

# A Lexicosyntactic Study of the Septuagint (Old Greek) Versions of the Books of Kingdoms

Samuel Hendrick Wessels

BAncHist (Macquarie)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Research

Department of Ancient History, Faculty of Arts  
Macquarie University, Sydney

17th of November, 2019



# Declaration

I, Samuel Hendrick Wessels, certify that this work has not previously been submitted for a degree in any other university or institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Samuel Hendrick Wessels

---

Date: 17/11/2019



# Summary

The Greek language undergoes numerous changes during the Koine period, which runs from the third century BCE to the sixth century CE. Written during the earlier part of this period, the Greek version of the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, represents one of the largest surviving corpora of Koine Greek. Nevertheless, while it has undergone considerable translation-technical and text-critical study, the relationship of its language to historical developments in Greek has received little scholarly attention. This is particularly true for the extra-Pentateuchal books. Following the approach of writers such as Thackeray, Lee and Evans, this thesis aims to identify and illustrate features of the Greek language characteristic of the Koine period in the Old Greek sections of the Septuagint books of Kingdoms. This process contributes to the linguistic contextualisation of these books. The translation style of Old Greek Kingdoms is generally considered to be highly ‘literal’ and ‘isomorphic’. The naturalness of their language and the degree of Semitic influence is therefore of primary interest to this thesis, particularly as it relates to the emergence of Koine Greek features.

These aims are approached through close study of the verbs πολεμῶ, ἐντέλλομαι and the pair ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι, each of which undergo or display linguistic developments characteristic of the Koine period. Comparison is made between Old Greek Kingdoms and contemporary Greek writings drawn from documentary sources, both papyrological and epigraphic, and, to a lesser extent, Greek literature. The analysis focuses variously on the syntactic relationships into which these words enter, their semantics and morphology, and on patterns of lexical usage. This thesis demonstrates that Koine period linguistic developments are identifiable in the language of Old Greek Kingdoms, despite some degree of influence from the source text. Moreover, it also shows that these books offer valuable evidence for linguistic developments otherwise poorly attested in the history of the Greek language.





# Acknowledgements

Very special thanks go to my supervisor Trevor Evans. His passion for ancient languages and extraordinary teaching skills have changed the course of my life over the last few years. Without his support and encouragement, this thesis would have been impossible.

At one point or another, nearly every member of the Macquarie University Ancient History Department has contributed to this thesis. In particular, the early encouragement and guidance of Lea Beness and Tom Hillard during my undergraduate studies will always be appreciated. Without their infectious passion for the ancient world, I doubt I would have pursued the study of history so far. Special thanks also belong to Linda Evans, who would do anything for her students, and to Peter Edwell, Ian Plant, Gil Davis, Gunner Mikkelsen and Susan Lupack. You have all been fundamental in forming my appreciation of what history is and what it can do. Special thanks go also to John Lee for his several significant contributions

The 2019 Ancient History MRES cohort have offered much support throughout this process. My thanks go to Gemma Green, Emma Bolton, Elizabeth Brice, Judy Simpson, Genevieve Holt and Patricia Yolie Dean. Above all, however, I must thank Samantha Mills who has become a close friend and confidant over the past few years.

The support of Chris Haddad in navigating the murky waters of post graduate life has been a tremendous help. Very special thanks go to Emmanuel Roumanis who has provided invaluable help with Modern Greek and, forsooth, has become one of my closest friends. To Peter Brown I owe almost all my familiarity with Homeric Greek. Thanks go also to Mark Matic, Phillip Brophy, Loren Dee and Tony Pryce. I have also thoroughly enjoyed working on Greek and Hebrew with my friend Louise Pryke while waiting for screensavers that don't exist. I would also like to thank Laura Jean who helped me across the line.

Above all, however, I give the deepest thanks to my mother, father, brother and sister. Your endless love and support are the greatest gifts of my life. Without you, none of this would be possible. I love you all.

S. H. W



# Contents

<i>List of Tables</i> .....	xi
<i>Abbreviations</i> .....	xii
1. Introduction .....	1
2. πολεμῶ .....	17
3. ἐντέλλομαι .....	40
4. ἔρχομαι/πορεύομαι .....	65
5. Conclusions .....	90
<i>Bibliography</i> .....	93



# List of Tables

1. Text Divisions of the Books of Kingdoms .....	3
2. Morphological Breakdown of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms .....	31
3. Complements of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms .....	34
4. Occurrences of ἐντελλόμαι in Koine Period Literature .....	42
5. Occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι by Writer .....	43
6. ἐντέλλομαι in Major Non-Christian Writers of the Koine Period .....	44
7. Syntagms Attested with ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms .....	54
8. Occurrences of -έρχομαι Compounds in Classical Literature .....	66
9. Morphological Breakdown of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms .....	73
10. Hebrew Equivalents for -έρχομαι Compounds .....	77
11. Hebrew Equivalents for -πορεύομαι Compounds .....	78
12. Morphological Breakdown of -έρχομαι and -πορεύομαι Compounds.....	79

# Abbreviations

Abbreviations of Septuagint (LXX) books follow the practice of *NETS*, with the exception of Kgds = Kingdoms. Papyrological references follow Oates et al. ‘Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets’. Epigraphical abbreviations follow Horsley and Lee ‘A Preliminary Checklist of Abbreviations of Greek Epigraphic Volumes’. However, where Horsley and Lee do not include the reference, the critical edition is listed in the abbreviations following. Greek literary writers are referenced in the manner of LSJ. Some texts not listed in LSJ, typically late Christian or Byzantine works, are referenced according to the abbreviations of Lampe’s *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Translations are my own except where otherwise noted.

BDAG	W. Bauer, F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich, 2000, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3rd ed., Chicago: Chicago University Press.
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs (eds.), 1907, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> , Oxford: Oxford University Press.
BDF	F. Blass and A. Debrunner, 1961, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , trans. and rev. R. W. Funk, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Beekes <i>EDG</i>	R. Beekes, with L. van Beek, 2010, <i>Etymological Dictionary of Greek</i> , 2 vols, Brill: Leiden.
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> , 1983, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
<i>BIOSCS</i>	The Bulletin of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies (renamed to The Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies <i>JSCS</i> ).

c.	Circa
Chaniotis, Verträge	A. Chaniotis, 1996, <i>Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit</i> , Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 24, Stuttgart: Steiner.
Chantraine DELG	P. Chantraine, 1968-1980, <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots</i> , Paris: Klincksieck.
EAGLL	G. K. Giannakis (ed.), 2013, <i>Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics</i> , 3 vols., Leiden: Brill.
Demos Rhamnountos II	V. Ch. Petrakos, 1999, Ο Δήμος του Ραμνούντος: Σύνοψη των ανασκαφών και των ερευνών (1813-1998), vol. II. Οι επιγραφές, Athens: Αρχαιολογική εταιρεία.
Göttingen ed.	<i>Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum: Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum.</i>
HALOT	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, 2001, <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> , rev. W. Baumgartner, J. J. Stamm, et al., trans. M. E. J. Richardson, 2 vols., Leiden: Brill.
IK Estremo oriente	F. Canali De Rossi, 2004, <i>Iscrizioni dello estremo oriente greco: Un repertorio</i> , Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 65, Bonn: Habelt.
IK Pessinous	J. Strubbe, 2005, <i>The Inscriptions of Pessinous</i> , Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 66, Bonn: Habelt.
IMT	M. Barth and J. Stauber, 1993, <i>Inschriften Mysia und Troas</i> , Munich: Universität München.
JSCS	The Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies (formerly The Bulletin of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies BIOSCS).
LEH	J. Lust, E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie, 2003, <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Revised Edition</i> , Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

LSJ	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, 1940, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , rev. and augm. H. Stuart Jones, 9th ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press.
LSJ <i>Suppl.</i>	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, 1996, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon: Revised Supplement</i> , ed. P. G. W. Glare, with the assistance of A. A. Thompson, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
LXX	The Septuagint, including all books included in the edition of Rhalfs.
Mauersberger <i>Lex.</i>	A. Mauersberger, 1956-2006, <i>Polybios-Lexikon</i> , Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Mayser <i>Grammatik</i>	E. Mayser, <i>Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit</i> , 2 pts. in 6 vols., Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1906-1938, repr. Berlin, 1970, 2 <sup>nd</sup> edn. of vol. i by H. Schmoll, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1970.
MH <i>Grammar II</i>	J. H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, 1919-1929, <i>A Grammar of New Testament Greek</i> , vol. II <i>Accidence and Word-Formation</i> , Edinburgh: T & T Clarke.
MHT <i>Grammar III</i>	J. H. Moulton, 1963, <i>A Grammar of New Testament Greek</i> , vol. III <i>Syntax</i> , by N. Turner, Edinburgh: T & T Clarke.
MT	Masoretic Text.
Muraoka <i>Lex.</i>	T. Muraoka, 2009, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> , Leuven: Peeters.
Muraoka <i>Syn.</i>	T. Muraoka, 2016, <i>A Syntax of Septuagint Greek</i> , Leuven: Peeters.
NETS	A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), 2007, <i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title</i> , New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version, 1989.

NT	New Testament.
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i> , 1997, 3rd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press.
OG	Old Greek portions of the Books of Kingdoms.
PHI	Packard Humanities Institute Greek Inscriptions.
Prose sur pierre	A. Bernand, 1992, <i>La Prose sur pierre dans l'Égypte hellénistique et romaine</i> , 2 vols. Paris: CNRS.
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> .
SM <i>Grammar</i>	H. W. Smyth, 1956, <i>Greek Grammar</i> , rev. G. M. Messing, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
TD	Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Triantaphyllidis Foundation), 2013, <i>Λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής</i> (Dictionary of Common Modern Greek) 9th repr., Thessaloniki: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
Temple de Kalabchah	H. Gauthier, 1911–1914, <i>Le Temple de Kalabchah</i> , 2 vols., Cairo: Imprimerie de L'Institut Français D'Archéologie Orientale.
TLG	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> (online at < <a href="http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu">http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu</a> >)





# Introduction

## 1.1 Preamble

Since the publication of Lee's *A Lexical Study of the Greek Pentateuch*, it has become increasingly common to describe the language of the LXX as 'natural Koine Greek'.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, suspicion concerning the 'naturalness' of LXX Greek persists, despite substantial support for Lee's thesis.<sup>2</sup> This continuing scepticism can only be dispelled through further study aimed at contextualising the LXX against historical developments in the history of the Greek language. However, such studies are lacking, especially for the extra-Pentateuchal books.<sup>3</sup> The situation is complicated by our still limited understanding of Koine syntax and lexicon.<sup>4</sup> The Old Greek (OG) sections of the books of Kingdoms,

---

<sup>1</sup> Horrocks 2010: 107 - 'while it is undeniable that, as a close translation of a sacred text, it embodies Hebraisms (especially where the obscurity or formulaic language of the original led to literalness), the analysis of the ordinary language of contemporary private papyrus documents from Egypt has now demonstrated conclusively that the Septuagint's general grammatical and lexical make-up is that of the ordinary, everyday written Greek of the times, and that it therefore constitutes an important source of information for the development of the language in the Hellenistic period.' Dines 2004: 110 - 'A broadly unifying feature [of LXX language] is that both authors and translators employ the 'Koine' or 'common' (i.e. 'shared') Greek of the Hellenistic age.' Jobs and Silva 2000: 106 - 'What then can be said about the Greek of the LXX as a whole? In the first place, it may be described as Hellenistic Greek.' The work of Deissmann is, of course, an important precedent to the study of the LXX as natural Koine Greek. On the significance of Deissmann's work to the study of the language of the LXX and NT, see Gerber 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Pietersma's (2017: 12) statement in the recent introduction to the SBL commentary series is a good example of the continuing skepticism regarding the naturalness of the Greek of the LXX - 'as a rule of thumb, no lexical sense in the translated LXX should be considered conventional usage unless it is attested in composition literature.' Significant monographs focused on the linguistic relationship of the LXX to the wider history of the language include Evans' *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch* (2001), Voitiła's *Présent et imparfait de l'indicatif dans le Pentateuque grec* (2001), Tjen's *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch* (2010), Aitkens' *No Stone Unturned* (2014b) and, especially, Lee's *The Greek of the Pentateuch* (2018). Volume 3 of the *Handbuch Zur Septuaginta* includes six particularly relevant chapters under the heading of 'The Greek of the Septuagint as Hellenistic Greek'.

<sup>3</sup> This lack of progress may be due in part to ongoing scepticism regarding the validity of the language of the LXX as evidence for developments in post-Classical Greek. Voitiła (2016: 118) notes, 'The general syntactic make-up of the Septuagint appears to be that of the contemporary Koine, with the exception of certain non-Greek features induced by the practice of literal translation ... In this survey we have reviewed several previously studied features of the Koine of the Septuagint but much research still needs to be done, particularly on the non-Pentateuchal books.' (my emphasis) cf. Aitken 2014a: 50 - 'While the Pentateuch has been recognized as reflecting standard language of the time as witnessed by the papyri, less work has been undertaken on other books.'

<sup>4</sup> With regard to the limited study of Koine Greek, it is significant that the recent publication of the *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek* actively avoids engaging with Koine material, as the title suggests. The authors note (van Emde Boas et al. 2018: xxxii–xxxiii), 'On the point of coverage, a few words must also be said about the second C[Classical] and G[Greek] of our title. There was a temptation (and a desire among a minority of our readers) to increase the diachronic and dialectological scope of the work to cover Homer, archaic lyric, the Koine, etc.; we also would have loved to say more about the Greek

known for their ‘literalism’ and text-critical difficulties, have not undergone such study.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, their language is consistently described as ‘natural Koine Greek’.<sup>6</sup>

## 1.2 Aims of the Present Study

The study of the language of OG Kingdoms has been dominated by translation-technical and text-critical considerations. It has not been studied as *Greek in its own right* or as evidence for developments in the history of Greek.<sup>7</sup> Voitila proposes that the LXX has limitations for study of the history of Greek as its language often ‘reveals the linguistic characteristics of its parent text.’<sup>8</sup> This is true. As a translation, its language cannot be used uncritically as linguistic data.<sup>9</sup> However, once the potential of Hebraistic influence has been isolated and accounted for, the language of the LXX becomes good evidence for the history of the Greek language. This thesis, therefore, has two goals. First, it aims to identify linguistic features in OG Kingdoms that reflect Koine period developments of the Greek language. Second, it seeks to study what the language of OG Kingdoms can tell us about the history of that language. Embedded in these main goals is the analysis of the general ‘naturalness’ of the Greek of OG Kingdoms. Following Thackeray, this thesis aims to contribute generally to the understanding of the Koine through study of the LXX.<sup>10</sup>

---

of inscriptions. However, as any such move would have drastically increased the size and complexity of the book (and accordingly decreased its accessibility), we decided to limit our purview to classical Greek.’ Negative views regarding the ‘quality’ of Koine Greek are easy to adduce and this is perhaps a contributing factor to the slow progress of Koine Greek studies. For example, Caragounis, discussing Atticism, talks of the ‘downward course that Greek had taken with Alexander’s empire.’ Caragounis 2013. Two of the largest recent contributions to the study of the language of the LXX are Muraoka’s 2009 *A Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint* and 2016 *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Unfortunately, neither of these works engage extensively with the wider history of the Greek language, particularly the documentary evidence, and largely examine the language of the LXX in isolation.

<sup>5</sup> For a definition of the ‘Old Greek’ sections and a rationale for focusing on that portion exclusively, see below under ‘1.3 Text History and the Divisions of the Books of Kingdoms’ and ‘1.4 The Unity of OG Kingdoms’.

<sup>6</sup> Wirth 2016: 224. Hugo 2015: 130. Law 2015: 150. Taylor 2007a: 245.

<sup>7</sup> The study of the Greek of the Pentateuch as Greek in its own right is the fundamental approach of Lee. He (2018: 2) states, ‘This book is about the Greek of the Pentateuch as Greek. I consider that approach to be fundamental. Certainly the Greek of the translation shows interference from the original Hebrew; but the instrument the translators deploy is fundamentally Greek, a language which they know well and know how to use in their translation.’

<sup>8</sup> Voitila 2016: 110.

<sup>9</sup> As Janse (2002: 388) notes, ‘interference in the LXX is due to a translation technique, typical of religious translations, which is at once calqued and word-for-word to produce a mimetic text. As a result, interference is almost limited to lexical and syntactic extension.’ Evans (2001: 2) notes, ‘We must always keep in mind the dual nature of translation Greek language and its special connections with the underlying Hebrew ... the Pentateuchal data must not be treated uncritically as ordinary Koine samples ... some syntactical phenomena, idiomatic in function, nevertheless manifest Hebrew interference through their frequencies of occurrence.’

<sup>10</sup> Thackeray 1909: 16, § 3 - ‘The Septuagint, considered as a whole, is the most extensive work which we possess written in the vernacular of the Κοινή or Hellenistic language, and is therefore of primary

### 1.3 Text History and the Divisions of the Books of Kingdoms

In 1907, Thackeray noted linguistic differences between sections of the books of Kingdoms.<sup>11</sup> Using ten linguistic criteria he divided the four books into five units marked as follows:<sup>12</sup>

Table 1. *Text Divisions of the Books of Kingdoms*

$\alpha$	=	1Kgds 1:1	–	1Kgds 31:13
$\beta\beta$	=	2Kgds 1:1	–	2Kgds 11:1
$\beta\gamma$	=	2Kgds 11:2	–	3Kgds 2:11
$\gamma\gamma$	=	3Kgds 2:12	–	3Kgds 21:43
$\gamma\delta$	=	3Kgds 22:1	–	4Kgds 25:27

Thackeray proposed that  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta\beta$ , and  $\gamma\gamma$ , which he saw as the products of three distinct translators, represented the earlier layer of translation.<sup>13</sup> Hence they are known as the Old Greek. Thackeray further proposed that  $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$  represented the product of a later translator working to fill in gaps left in the earlier translations.<sup>14</sup> Barthélemy's *Les*

---

importance for a study of later Greek, and the main function of a grammar of LXX Greek is to serve as a contribution to the larger subject, the grammar of the Κοινή.' The LXX was composed over several centuries. Aitken (2015b: 3–4) dates the Pentateuch to the third century BCE and proposes that the translation of subsequent books continued into the first century CE. Similarly, Dines (2004: 41–46) dates the composition of the LXX from the third century BCE to the first century BCE. Though extreme, the statement of Caird remains largely true - 'About the dating of the Septuagint as a whole only one statement can be made without fear of controversion: the process of translation was begun after the foundation of Alexandria in 331 B.C. and completed before A.D. 230, when Origen began work on his Hexapla.' Caird 1982: 96. Regardless of the precise date of its composition, that it was composed over such a long period of time coupled with its sheer size indicates that the LXX is an extraordinary source of information for the history of Greek in the Koine period.

<sup>11</sup> The four Greek books of Kingdoms (referred to as the books of Reigns in the North American tradition) correspond to 1–2 Samuel and 1–2 Kings in the Hebrew tradition.

<sup>12</sup> For Thackeray's criteria see, Thackeray 1907: 267–274, esp. 268. Shenkel (1968: 113–20) proposes a different division, with  $\beta\beta$  running from 2Kgds 1:1 to 2Kgds 9:13 and  $\beta\gamma$  beginning at 3Kgds 10:1. Thackeray's divisions, however, are generally accepted. The Greek characters used to mark these sections correspond to the Greek numbering of the books. Section  $\alpha$  corresponds to all of βασιλειῶν Α,  $\beta\beta$  to part of βασιλειῶν Β,  $\beta\gamma$  to part of βασιλειῶν Β and part of βασιλειῶν Γ,  $\gamma\gamma$  to part of βασιλειῶν Γ, and  $\gamma\delta$  to part of βασιλειῶν Γ and all of βασιλειῶν Δ. Wirth 2016: 13, n.3.

<sup>13</sup> Thackeray 1907: 263.

<sup>14</sup> Thackeray argued that the earlier translators purposely passed over portions of the narrative that reflect poorly on the Jewish tradition. He (1907: 263) states, 'He [the later translator] set himself to fill up the gaps which his predecessors had left by rendering into Greek the story of David's transgression and its outcome, which appears to have been previously passed over as unedifying, together with the story of growing degeneracy under the later Monarchy culminating in the captivity. It is not difficult to see the reason for the unwillingness of the earlier translators to bring such a story of disasters before the notice of heathen readers.'

*devanciers d'Aquila* demonstrated that the linguistic features of βγ and γδ resulted rather from a Hebraising revision that sought to align the Greek closer with the Hebrew.<sup>15</sup> Due to its consistent rendering of כּוּל by καὶ γε, Barthélemy named this the Kaige recension.<sup>16</sup> There is no consensus regarding why the OG sections escaped this process of recension.<sup>17</sup> Due to their complicated textual history, the books of Kingdoms cannot be treated as a linguistic unity.

## 1.4 The Unity of OG Kingdoms

This thesis focuses on the OG sections exclusively. This is promoted in part by the likelihood that α, ββ, and γγ are the work of one translator.<sup>18</sup> Thackeray's argument that each of the OG sections was the work of a different translator is unconvincing.<sup>19</sup> To distinguish α, he observes that while כּוּל is transliterated as γεδδούρ four times in 1 Kingdoms,<sup>20</sup> it is translated in 2 and 3 Kingdoms as σύστρεμμα and ἐξοδία.<sup>21</sup> Transliterations, however, are used inconsistently even within individual sections.<sup>22</sup> They are therefore insufficient to evidence multiple translators across α, ββ and γγ.<sup>23</sup> Despite his theory of distinct translators, Thackeray notes that ββ has 'considerable affinity' with α,

<sup>15</sup> Barthélemy 1963: 91–143.

<sup>16</sup> Barthélemy 1963: x, 33–47. Thackeray had already identified the standard rendering of כּוּל by καὶ γε. He states 'Καὶ γε as the rendering of כּוּל is one of numerous instances of a Greek word being selected from its resemblance to the Hebrew: it is common to α' [Aquila] σ' [Symmachus] θ' [Theodotion], but seems to have come into use before their time.' Thackeray 1907: 271.

<sup>17</sup> Taylor 2007a: 244. The textual history of Kingdoms continues as a major scholarly issue and the difficulties of the text, amongst other concerns, no doubt contribute to the delay of the Göttingen editions. For a good overview of the textual history of the books of Samuel see Hugo 2009. Significant further contributions concerning the Lucianic recension were made by Brock's *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel* (1966), and Taylor's *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns* (1992). Regarding the nature of the Kaige recension, the next major contributor was Gentry, who, rather than seeing the Kaige as a monolithic revision, proposed 'a continuum from the Greek Pentateuch to Aquila ... tending toward a closer alignment between the Greek and the Hebrew'. Gentry 1995: 497.

<sup>18</sup> Notwithstanding the linguistic differences between the OG and Kaige, both date to the Koine period. Thus, Kingdoms as a whole aligns with the stated goals of this thesis, that is the identification of Koine period linguistic developments. Nevertheless, the OG is the exclusive focus of this thesis due to the size of the text and the fact that analysis would be excessively complicated in treating the linguistically distinct OG and Kaige simultaneously.

<sup>19</sup> Without stating his reasons, Tov doubts Thackeray's proposal that each of the three OG sections was composed by a different translator. He states, 'Thackeray, *The Greek Translators*, produces some evidence for the distinction between the translation of 1 Samuel and 1 Kings, but the evidence is not convincing.' Tov 2008: 377, n.51.

<sup>20</sup> 1Kgds 30:8, 30:15 bis, 30:23.

<sup>21</sup> Thackeray 1907: 268. כּוּל = ἐξοδία, 2Kgds 3:22. כּוּל = σύστρεμμα, 2Kgds 4:2, 3Kgds 11:16.

<sup>22</sup> For example, Taylor (2007a: 246) notes that כּוּל is transliterated as ἀμεφεθ in 1Kgds 5:4 but translated in the very next verse as βαθμός.

<sup>23</sup> Aejmelaeus' (2007: 148–149) note that the translator of 1 Kingdoms displays some freedom in the selection of lexical equivalents is relevant to this point. See below under '1.5 the Language of OG Kingdoms and Translation-Technique'.

though he argues there is enough ‘I think, to shew that a fresh hand has produced it.’<sup>24</sup> On the contrary, Wirth notes that the syntactic phenomena he studies are consistent throughout 1 and 2 Kingdoms. He advances this as evidence of a single translator for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta\beta$ .<sup>25</sup> Regarding  $\gamma\gamma$ , Thackeray notes five occurrences of the preposition  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ , which is unattested elsewhere in Kingdoms.<sup>26</sup> This is better evidence for the presence of a separate translator but is unconvincing in isolation. The appearance of  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$  in  $\gamma\gamma$  may result from inconsistent translational practice. Tov argues that  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta\beta$  and  $\gamma\gamma$  are likely the work of a single translator.<sup>27</sup> Given the lack of compelling contrary evidence and the positive evidence advanced by Wirth, this is a reasonable proposition. Consequently, OG Kingdoms may be taken as a unified linguistic product.<sup>28</sup>

### 1.5 The Language of OG Kingdoms and Translation-Technique

As it was likely translated in the second century BCE, OG Kingdoms belongs to the linguistic context of the early Koine period.<sup>29</sup> Summations of its language consistently note that it represents ‘natural Koine Greek’.<sup>30</sup> Nevertheless, few works study this relationship directly. There are two exceptions. First, Wirth draws some connections between 1–2 Kingdoms and the history of Greek, but his focus is primarily translation-technical.<sup>31</sup> Second, Taylor’s study of the middle voice in 1 Kingdoms demonstrates that its use accords with natural Greek, and is not prompted by a feature of the source text such as the *Binyanim*.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Thackeray 1907: 263.

<sup>25</sup> Wirth 2016: 225–226. Wirth further notes that these syntactic phenomena are even detectable in the Kaige sections.

<sup>26</sup> Thackeray 1907: 268 - 3Kgds 7:9, 7:13, 7:16, 7:48, 8:7.

<sup>27</sup> Tov 2008: 377. Tov also points out that Muraoka (1983: 45) assumes the unity of Kingdoms  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta\beta$  and  $\gamma\gamma$ .

<sup>28</sup> Regardless, even if there were more than one translator, all were invariably writing in post-Classical Greek. Hence Koine period linguistic developments will be detectable in line with the aims of this thesis.

<sup>29</sup> The Koine period of the Greek language runs from the second century BCE to the sixth century CE. Lee divides this period into Early (iii-i BCE), Middle (i-iii CE) and Late (iv-vi CE). Lee 2007: 113, n.31. Lee is building on an idea advanced by Thumb suggesting a division in the history of the Greek language between 1 BCE and 1 CE. Thumb 1901: 9–10. The primary focus of this thesis is therefore the early Koine period. For the dating of OG Kingdoms see below under ‘1.7 Date of Composition of OG Kingdoms’.

<sup>30</sup> Hugo 2015: 130. Law 2015: 150. Taylor 2007a: 245.

<sup>31</sup> Wirth 2016: 225. It is also significant to note that Wirth does not study 3Kgds, Thackeray’s  $\gamma\gamma$ .

<sup>32</sup> Taylor concludes, ‘In no instance in 1 Reigns can one point to Hebrew influence having given rise to a single middle form. In this respect the words are Greek, and the syntax is also unmistakably Greek, seen clearly in the carefully-nuanced use of the middle’. Taylor 2006: 67. While Taylor’s work shows the natural use of the Greek middle, it is of less value for a direct study of the Koine features of OG Kingdoms. He does not include any discussion of linguistic developments in the Koine period, such as the gradual disappearance of the middle, though this is of limited relevance to the early Koine period. On the gradual replacement of the aorist middle with the aorist passive see Horrocks 2010: 103, 130, 256 and Browning 1983: 29.

Translation-technical observations are more common. The translation of OG Kingdoms is often described as ‘literal’ and ‘isomorphic’ though not slavishly so.<sup>33</sup> Aejmelaeus characterises the translator of 1 Kingdoms as ‘ambivalent’. She suggests that he proceeded using the word-for-word method, was unable to master larger syntactical units, but nevertheless ‘proves to be in good command of the Greek language’.<sup>34</sup> Wirth notes the common though not universal use of standardised syntactic reproductions of Hebrew linguistic phenomena.<sup>35</sup> Taylor observes the use of some lexical stereotyping, sometimes leading to semantic extension.<sup>36</sup> He points to such a case in 1 Kingdoms 2:1:

Καὶ εἶπεν

Ἐστερεώθη ἡ καρδία μου ἐν κυρίῳ,

ὑψώθη κέρας μου ἐν θεῷ μου·

(and she said, ‘my heart was strengthened in the lord, my horn was exalted in my god;)

The contextual meaning of the underlying קָרָה, here something like ‘strength’ or ‘power’, is ignored in favor of the standard equivalent, κέρας.<sup>37</sup> The resulting Greek is unnatural. Semantic extension also occurs in words, notably verbs, with more nuanced semantics. For example, the typical equivalent of הָלַךְ is πορεύομαι while καθίζω translates יָשָׁב. However, aside from their standard meanings of ‘to go’ and ‘to sit’ respectively, הָלַךְ can mean ‘to continue to do’ and יָשָׁב sometimes means ‘to inhabit’.<sup>38</sup> This again leads to instances of semantic extension as the Greek equivalents do not share these senses. This is not, however, the norm. As Pietersma and Wright note, the ‘vast majority’ of Greek words in the LXX

---

<sup>33</sup> Hugo 2015: 130, 2009:1. Law 2015: 151. Taylor 2007a: 245. Thackeray 1909: 13. Wirth (2016: 29) notes, ‘Die Wiedergabeweise des Samuelübersetzers steht auf der Skala von einer wörtlichen, ausgangssprachlich orientierten Übersetzungsweise bis hin zu einer freien, auf die Idiomatik der Zielsprache ausgerichteten Übersetzung auf der wörtlichen Seite. Sie ist aber nicht stereotypisierend.’ cf. Aejmelaeus 2007: 137 - ‘It is commonplace to say that this translation is of the more literal kind.’

<sup>34</sup> Aejmelaeus 2007: 148.

<sup>35</sup> Specifically, Wirth (2016: 219) notes that 93% of the occurrences of the ‘*figura etymologica*’ are rendered by a finite verb combined with a ‘*participium coniunctum*’; 77% of the occurrences of כִּי with an infinitive construct are rendered by ἐν τῷ + infinitive; and, finally, that the Hebrew conjunction ו is rendered by καὶ 95% of the time.

<sup>36</sup> Taylor 2007a: 245. On the issue of semantic and syntactic extension as a product of bilingualism see Janse 2002.

<sup>37</sup> Taylor 2007a: 245.

<sup>38</sup> Wirth 2016: 219.

‘normally mean what they meant in the Greek of that period.’<sup>39</sup> Moreover, while there is some stereotyping, the translator also demonstrates freedom in selecting lexical equivalents.<sup>40</sup> On the whole, Aejmelaeus and Wirth note the translator’s skillful use of Greek tenses.<sup>41</sup> Such observations prompt Wirth to state, ‘Der Übersetzer ist griechischer Muttersprachler: Sein Griechisch ist souverän fehlerfrei.’<sup>42</sup> Taylor makes a particularly important observation that is rarely stated otherwise; OG Kingdoms represents ‘non-literary Greek’.<sup>43</sup>

The Helsinki School advances the theory that LXX translators rendered small segments of Hebrew at a time.<sup>44</sup> Aejmelaeus proposes this as the approach of the 1 Kingdoms translator.<sup>45</sup> This theory has, however, not been proven, especially for the Pentateuch.<sup>46</sup> There is a better case for it in OG Kingdoms as is suggested by features such as apodotic καὶ and the restricted use of Greek particles.<sup>47</sup> If present, this method may have been partly dictated by the translators’ sometimes-limited command of Hebrew.<sup>48</sup> The potential linguistic implications of this phenomenon are considered throughout the thesis.

---

<sup>39</sup> Pietersma and Wright 2007b: xvii.

<sup>40</sup> Aejmelaeus (2007: 148–149) notes, ‘Within the limits of a few words he could use idiomatic Greek expressions, and when it was a question of just one word, he could be fairly free in choosing the equivalent and the form which he thought to be fitting for the context.’

<sup>41</sup> Aejmelaeus 2007: 145. Wirth 2016: 34.

<sup>42</sup> Wirth 2016: 30.

<sup>43</sup> Taylor 2007a: 246. Taylor’s prime evidence for this claim is the lack of typical Greek particles, on the use of which see below n. 47.

<sup>44</sup> For the initial formulation of this idea see Soisalon-Soininen 1987: 28–39. For a more recent expression, see Sollamo 2016: 171 - ‘Translation technique study has shown that the translators seem to have read and translated their source text in small units of a few words at a time.’

<sup>45</sup> Aejmelaeus 2007: 148–149.

<sup>46</sup> For a contrary view see Evans 2002: esp. 246–247. The Helsinki school’s assertion that the translators worked on small segments of text at a time accords with the theoretical assumptions of Pietersma who describes the ‘horizontal plane’ of his ‘two-dimensional text’ as ‘morphemes ... knit together into syntactic units to convey information.’ Pietersma 2017: 7.

<sup>47</sup> Regarding the issue of particle usage, it is significant that Evans (2010b: 202) notes, ‘particles already have a ‘learned’ or artificial quality even for educated third-century BCE writers.’ Thus, the restricted use of particles in OG Kingdoms is perhaps to be taken as evidence for their wider decline and that the language of OG Kingdoms aligns in this respect with contemporary vernacular usage. However, the potential influence of the source text must also be considered. Wirth (2016: 219) notes specifically the absence of μέν, δέ and γὰρ in OG Kingdoms: γὰρ occurs twice (1Kgds 20:30, 28:20); μέν once (1Kgds 20:14); δέ occurs 31 times (1Kgds 7:17, 10:16, 12:15, 13:21, 16:7, 17:9, 19:17, 24:18, 30:3, 30:10; 2Kgds 3:30, 3:39, 7:15, 7:19; 3Kgds 1:17, 2:13, 2:21, 3:8, 3:22, 9:6, 11:36, 12:11, 12:24r, 15:14, 17:13, 18:21, 20:2, 20:6, 21:9, 21:23, 21:39.) In addition, οὐν occurs twice at 1Kgds 19:2 and 20:31. On both occasions it corresponds to וְ. Additionally, δὲ is found 52 times and again commonly renders וְ (1Kgds 3:17, 6:3, 9:6, 9:18, 10:15, 14:17, 14:29, 14:41, 15:25, 15:30, 16:15, 16:16, 16:17, 16:22, 17:32, 20:5, 20:29 bis, 22:3, 22:7, 22:12, 23:22, 25:8, 25:24, 25:25, 25:28, 26:11, 26:16, 26:19, 27:5 bis, 28:8, 28:9, 28:21, 28:22, 30:15; 2Kgds 1:9, 2:14, 3:21, 7:2; 3Kgds 2:17, 8:26, 12:24k, 17:10, 17:11, 17:21, 19:4, 21:7, 21:31, 21:32, 21:35, 21:37.)

<sup>48</sup> Wirth 2016: 220 - ‘Neben seinem wohl manchmal zu schnellen Vorgehen hat er erkennbar Schwächen im Hebräischen. Immer wieder trifft er auf Vokabeln, die er nicht kennt. Teilweise errät er in solchen Fällen

## 1.6 OG Kingdoms and the Greek Pentateuch

According to Tov, ‘from the outset it was only natural that the Greek Torah would influence the translation of the subsequent books.’<sup>49</sup> Given the accepted chronology, it is probable that the extra-Pentateuchal translators were familiar with the language of the Pentateuch. The increasing prominence of the LXX throughout the Koine period suggests that this was the case.<sup>50</sup> The issue of Pentateuchal influence has bearing on the value of the extra-Pentateuchal books as evidence for the history of Greek. If extensive Pentateuchal influence can be demonstrated in an LXX book, then the value of that book as evidence for its *own linguistic context* is weakened. This would mirror the wider and later issue of Atticism. That is, the promotion and preservation of certain linguistic models on the grounds that they are ‘proper’. Regarding Atticism, Horrocks notes, ‘Where earlier historians like Polybius had settled for a practical compromise between the classical Attic of the writers studied in the classroom and the usage of the contemporary written Koine, the ideologues and devotees of revivalist Atticism modelled their style and usage directly on that of the authors of ancient Athens.’<sup>51</sup> This phenomenon creates difficulties for the study of the Koine as its preservation of archaic language tends to obscure linguistic developments. Similar, though less exaggerated, problems may emerge in the LXX if translators are substantially influenced by Pentateuchal linguistic models. On this issue, Tov argues that certain books can be characterised as more or less Pentateuchal.<sup>52</sup> For example, Gerleman’s study of the Greek version of Chronicles concludes that there is greater Pentateuchal linguistic influence on stories in that version than in those same stories as they appear in Kingdoms.<sup>53</sup> The ‘less Pentateuchal’ nature of OG Kingdoms is further evidenced by the fact that its lexical choices often diverge from the Pentateuch.<sup>54</sup> For

---

eine ungefähre Bedeutung aus dem Kontext, teilweise weicht er auf ähnliche Vokabeln aus; nicht selten behilft er sich mit Transliterationem.’

<sup>49</sup> Tov 1999b: 183. Barr has argued against the idea that the Pentateuch served as a lexicon for the subsequent translations. Barr 2003: 523–543.

<sup>50</sup> The increasing prominence of the LXX is attested by the letter of Aristeas. It reached a point of prominence at which it could challenge the authority of the original text. As a corollary to this note, if the translators were sufficiently competent to translate Hebrew into Greek, there is no reason to assume that the Greek version of the Pentateuch was necessarily their normal Bible.

<sup>51</sup> Horrocks 2010: 100.

<sup>52</sup> Tov 1999b: 184.

<sup>53</sup> Gerleman 1946: 22.

<sup>54</sup> This lexical divergence argues against the statement of Tov that the Pentateuch ‘was often consulted when the translators encountered difficult Hebrew words which also occurred in the Torah.’ Tov 1999: 191. Also arguing against Tov, Wirth (2016: 31) gives the examples of חָרֵם *Hip̄ʿil* and the abovementioned גָּדוֹד. The sole occurrence of this latter word in the Pentateuch at Gen 49:19 is rendered as *πειρατήριον* against the OG transliteration of *γεδδούρ* and translations by *σύστρεμμα* and *ἐξοδία*.



example, Hebrew אִפֶּה is translated as μέτρον at Deuteronomy 25:14 but transliterated at 1 Kingdoms 1:24. It is particularly notable that Pentateuchal religious terminology is absent from OG Kingdoms. Wirth notes that the Hebrew פֶּשַׁע translated consistently by ἀδικία in the Pentateuch is variously translated by ἀσέβεια and ἀνομία in 1–2 Kingdoms.<sup>55</sup> The general character of OG Kingdoms argues against extensive Pentateuchal influence.<sup>56</sup> This is not to suggest that the Pentateuch had no linguistic impact on OG Kingdoms. It was simply not used as a translational model. The independence of its language makes OG Kingdoms a prime target for study against the history of the Greek language.<sup>57</sup>

## 1.7 Date of Composition of OG Kingdoms

Like the majority of LXX books, the date of composition for OG Kingdoms is uncertain. The composition of the Pentateuch is often suggested as a *terminus post quem*.<sup>58</sup> The Pentateuch is commonly dated to the third century BCE, but this cannot be established with certainty.<sup>59</sup> The Kaige recension, often dated to the first century BCE, is used as a *terminus*

---

<sup>55</sup> Wirth 2016: 31.

<sup>56</sup> General support for this statement may be found in Thackeray's grouping of LXX books (1909: 13) which lists the Pentateuch as 'good κοινή Greek' and OG Kingdoms as 'indifferent Greek'. While Thackeray characterises the Pentateuch with a 'fairly high level of style' and 'faithfulness to the original, rarely degenerating into literalism' he places the four books of Kingdoms at the 'other extreme' in which 'we see the beginnings of the tendency towards pedantic literalism.' Thackeray 1909: 9. Elsewhere, Thackeray notes the translator of 'α has a certain independence or perhaps one should rather say a want of familiarity with renderings employed in the Pentateuch and elsewhere of some common Hebrew words.' Thackeray 1907: 274.

<sup>57</sup> Wirth argues that because the books of Kingdoms were not canonical in the sense of the Pentateuch and not constitutive of Jewish religious life, they cannot be seen as a continuation of a canon initiated by the Greek Pentateuch. Wirth argues, rather, that they must be considered '*sui generis*'. Wirth 2016: 222.

