα διὰ τοῦ σώματος αἴσθανόμεθα, Ig. 875d τάξιν τε καὶ νόμον, ἀ δη τὸ μὲν ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ ὧρα καὶ βλέπει, τὸ δ' ἐπὶ πάν ἁδυνατεῖ, 921a οὐδὲν τῷ νῷ βλέπων.

In all these authors ὧραω is the normal word for the idea. Even in those in which βλέπω 'see' is found, ὧραω is by far the commoner word.

We may conclude, therefore, that in the Classical period βλέπω in the sense of 'see' was a poetic variant of ὧραω, somewhat like Eng. 'behold' compared with 'see', but was not usual in prose, either Attic or Ionic, and, as its absence especially from Xenophon and Aristotle suggests, had spread little or not at all into everyday language. That it had, however, begun to appear occasionally in ordinary speech by about the end of the fourth century is a probable conclusion to be drawn from what we can learn of Menander's usage. In what survives of his plays I find three examples: Epit. 612 τί σ'αδ βλέπω 'γώ; Fr. 641 μέγιστὸν ἐστιν ὧρα τοῖς ἐπταλούσιν τὸ παρόντας ἐγγὺς τοὺς συναλγοῦντας βλέπειν, 683.12 ὦ γὰρ θεὸς βλέπει σε πλησίον παρὸς.

9. A good illustration of the difference is seen in Ar. Eg. 162-3 ἰευρι βλέπετε. τὰς στίχας ὧρας τὰς τῶν καὶ τῶν θάνων; cf. e.g. D. 19.87.
10. Information about the usage of Class. authors is derived from the standard indexes and lexicons to individual authors (see Bibliography).
11. I.e. among the occurrences of the word noted by Ast, Lexicon Platonicum; but Ast does not claim completeness.
12. Index in Koerte (2 ed.) and OCT of Dysc.
The present tense of ὁράω, on the other hand, occurs more than fifty times, the imperfect twice, so it is clear that ὁράω was still the usual word.

Θεάομαι and θεωρέω, though to some extent overlapping the uses of ὁράω etc., had special applications which can usually be discerned in their Classical occurrences.13

Other old words which could be used in this sense, such as δέρκομαι, λεύσσω, are irrelevant for our purpose, as being poetic or dialectal.

Going forward to the first century A.D. we find that a number of developments have occurred in the manner of expressing this idea. Our main evidence for this period is the NT, whose length and subject-matter require the expression of the idea often enough to make it a fairly reliable representative of first century A.D. usage. Moreover the usage of the NT is fully supported by the evidence of the papyri.14

The NT usage of the words concerned has often been observed and need not be demonstrated in detail here.15 The main points are as follows.

ὁράω in the pres. and impf. has almost, though not entirely, fallen out of use. Twenty occurrences of the pres. are found, but of these twelve are the imper. (ὁρα, ὁράτε) in the sense of 'take care' (that, not to, etc.); in the remaining eight ὁράω has its normal older sense of 'see', but it is probably significant that all except one of these instances are found in the more literary books, viz. Luke, Acts, and the Epistles.16 The one remaining example is Ev. Marc. 8.24 βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅτι ὡς δέντρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας, a passage not without certain difficulties.17 In any case this one example in a predominantly

---

13. See e.g. A. Prévot, Rev.Phil. IX (1935) 266-9.
14. See esp. MM s.vv. βλέπω, θεάομαι, θεωρέω, ὁράω.
15. See Bl. DF §101 s.vv. βλέπειν, ὁράν; Bauer s.v. ὁράω; MM; TWNT V 316ff. (Michaelis); H. Reinhold, De Graecitate Patrum Apostolicorum Librorumque Apocryphorum NTi Quaestiones Grammaticae (Diss.Phil.Hal. XIV.i) 1898, 97-100.
17. See e.g. C.E.B. Cranfield, St. Mark (Cambridge Gk.Test.Comm.), ad loc.
vernacular book does not affect the general picture. The impf. is found only once, Ev. Jo. 6.2, with v.l. ἐθεώρουν.

The pres. and impf. are normally provided by βλέπω, whose use in the sense of 'perceive visually', trans., is now fully established in ordinary usage, occurring over 100 times in NT. 18

The other tenses are normally expressed as before by εἶδον, ἰδώμα, ἰδού, etc.

In addition to βλέπω, two other contenders have appeared, θεάομαι and θεωρέω. The former (20 or so times in NT) is now practically synonymous with βλέπω, ὄραω. 19 It is used mostly in aor., never pres., thus competing to a small extent with the much commoner εἶδον. θεωρέω (over 50 times), although its fuller sense as in Classical Greek may often be felt, is also nearly synonymous with βλέπω, ὄραω, θεάομαι in many contexts. 20 It, too, tends to be restricted to certain tenses, viz. pres., and, less often impf., rarely aor., fut.

The uses of βλέπω, εἶδον established by NT times are maintained into Modern Greek, in which 'see' is normally expressed by pres. βλέπω, aor. εἶδα. In the δημοτική ὄραω has disappeared altogether.

Of the changes in words for 'see' which had occurred in the Koine vernacular by the time of the NT, the most important was that βλέπω had almost completely taken the place of the pres. and impf. tenses of ὄραω. It is clear that this development, just beginning at the end of the fourth century B.C., had more or less reached completion by the first century A.D. It is

---

18. It continues to be used in its other senses as well, and, invading the territory of ὄραω still further, is also used in the sense of 'take care' (Bauer, s.v. 6).

19. Cf. examples in Bauer and MM s.v.

Ammonius, Diff. 30, maintains the difference between βλέπω and θεάομαι, an indication that the popular tendency was to use them without differentiation of meaning. Similarly Th. Mag. 60.7.

20. C.C. Tarelli, JTS XLVII (1946) 175f.; TWNT V 319: 'θεωρέω then became a synon. of θεάομαι and ὄραω and largely replaced ὄραω in the koine' (forgetting βλέπω).

MM s.v. θεωρέω however maintain that θεωρέω 'was hardly a synonym of ὄραω'. Ev. Jo. 16.16, among other evidence cited in support, is particularly unconvincing.
reasonable to assume that the process of replacement was a gradual and continuous one during that period; that, in other words, as time went on, βλέπω was used more as ὀράω was used less. There is a possibility, therefore, of using these words to obtain an indication of the approximate date of a given text.

The evidence which we have already considered could by itself be applied in this way to the text of the Pentateuch, but what we must next endeavour to do is to trace the course of the replacement of ὀράω by βλέπω in the period between the end of the fourth century B.C. and the middle of the first century A.D. If that can be done with success it may be possible to narrow down the indication of date to within a century.

The evidence at our disposal for this period is, as might be expected, far from adequate, and is for practical reasons not easy to assemble. An attempt will be made, however, to collect such evidence as is available and to draw the conclusions it warrants, tentative though they may be.