<sup>58</sup> Dines 2004: 41 - 'Modern attempts to reconstruct LXX origins have concentrated on the Pentateuch, on the assumption that these books were the first to be translated.'

<sup>59</sup> Dines (2004: 41–42) provides a useful summary of the four main arguments for a third century BCE date for the Pentateuch: 1.) the letter of Aristeas has 'at least some historical plausibility'. 2.) Quotations and allusions to the Pentateuch seem to occur from the end of third century BCE. 3.) Other books of the LXX use the vocabulary of the Pentateuch. 4.) The language of the Pentateuch is 'consonant with the early third century'. The assertion that the letter of Aristeas has 'at least some historical plausibility' is debatable due to the credibility of the broader contents of that text. Additionally, the claim that later books of the LXX use vocabulary of the Pentateuch does not apply to OG Kingdoms. In support of the claim of linguistic evidence for a third century date, the works of Lee (1983: 139–44) and Evans (2001: 263–64) are adduced. However, in his most recent work, Lee notes that while the linguistic evidence indicates a date early in the Ptolemaic period it cannot 'establish a terminus ante quam earlier than the 2nd century BCE.' Lee 2018: 273. Moreover, it should also be noted that pressure for a date in the third century BCE is partly due to the Letter of Aristeas. Dines (2004: 51) notes, 'On lexical-syntactical criteria alone, the translation of the Pentateuch could have occurred as late as the early-second century. Without *Ep. Arist.* we would not, perhaps, be arguing quite so confidently for a third century date.' Tov (2015: 430) makes a relevant observation noting, 'the Epistle of Aristeas has greatly influenced the analysis of the Greek translation of the Torah. We suggest that it also influenced the analysis of the post-Pentateuchal books.'

*ante quem*. Thus OG Kingdoms is typically located in the second century BCE.<sup>60</sup> Beyond these broad dating methods, Caird argues that Sirach, the only LXX book dated with some confidence, provides the opportunity for relative dating of other books including OG Kingdoms.<sup>61</sup> The preface to Sirach states that the translator, known as the grandson of Ben Sira, translated his grandfather's Hebrew text, an epitome of Jewish scripture, into Greek around 132 BCE in Egypt.<sup>62</sup> Caird argues that the grandson of Ben Sira quoted directly from available LXX books whenever his grandfather had done so with the original Hebrew.<sup>63</sup> Consequently, Caird proposes that if literary 'borrowings' are detected in the Greek Sirach, then the books from which they are taken can be dated to before 132 BCE.<sup>64</sup> While he finds no evidence of 'borrowings' from 2–4 Kingdoms, he argues that the phrase ἄρνὸς γαλαθηνοῦ, found at Sirach 46:16, was taken from 1 Kingdoms 7:9.<sup>65</sup> That this is a case of 'borrowing' is centered on Caird's assertion that γαλαθηνός, meaning 'milk-suckling,' is a 'rare, poetical word'.<sup>66</sup> This is incorrect. The documentary evidence

<sup>60</sup> Wirth 2016: 223. Hugo 2015: 129. Law 2015: 149 - 'The translation of 1–2 Kings necessarily took place between the translation of the Greek Pentateuch in the third century B.C.E. and the kaige revision of the rest.'

<sup>61</sup> Caird 1982. The book of Sirach, as it is named in the Greek tradition, is known as The Wisdom of Joshua (Jesus) Ben Sira in the Hebrew tradition and Ecclesiasticus in the Latin tradition. Caird is followed recently by Hugo 2015: 129.

<sup>62</sup> Sir. *Prologue*. 27–35. The pivotal statement for dating is found at Sir. *Prologue*. 27 – 'Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέως παραγεννηθεὶς εἰς Αἴγυπτον...' (For in the thirty eighth year of King Ptolemy Euergetes, having arrived in Egypt...). Wright notes that there are two Ptolemies named Euergetes, 'Ptolemy III (reigned 246–221 B.C.E.) and Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II Physcon (Also designated Ptolemy VII, reigned 170–164, 146–117 B.C.E.). The earlier Ptolemy only reigned for twenty-five years, and so the Euergetes mentioned by the grandson must be Ptolemy VIII.' Wright 2015: 412–413. Caird (1982: 95) proposes the date of 132 BCE for the translation of Sirach. Wright's more recent assessment (2015: 412–413) concludes with an approximate date of 117 BCE. As this section is written in response to Caird's article, I use his date of 132 BCE.

<sup>63</sup> Caird 1982: 97 - 'Ben Sira's book was intended as a compendium of the Old Testament Scriptures, and from the surviving fragments of the Hebrew text, late and corrupt as they are, we can see that he constantly used scriptural phrases which were sometimes long enough to amount to actual citations. This is particularly so in chapters 44 to 49, which sing the praises of the heroes of the nation's history. For our purpose the important point is this, that, whenever the grandson recognizes such a scriptural borrowing in his grandfather's Hebrew, he himself borrows from the appropriate Greek translation, *if one happens to be available to him*.' (Emphasis in the original).

<sup>64</sup> Caird 1982: 97.

<sup>65</sup> Caird 1982: 98. Sir 46:16 - καὶ ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν κύριον δυνάστην ἐν τῷ θλίψαι ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ κυκλόθεν ἐν προσφορᾷ ἄρνὸς γαλαθηνοῦ. (And he called upon the lord, a mighty one, when his enemies were pressing upon him in a circle with an offering of a suckling lamb.) 1Kgds 7:9 - καὶ ἔλαβεν Σαμουηλ ἄρνα γαλαθηνὸν ἓνα καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν αὐτὸν ὀλοκαύτως σὺν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἐβόησεν Σαμουηλ πρὸς κύριον περὶ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἐπήκουσεν αὐτοῦ κύριος. (And Samouel took one suckling lamb and offered it as a whole burnt offering to the lord with the whole people, and Samouel cried out to the lord for Israel, and the lord heard him.) This case of 'borrowing' seems to motivate Hugo's statement that 1 Kingdoms was 'perhaps circulating before the second.' Hugo 2015:129. An interesting corollary to this is the preservation of the noun ἄρην in both Sirach and Kingdoms. Due to its varied morphology, this word was replaced in the Koine by the second declension ἄμνός. See Papanastassiou, 2001b: 665.

<sup>66</sup> Caird 1982: 98. Caird additionally argues that the common word for 'a suckling, whether of man or of beast, is θηλάζων.' Muraoka defines γαλαθηνός as 'milk suckling'. Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. 'γαλαθηνός'.

demonstrates that γαλαθηνός is common in the Koine period. An inventory of livestock dated to between 263 and 229 BCE from the Zenon archive written by an αἵπολος (goatherd) named Hermias includes the line καὶ ἐρίφους γαλαθηνούς ζ (and suckling kids 7).<sup>67</sup> It is attested twelve more times in another livestock inventory, in a papyrus dated to around 240 BCE.<sup>68</sup> It is also attested at least seven times in epigraphy of the early Koine Period.<sup>69</sup> These documents, especially the papyrological livestock inventories, are not ‘poetic’.<sup>70</sup> Caird’s proposed link between 1 Kingdoms and Sirach is broken. The translators of Kingdoms and Sirach simply used the standard lexicon of their times. Caird’s misdirection results from the primacy of literary evidence and the Classical cannon in the study of Greek. Certainly, γαλαθηνός is uncommon in literature, occurring only 170 times in all and primarily in poetry. This is not the full picture. The documentary evidence offers a glimpse into the Koine vernacular. In fact, OG Kingdoms and Sirach support the claim that this was the standard word in the early Koine period meaning ‘suckling’. This is a good example of how the LXX may be used, when approached with caution, as supporting evidence for broader observations about the history of Greek.

Additional linguistic evidence for dating OG Kingdoms may be adduced. Voitila notes, ‘the historic present, a tense that is relatively rare in Hellenistic prose and papyri, is attested, albeit infrequently, in the Septuagint.’<sup>71</sup> The historic present is a defining feature of OG Kingdoms.<sup>72</sup> Voitila’s assertion that the historic present is less typical of later Greek

---

<sup>67</sup> P.Cair. Zen. III 59429.17.

<sup>68</sup> SB XX 14577. Significantly, as it relates to Caird’s argument, eight of the twelve occurrences in this papyrus modify the noun ἄρην. A third fragmentary example dated to the fifth of February 226 BCE can be seen at P.Heid. 6 362.39.

<sup>69</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361.4 (350 BCE post.). IPriene 174.12 = SIG 1003.12 (ii BCE). IErythrMcCabe 61.19, 43, 46, 70, 99. (189/150 BCE). This last inscription, a list of animals given in sacrifice, contains several other reconstructed occurrences of γαλαθηνός.

<sup>70</sup> Moreover, θηλάζων, which Caird sees as the common word for the idea of ‘milk suckling’, is poorly attested in early Koine period papyri. It is used primarily in relation to the contracting of wet nurses - C.pap.gr.1.10. C.pap.gr.1.4. In addition, θηλάζων is used of an animal in the above quoted SB XX 14577 where it appears alongside several occurrences of γαλαθηνός. Muraoka gives three senses to θηλάζω. His second sense, ‘to give milk to’ seems to be most fitting in relation to these papyrological occurrences. It is significant, however, that he sees θηλάζω as also having the sense of ‘to suck and apply pressure to breasts in order to draw milk’ which implies that the word can mean ‘to suckle’. Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘θηλάζω’.

<sup>71</sup> Voitila 2016: 114. Voitila makes this observation in relation to Evans’ (2001: 262) statement that ‘verbal syntax in the Greek Pentateuch may be characterized generally as typical of early Koine vernacular usage. The Attic structures are still largely intact.’

<sup>72</sup> The historic present was the main criteria by which Thackeray distinguished the OG from what would later be termed the Kaige. Thackeray 1907: 273–274. Thackeray counts 220 historic presents in the OG sections of Kingdoms. Additionally, the predominance of the historic present in OG Kingdoms shows the writers intimacy with the Greek verbal system. Van Emde Boas et al. (2019: § 33.54) note that the historic present ‘makes it seem as if an action that occurred in the past occurs in the present and is, therefore, all the more urgent.’ Its presence in OG Kingdoms along with its decline in the Koine generally may be advanced

suggests an early date for OG Kingdoms. Additionally, Lee notes developments in words meaning ‘donkey’.<sup>73</sup> The standard classical word meaning ‘donkey’ was ὄνος. However, the papyri suggest ὑποζύγιον came to be used equally in the third century BCE only to disappear from use over the second and first centuries BCE.<sup>74</sup> Regarding OG Kingdoms, ὑποζύγιον is unattested while ὄνος occurs twenty-five times.<sup>75</sup> This supports a date following the decline of ὑποζύγιον in the second century.<sup>76</sup> There is no external evidence for the dating of OG Kingdoms and the proposal of the second century BCE, common amongst scholars and based largely on linguistic observations, is the best estimate based on the limited available evidence.<sup>77</sup>

## **1.8 Methodology**

This thesis studies individual words. This allows for focus on linguistic developments in a defined, traceable and controlled unit. Each chapter represents an independent study of the words πολεμῶ, ἐντέλλομαι and the pair ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι. These words have been chosen as they evidence linguistic changes in Koine period Greek and are well-attested outside the biblical corpus. Specifically, ἐντέλλομαι and the pair ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι relate to distinctive Koine patterns of lexical usage while πολεμῶ, as it is used in OG Kingdoms, relates to wider developments in case syntax.

Each chapter begins with a history of the use and development of the word studied with particular focus on Koine period developments. This offers a historical background against which its use in OG Kingdoms may be contextualised. The focus of each chapter is dictated

---

as evidence of an education in Classical Greek. In fact, the rarity of this phenomenon in the Pentateuch and the papyri makes it difficult to account for its predominance in OG Kingdoms in any other way immediately apparent way.

<sup>73</sup> Lee 1983: 140–143.

<sup>74</sup> Lee 1983: 141. The word ὑποζύγιον is, of course, not entirely new. It is well attested in the Classical period in the general sense of ‘draft animal’. It did, however, come to refer specifically to ‘donkey’ for a time in the third century BCE before declining in favor of the older word, ὄνος.

<sup>75</sup> 1Kgs 8:16, 9:3 bis, 9:5, 9:20, 10:2 bis, 10:14, 10:16, 12:3, 15:3, 22:19, 25:18, 25:20, 25:23, 25:42, 27:9; 3Kgs 2:40, 13:13 bis, 13:23, 13:24, 13:28 bis, 13:29.

<sup>76</sup> The translator’s inconsistent inclination toward stereotyping, particularly in the rendering of simple nouns, may be significant in respect to this point.

<sup>77</sup> Tov 2015: 430 - ‘Most of the circumstances surrounding the creation of the various books of Greek Scripture are unknown since we possess no external data about the translators and translations. The only extant information is embedded in legendary miracle stories about the creation of the Greek Torah included in the Epistle of Aristeas and subsequent sources.’ cf. Dines 2004: 45–46 - ‘There are no stories about the translation of these books [the Prophets and the Writings] to help or hinder understanding, so dating is perforce from internal evidence.’ Indirectly, this thesis illustrates additional linguistic data relevant to dating.

by how the word in question relates to developments in the Greek language in the Koine period. Various, this includes semantic, syntactic and lexical analysis. Semantic analysis considers the word's meaning, this has, however, been the subject of intense theoretical debate chiefly between Muraoka and NETS.<sup>78</sup> Muraoka defines LXX words with the 'sense a reader in a period roughly 250 B.C. - 100 A.D. who was ignorant of Hebrew or Aramaic might have made of the translation.'<sup>79</sup> Emphasizing the LXX '*as produced* rather than *as received*', NETS focuses on meaning at the point of translation.<sup>80</sup> A word's meaning is largely dictated by the socio-linguistic context of its use, not its later interpretation.<sup>81</sup> This thesis aligns more closely with NETS. Nevertheless, Lee notes the failure of NETS to appreciate the significance of translational intention. According to Lee, 'the meaning intended by the translator ... *is* the meaning, at the point of production.'<sup>82</sup> Lee proposes that translational intention can be analysed through three 'clues': (a) the contextual meaning of the word in the Greek text; (b) the meaning of the original text as understood by the translator; and, (c) the standard meaning of the Greek word at the time of translation.<sup>83</sup> Working from a text-as-produced perspective, this thesis applies Lee's three clues in the analysis of semantics.<sup>84</sup> Syntactic analysis considers the various relations into which the words enter with particular focus on case syntax and collocated phrases. The morphology of the word is studied in relation to developments in verbal terminations and to patterns of verbal usage. Lexical analysis focuses on patterns of vocabulary in OG Kingdoms in relation to wider patterns of contemporary usage.

The appearance of Koine period linguistic developments in OG Kingdoms is evidenced though comparison with contemporary Greek writings.<sup>85</sup> This thesis draws comparanda

---

<sup>78</sup> For a useful overview of this debate see Lee 2010.

<sup>79</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* viii.

<sup>80</sup> Pietersma and Wright 2007b: xv.

<sup>81</sup> Despite its theoretical problems, Muraoka's work represents one of the most advanced and comprehensive lexicographical studies of the LXX. It cannot be dismissed wholesale on theoretical concerns alone.

<sup>82</sup> Lee 2010: 122.

<sup>83</sup> Lee 2010: 122.

<sup>84</sup> Joosten made a similar point earlier. He describes the determination of meaning in the LXX as a 'stool with three legs.' He proposes that, 'Three main factors allow the modern scholar to define the meaning of the translation's lexemes: Hellenistic Greek usage, the context, and the Hebrew equivalent.' Joosten 2012: 81. Joosten made this argument in a 2005 article titled 'Source-Language Oriented Remarks on the Lexicography of the Greek Versions of the Bible' reprinted in a collection of his papers in 2012. I reference the reprint.

<sup>85</sup> Comparison of biblical Greek with contemporary writings, especially the papyri, is associated most famously with Deissmann. On his use of the papyri and inscriptions for the study of NT and LXX Greek, see Deissmann trans. Greive 1901: 71–74. On the historical significance of Deissmann to Greek linguistics see Gerber 2010. This approach has been developed and refined primarily by Lee, Evans and Aitken.

from literature, papyri and epigraphy. Noting Taylor's assertion that OG Kingdoms represents 'non-literary Greek', focus is given to documentary evidence which bears a closer linguistic makeup to OG Kingdoms than literature.<sup>86</sup> As it remains largely untapped, the epigraphic data has been engaged as far as practicable.<sup>87</sup> Comparanda drawn from around the second century BCE, the likely date of OG Kingdoms, is prioritised. While the use of comparanda is key to the methodology of this thesis, Pietersma goes too far in stating that 'as a rule of thumb, no lexical sense in the translated LXX should be considered conventional usage unless it is attested in composition literature.'<sup>88</sup> This extreme view suggests that LXX language should not be considered natural until it is proven to be. On the contrary, this thesis aims to show that features of the language of OG Kingdoms unattested in contemporary writings may be advanced as representative of natural Koine Greek phenomena.<sup>89</sup>

This thesis is focused on OG Kingdoms as it relates to natural Koine Greek. However, it is undeniable that certain linguistic features of the LXX are unnatural. As Janse notes,

---

Historically, this method has been used to disprove the notion that the LXX and NT were distinct from the mainstream of Greek linguistics. For example, the chief purpose of Lee's seminal 1983 study was '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.' Lee 1983: 1.

<sup>86</sup> Taylor 2007a: 246. See n. 89 below concerning Evans' promotion of documentary evidence in the study of LXX Greek in place of Pietersma's emphasis on 'compositional literature'.

<sup>87</sup> On the poor use of inscriptions as linguistic data for study of the LXX see Aitken 2014b: 1–2. On the difficulties of working with epigraphic material see Aitken 2014b: 34–44.

<sup>88</sup> Pietersma 2017: 12.

<sup>89</sup> Pietersma's assertion is also at considerable variance with his former statement that the 'vast majority' of Greek words in the LXX 'normally mean what they meant in the Greek of that period.' Pietersma and Wright 2007b: xvii. Additionally, Pietersma's emphasis on compositional *literature* is problematic. While literature offers important linguistic evidence, the papyrological and epigraphic evidence offers more relevant linguistic parallels to the LXX. Evans 2019: forthcoming. Regarding this method and the value of the documentary evidence Lee notes, 'the material that is closest in time to the Septuagint is the most valuable, and there is by good fortune a large body of Ptolemaic papyri. Elucidation involves a quest for parallels, and this has the additional outcome of enabling us to conclude (up to a point) whether a word or use belongs to normal Greek or is peculiar to the Septuagint. A further aspect of such researches is important. The traffic is not all one way: the Septuagint itself, used with due caution, is a witness to Koine Greek. By bringing the Septuagint and documentary evidence together we may elucidate or support either by the other.' Lee 2016: 102–103. The relevance of documentary evidence to the language of the LXX may be seen in the discussion of the word γαλαθηνός above under '1.7 Date of the Composition of OG Kingdoms'. Stolk provides a good discussion of the difficulties inherent in using the papyri as linguistic data. She notes that 'Papyrus documents are written by a large number of different scribes and they do not show the same degree of standardization as may perhaps be expected from literary texts. This means that evidence could be found for almost any linguistic claim ... a close examination of the textual, linguistic and social context could reveal the factors playing a role in every individual text [papyrus]. Secondly, this approach has to be combined with a comparison of the frequency of occurrence in a wider variety of contexts in order to allow for generalizations to be made.' Stolk 2015: 72. Evans' (2010b) discussion of 'good' Greek in third century BCE papyri promotes a similar kind of contextual analysis of the writers of each papyrus.

‘interference in the LXX is due to a translation technique, typical of religious translations, which is at once calqued and word-for-word to produce a mimetic text. As a result, interference is almost limited to lexical and syntactic extension.’<sup>90</sup> In study of the LXX, comparison with the source text is important for identifying potential Semitic influence. However, it is well-known that LXX Kingdoms differs from the standard Hebrew text preserved in the MT.<sup>91</sup> Readings offered by LXX Kingdoms have long been seen as deriving from a *Vorlage* antedating the MT.<sup>92</sup> The Qumran fragments confirmed this theory. Ulrich, discussing 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, states:

The OG repeatedly demonstrates that it faithfully translates a Hebrew text that is simply at variance with the MT. Thus, sound Greek readings which differ from the MT but lack extant Hebrew manuscript support should be seriously considered as based on an alternate Hebrew manuscript and thus as a serious candidate for the “original” text.<sup>93</sup>

While Ulrich concludes that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and OG Kingdoms are close members of a text tradition removed from the MT, he concedes that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the MT are ‘distant representatives of the same general edition of the book of Samuel.’<sup>94</sup> Despite its differences, comparison with the MT is standard in study of OG Kingdoms.<sup>95</sup> Significantly,

---

<sup>90</sup> Janse 2002: 388. Noting the role of the Hebrew source text, Pietersma (2017: 5) argues that ‘the text-as-produced can only be accessed by mapping the Greek text onto its Hebrew or Aramaic source text.’ This encourages comparison with the MT.

<sup>91</sup> Taylor offers a useful list of divergences between OG Kingdoms and the MT in his introduction to the NETS translation. Taylor 2007a: 247–248. The variations are especially pronounced in 3 Kingdoms. On the relationship between 3 Kingdoms and the MT, see Law 2011.

<sup>92</sup> Wirth (2016: 16) notes that Otto Thenius had made this observation as early as 1864. Thenius 1864: xxi.

<sup>93</sup> Ulrich 2015: 80. cf. Aejmelaeus 2007: 131–132 - ‘we now know for sure, after the discoveries in the Dead Sea area, that the Hebrew text used by the Septuagint translators frequently diverged from what was later to become the MT. Even a cursory comparison of the Greek text with the MT and the Qumran fragments ... soon reveals numerous examples of common readings between the Greek and Qumran and against the MT.’

<sup>94</sup> Ulrich 2015: 108.

<sup>95</sup> Reference to the MT is dictated in part by practical reasons. There is no other viable text for comparison. Wirth 2016: 24. Moreover, the differences between the MT and the OG are insufficient to dissuade this practice. Cf. Taylor 2007a: 247 - ‘While the Hebrew text underlying the OG is not identical to the MT, it nevertheless is quite close, and comparison with the latter proved helpful in understanding the Greek text.’ Cf. Taylor 2006: 49 - ‘While the Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the translator of 1 Reigns was not identical with any extant text, throughout 1 Reigns it was clearly very similar to the modern printed editions. Thus the point of comparison in this paper is the so-called Masoretic text (MT) as found in the standard reference volume *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart, 1977).’ Additionally, the analysis of semantics through consultation with the MT is supported by the NETS theory of ‘interlinearity’. Pietersma and Wright propose that this theory ‘legitimizes the use of the Hebrew parent as arbiter of established meanings in the target language.’ Pietersma and Wright 2007b: xv.

this thesis is not a translation-technical or text-critical study. Absolute correspondence between the OG and the MT is unnecessary for identifying Semitic influence on the Greek, which should, as far as possible, be assessed as natural or otherwise in and of itself through comparison with contemporary non-translational Greek, though the influence of the source text must also be considered.

## **1.9 Critical Texts Employed**

The critical text used in this study is Alfred Rhalfs' *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt 1935. As the Göttingen editions of the books of Kingdoms are not yet available, this is standard scholarly practice.<sup>96</sup> The Hebrew text employed is *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Both NETS and Wirth's translation-technical study, for example, are based on Rhalfs' edition. Taylor 2007a: 244. Wirth 2016: 27.

<sup>97</sup> Additionally, the Qumran fragments have been considered as far as possible, especially where they provide insight into the *Vorlage* of OG Kingdoms. These fragments have been accessed through Ulrich's 2010 *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls*.



## πολεμῶ

Usually glossed as ‘to wage war’, πολεμῶ is common in Greek military narrative. It permeates Classical and Koine period historiographical literature and occurs over 200 times in the LXX.<sup>1</sup> It is attested 29 times in OG Kingdoms.<sup>2</sup> Semantically, πολεμῶ remained largely static throughout its history, and this is confirmed through its use in OG Kingdoms.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, though there is some evidence of Hebraistic influence on the use of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms, close study demonstrates the emergence of natural Koine Greek semantics and lexicon. Additionally, the evidence offered by OG Kingdoms for the syntactic relations of πολεμῶ is unique as it is poorly attested in other Greek writings of the early Koine period. Therefore, OG Kingdoms is key to our understanding of the use of this word in vernacular Greek of the third and second centuries BCE. In particular, syntactic patterns found in OG Kingdoms in the use of this word relate closely to Koine period developments in case syntax.

### 2.1 History of πολεμῶ

According to Chantraine, the noun πόλεμος, from which πολεμῶ derives, corresponds to the verb πελεμίζω, meaning ‘to shake’.<sup>4</sup> He proposes that while πόλεμος properly refers to ‘combat’ it has the sense of ‘guerre’ as early as the *Iliad*.<sup>5</sup> The noun form is first attested

<sup>1</sup> Instances of πολεμῶ in the entire LXX according to a range of resources and electronic searches: Accordance (Rhafs’) = 221; TLG = 229; LEH = 225.

<sup>2</sup> 1Kgds 4:9, 4:10, 8:20, 12:9, 14:47, 15:18, 17:9, 17:32, 17:33, 19:8, 23:1, 23:5, 25:28, 28:1, 28:15, 29:8, 29:11, 31:1; 2Kgds 2:28, 8:10, 10:17; 3Kgds 12:21, 12:24, 12:24x, 12:24y, 16:28c, 21:1, 21:23, 21:25.

<sup>3</sup> This is due in part to the fact that it faced little competition from other words within its semantic domain. This statement does not apply, however, to Herodotus, in whose work στρατεύω is synonymous with πολεμῶ. See below under ‘History of πολεμῶ’.

<sup>4</sup> Chantraine *DELG* s.v. ‘πελεμίζω’, II.

<sup>5</sup> Chantraine sees the sense of ‘guerre’ at Hom. *Il.* 1.61 - Ἀτρεΐδῃ νῦν ἄμμε παλιμπλαγχθέντας ὄϊω/ ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν, εἴ κεν θάνατόν γε φύγοιμεν,/ εἰ δὴ ὁμοῦ πόλεμός τε δαμᾷ καὶ λοιμὸς Ἀχαιοῦς· (Son of Atreus, I think, that we shall return back home now if war(combat?) and disease together are to destroy the Achaeans, should we escape death.) This is not entirely convincing. The sense of ‘combat’, which Chantraine champions as the prime sense of the noun, is compatible in this context and is perhaps better suited to the typical Homeric depiction of warfare. As additional support for the primary sense of ‘combat’, Chantraine notes that the word is found in association with νεῖκος and φύλοπις in Homer. Chantraine also concedes that his proposed relationship between πελεμίζω and πόλεμος could be disputed. Beekes sees the noun from which πολεμῶ is derived, πόλεμος, as originating from the pre-Greek substrate language. Beekes *EDG* s.v. ‘πόλεμος’. This is proposed on the grounds of the suffix -εμ-ο-, which Beekes sees as an indicator of pre-Greek substrate origins. Beekes *EDG* xxxvi. Curiously, in his introduction, discussing his

as part of a personal name in a Linear B tablet where it occurs as e-u-ru-po-to-re-mo-jo, rendered into post-Euclidean Greek script as Εὐρυπολέμοιο.<sup>6</sup> Upon the reemergence of Greek as a written language following the Late Bronze Age collapse, the verbal form is common. The earliest attestation of πολεμῶ is found in a fragment of the seventh/sixth century BCE lyric poet Stesichorus recovered amongst the Oxyrhynchus papyri.<sup>7</sup> It also occurs in a fragment of the sixth century BCE poet Hipponax also found at Oxyrhynchus.<sup>8</sup> The word is unsurprisingly common in Classical historiography. It is attested 108 times in Thucydides and 120 times in the Xenophontean corpus. Herodotus, however, uses πολεμῶ only 17 times.<sup>9</sup> For the sense of ‘to wage war’ he inclines towards στρατεύω, which occurs 163 times in his history.<sup>10</sup> This may reflect personal stylistic preference or Herodotus’ understanding of the literary Ionic lexicon.<sup>11</sup> The verb πολεμῶ is also common in the Attic orators of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, and in Plato with 46 occurrences and Aristophanes with 13.<sup>12</sup> Morphologically, the word conjugates across the various tenses as is expected of an ε-contract verb. Passive forms are attested only five times in the Classical period.<sup>13</sup>

etymological practice, Beekes lists the word π(τ)όλεμος as an example for the -εμ-ο- suffix as an indicator of pre-Greek origins. Directly after his listing of the word in the introduction, he provides the note ‘if not IE’. However, in the actual entry for πόλεμος there is no indication that the word may be derived from IE rather than the pre-Greek substrate.

<sup>6</sup> Fn PY 324.26; Bennett and Melena and Olivier, forthcoming.

<sup>7</sup> Page 1974: 10 = P.Oxy. 32. 2617 fr. 4+5. col. i. 8 - ] = Stesich. S15, col 1.8 - τα νόωι διέλε[ν]/ ]ν·/ ] πολὺ κέρδιον εἶν/ ]οντα λάθραι πολεμε[ῖν/<—>. (Too fragmentary for translation.)

<sup>8</sup> West 1998: 151 = Hippon. fr. 117 = P.Argent 3 fr. 2.2 = P.Stras. 1.3.2 - ‘... · ταῦτα δ’ Ἰππῶνα[ξ] ~ - / οἱ ἴδεν ἄριστα βροτῶν, / οἱ δὲ κάριφαντος· ἅ μάκαρ ὅτ[ις] / μηδαμὰ κώ σ’ εἶδε / .]ρ[... ] ου πνέοντα φῶρα. τῶι χυτρεῖ [δὲ νῦν / Αἰσχυλίδῃ πολέμει· / ἐκεῖνος ἡμερσέ[ν σε . . . . . ]ης, / πᾶς δὲ πέφηνε δό[λος]. (Hipponax . . . knows this better than anyone and so does Ariphantus. Ah, blessed is he who has never yet seen you, you thief with the stench of a goat(?). Now wage war with the potter Aeschylides. He robbed (you?) of . . . and all your deceit has been revealed. Trans. Gerber 1999: 439.) There is some dispute as to the authorship of this fragment. It is sometimes attributed to Archilochus, a seventh century BCE poet. See Gerber 1999: 437.

<sup>9</sup> Hdt. *Proem*; 1.16, 17, 18 bis; 5.67, 94, 95, 120; 6.37, 48, 98; 7.9; 8.97, 113, 140; 9.7.

<sup>10</sup> For στρατεύω Powell gives the sole gloss of ‘wage war’. Powell 1938: s.v. ‘στρατεύω’. Good examples may be found at Hdt. 3.39, 44; 5.86, 99; 6.6; 8.10, 93. The word στρατεύω is poorly attested in the LXX. It occurs at Judg 19:8; 2Kgs 15:28; 1 Esd 4:6; 2 Makk. 15:17; 4 Makk 9:24, 18:5; Esa. 29:7. Muraoka gives the sense of ‘to wage war’ and a new sense of ‘to set out on an uphill journey’. Muraoka *Lex*. s.v. ‘στρατεύω’.

<sup>11</sup> A range of other expressions are found in Herodotus to express the idea of ‘to wage war’: ποιέω στρατηγῆν - Hdt. 1.71, 171; 3.3, 39; 5.99; φέρω πόλεμον - Hdt. 9.18, 40; φοιτάω ἐς πολέμους - Hdt. 1.37; 4.116; αἰείρω πόλεμον - Hdt. 7.156; 8.140A; ἀναιρέω πόλεμον - Hdt. 5.36; ἀντέχεσθαι τοῦ πολέμου - Hdt. 7.53; διαφέρω πόλεμον - Hdt. 1.25; ἐκφέρω πόλεμον - Hdt. 6.56; ἐσβάλλω ἐπὶ πολέμῳ - Hdt. 5.76; ἐπέφερον πόλεμον - Hdt. 5.81; προφέρων πόλεμον - Hdt. 7.9.c. None of these are attested in OG Kingdoms. Regarding the idea of a literary dialect, Browning (1983: 20) notes, ‘the use of these literary languages was determined by the literary genre, and not by the native dialect of the writer.’

<sup>12</sup> Occurrences in orators - Aeschines = 21; Andocides = 24; Demosthenes = 123; Isaeus = 3; Isocrates = 115; Lysias = 9.

<sup>13</sup> X. *Mem*. 3.5.10; *An*. 4.1.1; Pl. *R*. 600a; *Mx*. 242e; Th. 5.26.6.

The word continued through Koine and Medieval period literature. It is particularly well-attested in the early Koine period historiographical writers Polybius with 138 occurrences, Diodorus Siculus with 173 and Dionysius of Halicarnassus with 167. It is also well-attested in Strabo, who lived during the first centuries BCE and CE, with 94 occurrences. Semantically, the word is highly stable throughout its history. Likewise, its morphology remained largely unchanged with the only notable variation being the increased frequency of passive forms.<sup>14</sup> It continued in common use through the Medieval period and has survived into the modern Greek vocabulary. The Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής gives two main senses for the modern verb πολεμώ. The first is ‘wage or take part in (a) war against someone.’<sup>15</sup> The second is ‘react against, oppose someone or something strongly; contest (also the idiom for ‘run a race’), fight/ battle, clash with someone or something.’<sup>16</sup> This sense is given the sub-sense of ‘put in/make big, strong efforts, struggle to achieve something, try hard, strive, toil for something’.<sup>17</sup> This final sub-sense is the only major semantic development in the history of the word and postdates the LXX.

Syntactically, LSJ makes a significant observation regarding the later use of this word. LSJ’s subsection II.1 of its entry for πολεμῶ provides the note ‘later c. acc., *make war upon*’.<sup>18</sup> In support of this observation, LSJ cites the fourth/third century BCE Attic orator Dinarchus, though there is manuscript uncertainty around the use of the accusative and recent editions emend the text to a dative.<sup>19</sup> More certain references are made to Diodorus Siculus and Polybius,<sup>20</sup> and a single reference is given to the first book of Maccabees in the

<sup>14</sup> This is likely due to the greater quantity of material from later periods of the Greek language rather than any linguistic development.

<sup>15</sup> TD s.v. ‘πολεμῶ’, 1 - ‘διεξάγω ἢ συμμετέχω σε πόλεμο ἐναντίον κάποιου’.

<sup>16</sup> TD s.v. ‘πολεμῶ’, 2.α - ‘αντιδρώ, ἐναντιώνομαι έντονα σε κτ. ἢ σε κτ., διεξάγω αγώνα, μάχομαι, συγκρούομαι με κτ. ἢ με κτ.’

<sup>17</sup> TD s.v. ‘πολεμῶ’, 2.β - ‘καταβάλλω μεγάλες, έντονες προσπάθειες, αγωνίζομαι να πετύχω κτ., πασχίζω, μοχθῶ για κτ.’

<sup>18</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘πολεμέω’, II.1

<sup>19</sup> Din. 1.36. - ‘τοιούτων ὧ δέσποιν’ Ἀθηνᾶ καὶ Ζεῦ σῶτερ συμβούλων καὶ ἡγεμόνων ὄφελον τυχεῖν οἱ πολεμήσαντες τῇ πόλει, καὶ μηδεπώποτε βελτιόνων.’ (O lady Athena and Zeus the Saviour, I wish that the those attacking the city had gotten leaders and councillors like these, and never better.) Conomis’ 1975 Tuebner edition emends the text such that the form of πολεμῶ take a dative rather than an accusative.

<sup>20</sup> D. S. 4.61.3 - ‘... καὶ ὁ Μίνως πολεμῶν ἐπαύσατο τὰς Ἀθήνας.’ (And Minos stopped waging war on Athens). 13.84 - ‘φασὶ δὲ τὸν Ἀντισθένην, ἐπειδὴ τὸν υἱὸν ἐώρα πολεμοῦντά τινα τῶν ἀγρογειτόνων πένητα ...’ (And they say that Antisthenes, when he saw his son fighting with some poor man, one of his neighbouring farmers ...); 14.37 - ‘... Ξενοφῶντα. ὃς ἀναλαβὼν τὴν δύναμιν ὥρμησε πολεμήσων Θράκας τοὺς περὶ τὸν Σαλμυδησὸν οἰκοῦντας.’ (... Xenophon. Who took the army and set out to wage war on the Thracians who lived around Salmydessus.); Plb. 1.15.10 - ‘καὶ γὰρ ἐξεχώρησαν οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι καὶ Συρακόσιοι τῶν ὑπαίθρων, καὶ τὰς Συρακούσας ἐπολέμουν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι κατὰ πόδας, ὥς δ’ οὗτός φησι, καὶ

LXX.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, the dative is far more common in Koine period literature. Of the 137 occurrences of πολεμῶ in Polybius, the occasion cited by LSJ is the single example of it taking an accusative, while the dative occurs 57 times.<sup>22</sup>

Documentary evidence for πολεμῶ is limited. Its 11 occurrences in the documentary papyri are scattered across the CE period.<sup>23</sup> This is unsurprising. Matters of war are not the usual content of these documents, which are primarily concerned with day-to-day life, trade and administration.<sup>24</sup> The three earliest of the papyrological occurrences, dated to the first and third centuries CE, are all of a private nature. They provide some slight evidence for the currency and use of the word in lower register writings of the centuries following the composition of OG Kingdoms. The word is better attested in inscriptions with 42 examples across the epigraphic corpus. Of these, seven date to the third century BCE and 11 to the second century BCE.<sup>25</sup> However, the register of inscriptions tends to be somewhat elevated, meaning that their relationship to the vernacular is problematic. Given that the word is so poorly attested in the papyri and the nature of the epigraphic material, the LXX becomes

---

τὴν Ἐχέτλαν ...' (for the Carthaginians and the Syracusans retreated from the open field, and the Romans attacked Syracuse on foot, as he says, and Echeta ...)

<sup>21</sup> LXX 1 Macc 5.30 – 'ἰδοὺ λαὸς πολὺς, οὗ οὐκ ἦν ἀριθμὸς, αἶροντες κλίμακας καὶ μηχανὰς καταλαβέσθαι τὸ ὄχρωμα καὶ ἐπολέμουν αὐτούς.' (look, a large gathering of people, which was countless, carrying ladders and siege engines to capture the fortress, and they were fighting them.)

<sup>22</sup> Plb. 1.6.4, 6.6, 62.8, 64.6, 74.7; 2.13.5, 36.7; 3.4.10, 11.2, 41.3, 56.5, 77.4, 85.4; 4.3.4, 17.1, 29.7, 53.5, 59.5; 5.1.5, 11.5, 77.1, 104.1; 9.36.12, 38.5; 11.19.3, 24a.3; 12.26.2; 16.27.2, 34.3, 34.7; 18.3.2, 3.10, 4.7, 5.2, 14.8, 37.2, 47.1; 21.21.11, 43.4; 22.16.4, 18.10; 25.2.12; 27.3.3, 5.8; 30.31.4; 32.13.4, 13.9, 15.14; 33.1.2, 9.8, 16.7; 36.9.6, 14.1.

<sup>23</sup> O.Did. 325.13 (c. 77–92 CE); BGU 3 884.10 (c. 76–84 CE). The former of these details a complaint from a Roman soldier named Julius Bithynus. The latter is a letter from one Theoktistos to an Apollonios regarding a conflict with one Chairemon. SB 1 4317.13 (c. 200 CE); BGU 4 1035.9, 11 (c. 400–450 CE); SB 14 11957.8, 17, 23 bis, 30 (c. 450–500 CE); SB 4 7436.6 (c. 575–599 CE).

<sup>24</sup> The one major exception is a letter (SB 14 11957) from the King of the Blemmyes to the King of the Noubades which contains five occurrences of πολεμῶ.

<sup>25</sup> Third century BCE occurrences - IG II<sup>2</sup> 1.1 732.14; IG IX 1 683.7; IG XII 4 1:248.14 = IKret 4 168.14 = Chaniotis Verträge 75c 14; IKret 3.iii.1.11; IKret 3.vi.11.6 = Chaniotis Verträge 12.6; IMT 1485.8; IMT 173.9. Second century BCE occurrences - Chaniotis Verträge 61. B.1. 20 (110/9 or 109/8 BCE); IGBulg V 5094.6 (c. ii/i BCE); IKret 1 v 53\*.40 = ITeosMcCabe 17. 40; IKret 1 vi 2\*.28 = ITeosMcCabe 18.28; IKret 1 viii 9\*.17 = IMagnMai 35.17; IKret 1 xvi.17.16 = Chaniotis Verträge 37.16; IKret 3 iii.3.A.1.38, 39; IKret 3 iv 9\*.138 = IMagnMai 160.110 (112/111 BCE); IKret 4 186.B.7 = Chaniotis Verträge 31.A7. Other occurrences - FD 3 3:77.1 (iv BCE); IBosp 1237.1 (193 CE); IG II<sup>2</sup> 107.41 (368/7 BCE); IG II<sup>2</sup> 111.28 (363/2 BCE); IG II<sup>2</sup> 127.40 (356/5 BCE); IG II<sup>2</sup> 207. frg. b-d.19 = IG II<sup>3</sup> 1. 295. frg. b-d. 36 (349/8 BCE); IG II<sup>2</sup> 236.frg. a. col. I.19 (338/7 BCE); IG IV 556.12 (375 BCE); IG VII 2418.23 (355–346 BCE); IG XIV 930.8 (Undated); IGLSyria 21.2 153.101.1.4 (560–565 CE); IGLSyria 21. 152.2 = ISyriaPrinceton 1. 3.284.2 (Undated); IKnidos 31.Kn. IV/B.9 (100 BCE c.); OGI 199.60.375.2, 3, 61.375.1, 62.377.9 (522–525 CE); OGI 201.2, 16 = Prose sur pierre 67.2, 16 = Temple de Kalabchah 204.2, 16 (v CE); SEG 26:1813.22 = OGI 200.Add(2).22. (iv/v CE); SEG 32:1601.8 = OGI 200.Add(1).8 = OGI.200.10 (iv/v CE); SEG 35:1475.1a+1b.3.3 = IK Estremo oriente 53.frg.3.12 (591 CE); SEG 47:1291.27 (c. iv CE); SIG 31. 1.3 (479 BCE).

our central piece of evidence for the use of this word in lower register writings in the early Koine period.

## 2.2 Semantics of πολεμῶ

Regarding its semantics, the word πολεμῶ is stable throughout its history.<sup>26</sup> The various lexica provide a series of glosses and definitions that are largely consistent, though they do seem to be partly etymologising in nature due to the ongoing influence of earlier lexica.<sup>27</sup> Muraoka's lexicon provides a single sense definition for πολεμῶ; 'to make war'.<sup>28</sup> In the following sections, Muraoka provides three subdivisions; a. is devoted to absolute uses, b. outlines various syntagmatic relationships of the verb, and c. is devoted to the passive, 'to have war made upon one'. This is correct for the most part, however, there are occurrences of πολεμῶ in Ancient Greek and in the LXX where the word is used in reference to *specific instances* of combat rather than an abstract or all-encompassing idea of warfare.<sup>29</sup> This is touched upon by LSJ; section I.1 offers the gloss of 'to be at war or make war' with the note of 'τινι with one'. However, section I.2 offers the gloss of 'fight, do battle'. In support of this observation, LSJ references Plato's *Protagoras*:

τίνες δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἵππων πολεμεῖν θαρραλέοι εἰσιν; πότερον οἱ ἵππικοι ἢ οἱ ἄφιπποι;<sup>30</sup>

(Who is brave at fighting from horses? Those skilled on horseback, or those who aren't?)

---

<sup>26</sup> The only major development in the semantics of πολεμῶ seems to be the modern use in the sense of 'I struggle or strive against something or to achieve something.' TD s.v. 'πολεμῶ', 2.β. This sense post-dates the Koine period.

<sup>27</sup> On the ease with which old glosses and definitions, sometimes dating from the Medieval period, can make their way into modern lexica, see Lee 2003b: 3–12.

<sup>28</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. 'πολεμέω', a.

<sup>29</sup> In Muraoka's words, his subdivisions are 'considered useful to identify distinct sets of references, diverse syntagmatic features, but sometimes a sense which can somehow be subsumed under a major subdivision.' Muraoka *Lex.* xiv. From this, it is possible that Muraoka is aware that πολεμῶ may be used in this more specific way, but it is not made clear from his entry. In his review of Muraoka's *Lexicon of the Twelve Prophets*, Lee notes 'That Muraoka has tackled this task in a language not his first is highly commendable; the reader cannot fail to be impressed by the results. There are times when one might quibble over details of English expression, but this is not a serious problem: the intended meaning is always sufficiently clear.' Lee 2004: 129.

<sup>30</sup> Pl. *Prt.* 350 a.

The fact that Plato refers to fighting from horseback demonstrates that he is referring to a specific manner of fighting or a skill, rather than a generalised sense of warfare. LSJ also cites Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*:<sup>31</sup>

ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὔτε τρέφειν οὐδείς ἐθέλει καλὸς κάγαθός κάμηλον ὥστ' ἐποχεῖσθαι  
οὔτε μελετᾶν ὡς πολεμήσων ἀπὸ τούτων.

(But no well born man is willing to keep a camel to ride or practice on it in order  
to fight from them.)

While this use of πολεμῶ is not particularly well-attested, this more specific application, which should not be interpreted as a separate sense, has some bearing on the relationship of the Greek of OG Kingdoms to the wider history of the language.<sup>32</sup> A definition encompassing both the idea of 'to wage war' and 'to fight' would represent an advance on the current lexical definition πολεμῶ. This would also provide for a more appropriate understanding of the true meaning of the word which currently occupies a space across 'wage war' and 'fight'. A clearer definition may be 'to engage in armed conflict (with)' used in reference to multiple combatants.

### 2.3 Πολεμῶ and Translation Technique in OG Kingdoms

Due to the potential introduction of semantic Hebraisms, it is necessary to consider the possible linguistic effects of translation-technique on πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms. In respect to πολεμῶ, all but two of its twenty-nine occurrences render the Hebrew root נִלַּח Nīḥ<sup>al</sup>. The two exceptions are found in 1 Kingdoms 29:11 and 3 Kingdoms 12:24x. The Greek text of the former runs:

<sup>31</sup> X. *Cyr.* 7.1.49. A good contrast to this more specific use may be seen in the opening lines of Thucydides' history - 'Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων, ὡς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς καθισταμένου καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων ...' (Thucydides, an Athenian, documented the war of the Peloponnesians and the Athenians, how they warred against each other, beginning immediately when it started and expecting that it was going to be great and more deserving of telling than those that preceded...) Th. I.1. Thucydides has in mind a large-scale conflict, fought over years between a range of peoples and encompassing numerous battles, by both land and sea.

<sup>32</sup> The glosses of Mauersberger's *Polybios-Lexikon* do not make it clear if he recognises this more specific use in Polybius. They run 'krieg führen, kämpfen, auch K. beginnen, in den K. Ziehen, sich im Kriegszustand befinden'. Mauersberger *Lex.* s.v. 'πολεμέω'.

καὶ ὄρθρισεν Δαυιδ αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ ἀπελθεῖν καὶ φυλάσσειν τὴν γῆν  
τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, καὶ οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι ἀνέβησαν πολεμεῖν ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ.

(And Daud rose, he and his men, to depart and to guard the land of the  
allophyles, and the allophyles went up to fight against Israel.)

The MT text at 1 Sam 29:11 differs from the LXX version and possesses no word prompting πολεμεῖν.<sup>33</sup> The second variation, found at 3 Kingdoms 12:24x, has no MT equivalent. These divergences are best explained by the common differences between the Hebrew *Vorlage* and the MT.<sup>34</sup> Nonetheless, it is clear that the translator's practice was stereotypical in regard to נִלָּח Nip̄'al which was almost universally translated by πολεμῶ. This is unsurprising; as has been noted, the translator at times inclines to stereotyping.<sup>35</sup> This does not, however, necessitate the presence of semantic extension as the Hebrew root נִלָּח Nip̄'al happens to largely coincide with πολεμῶ. HALOT notes that it occurs occasionally in the Qal in the Psalms with the sense of 'to fight'.<sup>36</sup> However, it predominately occurs in the Nip̄'al with the sense of 'to come to blows, fight'.<sup>37</sup> BDB gives a range of senses for נִלָּח Nip̄'al, including 'engage in battle' and 'sometimes wage war'.<sup>38</sup> BDB also notes that the word may be used to indicate single combat, which has some bearing on the use of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms.

## 2.4 The Semantics of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms

As a starting point for discussing the semantics of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms, it is instructive to observe Taylor's translational practice in NETS. His glosses provide insight into his understanding of the word's meaning. Taylor uses only two English equivalents: 'to fight' 28 times and 'to war' only once. The single variation is found at 1 Kingdoms 28:15:

καὶ εἶπεν Σαουλ Θλίβομαι σφόδρα, καὶ οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι πολεμοῦσιν ἐν ἐμοί...

<sup>33</sup> 1 Sam 29:11- וישכם דוד הוא ואנשיו ללכת בבקר לשוב אל־ארץ פלשתים ופלשתים עלו יזרעאל (So David set out with his men early in the morning, to return to the land of the Philistines. But the Philistines went up to Jezreel. NRSV)

<sup>34</sup> None of the Qumran scrolls are relevant to these two instances of variation.

<sup>35</sup> Wirth 2016: 219; Taylor 2007a: 245.

<sup>36</sup> HALOT s.v. 'לָחַם', 2.; cf. BDB s.v. 'לָחַם Qal'.

<sup>37</sup> HALOT s.v. 'לָחַם', 1.

<sup>38</sup> BDB s.v. 'לָחַם Niph.'

And Saoul said, “I am greatly distressed, and the allophyles are warring against me.... (NETS)<sup>39</sup>

There is no evident reason as to why Taylor uses ‘to war’ here over his predominate gloss of ‘to fight’. Perhaps it owes to the fact that Saoul is speaking in a generalised and abstract manner about his problems.

Analysis of the 29 occurrences of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms reveals three contexts in which the word is used; ‘to fight a war’, ‘to fight a battle’ and ‘to fight in single combat’. Not all the occurrences of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms fall neatly into one of these contexts, yet all fall under the single sense definition of ‘to engage in armed conflict (with)’. Of the contextual uses of πολεμῶ, the last, ‘to fight in single combat’, is the only application of the word in OG Kingdoms that is not natural Greek. Nevertheless, close study of the sections that use the word in this way reveals the subsequent emergence of natural Greek, as shall be demonstrated below.

#### πολεμῶ, ‘to wage war’

Most occurrences of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms align with the generalised use of the word.<sup>40</sup> Contextually, the word is used to refer to wider acts of large-scale military conflict between two peoples, usually Israel against various other tribes or nations. 1 Kingdoms 14:47 provides a good example:

Καὶ Σαουλ κατακληροῦται ἔργον ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ. καὶ ἐπολέμει κύκλῳ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸν Μωαβ καὶ εἰς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ εἰς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἐδωμ καὶ εἰς τὸν Βαιθεωρ καὶ εἰς βασιλέα Σουβα καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους...

(And Saoul received by lot duty over Israel. And he waged war on all of his enemies in a circle, against Moab and against the sons of Ammon and against the sons of Edom and against Baitheor and against the king of Souba and against the allophyles...)

<sup>39</sup> Taylor 2007: 269.

<sup>40</sup> Examples of this contextual use may be seen at 1Kgds 8:20, 12:9, 14:47, 15:18, 28:15, 29:8; 3Kgds 16:28c, 12:21, 12:24x, 21:1. Note also, that Taylor tends to use the gloss of ‘to fight’ which is often a good translational equivalent for the more generalised sense.



This generalised reference is well attested in all periods of the language. It remains the primary use of the word in the Koine period. Several epigraphic examples taken from around the time of the composition of OG Kingdoms attest the currency of this use. In an honorary degree dated to 218 BCE and found on Kos, the Gortynians honour one Hermias the physician. This decree includes the words ‘...συμμάχων τε ἀμῖν πολλῶν παραγεγονότων καθ’ ὃν καιρὸν ἐπολεμίομεν, καὶ τούτων τὰν αὐτὰν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐποιήσατο...’ (...and when there were many allies with us during the time that we were at war, he provided them with the same care...).<sup>41</sup> That this decree precedes ἐπολεμίομεν with the prepositional phrase καθ’ ὃν καιρὸν implies a lengthy period of warfare.<sup>42</sup> This is not a battle, but protracted war. Numerous similar examples may be sourced from literature. The following occurs in Polybius:<sup>43</sup>

πρὸς οὓς ποιησάμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι σπονδὰς καὶ διαλύσεις εὐδοκουμένας Γαλάταις καὶ γενόμενοι πάλιν ἀνελπίστως τῆς πατρίδος ἐγκρατεῖς καὶ λαβόντες οἷον ἀρχὴν τῆς συναυξήσεως ἐπολέμουν ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς χρόνοις πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας.

(With whom the Romans made a treaty and settlements agreeable to the Gauls, and being unexpectedly in command of their homeland and having a base for expansion they made war in the following periods of time against their neighbours.)

<sup>41</sup> IG XII 4 1:248.14 = IKret 4 168.14 = Chaniotis Verträge 75c 14. A longer extract from the inscription runs as follows: ἐπειδὴ Ἑρμίας Ἑμμενίδα χει[ρο]-/τονθὲνς ὑφ’ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀποστευθὲνς παρ’ ἀμῆ ια-/τρὸς ἀξίως πεπόηται τὰν παρ’ ἀμῖν ἐπιδαμίαν/ὑμῶν τε τῶν ἀποστειλάντων καὶ αὐτοσαντῶ, ἐ- 5/τι δὲ καὶ ἀμίων τῶν δόντων ὑμῖν τὰν ἐπιτροπὰν/τᾶς αἰρέσιος τῷ ἱατρῷ, ἀνέγκλητος ἰὼν ἐμ πᾶσι τ-/ὰν ἐπιδαμίαν πεποιήται ἔτια πέντε ἐπιμελόμε-/ενός τε τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατοικιό-/ντων Γόρτυνι φιλοτιμίως τε καὶ ἐντενίως κατὰ τὰ- 10/ν τέχνην καὶ τὰν ἄλλαν ἐπιμέλειαν πολλὸνς ἔ-/σωσε ἐς μεγάλων κινδύνων οὐδὲν ἐλλείπω-/ν προθυμίας, συμμάχων τε ἀμῖν πολλῶν παραγε-/γονότων καθ’ ὃν καιρὸν ἐπολεμίομεν, καὶ τούτων/τὰν αὐτὰν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐποιήσατο καὶ ἔσωσε ἐς 15/μεγάλων κινδύνων βωλόμενος εὐχαριστῆν τᾶ-/ι ἀμῇ πόλει ... (Since Hermias, a.k.a Emenida, who was chosen by you and sent to us as a physician, made his stay with us in a way worthy of you who sent him, of himself and also of us who gave you the duty of choosing the doctor, being blameless in every way, he stayed for five years caring for the citizens and other inhabitants of Gortyn in an honourable and committed manner in line with his skill and other treatment he saved many in great danger, and worked diligently, and when there were many allies with us during the time that we were at war, he provided them with the same care and saved them in great dangers hoping to do good to our city ...)

<sup>42</sup> The form ἐπολεμίομεν is a first person plural imperfect indicative active. In the Cretan dialect, a subset of Doric, ‘short /e/ closed to /i/ before /a/ or /o(:)/.’ Bile 2013. The inscription was found on Kos, a Doric speaking island, but presumably came from Gortyn on Crete or was inscribed by a Gortynian craftsman.

<sup>43</sup> Plb. 1.6.3.

The use of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms in a generalised sense referring to broad acts of warfare accords well with wider contemporary usage evidenced by contemporary epigraphy and literature.

### πολεμῶ, ‘to fight a battle’

At 2 Kingdoms 10:17, Syria, the Arameans of the Hebrew tradition, launches an invasion against Daid:

καὶ ἀνηγγέλη τῷ Δαυιδ, καὶ συνήγαγεν τὸν πάντα Ἰσραηλ καὶ διέβη τὸν Ἰορδάνην καὶ παρεγένοντο εἰς Αἰλαμ· καὶ παρετάξατο Συρία ἀπέναντι Δαυιδ καὶ ἐπολέμησαν μετ’ αὐτοῦ.

(And it was announced to Daid, and he gathered together the whole of Israel and he crossed the Jordan and he arrived at Hailam; and Syria arrayed itself against David and they fought with him.)

As can be seen from the context of this passage, this use of πολεμῶ refers to a battle, not an extended period of generalised warfare. Syria has drawn itself up (παρετάξατο) against (ἀπέναντι) Daid in a local sense.<sup>44</sup> The subsequent passage lists the number of chariots destroyed and horsemen killed during the battle along with the smiting of Sobek, the Syrian commander.<sup>45</sup> This contextual use of πολεμῶ appears to occur in several other locations in OG Kingdoms.<sup>46</sup> As is demonstrated above from the examples taken from Plato and Xenophon, this contextual application of the word occurs in Classical Greek.<sup>47</sup> It is not, however, well attested in the Koine period. It is not found in the papyri or in the inscriptions. In this regard it is significant to note the word μάχομαι. This word is unattested in OG Kingdoms but is commonly used to mean ‘fight’ in reference to military battles in

<sup>44</sup> παρατάσσω is a Greek technical military term used since the Classical period to denote the idea of ‘array in battle order’. LSJ s.v. ‘παρατάσσω’, A.1. Muraoka gives παρατάσσω several senses, the most relevant of which are ‘to draw up in battle order’ and in the middle ‘to do battle’. Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘παρατάσσω’, 1–2. The collocation of παρατάσσω with πολεμῶ in 2Kgs 10:17 makes it clear that the sense of ‘to draw up in battle order’ is intended. The Hebrew root קָרַע, which often means ‘to draw up a battle formation’ (HALOT s.v. ‘קָרַע qal’), supports this interpretation.

<sup>45</sup> 2Kgs 10:18 - καὶ ἔφυγεν Συρία ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἰσραηλ, καὶ ἀνεῖλεν Δαυιδ ἐκ τῆς Συρίας ἑπτακόσια ἄρματα καὶ τεσσαράκοντα χιλιάδας ἰππέων· καὶ τὸν Σωβακ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ ἐπάταξεν, καὶ ἀπέθανεν ἐκεῖ. (And Syria fled from before Israel, and Daid destroyed from Syria seven hundred chariots and forty thousand horsemen; and he slaughtered Sobek the leader of their force and he died there.)

<sup>46</sup> 1Kgs 4:10, 19:8, 28:1, 31:1; 2Kgs 2:28; 3Kgs 21:23, 21:25.

<sup>47</sup> Pl. *Prt.* 350 a; X. *Cyr.* 7.1.49.

non-Biblical Greek of the Koine period.<sup>48</sup> It occurs 57 times in Polybius and is often used in direct reference to battles:

οἱ δ' ἐν τοῖς βαρέσιν ὅπλοις παρ' ἀμφοῖν τὰς πρώτας ἔχοντες καὶ μέσας τῆς ὅλης παρεμβολῆς τάξεις ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἐμάχοντο συστάδην, ἐφάμιλλον ποιοῦμενοι τὸν κίνδυνον.<sup>49</sup>

(On both sides those in heavy armour who occupied the first lines and the middle ranks of the whole battle line were fighting for a long time at close quarters, with both facing the same danger.)

Nevertheless, Polybius does offer a single use of *πολεμῶ* in reference to a more specific act of combat:

‘καὶ γὰρ ἐξεχώρησαν οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι καὶ Συρακόσιοι τῶν ὑπαίθρων, καὶ τὰς Συρακούσας ἐπολέμουν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι κατὰ πόδας, ὥς δ' οὗτός φησι, καὶ τὴν Ἐχέτλαν ...’

(for the Carthaginians and the Syracusans retreated from the open field, and the Romans attacked Syracuse on foot, as he says, and Echetla ...)

The prepositional phrase *κατὰ πόδας* implies that this refers to an assault, not a protracted war. While the word *μάχομαι* may seem a better fit for the context of 2 Kingdoms 10:17 and similar OG Kingdoms occurrences, the translator does not vary his standard equation of *πολεμῶ* equals *מלח*. This is not, however, mechanical stereotyping. The example from Polybius demonstrates that the word was still used in this way in the early Koine period. It is consistent with a general tendency towards stereotyping in OG Kingdoms; however, this does not constitute a case of significant semantic extension. Moreover, the fact that the translator elsewhere varies his translation of *מלח*, as will be seen in the following section, indicates that he was willing to adapt his lexical choices according to context and that was

<sup>48</sup> The word *μάχομαι* appears twice in the Kaige sections, at 2Kgds 14:6 and 4Kgds 3:23. The former occurrence appears to render a form of *נצח* *Nip'al* while the latter translates *חרב* *Nip'al*. Muraoka gives *μάχομαι* two main sense ‘to get involved in a strife and a dispute’ and ‘to fight physically’. Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘μάχομαι’, 1–2; LSJ gives the general gloss of ‘fight’ and notes ‘in *Hom.* mostly of armies and persons fighting as parts of armies, but sts. of single combat’. LSJ s.v. ‘μάχομαι’, A.

<sup>49</sup> Plb. 3.76.8.

comfortable that the use of πολεμῶ in reference to military battles did not constitute intolerably unnatural Greek.

### πολεμῶ, ‘fight, of single combat’

The final translational choice for πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms demonstrates a striking case of the emergence of natural Greek. At 1 Kingdoms 17:9 Goliath steps before the Israelite army, calls for a challenger and states:

καὶ ἐὰν δυνήθῃ πρὸς ἐμέ πολεμῆσαι καὶ ἐὰν πατάξῃ με, καὶ ἐσόμεθα ὑμῖν εἰς δούλους, ἐὰν δὲ ἐγὼ δυνήθω καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν, ἔσεσθε ἡμῖν εἰς δούλους καὶ δουλεύσετε ἡμῖν.

(And should he be able to fight (war) with me and should he strike me, then we will be slaves to you, but should I be able and I strike him, you will be to us for slaves and you will be subject to us.)

Similar uses of πολεμῶ are found at 1 Kingdoms 17:32 and 17:33, each referring again to the single combat between David and Goliath.<sup>50</sup> In all three of these instances, the corresponding MT passages have the Hebrew root פָּלַח.<sup>51</sup> As BDB suggests, this root is natural in Hebrew in such contexts.<sup>52</sup> Single combat was a common phenomenon in the early and middle Roman Republic.<sup>53</sup> Writers of the Greek historiographical tradition used a variety of verbs to describe this activity, though the most common is certainly μονομαχῶ,

<sup>50</sup> 1Kgs 17:32 - ὁ δοῦλός σου πορεύσεται καὶ πολεμήσει μετὰ τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου τούτου. (Your slave will go and he will fight with this allophyle.). 1Kgs 17:33 - καὶ εἶπεν Σαουλ πρὸς Δαυὶδ Οὐ μὴ δυνήσῃ πορευθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀλλόφυλον τοῦ πολεμεῖν μετ’ αὐτοῦ. (and Saoul said to David, you will certainly not be able to go against the allophyle in order to fight with him.) Note also that Lee suggests that the ‘curious idiom’ of οὐ μὴ represents ‘something that might have been learnt in the classroom.’ Lee 2018: 55. This suggests familiarity with ‘good’ Greek on the part of the translator. Lee also notes that οὐ μὴ does not fit any one feature of Hebrew and that the translators’ use of it ‘was governed by their own perception of what was appropriate to the context in front of them.’ Lee 2018: 55. This again demonstrates natural Greek usage in accordance with contextual demands in OG Kingdoms.

<sup>51</sup> 1 Sam 17:9 - אם יוכל להלחם אתי והכני והיינו לך לעבדים ואם אני אוכל לו והכיתיו והייתם לנו לעבדים ועבדתם אתנו - (If he is able to fight with me and kill me, then we will be your servants; but if I prevail against him and kill him, then you shall be our servants and serve us.’ NSRV); 1 Sam 17:32 - ויאמר דוד אל שאול אל יפל לב אדם עליו - (David said to Saul, ‘Let no one’s heart fail because of him; your servant will go and fight with this Philistine.’ NSRV); 1 Sam 17:33 - ויאמר שאול אל דוד לא תוכל להלחם הזה הפלשתי הזה להלחם - (Saul said to David, ‘You are not able to go against this Philistine to fight with him; for you are just a boy, and he has been a warrior from his youth.’ NSRV).

<sup>52</sup> BDB s.v. ‘לחם Niph.’

<sup>53</sup> On the historical phenomenon of single combat in early and middle Rome see Oakley 1985. This article contains a useful list of examples of single combat from the historians of the early and middle Roman Republic.

glossed by LSJ as ‘fight in single combat’.<sup>54</sup> Polybius notes that Roman soldiers were so keen for fame that they often engaged in single combat, for which he uses the word μονομαχῶ.<sup>55</sup> Additionally, he uses it in the context of Hannibal asking his men if any of them were willing to fight one-on-one with Roman prisoners.<sup>56</sup> It is also common in Diodorus Siculus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus in whose works it consistently appears in scenes of one-on-one combat.<sup>57</sup> The word πολεμῶ is unattested in this context outside of OG Kingdoms. It is reasonable to conclude that the word μονομαχῶ is the standard word for representing this phenomenon and that the use of πολεμῶ in this context in OG Kingdoms is unnatural. However, as πολεμῶ has a history of being used to mean ‘physically fight’ in the sense of armed conflict, this is not an extreme semantic extension. While the lexical choice is unusual for the context, the meaning is clear. This provides some support to Wirth’s note that the translator sought to produce a text that was accessible and sufficiently comprehensible to Greek readers.<sup>58</sup>

However, a significant lexical variation demonstrates the emergence of more natural Greek semantics and the violation of the pattern of  $\alpha\pi\lambda$  equals πολεμῶ. This occurs in 1 Kingdoms 17:10 where Goliath states:

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἀλλόφυλος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὠνεΐδισα τὴν παράταξιν Ἰσραὴλ σήμερον ἐν  
τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ· δότε μοι ἄνδρα, καὶ μονομαχήσομεν ἀμφοτέρω.

(And the allophyle said, ‘look, I have reprimanded the battle line of Israel today  
on this day; give to me a man, and we will both fight in single combat.’)

---

<sup>54</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘μονομαχ-εῖον’.

<sup>55</sup> Plb. 6.54.4 - ‘πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐμονομάχησαν ἐκουσίως Ῥωμαίων ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ὅλων κρίσεως...’. (For many of the Romans willingly fought in single combats to decide the matter for all...)

<sup>56</sup> Plb. 3.62.5 - ‘καθίσας οὖν τούτους εἰς τὸ μέσον προέθηκε πανοπλίας Γαλατικὰς, οἷα εἰώθασιν οἱ βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν, ὅταν μονομαχεῖν μέλλωσιν, κατακοσμεῖσθαι.’ (He placed these [men] in the middle and set forth Gallic armor, the likes of which their kings are accustomed to be adorned with whenever they are about to engage in single combat;); Plb. 3.62.7 - ‘πάντων δ’ ἀναβοησάντων ἅμα καὶ δηλούντων ὅτι βούλονται μονομαχεῖν, κληρώσασθαι προσέταξε καὶ δύο τοὺς λαχόντας καθοπλισμένους ἐκέλευσε μάχεσθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους.’ (When they all shouted out at the same time and showed that they wanted to fight, he ordered them to draw lots and the two to whom the lots fell he ordered to equip themselves and to fight with each other.)

<sup>57</sup> D.S. 5.28.4, 5.28.5, 5.39.7, 9.12.1, 17.6.1, 17.83.6, 17.100.2, 26.14.2; D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 3.12.2, 10.37.3, 15.4.6.

<sup>58</sup> Wirth 2016: 220.

The corresponding MT passage again displays a form of  $\text{חָל}$ .<sup>59</sup> There almost complete alignment in this verse as it appears in OG Kingdoms with the MT, despite the general differences between the latter and the Greek *Vorlage*. With the exception of the Greek  $\text{ἰδοὺ}$ , every element of the Greek sentence mirrors that of the Hebrew MT. Given the great degree of similarity in the OG and MT, there is no compelling reason to assume that the *Vorlage* contained a different verbal root.<sup>60</sup> The variation is best explained in terms of natural Greek. It is context and the demands of natural Greek lexicon that prompt the use of  $\text{μονομαχῶ}$ . This remarkable variation provides further evidence for the freedom of lexical choice sometimes exercised by the translator.<sup>61</sup> It also suggests that the translator is no longer comfortable with the preceding uses of  $\text{πολεμῶ}$  in this context.<sup>62</sup>

## 2.5 Concluding remarks on the semantics of $\text{πολεμῶ}$

The use of  $\text{πολεμῶ}$  in OG Kingdoms is based on a largely stereotypical translational pattern;  $\text{חָל}$  equals  $\text{πολεμῶ}$ . Nevertheless, the translator's effective comprehension of the nuanced semantics of  $\text{πολεμῶ}$  obviates extensive semantic distortion. Most occurrences of the word in OG Kingdoms are natural. The exception to this is the three uses of the word in relation to the single combat between Daudid and Goliath. This is a lexical Hebraism. However, it is in the fourth translation of  $\text{חָל}$  that the strikingly natural occurrence of  $\text{μονομαχῶ}$  appears. On the whole, the use of  $\text{πολεμῶ}$  in OG Kingdoms accords with wider early Koine period usage, noting that the semantics of this word do not vary greatly throughout its history. Nevertheless, the syntax of  $\text{πολεμῶ}$  provides clearer evidence for linguistic developments in the history of the Greek language manifesting in the language of OG Kingdoms.

<sup>59</sup> 1 Sam 17:10 - וַיֹּאמֶר הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי אֲנִי חֹרֶפְתִּי אֶת מַעֲרֻכֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה תֵּנוּ לִי אִישׁ וְנִלְחַמָּה יַחַד (And the Philistine said, 'Today I defy the ranks of Israel! Give me a man, that we may fight together.' NSRV).

<sup>60</sup> The Qumran scrolls do not provide any insight into an alternative Hebrew textual tradition for this verse.

<sup>61</sup> Aejmelaesus notes that the translator of 1 Samuel exercises lexical variation. Aejmelaesus 2007: 146–7.

<sup>62</sup> It is interesting to note that the only other occurrence of  $\text{μονομαχῶ}$  in the LXX is found in Psalm 151:1, which also refers to the fight between Daudid and Goliath. Ps 151:1 - 'Οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυιδ καὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ· ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιάδ. Μικρὸς ἦμην ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου/ καὶ νεώτερος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρός μου/ ἐποίμαινον τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρός μου. (This Psalm is autographical. Regarding Daudid and outside the number: When he fought Goliath in single combat. I was small among my brothers and the youngest in the house of my father; I would shepherd the sheep of my father. Pietersma 2007: 619) Note that Pietersma, the NETS Psalms translator, includes the phrase 'When he fought Goliath in single combat' in a footnote. While he translates Rahlfs' edition of the Psalms, Pietersma notes that 'Further improvements to Rahlfs' edition have been made in the light of additional textual information (chiefly II–V CE; especially the famous P. Bodmer XXIV [Rahlfs 2110]) and more recent study. All these, however, have been included in the footnotes to NETS.' Pietersma 2007: 542. Seemingly, the word  $\text{μονομαχῶ}$  is therefore a later insertion in Psalm 151, perhaps under the influence of OG Kingdoms.

## 2.6 Morphology and Syntax of πολεμῶ

The following table shows the morphological breakdown of the 29 occurrences of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms:

Table 2: *Morphological Breakdown of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms*

<b>Finite</b>			
Indicative			
	Present active		3
	Imperfect active		2
	Future active		6
	Aorist active		8
Subjunctive			
	Aorist active		1
Imperative			
	Aorist active		1
<b>Non-finite</b>			
Infinitive	Present active		6
	Aorist active		2

Although this is a small pool of data, it illustrates characteristics indicative of the translation books of the LXX and of standard Koine Greek.<sup>63</sup> The prevalence of the future tense is explained, in part, by the common use of the future in the LXX to express a command, a feature noted by Conybeare and Stock.<sup>64</sup> 3 Kingdoms 12:24 illustrates this phenomenon:<sup>65</sup>

Τάδε λέγει κύριος Οὐκ ἀναβήσεσθε οὐδὲ πολεμήσετε μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν  
υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ·

(The lord says these things, ‘you will not go up and you will not fight with your  
brothers, the sons of Israel.’)

The corresponding Hebrew text uses a *yiqṭōl*/imperfect form of נָלַח *Niṣṣal* negated by אֵלֶּיךָ:<sup>66</sup>

<sup>63</sup> For a general overview of the verbal system in the Greek Pentateuch see Evans 2001. He provides tables indicating the frequencies of occurrences in the Greek Pentateuch of various verbal forms that correspond to the above table. Evans 2001: 55.

<sup>64</sup> Conybeare and Stock 1995: 72, § 74. Cf. Voitila 2016: 115.

<sup>65</sup> Additional examples may be seen at 1Kgds 15:18 and 3Kgds 12:24y.

<sup>66</sup> The use of אֵלֶּיךָ with the *yiqṭōl*/imperfect is the standard way of expressing an absolute prohibition. Van der Merwe and Naudé and Kroeze 2017: 163, § 19.3.5.1.

כה אמר יהוה לא תעלו ולא תלחמון עם אחיכם בני ישראל

1 Kings 12:24

Contextually, the future tense of the Greek verb clearly indicates a command in this passage. Comparison with the MT confirms the imperatival sense. While this may be attributed to the easy translational choice of replicating the *yiqṭōl*/imperfect with a Greek future indicative verb, Mandilaras notes that the use of the future in an imperatival sense occurs throughout the history of Greek and is particularly well-attested in the non-literary papyri.<sup>67</sup> The syntax of the Greek is intelligible independent from the Hebrew, and the use of the future in an imperatival sense reflects natural early Koine period practice.

The infinitival forms of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms predominately express purpose. At 1 Kingdoms 28:1, 29:8 and 29:11 this takes the form of a simple infinitive. At 1 Kingdoms 17:33, 3 Kingdoms 12:21 and 12:24x it takes the form of a genitive articular infinitive. Most of these Greek infinitives render the Hebrew root להם *Niṣ'al* in the infinitive construct prefixed with ל.<sup>68</sup> However, two of the Greek infinitives, those at 1 Kingdoms 29:11 and 3 Kingdoms 12:24x, have no correspondent in the MT while 1 Kingdoms 29:8 renders a *wəqāṭal*/consecutive perfect form of להם *Niṣ'al*.<sup>69</sup> Aside from translation-technical concerns, this is natural Greek for the period. The expansion of the genitive articular infinitive for the expression of purpose is a well-known feature of the Koine.<sup>70</sup> Likewise,

<sup>67</sup> Mandilaras 1973: 188–190, § 396. cf. Voitila 2016: 115. Melazzo 2013: ‘Imperative’. Tjen (2010: 189–193) offers a particularly good discussion concerning the use of the Greek future indicative in an imperatival sense with a particular focus on Koine period documentary evidence. He notes, ‘at the present stage of our study it is reasonable to conclude that the occurrences of the future in official documents, such as royal decrees and legal pronouncements, suggest its natural use in legal-instructional contexts, hence its corresponding use in the LXX.’ Tjen 2010: 193.

<sup>68</sup> 1 Sam 28:1 = 1Kgds 28:1; 1 Sam 17:33 = 1Kgds 17:33; 1 Kings 12:21 = 3Kgds 12:21.

<sup>69</sup> In general, expressions of purpose with ἵνα are rare in OG Kingdoms. It is found only at 2Kgds 2:22 and 3Kgds 13:31 and 15:4. None of these contain a form of πολεμῶ. The alternative of ὅπως with the subjunctive is more frequent in OG Kingdoms. It is found at 1Kgds 6:5, 9:6, 13:9, 15:15; 2Kgds 10:3; 3Kgds 6:6, 8:40, 8:43, 8:60, 11:36 and 12:15. The correspondence between the MT and these passages is problematic, yet there appears to be little in the Hebrew that prompts the use of a ἵνα or ὅπως clause. Lee notes that ὅπως generally becomes less popular during the Koine period, at which time ἵνα becomes more common. Lee 2018: 73. The frequency of ὅπως over ἵνα may be advanced as further evidence of an early date for OG Kingdoms, though the issue of ‘tone’ must be borne in mind. Rather than a case of simple replacement, ὅπως is seen as a more formal alternative to ἵνα in the later Koine period. Lee 2018: 73.

<sup>70</sup> Mayser *Grammatik* ii.1, 321–323. Mandilaras 1973: 334, § 817. Voitila 2016: 112. Horrocks 2010: 94 - ‘[the chief replacement for complicated Classical participle syntax was] the substantivized infinitive functioning as a gerund (lit. ‘the to-do X’ = ‘doing X’), typically governed by a preposition to impart a determinate sense to the expression, but also used alone in the genitive to express purpose (a usage perhaps derived from an adnominal origin).’ Despite their general scepticism regarding the naturalness of the Greek



the simple infinitive expressing purpose is attested in the Ptolemaic papyri, in which it is often collocated with verbs of motion including various compounds of βαίνω, γίνομαι in the sense of ‘arrive’, ἀπέρχομαι, ἤκω and πορεύομαι.<sup>71</sup> In this respect, OG Kingdoms again corresponds to contemporary natural early Koine Greek usage. Five of the six infinitival forms of πολεμῶ expressing purpose, both the simple infinitive and the genitive articular infinitive, are found in conjunction with verbs of motion.<sup>72</sup>

On one occasion in OG Kingdoms, an infinitival form of πολεμῶ serves a prolativ function to the verb προστίθημι. This construction results from the main verb functioning in an adverbial role with the ‘main verbal idea transferred to the infin.’<sup>73</sup> This is found at 2 Kingdoms 2:28:

καὶ ἐσάλπισεν Ἰωαβ τῇ σάλπιγγι, καὶ ἀπέστησαν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ οὐ κατεδίωξαν  
ὀπίσω τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ οὐ προσέθεντο ἔτι τοῦ πολεμεῖν.

(And Ioab trumpeted with the trumpet, and the whole people withdrew and did  
not pursue after Israel and they did not continue any longer to wage war.)

Lee notes that scholars have debated extensively whether this constitutes normal Greek. He concludes, ‘It is not. It is a Hebraism, unparalleled in Greek.’<sup>74</sup> This is true in the case of OG Kingdoms. It is, however, an exception. The majority of the uses of πολεμῶ in the infinitive reflect normal Koine syntax.

---

of the LXX, Conybeare and Stock concede that the ‘genitive infinitive of purpose’ is ‘not entirely unknown to classical authors (e.g. Plat. Gorg. 457 E τοῦ καταφανὲς γενέσθαι) and is especially favoured by Thucydides. There is nothing in the Hebrew to suggest it.’ Conybeare and Stock 1995 (reprinted from 1905): 58–59, § 59. On Conybeare and Stock’s sceptical view of the Greek of the LXX see §38 titled ‘The Construction of the LXX not Greek’, cf. 22.

<sup>71</sup> Mandilaras 1973: 320, § 770. Mayser *Grammatik* ii.1. 297. MHT *Grammar* III, 134–135.

<sup>72</sup> 1Kgds 17:33 (πορευθῆναι), 1Kgds 28:1 (ἐξελεῖν), 1Kgds 29:8 (ἔλθω), 1Kgds 29:11 (ἀνέβησαν), 3Kgds 12:24x (ἀνέβη). The one exception is 3Kgds 12:21. However, this is a borderline case. The verse begins with εἰσῆλθεν. However, there is another finite verb, ἐξεκκλησίασεν, between the verb of motion and the genitive articular infinitive expressing purpose.

<sup>73</sup> MHT *Grammar* III, 226–227.

<sup>74</sup> Lee 2018: 213. Conybeare and Stock (1995 [reprinted from 1905]: 97 § 113) refer to the construction of προστίθημι with an infinitive as ‘another very common Hebraism’. Thackery (1909: 52) considers it ‘next to ἐγένετο probably the most frequent Hebraism in the LXX.’ MHT *Grammar* III, 227, refers to it as the ‘Hebraistic προστιθέναι c. infin.’ Muraoka (*Syn.* 356 § 30, bg) notes ‘there are a number of verbs which, in certain contexts, are semantically incomplete on their own and in need of complementation, which is provided by means of an infinitive. Examples are οὐ προσέθετο τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ‘it did not return again’ Ge 8.12.’ Curiously, the note that this is ‘most probably a Hebraism’ is relegated to a footnote. Muraoka *Syn.* 356, § 30, bg, n. 5.