For the third century B.C. a survey was made of the main collections of iii B.C. papyri.21 The pres. tense of ὀράω in the sense of 'see' is found some 24 times in these documents, the impf. three times. βλέπω occurs only in the sense of 'face' (towards).22

The papyrus evidence of the first and second centuries B.C. is very meagre. In addition, some has to be sought among publications of documents of other periods, so that a survey of all the evidence is difficult. The main collections23 were examined, however, and gave the following result. Eight examples of the pres. of ὀράω 'see' are found, none of the impf. βλέπω, on the other hand, is twice found clearly in this sense:


22. Three times, PCair.Zen. 847.7, 42, 50. In one other occurrence of the word, ib. 639.5, the meaning is unclear, and since the preceding letters are lost the original reading could have been a compound of βλέπω (so ed., suggesting διαβλέπω as a possibility).

23. PTab. i, iii, 1 and 2, PAdler, BGU vi, viii, UPZ i, ii, PStrassb. ii, and parts of PRI. ii, iv, PSI ix, FAmh. ii.
Some further information about this period may be gained from Polybius (c. 202-120 B.C.). The transitive use of βλέπω in the sense of 'see' occurs fifteen times in his writings, e.g.

18.46.8 Βουλομένων τῶν ἀνθρώπων μὴ μόνον ἀκοῦειν, ἀλλά καὶ βλέπειν τὸν λέγοντα
18.20.7 ... ὡστε ... μὴ δε τοὺς ἐν ποσὶ δύνασθαι βλέπειν.

The word is however still most often used in its earlier sense of 'look' (at, towards), with preposition following. Unfortunately no information is available from the lexicons for Polybius' use of οραω, but we can almost certainly assume that he used it more often than βλέπω.

Finally, we can add from the inscriptions an example of βλέπω 'see' from the first century B.C.:

SIG 1104.42 (c. 37/6 B.C.)... ἵνα ... πολλοὶ ξηλωταί γίνωνται (τοῦ) τὴν σύνοδον ἐπαύξειν, βλέποντες τὸν κτίσαντα τυγχάνοντα τῆς πρεπούσης εὐνοίας τε καὶ μνήμης.

This is the only example in the inscriptions collected in Dittenberger, SIG.

It seems likely that in the third century B.C. οραω was still the normal word in the pres. and impf. Although not as many as we should like, the comparatively large number of its occurrences, 27, as against none of βλέπω, makes that conclusion probable. βλέπω may, however, have been used occasionally, as

24. Mauersberger, Polybios-Lexikon, s.v.
25. Mauersberger's lexicon is still in progress, and the earlier lexicon of Schweighäuser does not note any occurrences of the word.
26. Examples of οραω noted at random are at 5.26.14, 6.2.7, 6.5.8.
we should expect judging from the evidence of Menander noticed earlier, and that possibility is of course not ruled out by the fact that no examples are found in iii B.C. papyri.

For the next two centuries the papyri fail us almost completely, providing too few examples of the two words for a satisfactory comparison of one with the other. But the examples that are found would support the tentative conclusion that during the second century B.C. \( \beta \lambda \epsilon \omicron \omega \) 'see' became more common, so that by the end of the century, perhaps earlier, the two words were equally common; and that in the first century B.C. \( \beta \lambda \epsilon \omicron \omega \) became more and more the usual word, with \( \omicron \rho \delta \omega \) beginning to be obsolete. Additional information from another source helps towards this conclusion. That \( \beta \lambda \epsilon \omicron \omega \) 'see' appears at all in Polybius, whose Greek tends towards the literary language, is I suggest an indication that it had become fairly well established in everyday language by his time.

I am suggesting, then, that it was during the second century B.C. that \( \beta \lambda \epsilon \omicron \omega \) began to compete seriously with \( \omicron \rho \delta \omega \). Clearly the evidence does not permit a positive conclusion on this point. We do know, however, that by about the middle of the first century A.D. \( \beta \lambda \epsilon \omicron \omega \) had all but ousted \( \omicron \rho \delta \omega \). It is highly probable, therefore, that \( \beta \lambda \epsilon \omicron \omega \) began to be common some time earlier. Naturally it is difficult to estimate the rate at which a development of this kind would progress, but it is certain to have taken place gradually. Therefore we may say with some certainty that at the latest \( \beta \lambda \epsilon \omicron \omega \) would have been in fairly common use by 100 B.C. And, if the evidence of Polybius in particular is kept in mind, an earlier date, around 150 B.C., can reasonably be inferred. An even earlier date is of course quite possible, but we have insufficient evidence to attempt to establish it. Around the middle of the century is suggested here as the earliest at which it can be put with any safety.

Turning at last to the Pentateuch, we find 25 occurrences of the pres. of \( \omicron \rho \delta \omega \) and three of the impf. (Rahlfs' text). These may be classified as follows:\(^{27}\)

\(^{27}\) Some of the examples are difficult to classify satisfactorily, but these do not affect the main point. For an analysis along different lines see \textit{TWNT} V 324-8.
1. 'take care', Ex. 33.5 ὀράτε μὴ πληγηῆν ἄλλην ἐπάξω ἑγὼ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς, and probably also 31.13.

2. 'look', Ge. 29.2 καὶ ὀρᾷ καὶ ἵδοὺ φρέαρ, Ex. 14.10 ἀναβλέψαντες ... τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀρῶσιν, καὶ οἱ Ἀιγύπτιοι ἐστρατοπέδευσαν ...

3. 'have the faculty of sight': (a) Ge. 27.1 ἡμβλύνθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὀρῶν, (b) of prophetic vision, 'have the power of perception', Nu. 24.3,15 ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ ἀληθινὸς ὀρῶν.

4. 'perceive visually', trans., fourteen times in the pres., e.g. Ge. 13.15 τὴν γῆν, ἦν σὺ ὀρᾶς, 31.5, Ex. 2.6, 32.19, Nu. 14.22; three times impf., Ex. 5.19, 20.18, 33.10.

5. ὦρα exclamatory, 'look!' or 'see!': Ge. 31.50 ὦρα οὐθεὶς μεθ’ ἡμῶν ἔστιν, Ex. 4.23, 25.40, Nu. 1.49.

Thus ὦρα in the sense that concerns us occurs in the Pentateuch fourteen times in the pres., three times in the impf. As we shall see in a moment, this number considerably outweighs the number of occurrences of βλέπω in the same sense.

Tenses other than pres. and impf. are supplied by εἶδον, ἔδρακα, ὤψομαι (with passives ὦφθην, ὤμμαι, ὁφθήσομαι).

Θεάομαι and θεωρέω do not occur at all.

βλέπω is used in the following ways:

1. (a) 'look' (at), De. 28.32 οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ σου βλέπονται σφακελίζοντες εἰς αὐτά, (b) 'face' (towards), of aspect, Nu. 21.20 ἀπὸ κορυφῆς τοῦ λελαξεμένου τὸ βλέπον (sic) κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς ἐρήμου.

2. 'watch', 'look on', abs., De. 4.34 ὦσα ἐποίησεν ... ἐνώπιον σου βλέποντος.

3. 'have the faculty of sight', Ex. 4.11 τίς ἐποίησεν ... βλέποντα καὶ τυφλῶν; 23.8, Ge. 48.10, De. 29.3.

28. This example might also be regarded as an instance of sense 4, since the καὶ clause is in effect the object of ὦρωσιν. Cf. M. Johannessen, Zeitschr. f. vergleichende Sprachforschung LXIV (1937) 198, and, for examples of this paratactic construction in Mod.Gk., Thumb, Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular 185.
4. 'perceive visually', trans., De. 45.12 ἰδοὺ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν βλέπουσιν καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ βενιαμίν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μου ὅτι τὸ στῶμα μου τὸ λαλοῦν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 29 De. 28.34 καὶ ἔση παράπληκτος διὰ τὰ ὄραμα τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου, καὶ βλέψη. 30

In the Pentateuch, then, there are only two examples of βλέπω in the sense of 'perceive visually', trans. Of these, it is important to note, one is the future tense, competing not with ὀράω or ἑώρων but with ὑψωμαι (which occurs about 50 times). Thus the numbers to be compared are: ὀράω 14, βλέπω 1; ἑώρων 3, ἐβλεπον 0. It is clear that the normal word in the pres. and impf. is still ὀράω.

It is worth adding that the four examples of exclamatory ὅρα (above, ὀράω 5) might also be taken into account in this comparison. If at the time our text was written βλέπω was displacing ὀράω, it would probably have been used in those places also. 31

What conclusion, then, is to be drawn? If my interpretation of the evidence is correct, βλέπω as a synonym of ὀράω had begun to be fairly common at latest by about the middle of the second century B.C., so that in a vernacular text dating from that time or later we could expect βλέπω to be used more than occasionally for the idea of 'perceive visually', trans. Since ὀράω is still the usual word in the Pentateuch, it can be concluded that our text must be dated earlier than 150 B.C., and that a date in the third century B.C. would be quite

29. βλέπουσιν A; no. v.11. (BS are lacking here).
30. βλέψη AB etc., βλέπεις Gkx, ὀψη Θηνπτ.
   According to Thackeray, 'the last few chapters of Dt. seem to occupy a position by themselves in the Pentateuch' (Gramm. 8 n.2), and 'in Dt. some new elements in the vocabulary begin to make their appearance ..., particularly in the closing chapters' (14). Thackeray did not elaborate on this, beyond noting two examples of novel renderings. If correct, the observation could be of some significance here.
   F. Baumgärtel, 'Zur Entstehung der Pentateuchseptuaginta' 77 (in: Herrmann and Baumgärtel, Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta, Berlin, 1923) considers evidence for dividing De. into two halves by different translators, but does not add to Thackeray's observation.
31. Cf. 1 Ki. 25.35 βλέπε ἡκουσα τῆς φωνῆς σου, 3 Ki. 17.23 βλέπε, ζη ὁ υἱός σου.
consistent with the evidence.

The fact that θεάομαι and θεωρέω are not used in the Pentateuch also points to an early date. As we saw, by the first century A.D. these two words had become current as near synonyms of the other words for 'see' (θεάομαι usually in the aor., θεωρέω pres. and impf.). I have not attempted to trace the course of this development in the centuries between the end of the Classical period and the first century A.D., but it is likely that it took place gradually during that time. Therefore a text in which the words are not used for the idea is almost certainly to be dated early in that period rather than late.

An examination of the words used for 'donkey' gives a similar result. Here we have the case of an incoming word competing for a time with the older word for an idea and then falling out of use, leaving the older word in possession again.

όνος, ὁ, ἡ, the normal word since Homer, continues in use in post-Classical Greek right up to Byzantine times, when it begins to be eclipsed by γάϊδαρος (γαϊδούρι), the Modern Greek word. It is fully attested in papyri throughout this period (examples in MM).

In the third century B.C. and later in the Ptolemaic period ύποζύγιον, originally any 'beast of draught or burden' (Theogn. +), is frequently used, as Mayser shows,32 to mean 'donkey'. Thus e.g. in Phil. 34.3 (243-2 B.C.) ... ἐν ὧν ἐγέρθησαι ἐπαναγκάζω τὸν Ἀλλήλοον ἦ ὁ ύποζύγιον ἀποδοῦναι τῷ κυρίῳ ἢ τιμήν τοῦ ὄνου (δραχμᾶς) κ., and see the other examples quoted by Mayser. It may be true that in some contexts ὑποζύγιον still had the more general reference (cf. MM s.v.), but there can be no doubt that it mostly meant 'donkey' specifically.33

---

33. According to Mayser this restriction in meaning is already beginning to appear in Arist., and is fully established in Thphr. LSJ also find it as early as Hp. Aph. 4.70 τὰ οὖρα ἀνατεταραγμένα οἶνον ύποζύγιον, but it does not seem necessary here, or in the similar example in Epid. 1.26.123.

The semantic development seen in this word incidentally tells us that the donkey was the beast of burden par excellence at the time when the development occurred. On the donkey in Ptolemaic Egypt see Schnebel, Landwirtschaft 335ff.
The important point for our purpose is that, according to the evidence of the papyri, ὑποζύγιον in the sense of 'donkey' was very common in the third century B.C., but in the second or first century B.C. began to disappear from use and by the first century A.D. had fallen out more or less completely.\(^{34}\)

In the collections of iii B.C. papyri examined earlier for ὄραω, βλέπω, there occur a total of 72 examples of ὄνος, 86 of ὑποζύγιον. It is clear, then, that the two words were equally common at this time.

For the next two centuries the evidence is meagre once again, but nevertheless points to the conclusion that at some time in ii B.C. ὑποζύγιον began to be less common than previously.

In ii B.C. papyri I find 3 examples of ὄνος in its normal use, and, perhaps to be left out of account, over 50 examples in the sense of 'donkey-load' in PTeb. 848, 849, etc. ὑποζύγιον is found twice, viz. PTeb. 92.13 = 161.8 (late ii B.C.) καὶ ἐντεῦθεν κατάγεται δὲ ὑποζυγίων, Pstrassb. 93.5 (120 B.C.) ἀλωτικά ὑποζύγηα. In both these instances there is a possibility, though it is not to be pressed, that the less specific sense is intended. The editors translate the PTeb. example by 'beasts of burden'.

In the papyri of i B.C. I find ὄνος 5 times, ὑποζύγιον not at all.

By i A.D. ὑποζύγιον in the sense of 'donkey' had quite definitely fallen out of normal use. In the papyri of i A.D. and later in BGU i, ii, and iii there are 50 or more examples of ὄνος, in POxy. i-iv, vi-x there are 18, and none of ὑποζύγιον in either collection. In this period the only examples of the latter word known to me, apart from NT, are Sammelb. 3924.12,27 (an edict of Germanicus, 19 A.D.) τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς πόλεως δια-τρέχοντα ὑποζύγια τούς ἀπαντῶντας πρὸς βίαν περιαλείποντας καλῶν,

---

34. 'Seit der Kaiserzeit kommt das Wort nicht mehr vor, ὄνος herrscht wieder allein', Mayser, ib.