## 2.7 Complements of πολεμῶ

Muraoka notes that πολεμῶ enters into a range of syntactic relationships in the LXX. Aside from absolute uses, he observes that the verb takes either a bare accusative or dative.<sup>75</sup> Muraoka also identifies several prepositional phrases collocated with the verb that mark the person or thing fought or warred against, including ἐπί τινι (of the person), πρὸς τινα, ἐπὶ τινα and μετὰ τινος.<sup>76</sup> Finally, he notes the use of ἐν τινι of the person as a neologism. The majority of these complements are represented in OG Kingdoms. However, there is an additional prepositional phrase found with πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms not noted by Muraoka; εἰς with the accusative. The following table lists the frequency of complements found with πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms:

Table 3: *Complements of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms*

Bare accusative	11
ἐν + dative	4
ἐπὶ + accusative	3
εἰς + accusative	6
μετὰ + genitive	5
πρὸς + accusative	5
Intransitive	1

The absence of the bare dative is striking.<sup>77</sup> This was overwhelmingly the most common case found with πολεμῶ in the Classical and Koine periods.<sup>78</sup> In terms of contemporary literary evidence, Polybius uses the dative 50 times and the accusative only once.<sup>79</sup> The use of the dative with πολεμῶ is likewise well-attested in inscriptions of the third and second centuries BCE.<sup>80</sup> On the other hand, the use of a bare accusative with πολεμῶ is unattested

<sup>75</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘πολεμέω’. b., ‘+ τινα ... + dat. pers.’

<sup>76</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘πολεμέω’. b.

<sup>77</sup> Muraoka terms the dative with verbs of conflict the ‘Dative of confrontation, opposition, obedience or conformity.’ Muraoka *Syn.* 169, § 22 wi.

<sup>78</sup> LSJ suggests that this is the primary case found with the word. The entry states ‘τινι with one’ but only notes the use of the accusative as ‘later’. LSJ s.v. ‘πολεμέω’. Van Emde Boas et al (2018: § 30.39) note that πολεμῶ takes a dative as its ‘first complement’.

<sup>79</sup> Accusative - Plb 1.15.10. Dative - Plb 1.6.4, 1.6.6, 1.62.8, 1.64.6, 1.74.7, 2.13.5, 2.36.7, 3.4.10, 3.11.2, 3.56.5, 3.77.4, 3.85.4, 4.3.4, 4.17.1, 4.29.7, 4.53.5, 4.59.5, 5.1.5, 5.11.5, 5.77.1, 5.104.1, 9.36.12, 9.38.5, 11.19.3, 11.24a.3, 12.26.2, 16.27.2, 16.34.3, 16.34.7, 18.3.10, 18.4.7, 18.5.2, 18.14.8, 18.37.2, 18.47.1, 21.21.11, 21.43.4, 22.16.4, 22.18.10, 25.2.12, 27.3.3, 27.5.8, 30.31.4, 32.13.4, 32.13.9, 32.15.14, 33.1.2, 33.9.8, 33.16.7, 36.9.6, 36.14.1.

<sup>80</sup> IKret 3 iv 9\*.138 = McGabe, Magnesia 160.110 (112/111 BCE); IKret 1 viii 9\*.17 = McGabe, Magnesia 35.17. (196 BCE); IKret 4 186.B.7, 11 = Chaniotis Verträge 31.A7, 11 (200–150 BCE) bis; IMT Skam/NebTaeler 173.9 (281–260 BCE). There are no papyrological occurrences of the dative with πολεμῶ.

in epigraphy,<sup>81</sup> and the papyrological evidence offers little support for its common use.<sup>82</sup> Given the different coding of the languages, the Hebrew source text has no effect on the translator's choice to use an accusative in place of the dative.<sup>83</sup> Significantly, standard Greek case syntax is preserved in relation to other verbs. Notably verbs of hearing and ruling sometimes take the genitive.<sup>84</sup> The absence of the dative as object of *πολεμῶ* in OG Kingdoms is therefore problematic. LSJ notes the use of a bare accusative with *πολεμῶ* as a feature of 'later' Greek.<sup>85</sup> In support of this, it references Dinarchus, Diodorus Siculus, Polybius and 1 Maccabees 5:30.<sup>86</sup> Additional support for the use of a bare accusative object with *πολεμῶ* may be drawn from the Pentateuch.<sup>87</sup> It is also significant that no Pentateuchal occurrence of *πολεμῶ* takes a dative. Owing to the poor attestation of *πολεμῶ* in the papyri, the LXX represents the best evidence we have regarding the use of this word in lower register Greek. Collectively, the literary evidence offered by LSJ, and the limited papyrological and Pentateuch evidence is sufficient to support an argument that OG Kingdoms' use of an accusative object with *πολεμῶ* represents the standard use of the word

---

<sup>81</sup> Notably, three Classical inscriptions use *πόλεμος* as a cognate accusative for *πολεμῶ* - IG II<sup>2</sup> 207. frg. b-d.19 = IG II<sup>3</sup> 1 295. frg. b-d. 36 (349/8 BCE); IG VII 2418.23 (355–346 BCE); SIG 31.coil 1.3 (479 BCE). Incidentally, these inscriptions corroborate the 'naturalness' of the use of *πόλεμος* as a cognate accusative in OG Kingdoms, which occurs at 1Kgds 8:20 and 25:28. Further contemporary support for the use of *πόλεμος* as a cognate accusative with *πολεμῶ* may be found at Plb. 3.30.4, 11.4.7, 22.18.10, 30.31.4, 36.9.9.

<sup>82</sup> This is partly due to the fact that the word is simply not common in the papyri. There is a single attestation in a papyrus dating to the second century CE. SB 1 4317.12 - 'πολεμεῖ με διότι εἶπόν σοι εἰς ὄψιν· οὐτὲν θέλω παρὰ σοι ἐπὶ ὅσον ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίαν εἰμί ...' (It wars (pains?) me because I said to your face; I want nothing from you for as long as I am in Alexandria ...). This is a private letter from one Ptolemaius to his wife Diodora concerning a fight they had.

<sup>83</sup> Regarding translation-technique, the use of the bare accusative as object of *πολεμῶ* is not predictable from the MT. The eleven cases of the bare accusative in OG Kingdoms may be found at 1Kgds 4:9, 4:10, 8:20, 14:47, 15:18, 19:8, 25:28, 29:8; 2Kgds 8:10; 3Kgds 16:28c and 21:23. The corresponding passages in the MT demonstrate extensive variation. 1 Sam 4:9 and 4:10 have nothing corresponding to the Greek accusative. 1 Sam 8:20 marks its object with the definite direct object marker. 1 Sam 14:47, 15:18, 19:8, 29:8, and 2 Sam 8:10 mark their object with the preposition *καί*, which is interestingly not rendered by *ἐν* τι. The preposition *καί* marks the object in 1 Kings 20:23 (= 3Kgds 21:23). 1 Kings 25:28 has an indefinite object and, finally, 1 Kings 22:46 (= 3Kgds 16:28c) uses a Hebrew relative particle which is rendered with a Greek accusative relative pronoun, as is demanded by natural Greek syntax.

<sup>84</sup> e.g. 1Kgds 8:19 - καὶ οὐκ ἠβούλετο ὁ λαὸς ἀκοῦσαι τοῦ Σαμουηλ ... (And the people was not willing to hear Samouel ...). 1Kgds 4:6 - καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι τῆς κραυγῆς ... (and the allophyles heard the shout ...) 1Kgds 11:12 - καὶ εἶπεν ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Σαμουηλ Τίς ὁ εἶπας ὅτι Σαουλ οὐ βασιλεύσει ἡμῶν; (And the people said to Samouel, "Who said that 'will Saoul not rule us?'" )

<sup>85</sup> LSJ s.v. 'πολεμέω', II.1 - 'later c. acc., *make war upon*'.

<sup>86</sup> Din. 1.36. (the Stephanus manuscript has a dative object, the codd. has an accusative.); D.S. 4.61, 13.84, 14.37; Plb. 1.15.10.

<sup>87</sup> Ex 14:25 - ὁ γὰρ κύριος πολεμεῖ περὶ αὐτῶν τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους. (for the Lord is fighting the Egyptians on their behalf.); Num 21:26 - ἔστιν γὰρ Ἐσεβὼν πόλις Σηὼν τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ἀμορραίων, καὶ οὗτος ἐπολέμησεν βασιλέα Μωάβ τὸ πρότερον, καὶ ἔλαβεν πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἀροὴρ ἕως Ἀρνών. (For Hesebon is a city of Seon, the king of the Ammorites, and he fought the king of Moab earlier and he took all of his land from Aroer to Arnon); Ex 17:8 potentially has another example - Ἦλθεν δὲ Ἀμαλὴκ καὶ ἐπολέμει Ἰσραὴλ ἐν Ῥαφιδίν. (And Amalek came and fought Israel in Rafidin.)

in the vernacular.<sup>88</sup> Consequently, OG Kingdoms' language can now be adduced as solid supporting evidence that the accusative supplanted the dative in lower register use of this word as early as the second century BCE. In her reassessment of the 'decline of the dative', Stolk notes that 'the variation and change in the argument realizations of individual verbs is often not properly understood and not (consequently) regularized by editors ... it would be possible to reveal some further changes through diachronic analysis of argument structures of individual verbs.'<sup>89</sup> Given that πολεμῶ is so well attested in the language of OG Kingdoms, this is a key resource for the kind of diachronic analysis proposed by Stolk.

The various prepositional phrases collocated with πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms are largely paralleled in contemporary language. The use of πρὸς with the accusative occurs five times in OG Kingdoms.<sup>90</sup> In regard to translation-technique, the use of this preposition does not appear to correlate to any one Hebrew word.<sup>91</sup> This construction occurs in Polybius with πολεμῶ 33 times.<sup>92</sup> It is also attested in an inscription from 375 BCE,<sup>93</sup> and is commonly used with a sense of hostility.<sup>94</sup> The preposition ἐπὶ is collocated with πολεμῶ three times in OG Kingdoms.<sup>95</sup> This typically renders the preposition כַּ, which often marks the object of כּוּל Nip<sup>c</sup>al.<sup>96</sup> This is poorly attested in Greek. There are no papyrological or epigraphical attestations of this construction with πολεμῶ. In terms of literature, this preposition is collocated with πολεμῶ only once in Thucydides.<sup>97</sup> Nevertheless, the use of ἐπὶ with the

<sup>88</sup> The contrary evidence offered by Polybius may be challenged on the grounds that his language gives evidence for a markedly different register of Greek.

<sup>89</sup> Stolk 2015: 74.

<sup>90</sup> 1Kgds 17:9; 3Kgds 12:21, 12:24y, 12:24x, 21:25.

<sup>91</sup> 1Kgds 17:9 = חָ; 3Kgds 12:21 = כּ; 3Kgds 12:24y = כּ; 3Kgds 12:24x = no equivalent; 3Kgds 21:25 = direct definite object marker.

<sup>92</sup> Plb. 1.3.2, 1.6.3, 1.70.6, 1.88.7, 2.20.10, 2.49.6, 2.49.7, 3.2.4, 3.5.2, 4.32.5, 4.54.5, 5.45.6, 5.104.9, 5.104.11, 5.108.4, 7.9.8, 7.9.9, 9.30.9, 9.36.3, 11.5.1, 18.3.5, 18.5.1, 18.5.2, 18.11.10, 18.37.4, 18.51.4, 20.4.5, 21.23.7, 21.32.4 bis, 21.43.24, 23.10.4, Fr. 39.7.

<sup>93</sup> IG IV 556.12.

<sup>94</sup> LSJ s.v. 'πρός', C.1.4.

<sup>95</sup> 1Kgds 29:11 - ... καὶ οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι ἀνέβησαν πολεμεῖν ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ. (And the allophyles went up to fight against Israel); 1Kgds 31:11 - Καὶ οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι ἐπολέμουν ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ ... (And the allophyles were fighting against Israel...) 3 Kgds 21:1 - ... καὶ ἀνέβησαν καὶ περιεκάθισαν ἐπὶ Σαμάρειαν καὶ ἐπολέμησαν ἐπ' αὐτήν. 'And they went up and besieged Samaria and they fought against it.' Obviously, the case of the object of the preposition cannot be identified in 1Kgds 31:1 and 1Kgds 29:11 as it is Ἰσραηλ.

<sup>96</sup> The sole exception to this is 1Kgds 29:11 which has no MT equivalent. The Qumran scrolls do not preserve this verse.

<sup>97</sup> Th. 8.44.3 - οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ταῖς ἐκ τῆς Σάμου ναυσὶν αἰσθόμενοι ἔπλευσαν μὲν βουλόμενοι φθάσαι καὶ ἐπεφάνησαν πελάγιοι, ὕστερήσαντες δὲ οὐ πολλῷ τὸ μὲν παραχρῆμα ἀπέπλευσαν ἐς Χάλκην, ἐντεῦθεν δ' ἐς Σάμον, ὕστερον δὲ ἐκ τῆς Χάλκης καὶ ἐκ τῆς Κῶ [καὶ ἐκ τῆς Σάμου] τοὺς ἐπίπλους ποιοῦμενοι ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥόδον ἐπολέμουν. (The Athenians became aware at this time and sailed with their ships from Samos wanting to arrive first and they appeared at sea, but because they arrived too late they sailed off for the moment for a little while to Chalce, and from there to Samos, and later, as they made naval attacks from Chalce and from Cos (and from Samos), they made war on Rhodes.)

accusative implying a sense of hostility is well evidenced in the Classical period.<sup>98</sup> There is, therefore, no compelling reason to take this as unnatural Greek. It is also significant that the translator does not render the כ with Greek ἐν. This implies he has opted for natural Greek over the simple translational equivalent, as he had done on other occasions.<sup>99</sup> The use of εἰς with the accusative collocated with πολεμῶ is not noted by Muraoka. It occurs six times in OG Kingdoms in a single verse.<sup>100</sup> Each occurrence of εἰς has a corresponding כ in the MT and this is corroborated by the Qumran scrolls.<sup>101</sup> Again, it is significant that the translator has avoided the mechanical equation of כ with ἐν. Moreover, πολεμῶ collocated with εἰς and the accusative is attested in a papyrus dating to the first century CE.<sup>102</sup> The prepositional phrase μετὰ with a genitive is attested with πολεμῶ five times in OG Kingdoms.<sup>103</sup> Except for a very late attestation, this is not found in epigraphy.<sup>104</sup> Moreover, it is unattested in Polybius and is only attested in papyri from the second half of the fifth century CE.<sup>105</sup> LSJ notes that the sense of μετὰ with a hostile sense is a feature of later Greek.<sup>106</sup> However, the references LSJ provides in support of this sense are taken from the LXX and the book of Revelation, both of which may be influenced by Semitic languages and should be critically considered. In OG Kingdoms, it is possibly the product of translation-technique, as all of these occurrences correspond to a form of אֶמֶת with the exception of 1 Kingdoms 28:1 which corresponds to כ.<sup>107</sup> Without further non-biblical evidence for the use of this phrase with πολεμῶ, it is difficult to accurately assess its naturalness. Finally, on three occasions ἐν with the dative is collocated with πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms.<sup>108</sup> Muraoka sees ἐν in this context as functioning to indicate ‘a person to whom

<sup>98</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘ἐπί’. C. 4.

<sup>99</sup> On the translation of כ with ἐν marking the object of πολεμῶ see below in this paragraph.

<sup>100</sup> 1Kgds 14:47- καὶ ἐπολέμει κύκλῳ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸν Μωαβ καὶ εἰς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων καὶ εἰς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἐδομ καὶ εἰς τὸν Βαιθεωρ καὶ εἰς βασιλέα Σουβα καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους· (And he was fighting all his enemies in a circle, against Moab and against the sons of Ammon and against the sons of Edom and against Baithewr and against the King of Souba and against the allophyles;)

<sup>101</sup> 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, frg.6. The OG is closer to the Qumran scroll than the MT, though the MT is still very similar. OG and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> have εἰς βασιλέα Σουβα and וְכִלְיָהוּ respectively against the MT which has וְכִלְיָהוּ.

<sup>102</sup> O.Did. 325.12 - ἀφ’ οὗ τε ἀ-νέβην, μετὰ Λονγίνου/συνσκηνοῦ. εἰς ἡμᾶς/ἄνθρωπος πολεμεῖ, ὁ κομον[ο]πλᾶρις σου, /ψευδομαρτυρῶν. (Since I went up, I am staying with Longinos. A man, your κομονοπλᾶρις(?), is fighting against us by spreading false testimony.)

<sup>103</sup> 1Kgds 17:32, 17:33, 28:1; 2Kgds 10:17; 3Kgds 12:24.

<sup>104</sup> OGI 201. 2 = *Prose sur pierre* 67.2 = *Temple de Kalabchah* 204.2. (v CE) - ἐγὼ Σιλκῶ, βασιλίσκος Νουβάδων καὶ ὧν τῶν Αἰθιοπῶν ἦλθον εἰς Τάλμιν καὶ Τάφιν. ἅπαξ δύο ἐπολέμησα μετὰ τῶν Βλεμύων, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκεν μοι τὸ νίκημα. (I Silco, King of the Nubades and of all the Ethiopians, came to Talmis and Tafis. Once twice I fought with the Blemyes and God gave me the victory.) An early Classical example, dating to 356/5 BCE, means ‘fight on the side of’ not ‘against’. IG ii<sup>2</sup> 127.40.

<sup>105</sup> Chr.wilck. 23.10 = BGU 4 1035.10; SB 14 11957.30.

<sup>106</sup> LSJ, s.v. ‘μετά’, A.III.1.

<sup>107</sup> The Qumran scrolls do not preserve the relevant word.

<sup>108</sup> 1Kgds 12:9, 23:5, 28:15.

sth is done'.<sup>109</sup> He rightly notes the use of this prepositional phrase with πολεμῶ as a neologism; it is unnatural as Greek and is unattested outside the LXX.<sup>110</sup> All of these instances of ἐν translate the Hebrew preposition ׀. This is significant to the naturalness of the other prepositional phrases. That the translator elsewhere avoids the simple equation of ׀ with ἐν indicates that he often chooses natural Greek in place of mechanical equations. Overall, while the translator sometimes uses simple translational equivalents for Hebrew prepositions, more often he avoids such patterns and thereby produces largely idiomatic and natural Greek.<sup>111</sup>

## 2.8 Concluding Remarks on πολεμῶ

The use of πολεμῶ in OG Kingdoms generally reflects the language of the early Koine period. In terms of translation-technical concerns, the semantics of πολεμῶ largely align with those of its standard Hebrew correspondent ׀ל Nip̄'al. This alignment reduces the risk of excessive semantic extension. However, the use of πολεμῶ as the operative verb translating ׀ל Nip̄'al in description of the single combat between Daud and Goliath pushes the semantic boundaries of the Greek verb. The solitary shift to μονομαχῶ in 1 Kingdoms 17:10 demonstrates the translator's sensitivity to the semantics of πολεμῶ, his familiarity with standard the Greek lexicon of the period, and his willingness to suspend stereotyping in situations where the meaning of the Greek is unduly distorted. It is also a valuable piece of evidence from one of the most 'literal' portions of the LXX against the broad assertion of Pietersma that '... creative use of language ... is in rather short supply in our anthology of translated texts.'<sup>112</sup>

Study of the syntax of πολεμῶ demonstrates again that the language of OG Kingdoms largely conforms to that of the early Koine period. Many of the constructions, notably the future tense indicating a command and the use of the bare infinitive and genitive articular infinitive for the expression of purpose, align well with the language of the third and second centuries BCE. When it comes to prepositional phrases collocated with πολεμῶ, the translator's inconsistent use of stereotyped equivalents sometimes results in slightly less idiomatic Greek; this is most notable in the use of ἐν with the dative and, possibly, μετὰ

<sup>109</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. 'ἐν', 10.

<sup>110</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. 'πολεμέω', b.

<sup>111</sup> This accords with Ajemelaus' (2007: 148) description of the translator of 1Kgds as 'ambivalent'.

<sup>112</sup> Pietersma 2017: 9–10.

with the genitive. Nevertheless, the majority of prepositional phrases collocated with *πολεμῶ* in OG Kingdoms are natural. Moreover, the translator is not bound when it comes to case syntax. Nothing in the Hebrew dictates the use of a dative or an accusative. That the accusative was chosen by the translator is an interesting early example of case variation with this verb. Given that *πολεμῶ* is so poorly attested in the papyri and is not common in the Pentateuch, OG Kingdoms offers the best evidence for the use of the word in lower register writings of the early Koine period.

## ἐντέλλομαι

Ancient Greek has a rich stock of verbs meaning ‘to give orders for (something to be done, etc.); to bid, command, direct.’<sup>1</sup> Such words are well-attested throughout the history of the language and are common in both the documentary and literary evidence. They are likewise common in the LXX, filled as it is with the commands of kings, prophets and God. Significantly, the various words that occupied this semantic field, such as *κελεύω*, *προστάσσω*, *συντάσσω* and *ἐντέλλομαι* fluctuated in usage throughout the history of the language. The use of these words is intimately related to their connotation, that is their ‘flavour’ or ‘tone’, rather than their lexical meaning.<sup>2</sup> The language of OG Kingdoms can be contextualised against this dynamic history, which is well-evidenced by a significant body of non-biblical data. Additionally, that ‘order’ verbs often display complicated syntax allows for the analysis of the ‘naturalness’ of the Greek of OG Kingdoms from a syntactic perspective.

Lee and Muraoka have produced the two most significant contributions to the topic of ‘order’ verbs in the LXX, with the former addressing semantics and the latter syntax.<sup>3</sup> This chapter will consider the linguistic-historical and semantic observations of Lee, which are limited to the Pentateuch, as they relate to the use of ‘order’ verbs in OG Kingdoms.<sup>4</sup> Subsequently, it will analyse the syntax of these words as they appear in OG Kingdoms through close engagement with Muraoka’s syntactical study. However, Muraoka largely ignores the relationship of LXX syntax to the wider history of the Greek language. This chapter, therefore, aims to consider the syntax of ‘order’ verbs in OG Kingdoms in relation

---

<sup>1</sup> OED s.v. ‘order’, III. 7. a.

<sup>2</sup> Lee 2003: 520.

<sup>3</sup> Lee’s treatment of ‘order’ verbs may be found in a retrospective of his 1983 thesis and a short coverage in his 2018 monograph. Lee 2003a: 517–523, 2018: 64–66. Muraoka’s study of syntax is titled ‘On the Syntax of Verba Jubendi in the Septuagint’. Muraoka 2006: 69–80. Concerning terminology, Lee refers to such words as ‘order’ verbs. Muraoka terms them ‘verba jubendi’. This chapter follows Lee’s terminology.

<sup>4</sup> Lee also notes ‘I have not made any attempt on the inscriptions for the usual reasons: 3rd B.C.E. texts are scattered through numerous volumes; they come from a variety of ancient localities, not just Egypt; and their genres vary markedly.’ Lee 2003a: 519, n. 15. The treatment given to ‘order’ verbs in Lee’s 2018 monograph does not redress this. This chapter attempts as far as practicable to incorporate some epigraphic data.



to wider linguistic trends illustrated through comparison against non-biblical, primarily documentary, data.

First, it is significant to note that ἐντέλλομαι is the only ‘order’ verb attested in OG Kingdoms. It is, therefore, the focus of this chapter. Nevertheless, consideration is given to the history of other verbs belonging to this semantic field, such as προστάσσω and κελεύω, in order to understand the wider linguistic historical context of OG Kingdoms.<sup>5</sup>

### 3.1 History of ἐντέλλομαι

Chantraine proposes that τέλλω, from which ἐντέλλομαι is derived, comes from the Indo-European root \*τελ-γ<sup>e</sup>/o and has the basic sense of ‘accomplir’ which takes on the meaning of ‘se lever’.<sup>6</sup> The simplex produced two main compounds of different meanings; the first is ἀνα-τέλλω with the sense of ‘faire pousser, faire naître’, and the second is ἐπιτέλλω and ἐπιτέλλομαι with the sense of ‘ordonner, prescrire’. Finally, Chantraine notes that ‘ἐν-τέλλομαι < donner des instructions > (Hdt., etc.) est fréquent en grec hellénistique et tardif.’<sup>7</sup> This brief observation is key to understanding the historical context of the language of OG Kingdoms.

The earliest attestation of ἐντέλλομαι is found in Pindar’s *Olympian Odes*, where uniquely it occurs in the active voice.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, through the majority of its history, ἐντέλλομαι was a middle deponent, in that it typically lacked a present active form and that its future and aorist forms were middle.<sup>9</sup> This changes toward the very end of the Koine period, where

<sup>5</sup> The semantic field of ἐντέλλομαι is shared in addition by ἐπιτάσσω, παραγγέλλω, διατάσσω, ἐξηγοῦμαι and συντάσσω. This list is compiled from Lee 2003a: 517 and n.12 and Muraoka 2006: 70. It is not comprehensive. Verbs such as λέγω and διαστέλλομαι may also carry the sense of ‘to order’. Due to space constraints, these words do not form part of this study. In addition, some of the ‘order’ words that are covered, συντάσσω for example, have senses other than ‘to order’. The figures provided below include all occurrences regardless of contextual meaning.

<sup>6</sup> Chantraine *DELG* s.v. ‘τέλλω’. According to Beekes, ἐντέλλομαι derives from the Indo-European root \*telh<sub>2</sub> with the basic meaning of ‘bear, endure’. Beekes *BDG* s.v. ‘τέλλω’, 2.

<sup>7</sup> Chantraine *DELG* s.v. ‘τέλλω’.

<sup>8</sup> Pi. *O.* 7. 39–43 - τότε καὶ φανσίμβροτος δαίμων Ὑπεριονίδας/ μέλλον ἐντειλεν φυλάσασθαι χρέος παισὶν φίλοις,/ ὡς ἂν θεᾷ πρῶτοι κτίσαιεν βωμὸν ἑναργέα, καὶ σεμνὰν θυσίαν θέμενοι/ πατρί τε θυμὸν ἰάναιεν κόρη τ’ ἐγχειβρόμῳ. (At that time Hyperion’s son, divine bringer of light to mortals, charged his dear children to observe the obligation that was to come, that they might be the first to build for the goddess an altar in full view, and by making a sacred sacrifice might cheer the hearts of the father and his daughter of the thundering spear. Trans. Race 1997: 125–127.) LSJ notes that ἐντέλλομαι occurs only in the active here and in *S. fr.* 269. LSJ s.v. ‘ἐντέλλω’, A.

<sup>9</sup> *SM Grammar* § 810. cf. Allan 2013: ‘Media Tantum’. LSJ gives the note ‘mostly in Med.’ LSJ s.v. ‘τέλλω’, A.

aorist passive forms of ἐνετάλθην begin to appear.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, ἐντέλλομαι remained a middle deponent throughout the Koine period. Despite its early attestations, ἐντέλλομαι only enjoyed literary prominence in certain periods and certain writers. Lee notes that of the 106 occurrences in fifth century BCE literature, 91 belong to Herodotus.<sup>11</sup> Seven appear in Xenophon; six in the *Cyropedia* and one in the *Anabasis*, which, interestingly, belongs to a speech of Xenophon himself.<sup>12</sup> It is unattested in Thucydides and Demosthenes, and appears only three times in Plato.<sup>13</sup> It remained uncommon in fourth century BCE literature, occurring only once in Aeneas Tacticus and twice in Aristotle.<sup>14</sup> This picture is, of course, heavily influenced by the chance survival of the Greek literary record. Nevertheless, it is clear that it was not a common word in Attic Greek during the fourth and fifth centuries BCE. It was, however, extremely common in the literary Ionic of Herodotus.

This situation changes dramatically in the subsequent history of the Greek language. The following table sets out the occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι in literature through the Koine period:

Table 4: *Occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι in Koine Period Literature*

Century	Occurrences
iii BCE	430
ii BCE	23
i BCE	31
i CE	132
ii CE	265
iii CE	43
iv CE	1052
v CE	256
vi CE	190

<sup>10</sup> Aorist passive forms of ἐντέλλομαι are unattested in the papyri and epigraphy. The earliest literary aorist passive forms are attested in letters of Saint Barsanuphius dated to the sixth century CE. Bars. *Resp.* 615, 836 bis. On the gradual replacement of the aorist middle with the aorist passive see Horrocks 2010: 103, 130, 256 and Browning 1983: 29.

<sup>11</sup> Lee 2003a: 519.

<sup>12</sup> X. *Cyr.* 3.3.40, 4.2.12, 5.3.47, 5.4.2, 5.5.3; *An.* 5.1.13.

<sup>13</sup> Pl. *Chrm.* 157b; *Prt.* 325d; *R.* 393e. The remaining attestations assigned to the fifth century BCE by TLG are Hp. *Epid.* 6.7.3; Hippas Eleus *fr.* 20; Pherecyd. *fr.* 78; E. *Ph.* 1648; S. *fr.* 269, 462.

<sup>14</sup> Aen.Tact. 31, 8; Arist. *Oec.* 1352a; *SE.* 166b. There is an additional attestation from the fourth century BCE in a fragment of Hecat. 3a 264 F *fr.* 25.

Of the occurrences dated to the third century BCE, 406 belong to the LXX. As TLG's tagging system attributes all of the LXX to the third century BCE, these occurrences should rather be distributed according to the time of each book's composition to the extent that this can be determined.<sup>15</sup> Attestations of the second and first centuries BCE are artificially deflated due to this. Despite this difficulty, the word is certainly common in the Pentateuch. According to Lee, ἐντέλλομαι occurs in this portion of the LXX 156 times.<sup>16</sup> It is interesting to note the distribution of ἐντέλλομαι amongst literary writers. The following table indicates the top ten writers by use of ἐντέλλομαι from the fifth century BCE to the sixth century CE:

Table 5: *Occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι by Writer*

1. LXX	406
2. Cyril of Alexandria (vi/v CE)	238
3. John Chrysostom (vi/v CE)	181
4. Origen (iii/vi CE)	126
5. Theodoret of Cyrus (vi/v CE)	106
6. Herodotus (v BCE)	91
7. Athanasius (vi CE)	90
8. Eusebius (iii/vi CE)	84
9. Didymus Caecus (vi CE)	63
10. Council of Ephesus I (431 CE)	59

With the exception of Herodotus and the LXX, this list is dominated by the Christian literary tradition.<sup>17</sup> This is partly due to the fact that extensive portions of these writers' works have survived. Nevertheless, ἐντέλλομαι is poorly attested in non-Christian literature of the Koine period:

<sup>15</sup> On the difficulties of dating the LXX see '1.7 Date of Composition of OG Kingdoms'.

<sup>16</sup> Lee 2018: 65.

<sup>17</sup> The LXX was at first a Jewish production later adopted by Christianity.

Table 6: *ἐντέλλομαι* in Major Non-Christian Writers of the Koine Period

Dio Cassius (c. 150–after 235 CE)	21
Polybius (c. 200–118 BCE)	17
Appian (c. 100–160 CE)	14
Diodorus Siculus (c. 80–20 BCE)	10
Dionysius of Halicarnassus (c. 50–7 BCE)	4
Lucian (c. 120–190 CE)	10
Herodian (c. 180–240 CE)	10
Pausanias (c. 120–180 CE)	6
Arrian (c. 86–180 CE)	5
Epictetus (c. 50–100 CE)	4
Plutarch (c. 50–after 120 CE)	3

It is probable that this pattern of usage arises partly from the linguistic influence of the LXX. The Christian writers listed above would have been intimately familiar with it and especially the Pentateuch, in which the frequency of *ἐντέλλομαι* is disproportionate with other major Greek literary corpora.

The documentary sources compliment the history indicated by the literary evidence. The word is uncommon in epigraphy, occurring just under 40 times in the entire corpus. Interestingly, none of these occurrences are dated to the Classical period. It is in the Koine period that *ἐντέλλομαι* becomes more common. It is found nine times in epigraphy dated to the early Koine period.<sup>18</sup> As in literature, *ἐντέλλομαι* becomes even more frequent in epigraphy of the CE period, occurring 17 times.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, the papyrological evidence also attests to the growing prominence of *ἐντέλλομαι*, which appears 42 times in papyri of

<sup>18</sup> FD 3 4:153.14 (246 or 242 BCE); IG ii<sup>2</sup> 870.2 = IG ii<sup>3</sup> 1 1461.3 (300–101 BCE c.); IG v 2 266.19 (46–43 BCE); IG xii 3 330.18 (210–195 BCE c.); IG xii 4 1:209.49 = Rigsby, *Asyria* 11.49 = TAM IV 1 1.49 (242 BCE c.); ILabraunda 33.37 (220 BCE c.); ILabraunda 38.33 (240 BCE c.); ILabraunda 42.2.12 (220 BCE c.); SEG 39:1426.18 (238 BCE after).

<sup>19</sup> Alabanda 32.6 (imperial); CB 528.372.6 (249 CE); FD 3.4 4:286.17 (52 CE) bis; FD III 4:302.col. II.frg. 420.37 (125 CE); IDelph 4:152.37 (125 CE); IEphMcCabe 187.8 (imperial); IEphMcCabe 188.10 (imperial); IG ii<sup>2</sup> 13249.37 (305–306 CE); IGBulg 3.2 1690.e.43 (202 CE); IGLSyr 5 1998.17 = SEG 17:755.17 (81–96 CE); IK Arykanda 111.2 (101–200 CE); IK Kibyra 254.8 (195/196 CE); MDAI(A) 20 (1895) 386.5.14 (55 CE); Spomenik 71 (1931) 28.54.7 (212 CE after); TAM v.3 1531.a.7, b.2 (975–1000 CE c.). There are an additional 7 occurrences that are undated. IKhiosMcCabe 13.19; TAM v.2 828.b.9; IKilikiaHW 54.123.5; IG ii<sup>2</sup> 3956.3; IGUR ii 545.5; IGUR ii 478.6; IGUR II 466.5.

the early Koine period.<sup>20</sup> It is also extremely well-attested in papyri of the Middle and Late Koine period.<sup>21</sup>

Nevertheless, ἐντέλλομαι had extensive competition from other prominent ‘order’ verbs throughout the third, second and first centuries BCE. As Lee notes, κελεύω is the typical ‘order’ verb in Classical Greek.<sup>22</sup> It was also more common than ἐντέλλομαι in literature

<sup>20</sup> BGU 8 1755.14 (52 BCE); BGU 8 1760.25 (50 BCE); P. Congr.xv. 10.1 (263–229 BCE); P.Bad. 4 48.16 (127 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 1 59029.5 (258 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 1 59030.1 (258 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 1 59057.3 (257 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 1 59066.3 (257 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 1 59084.2 (257 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 1 59093.15 (257 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 2 59217.5 (254 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 3 59408.6 (350 BCE c.); P.Cair. Zen. 3 59416.6 (263–229 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 3 59488.1 (250 BCE c.); P.Cair. Zen. 4 59546.2 (257 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 4 59598.1 (246–245 BCE); P.Cair. Zen. 5 59816.2, 13; P.Col. 4 91.7 (241 BCE); P.Grenf 2 14c.8 (225 BCE); P.Heid. 6 366.4 (iii BCE); P.Hib. 2 248.Fr2.19 (250 BCE); P.Lond. 7 1948.1, 11 (257 BCE); P.Lond. 7 1968.10 (255 BCE); P.Lond. 7 2180.9 (263–229 BCE); P.Petr. 2 42 (a).A.8 (260–249 BCE); P.Rainer Cent. 46.11 (199–175 BCE); P.Ryl. 4 593.3 (35 BCE); P.Sorb. 3 88.2 (241 BCE); P.Tebt. 1 37.11 (73 BCE); P.Tebt. 3.1 702.9 (260 BCE); P.Tebt. 3.1 747.3, 8 (243 BCE); P.Zen. Pestm. 49.18 (244 BCE); PSI 4 326.11 (257 BCE); PSI 4 412.3 (263–229 BCE); PSI 6 568.1 (253–252 BCE); SB 20 14728.13 (103 BCE); SB 26 16635.4 (248 BCE); UPZ 1 61.9 (161 BCE).

<sup>21</sup> BGU 1 361.2.21 (184 CE c.); BGU 1 93.4 (ii/iii CE); BGU 2 417.18, 23 (50–99 CE); BGU 2 435.18 (ii/iii CE); BGU 2 624.4 (284–304 CE); BGU 2 665.15 (i CE); BGU 7 1674.12 (ii CE); CPR 6 80.18 (ii CE); O.Ber. 2 195.17 (50–75 CE); O.Claud. 1 147.5 (ii CE); O.Claud. 2 259.7 (ii CE); O.Did. 382.3 (110–115 CE); O.Did. 44.6 (200–225 CE); P.Abinn. 58.7 (345 CE); P.Ammon 1 3.6.13, 14 (348 CE); P.Ammon 2 27.8, 13 (348 CE); P.Ammon 2 33.3 (348 CE); P.Ammon 2 37. 13 (348 CE); P.Ammon 2 38, 15 (348 CE); P.Amst. 1 39.19 (iv CE); P.Athen. 64. 1 (ii CE); P.Berl. Zill. 13. 6 (vi CE); P.Brem. 18.7 (113–120 CE); P.Cair. Isid. 77. 21 (320 CE); P.Col. 10 278.7 (240–260 CE); P.Col. 10 279. 9 (240–260 CE); P.Col. 8 225.19 (170–199 CE); P.Daris 48.3 (75–125 CE); P.Erl. 119.12 (iii CE); P.Fay. 111.11 (96–6 CE); P.Fay. 344 V.9 (ii CE); P.Flor. 2 177.8 (257 CE); P.Giss. Bibl. 3 20.2 (113–117 CE); P.Giss. Bibl. 3 28. 24 (iii CE); P.Giss. Bibl. 3 32.22 (iii/iv CE); P.Hamb. 4 257.3 (ii/iii CE); P.Harr. 1 63.8 (161 CE after); P.Haun. 2 17.21 (ii/iii CE); P.Haun. 2 28.8 (31 CE); P.Herm. 11.5 (iv CE); P.Iand. 6 108.3 (200 CE c.); P.Kell. 1 6.3 (300–350 CE c.); P.Lips. 1 38.5, 6 (390 CE); P.Lond. 2 196.1 (138–148 CE); P.Lond. 6 1917.24 (330–340 CE c.); P.Louvre 1 67.3, 11 (275–299 CE); P.Louvre 2 104.17 (ii CE); P.Matr. 5.6 (336 CE); P.Merton 3 112.5 (ii CE); P.Meyer 20.48 (200–250 CE); P.Mich. 15 717.7 (iii CE); P.Mich. 3 213.12 (iii CE); P.Mich. 3 219.5 (296–297 CE); P.Muench.3.1.121.13 (ii CE); P.Oxy. 10 1299.10 (iv CE); P.Oxy. 12 1423.4 (325–375 CE); P.Oxy. 12 1584. 6, 8 (ii CE); P.Oxy. 14 1669. 3, 7 (iii CE); P.Oxy. 2 291. 6 (25–29 CE); P.Oxy. 22 2348. 33 (224 CE); P.Oxy. 3 527.2 (ii–iii CE); P.Oxy. 31 2594.2 (ii CE); P.Oxy. 31 2600.3 (275–325 CE); P.Oxy. 44 3199. 3, 6 (ii CE); P.Oxy. 48 3389. 8 (343 CE); P.Oxy. 48 3403.5 (330–385 CE); P.Oxy. 55 3807. 21 (26–28 CE c.); P.Oxy. 55 3808.14 (75–125 CE); P.Oxy. 55 3813.86 (iii–iv CE); P.Oxy. 63 4359.8 (324 CE); P.Oxy. 7 1070. 16, 50 (212–299 CE); P.Oxy. 73 4963.5 (iii–iv CE); P.Oxy. 78 5180.5, 8 (ii–iii CE); P.Oxy. 8 1154. 3 (75–99 CE); P.Oxy. 81 5286. 8 (88 CE); P.Petaus 27.2 (184–186 CE); P.Phil. 32.2 (75–99 CE); P.Prag.Varcl. 2 19. 3 (253–256 CE); P.Princ. 3 188. 20 (i–ii CE); P.Rein. 1 55. 4 (260 CE); P.Ross. Georg. 3 1. 15 (270 CE c.); P.Ryl. 2 229.5 (38 CE); P.Ryl. 2 241. 10 (iii CE); P.Ryl. 4 690. 1, 4 (iii CE); P.Ryl. 4 696. 4 (275–299 CE); P.Sarap. 83. 20 (90–133 CE); P.Sijp. 9 d. 8 (ii CE); P.Strasb. 4 170. 6 (ii CE); P.Strasb. 4 259.3 (ii CE); P.Strasb. 5 346.12, 19 (ii CE); P.Tebt. 2 423.10 (200–216 CE); P.Warr. 14.5 (ii CE); P.Warr. 15. 12 (ii CE); P.Worp. 52.3 (ii CE); P.Yale 1 78.4 (1–50 CE); PSI 12 1241.23 (159 CE); PSI 12 1246.5 (219–222 CE); PSI 12 1247.17 (iii CE); PSI 12 1260.3 (200–265 CE); PSI 14 1418.14 (iii CE); PSI 14 1419.9 (iii CE); PSI 14 1445.8 (iii CE); PSI 15 1555.10 (iii CE); PSI 9 1042.10 (iii CE); PSI 9 1080.3 (iii CE); SB 10 10529.4, 21 (i–ii CE); SB 10 10557.3 (225–275 CE); SB 12 11020. 3 (130–300 CE); SB 12 11130.16 (iii–iv CE); SB 12 11148.5 (i–ii CE); SB 14 11899.10 (ii CE); SB 14 11900. 7, 13 (ii CE); SB 16 12245. 15 (iii CE); SB 16 12577. 6, 10, 18 (iii CE); SB 16 12692. 11 (339 CE); SB 18 14052. 7, 9 (iii CE); SB 20 14278. 16 (70–100 CE); SB 20 14987. 26 (vi CE?); SB 24 16289.9, 19 (i–ii CE); SB 24 16290.3, 7 (ii–iii CE); SB 6 9415. 2 (249–268 CE); SB 6 9466.3 (255 CE); Stud.Pal. 20 4. 34 (124 CE); W.Chr. 41. 33 (232 CE).

<sup>22</sup> Lee 2003a: 517.

of the Koine period.<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, it is uncommon in the papyri. Lee notes that it occurs some 30+ times in the third century BCE,<sup>24</sup> and figures for the second century BCE are similarly low, with only five occurrences, though this is partly due to the fact that little papyrological material survives from that century.<sup>25</sup> It occurs frequently throughout the subsequent papyrological record.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, the verb *κελεύω* is prominent throughout the epigraphic record during the third and second centuries BCE.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, it is poorly attested in the LXX. Most of its occurrences are found in 2, 3 and 4 Maccabees with 13, 3 and 4 attestations respectively.<sup>28</sup> The appearance of *κελεύω* in these books is perhaps to be expected as these are late and Atticistic compositions.<sup>29</sup> Based on the evidence, it is apparent that there was a variety of common lexical items in the Koine period meaning ‘to give an order for something to be done’. In higher register literature and epigraphy, the most prominent verb was *κελεύω*. Nevertheless, in the Koine period both *προστάσσω* and *συντάσσω* are common, particularly in the papyri.<sup>30</sup> The verb *ἐντέλλομαι* was not prominent over its rivals in the literary or documentary evidence of the early Koine period.

<sup>23</sup> *κελεύω* literary occurrences: v BCE 1378; iv BCE 768; iii BCE 263; ii BCE 57; i BCE 772; i CE 2849; ii CE 3079; iii CE 662; iv CE 5189; v CE 2248; vi CE 1641.

<sup>24</sup> Lee 2018: 65.

<sup>25</sup> UPZ 1 68.4; UPZ 1 119.24; BGU 10 2005.6; P.Münch. 3 57.v.10, 12.

<sup>26</sup> It occurs some 492 times from the first century BCE to the sixth century CE. In addition, the substantivised aorist passives participles *τὸ κελευθὲν* and *τὰ κελευσθέντα* are extremely common in the papyrological evidence. These are unattested in the third and second centuries BCE but occur in the subsequent centuries over 300 times.

<sup>27</sup> Third century BCE epigraphic occurrences of *κελεύω* – Agora 16.218.13; Chaniotis, *Verträge*, 27 alt rdg. 54; FD iii 1:486. 1, b.13; FD iii 1:486. 1, b.6; FD iii 2:134.21; FD iii 3:215.32; IDelos 325.11; IDelos 361.5; IDelos 500.b.8; IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1283.11; IG iv<sup>2</sup> 1 74.14; IG ix 1<sup>2</sup> 1:192.16 = ITeosMcCabe 1.16; IG v 2 357.65; IG xi 2.159.74; IK Estremo oriente 292.5; IKret ii xix 7.1 = SEG 42:818.1; IPark 24.20; ITeosMcCabe 29.3; SEG 31:586.6.left.1. Second century BCE epigraphic occurrences of *κελεύω* – BCH 110 (1986), 438, 4.13; FD iii 4:37.b.6; FD iii 6:117.15; FD iii 2:172.42; FD iii 2:233.10; FD iii 2:70.35, 65; FD iii 4:37.c.10 = IKnidos 1 31, DlpH C/IV.10; FD iii 2:242.10; GDI ii 1719.12; GDI ii 1757.11; GDI ii 1785.14; GDI ii 1884.9; GDI ii 1890.17; GDI ii 1901.7; GDI ii 2159.18; IEgVers 68.1; IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1368.107; IG ix 1 32.47; IG ix 1<sup>2</sup> 3:621.8; IG ix 1<sup>2</sup> 3:676.17; IG ix 1<sup>2</sup> 3:683.10; IG ix 1<sup>2</sup> 3:756.11; IG ix 1<sup>2</sup> 3:712.7; IG ix 2 89.b.33; IG v 1 1379. 5, 6, 24; IG v 1 5.12, 16; IG v 2 436.9; IG v 2 437.22; IG vii 223.17; IG vii 3073.24; IG vii 3075.10; IG vii 3376.14 = Darmezin, *Affranchissements* 58.78.14; IG xi 4 1065.b.12 = IG xii 5 128.b.12; IG xii 3 173.11; IG xii 3 249.29; IG xii 7 67.68; IKret i xvii 18.7; IKret i xvii 19.11; IKret ii xi 3. 6, 7, 19. 24. 29. 37; IKret iii iv 10.71 = Chaniotis, *Verträge* 57b.71; IMagnMai 123.59; IMT Aisep/Kad Dere 1128.2; IMT NoerdITroas 4.35, 61; IPriene 142.14; IPrusaOlymp 90.13; ISmyrna 29.19; SB 3:6947.2; SEG 26:121.13; SEG 35:665.27 = SEG 35:1845 block B.2.27; SIG 672.79. Additionally, the word *κελευω* occurs in three common formulaic expressions in the epigraphy. The phrase *ἀρχιτέκτονος κελεύοντος*, ‘the chief builder ordered’, and variations of it occur over 500 times in the epigraphic record. This is sometimes expanded to *κελευόντων ἐπιμελητῶν καὶ ἀρχιτέκτονος* and variations which are found around 30 times. The third formula is *κελευσάντων τῶν ἱερομναμόνων*, ‘the representatives of each Amphictyonic state ordered’. Such examples are obviously found at Delphi and number 22. The fact that these are fixed formulaic expressions limits their value as evidence for the history of the contemporary spoken language.

<sup>28</sup> Occurrences of *κελεύω* in other LXX books: 1Esd 9:53; Idt 2:15, 12:1; Tob. 8:18; Bel 14.

<sup>29</sup> In his division of the LXX books, Thackeray lists 2, 3 and 4 Maccabees as ‘literary and Atticistic’ under his category of ‘Free Greek’. Thackeray 1909: 13.

<sup>30</sup> Lee 2018: 65.

This does not mean, however, that its use in the LXX reflects an unnatural lexical choice. It was part of the natural vocabulary of the period, as is demonstrated by the papyrological evidence.<sup>31</sup>

While ἐντέλλομαι should not be seen as an unnatural lexical choice, given the history of this semantic field, its prominence in the LXX needs to be considered. Why did the translators not use the more common alternatives? Lee suggests that the prevalence of ἐντέλλομαι in the Pentateuch is partly due to the fact that it provides an etymological match for the Hebrew construction of מצוה ... צוה when combined with the noun ἐντολή.<sup>32</sup> This feature occurs five times in OG Kingdoms.<sup>33</sup> Similarly, while this feature occurs frequently in Deuteronomy, it occurs only once in Numbers and once in Leviticus.<sup>34</sup> Given that it is not a frequent feature of the language of the Pentateuch or of OG Kingdoms, it is better to see the etymological match of ἐντέλλομαι and ἐντολή as a convenient though not necessarily motivating consideration. It is also possible that the choice in OG Kingdoms is partly attributable to the precedent of the Pentateuch in which ἐντέλλομαι is the most common ‘order’ verb, though others are fairly common too.<sup>35</sup> This does not suppose that the translator of OG Kingdoms used the Pentateuch as a translational guide. Given the literary and stylistic differences between the Pentateuch and OG Kingdoms, this is unlikely.<sup>36</sup> All it requires is that he was familiar with the language of the Pentateuch for it to exert some level of influence. Notwithstanding, the most likely answer to the use of

<sup>31</sup> The figures given by Lee for a range of significant ‘order’ verbs in the third century BCE papyri are ‘κελεύω 30 +, ἐντέλλομαι 30 +, προστάσσω 100 +, συντάσσω 300 +’. Lee 2018: 65. In this respect it is interesting to note that ἐντέλλομαι is common in the New Testament, occurring 15 times - Mt 4:6, 17:9, 19:7, 28:20.; Mk 10:3, 13:34.; Lk 4:10.; Jn 8:5, 14:31, 15:14, 15:17.; Acts 1:2, 13:47.; Heb 9:20, 11:22. Κελεύω is attested 26 times - Mt 8:18, 14:9, 14:19, 14:28, 18:25, 27:58, 27:64; Lk 18:40; Acts 4:15, 5:34, 8:38, 12:19, 16:22, 21:33, 21:34, 22:24, 22:30, 23:3, 23:10, 23:35, 24:8, 25:6, 25:17, 25:21, 25:23. Προστάσσω occurs seven times Mt 1:24, 8:4; Mk 1:44; Lk 5:14; Acts 10:33, 10:48, 17:26. Finally, συντάσσω occurs three times, Mt 21:6, 26:19, 27:10. Interestingly, the majority of occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι in the New Testament appear in the higher register portions.

<sup>32</sup> Lee 2018: 65.

<sup>33</sup> 1Kgds 13:13; 3Kgds 2:43, 8:58, 11:11, 13:21. It also occurs in the Kaige sections four times - 3Kgds 17:13; 4Kgds 17:34, 18:6, 21:8.

<sup>34</sup> Leu 27:34 - Αὐταὶ εἰσιν αἱ ἐντολαί, ἃς ἐνετείλατο κύριος τῷ Μωϋσῇ πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινά. (These are the commands which the lord commanded to Moyses for the sons of Israel on the mountain Sina). Num 36:13 - Αὐταὶ αἱ ἐντολαὶ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα καὶ τὰ κρίματα, ἃ ἐνετείλατο κύριος ἐν χειρὶ Μωϋσῆ ἐπὶ δυσμῶν Μωαβ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κατὰ Ἰεριχώ. (These are the commandments and the statutes and judgements which the lord commanded with the hand of Moyses to the west of Moab at the Jordan below Jericho.)

<sup>35</sup> Figures from the Pentateuch for ‘order’ verbs; ἐντέλλομαι = 156, συντάσσω = 82, προστάσσω = 12. Lee 2018: 65.

<sup>36</sup> On the influence of the Pentateuch on OG Kingdoms, see above under ‘1.6 OG Kingdoms and the Greek Pentateuch’.

ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms is to be found in the language of the translator himself. It was a natural word meaning ‘to order’ that carried a tone appropriate for the subject material, as shall be discussed below. Moreover, the prevalence of the word in the Pentateuch and in OG Kingdoms perhaps suggests that the word was more common than the papyri alone suggest.

### 3.2 Hebrew Source

Before considering semantics, it is important to consider the issue of translation-technique. All but five of the 31 occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms translate forms of צוה.<sup>37</sup> One of these, 3 Kingdoms 2:35L, has no equivalent MT passage.<sup>38</sup> At 3 Kingdoms 13:17, the MT has the noun דבר which corresponds to the Greek ἐντέταλται. As a verbal form דבר in the Pi<sup>c</sup>ēl can have the sense of ‘to order’.<sup>39</sup> It is possible that the translator has misread his *Vorlage*, though it is also possible that this results from divergence between the MT and the text that the translator was working from. The remainder of the MT passage differs from the OG version. Notably the Greek has a λέγων that does not correspond to a למור.<sup>40</sup> On three occasions, ἐντέλλομαι renders forms of פקד Nip<sup>c</sup>al.<sup>41</sup> Significantly, the root פקד, which appears in a variety of stems, is translated by several Greek verbs in OG Kingdoms.

<sup>37</sup> 1Kgds 13:13, 13:14 bis, 18:22, 20:29, 21:3, 25:30; 2Kgds 4:12, 5:25, 7:7, 9:11; 3Kgds 2:43, 2:46, 5:20, 6:1a, 8:58, 9:4, 11:10 bis, 11:11, 11:38, 13:9, 13:21, 15:5, 17:4, 17:9.

<sup>38</sup> There is also no equivalent in the Qumran scrolls.

<sup>39</sup> HALOT s.v. ‘דבר’, pi. 6. The noun form can also carry the sense of ‘an order’. HALOT s.v. ‘דָּבַר’, 1.

<sup>40</sup> 1Kings 13:17 - כי דבר אלי בדבר יהוה לא תאכל לחם ולא תשתה שם מים לא תשוב ללכת בדרך אשר הלכת בה: (for it was said to me by the word of the LORD: ‘You shall not eat food or drink water there, or return by the way that you came.’ NRSV) = 1Kgds 13:17 ὅτι οὕτως ἐντέταλταί μοι ἐν λόγῳ κύριος λέγων Μὴ φάγῃς ἄρτον ἐκεῖ καὶ μὴ πῖνῃς ὕδωρ ἐκεῖ καὶ μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣ ἐπορεύθης ἐν αὐτῇ. (Thus, the lord ordered me with a word saying, ‘do not eat bread there and do not drink water there and do not return on the road on which you went on it.’)

<sup>41</sup> 1Sam 25:7 ועתה שמעתי כי גוזים לך עתה הרעים אשר לך היו עמנו לא הכלמנום ולא נפקד להם מאומה כל ימי היותם בכרמל: (I hear that you have shearers; now your shepherds have been with us, and we did them no harm, and they missed nothing, all the time they were in Carmel. NRSV) = καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἀκήκοα ὅτι κείρουσίν σοι· νῦν οἱ ποιμένες σου, οἳ ἦσαν μεθ’ ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκώλυσάμεν αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐκ ἐνετειλάμεθα αὐτοῖς οὐθὲν πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ὄντων αὐτῶν ἐν Καρμὴλ. (And now look, I have heard that they are shearing for you; now your shepherds, who were with us in the wilderness, and we did not hinder them and we did not order anything of them for all the days that they were in Carmel.) 1Sam 25:15 והאנשים טובים לנו מאד ולא הכלמנו - (Yet the men were very good to us, and we suffered no harm, and we never missed anything when we were in the fields, as long as we were with them; NRSV) = καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ ἡμῖν σφόδρα· οὐκ ἀπεκώλυσαν ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ ἐνετείλαντο ἡμῖν πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, ὥς ἡμεν παρ’ αὐτοῖς: (And the men were very good to us; they did not hinder us and they did not order us for all the days which we were with them;). 1Sam 25:21 - ודוד אמר אך לשקר שמרתי את כל אשר לזה במדבר ולא נפקד מכל אשר לו - (Now David had said, “Surely it was in vain that I protected all that this fellow has in the wilderness, so that nothing was missed of all that belonged to him; but he has returned me evil for good. NRSV) = καὶ Δαυὶδ εἶπεν Ἴσως εἰς ἄδικον πεφύλακα πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ οὐκ ἐνετειλάμεθα λαβεῖν ἐκ πάντων τῶν αὐτοῦ οὐθὲν, καὶ ἀνταπέδωκέν μοι πονηρὰ ἀντὶ ἀγαθῶν: (And David said, ‘perhaps as a wrong I have guarded all his possessions in the wilderness and we did not order to take anything from all of his things, and he has returned me an evil in place of good’.)



The majority are translated by ἐπισκέπτομαι,<sup>42</sup> but forms of καθίστημι,<sup>43</sup> ἐκπηδάω,<sup>44</sup> ἐπιζητέω,<sup>45</sup> ἐπιτίθημι,<sup>46</sup> and ἐκδικάω<sup>47</sup> all appear. The Hebrew קָפַח has a range of meanings, one of which is ‘to instruct, command, urge, stipulate’.<sup>48</sup> The choice to render קָפַח by ἐντέλλομαι on these occasions is based on the translator’s assessment of the semantic demands of the context. Nevertheless, again a largely stereotypical pattern is evident; צוּח equals ἐντέλλομαι, though this pattern is altered according to the semantic demands of particular contexts.

### 3.3 Semantics of ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms

Semantically the use of ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms largely aligns with non-biblical Koine Greek. This owes in part to the semantic alignment of Hebrew צוּח with ἐντέλλομαι. HALOT gives צוּח the primary sense of ‘to give an order, command’.<sup>49</sup> For ἐντέλλομαι, LSJ offers only the glosses of ‘enjoin, command’.<sup>50</sup> This may be supplemented with BDAG’s entry, which offers the definition of ‘to give or leave instructions, *command, order, give orders*’.<sup>51</sup> Muraoka’s entry for ἐντέλλομαι aligns with HALOT’s entry for צוּח. He offers three main senses, two of which have subsenses: 1.) ‘to issue an order or instruction, enjoin’; 2.a.) ‘to prescribe, charge with the execution of or adherence to’; 2.b.) ‘to prescribe and pronounce with authority’; 3.a.) ‘to transfer the authority to and place under the charge of’; 3.b.) ‘to authorise sbd. to act as’. Given the semantic coincidence of צוּח and ἐντέλλομαι, there is reduced possibility of semantic distortion in the target language.

### 3.4 Flavor and Tone

While the basic meaning of ἐντέλλομαι is relatively unproblematic, its subtleties are elusive. As Lee notes, it is impossible to distinguish semantically between ἐντέλλομαι,

<sup>42</sup> 1Kgds 2:21, 11:8, 13:15, 14:17 bis, 15:4, 20:6 bis, 20:18 bis, 20:25, 20:27; 2Kgds 2:30; 3Kgds 20:15 (= 1Kings 21:15), 20:26 (= 1Kings 21:26), 20:27 (=1Kings 21:27).

<sup>43</sup> 1Kgds 29:4; 3Kgds 11:28.

<sup>44</sup> 3Kgds 20:39 bis (= 1Kings 21:39).

<sup>45</sup> 2Kgds 3:8.

<sup>46</sup> 3Kgds 14:27.

<sup>47</sup> 1Kgds 15:2.

<sup>48</sup> HALOT s.v. ‘קָפַח’, 4.a.

<sup>49</sup> HALOT s.v. ‘צוּח’. The three main sense given by HALOT for צוּח are 1) ‘to give an order, command’; 2) ‘to command, instruct, order’ (with the command expressed by a consecutive perfect; with a consecutive imperfect; with אָמַר and an independent clause; and ל with an infinitive.); 3) ‘to send someone (to a place for a task)’.

<sup>50</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘ἐντέλλω’, 1.A.

<sup>51</sup> BDAG s.v. ‘ἐντέλλω’.

συντάσσω, προστάσσω and κελεύω.<sup>52</sup> The distinction is, according to Lee, not a matter of semantic meaning but one of ‘flavor’ or ‘tone’.<sup>53</sup> Accepting that this is the case, that OG Kingdoms uses only ἐντέλλομαι is problematic. The translator makes no attempt to vary the language to suit context or to engender ‘flavor’ or ‘tone’. In view of this, it would seem that the subtleties, the ‘flavor’ and ‘tone’, of the word in each context are unvarying. Nevertheless, while stereotyping removes the possibility of studying the tone of the word in each individual context, the general choice of ἐντέλλομαι remains significant. Why did the translator choose this word over the other possibilities, especially given that the surviving evidence suggests that ἐντέλλομαι was not as common as other ‘order’ verbs? The answer lies in Lee’s suggestion of ‘tone’. In his 2003 article, Lee suggests that the tone of ἐντέλλομαι is perhaps ‘somewhat elevated.’<sup>54</sup> In his more recent monograph, he notes its ‘somewhat imposing air’.<sup>55</sup> This assertion finds some support in the epigraphic evidence. In an inscription dated to around 220 BCE, it is used in a letter of King Philip V of Macedon in reference to an order that had been given by Seleukos.<sup>56</sup> That it was used by a king in reference to a king, suggests that the word could be used with a considerable sense of gravity.

That ἐντέλλομαι was used at all in OG Kingdoms is consistent with post-Classical lexical developments. There is extensive evidence that this was a standard word meaning ‘to order’ in Koine Greek as evidenced by the papyri, and there is further evidence that it was not common in the Classical period, both in literature and epigraphy. Semantically, the use of ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms agrees with contemporary wider Greek and there appears to be no semantic distortion. Interestingly, it is used by the translator as the default ‘order’ verb. This is suggested by the fact that it translates not only צוה but also פקד in the sense of ‘to order’. This is somewhat surprising, given that other ‘order’ verbs were generally more

---

<sup>52</sup> Lee 2018: 65.

<sup>53</sup> Lee 2003a: 520. Lee, discussing the topic of ‘connotation or tone’, states that while words ‘may have the same semantic value or lexical meaning, ... they do not have exactly the same effect: they differ in some way that is not semantic but of some other kind.’ Lee 2018:41.

<sup>54</sup> Lee 2003a: 520.

<sup>55</sup> Lee 2018: 64.

<sup>56</sup> ILabraunda 33.37 – ‘ἀπέφαινον δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ[ι]/ ἱερῷ διατρίβοντας πολίτας ὑμῶν εἶναι καὶ φυλάς/ νέμειν καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς χρῆσθαι νόμοις, καὶ/ Σέλευκον δὲ ἀφιέντα τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθέραν ἀποδοῦ/ναι ὑμῖν τὰ τε λοιπὰ χωρία τὰ προσόντα τῇ πόλει κα[ι]/ [τ]ὸ ἱερόν, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἶχετε, καὶ τὸν Ὀλύμπιχον,/ [ὦ]ς Σέλευκος ἐγγεῖλατο ἐξαγαγε[ῖν τ]ὰ [στρατόπε]-/[δα, διατ]ετ[ελε]κέναι? ....c.13.....’ (and I declared that your citizens are the ones residing in the temple and allotting the tribes and enjoying their own laws and that Seleukos set the city free and gave to you the other regions near your city and the temple, just as you had from the beginning, and Olympichos, as Seleukos ordered to lead out the army...)

common in the surviving evidence for Koine Greek. The choice is motivated by several factors; the etymological match with ἐντολή that serves to replicate the Hebrew construction  $\text{הָיָה...מִצְוָה}$ , the possible influence of the Pentateuch, and, most significantly, the tone of the word itself. However, as ἐντέλλομαι serves as the stereotyped rendering of  $\text{הָיָה}$ , the nuances of the word's 'flavor' and 'tone' are largely negated. Notwithstanding, the general choice of ἐντέλλομαι and its common use in OG Kingdoms provides further evidence that it was a common 'order' verb and that its tone was appropriate for the seriousness of the subject matter. Collectively, the evidence of the Pentateuch and that of OG Kingdoms, both of which use ἐντέλλομαι extensively, may suggest that the word ἐντέλλομαι was more common than the evidence of the papyri alone indicates particularly in contexts demanding a more authoritative tone.

### 3.5 Syntax of ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms

Greek 'order' verbs are syntactically complex. Muraoka attributes this to the fact that they commonly have multiple arguments, including: a.) the agent who issues the command; b.) the recipient of the command; and c.) the command itself.<sup>57</sup> OG Kingdoms displays a variety of constructions, particularly in the expression of the command itself.<sup>58</sup> The expression of the agent is syntactically simple. It is marked by the nominative case or expressed in the person of the verb. Muraoka's only observation concerning the syntax of the agent regards occasional impersonal passive uses of 'order' verbs.<sup>59</sup> No such uses of ἐντέλλομαι occur in OG Kingdoms. It is unlikely that a *medio tantum* verb such as ἐντέλλομαι would be used in such a construction. Moreover, there appears to be no impersonal passive uses of ἐντέλλομαι in papyri of the early Koine period.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Muraoka 2006: 69. Note that Muraoka uses the term 'agens' in place of 'agent'.

<sup>58</sup> Muraoka's 2006 article divides his discussion into: I.) agent (agens), II.) recipient and III.) message. The following discussion follows this layout. It is also significant to note that Muraoka does not generally engage with the relationship of LXX syntax to the wider Koine in his article.

<sup>59</sup> All the examples of impersonal passive 'order' verbs given by Muraoka are of verbs other than ἐντέλλομαι. Given that ἐντέλλομαι is a *media tantum* verb, an impersonal passive use may be unlikely.

<sup>60</sup> the only impersonal passive use of ἐντέλλομαι in the LXX is taken to be Sirach 7:31 - φοβοῦ τὸν κύριον καὶ δόξασον ἱερέα/ καὶ δὸς τὴν μερίδα αὐτῷ, καθὼς ἐντέταται σοι. Wright translates this as, 'Fear the Lord, and honor a priest, and give him his portion, as it has been commanded of you.' Wright, 2006: 725. This appears to be prompted by the underlying Hebrew text, as impersonal passive uses of ἐντέλλομαι are rare in wider Greek.

### 3.6 Recipient

According to Muraoka, the LXX as a whole overwhelmingly marks the recipient of a command in the dative case.<sup>61</sup> This holds true for OG Kingdoms. Of the 31 occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι, 26 mark the recipient with the dative case.<sup>62</sup> Of the five exceptions, four do not indicate a recipient.<sup>63</sup> The remaining exception presents a linguistic challenge. It occurs at 1 Kingdoms 20:29 and runs ‘καὶ ἐνετείλαντο πρὸς με οἱ ἀδελφοί μου’. Taylor translates this as ‘and my brothers gave orders to me’.<sup>64</sup> Muraoka notes that the indication of the recipient of a command with πρὸς τινα is rare in the LXX; it occurs only here and at 2 Supplements 19:9 and Numbers 15:23.<sup>65</sup> Muraoka attributes this construction, πρὸς τινα, to the influence of the *Vorlage*.<sup>66</sup> It is significant to note that the Greek of 1 Kingdoms 20:29 deviates from the MT. The person of the ‘order’ verb in the MT is singular, while it is plural in OG Kingdoms.<sup>67</sup> Nevertheless, both the MT and the Qumran scrolls mark the recipient of צוה with the preposition ל.<sup>68</sup> The two other examples noted by Muraoka follow a similar pattern, though on each occasion the MT uses a different preposition.<sup>69</sup> The most likely assumption, as Muraoka notes, is that the occurrence of πρὸς τινα in OG Kingdoms is due to an isomorphic replication of the source text. Muraoka’s assessment is supported by the fact that no other occurrence of צוה in the MT marks its recipient with ל. That this is a Hebraism is supported by the fact that the expression of the recipient of a command by πρὸς τινα is absent from the early Koine period documentary evidence.

However, the vast majority of examples of ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms follow standard contemporary Greek in the use of the dative case. While the decline of the dative is dated between the sixth and eighth centuries CE, there are earlier hints of this decline.<sup>70</sup> In his

---

<sup>61</sup> Muraoka 2006: 70.

<sup>62</sup> 1Kgds 13:13, 13:14 bis, 18:22, 21:3, 25:7, 25:15, 25:30; 2Kgds 4:12, 5:25, 7:7, 9:11; 3Kgds 2:35l, 2:46, 8:58, 9:4, 11:10 bis, 11:11, 11:38, 13:9, 13:17, 13:21, 15:5, 17:4, 17:9.

<sup>63</sup> 1Kgds 25:21; 3Kgds 5:20, 6:1a, 2:43.

<sup>64</sup> Taylor 2007b: 263.

<sup>65</sup> Muraoka 2006: 71. Neither of these passages are preserved in the Qumran scrolls.

<sup>66</sup> Muraoka 2006: 71. n. 9.

<sup>67</sup> 1Sam 20:29 - ... צוה לי אחי...

<sup>68</sup> 4QSam<sup>b</sup> f.6 3.

<sup>69</sup> 2Suppl 19:9 - καὶ ἐνετείλατο πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ... (and he commanded you saying...) = 2Chr 19:9 - ... ויצו עליהם לאמר. Num 15:23 - καθὰ συνέταξεν κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ... ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἧς συνέταξεν κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς. (Just as the lord commanded you ... from the day when the lord commanded you.) = ... את כל- אשר צוה יהוה אליכם ... מן-היום אשר צוה

<sup>70</sup> The most recent and advanced assessment of the decline of the Dative is Stolk’s 2015 Thesis. For older views see see Humbert 1930: 103–5; Moulton 1908: 50–68; Browning 1983: 37; Horrocks (2010: 114–117) notes that the decline of the dative is beginning to be evident in the papyrological evidence from the Koine period.

discussion of the LXX, Horrocks notes the tendency of 2Kings 18: 17-21 to replace the dative with an accusative after verbs of ‘saying’, ‘trusting’ and ‘disobeying’.<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, the papyrological evidence from the third century BCE has 18 examples of the dative used to indicate the recipient of a command with ἐντέλλομαι.<sup>72</sup> There are an additional four from the second century BCE,<sup>73</sup> and three from the first century BCE.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, the dative is still attested with ἐντέλλομαι in papyri from the fifth century CE.<sup>75</sup> Consequently, the expression of the recipient of ‘order’ verbs in OG Kingdoms reflects natural Koine Greek language. Considering Stolk’s emphasis on studying the history of argument realisation of individual verbs, OG Kingdoms presents important evidence for such research. The sole exception to this is the phrase πρὸς τινά which appears to be influenced by a literal rendering of the *Vorlage* and is unparalleled outside the LXX.

### 3.7 Message

Muraoka identifies ten different ‘syntagms’ in the LXX used to convey the message or content of an ‘order’ verb.<sup>76</sup> They are as follows:

- a) + inf.
- aa) ὥστε + inf.
- b) + dat. pers. and inf.
- c) + acc. rei
- d) + dat. pers. and acc. rei
- e) + (dat. pers.) + λέγων introducing an oratio recta
- f) + ἵνα or ὅπως with a subj.
- fa) + dat. pers. and ἵνα with a subj.
- g) + indicative, finite verb
- h) + imperative

<sup>71</sup> Horrocks 2010: 107–108. This section of Kingdoms belongs to the Kaige.

<sup>72</sup> P.Cair. Zen. 1 59057. P.Cair. Zen. 1 59066. P.Cair. Zen. 1 59093. P.Cair. Zen. 3 59408. P.Cair. Zen. 3 59416. P.Cair. Zen. 3 59488. P.Cair. Zen. 4 59598. P.Cair. Zen. 5 59816. P.Col. 4 91. P.Grenf 2 14c. P.Heid. 6 366. P.Lond. 7 1948. P.Petr. 2 42 (a). P.Tebt. 3 .1 702. P.Tebt. 3 .1 747. P.Zen. Pestm. 49. PSI 4 326. PSI 4 412. This figure excludes an additional six examples that are partially restored. - P.Cair. Zen. 1 59029. P.Cair. Zen. 1 59030. P.Cair. Zen. 2 59217. P.Cair. Zen. 4 59546. P. XV. Congr. 10. SB 26 16635.

<sup>73</sup> P.Bad. 4 48. P.Rainer Cent. 46. SB 20 14728. UPZ 1 61.

<sup>74</sup> BGU 8 1760. P.Ryl. 4 593. P.Tebt. 1 37.

<sup>75</sup> P.Berl. Zill. 13. P.Cair. Masp. 2 67161. SB 20 14987.

<sup>76</sup> Muraoka 2006: 71–80, esp. 71–72.

The last two of these are not, like the others, fully subordinated to the ‘order’ verb of the main clause. Although they occur as coordinated clauses introduced by *καί*, they nonetheless convey the content or message of the ‘order’ verb. Of Muraoka’s ten syntagms, six are attested in OG Kingdoms. The following table sets out the type of construction, the number of its occurrences and their locations in OG Kingdoms:

Table 7: *Syntagms Attested with ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms*<sup>77</sup>

Type	Occurrences	Reference
a) + inf	1	1Kgds 25:21
b) + dat. pers. and inf.	3	2Kgds 7:7      3Kgds 11:10(2) 3Kgds 17:4
c) + acc. rei	1	3Kgds 2:43
d) + dat. pers. and acc. rei	12	1Kgds 13:13      1Kgds 13:14(2) 1Kgds 21:3(1)      1Kgds 25:7 2Kgds 9:11      3Kgds 8:58 3Kgds 9:4      3Kgds 11:10(1) 3Kgds 11:11      3Kgds 11:38 3Kgds 13:21      3Kgds 15:5 <sup>78</sup>
e) + (dat. pers.) + λέγων introducing an oratio recta	4	1Kgds 18:22      3Kgds 2:351 3Kgds 13:9      3Kgds 13:17
g) + indicative, finite verb	3	2Kgds 4:12      3Kgds 2:46 3Kgds 6:1a
h) + imperative	1	3Kgds 5:20

There are an additional four occurrences in which the content of the command is not stated: these include 1 Kingdoms 20:29, 25:15, 21:3(2) and 2 Kingdoms 5:25. Two more examples of ἐντέλλομαι are found at 1 Kingdoms 13:14(1) and 25:30 that display a construction not noted by Muraoka. Specifically, *εἰς* with a substantivised participle. Finally, 3 Kingdoms 17:9 uses an articular infinitive to express the content of the order. Each of the constructions listed in the table above are discussed in turn below in relation to wider Greek usage. In order to reduce repetition, the issue of the recipient indicated by the dative case is ignored and Muraoka’s syntagms marked as a.) and b.) will be treated together, as will c.) and d.). Finally, the construction of *εἰς* with a substantivised participle,

<sup>77</sup> The numbers in brackets indicate that ἐντέλλομαι occurs more than once in the passage cited.

<sup>78</sup> This occurrence displays relative attraction.

not mentioned by Muraoka in his 2006 article but discussed in his *Lexicon*, occurs twice in OG Kingdoms and will be treated last.<sup>79</sup>

**a) + inf/ b) + dat. pers. and inf.**

Muraoka notes that in the expression of commands, Koine Greek tends to use subordinate clauses introduced by ἵνα or ὅπως over the bare infinitive. However, he also notes that the use of the infinitive remains ‘very much alive’ in LXX Greek.<sup>80</sup> In OG Kingdoms the use of the infinitive to express the content of a command occurs four times. Despite the general tendency of Koine Greek to favour ἵνα/ὅπως and ὅτι clauses over participial and infinitival constructions, Horrocks notes that infinitives remained standard in cases involving true control relations, such as order verbs.<sup>81</sup> This is confirmed by the papyrological evidence. The use of the bare infinitive with ἐντέλλομαι is common in papyri of the third century BCE.<sup>82</sup> There are four occurrences in the second century BCE.<sup>83</sup> This is extended by the second Century BCE epigraphic evidence for ἐντέλλομαι, in which the same construction is found three times.<sup>84</sup> On the whole, this construction is natural and well-attested in contemporary documentary evidence of the third and second centuries BCE.

**c) + acc. rei/ d) + dat. pers. and acc. rei**

Muraoka notes that a verbal noun is commonly used in the accusative case as the object of ‘order’ verbs.<sup>85</sup> The use of a direct object is frequent in OG Kingdoms, often occurring as a relative pronoun with ἐντολή<sup>86</sup> or πρόσταγμα<sup>87</sup> as its antecedent. Muraoka lists such cognate accusatives, specifically ἐντολή, alongside the use of verbal nouns.<sup>88</sup> Several

<sup>79</sup> 1Kgds 13:14 - καὶ ἐντελεῖται κύριος αὐτῷ εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ... (And the lord will command him to be ruler over his people...). 1Kgds 25:30 - καὶ ἐντελεῖται σοι κύριος εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ... (and the lord will command you to be leader over Israel...).

<sup>80</sup> Muraoka 2016: 576, §69.

<sup>81</sup> Horrocks 2010: 93–94. On the tendency of Koine Greek to use ἵνα/ὅπως and ὅτι clauses over participial and infinitive constructions, see Horrocks 2010: 92–96, cf. Voitila 2016: 112. Mandilaras notes that it is standard practice for the language of the papyri to use an infinitive with verbs of ‘ordering’, ‘commanding’ and ‘persuading’. Mandilaras 1973: 329–330, § 796.

<sup>82</sup> P.Bad. 4 48. P.Cair. Zen. 1 59029. P.Cair. Zen. 1 59066. P.Cair. Zen. 1 59093. P.Cair. Zen. 5 59816. P.Grenf 2 14c. P.Lond. 7 1948. P.Sorb. 3 88. P.Zen. Pestm. 49. SB 20 14728. There are several other partially restored examples - P.Cair. Zen. 1 59030. P.Cair. Zen. 2 59217. P.Hib. 2 248. P.Rainer Cent. 46. P. XV. Congr. 10. As noted by LSJ, this construction is common with ἐντέλλομαι in Classical Greek. LSJ s.v. ἐντέλλω, I – ‘c. dat. pers. et inf.’

<sup>83</sup> P.Bad. 4 48. P.Rainer Cent. 46. SB 20 14728. UPZ 1 61.

<sup>84</sup> FD 3.3: 239. IG XII, 3: 91. IG XII, 3: 330.

<sup>85</sup> Muraoka 2006: 75.

<sup>86</sup> 1Kgds 13:13; 3Kgds 2:43, 13:21.

<sup>87</sup> 3Kgds 8:58, 11:11.

<sup>88</sup> Muraoka 2006: 76.

similar uses occur in cases where a neuter plural relative serves as the object of a form ἐντέλλομαι.<sup>89</sup> Muraoka is typically silent regarding the connection of this construction to wider Greek usage. Nevertheless, the use of a bare accusative object is attested since the Classical period; LSJ provides the note ‘τινί τι’.<sup>90</sup> It is however, not a common feature of the language of the papyri.

### **e) + (dat. pers.) + λέγων introducing an *oratio recta***

This construction, which is found commonly with a variety of verbs in the LXX, is noted by Muraoka as a case of anacolouth in which λέγων functions as a stereotypical rendering of למור and introduces direct speech.<sup>91</sup> This is the case with OG Kingdoms; all four occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι collocated with a participial form of λέγω render the Hebrew construction למור ... צוה.<sup>92</sup> Additionally, in each occurrence of ἐντέλλομαι with a dependent λέγων, the following direct statement contains a direct command.<sup>93</sup> The corresponding Hebrew direct statements likewise contain direct commands, commonly marked by a

<sup>89</sup> 1Kgds 13:14; 2Kgds 9:11; 3Kgds 9:4, 11:10, 11:38, 15:5 (this final example is a case of relative attraction).

<sup>90</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘ἐντέλλομαι’, A.1. – in support of this, LSJ references Herodotus 1.47 - ἐντεϊλάμενος δὲ τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι τάδε ἀπέπεμπε ἐς τὴν διάπειραν τῶν χρηστηρίων ... (He gave the Lydians these instructions and he sent to test the oracles ...)

<sup>91</sup> Muraoka *Syn.* 780, § 90 e.; The use of λέγων introducing direct speech is common in OG Kingdoms. It occurs 135 times with various introductory forms of λέγω; λέγων - 1Kgds 2:20, 2:36, 7:3, 9:15, 9:26, 10:2, 10:18, 11:7, 11:14, 12:6, 13:3, 14:24, 14:28, 15:10, 16:19, 16:22, 18:22, 19:2, 19:6, 19:15, 20:21 bis, 20:38, 23:2, 23:27, 24:9, 25:14, 26:6, 26:14, 27:1, 27:11, 27:12, 28:10, 30:8, 30:26; 2Kgds 1:16, 2:1, 2:22, 3:12, 3:13, 3:14, 3:17, 3:18, 3:35, 5:19, 6:9, 7:4, 7:7, 7:27; 3Kgds 2:23, 2:29 bis, 2:30, 2:35l, 2:35n, 2:42, 5:16, 5:19, 5:22, 8:15, 8:25, 8:55, 9:5, 12:6, 12:12, 12:14, 12:16, 12:22, 12:23, 12:24d, 12:24o, 12:24y bis, 13:3 bis, 13:4, 13:9, 13:12, 13:17, 13:18, 13:21, 13:22, 13:31, 15:18, 18:1, 18:29, 18:31, 20:2, 20:6, 20:9, 20:17, 20:19, 20:23, 21:5, 21:10. λέγοντες - 1Kgds 5:10, 6:2, 6:21, 14:33, 15:12, 18:22, 19:19, 20:42, 23:1, 23:19, 25:40, 26:1, 26:19, 27:11, 29:5; 2Kgds 2:4, 3:23, 5:6, 6:12; 3Kgds 2:29, 2:39, 2:41, 8:47, 12:3, 12:7, 12:10 bis, 12:24t, 20:10, 20:13, 20:14, 21:17. λεγόντων - 1Kgds 13:4, 24:2, 24:10; 3Kgds 12:9, 16:16. λέγουσα - 1Kgds 1:11, 19:11. λέγουσαι - 1Kgds 21:12. The use of the participle is consistently in agreement with the speaker, which indicates that λέγων has not yet become fixed.