In Mod.Gk. ὑποζύγιον has only the meaning 'beast of burden', and that too only in learned or archaistic Gk. (Jannaris, s.v. burden).
The *NT* has two examples of *ὑποζύγιον*, one of which, *Ev. Matt.* 21.5, is in a quotation from the LXX. The other is at 2 *Ep.Petr.* 2.16, in a reference to the story of Balaam and the ass: ... Βαλαάμ τού Βεώρ, ὃς μισθόν ἀδικίας ήγάπησεν, ἐλεγξάν δὲ ἔσχεν ἱδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ θεωρεῖσαν ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν. Although in the LXX description of this incident, in *Nu.* 22.28, ὄνος, not ὑποζύγιον, is the word used, it is possible, I suggest, that ὑποζύγιον was used by the author of the Epistle as a deliberate reminiscence of LXX language. ὄνος, on the other hand, occurs five times in *NT* (twice in quotations of LXX).

In the Pentateuch ὑποζύγιον is found 14 times altogether (Rahlfs’ text). Although the context does not always give a decisive indication of the meaning, there can be no doubt that the translators used it in the sense of ‘donkey’. In all instances where there is a word corresponding to it in MT it renders Hebrew רָשָׁם, 'he-ass', BDB, and there are numerous examples of its use in the same kind of context as ὄνος; e.g. *Ex.* 22.9 ὑποζύγιον ὁ μόσχον ὁ πρόβατον ἢ πᾶν κτήνος, *Ge.* 12.16 πρόβατα καὶ μόσχοι καὶ ὄνοι, ... ἡμίονοι καὶ κάμηλοι; *Ex.* 13.13 πάν διανοημένον μὴ τραβήγνῃ ὄνος ἄλλαξεν προβάτῳ, 34.20 καὶ πρωτότοκον ὑποζύγιον λυτρώσῃ προβάτῳ.

Ονος occurs a total of 43 times (Rahlfs), rendering רָשָׁם

35. The slight evidence afforded by the inscriptions in *SIG* and *OGI* accords with the above. ὑποζύγιον occurs only in an inscription of iv B.C., *SIG* 243 D. 55 (whether it means 'donkey' or not it is impossible to tell); one example of ὄνος is from iii B.C., the rest (3) A.D.

36. The unusual style of this Epistle has been remarked on. ‘1 Peter is written in straightforward Hellenistic Greek, whereas 2 Peter affects a style that is almost literary, replete with quite uncommon words’, Sidebottom, *James, Jude & 2 Peter* (Century Bible) 96; cf. Bigg (*ICC*) 224f. It is worth mentioning also that the Epistle is generally agreed to be late: certainly later than 100 A.D., and for some as late as 140 A.D. It is unlikely that the writer reflects the living speech of his time in using ὑποζύγιον in this way.
and ήνηῳ (‘she-ass’, BDB). In 17 instances, most of which are in Nu. 22, it is found with the feminine article. In these places ὑποζύγιον, giving no indication of sex, could not have been used. The discrepancy between the numbers of occurrences of the two words is therefore not as great as at first appears and is hardly enough to be significant. It seems clear that in the translators' vocabulary both words were in full use. Both are to be found within the space of two or three chapters, as e.g. Ge. 34.28 ὄνος, 36.24 ὑποζύγιον, Ex. 20.10 ὑποζύγιον, 21.33 ὄνος, and on one occasion within the same chapter: Ex. 22.3 ὄνος, 8.9,29 ὑποζύγιον.

It is true that whereas ὄνος occurs in all books ὑποζύγιον is not found in Le. and Nu. But it would be hard to see significance in this. Le. and Nu. could scarcely be separated from the other books on this basis, since the evidence of the vocabulary as a whole points overwhelmingly to the homogeneity of the Pentateuch. Moreover, in the case of Le. a word for the idea is required only once (15.9). Notice also that in one book, Ex., ὑποζύγιον outnumbers ὄνος 11 to 3. In short, the distribution of the two words appears to be random.

Clearly, then, in regard to words for 'donkey', the vocabulary of the Pentateuch text as we know it fits very well with a date in the third century B.C. Owing to the unsatisfactory nature of our evidence for the second century B.C., it cannot be said with certainty whether a date in that century is also possible. It is reasonable to argue, however, that since ὑποζύγιον, like ὄραω, must have dropped out gradually, and appears to have become obsolete by the first century B.C., a text exhibiting ὑποζύγιον as often as the Pentateuch could not be much later than about the middle of the second century B.C. It can at any rate be stated with confidence that a date in the first century B.C. or later is quite improbable.

The two groups of words we have examined, then, support each other in indicating that our text of the Pentateuch is older than about the middle of the second century B.C. The evidence does not permit us to conclude definitely that our text is as old as the third century B.C., but it does show that our MSS preserve, essentially unchanged, an early text. It is a
reasonable supposition that that text is in fact the ancient LXX version of the third century B.C.

There are a number of other groups of words that might be used to support this result. It has not been possible to examine these in detail for the present study, but it is worth while noticing them because even without a full examination it can be seen that they point to an early date for our text. It is however uncertain whether they would agree with the lower limit of 150 B.C. suggested by the words for 'see' and 'donkey'.

In the later Koine βούλομαι tends to be replaced by θέλω (which alone passes into Modern Greek).\(^{37}\) In the more vernacular books of the NT the former occurs only in special contexts,\(^ {38}\) the latter being the usual word. In the Pentateuch, however, βούλομαι is still in full use (14 times; θέλω c. 20 times).

Much the same situation is found with βοάω and κράζω. In the Pentateuch the former is the usual word for 'cry out' (c. 13 times). κράζω appears to be just coming into use. It is found 5 times, in somewhat different contexts from βοάω, viz. in descriptions of a body of people raising a cry, not of a single person. In the NT, on the other hand κράζω is the usual word; βοάω is rare, occurring occasionally in more literary books, in quotations from the LXX, and once in Mark for a special reason.\(^ {39}\)

Words for 'go (away)' also indicate the earliness of the Pentateuch. The common later use of υπάγω in this sense was apparently not established until the first century A.D. It does not occur in the Pentateuch. On the other hand άποτρέχω, which appears to have dropped out later, is common in the Pentateuch and in iii B.C. Greek.\(^ {40}\)

---

38. See above p.124 n.11.
39. See above p.124 n.11.
40. See above pp.125 ff., and esp. 127 n.17.
CHAPTER IX
CONCLUSION

The vocabulary of the Pentateuch has many close links with the vocabulary of contemporary vernacular Greek. It has been shown that the translators' vocabulary includes a large number of uses, formations, and words that had recently become current in the language. Some instances in which an old word became obsolete in the Koine and was replaced by a new one have also been examined. Here too we have found agreement between the Pentateuch and the Greek of the time.

The examples that have been studied in detail here are of course only a section of the vocabulary. But it can hardly be doubted that what has been shown for these examples is also true of the greater part of it. Attention has been concentrated on new words and uses attested in documents close in date to the Pentateuch. But these are only the most obvious illustrations of the connexion between the translators' vocabulary and that of the time. As we saw in the general survey in Chapter III there are many other new words and uses that are less well attested but are nevertheless sure to have been normal Greek of the third century B.C. In addition we saw that old words and uses are an important element in the translators' vocabulary. Moreover, a large number of these are attested in papyri of the third century B.C. It is also clear that the translators were familiar with many idiomatic Greek expressions and uses. Words for 'wash' (pp.36ff.) are a case in point.

Some of the examples studied give an especially good indication of the translators' familiarity with the vocabulary of their time. Words like τοπάρχης (p. 98), παρεπίδημος (112), and πάροικος (60), and uses such as χρυσούς as the name of a measure of weight and value (63ff.), ἀπέχω 'I have received' (61ff.), and ἀποτρέχω 'go free', of slaves (127), were part of the technical terminology of the day. It seems unlikely that speakers of an isolated form of Greek would employ such terms at all.
It is worth pointing out, too, that in regard to subject-matter the words and uses examined are a cross-section of the vocabulary.

As to words and uses unattested outside Biblical and related literature, the survey in Chapter III suggested that these are actually a small proportion of the whole vocabulary. Moreover, there are strong indications that a number of them are in fact normal Greek. They are unattested because of the incompleteness of our evidence. If more evidence were available their currency in normal Greek would almost certainly be established. We have seen a number of instances in which a word or use apparently peculiar to Biblical Greek has now been shown to be normal Greek by evidence recently made available or previously overlooked. It can hardly be doubted that there are others of the same kind.

In short, the conclusion to which this examination leads is that the bulk of the Pentateuch vocabulary is the same as that of contemporary Greek.

It has also been shown that the case for regarding the Greek of the LXX as a 'Jewish-Greek' dialect is a weak one. Especially detrimental to this theory is the observation that the Pentateuch translators frequently avoid reproducing the Hebrew idiom of their original. There are undoubtedly numerous Hebraisms in the version, but advocates of 'Jewish-Greek' have emphasized them to the exclusion of instances in which Hebraism is avoided.

These findings strongly support the view that the Greek of the LXX is to be regarded as essentially the Greek of the time and that its peculiarities are to be explained chiefly as a result of the translation process. A final conclusion on this question will of course not be possible until the remainder of the LXX and syntax as well as vocabulary have been fully examined. Nevertheless this study has shown that there are strong grounds for reaffirming Deissmann's view.

1. See ἅπερίτμητος (111), κόρος (116f), μέρος 'side' (72ff.), and examples on p.44f.
This study is also offered as a contribution to LXX lexicography. The detailed examination of individual words and uses will, it is intended, form part of the preliminary study for the much-needed LXX lexicon. In addition there are certain general points to be noticed.

It has been clearly shown that lexical study of the LXX cannot afford to neglect the evidence of contemporary Greek, in particular the evidence of the Egyptian papyri. The LXX vocabulary must not be studied in isolation from its linguistic context. This is not to say that it will always be found to agree with the Greek of the time. Undoubtedly the opposite will be the case in many instances. But it must not be assumed, before the evidence is thoroughly investigated, that LXX usage in a given instance is independent of current usage.

It has been shown that the evidence of the papyri does contribute to the understanding of LXX usage. We have seen instances in which it throws considerable light on the meaning of a word in the LXX.² Indeed in some cases the meaning could hardly be understood correctly without the knowledge of contemporary usage.³

Furthermore, there are clearly many discoveries yet to be made about the LXX vocabulary. The treatment of it in the existing lexicons is seldom satisfactory and must not be relied on. Much investigation is needed before a satisfactory lexical treatment of LXX word can be given.

It may be added that in the present study I have given most attention to the evidence of papyri and little to that of inscriptions, the editions of which are poorly indexed. But it is certain that the latter, if thoroughly investigated, would have much relevant information to offer.⁴

². E.g. ἀποτρέχω (125ff.), ἐνοχλέω (66), παράδεισος (53ff.), προσπορεύομαι (89 ff.).
³. E.g. ἀποσκευή (101ff.), τοπάρχης (98), χρυσοῦς (63ff.).
⁴. Cf. the attestation provided by the inscriptions in the case of ἐκδανείζω (93), κόκκινος (111f.), σανιδωτός (112), and other words noticed on p.45.

The evidence for βλέπω and ὀρᾶω (pp.135ff.) in iii-i B.C. could, I feel sure, be supplemented from this source.
In regard to the dating of our text of the Pentateuch, it has been possible only to show that our text is probably older than the middle of the second century B.C. This nevertheless is a useful indication that our MSS witness to an early text.

Moreover, the method of dating used here could be applied in other parts of the LXX. An illustration of this may be noticed. In the two texts of Judges as printed by Rahlfs, A and B, there are a number of differences in vocabulary that must be significant for dating. They are as follows: 9.36, 19.30 ὀρνώ A, βλέπω B; 13.23 βούλομαι A, θέλω B; 5.10, 19.3, 10, 21, 28 ὑποζύγιον A, ὄνος B (in 1.14, however, B has ὑπ. once, where A has it twice). In each place (apart from 1.14) the reading of B is likely to be more recent than that of A: where A has the word in use early in the Koine B has the word which later replaced it. The textual history of Judges is very complicated involving a good deal more than just the two major texts A and B. And these texts themselves no doubt contain recensional elements. It would therefore be unwise to draw any firm conclusion here about the age of A or B as a whole. It may however be said that the features of vocabulary mentioned suggest that the text witnessed to by A is older than that witnessed to by B. At any rate it is clear that these features have something to contribute to the study of the text of Judges.

In conclusion two other points may be mentioned.

Some have found evidence to suggest that more than one translator worked on the Pentateuch. This view is very likely correct, but it is worth noticing that the evidence examined here does not provide any support for it. This study suggests that both in age and level of language the vocabulary of the Pentateuch is homogeneous. That is to say, all parts of it employ on the whole the everyday vocabulary of the third or second century B.C.

5. I have noted here only words discussed in Chapter VIII. Others pointing in the same direction might be added.

6. See F. Baumgärtel's study already cited (above p.139 n.30), and O.J. Baab, JBL LII (1933) 239-43.
The other point is one of interest for the study of Hellenistic Greek generally. It is clear that the Pentateuch itself is likely to be a good witness to the vocabulary of early Koine Greek. It must of course be used with caution. Any possibility of Hebraism would naturally vitiate its evidence. But there are many instances in which it could be of value. It frequently provides early attestation for a word or use known only from late in the Koine. There are also many words and uses unattested elsewhere that could be accepted as normal Greek on its evidence.
APPENDIX I
FURTHER EXAMPLES OF AVOIDANCE OF HEBREW IDIOM

Here are collected some other examples of the same kind as those discussed in Chapter II. I note each as briefly as possible, giving only the information necessary to identify it. The references cited in each case are not meant to be exhaustive.