<sup>92</sup> 1Kgds 18:22 - καὶ ἐνετείλατο Σαουλ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ λέγων Λαλήσατε ... (And Saoul commanded his servants saying, ‘speak ...). 3Kgds 2:35l - Καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔτι Δαυιδ ζῆν ἐνετείλατο τῷ Σαλωμων λέγων Ἰδοὺ μετὰ σοῦ Σεμεὶ υἱὸς Γηρα υἱὸς σπέρματος τοῦ Ιεμινι ἐκ Χεβρων’ (And while David was still alive, he commanded Salomon saying, ‘look, Semei, the son of Gera of the seed of Iemini from Chebron is with you.’). 3Kgds 13:9 - ὅτι οὕτως ἐνετείλατό μοι ἐν λόγῳ κύριος λέγων Μὴ φάγῃς ἄρτον καὶ μὴ πίῃς ὕδωρ καὶ μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣ ἐπορεύθης ἐν αὐτῇ. (Because in this way the Lord commanded me with a word saying, ‘Do not eat food and do not drink water and do not turn back on the road, on which you came on it.’). 3Kgds 13:17 - ὅτι οὕτως ἐντέταλταί μοι ἐν λόγῳ κύριος λέγων Μὴ φάγῃς ἄρτον ἐκεῖ καὶ μὴ πίῃς ὕδωρ ἐκεῖ καὶ μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣ ἐπορεύθης ἐν αὐτῇ. (Because in this way the Lord commanded me with a word saying, ‘Do not eat food there and do not drink water there and do not turn back on the road, on which you came on it.’)

<sup>93</sup> 1Kgds 18:22 - Λαλήσατε (speak). 3Kgds 13:9 - Μὴ φάγῃς ἄρτον καὶ μὴ πίῃς ὕδωρ καὶ μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς ... (do not eat bread and do not drink water and do not turn ...). 3Kgds 13:17 - Μὴ φάγῃς ἄρτον ἐκεῖ καὶ μὴ πίῃς ὕδωρ ἐκεῖ καὶ μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς (do not eat food there, and do not drink water there and do not turn ...). In the case of 3Kgds 2:35l the direct command, ‘καὶ νῦν μὴ ἀθώωσῃς αὐτόν’ (and now do not leave him unpunished), does not occur until 3Kgds 2:35o.



yiqṭōl/imperfect verb with אֵל expressing a prohibition.<sup>94</sup> The use of μὴ with an aorist subjunctive effectively matches the underlying Hebrew. More significantly, it simultaneously demonstrates a creative use of an equivalent expression in the Greek language. The use of μὴ with a subjunctive expressing a prohibition is extremely common in the papyri and is frequent in the Classical language.<sup>95</sup> As to the use of λέγων, Conybeare and Stock refer to this construction as a ‘special case of irregularity in LXX Greek’ and that ‘in the N.T. this Hebraism occurs only once’.<sup>96</sup> Muraoka offers the simple assessment that ‘This is no Hebraism’.<sup>97</sup> In support, he points to the LSJ entry for λέγω which notes that it may be used pleonastically in conjunction with another verb of saying.<sup>98</sup> In support of this assertion, LSJ offers a number of references to Classical literature.<sup>99</sup> However, there are no occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι with a participial form of λέγω and a direct statement expressing the content of a command in the papyri. Nevertheless, this is not unnatural Greek. The sense is certainly clear, and its component parts are all attested in contemporary Greek. However, its prevalence in OG Kingdoms and the LXX is due to the Hebrew source text.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>94</sup> 1Sam 18:22 has the imperative דברו Pi'el - וכלעבדיו (Saul commanded his servants, "Speak to David in private and say, 'See, the king is delighted with you, and all his servants love you; now then, become the king's son-in-law.'" NRSV). The remainder of the occurrences have a yiqtol/imperfect with לא expressing a prohibition. van der Merwe and Naudé and Kroeze 2017: 163–164, § 19.3.5.1. 1Kings 2:9 (= 3Kgs 2:35L) - ועתה אלתיקורו - (Therefore do not hold him guiltless NRSV). The לא is in the preceding verse. 1Kings 13:9 (= 3Kgs 13:9) - כי־כן צוה - (For thus I was commanded by the word of the LORD: You shall not eat food, or drink water, or return by the way that you came." NRSV). 1Kings 13:17 (= 3Kgs 13:17) - כי־דבר אלי בדבר יהוה לא־תאכל לחם ולא־תשתה שם מים לא־תשוב ללכת בדרך אשר־ - (for it was said to me by the word of the LORD: You shall not eat food or drink water there, or return by the way that you came.").

<sup>95</sup> Mandilaras 1973: 253, § 562.

<sup>96</sup> Conybeare and Stock 1995 [reprinted from 1905]: 97, § 112. The Single NT reference is to Rev 11:15 - Καὶ ὁ ἕβδομος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν· καὶ ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, λέγοντες Ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ ...'. (and the seventh angel sounded his trumpet; and there were great voices in the sky, saying 'The kingdom of the world has begun, of our Lord and of his anointed one ...')

<sup>97</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. 'λέγω', l. c.

<sup>98</sup> LSJ s.v. 'λέγω', iii. 7.

<sup>99</sup> Hdt. 1.122 - 'ἔλεγε φάς', 3.156 - 'ἔφη λέγων', 5.36. Ar. *An.* 472 - 'ἔφασκε λέγων', *V.* 795 - 'ἦ δ' ὅς λέγων'. S. *Aj.* 757 - 'ὥς ἔφη λέγων'. D 8.74 'καὶ λέγων εἶπεν οὕτω πως'.

<sup>100</sup> Eventually, the use of λέγων as an equivalent to ‘double quotation marks in modern languages’, as Muraoka terms it, can be problematic in the LXX. Muraoka *Syn.* 382, § 31. daa. Muraoka provides the example of Gen 22:20 - καὶ ἀνηγγέλη τῷ Ἀβραάμ λέγοντες Ἰδοὺ... (and it was reported to Abraam saying, ‘look...’). OG Kingdoms consistently matches the gender, number and case of the participle to the speaker.

**g) + indicative, finite verb**

Muraoka notes that the LXX occasionally indicates the message of an order though ‘a paratactically conjoined second verb.’<sup>101</sup> In his discussion of this construction, Muraoka includes two examples from OG Kingdoms; 2 Kingdoms 4:12 and 3 Kingdoms 2:46.<sup>102</sup> To this may be added 3 Kingdoms 6:1a:

καὶ ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ αἴρουσιν λίθους μεγάλους τιμίους εἰς τὸν θεμέλιον τοῦ οἴκου καὶ λίθους ἀπελεκήτους·

(... that the king ordered and they take large valuable stones for the foundation of the house and unhewn stones.)<sup>103</sup>

This is not natural Greek. The Hebrew verb צוה commonly expresses the content of the command in a coordinate clause with a *wəqāṭal*/consecutive perfect verb.<sup>104</sup> This is the construction that the MT uses at 1 Kings 5:31, the section corresponding to 3 Kingdoms 6:1a above:

ויצו המלך ויסעו אבנים גדלות אבנים יקרות ליסד הבית אבני גזית

(At the king’s command, they quarried out great, costly stones in order to lay the foundation of the house with dressed stones. NRSV)

From a text-as-received perspective it is unlikely that readers with no understanding of Hebrew syntax would understand that the paratactic clause introduced by καὶ defines the content of the command.<sup>105</sup> Moreover, it has been suggested that the translator of OG Kingdoms has limited control over Hebrew.<sup>106</sup> It is not entirely clear that he understood the nuances of the Hebrew construction he was rendering. Regardless, the resulting Greek does

<sup>101</sup> Muraoka 2006: 78.

<sup>102</sup> 2Kgs 4:12 - καὶ ἐνετείλατο Δαυὶδ τοῖς παιδαρίοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποκτείνουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ κολοβοῦσιν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκρέμασαν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς κρήνης ἐν Χεβρων ... (and David ordered his servants and they killed them and cut off their hands and their feet and they hung them at the well in Chebron ...). 3Kgs 2:46 - καὶ ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμων τῷ Βαναϊα υἱῷ Ἰωδαε, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀνεῖλεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀπέθανεν· (and the king Solomon ordered Banaia the son of Iodae, and he went out and killed him, and he died;).

<sup>103</sup> This translation begins with ‘that’ as the preceding verse, 3Kgs 6:1, begins ‘Καὶ ἐγενήθη ...’ ‘and it came about that ...’. cf. Muraoka *Syn.* 2016: 614–617, § 72. j.

<sup>104</sup> HALOT s.v. ‘צוה’, 2.a. van der Merwe and Naudé and Kroeze 2017: 195, § 21.3.1.1.(2).

<sup>105</sup> Taylor translates the Greek text as ‘...that the king commanded, and they took great, costly stones for the foundation of the house, and unhewn stone.’ Taylor, 2007b: 302. It seems that Taylor does not see the ‘paratactically conjoined second verb’ as inherently expressing the content of the order.

<sup>106</sup> Wirth 2016: 220.

not reflect a natural Koine feature. Contrary to Muraoka, this perhaps should not be recognised as an identifiable feature of LXX syntax. The rules of LXX syntax are the rules of Koine Greek. If we can confidently assert that the translator intended the second paratactic clause to express the content of the command, it is to be seen as a Hebraism resulting from translation-technique. Otherwise, it is simply two coordinated clauses.

## h) + imperative

This construction occurs once in OG Kingdoms at 3 Kingdoms 5:20:

καὶ νῦν ἔντειλαι καὶ κοψάτωσάν μοι ξύλα ἐκ τοῦ Λιβάνου ...

(and now order and let them cut down wood for me from Lebanon ...)

The OG text here aligns word for word with the underlying Hebrew:

ועתה צוה ויכרתו לי ארזים מן הלבנון

(Therefore command that cedars from the Lebanon be cut for me. NRSV)

In the MT, the content of the command is expressed by a coordinated jussive/short *yiqṭōl*.<sup>107</sup> Some examples of similar constructions in compositional Greek, especially lower register writings, may be adduced from the papyri.<sup>108</sup> However, the presence of similar phenomena in the papyri, is not particularly relevant in these circumstances.<sup>109</sup> Given the close correspondence of the Greek to the Hebrew this is best explained as a literalistic

<sup>107</sup> van der Merwe and Naudé and Kroeze 2017: 169, § 19.5.1.3. cf. HALOT s.v. 'צוה', 2. HALOT notes that the command is expressed in a coordinate clause with a consecutive perfect or a jussive. For the note on the use of the jussive in such constructions, HALOT references this exact passage, 1Kings 5:20.

<sup>108</sup> The expression of a command through the addition of a logically connected imperative is attested with the verb ἐντέλλομαι in two papyri dating to the end of the third century CE. SB 6 9077. 1–6 = P.Prag.Varcl 2.19 (253–256 CE c.) - Κοπρῆς Ζωσίμου/τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν./ πάντως ἐνετειλάμην/ σοι ξύλα κόψον καὶ ξύλι-/σον καὶ παράδος Ἡρώ-/νίνω τῷ φρ(οντιστῇ). (Kopres to Zosimos his brother greetings. I have certainly ordered you, cut wood and kindling and give it to Heroninos the manager.). P.Mich. 3. 219. 5–7 (296–297 CE c.) - καὶ ἐντέλλομέ σοι,/ κύριε μου ἄδελφαι, πρόσεχε τῇ θυγα-/τρί μου, καὶ, ἢ τινος χρίαν ἔχει, δὸς αὐτῇ. (And I order you, my lord brother, look after my daughter, and, if she has need of anything, give it to her.) This evidence is late. Moreover, it is further weakened by the fact that the introductory verb of the OG Kingdoms passage is itself an imperative and, in addition, that the logically dependent imperative is third person and introduced by καί. Finally, the syntax of these papyri is best explained by the fact that the writer has shifted into direct discourse.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Stolk 2015: 72 - 'Papyrus documents are written by a large number of different scribes and they do not show the same degree of standardization as may perhaps be expected from literary texts. This means that evidence could be found for almost any linguistic claim.'

rendering. While it is best to attribute the construction to Hebraistic influence, internally it is functional as Greek and the meaning is clear.

### **εἰς + accusative**

Finally, OG Kingdoms sometimes indicates the content of the order expressed by ἐντέλλομαι with the preposition εἰς and a dependent accusative. In his lexicon, Muraoka notes that when this construction is found with ἐντέλλομαι the verb takes the sense of ‘to authorize sbd to act as’.<sup>110</sup> The only references he provides for this construction are the two occurrences in OG Kingdoms.<sup>111</sup> The first, 1 Kingdoms 13:14, runs, along with its corresponding Hebrew:

καὶ ἐντελεῖται κύριος αὐτῷ εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ...

(And the lord will command him to be ruler over his people...)

וַיְצוּהוּ יְהוָה לְנָגִיד עַל-עַמּוֹ ...

(and the LORD has appointed him to be ruler over his people... NRSV)

The second, 1 Kingdoms 25:30, runs:

... καὶ ἐντελεῖταί σοι κύριος εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ.

(... and the lord will command you to be leader over Israel.)

... וַיִּצוֹךְ לְנָגִיד עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל

(... and has appointed you prince over Israel. NRSV)

As can be seen, the Greek prepositional phrases, εἰς ἄρχοντα and εἰς ἡγούμενον, both render לְנָגִיד.<sup>112</sup> This sense and construction are influenced by the underlying Hebrew.

<sup>110</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘ἐντέλλομαι’, 3.b.

<sup>111</sup> He provides the note ‘+ dat. pers., εἰς ἄρχοντα ‘as ruler’ 1K 13.14, εἰς ἡγούμενον ‘as leader’ 25.30’. Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘ἐντέλλομαι’, 3.b.

<sup>112</sup> The variation between ἄρχοντα and ἡγούμενον is difficult. The former example, 1Kgds 13:14, has Samouel talking to Saoul about a future king, that is Dauid. The second, 1Kgds 25:30, occurs in a speech given by Abigaia to Dauid. There appears to be no difference in reference. Thus, ἄρχοντα and ἡγούμενον seem semantically interchangeable. Perhaps the variation is attributable to the following prepositional phrases. In the former the ruler is set ‘over the people’; in the latter, the leader is set ‘over Israel’. Perhaps the translator saw a clearer relationship between an ἄρχων and λαὸς, and between a ἡγεμὼν and a nation or

HALOT notes that when צוה occurs with the prepositional phrase לנגיד, the sense is to be taken as ‘to commission’.<sup>113</sup> This aligns with the sense assigned by Muraoka to ἐντέλλομαι in such cases. This construction occurs in other verses of OG Kingdoms with different verbs<sup>114</sup> and appears throughout the LXX.<sup>115</sup> This is not natural Greek; it is a Hebraism.

tribe. This is another interesting case of lexical variation on the part of the translator that runs counter to his tendency toward stereotyping.

<sup>113</sup> HALOT s.v. ‘צוה’, 3. a. All of the references given by HALOT are to Samuel-Kings. 1Sam 13:14, 25:30; 2Sam 6:21; 1Kings 1:35. The second two of these references correspond to Kaige passages. 2Kgs 6:21 - εὐλογητὸς κύριος, ὃς ἐξελέξατό με ὑπὲρ τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντα τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταστήσασαί με εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ· (blessed be the Lord who chose me over your father and over all his house to appoint me as leader for his people, for Israel; NETS). 3Kgs 1:35 - καὶ ἐγὼ ἐνετείλαμην τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα. (and I myself commanded that he be ruler over Israel and Iouda. NETS).

<sup>114</sup> 1Kgs 9:16 - καὶ χρίσεις αὐτὸν εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν μου Ἰσραὴλ ... (And you will anoint him as leader over my people Israel ...) = ומשחתו לנגיד על-עמי ישראל... (and you shall anoint him to be ruler over my people Israel. NRSV). 1Kgs 10:1 bis - Οὐχὶ κέχρικέν σε κύριος εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ; ... ὅτι ἔχρισέν σε κύριος ἐπὶ κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἄρχοντα· (Has the lord not anointed you as ruler over his people, over Israel? ... that the lord anointed you as ruler over his inheritance.) = הלוא כִּי־משחך יהוה על־נחלתו (Has the Lord not anointed you as ruler over his inheritance?). The MT lacks an equivalent to the first Greek clause. 2Kgs 5:2 - καὶ σὺ ἔσει εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ. (and you will be ruler over Israel.) = ואתה תהיה לנגיד על־ישראל... (and you will be ruler over Israel.). 2Kgs 6:21 - ... τοῦ καταστήσασαί με εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ· (... to establish me as leader over his people, over Israel ...) = ... לצות אתי נגיד על-עם יהוה על־ישראל... (to appoint me as prince over Israel, the people of the LORD. NRSV). 2Kgs 7:8 - τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν μου ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ. (... in order for you to be ruler over my people, over Israel.) = להיות נגיד על-עמי על־ישראל... (to be prince over my people Israel. NRSV). 3Kgs 12:24b - καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν Σαλωμων εἰς ἄρχοντα σκυτάλης ἐπὶ τὰς ἄρσεις οἴκου Ἰωσηφ ... (and Salomon made him ruler of the cudgel over the burdens of the house of Ioseph ... NETS) = 1Kings 11:28 (NRSV). 3Kgs 12:24t bis - εἰς τὰ σκηνώματά σου, Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ εἰς ἄρχοντα οὐδὲ εἰς ἡγούμενον. (to your tents, Israel, because this man is not a leader or a ruler.) The MT equivalent found at 1 Kings 12:16 varies considerably from the Greek and has nothing mirroring the Greek εἰς ἄρχοντα and εἰς ἡγούμενον.

<sup>115</sup> Judg 11:6 - Δεῦρο καὶ ἔσῃ ἡμῖν εἰς ἡγούμενον ... (Come and you will be a leader to us...) = ... והייתה לנו (Come and be our commander... NRSV). Judg 11:11 - καὶ κατέστησαν αὐτὸν ἐπ’ αὐτῶν εἰς κεφαλὴν εἰς ἡγούμενον. (And they appointed him over them as a head for a leader.) = וישמו העם אותו עליהם לראש (and the people made him head and commander over them. NRSV). 2Kgs 23:19 (Kaige) - καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς εἰς ἄρχοντα. (And he became a commander for them. NETS) = ויהי להם לשר (and [he] became their commander. NRSV). 3Kgs 1:35 (Kaige) - καὶ ἐγὼ ἐνετείλαμην τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα. (and I myself commanded that he be ruler over Israel and Iouda. NETS) = ואתו צויתי (For I have appointed him to be ruler over Israel and over Judah. NRSV). 1Suppl 5:2 - ὅτι Ἰουδᾶς δυνατὸς ἰσχύι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐξ αὐτοῦ. (Because Ioudas was powerful in strength also among his brothers and one from him became a leader. NETS) = כי יהודה גבר באחיו ולנגיד ממנו (Though Judah became prominent among his brothers and a ruler came from him. NRSV). 1Suppl 11:2 - καὶ σὺ ἔσῃ εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ. (and you will be a leader over Israel.) = ואתה תהיה נגיד על עמי ישראל (You who shall be ruler over my people Israel. NRSV). 1Suppl 11:6 tris - Πᾶς τύπτων Ἰεβουσαῖον ἐν πρώτοις καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἄρχοντα καὶ εἰς στρατηγόν· καὶ ἀνέβη ἐπ’ αὐτὴν ἐν πρώτοις Ἰωαβ υἱὸς Σαρουῖα καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς ἄρχοντα. (“Anyone who first strikes a Jebusite will be a commander and a general.” And Joab son of Sarouia went up first and was made a commander. NETS) = כל־מכה יבوسی בראשונה יהיה לראש ולשר ויעל בראשונה יואב בן־צרויה ויהי לראש וקצין (Whoever attacks the Jebusites first shall be chief and commander.” And Joab son of Zeruiah went up first, so he became chief. NRSV). 1Suppl 17:7 - ... τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν μου Ἰσραὴλ· (... to be a leader over my people Israel;) = להיות נגיד על עמי ישראל... (to be ruler over my people Israel. NRSV). 1Suppl 11:21 - καὶ ἦν αὐτοῖς εἰς ἄρχοντα καὶ ἔως τῶν τριῶν οὐκ ἦρχετο. (and he was their chief, and as far as the three he would not come. NETS) = ויהי להם לשר (And [he] became their commander; but he did not attain to the Three.). 2Suppl 6:5 - καὶ οὐκ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν ἀνδρὶ τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν μου Ἰσραὴλ· (and I did not choose for a man to be leader over my people Israel; NETS) = ולא בחרתי באיש להיות נגיד על עמי ישראל (And I chose no one as ruler over my people Israel. NRSV). 2Suppl 11:22 - καὶ κατέστησεν εἰς ἄρχοντα Ποβοαμ τὸν Αβια τὸν τῆς

The prepositional phrases εἰς ἡγούμενον and εἰς ἄρχοντα are unattested with ἐντέλλομαι in this sense in the literature and the documentary evidence of the Koine period. As Greek, it may be interpreted as an extension of the use of the preposition εἰς as indicating purpose or object.<sup>116</sup> Nevertheless, it results from a literalistic rendering of the preposition לְ with a dependent noun meaning ‘leader’ or ‘ruler’.

### **3.8 Concluding Remarks on the Syntax of ἐντέλλομαι**

The syntax of ἐντέλλομαι represents a mix of natural Greek and Hebraistic influence. Within the parameters of this study, the influence of the source text is most notable in the use of ἐντέλλομαι with the prepositional phrase εἰς with an accusative indicating the assigning of someone to a role. This is a clear reflection of the underlying Hebrew צוה לנגיד. Muraoka’s identification of the content of ‘order’ verbs being expressed through coordinate finite verbs, both indicative and imperative, is problematic. Muraoka’s interpretation appears to be based on a reading of the Greek through the underlying Hebrew. *Qua* text, it is perhaps better to interpret such constructions as two paratactically joined independent clauses. It is clunky and certainly not good Greek prose style, but it is intelligible as Greek. Nevertheless, the majority of the syntagmatic relations into which ἐντέλλομαι enters in OG Kingdoms are natural. This is especially true for those cases in which ἐντέλλομαι takes a dative of the person commanded and an infinitive expressing the content of the command. Like πολεμῶ, it is significant that Greek case syntax is unaffected by the source text. Hence the use of a dative as marking the recipient of the command represents contemporary standard Greek. Finally, the common use of an accusative object is partly inspired by the source text but is not unnatural.

---

Μααχα εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ. (And Roboam appointed Abia son of Maacha as ruler, as leader among his brothers. NETS) = ויעמד לראש רחבעם את אביה בן מעכה לנגיד (Rehoboam appointed Abijah son of Maacah as chief prince among his brothers. NRSV). 2Esd 15:14 - Ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἐνετείλατό μοι εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα αὐτῶν ἐν γῇ Ιουδα ... (From the day that he commanded me to be their ruler in the land of Iouda ... NETS) = Neh 5:14 - גם מיום אשר צוה אתי להיות פהם בארץ יהודה (Moreover from the time that I was appointed to be their governor in the land of Judah. NRSV). 1Makk 9:30 bis - νῦν οὖν σὲ ἡρετισάμεθα σήμερον τοῦ εἶναι ἀντ' αὐτοῦ ἡμῖν εἰς ἄρχοντα καὶ ἡγούμενον ... (Now then we have chosen you today in his place to be for us a ruler and a leader ... NETS). Mic 5:1 - ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ισραηλ. (One from you shall come forth for me to become a ruler in Israel. NETS) = מִמְּךָ לִי יֵצֵא לְהוֹיֹת מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל (from you shall come forth for me one who is to rule in Israel. NRSV).

<sup>116</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘εἰς’, A.V.1. SM *Grammar* § 1686d.

### 3.9 Concluding Remarks on ἐντέλλομαι

The presence of ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms reflects developments in lexical patterns evidenced in the early Koine period. Lee notes that κελεύω, the standard ‘order’ verb of the Classical period, loses much of its potency in Koine Greek. In its place, he argues, ‘other formal, authoritative-sounding words were preferred to express ‘command, instruct, direct.’<sup>117</sup> This aligns with the presence of ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms. It is likely that the heavier and more formal ‘tone’ of the word, noted by Lee, motivated the translator to use it over the other common ‘order’ verbs in view of the gravity of the subject material. However, as ἐντέλλομαι is the only ‘order’ verb found in this text, it is impossible to study its ‘tone’ or ‘flavour’ in consideration of each individual context. Moreover, ἐντέλλομαι itself is partially stripped of its ‘tone’ as a result of its universal application regardless of that context. Nevertheless, the selection of this verb over other options suggests firstly that it was a word in contemporary use although it was not as common as other ‘order’ verbs. Significantly, it is probable that it chosen due to the fact that its tone was appropriate to the gravity of the material. Nor does the equation of הָצַו with ἐντέλλομαι result in significant semantic extension.

In relation to the Pentateuch, Lee draws the conclusion that the translators in general ‘adopted a middle-level Koine Greek of their time, moderately educated, but not literary, and not colloquial or informal.’<sup>118</sup> This conclusion may be extended to OG Kingdoms with the addendum that this translation inclined more toward stereotyping. The relevance of Lee’s conclusion to OG Kingdoms may be supported by its use of ἐντέλλομαι, an official sounding word evidenced in contemporary Greek papyri. Additionally, while it does not specifically illustrate developments in Koine Greek, the syntax of ἐντέλλομαι in OG Kingdoms is largely natural with some noted exceptions.

Finally, it is interesting to consider the possibility that the LXX not only reflects linguistic change in the Koine period, but also prompts it. While ἐντέλλομαι was certainly a common word throughout the Koine period, the extreme prevalence of the word in Christian writers of the Middle and Late Koine period is perhaps partly attributable to the linguistic influence of the LXX. It is well known that the LXX supplanted the original Hebrew compositions

---

<sup>117</sup> Lee 2018: 64.

<sup>118</sup> Lee 2018:63.

and became the standard Bible of many Jews and Christians.<sup>119</sup> Its cultural and religious significance was such that it is possible that its linguistic peculiarities and lexical preferences, such as the common use of ἐντέλλομαι, may have informed subsequent developments in the Greek language.

---

<sup>119</sup> Dines 2004: 135.



## ἔρχομαι/πορεύομαι

Ancient Greek has a diverse vocabulary belonging to what Louw and Nida refer to as the ‘domain of linear movement’, that is verbs expressing the idea of physical motion from one place to another.<sup>1</sup> In his 1983 thesis, Lee outlined and demonstrated the presence of a range of Koine period developments in this lexical domain in the Greek Pentateuch.<sup>2</sup> In pursuit of the main aims of the thesis, this chapter aims to identify to what degree the observations of Lee apply to the OG sections of the Books of Kingdoms and thereby demonstrate the naturalness of the language when viewed against contemporary Koine period developments. In Classical Attic Greek, ἔρχομαι was the main verb meaning both ‘to go’ and ‘to come’. This verb was highly suppletive, with many forms and tenses derived from εἶμι and ἦλθον. Additionally, this system was used in numerous verbal compounds in the Classical period. Amongst the array of changes in the Koine period, perhaps the most evident is the increased prominence of πορεύομαι, especially in verbal compounds. These dynamic and identifiable developments led Evans to propose that this semantic domain provides a valuable avenue of study for dating books of the LXX. He notes that, ‘the contrasts among verbs of “going” must be viewed against a complicated set of developments occurring in the post-classical Koine.’<sup>3</sup> While the dating of OG Kingdoms is not the primary goal of this chapter or thesis, the identifiable Koine period developments in this domain, which primarily affect lexicon, semantics and morphology, offer a powerful tool for the linguistic contextualisation of these books.<sup>4</sup>

Aside from ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι, the ‘domain of linear movement’ contains numerous other verbs including ἵκω, οἶχομαι, ἀφικνέομαι, παραγίνομαι, βαίνω and ὑπάγω, which is a very late addition, along with a range of verbal compounds, including notably ἀποτρέχω. Due to word and time constraints, these other words are considered only briefly and

<sup>1</sup> For a representative selection of such words evidenced in NT vocabulary see Louw and Nida 1989: §15.

<sup>2</sup> Lee 1983: 85–92, 125–128, 144.

<sup>3</sup> Evans 2010a: 19.

<sup>4</sup> In this respect it is also significant to note that the dating criteria offered by linguistic data can only provide a date within a few centuries. The primary support offered by this kind of study would be to confirm that the language aligns with standard second century BCE usage and thereby support the date advanced by previous studies.

especially as they relate to the use of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι and their compounds or are otherwise particularly relevant to Koine period linguistic developments.

#### 4.1 History of ἔρχομαι, πορεύομαι and Compounds

The earliest attestations of the ἔρχομαι system may be seen in the linear B documents which preserve forms of εἶμι.<sup>5</sup> Upon the re-emergence of written records for Greek, the system of ἔρχομαι with the suppletive εἶμι and ἦλθον, is extremely common. This system had the sense of both ‘to come’ and ‘to go’ in Classical Greek.<sup>6</sup> In Attic, the present indicative forms were provided by ἔρχομαι. The oblique moods, however, along with the non-finite forms were derived from εἶμι, which also provided the future and imperfect tenses. The alternative future ἐλεύσομαι is rare in Attic prose but common in Homer, tragedy and the Ionic dialect.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, forms of the imperfect ἤρχομην are extremely rare in Classical literature, even in compounds.<sup>8</sup> Finally, the aorist is provided by ἦλθον, which also provides the perfect, ἐλήλυθα.<sup>9</sup> Compound forms derived from the system of ἔρχομαι, εἶμι and ἦλθον are extremely common in Classical Greek literature, as the following table demonstrates:

Table 8: *Occurrences of -έρχομαι Compounds in Classical Literature*

	5th century BCE	4th century BCE
ἀνα-	35	46
ἀπο-	420	235
δια-	493	312
εἰς-	362	300
ἐκ- / ἐξ-	339	277
ἐπι-	251	155
κατα-	177	65
μετα-	49	35
παρα-	322	274
περι-	78	48

<sup>5</sup> Jorro and Adrados 1999: s.v. ‘i-jo-te’. PY An 1.1, MY Au 657.1, KN B 7041, L 682.2, KN V 1523, Cf. Chadwick and Baumbach 1963: 188, s.v. ‘εἶμι’. Regarding the earliest history of ἔρχομαι, Chantraine states ‘Pas d’étymologie assurée’. Chantraine *DELG* s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’. Beekes derives it from the Indo-European root \*h<sub>2</sub>erg<sup>h</sup>. Beekes *EDG* s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’. He further proposes that εἶμι, which provides the standard Attic future and imperfect forms, is derived from Indo-European \*h<sub>1</sub>ei-. Beekes *EDG* s.v. ‘ἐλεύσομαι’. Beekes is, however, unsure concerning the etymology of ἦλθον. Beekes *EDG* s.v. ‘ἐλθεῖν’.

<sup>6</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’, II.

<sup>7</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’, A.

<sup>8</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’, A.

<sup>9</sup> LSJ notes that the stem ἐλυθ- provides the aorist, perfect and future ἐλεύσομαι. LSJ s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’, A.

προ-	115	155
προσ-	252	239
συν-	207	116
ὑπο-	76	19

This verbal system undergoes extensive change in the Koine period.<sup>10</sup> Semantically, ἔρχομαι loses the sense of ‘to go’ but continues with the restricted meaning of ‘to come’.<sup>11</sup> This development has persisted into the modern language.<sup>12</sup> In general, forms derived from εἶμι are largely obsolete by the early Koine period, especially in the simplex.<sup>13</sup> Notwithstanding, certain forms, such as the present infinitive and participles derived from εἶμι, endure for longer, particularly in compound forms.<sup>14</sup> Even Polybius’ literary Koine evidences the decline of εἶμι.<sup>15</sup> Instead, in the Koine future tense forms are increasingly derived from the Ionic ἐλεύσομαι.<sup>16</sup> LSJ offers the brief note that ἐλεύσομαι is ‘freq. later.’<sup>17</sup> Such forms are attested in the epigraphy<sup>18</sup> and in the papyri of the Koine period.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Much of the following Koine period history for words occupying the ‘domain of linear movement’, especially that concerning compound verbs, is dependent on Lee 1983: 86–92 and 128.

<sup>11</sup> BDF § 101, s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’. Chantraine *DELG* s.v. ‘εἶμι’. Lee 1983: 86, n.1.

<sup>12</sup> TD s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’.

<sup>13</sup> Mayser *Grammatik* i<sup>2</sup> 355–356, § 73, II, 9 - ‘Das Verbum εἶμι, dessen Futurbedeutung nicht mehr fühlbar ist, wird immer spärlicher gebraucht und durch ἔρχομαι ersetzt; im N. T. ist es selten, dagegen auffallend häufig bei den apostolischen Vätern.’, cf. ii.2, 126–127. Mandilaras 1973: 80, § 120. Regarding the loss of εἶμι in the LXX and NT see Lee 2018: 119, 1983: 86, n. 4. BDF § 99.1. Thackeray 1909: 257 – ‘Εἶμι in the LXX period had well-nigh disappeared from popular speech, being replaced by the hitherto unused tenses and moods of ἔρχομαι.’ Chantraine *DELG* s.v. ‘εἶμι’ - ‘Le verbe εἶμι est déjà peu usuel dans le gr. hellén. Dans le NT, il ne se trouve guère que chez Luc et seulement avec préverbe.’ The figures Lee provides for occurrences of εἶμι in the LXX are extremely low. There are 29 in total. 21 of these are found in the literary books, and the remaining occurrences are scattered almost at random. Ex = 5; Deut = 1; 1 Suppl = 1; 1 Kgds 1. On the occurrence of a form of εἶμι in 1 Kgds see below, n. 61.

<sup>14</sup> Thackeray 1909: 257. Lee 1983: 86, n.4. Lee notes that in the Pentateuch compounds of ἀπ- εἰς- ἐξ- and ἐπ-εἶμι all occur only in participial forms. He also notes that almost all occurrences of compounds of εἶμι in the third century papyri are participial in form. Lee 1983: 86, n.4.

<sup>15</sup> Forms of ἐλεύσομαι, εἶμι and πορεύσομαι are extremely rare in Polybius. The only occurrence is the future middle infinitive of πορεύσομαι - Plb. 32.3.4.

<sup>16</sup> The adoption of Ionic forms into Attic and then into the Koine is explained by the incorporation of Ionic speaking territories into the Athenian empire. Rafiyenko and Seržant, forthcoming. Interestingly, Muraoka’s lexicon lists ἐλεύσομαι as the second principal part for ἔρχομαι. Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’.

<sup>17</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’, A.

<sup>18</sup> IGLSkythia 1. 267.2 (i BCE – i CE). IAPHrodArchive 48.11 (222/235 CE). IEphZoll 27.33 (166–215 CE c.).

<sup>19</sup> O.Did. 359.4 (88–92 CE). P. Merton 2.63.13 (58 CE). P.Berl. Zill. 9.6 (68 CE). P.Flor. 1.74.17 (181 CE). P.Freib. 4.65.4 (ii CE). P.Giss. 1.18.12 (113–120 CE). P.Iand. 2.16.7 (v–vi CE). P.Kell. 1.68.26 (iv CE). P.Köln 14.581.4 (iii CE). P.Lund 2.2.4 (ii CE). P.Mich. 8.485.17 (105 CE c.). P.Oxy 6 967.1 (ii CE). P.Oxy. 4.805.4 (25 BCE). P.Oxy. 8.1159.8 (275–300 CE). P.Oxy.12 1489.6 (275–299 CE). P.Oxy.41.2981.10 (ii CE). P.Par. 18.8 (iii CE). P.Par. 18.9 (iii CE). P.Tebt.2 583.22 (iii CE). P.Warr. 18.6 (iii CE). SB 12. 10803.13 (315–325 CE). SB 12.10772.9 (250–300 CE). SB 28 17110.9 (175–225 CE). SB 6 9121.12 (31–64 CE).

Moreover, LSJ notes that imperfect forms of ἡρχόμεν are ‘freq. later.’, which also results from the loss of εἶμι.<sup>20</sup>

While the aorist and perfect tenses continue to derive from ἤλθον in the Koine period, this is subject to some morphological development. Browning and Mandilaras note that the wider phenomenon of the replacement of the second aorist endings with first aorist endings begins with this verb with forms of ἤλθα appearing in the first century BCE.<sup>21</sup> Additionally, Mandilaras notes that the aorist ending -οσαν, which is attested in the Ptolemaic papyri,<sup>22</sup> is confined largely to compounds of -ἤλθον in the first few centuries CE.<sup>23</sup>

Although neither Chantraine nor Beekes discuss the etymology of πορεύομαι, it is attested in archaic period poetry. It occurs in the middle voice in a fragment of the seventh/sixth century BCE Lesbian lyric poet Alcaeus.<sup>24</sup> The sixth/fifth century BCE poet Pindar has five occurrences of πορεύομαι, which occur primarily in the active voice with the sense of ‘cause to go’.<sup>25</sup> The one exception to Pindar’s use of πορεύομαι in the active comes in a fragment of his *Dithyrambs* where it occurs in the passive with the sense of ‘to go’.<sup>26</sup> The

<sup>20</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’. A. Cf. Veitch 1887: 274, s.v. “Ἐρχομαι” - ‘imp. ἡρχόμεν rare and usu. late in *simple*.’ Imperfect forms of εἶμι are unattested in the LXX (on Muraoka’s assertion that there is an imperfect form of εἶμι in OG Kingdoms, see below n. 61). Forms of ἡρχόμεν, however, are relatively common - Gen 29:6, 29:9, 37:25, 48:7; Num 22:37; Ies 17:12; 1 Suppl 11:21, 11:25, 12:23; 2 Suppl 9:21, 10:1; 2 Esd 16:17; Tob 10:1; 1Makk 6:40, 13:9; Iezek 1:4, 9:2, 43:2, 47:8; Dan 7:13, 8:5; Sous 6.

<sup>21</sup> Browning 1983: 29. Mandilaras 1973: 150, § 317 (6) - ‘On the evidence of the papyrus texts, we realize that the intrusion of the first aorist into the inflexion of the second aorist was already noticeable in the Ptolemaic period, and quite strong in the Roman and Byzantine times. Attic has already employed the heteroclite forms εἶπον-εἶπα, ἤνεγκον-ἤνεγκα, ἔλιπον-ἔλειψα thus giving the starting point of the inflexion of the second aorist according to the first.’ The replacement of the second aorist ἤλθον with first aorist endings persists into the modern language. TD s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’. On ‘Analogical Pressure on the Strong Aorist Paradigm’ see Horrocks 2010: 109–110.

<sup>22</sup> Mayser *Grammatik* I<sup>2</sup> 83.

<sup>23</sup> Mandilaras 1973: 155–156, § 321.

<sup>24</sup> Alc. *Fr.* 306, 14, col 2, 29 = P. Oxy. 2307. 14. col 2, 29 - ‘λ’ οὐ σ . [ . . ] των ἔν<ν>εκ[α/ται . . . [ . . ] οὐ διὰ τὸ [πεπα-/λαιῶσθ [αι . . . ] . . . [ κα-/θορμισθῆναι ἢ[τοι τῆς/ συνουσί[ας] πεπλ[η] ναῦς π[α]λαιὰ του[.] . [ / πλεῖν κ[α]τίσχει τουτι[ / π[ . . . . . ] γας πορεύετα[ / τ[οὺς λεγ]ομένους πε[σ-/σοὺς κί]νεις πάντα λί[θον/τάγεται ω[.] .’ (‘But not because of . . . : not because she has grown old (does she wish) to be brought into harbour . . . intercourse . . . old ship . . . restrains from sailing . . . travels . . . so-called ‘pessoï’ . . .’ Trans. Campbell 1982: 349.)

<sup>25</sup> The first *Olympian Ode* offers a good example of πορεύομαι in the active with the sense of ‘cause to go’ - τῷ μὲν εἶπε: “Φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας/ ἄγ’ εἴ τι, Ποσειδάων, ἐς χάριν/ τέλλεται, πέδασον ἔγχος Οἰνομάου χάλκεον,/ ἐμὲ δ’ ἐπὶ ταχυτάτων πόρευσον ἀρμάτων/ ἐς Ἄλιν, κράτει δὲ πέλασον. Pi. *O.* 1.75–79. (He said to him, “If the loving gifts of Cyprus count at all for gratitude, Poseidon, come! Hold back the bronze spear of Oenomaus and speed me in the swiftest of chariots to Elis and bring me to victorious power.” Trans Race 1997: 55.) The remaining examples of πορεύομαι in the active in Pindar are Pi. *O.* 3.25; P. 11.21; N. 7.29. Van Emde Boas et al. (2018: § 35.17) note πορεύομαι as a middle verb expressing a change of body position that has a causative counterpart in the active.

<sup>26</sup> D.H. *Comp.* 22 = Pi. *fr.* 75.8. - ιοδέτων λάχετε στεφάνων τῶν τ’ ἐαρι-/δρόπων ἀοιδᾶν, Διόθεν τέ με σὺν ἀγλαΐα/ ἴδετε πορευθέντ’ ἀοιδᾶν δεύτερον/ ἐπὶ τὸν κισσοδαῖ θεόν,/ τὸν Βρόμιον, τὸν Ἐριβόαν τε βροτοὶ

word is relatively well-attested in Classical literature, with 812 and 248 occurrences in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE respectively. It is especially common in Xenophon and is frequently found in military narrative with the sense of ‘march’.<sup>27</sup> In contrast to ἔρχομαι, compounds of πορεύομαι are uncommon in Classical Greek.<sup>28</sup> The use of πορεύομαι in the middle voice with the sense of ‘to go’ became standard in the Koine period, where it occurs with almost equal frequency with ἔρχομαι.<sup>29</sup> BDF notes that the rise of πορεύομαι in the Koine period is related to ἔρχομαι losing the sense of ‘to go’, as the former came to supply the present system for the sense of ‘to go’.<sup>30</sup> As Lee notes, the major historical change associated with πορεύομαι is, however, its increasing frequency in compound forms.<sup>31</sup> He further notes that this applies primarily to the present and imperfect tenses, with future, aorist and perfect compound forms being typically supplied by -ελεύσομαι, -ἦλθον and -ελήλυθα compounds.<sup>32</sup> Compounds of -ελεύσομαι are common in the Koine period,

---

καλέομεν/ γόνον ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων μελπόμεν<οι=γυναικῶν τε Καδμεϊᾶν {Σεμέλην}.... (‘Receive wreaths of plaited violets and the songs plucked in springtime, and look upon me with favor as I proceed from Zeus with splendor of songs secondly to that ivy-knowing god, whom we mortals call Bromius and Eriboas as we sing of the offspring of the highest of fathers and of Cadmean women.’ Trans. Race 1997: 320–321.)

<sup>27</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘πορεύω’, II.1.

<sup>28</sup> Lee 1983: 85. Lee notes the exceptions διαπορεύομαι, συμπορεύομαι and ἐμπορεύομαι which occur in Classical Greek literature with some frequency. διαπορεύομαι = Aen.Tact. 32 10. Arist. *Aud.* 802b, *EN.* 1174b, *Oec.* 1348a, 1353a, *PA.* 640b, *Pr.* 867a. Autol. *De sphaera quae movetur*, 3 quater, *De ortibus et occasibus* 1.1 quater, 1.2 quater, 1.3 quater, 1.4 bis, 1.6, 1.8 quater, 1.9, 1.10 decies, 1.12 quattuordecies, 1.13 duodecies, 2.10, 2.18 bis. Th. 1.107.4, 5.52.2. Hdt. 4.33, 7.114. Isoc. *Paneg.* 148. X. *HG.* 3.4.13, 4.6.6, 6.4.21, *An.* 2.2.11, 2.5.18, 2.5.19, 3.3.3, 6.5.19, *Cyr.* 7.1.10, *Cyn.* 5.31. Pl. *Phd.* 85d, *Smp.* 221b, *Ti.* 44 c. *Lg.* 845a, 905b, 952e, *R.* 534c. Hp. *Epid.* 5.1.82. συμπορεύομαι = Th. 8.87.1. E. *IT.* 1488. X. *An.* 1.3.5, 1.4.9, 4.1.28. Pl. *Cra.* 412a, *Phd.* 249c. Arist. *EN.* 1160a, *Mir* 838a. ἐμπορεύομαι = Arist. *Ach.* 75.4. E. *Andr.* 1032. S. *El.* 405, *Fr.* 873:1, *OT.* 456. Hp. *De arte* 1, *Ep.* 10. Pl. *Lg* 949e, 952e. Th. 7.13.2. X. *Lac.* 7.1, *Vect.* 3.1, 3.3.

<sup>29</sup> Figures for πορεύομαι in a variety of Koine period sources demonstrate its increasing prevalence. Polybius has 34 occurrences of πορεύομαι against 117 of ἔρχομαι. As a whole the LXX has 993 occurrences of πορεύομαι and 926 occurrences of ἔρχομαι. It is impractical to quote exact figures for πορεύομαι in the papyri. However, a search for selected forms compared against the equivalent forms of ἔρχομαι indicates that it was very common in documentary evidence from the Koine period. Πορεύεσθαι = 51, ἔρχεσθαι = 81; πορεύομαι = 12, ἔρχομαι = 91; πορευόμεθα = 4, ἐρχόμεθα = 15; πορεύονται = 6, ἔρχονται = 39.

<sup>30</sup> BDF § 101, s.v. ‘ἔρχεσθαι’. The continued decline of ἰέναι and ἔρχεσθαι in favour of πορεύεσθαι in the Medieval period, along with the increasing adoption of passive forms in place of the middle, is suggested by the *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίων* which provides the note, ‘ἰέναι· πορεύεσθαι, ἢ πορευθῆναι.’ Cunningham 2003: 272.

<sup>31</sup> Lee 1983: 86 According to LSJ, the increasing use of -πορεύομαι is particularly relevant to compounds of εἰσ- and ἐξ-. LSJ s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’. Similarly, under his entry for ἔρχομαι, Chantraine provides the note, ‘Employé depuis Hom. jusqu’au grec tardif avec concurrence de ἐκ-, εἰσ-, πορεύομαι.’ Chantraine *DELG* s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’.

<sup>32</sup> Lee 1983: 86. Future compounds derived from -πορεύομαι are exceedingly rare in the papyri. BGU 6 1463. 7 (246 BCE). P.Flor. 3 295.9 (566–568 CE). P.Mich. 15 709.6 (209–210 CE). They are unattested in epigraphy.

however some forms, especially participial forms, derived from -εἶμι endure for longer.<sup>33</sup> While -πορεύομαι became the standard word used in compounds, the sense of ‘go away’ was provided by ἀποτρέχω in place of the expected ἀποπορεύομαι.<sup>34</sup> In Classical Greek, ἀποτρέχω implies rapid motion often accompanied with the physical act of running. The earliest attestation of this word, found in Herodotus in the aorist tense, carries this sense:

τοῖσι δὲ Πέρσησι οὐδενὸς μαχομένου φόβος ἐνέπεσε, ἀποδραμόντες δὲ ὅσον τε  
ἑξήκοντα στάδια ἵζοντο.<sup>35</sup>

Although no one was fighting, fear fell upon the Persians and they took up a position when they had run as far as sixty stades.

The use of the word φόβος in the proceeding clause implies that the motion of the Persians is rapid. Lee provides another example from Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* that demonstrates the inherent rapidity of ἀποτρέχω through contrast with the adverb βάδην:

ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ μὲν βάδην τὰ δὲ ἀποδραμὼν οἴκαδε ἀπεστλεγγισάμην.<sup>36</sup>

(And I went home, partly walking partly running, and I cleaned myself with a strigil.)

In the Koine period, ἀποτρέχω becomes semantically bleached and loses the implication of haste. Lee gives the evidence of two papyri, both of which use ἀποτρέχω in contexts that

---

<sup>33</sup> Lee 1983: 86, n.4. Lee notes that almost all occurrences of compound forms of -εἶμι in the Pentateuch are participial in form. Thackeray (1909: 257, § 23.12) notes in regard to εἶμι that the ‘participle and inf. of a few compounds seem to have been the last to go.’

<sup>34</sup> Lee 1983: 86, 125–128. ἀποπορεύομαι is completely absent from the LXX and NT, has very few occurrences in the entire history of Greek literature and appears only once in the papyri and twice in the epigraphy. TLG notes only 25 literary examples of ἀποπορεύομαι in all Greek literature. P.Hal. 1. 177. IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> 1:188.18 = IG IX 2 205.18. ITeosMcGabe 31.82.

<sup>35</sup> Hdt. 4.203.3.

<sup>36</sup> X. *Oec.* 11.18.

do not suggest any sense of haste, rapidity or any idea of running.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, it is attested five times in Polybius, all of which have the sense of ‘depart’ rather than ‘run away’.<sup>38</sup>

## 4.2 ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms

The language of OG Kingdoms reflects the abovementioned historical developments in the domain of linear movement. By way of overview, there is a spread of occurrences of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι and derived compounds. The simplex ἔρχομαι occurs 103 times<sup>39</sup> and πορεύομαι occurs 187 times.<sup>40</sup> In terms of compounds, 33 are derived from -πορεύομαι<sup>41</sup> and 185 from -ἔρχομαι.<sup>42</sup> These figures themselves provide evidence for the

<sup>37</sup> Lee 1983: 125. P.Mich. 1 55 10 (240 BCE) - ‘καλῶς ποιήσεις ὑπὲρ ὧν Πτολεμαῖος ἀδελφὸς ἀναπέπλευκεν πρὸς σέ ἐπιμελῶς διοικήσας, ἵνα ταχέως πρὸς με ἀναστρέφῃ καὶ μὴ ἐπικωλύωμαι ἐὰν δέη ἀναπλεῖν· συντόμως γάρ δεῖ ἀποτρέχειν ἐντεῦθεν.’ (Please earnestly take care of those things concerning which my brother has sailed up to you so that he might come back to me quickly and I might not be delayed if I need to sail up. For I need to leave here soon.) P.Cair. Zen. 3 59409.8 (263–229 BCE) - ‘ἐπειδὴ μετεπέμψον με, ἄξιῶ, εἰ καὶ σοι φαίνεται καὶ χρέαν ἡμῶν ἔχεις, ἐμφανίσας μοι ἐν ᾗ ἔσομαι τάξει· εἰ δὲ μὴ χρέαν ἔχεις, ἵνα ἀποτρέχω εἰς τὸ τεταγμένον.’ (Because you summoned me, I ask you, if it seems good to you and you have need of us, show me in which station I will be; but if you do not have need, so that I may depart to my assigned position.)

<sup>38</sup> Lee 1983: 125. A good example of this phenomenon in Polybius is 3.24.12 - ἐν Σαρδόνι καὶ Λιβύῃ μηδεὶς Ῥωμαίων μῆτ’ ἐμπορευέσθω μῆτε πόλιν κτιζέτω εἰ μὴ ἕως τοῦ ἐφόδια λαβεῖν ἢ πλοῖον ἐπισκευάσαι. ἐὰν δὲ χειμῶν κατενέγκῃ, ἐν πένθ’ ἡμέραις ἀποτρεχέτω. (Let no Roman trade or found a city in Sardinia and Libya unless for as long as it takes to acquire provisions or to fix his ship. But should the weather compel him, let him depart within five days.) The other occurrences of ἀποτρέχω in Polybius are Plb. 3.22.7, 21.43.10, 21.43.18, 31.20.3.

<sup>39</sup> 1Kgds 2:13, 2:14, 2:15, 2:27, 2:31, 3:10, 4:3, 4:5, 4:12, 4:13, 7:1, 9:5, 9:15, 9:16, 10:8, 10:9, 10:10, 10:13, 10:22, 11:4, 11:5, 11:9 (bis), 12:12, 14:5 (bis), 14:20, 15:5, 16:4, 16:11, 17:34, 17:43, 17:45, 19:16, 19:22, 19:23, 20:1, 20:9, 20:24, 20:37, 21:2, 21:11, 22:1, 22:5, 23:10, 23:27, 24:4, 25:9, 25:12, 25:26, 25:33, 25:40, 26:1, 26:10, 27:9, 28:4, 28:8, 29:4, 29:8, 30:3, 30:9, 30:17, 30:26, 31:4, 31:7, 31:8; 2Kgds 1:2, 2:4, 2:23, 2:29, 3:20, 3:24, 3:35, 4:4, 5:3, 5:13, 5:20, 7:14; 3Kgds 2:28, 2:30, 8:18, 8:31, 9:28, 10:1, 10:2, 10:10, 10:12, 10:13, 10:14, 10:22, 11:18 (bis), 11:43, 12:1, 12:24f, 13:10, 13:11, 13:12, 13:14, 18:7, 19:3, 19:4, 20:13, 21:43.

<sup>40</sup> 1Kgds 1:14, 1:17, 1:18, 1:19, 2:26, 3:6, 3:8, 3:9, 3:21 (bis), 6:9, 6:12 (bis), 7:16, 8:3, 8:5, 9:3, 9:6 (bis), 9:7, 9:9 (bis), 9:10 (bis), 10:2, 10:14, 10:26, 11:14, 11:15, 12:14, 14:3, 14:17, 14:19 (bis), 14:26, 15:3, 15:12, 15:18, 15:20, 16:2, 17:32, 17:33, 17:36, 17:37, 17:39, 17:45, 17:48, 18:27, 19:18, 19:22, 19:23 (bis), 20:11, 20:22, 20:28, 20:40, 20:42, 22:5 (bis), 23:2 (bis), 23:3, 23:5, 23:13 (bis), 23:16, 23:22, 23:23, 23:24, 23:25, 23:26 (bis), 23:28, 24:3, 25:42, 26:19, 27:2, 28:7, 28:8, 28:22, 29:7, 29:10 (bis), 30:9, 30:21, 30:22, 31:12; 2Kgds 2:19, 2:29, 2:32, 3:1 (bis), 3:16 (bis), 3:19, 3:21 (bis), 3:31, 4:5, 5:10 (bis), 6:2, 6:4, 6:12, 7:5, 7:9, 8:3, 8:6, 8:14; 3Kgds 2:29, 2:31, 2:35m, 2:40 (bis), 2:41, 2:42, 3:3, 3:4, 3:14 (bis), 8:23, 8:25 (bis), 8:36, 8:58, 8:61, 9:4 (bis), 9:6, 9:12, 11:8, 11:10, 11:15, 11:33, 11:38, 12:1, 12:24, 12:24a, 12:24g (bis), 12:24k, 12:24o, 12:24u, 12:24z, 12:28, 12:30, 13:9, 13:12, 13:14, 13:17, 13:28, 15:3, 15:26, 15:34, 16:2, 16:19, 16:26, 16:28b, 16:28f (bis), 16:31 (bis), 17:3, 17:9, 17:10, 17:11, 17:15, 18:1, 18:2, 18:6 (bis), 18:8, 18:11, 18:14, 18:16 (bis), 18:18, 18:21 (bis), 18:45, 19:4, 19:8, 19:15, 19:21, 20:26, 20:27, 21:38.

<sup>41</sup> 1Kgds 5:5, 9:14, 11:7, 11:11, 12:2, 14:11, 17:7, 17:8, 17:35, 18:13 bis, 18:16 bis, 24:15, 25:19, 26:5, 26:7, 29:2 bis, 29:3; 3Kgds 2:30, 5:13, 8:9, 9:8, 10:29, 13:25, 14:28, 15:17 bis, 16:18, 18:35, 21:18, 21:39.

<sup>42</sup> 1Kgds 1:18, 1:19, 1:23, 1:24, 2:3, 2:11, 2:20, 2:30, 2:35, 4:1, 4:14, 4:16, 5:3, 5:8 bis, 5:9, 5:10, 5:11, 6:6, 6:8, 6:14, 6:20, 7:11, 7:13, 8:20, 9:4 quarter, 9:11, 9:13 bis, 9:14, 9:26, 9:27, 10:2, 10:3, 10:5 bis, 10:14, 10:25, 10:26, 11:3, 11:7, 11:10, 12:2, 12:8, 13:10, 13:15, 13:17, 13:23, 14:11, 14:23, 14:26, 14:36, 14:41, 14:46, 15:6, 15:27, 15:32, 15:34, 16:8, 16:13, 16:21, 17:4, 17:40, 18:6, 19:3, 19:12, 20:13, 20:35, 20:40, 20:41, 21:1 bis, 21:6, 21:16, 22:3, 23:7, 23:13 bis, 23:15, 23:18, 24:14, 24:23, 25:5, 26:6 bis, 26:11, 26:12, 26:15, 26:20, 26:22, 26:25, 28:1 bis, 28:21, 28:25, 29:11, 30:1, 30:2, 30:21, 30:23, 30:31; 2Kgds 1:15, 2:12, 2:13, 2:15, 2:24, 3:7, 3:22, 3:23, 4:5, 4:7 bis, 5:6 tris, 5:8, 5:24, 6:9, 6:19, 6:20, 7:7, 7:18, 10:8, 10:13, 10:14; 3Kgds 2:13, 2:19, 2:36, 2:42, 2:46, 3:6, 8:10, 8:19, 8:44, 8:66, 9:12, 11:2 bis, 11:17, 11:22, 11:29,

linguistic context of OG Kingdoms. That πορεύομαι and its compounds are so well attested is to be expected for a document composed in the Koine period and is clear evidence of natural Koine lexical patterns, noting of course, that the predominance of compounds derived from -έρχομαι is intimately related to the issue of tense, as shall be discussed below.

### 4.3 Hebrew Equivalents for ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms

Before studying OG Kingdoms' use of the simplices of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι against that of the wider Koine, it is necessary to consider translation technique. Though her discussion covers only 1 Kingdoms, Aejmelaeus notes that the Hebrew roots הלך and בוא are translated by a variety of Greek verbs.<sup>43</sup> She notes that while הלך is translated primarily by πορεύομαι and ἀπέρχομαι, it is also rendered by ἀναστρέφω, προέρχομαι, καταβαίνω, προπορεύομαι and ἀποτρέχω.<sup>44</sup> Similarly, Aejmelaeus notes that aside from the typical rendering of ἔρχομαι, בוא is also rendered by εἰσέρχομαι, παραγίνομαι, ἦκω, εἰσπορεύομαι, ἀπέρχομαι, ἐπέρχομαι, προσέρχομαι and εἴσιμι.<sup>45</sup> This variation evidences the fact that the translator of OG Kingdoms uses the Greek vocabulary in consideration of the linguistic demands of the target language rather than simply mechanically replicating translational equivalents.

Study of the whole of OG Kingdoms confirms Aejmelaeus' observations regarding 1 Kingdoms.<sup>46</sup> The translator tends to equate הלך with πορεύομαι and בוא with ἔρχομαι, though there is also a considerable range of variation. 91 of the 103 occurrences of ἔρχομαι translate forms of בוא Qal. Regarding the remainder of the occurrences, seven have no match in the MT<sup>47</sup> and there is one corresponding to each of the Hebrew verbs היה, הלך, ירד, ישב, עוה.<sup>48</sup> These individual variations may be attributable to differences between the MT and the *Vorlage*, but it is equally possible that they result from the translator using language appropriate to the context. Unfortunately, none of these instances are preserved in the Qumran fragments. Hebrew equivalences for πορεύομαι present a similar image. Of its 187

12:5 bis, 12:16, 12:21, 12:25, 13:7, 13:8, 13:22, 13:24, 13:25, 16:10, 17:12, 17:13, 17:18, 18:5, 18:6, 18:12 bis, 18:29 bis, 19:9, 19:11 bis, 19:13, 19:19 bis, 20:5, 21:13, 21:16, 21:17 bis, 21:19, 21:21, 21:22, 21:28, 21:30, 21:31, 21:33 bis, 21:36, 21:39.

<sup>43</sup> Aejmelaeus 2007: 146–148.

<sup>44</sup> Aejmelaeus 2007: 147. She also notes that δεῦρο commonly translates imperative forms of הלך.

<sup>45</sup> Aejmelaeus 2007: 147.

<sup>46</sup> Note here the likelihood that OG Kingdoms represents the work of a single translator. See above under '1.4 the Unity of OG Kingdoms'.

<sup>47</sup> 1Kgds 14:5 bis, 22:1, 30:17; 3Kgds 11:43, 12:24f, 18:7.

<sup>48</sup> 1Kgds 20:24 (ישב); 1Kgds 29:4 (ירד); 2Kgds 7:14 (עוה) The MT equivalent for this verb is substantially different - ... καὶ ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀδελφία αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλέγξω αὐτὸν... = ... אשר בהעותו והכחתיו ...; 3Kgds 8:18 (היה); 3Kgds 10:13 (הלך).



occurrences, 164 render forms of הלך. Of the remaining 23 occurrences, 17 have no match in the MT<sup>49</sup> and the rest equate to one occurrence of בוא, מלא, עבר and שוב and two occurrences of עלה.<sup>50</sup> As can be seen, the translator of OG Kingdoms tends to equate הלך with πορεύομαι and בוא with ἔρχεσθαι. These are, however, by no means absolute rules. The translator consistently varies his renderings, as Aejmelaeus demonstrates in studying equivalents from the Hebrew into Greek. This implies that the translator used words fitting for the context. Moreover, some of these choices are influenced by Koine period lexical and morphological developments, as will be demonstrated.

#### 4.4 Morphological Profile of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms

The following table sets out the morphology of the simplices of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι as they appear in OG Kingdoms:

Table 9: *Morphological Breakdown of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms*

Finite		ἔρχομαι	πορεύομαι		
	Indicative	Present	32	8	
		Imperfect	7	22	
		Future	-	8	
		Aorist	39	76	
		Perfect	2	3	
	Subjunctive	Aorist	5	11	
		Imperative	Present	1	26
	Aorist		-	6	
	Non-finite		Infinitive	Present	-
		Aorist		10	8
Participle		Present	4	6	
		Aorist	2	1	
		Perfect	2	-	

<sup>49</sup> 1Kgds 1:14, 3:21 bis, 12:14, 15:12, 17:36, 20:28, 29:10; 3Kgds 2:31, 9:12, 12:24a, 12:24g bis, 12:24o, 12:24u, 12:28, 20:27. These passages are not preserved in the Qumran scrolls.

<sup>50</sup> 1Kgds 17:45 (בוא); 1Kgds 1:19 (שוב); 1Kgds 6:9 (עלה); 1Kgds 27:2 (עבר); 3Kgds 11:8 (מלא); 3Kgds 11:15 (עלה).

#### 4.5 Analysis of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms

The relatively high number of occurrences of πορεύομαι against ἔρχομαι in OG Kingdoms, which is typical of Koine Greek lexical patterns, is primarily due to the semantic change in ἔρχομαι which loses the sense of ‘to go’.<sup>51</sup> This semantic development is attested throughout the LXX. Muraoka’s lexicon gives ἔρχομαι the primary sense of ‘to come to or arrive at a focal point’ but assigns no sense of ‘to go’.<sup>52</sup> Similarly, it gives the primary sense of πορεύομαι as ‘to leave a place and head for another’.<sup>53</sup> Regarding OG Kingdoms specifically, it is interesting to note Taylor’s translational equivalents for ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι. For πορεύομαι, 165 of the 187 occurrences are rendered by English ‘go’ or ‘went’. There are, however, some variants. Taylor’s renderings of ‘follow’, ‘depart’, ‘leave’, ‘get away’ and ‘set out’ are merely translational variants semantically indistinguishable from the general sense of ‘to go’.<sup>54</sup> At 1 Kingdoms 3:21 Taylor translates πορευόμενοι ἐπορεύοντο as ‘they kept advancing’.<sup>55</sup> The corresponding MT text is substantially shorter and contains no Hebrew equivalent, but the translator is most likely rendering a form of the *figura etymologica*.<sup>56</sup> The same construction, ἐπορεύετο πορευόμενος, for which the MT has וַיִּלְךָ הַלֵּךְ is rendered as ‘they increased’ at 1 Kingdoms 14:19. Semantically and syntactically, this is not natural Greek. It is a replication of a Hebraistic construction. On four occasions, Taylor renders forms of πορεύομαι as ‘to walk’.<sup>57</sup> One of these is semantically indistinguishable from the general sense of ‘to go’.<sup>58</sup> The other three, however, have a figurative sense of ‘to conduct oneself, follow a certain moral life style’. As Muraoka notes, this is not a new use of the word.<sup>59</sup> On the other hand, there are eight occasions where Taylor uses various tenses of English ‘to come’ to render

<sup>51</sup> BDF § 101 s.v. ‘ἔρχεσθαι’.

<sup>52</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’, 1.a.

<sup>53</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘πορεύομαι’, I.1. As further evidence of this semantic shift in the LXX, under his entry for ἔρχομαι, Muraoka provides the note “Opp. πορεύομαι- πόθεν ἔρχη καὶ ποῦ πορεύη; ‘where do you come from and where are you going to?’ Ge 16.8, γενεὰ πορεύεται καὶ γ. ἔρχεται Ec 1.4.” Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘ἔρχομαι’, 1.a. Likewise, under his entry for πορεύομαι, Muraoka notes ‘opp. ἔρχομαι’. Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘πορεύομαι’.

<sup>54</sup> ‘Follow’ - 1Kgds 12:14. ‘Depart’ - 3Kgds 21:38. ‘Leave’ - 1Kgds 22:5 bis. ‘Get away’ - 1Kgds 23:26. ‘Set out’ - 1Kgds 9:6.

<sup>55</sup> Taylor 2007b: 251.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Judg 4:9 - καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν Δεββωρα Πορευομένη πορεύσομαι μετὰ σοῦ· (And Debhora said to him I will certainly go with you;) = MT ... ותאמר הֲלֹךְ אִלַּי עִמָּךְ (And she said, “I will surely go with you ... NRSV).

<sup>57</sup> 2Kgds 3:31; 3Kgds 3:3, 3:14 bis.

<sup>58</sup> 2Kgds 3:31 - καὶ εἶπεν Δαυὶδ πρὸς Ἰואβ καὶ πρὸς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τὸν μετ’ αὐτοῦ Διαρρήξατε τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν καὶ περιζώσασθε σάκκους καὶ κόπτεσθε ἔμπροσθεν Αβεννηρ· καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Δαυὶδ ἐπορεύετο ὀπίσω τῆς κλίνης. (And David said to Joab and to all the people with him tear your clothes and put on sack cloth and strike yourselves before Abenner; and the king David went behind the bier.)

<sup>59</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘πορεύομαι’, II.3.

πορεύομαι.<sup>60</sup> There are even cases in which Taylor uses both ‘to go’ and ‘to come’ in the same verse for πορεύομαι.<sup>61</sup> Nevertheless, many are arguably better interpreted as meaning ‘to go’. Taylor’s translational equivalents for ἔρχομαι balance with his interpretation of πορεύομαι. Of the 102 occurrences of ἔρχομαι, 92 are translated with the sense of ‘to come’. Conversely, there are ten instances where Taylor uses ‘to go’.<sup>62</sup> While some of these are debatable, the context of most of these occurrences does in fact demand the sense of ‘to go’ over ‘to come’. Nevertheless, overall the fact that ἔρχομαι lost the sense of ‘to go’, which consequently prompted the increased use of πορεύομαι, is apparent in the language of OG Kingdoms.

Regarding morphology, imperfect forms of ἔρχομαι in OG Kingdoms are supplied by ἡρχόμεν, as is typical of Koine Greek, rather than the Classical Attic εἶμι.<sup>63</sup> This same phenomenon appears in the total absence of future tense forms of εἶμι, along with both participial and infinitival forms.<sup>64</sup> While there are no present infinitival forms of ἔρχομαι in OG Kingdoms, the few present participles follow the pattern of ἐρχόμενος over the old ἰών.<sup>65</sup> There are no future forms derived from ἐλεύσομαι in the simplex in OG Kingdoms. This is, however, due to the chance requirements of the narrative. All examples of ἦλθον in the simplex in OG Kingdoms retain the strong aorist endings. Browning’s observation that forms of ἦλθα begin to appear in the first century BCE may be advanced as additional supporting evidence for a date prior to that century, though it must be caveated with the knowledge that second aorist forms persist alongside the new first aorist endings well into the Koine period.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>60</sup> 1Kgds 17:45, 17:48, 27:2, 23:16; 3Kgds 12:24k, 13:9, 13:17, 18:16.

<sup>61</sup> 3Kgds 18:16 - καὶ ἐπορεύθη Αβδίου εἰς συναντήν τῷ Αχααβ καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐξέδραμεν Αχααβ καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς συνάντησιν Ἡλίου. (And Abdiou went to meet Achaab and told him, and Achaab ran forth and came to meet Eliou. NETS)

<sup>62</sup> 1Kgds 10:10, 10:13, 14:5 bis, 21:11, 22:5, 29:4, 29:8; 3Kgds 9:28, 10:13.

<sup>63</sup> 1Kgds 2:13, 2:15, 11:5, 17:34, 27:9; 3Kgds 10:22, 12:1. Similarly, the Pentateuch has five occurrences of ἡρχόμεν - Gen 29:6, 29:9, 37:25, 48:7; Num 22:37. Muraoka points to 1Kgds 25:15 as an imperfect form of εἶμι. The text runs, ‘οὐκ ἀπεκώλυσαν ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ ἐνετείλαντο ἡμῖν πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, ὥς ἦμεν παρ’ αὐτοῖς.’ (They did not hinder us or order us for all the days that we were with them.) Muraoka suggests that ἦμεν should be read as ἦμεν. Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘εἶμι’. Lee doubts this interpretation. Lee, 2018: 119, n.126. Likewise, the NETS translation, which runs ‘when we were in the fields’, agrees with Lee.

<sup>64</sup> Blass and Debrunner and Funk 1961: 50, § 99 – ‘ἵεναι is not popular in Hellenistic either in the simple or compound form (ἐρχεσθαι instead §101); only Lk and Heb (literary language) use it in the NT, and only in compounds and then not always correctly’. Cf. Lee 1983: 86, n.4.

<sup>65</sup> 1Kgds 14:5 bis, 2:14, 11:9.

<sup>66</sup> This phenomenon is better attested in OG Kingdoms in other words, such as εἶπον which occurs with first aorist endings commonly, although this is also attested in the Classical period. It appears at - 1Kgds 2:30, 4:3, 4:22, 6:3, 6:4, 6:20, 7:6, 7:8, 8:5, 8:6, 8:19, 9:17, 9:23, 10:14, 10:19, 10:24, 10:27, 11:10, 11:12, 12:1, 12:4, 12:5, 12:12, 12:19, 13:12, 14:34, 14:36, 16:4, 16:15, 16:16, 19:22, 21:12, 23:3, 23:22, 24:11, 25:34,

Although the optative is gradually lost throughout the Koine period, the absence of such forms of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms is attributable to the linguistic demands set by the source text and its narrative and does not result from the decline of the optative.<sup>67</sup> In general, the optative remains common in OG Kingdoms occurring 44 times.<sup>68</sup> It is used primarily to express volition,<sup>69</sup> but also occurs in expressions of potentiality and in the protases of conditional statements.<sup>70</sup> Interestingly, the potential uses of the optative in OG Kingdoms all lack the particle ἄν. Nevertheless, Evans notes that this particle ‘does not seem to be a necessary element of potential expressions.’<sup>71</sup> All occurrences of the potential optative in OG Kingdoms appear as τάδε ποιήσαι ... τάδε προσθείη and they universally translate the Hebrew expression וכה יעשה ... וכה יסיף. It is significant to note that Evans uses the ‘health of the potential optative’ as evidence for a date of composition for the Pentateuch in the third century BCE.<sup>72</sup> The lack of the particle ἄν and the fact that the potential optative occurs only in rendering a fixed Hebrew expression implies that the translator was familiar with the potential optative, but that it was not a common feature of his language. This may be advanced as evidence that the decline of the potential optative was advanced by the time of the composition of OG Kingdoms. Moreover, that the primary function of the optative in OG Kingdoms is volitive accords with Evans’ note that this was the last function to disappear.<sup>73</sup>

The use of the simplices of πορεύομαι and ἔρχομαι in OG Kingdoms reflects a number of developments known to have occurred during the Koine period. This includes the loss of future and imperfect forms derived from εἶμι, the increased use of ἡρχόμεν as the standard

---

28:7, 30:22; 2Kgds 1:7, 1:8, 4:8, 5:1, 6:22; 3Kgds 8:29, 12:24r, 21:8. Additionally, second aorist forms of εἶπον in the third person singular and plural are still extremely well-attested in OG Kingdoms.

<sup>67</sup> On the decline of the optative see Evans 2001:175–197, esp 175–180. Notably, the most common optative in OG Kingdoms is γένοιτο which occurs six times at 1Kgds 2:33, 24:16, 25:26; 3Kgds 8:57, 10:9, 20:3. This is one of the forms that Evans (2001: 176) notes as persisting into the Koine period as a ‘stereotyped phrase’ despite the general and gradual disappearance of the optative.

<sup>68</sup> As an interesting point of comparison, there are 80 optatives in all five books of the Greek Pentateuch. Evans 2001: 175.

<sup>69</sup> 1Kgds 1:17, 1:23, 2:20, 3:17, 14:44 bis, 20:16, 24:13, 24:16 tris, 25:26, 26:19, 26:20, 26:24; 2Kgds 2:6, 3:29, 7:26; 3Kgds 2:33, 8:57 tris, 10:9, 20:3.

<sup>70</sup> 1Kgds 20:13 bis, 25:22 bis; 2Kgds 3:9 bis, 3:35 bis; 3Kgds 2:23 bis, 19:2 bis, 21:10 bis. In conditional statements – 1Kgds 24:20 bis.

<sup>71</sup> Evans 2001: 189. Cf. *SM Grammar* § 1821. Mandilaras 1973: 281, § 640.

<sup>72</sup> Evans 2001: 190.

<sup>73</sup> Evans 2001: 176.

imperfect and, most significantly, the reduced use of ἔρχομαι in the sense of ‘to go’ which has the correlative effect of increasing the use of πορεύομαι.

#### 4.6 ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι Compounds in OG Kingdoms

Like the simplices, the use of compound forms of -έρχομαι and -πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms displays a range of linguistic features reflective of Koine period developments. It is particularly significant to note that compound forms of -έρχομαι decline significantly in the Koine period in favour of compounds of -πορεύομαι.<sup>74</sup>

#### 4.7 Hebrew Equivalents for -έρχομαι and -πορεύομαι Compounds

When the issue of translation technique is considered, the translator’s use of Greek compound verbs again demonstrates a high degree of variation. There are 185 occurrences of verbal compounds derived from -έρχομαι in OG Kingdoms with a range of prefixes including ἀπο-, δια-, εἰς-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, μετα-, παρα- and προσ-. The following table sets out the Hebrew equivalences for -έρχομαι compounds:

Table 10: *Hebrew Equivalents for -έρχομαι Compounds*

Prefix	Occurrences	Hebrew Equivalent(s)	
ἀπο-	41	No MT match = 3 <sup>75</sup> בוא = 1 <sup>76</sup>	עלה = 1 <sup>77</sup> הלך = 36 <sup>78</sup>
δια-	16	No MT match = 1 <sup>79</sup> הלך = 6 <sup>80</sup>	עבר = 8 <sup>81</sup> עמד = 1 <sup>82</sup>
εἰς-	60	No MT match = 4 <sup>83</sup> בוא = 48 <sup>84</sup>	הלך = 2 <sup>86</sup> ירד = 2 <sup>88</sup>

<sup>74</sup> The seminal treatment of this phenomenon is Lee 1983: 85–92.

<sup>75</sup> 1Kgds 2:11, 10:25; 3Kgds 18:29.

<sup>76</sup> 1Kgds 25:5.

<sup>77</sup> 1Kgds 13:15.

<sup>78</sup> 1Kgds 2:20, 6:6, 6:8, 10:2, 10:3, 10:26, 14:46, 15:6, 15:27, 15:34, 16:13, 19:12, 20:13, 21:1, 22:3, 23:18, 24:23, 26:11, 26:12, 26:25, 28:25, 29:11, 30:2; 2Kgds 3:22, 3:23, 4:7, 5:6, 6:19; 3Kgds 8:66, 11:22, 12:5 bis, 12:16, 18:12, 19:19, 21:36.

<sup>79</sup> 3Kgds 18:5.

<sup>80</sup> 1Kgds 2:30, 2:35, 12:2, 30:31; 2Kgds 7:7; 3Kgds 3:6.

<sup>81</sup> 1Kgds 9:4 quarter, 26:22, 14:23, 9:27; 3Kgds 18:6.

<sup>82</sup> 1Kgds 6:20.

<sup>83</sup> 1Kgds 1:18, 1:24, 5:3, 5:11.

<sup>84</sup> 1Kgds 1:19, 4:14, 5:10, 6:14, 9:13 bis, 10:5 bis, 10:14, 12:8, 14:26, 16:21, 20:41, 21:1, 21:16, 23:7, 26:15, 28:21, 30:1; 2Kgds 2:24, 3:7, 4:5, 4:7, 5:6 bis, 5:8, 6:9, 7:18, 10:14; 3Kgds 2:13, 2:19, 11:2 bis, 11:17, 12:21, 13:7, 13:8, 13:22, 13:25, 16:10, 17:12, 17:13, 17:18, 18:12, 19:9, 20:5, 21:30, 21:33.

<sup>86</sup> 1Kgds 20:40; 3Kgds 13:24.

<sup>88</sup> 1Kgds 26:6 bis.

		גלה = 1 <sup>85</sup>	יצא = 2 <sup>87</sup>	נפל = 1 <sup>89</sup>
ἐκ-	49	No MT match = 1 <sup>90</sup> הלך = 1 <sup>91</sup>	יצא = 46 <sup>92</sup> צבה = 1 <sup>93</sup>	
ἐπι-	2	בוא = 1 <sup>94</sup> עבר = 1 <sup>95</sup>		
μετα-	3	סבב = 3 <sup>96</sup>		
παρα-	4	עבר = 4 <sup>97</sup>		
προσ-	10	No MT match = 1 <sup>98</sup> בוא = 1 <sup>99</sup>	הלך = 1 <sup>100</sup> נגש = 6 <sup>101</sup>	קרב = 1 <sup>102</sup>

There are in total 33 compound forms of -πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms. Again, they are made from a variety of prefixes including δια-, εἰς-, -ἐκ/-ἐξ, παρα- and προσ-. The following table sets out the Hebrew translational equivalents:

Table 11: *Hebrew Equivalents for -πορεύομαι Compounds*

Prefix	Occurrences	Hebrew Equivalent(s)
δια-	4	הלך = 2 <sup>103</sup> עבר = 2 <sup>104</sup>
εἰς-	10	בוא = 10 <sup>105</sup>

<sup>85</sup> 1Kgds 14:11.

<sup>87</sup> 1Kgds 9:14.

<sup>89</sup> 1Kgds 11:7.

<sup>90</sup> 1Kgds 1:23.

<sup>91</sup> 2Kgds 2:12.

<sup>92</sup> 1Kgds 2:3, 4:1, 7:11, 8:20, 9:11, 9:26, 11:3, 11:10, 13:10, 13:17, 13:23, 14:41, 17:4, 18:6, 19:3, 20:35, 21:6, 23:13 bis, 23:15, 24:14, 26:20, 28:1, 30:21; 2Kgds 2:12, 2:13, 6:20, 10:8; 3Kgds 2:36, 2:42, 2:46, 8:10, 8:19, 8:44, 9:12, 11:29, 12:25, 19:11, 19:13, 21:16 (= 1Kings 20:16), 21:17 (= 1Kings 20:17) bis, 21:19 (= 1Kings 20:19), 21:21 (= 1Kings 20:21), 21:31 (= 1Kings 20:31), 21:33 (= 1Kings 20:33), 21:39 (= 1Kings 20:39).

<sup>93</sup> 1Kgds 28:1.

<sup>94</sup> 1Kgds 30:23.