I. A Hebrew word is not rendered by the literal equivalent

(i) ἔχωθεν Ge. 15.8 and often elsewhere
εξελεφερόω Le. 17.9 and often elsewhere
κατακλύσω Ex. 17.14, 32.15, Nu. 11.26
τίθημι Ex. 34.10, 27

(ii) μάρτυς Nu. 22.20

(iii) ἅπαξ Ex. 21.5, 7

(iv) στρατή Ex. 21.5, 7

(v) σέι Ge. 24.47, 41.42

(vi) ἐπιφεύγω Ge. 37.22
ἀνίημι Ge. 49.21

II. A Hebrew idiomatic expression is not rendered literally

(i) involving בַּר Ex. 9.28, Nu. 16.3, 7, De. 1.6, 2.3

(ii) involving בֵּית Ge. 30.15

(iii) involving חָפַל, נָסִי, כְּפַיָּר Ge. 47.12, Ex. 16.21, Le. 25.52, 27.16, Nu. 7.5, 35.8
(iv) מֵרִיתָן  \( \text{Ex. 16.3} \)

(v) זְכִרְךָ  \( \text{Ex. 12.6, 29.39, 41} \)

(vi) Other examples of various kinds may be seen in:
\( \text{Ge. 18.1, 21.20, 27.20, 43.23, Ex. 23.1, 36.4, Nu. 4.19, 21.4, 32.19, De. 2.37.} \)

III. A Hebrew construction is not rendered literally

A noun in the construct followed by another noun is rendered by noun and adjective

\[ \text{אֲרָגָן} \quad \text{סְתֶלָה} \quad \text{לַחִין} \quad \text{Ge. 35.14} \]
\[ \text{בַּרְנֶנ} \quad \text{פָּלָקֶתָּ} \quad 	ext{לֹחַין} \quad \text{Ex. 31.18, etc.} \]

Other examples may be seen in the translators' use of the following adjectives:  \( \text{ἀργυροῦς, βρῶσιμος, πατρικός, πολεμικός, πτερωτός, σιδηροῦς, στυράκινος, τεκτονικός, χαλκοῦς, χρυσοῦς, χωνευτός.} \)
APPENDIX II

SOME OLD WORDS AND USES
ATTESTED ALSO IN iii B.C. PAPYRI

This list has been compiled on the basis of the papyrus evidence recorded by LSJ, Bauer, and MM, in which the exact references may be seen. I have not personally confirmed the references given there.

άμαω
άνδρίζομαι 'act courageously'
άντιλαμβάνομαι 'help'
ἄξινη
ἄπαγω
ἀπολύομαι 'depart'
ἀποσβέω 'scare away'
ἀποτίθημι 'stow away'
ἀρεστός
ἀρραβών
ἀρχιτεκτονέω
ἀσεβεία
ἀσεβεω
ἀσεβῆς
ασκός
ἀτιμάζω
αυλή
αχυρον
βοηθός
βόσκω
βύσσινος
γραμματεύς
δάνειον
δεκάτη 'tithe'
δέρμα
δεσμωτήριον
desimwetíron
δεσμώτης
diasmwotis
διαμαρτάνω
diamaartan
διασφέω
diasphoe
διατηρέω
diatere
διέρχομαι of time, 'elapse'
dierkoma of time, 'elapse'
diaskstis
diowux
drepanon
drumos
dorfan
εγκατάλειπω
ekataleip
εγχώριος
ekhori
έκδύνω
ekduno
έκθερίζω
ektheriz
έκλειπω 'fail'
ekleip
έκχωρέω
ekxoroe
έλεγχω pass. 'be convicted'
elexhox
έμπορος
emporos
ένδεια
endon
έναντίον + gen.'in the presence of'
endonion + gen.'in the presence of'
ενδεής
dende
εντολή
entole
έντολη
entole
έξαιρέω 'rescue'
έξέρχομαι of time, 'expire'
έξετάζω
έξοδα
έπέκα 'wait'
έπιλανθάνομαι
έπιλέγω
έπιλοιπος
έπιμελέομαι
έπιτελέω
έπιτιμάω 'rebuke'
έπιφαίνω pass. of a god
έρεούς
έρευνών
έρον
έτοιμος
ευθύς adv.
έπαθον
έχομενος 'next to'
έχων
ήγεμών, τά θεμέλια, τά θερί ζω
θήρα 'hunt'
θησία
θέρις
θήρα 'hunt'
θηρεύω
θήρα 'hunt'
θυσία
Ιβις
ιερεύς
καθαίρεω 'demolish','dismantle'
καθαίρεσις 'demolition'
καθίζω intrans.
καθίστημι 'appoint'
καθώς
κλέφτης
κλέφτης
κλέφτης
κλήρος 'block of land'
κλίβανος
κοιλία 'belly'
κομίζω med. 'recover' (money)
κόραξ
κόσμος 'adornment'
κραυγή
κραυγή
κρίθινος
κρόκη
κρόκη
κρόκη
κύάδος
λίθινος
λιμός
λοιδορέω
λοιδορέω
λοιδορέω
λοιδορέω
λυχνία
λυχνία
λυχνία
λύχνος
λύχνος
λύχνος
μαρτυρέω 'give evidence'
μαρτυρία
μαρτυρία
μάρτυς
μάρτυς
μέτωπον
μεταpektómathai
νουμηνία
οίκεία
οίκεία
οίκνεω
οίκνεω
οίκνεω
όψιμοδόν
όψιμοδόν
όψιμοδόν
όψιμοδόν
όψιμοδόν
όψιμοδόν
όψιμοδόν
όψιμοδόν
όψιμοδόν
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
οφείλημα
ναραγίγνοναι 'come'
ναραγίγνοναι 'come'
ναραγίγνοναι 'come'
ναραγίγνοναι 'come'
παραδίδωμι 'hand over into custody'
παραδίδωμι 'hand over into custody'
παραθήκη
παρακρούομαι 'cheat'
παρατίθημι 'deposit'
πατρικός
πάχος
πενθερός
πενιχρός
περιτέμνω 'circumcise'
πήχυς measure of length
πλινθεύω
ποικίλος of cattle
πράσις
προσεύχομαι
προσπίπτω 'prostrate oneself'
πρόσταγμα
προστάσω
προχειρίζω 'select', 'appoint'
πυγμή
ραθυμέω
ραντός
ρόα
σιτοποιός
σκόρδον
σταφίς
στέαρ
στερεός
στήμων
στολή
στύλος 'of gathering harvest'
sυμβαίνω
συμπερεύομαι
συναγωγή of gathering harvest
συναναβαινώ
συναντάω 'meet'
συναποστέλλω
σύνεγγυς
σύνοιδα
συνοικέω 'live in wedlock with'
σφραγίζω
σφραγίς 'seal'; 'signet-ring'
σώμα 'person'
σώμα 'person'
σέλεινα 'die'
σέληνος 'tax'
τετράπον
τιμάομαι 'assess value'
τόξος 'interest'
τράγος
τράπεζα cultic term 'table for offerings'
τρίμηνον 'period of three months'
τρίχινος
τροφή
τριφώς
τρυγάω
τρύγητος
tύμπανον
ύδροφορός
ύπερέχω 'outdo'
ύδοσις
ύφαντης
ύφαινω
φιάλη
φυλακή period of time, 'watch'
χίδρον
χίμαιρα
χόρτος
χούς (measure)
χωρέω 'have room for'
χώστως
ώσεί 'as if'; with numbers, 'about'
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άγαθοποιέω 42  ἀποχή 61
άγιαστήριον 52  ἀργύριον 64
ἀγορασμός 100  ἀρδεύω 119, 121
ἀγροικός 33  ἀρδῶ 118ff.
ἀλήθεια 51  ἀροτριάω 113
ἀλίσκομαι 35  ἀρόω 113
ἀλογος 50  ἀρσενικός 109ff.
ἀμνάς 108  ἀρσην 109
ἀμπελών 54, 107  ἀρχή 51
ἀναδέχομαι 59  ἀρχι- 48f., 96
ἀναζωγή 101  ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ 48f.
ἀναιδής 33  ἀρχιοινοχός 96
ἀνάστημα 51  ἀρχωμαι 70, 71
ἀναστρέφω 82  ἄσμιος 111
ἀνασφάλαντος 111  ἀσφαλτῶ 48
ἀνθυφαιρέω 94  ἀστενῶ 45
ἀνίημι 70  ἀυρίον 95
ἀντίκειμαι 82  ἀφίημι 94
ἀξιόω 68ff.  ἀφίστημι 35f.
ἀπάγω 67  ἀφιέσσιμα 45
ἀπειμι 127, 128
ἀπερίτμητος 111, 146 -βαίνω 86
ἀπέρχομαι 127  βαρέως φέρω 35
ἀπέχω 61f., 145  βδέλυγμα 47
ἀποβαίνω 128  βερυλλίων 42
ἀποβαίνω 128  βλέπω 127, 131ff.,
ἀποβαίνω 128  ἄγαθοποισιμα 147, 148
ἀποβαίνω 128  βοάω 124, 144
ἀποβαίνω 128  βούλομαι 124, 144,
ἀποβαίνω 128  148
ἀποβαίνω 128  βούνις 114
ἀποβαίνω 128  βούνις 114f.
ἀποβαίνω 128  βρέχω 122ff.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Γενική λέξη</th>
<th>Χρονική ταξινόμηση</th>
<th>Ενδείκνυση</th>
<th>Σημείωμα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βρούχος</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>δόσις</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαϊδαρός</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>δραχμή</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γόμον ποιέω</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>δῶρον</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γειώρας</td>
<td>16, 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γελοιάζω</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>εγγίζω</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεμίζω</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>εγκάθημαι</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γένημα</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>εγκαταλείπω</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γογγύζω</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-ειμι</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γογγυσμός</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γόμος</td>
<td>45, 62</td>
<td>εἰσέρχομαι</td>
<td>85, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γομορ</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>εἰσπορεύομαι</td>
<td>86 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δακρύω</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>εκδακρύω</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>δανέζω</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>εκδέχομαι</td>
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</tr>
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<td>33</td>
<td>εκδοχή</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>110</td>
<td>εκδοχος</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
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<td>δέρκομαι</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>εκεί</td>
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<td>81</td>
</tr>
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<td>51</td>
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<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>35</td>
<td>εκκαθαρίζω</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαβαίνω εἰς</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>εκκλίζω</td>
<td>40</td>
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<tr>
<td>διαδίκασις</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>εκπορεύομαι</td>
<td>85, 91f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διακούω</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>εκπορεύομαι</td>
<td>92 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διακόρων</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>εκτρωμα</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διάκρισις</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>εκτρωμα</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διάλευκος</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ελαΐων</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διανηθώ</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>ελεημοσύνη</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαπορεύομαι</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>εμπορεύομαι</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διασάψισις</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>εμπορεύομαι</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διατελέω</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>εμπροσία</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαφωνέω</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>εμπροσία</td>
<td>100 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίδραχμον</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>εν γαστρὶ ἐκῳ</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίδωμι</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ενάρχομαι</td>
<td>70 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικαιόω</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>ενδικατομή</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δικτωστός</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>ενδικατομή</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διοδέω</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>ἐνοχλέω, ὑμαι</td>
<td>66, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόμα</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>εντρέπομαι</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόξα</td>
<td>30, 51</td>
<td>εξάγω</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
έξαποστέλλω 93f. δίβις 115
έξέρχομαι 92 θυσιαστήριον 52
έπαίρω πρόσωπον 51
έπαύριον 95 ίδιον 51
έπέρχομαι 88f. ἱλαστήριον 30, 52
έπιβάλλω 70 ἔλεως γίνομαι 34
έπικαταράομαι 48 ἰματισμός 101
έπιπορεύομαι 88f. ἱππος 35
έπωμίς 51 ἴσον ἴσος 35
έργοδιώκτης 96f. ἰχνος 42
έγγον 91 καδαίρω 48
έρυθρός 111, 112 καδαίρις 48
έρχομαι 85 κάθημαι 40, 51
-έρχομαι 85f., 128 καλ 51
έσπερινῶς 110 καιρός 83
έτασμός 44f. καλύπτω 77
έτερόζυγος 97 κάρταλλος 115f.
-ετής 26 κατά μόνας 35
εὐδοκέω 97 κατά χώραν μένω 35
εὐφρίσκω 51 καταβοάω 29
έχθρία 43 καταγιγνομαι 95
ἔχω 32 καταγόμενον 99
καταδυναστεία 48
κατεδυναστεία 48
κατακλίνω 28 κατακλίνω 28
καταβοᾶω 29
καταγίγνομαι 95
καταγώγιον 99
κατατείνω 71f.
κατατρέχω 83
καταπενθέω 42
καταπρονομεύω 48
κατατείνω 71f.
καταρέχω 83
καταφεύγω 48
κατάφυτεςία 58
καταφυτεύω 48
καταφύτος 58
καταχέω 34
καταψύχω 50
κερατίζω 42
κήπος 54, 55
κιβωτός 30, 51  νευροκοπέως 98
κλαίω 124  νίζω 36ff.
κλητή 51  νίπτω 36ff.
κόκκινος 111ff., 147
κόνδυλοι 116  δόδον 51
κόρας 116ff., 146  δόδος βασιλική 34
κουρά 58  οικετής 33
κράζω 124, 144  οίκοδομέω 51
κράσπεδον 51  ολεθρεύω 42
κρίνω 78  ολιγοψυχική 76
κρύπτω 77  ολιγοψυχία 49, 76
κτηνοτρόφος 42ff.  ολυκή 62ff.
κύμα 33  ολοκάρπωσις 52
κύριος 83  ολοκάρπωμα 52
κύρος 83  ονομα 32
ναος 140ff., 148
λαλέω 83, 95  ὀράω 127, 131ff., 147, 148
λαξεύω 48
λεύσσω 133  ὀρθρέων 46
λιμαγχονέω 33
λίθος 33, 45  ὀρθρίζω 46
λιμαγχονέω 33  δτι 32
λοίπων 36ff.  οδός 32
λύνω 49  ὀρθαλμός 51
λύμα 49  ὀχυρώμα 68
μαλακία 67  παράδεισος 53ff., 147
μαλακίζομαι 66ff.  παράθεμα 52
μαλακός 67  παρακάλεω 83
μάρσιππος 117  παρακαλέω 28ff.
μέγας 32  παρακαλέω 92
μέλλω 29  παρακαλέω 112, 145
μέρος 45, 72ff., 146  παρέχομαι 92
μετάφρεσκενον 33  παρέχομαι 56ff.
μετάφρασις 26  παρακαλέω 49, 61
μέσθιος 112  παρακαλέω 49
μέτρα 51  παρακαλέω 49, 60ff., 145
μονοχάριον 108ff.  πάσχα 16, 30, 52
μόσχος 109  πάσχα 16
μώμος 51  παύσιμοι 34
μόσχων 51  πεδίον 58
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<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>95</td>
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<tr>
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<td>111</td>
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<td>63f.</td>
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<td>51</td>
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<td>84</td>
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<td>51</td>
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<td>πλεόνασμα</td>
<td>99</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>πυράκης</td>
<td>109</td>
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</tr>
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<td>σάββατα</td>
<td>16,30,52</td>
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<td>28,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σάγμα</td>
<td>45,84</td>
<td>φλέγω</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σανιωτός</td>
<td>45,112,147</td>
<td>φλογίζω</td>
<td>49f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σιτοβολών</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>φυτεύω</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σιτομετρέω</td>
<td>45,98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκεπάζω</td>
<td>50,76ff.</td>
<td>χείρ</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκέπτομαι</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>χερουθ</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκεύος</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>χλωρόν</td>
<td>58f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιταλικό</td>
<td>Ελληνικό</td>
<td>Ημιτελές</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χόρτασμα</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρόνος</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρυσούς</td>
<td>63ff., 145</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άδει</td>
<td>81f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>Aramaic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ירחım</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אמ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>לברוה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אזור</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>תק</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לברוה</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רכ בכר</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בכר</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>מרגשים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מבר</td>
<td>11,24,26</td>
<td>מבר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וכ</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גיורא</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>מקרא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גמא</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>מדר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>55f.</td>
<td>משלכ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רדר</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>וגש</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הגר</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>וגש</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זב</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>זמר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חגור</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>סור</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חגור</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>עכרי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חלב</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>עלי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חלב</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>עלי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>החימר</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>ערש</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חימר</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>ערש</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סף</td>
<td>104ff.</td>
<td>עמק</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צי</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>מחת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יקומ</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>מקרד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ישב</td>
<td>40,51</td>
<td>מתקרא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כנס</td>
<td>39f.</td>
<td>מחר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כנלו</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Этפ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כנפו</td>
<td>64f.</td>
<td>ושר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נצר</td>
<td>116,117</td>
<td>נצר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ערש</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אב</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ראש</td>
<td>27,51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רדה</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רוח</td>
<td>39f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רחם</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רימ</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לכש</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שבת</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שבאה</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שופ</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שטח</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שלום</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שלח</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שקה</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שקל</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נבה</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נמי</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נגב</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Obsolescence, see Innovation and obsolescence

Orlinsky, H.M., 9, 129

Papyri, xiif., 2, 3, 5, 22ff., 33ff., 43ff., 45ff., 53ff. passim, 145, 147, 152ff.; lexicons, indexes, to, 9, 45

Pentateuch, date of, 3ff., 129ff., 148; as guide to later translators, 20; homogeneity of vocab., 143, 148; different translators in, 139, 148

Phrynichus, 98, 99, 101, 114, 115, 122

Poetic words, 34

Pollux, 66

Polybius, 10, 125, 136, 137, and passim

Rabin, Ch., 19, 20, 21, 30

Rahlfs, A., xiv, 129

'Rain' words, 122ff.

Replacement, see Innovation and obsolescence

Repo, E., 7

Schleusner, J.Fr., 2, 9, 69, 72

'See' words, 131ff., 147, 148


Semitic influence, 11ff.

Septuagint, see LXX

Shipp, G.P., v, 124

Speech of God, 124

Sturz, F.Guil., 6

Stylistic variation, see Translation methods
Suppletion, 86,88,127,128, 133f.,138

Tarelli, C.C., 134

Technical terms, 59ff.,98, 106,126ff.,145

Text of LXX, xiv, 3ff.,38,67, 71,80,81,87,104,127,129f., 139,143f.,148

Thackeray, H.St.J., 1,14,86, 96,127,139

Thomas Magister, 46,99,122, 127,134

Thumb, A., 1

Transitive and intransitive use, 49f.

Translation methods, 12,18ff.; idiom rendering, 24ff., 34ff.,50,57,62,63,76,80,90f., 121,127,150ff.; etymologizing rendering, 51,95; literal rendering, 20,40,51,57,60,91, 94,121; phonetic resemblance betw. rendering and Heb., 51; stylistic variation, 71,80, 92,128; choice of dignified vocab., 124; various, 89; see also Hebrew

Turner, E.G., 45f.

Turner, N., 1,13,22ff.

TWNT, 7,36,37,38,56,133,134, 137

Variants, textual, see Text of LXX

Vocabulary of LXX, 145ff.; general survey of, 31ff.; previous study of, 5ff.; vernacular character of Pent. vocab., 131; homogeneity of Pent. vocab., 143,148; as evidence for Koine vocab., 149; use in dating, 4,129ff., 148; papyri and, 1ff.,3,6,33, 34,43f.,45ff.,53ff. passim, 147,152ff.; theological study of, 7; lexicons and, 8ff., 44ff.,147; NT vocab. and, 8f., 45,127,133f.,142,144; choice of dignified vocab., 124; loan-words in, 16,30,52,114ff.; poetic words in, 34; old words and uses in, 32ff.,145,152ff.; new Koine words and uses in, 40ff.,53ff.,85ff.,114ff., 118ff.,145; neologisms in, 30, 50ff.,111; idiomatic Greek in, see Greek idiom; see also Lexicography of LXX

'Wash' words, 36ff.,145

'Wish' words, 144

Word formation, new formations, 47f.,51f.,85ff.; compounds, in general, 48f.; verb cmpds. with prep.,35f.,48,57f.,85ff.; with double prep., 93f.; prep. adds little, 92f., -ειμί, 86, 128; other prep. cmpds., 94ff.; ἀγαθός - cmpds., 48f.,96; various other cmpds., 96ff.; noun formations, 98ff.; in -μα, 98ff.; in -σμός, 100f.; in -η, 101ff.; in -ῶν, 107f.; various noun formations, 108f.; adjective formations, 109ff.; verb formations, 113

Xenophon, foreshadows Koine, 69,76,86,91,110,113,122,125

Ziegler, J., 8