<sup>95</sup> 3Kgds 19:19.

<sup>96</sup> 1Kgds 5:8 bis, 5:9.

<sup>97</sup> 1Kgds 16:8; 2Kgds 2:15; 3Kgds 18:29, 19:11.

<sup>98</sup> 1Kgds 4:16.

<sup>99</sup> 1Kgds 7:13.

<sup>100</sup> 1Kgds 15:32.

<sup>101</sup> 1Kgds 17:40; 2Kgds 1:15, 10:13; 3Kgds 21:13 (= 1Kings 20:13), 21:22 (= 1Kings 20:22), 21:28 (= 1Kings 20:28).

<sup>102</sup> 1Kgds 14:36.

<sup>103</sup> 1Kgds 12:2; 3Kgds 18:35.

<sup>104</sup> 1Kgds 29:3; 3Kgds 9:8.

<sup>105</sup> 1Kgds 5:5, 9:14, 11:11, 18:13, 18:16, 26:5, 26:7; 3Kgds 14:28, 15:17, 16:18.

ἐκ-/εξ-	13	יצא = 13 <sup>106</sup>
παρα-	4	עבר = 4 <sup>107</sup>
προ-	2	הלך = 1 <sup>108</sup> עבר = 1 <sup>109</sup>

As can be seen, for both -έρχομαι and -πορεύομαι compounds, there is variation in the Hebrew equivalents. Notably, the primary Hebrew roots translated by these Greek compounds are הלך and בוא. These are, of course, the same two main verbal roots translated by the Greek simplices. The obvious conclusion is that the translator is working according to the context of the narrative as he understands it and in accordance with natural Koine Greek lexicon, as opposed to merely producing mechanical equivalents. It is not the Hebrew that dictates the use of a compound form. Rather, it is the contextual demands of the target language.

#### 4.8 Morphological Profile of -έρχομαι and -πορεύομαι Compounds

The following table sets out the morphology of the compounds of ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι as they appear in OG Kingdoms:

Table 12: *Morphological Breakdown of -έρχομαι and -πορεύομαι Compounds*<sup>110</sup>

Compound				-έρχομαι	-πορεύομαι
ἀπο-	Finite	Indicative	Present	-	-
			Imperfect	-	-
			Future	3	-
			Aorist	28	-
			Perfect	-	-
			Pluperfect	1	-
		Subjunctive	Aorist	3	-
		Imperative	Aorist	3	-

<sup>106</sup> 1Kgds 11:7, 14:11, 17:8, 17:35, 18:13, 18:16, 24:15; 3Kgds 2:30, 5:13, 8:9, 15:17, 21:18, 10:29.

<sup>107</sup> 1Kgds 29:2 bis; 3Kgds 13:25, 21:39.

<sup>108</sup> 1Kgds 17:7.

<sup>109</sup> 1Kgds 25:19.

<sup>110</sup> This table provides figures for the indicative in the present, imperfect, future, aorist and perfect tense for every verbal compound. The figures for attestations of the pluperfect indicative, non-finite forms and the oblique moods are only provided when they occur.

	Non-Finite	Infinitive	Aorist	3	-
δια-	Finite	Indicative	Present	-	1
			Imperfect	-	1
			Future	2	-
			Aorist	9	-
			Perfect	1	-
	Non-Finite	Subjunctive	Aorist	1	-
		Imperative	Aorist	1	-
		Infinitive	Aorist	2	-
		Participle	Present	-	2
εισ-	Finite	Indicative	Present	-	4
			Imperfect	-	3
			Future	15	-
			Aorist	36	-
			Perfect	-	-
	Non-Finite	Subjunctive	Aorist	3	-
		Imperative	Aorist	4	-
		Infinitive	Aorist	1	-
		Participle	Present	-	3
			Aorist	2	-
ἐκ-/ἐξ-	Finite	Indicative	Present	1	5
			Imperfect	-	4
			Future	9	-
			Aorist	27	-
			Perfect	2	-
	Non-Finite	Subjunctive	Aorist	2	-
		Imperative	Aorist	2	-
		Infinitive	Present	-	1
			Aorist	3	-
		Participle	Present	-	3



ἔρχομαι/πορεύομαι

			Aorist	2	-
			Perfect	1	-
ἐπι-	Finite	Indicative	Present	-	-
			Imperfect	-	-
			Future	-	-
			Aorist	1	-
			Perfect	-	-
	Non-Finite	Participle	Present	1	-
μετα-	Finite	Indicative	Present	-	-
			Imperfect	-	-
			Future	-	-
			Aorist	1	-
			Perfect	-	-
	Non-finite	Imperative	Aorist	1	-
		Infinitive	Aorist	1	-
παρα-	Finite	Indicative	Present	-	-
			Imperfect	-	3
			Future	1	-
			Aorist	3	-
			Perfect	-	-
	Non-Finite	Participle	Present	-	1
προσ-	Finite	Indicative	Present	-	-
			Imperfect	-	-
			Future	-	-
			Aorist	7	-
			Perfect	-	-
	Non-Finite	Subjunctive	Aorist	1	-
		Infinitive	Aorist	1	-
		Participle	Aorist	1	-

προ-	Finite	Indicative	Present	-	1
			Imperfect	-	1
			Future	-	-
			Aorist	-	-
			Perfect	-	-

#### 4.9 Analysis of -έρχομαι and -πορεύομαι Compounds in OG Kingdoms

The above table demonstrates that the use of compound forms of -έρχομαι and -πορεύομαι in OG Kingdoms adheres to linguistic trends evidenced in the early Koine period. Amongst the most striking of these is the complete absence of compound forms of -πορεύομαι prefixed with ἀπο- along with the absence of present tense forms of ἀπέρχομαι. This aligns with the unexpected adoption of ἀποτρέχω as the standard word meaning ‘to go away’ in the Koine period.<sup>111</sup> This word occurs four times in OG Kingdoms, repeatedly with the sense of ‘depart’ or ‘go away’, rather than the older sense of ‘run away’.<sup>112</sup> This is a significant example of natural Koine lexicon and natural Koine semantics appearing in OG Kingdoms.<sup>113</sup> In terms of translation equivalents, three of the occurrences of ἀποτρέχω translate forms of the Hebrew root  $\text{לָחַל}$ . The one exception is 3 Kingdoms 12:16, for which the relevant portion of the corresponding MT passage runs  $\text{לְאֶהֱלֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  (to your tents,

<sup>111</sup> Lee 1983: 125.

<sup>112</sup> 1Kgs 8:22 - καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Σαμουὴλ Ἄκουε τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶν καὶ βασιλεύσον αὐτοῖς βασιλέα. καὶ εἶπεν Σαμουὴλ πρὸς ἄνδρας Ἰσραὴλ Ἀποτρεχέτω ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ. (And the Lord said to Samouel, ‘Hear their voice and appoint a king for them. And Samouel said to the men of Israel, ‘Let each man return to his city.’) 3Kgs 2:26 - Καὶ τῷ Αβιαθαρ τῷ ἱερεὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀπότρεχε σὺ εἰς Ἀναθωθ εἰς ἀγρόν σου, ὅτι ἀνὴρ θανάτου εἶ σὺ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ, καὶ οὐ θανατώσω σε, ὅτι ἦρας τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ ὅτι ἐκακουχήθης ἐν ἅπασιν, οἷς ἐκακουχήθη ὁ πατήρ μου. (And the king said to Abiathar the priest, ‘Return to Anathoth, to your field, because you are a man of death on this day, and I will not put you to death, because you took up the ark of the covenant of the Lord before my father, and because you suffered all the things which my father suffered.’) Taylor translates ‘Ἀπότρεχε σὺ εἰς Ἀναθωθ ...’ as ‘Depart quickly to Anathoth...’ The context of the verse may suggest a sense of haste due to a possible threat of violence, though the general usage of ἀποτρέχω in the Koine period seems equally fitting and is more natural as Koine Greek in this context. 3Kgs 12:16 - καὶ εἶδον πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι οὐκ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ λαὸς τῷ βασιλεὶ λέγων Τίς ἡμῖν μερίς ἐν Δαυιδ; καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν κληρονομία ἐν υἱῷ Ἰεσσαὶ· ἀπότρεχε, Ἰσραὴλ, εἰς τὰ σκηνώματά σου· νῦν βόσκει τὸν οἶκόν σου, Δαυιδ. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὰ σκηνώματα αὐτοῦ. (And all Israel saw that their king did not listen, and the people responded to the king saying, ‘What share is there for us in David? And we do not have an inheritance in the son of Iessai; depart, Israel, to your tents; Now feed your house, David. And Israel departed to their tents.’) 3Kgs 21:36 - καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Ἄνθ’ ὧν οὐκ ἤκουσας τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου, ἰδοὺ σὺ ἀποτρέχεις ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, καὶ πατάξει σε λέων· καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὗρίσκει αὐτὸν λέων καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτόν. (And he said to him, ‘Because you have not heard the voice of the Lord, look, you are departing from me and a lion will strike you.’ And he departed from him, and a lion finds him and struck him.)

<sup>113</sup> The use of the word ἀποτρέχω in the Pentateuch as evidence for natural Koine vocabulary is an important point in Lee’s 1983 thesis. Lee 1983: 125–128.

Israel). There is no imperative form. It is possible that this is a case of variation between the MT and the *Vorlage*.<sup>114</sup> Nevertheless, it is significant that the Greek text balances the ἀπότρεχε against the ἀπῆλθεν of the following clause. This balancing also occurs at 1 Kingdoms 21:36.<sup>115</sup> The corresponding use of these two verbs in different tenses demonstrates that the translator sees them as having the same semantic meaning. The variation between ἀποτρέχω and ἀπῆλθεν is prompted by the standard Koine use of particular forms in different tenses. This aligns with the fact that the aorist tense of compound verbs continues to be supplied by -ῆλθεν throughout the Koine period. This phenomenon is likewise attested consistently in OG Kingdoms, in which all aorist tense forms, including the oblique moods and non-finite forms, are supplied by -ῆλθεν. This trend applies also to the perfect system. While this system is not well-attested in OG Kingdoms, all five forms of the perfect system for compound verbs are derived from -ελήλυθα.<sup>116</sup> The beginnings of the merger of the perfect and aorist tenses can be detected as early as Menander; however, the low attestation of the perfect system in OG Kingdoms is unrelated to this process which does not become a prominent development until later in the history of the language.<sup>117</sup> Its low number of occurrences in OG Kingdoms is determined by the necessities of the narrative. Moreover, the use of the perfect system in OG Kingdoms aligns with its earlier and its contemporary use.<sup>118</sup>

The role of -πορεύομαι compounds in the present system again accords with natural Koine Greek. As can be seen throughout the above table, the overwhelming majority of finite present and imperfect compound verbal forms are supplied by -πορεύομαι. This accords precisely with Lee's observation that 'In the Koine ... [compounds of -πορεύομαι] come into use as the main replacements for the earlier compounds of -έρχομαι, which tend to drop out. The new compounds usually supply the present and imperfect.'<sup>119</sup> For OG Kingdoms, the only exception to this pattern in the indicative is found at 1 Kingdoms 23:15

<sup>114</sup> This passage is not preserved in the Qumran fragments.

<sup>115</sup> 3Kgs 21:36 - καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Ἄνθ' ὃν οὐκ ἤκουσας τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου, ἰδοὺ σὺ ἀποτρέχεις ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ πατάξει σε λέων· καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὗρίσκει αὐτὸν λέων καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτόν. (And he said to him, 'Because you have not heard the voice of the Lord, look, you are departing from me and a lion will strike you.' And he departed from him, and a lion finds him and struck him.)

<sup>116</sup> 1Kgs 9:11 - 'ἐξεληλυθότα'. 1Kgs 12:2 - 'διεληλυθα'. 1Kgs 26:20 - 'ἐξεληλυθεν'. 2Kgs 3:22 - 'ἀπεληλύθει'. 3Kgs 21:17 - 'ἐξεληλύθασιν'.

<sup>117</sup> On the merger of the aorist and perfect see Horrocks 2010: 176–178.

<sup>118</sup> Mandilaras (1973: 217, § 458) notes that the perfect is still in full use in the Ptolemaic papyri and that it 'almost entirely conforms to late Classical and Hellenistic usage.' Its full use in OG Kingdoms is therefore not surprising.

<sup>119</sup> Lee 1983: 85–86.

which has the form ἐξέρχεται.<sup>120</sup> Nevertheless, the use of -πορεύομαι in compounds over -έρχομαι extends also into non-finite forms. The single present infinitival form is supplied by ἐκπορεύεσθαι at 3 Kingdoms 8:9.<sup>121</sup> Regarding present participles, the majority again come from -πορεύομαι compounds. There is, however, an interesting variation to this pattern; at 1 Kingdoms 30:23 the form ἐπερχόμενον is found.<sup>122</sup> Here the participle has the sense of ‘to advance against’ with hostility. This again demonstrates natural Greek semantics, with the word ἐπέρχομαι commonly carrying a sense of hostility making it an appropriate choice for the context.<sup>123</sup> It is also significant that this form uses the post-classical -ερχόμενος over the classical -ιών. The disappearance of forms derived from εἶμι in the Koine period is also detectable in the formation of future tense compounds in OG Kingdoms. All 30 future forms of compound verbs derive from the Ionic future -ελεύσομαι.<sup>124</sup> This too is noted by Lee as standard for the early Koine period.<sup>125</sup>

Several features of verbal terminations also relate closely to Koine period linguistic developments. In line with the observations of Browning, there is some interchange between strong and weak aorist endings in compound forms of -ῆλθον, though second aorist forms are still the most prominent.<sup>126</sup> Notably, several of these first aorist -ῆλθον compounds are imperatives. Thackeray notes that the use of first aorist endings on what were once second aorist verbs begins in the case of ῆλθον primarily in the imperative, though he also notes that -α forms of the indicative are attested, even in the Pentateuch.<sup>127</sup>

<sup>120</sup> 1Kgds 23:15 - καὶ εἶδεν Δαυὶδ ὅτι ἐξέρχεται Σαουλ τοῦ ζητεῖν τὸν Δαυὶδ· καὶ Δαυὶδ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἀρχμώδει ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Ζιφ. (And David saw that Saul was coming out to seek David; and David was on the dry mountain in new Ziph.)

<sup>121</sup> 3Kgds 8:9 - οὐκ ἦν ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ πλὴν δύο πλάκες λίθιναι, πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης, αἷς ἔθηκεν ἐκεῖ Μωϋσῆς ἐν Χωρηβ, ἃ διέθετο κύριος μετὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου. (There was nothing in the ark except two stone tablets, tablets of the covenant, which Moyses placed there in Choreb, which the lord arranged with the sons of Israel when they came out from the land of Egypt.)

<sup>122</sup> 1Kgds 30:23 - καὶ εἶπεν Δαυὶδ Οὐ ποιήσετε οὕτως μετὰ τὸ παραδοῦναι τὸν κύριον ἡμῖν καὶ φυλάξαι ἡμᾶς καὶ παρέδωκεν κύριος τὸν γεδδουρ τὸν ἐπερχόμενον ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς εἰς χεῖρας ἡμῶν. (and David said, ‘You will not do so after the lord delivered to us and guarded us and the lord gave the geddour that was coming against us into our hands.’)

<sup>123</sup> LSJ s.v. ‘ἐπέρχομαι’, A.I.1.b. - ‘freq. in hostile sense, go or come against, attack abs.’

<sup>124</sup> 1Kgds 2:30 (διελεύσεται), 2:35 (διελεύσεται), 6:8 (ἀπελεύσεται), 8:20 (ἐξελεύσεται), 10:3 (ἀπελεύσει), 10:5 (εἰσελεύσει), 11:3 (ἐξελεύσόμεθα), 11:10 (ἐξελεύσόμεθα), 19:3 (ἐξελεύσομαι), 20:13 (ἀπελεύσει), 21:16 (εἰσελεύσεται), 24:14 (ἐξελεύσεται), 26:6 bis (εἰσελεύσεται, εἰσελεύσομαι), 28:1 (ἐξελεύσει); 2Kgds 5:6 bis (εἰσελεύσει, εἰσελεύσεται), 5:8 (εἰσελεύσονται), 5:24 (ἐξελεύσεται), 6:9 (εἰσελεύσεται); 3Kgds 2:36 (ἐξελεύσει), 8:44 (ἐξελεύσεται), 11:2 bis (εἰσελεύσονται, εἰσελεύσονται), 13:8 (εἰσελεύσομαι), 13:22 (εἰσέλθῃ), 17:12 (εἰσελεύσομαι), 18:12 (εἰσελεύσομαι), 19:11 bis (Ἐξελεύσει, παρελεύσεται).

<sup>125</sup> Lee 1983: 86.

<sup>126</sup> 1Kgds 25:5 (ἀπέλθατε), 2:3 (ἐξελθάτω), 7:11 (ἐξῆλθαν); 2Kgds 10:8 (ἐξῆλθαν), 10:14 (εἰσῆλθαν); 3Kgds 21:33 (Εἰσέλθατε), 21:19 (ἐξελθάτωσαν).

<sup>127</sup> Thackeray 1909: 211, § 17.2.

One of the more interesting forms is ἐξήλθοσαν which occurs at 2 Kingdoms 2:13.<sup>128</sup> Mayser notes that the aorist ending -οσαν is attested in the Ptolemaic papyri.<sup>129</sup> Moreover, Mandilaras notes that this ending is most common in the post-Ptolemaic papyri in select verbs, primarily the simplex and compound forms of -ῆλθον.<sup>130</sup> Thackeray notes this as a Koine period development intended to ‘discriminate between the 1st sing. and the 3rd plur. which in classical Greek ended alike in -ov in these two tenses.’<sup>131</sup> Thus the presence of an -οσαν ending is not surprising given the wider contemporary linguistic circumstances of OG Kingdoms.

#### 4.10 Other Verbs of Linear Movement

The focus of this chapter rests on a limited selection of verbs chosen because they exhibit numerous changes indicative of Koine period developments. A brief note is necessary to confirm that OG Kingdoms uses other verbs belonging to the domain of linear movement, though these are not studied in detail. The verb παραγίγομαι is common in the sense of ‘come’ and consistently renders the Hebrew בוא.<sup>132</sup> Interestingly, the Greek ἦκω is also used with the same sense, primarily in the future and present with a perfect reference and again consistently translates בוא.<sup>133</sup> The verb ἀφικνέομαι, on the other hand, is unattested in OG Kingdoms. This is also an uncommon word in the LXX in general.<sup>134</sup> The ideas of ‘go up’ and ‘go down’, which are primarily represented in Hebrew by עלה and ירד, are typically translated by the Greek ἀναβαίνω and καταβαίνω in OG Kingdoms.<sup>135</sup> In this

<sup>128</sup> 2Kgds 2:13 - καὶ Ἰωαβ υἱὸς Σαρουίας καὶ οἱ παῖδες Δαυὶδ ἐξήλθοσαν ἐκ Χεβρων καὶ συναντῶσιν αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὴν κρήνην τὴν Γαβαων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, καὶ ἐκάθισαν οὗτοι ἐπὶ τὴν κρήνην τὴν Γαβαων ἐντεῦθεν καὶ οὗτοι ἐπὶ τὴν κρήνην ἐντεῦθεν. (and Ioab Son of Sarouias and the sons of Daudid went out from Chebron and met them at the well of Gabaon at the same place and they sat, these at the well of Gabaon here and these at the well there.)

<sup>129</sup> Mayser *Grammatik* I.II, 83.

<sup>130</sup> Mandilaras 1973: 155, § 321.

<sup>131</sup> Thackeray 1909: 210, § 17.1.

<sup>132</sup> 1Kgds 8:4, 9:6, 13:8, 13:10, 13:11, 13:15, 15:13, 19:18, 20:21, 20:24, 20:27, 20:29, 22:9, 22:11, 25:19, 25:34, 25:36, 30:21; 2Kgds 1:3, 3:13, 3:22, 3:25, 5:1, 5:18, 6:6, 6:16, 8:5, 9:6, 10:2, 10:14, 10:16, 10:17; 3Kgds 3:15, 5:14, 10:7, 12:12, 13:1, 21:27.

<sup>133</sup> 1Kgds 2:34, 2:36, 4:6, 4:7, 4:16, 9:12, 10:3, 10:7, 15:12, 16:2, 16:5, 20:19, 22:5, 23:7, 25:8, 26:3, 26:4, 29:6, 29:9, 29:10; 2Kgds 3:23; 3Kgds 8:42, 13:21, 19:15.

<sup>134</sup> Gen 28:12, 38:1, 47:9; Idt 1:14, 8:32; 2Makk 6:15; Prov 1:27; Iob 11:7, 13:27, 15:8, 16:20; Sir 43:27, 43:30, 47:16.

<sup>135</sup> ἀναβαίνω - 1Kgds 1:3, 1:7, 1:11, 1:21, 1:22 bis, 1:24, 2:10, 2:14, 2:19, 2:28, 5:12, 6:20, 7:7, 9:11, 9:13 bis, 9:14 bis, 9:19, 9:26, 10:3, 11:1, 13:5 bis, 13:15, 14:9, 14:10 bis, 14:12 bis, 14:13, 14:21, 14:46, 15:2, 15:6, 15:34, 23:19, 24:1, 24:23, 25:5, 25:13, 25:35, 27:8, 28:13, 28:14, 28:15, 29:11; 2Kgds 2:1 tris, 2:2, 2:27, 5:17, 5:19 bis, 5:22, 5:23, 8:7; 3Kgds 2:35f, 5:14b, 10:29, 12:18, 12:24, 12:24o, 12:24u, 12:24x, 12:24y, 12:27, 12:28, 12:32, 12:33 bis, 14:25, 15:17, 15:19, 16:17, 18:29, 18:41, 18:42 bis, 18:43, 18:44, 21:1 bis, 21:22, 21:26. καταβαίνω - 1Kgds 6:21, 9:25, 9:27, 10:5, 10:8 bis, 13:12, 13:20, 14:36, 14:37, 15:12, 17:8, 22:1, 23:4, 23:6, 23:8, 23:11, 23:20, 23:25, 24:8, 25:1, 25:20 bis, 26:2, 26:10, 30:24; 2Kgds 1:21, 5:17, 5:24; 3Kgds 2:35n, 6:32, 18:44, 20:16, 20:18 bis.

respect, it is significant to note that ἀνα- and κατα- compounds of -έρχομαι and -πορεύομαι are extremely rare in OG Kingdoms.<sup>136</sup> This owes to the fact that these ideas, ‘go up’ and ‘go down’, were chiefly supplied by compounds of -βαίνω in the Koine period.<sup>137</sup> This again confirms the naturalness of the lexicon of OG Kingdoms. The verb οἶχομαι is unattested in OG Kingdoms. It is rare in the LXX in general and appears only three times in the Pentateuch.<sup>138</sup> Likewise, ὑπάγω, which becomes common in the sense of ‘go away’ in the first century CE, is not found in OG Kingdoms as is to be expected given the proposed date of composition.<sup>139</sup>

#### **4.11 Syntax of ἔρχομαι/πορεύομαι and Compounds**

One of the more significant Koine period developments that affects the use of verbs belonging to the domain of linear movement is increasing confusion between the prepositions ἐν and εἰς. By the beginning of the CE period, the preposition εἰς, which in the Classical period more commonly meant ‘into’, had largely subsumed the function of ἐν, which formerly had expressed primarily a locative sense.<sup>140</sup> This ultimately resulted in the disappearance of ἐν over the first few centuries CE.<sup>141</sup> Mayser notes that this phenomenon is detectable in the Ptolemaic papyri.<sup>142</sup> In OG Kingdoms, predominantly the preposition ἐν continues to express a locative sense. A good example is 1 Kingdoms 2:14:

κατὰ τάδε ἐποίουν παντὶ Ἰσραὴλ τοῖς ἐρχομένοις θῦσαι κυρίῳ ἐν Σηλωμ.

(and they used to do according to this to all Israel as they were coming to sacrifice to the lord at Selom.)

---

<sup>136</sup> The only occurrence is 3Kgds 13:12 - καὶ ἐλάλησεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ πατήρ αὐτῶν λέγων Ποία ὁδὸς πεπόρευται; καὶ δεικνύουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ὁδὸν, ἐν ᾗ ἀνῆλθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐλθὼν ἐξ Ἰουδα. (And their father spoke to them saying, ‘on which road has he come? And his sons showed him the road on which the man of god who came from Iouda went up.’)

<sup>137</sup> Lee 1983: 86, n.3.

<sup>138</sup> Gen 12:4, 25:34, 31:19; 2Suppl 8:17, 8:18, 21:9; 1Esdr 9:54; Tob 2:7; 4Makk 4:1, 4:14; Job 14:10, 14:20, 19:10, 30:15; Hos 10:14; Jer 9:9, 16:11, 27:6, 30:1, 31:11, 35:11, 48:10, 48:12, 48:15, 48:17; Bar 1:22.

<sup>139</sup> Lee 1983: 144. BDF § 101 s.v. ‘ἄγειν’ - ‘Υπάγειν is the popular word for ‘go, depart’ (from which MGr πάγω πηγαίνω): most frequently in John, never Acts, Paul, Heb; it forms only a pres. (most frequently impera. ὑπάγε ὑπάγετε; other present forms, e.g. Jn 3: 8 ὑπάγει) and is supplemented by means of πορεύεσθαι (which is not itself defective’).

<sup>140</sup> Voitila 2016: 117.

<sup>141</sup> Voitila 2016: 118.

<sup>142</sup> Mayser *Grammatik* II.2: 371–373.

Additionally, εἰς is consistently used to express directionality with ἔρχομαι, πορεύομαι and compounds which aligns with its historic use.<sup>143</sup> There is, however, one instance in which ἐν is possibly used with the sense of directionality. It is found at 3 Kingdoms 19:4:

καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπορεύθη ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὁδὸν ἡμέρας καὶ ἦλθεν καὶ ἐκάθισεν ὑπὸ ραθμ  
ἐν ...

(and he went into the wilderness for a day's journey and he came, and he sat  
down under one rathm ...)

As Voitila notes, it is often difficult to detect if the writer intended 'directionality or location'.<sup>144</sup> This is true for the above reference; the sense may be intended to mean that the subject marched for a day 'within the wilderness', rather than 'into the wilderness'. Additionally, there is one particularly good example in which εἰς serves both a locative and a directional function in the same verse:

καὶ εἶπεν Ἰωνᾶθαν πρὸς Δαυὶδ Πορεύου καὶ μένε εἰς ἀγρόν. καὶ ἐκπορεύονται  
ἀμφοτέρω εἰς ἀγρόν.

(And Jonathan said to David, 'Go and stay in a field. And they both went out  
into a field.')

As can be seen, there are clear indications of the interchange of ἐν and εἰς in the language of OG Kingdoms.

Other syntactic relations found with ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι and their compounds in OG Kingdoms are indicative of good command over natural Greek. Although these are not unique to the Koine period, they demonstrate the translator's familiarity with the target language. Specifically, various verbs belonging to the domain of linear movement are commonly found with a bare dative relative pronoun.<sup>146</sup> All of these dative relative

<sup>143</sup> 1Kgds 1:18, 1:19, 4:3, 4:5, 4:12, 9:5, 9:10, 10:10, 10:13, 10:26, 11:4, 11:14, 11:15, 15:12, 16:4, 17:48, 19:22, 19:23, 20:40, 20:42, 21:2, 22:1, 23:3, 23:5, 23:16, 23:28, 24:4, 25:26, 25:33, 25:40, 26:1, 29:4, 29:10, 30:3, 20:26; 2Kgds 2:19, 2:29, 3:20, 5:3; 3Kgds 2:30, 2:35m, 2:40, 2:41, 2:42, 3:4, 9:12, 9:28, 10:2, 10:13, 11:18, 11:43, 12:1 bis, 12:24f, 13:10, 16:28f, 17:9, 17:10, 18:7, 18:16, 18:45, 19:3, 21:43.

<sup>144</sup> Voitila 2016: 118.

<sup>145</sup> 1Kgds 20:11.

<sup>146</sup> 1Kgds 13:10 - καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἐν ὁδῷ ἄλλῃ καὶ οὐκ ἀνέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣ ἦλθεν ἐν αὐτῇ εἰς Βαιθηλ. (and he departed on another road and did not return on the road on which he came on it to Baithel.). 2Kgds 7:7 - ἐν πᾶσιν, οἷς διῆλθον ἐν παντὶ Ἰσραηλ, εἰ λαλῶν ἐλάλησα πρὸς μίαν φυλὴν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ ... (in

pronouns have a dative antecedent. These are universally cases of relative attraction.<sup>147</sup> As is expected, the dative relative pronoun renders the Hebrew relative particle אשר. The resulting Greek is perfectly natural and uses a feature of the Greek language, relative attraction, attested since the Classical period, in a clever way that renders a single Hebrew word with a single Greek word that accords entirely with natural Greek.<sup>148</sup>

#### **4.12 Concluding Remarks on ἔρχομαι, πορεύομαι and Compounds**

The verbs ἔρχομαι, πορεύομαι and their compounds undergo extensive development in the Koine period. This complicated pattern of interrelated developments is identifiable in the language of OG Kingdoms. Semantically, ἔρχομαι has the reduced sense of ‘to come’ while πορεύομαι occupies the semantic field of ‘to go’. The complicated series of developments seen in the sphere of morphology is also attested. The old Attic εἶμι has fallen away entirely. In its place are found participial and imperfect forms of ἔρχομαι following the patterns of ἐρχόμενος and ἤρχομην. Additionally, the future is supplied by the Ionic ἐλεύσομαι. There is a demonstrated tendency to replace second aorist endings with first aorist endings in certain moods and tenses of -ἦλθον compounds. Moreover, compound forms of the present and imperfect tenses are derived almost entirely from -πορεύομαι. While there is a tendency toward stereotyping, the few variations on this pattern, notably the use of ἐπέρχομαι in the sense of ‘to attack’, demonstrates again natural Greek semantics and the sensitivity of the translator to context. The use of ἀποτρέχω in a semantically bleached sense as the default word for the idea of ‘go away’ is also attested. The Koine period confusion between ἐν and εἰς is attested in the language of the translator of OG Kingdoms.

---

everything to which I have moved about in all Israel, if speaking I spoke with one tribe of Israel ...). 2Kgds 7:9 - καὶ ἦμην μετὰ σοῦ ἐν πᾶσιν, οἷς ἐπορεύου, καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσα πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ἀπὸ προσώπου σου καὶ ἐποίησά σε ὀνομαστὸν κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα τῶν μεγάλων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. (And I was with you in everything to which you went and I destroyed all your enemies from your face and I made you famous like the name of the great ones upon the earth.) 2Kgds 8:6 - καὶ ἔσωσεν κύριος τὸν Δαυὶδ ἐν πᾶσιν, οἷς ἐπορεύετο. (And the Lord preserved David in everything to which he would go.) 2Kgds 8:14 - καὶ ἔσωσεν κύριος τὸν Δαυὶδ ἐν πᾶσιν, οἷς ἐπορεύετο. (And the Lord preserved David in everything to which he would go.) 3Kgds 13:9 - Μὴ φάγῃς ἄρτον καὶ μὴ πῖνῃς ὕδωρ καὶ μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣ ἐπορεύθης ἐν αὐτῇ. (Do not eat bread and do not drink water and do not return on the road on which you went on it). 3Kgds 13:17 - Μὴ φάγῃς ἄρτον ἐκεῖ καὶ μὴ πῖνῃς ὕδωρ ἐκεῖ καὶ μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣ ἐπορεύθης ἐν αὐτῇ. (Do not eat bread there and do not drink water there and do not return on the road on which you went on it).

<sup>147</sup> Smyth notes, ‘a relative pronoun is often attracted from its proper case into the case of its antecedent, especially from the accusative into the genitive or dative.’ *SM Grammar* § 2522. van Emde Boas et al. 2018: 569, § 50.13 - ‘The relative nearly always takes on the same case as its antecedent if (and only if): ... the antecedent is in the genitive or dative’.

<sup>148</sup> Interestingly, Muraoka begins his discussion of the phenomenon of ‘attraction to the antecedent’ in the LXX by noting the rules of Classical Greek. Muraoka *Syn.* 731, § 86, a.



The findings of this study of verbs of linear movement align with Lee's observations regarding the language of the Pentateuch and the wider history of the words in post-Classical Greek.<sup>149</sup> The linguistic similarities in the use of these words in OG Kingdoms and the Pentateuch suggests that these two portions of the LXX used natural Koine Greek, that they shared the same linguistic context and that they were composed within a relatively close period of time to one another. Close study of the use of ἔρχομαι, πορεύομαι and their compounds against the wider history of the Greek language allows for the evidenced-based assertion that the language of OG Kingdoms reflects natural Koine Greek.

---

<sup>149</sup> Lee 1983: 85–92, 125–128, 144.

## Conclusions

Through a series of studies on the verbs πολεμῶ, ἐντέλλομαι, and ἔρχομαι/πορεύομαι and their compounds, this thesis has demonstrated that the language of OG Kingdoms reflects linguistic developments of the Greek language in the Koine period. The essentially Koine nature of its language manifests itself in a number of ways. Despite its reputation as highly ‘literal’ and ‘isomorphic’, OG Kingdoms consistently uses vocabulary typical of the Koine period. The use of ἐντέλλομαι as the standard word meaning ‘to order’ or ‘to command’ reflects normal contemporary patterns within this semantic domain. The examples of this word in the documentary evidence demonstrate that it was in use in the early Koine period, though not as common as other alternatives. Its universal use in OG Kingdoms offers support to Lee’s suggestion that this word had a heavier tone than other possible ‘order’ verbs which were more common. It was likely chosen as the standard ‘order’ verb in OG Kingdoms as its tone fits the authoritative and serious nature of the subject matter. Natural Koine lexicon is particularly apparent in verbs belonging to the domain of linear movement. The use of πορεύομαι meaning ‘to go’ is standard for the early Koine period. This lexical choice relates closely to the fact that ἔρχομαι lost the sense of ‘to go’ at that time. This semantic development is also present in OG Kingdoms. Notably, ἀποτρέχω is repeatedly used as the present tense form for the idea of ‘to go away’ in place of ἀπέρχομαι or ἀποπορεύομαι. The solitary use of the present participial form of ἐπέρχομαι in the sense of ‘to attack’, which serves as one of many possible translational equivalents for the Hebrew בָּרַח, indicates the use of natural Greek lexicon in accordance with the contextual meaning of the Hebrew, though this is not a Koine development.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the violation of the equation of חָלַל with πολεμῶ in the story of David and Goliath demonstrates another case of natural Greek lexicon. The word chosen, μονομαχῶ, is not a common word. Nevertheless, it is used consistently by high register literary writers of the Greek historiographical tradition in the Koine period including Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Diodorus Siculus, when relating the numerous instances of single combat in the early and middle Roman Republic. Further study would no doubt reveal

---

<sup>1</sup> 1Kgs 30:23.

numerous other instances in which the vocabulary of OG Kingdoms reflects natural Greek and, more importantly, Koine period lexical developments.

More than simply reflecting known developments in Koine Greek, OG Kingdoms itself offers valuable evidence for changes in the Greek language largely unattested elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> The thesis has demonstrated this in regard to the use of the accusative case with πολεμῶ in place of the dative, the standard case used with this word in Classical Greek and Polybius' literary Koine. The papyri provide no evidence for the use of this word in lower register writings of the early Koine period. The epigraphy offers some evidence for its use, but this is limited and primarily belongs to higher register texts such as official decrees. Consequently, OG Kingdoms is the best evidence we have for lower register use of πολεμῶ in that period. The evidence offered by OG Kingdoms on this point is supported by a small number of occurrences of the same phenomenon in the Pentateuch and a few other occurrences in Koine period literature. Moreover, as Hebrew has no one linguistic feature corresponding to the category of case, it is unlikely that the source text informs the use of the accusative in place of the dative in OG Kingdoms. Notably other verbs, such as verbs of hearing and ruling, typically exhibit natural case syntax.<sup>3</sup> Given its frequency of use in OG Kingdoms, this text offers strong evidence that the accusative supplanted the dative as the standard case used with πολεμῶ in lower register Greek of the early Koine period.<sup>4</sup>

Regarding linguistic contextualisation, Evans states that 'verbal syntax in the Greek Pentateuch may be characterized generally as typical of early Koine vernacular usage. The Attic structures are still largely intact.'<sup>5</sup> This statement may be extended to OG Kingdoms in regard to the use of the words studied in this thesis.<sup>6</sup> On the whole, the three voices of

---

<sup>2</sup> Regarding the study of the language of the LXX through use of the papyri, Lee notes, 'The traffic is not all one way: the Septuagint itself, used with due caution, is a witness to Koine Greek. By bringing the Septuagint and documentary evidence together we may elucidate or support either by the other.' Lee 2016: 102–103.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. 1Kgds 13:4 - καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ ἤκουσεν λεγόντων Πέπαικεν Σαοὺλ τὸν Νασιβ τὸν ἀλλόφυλον, καὶ ἡσχύνθησαν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις. (And all Israel heard people saying, 'Saoul struck Nasib the allophyle and Israel was ashamed among the allophytes.')

<sup>4</sup> In regard to this observation it is important to bear in mind Stolk's (2015: 74) note that 'the variation and change in the argument realizations of individual verbs is often not properly understood and not (consequently) regularized by editors ... it would be possible to reveal some further changes through diachronic analysis of argument structures of individual verbs.' The LXX is an important evidentiary source for the study of 'argument structures of individual verbs', particularly for lexical items not well attested in the papyri.

<sup>5</sup> Evans 2001: 262.

<sup>6</sup> The following observations concerning the persistence of the 'Attic system' are based on Evans' summary of changes in the Greek verbal system throughout the Koine period. Evans 2001: 53–54.

the verb persist, with the middle and passive remaining morphologically distinct. The synthetic future is well attested. The optative, which has received only limited attention in this study, is present in both its volitive and potential senses.

This is not to suggest that the language of OG Kingdoms reflects only natural Koine Greek. This thesis has shown cases of unnatural Greek. Notably the use of εἰς with an accusative after an ‘order’ verb expressing the idea of ‘to authorize sbd to act as’<sup>7</sup> is a stereotyped rendering of the Hebrew לַגִּיד. Additionally, various syntactic expressions of the content of an order verb follow the Hebrew to the point that the Greek becomes irregular. It is therefore undeniable that OG Kingdoms, like all translation books of the LXX, exhibits a degree of Semitic influence. This manifests in features such as the prevalence of parataxis over hypotaxis, the use of apodotic καί, the redundant use of pronouns in relative clauses and instances of semantic extension resulting from stereotyping. Nevertheless, once the Hebraistic influence has been identified and isolated, the vast body of material that remains offers a unique insight into the written language of the Koine period. This material is an essential tool for our understanding of the history of the Greek language.

Despite the restricted scope of this thesis, it has demonstrated that known Koine period developments consistently manifest themselves in the language of OG Kingdoms. Consequently, this thesis provides an evidenced-based contribution to the assertion that the Greek of OG Kingdoms is essentially natural Koine. Moreover, it has also demonstrated the value of the language of OG Kingdoms for extending our understanding of the history of Greek in the post-Classical period. Further and more detailed studies of this sort are necessary, especially on other extra-Pentateuchal translations within the LXX. Such research, undertaken with due caution, offers the tantalising possibility that it may reveal more evidence of linguistic developments of the Greek language in the Koine period otherwise poorly attested or as yet undiscovered.

---

<sup>7</sup> Muraoka *Lex.* s.v. ‘ἐντέλλομαι’, 3.b.

# Bibliography

- Aejmelaesus, A., 2007, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, Leuven: Peeters.
- Aejmelaesus, A., 2013, 'The Septuagint and Oral Translation', in M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies 2010*, SBLSCS 59, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, pp. 5–13.
- Aitken, J. K., 2008, 'Phonological Phenomena in Greek Papyri and Inscriptions and Their Significance for the Septuagint', in J. Corley and V. Skemp (eds.), *Studies in the Greek Bible: Essays in Honor of Francis T. Gignac, S. J.*, CBQMS 44, Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, pp. 256–77.
- Aitken, J. K., 2013, 'The Septuagint and Egyptian Translation Methods', in M. van der Meer (ed.), *XV Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, SBLSCS 60, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press pp. 269–293.
- Aitken, 2014a, 'Jewish Worship amid Greeks: The Lexical Context of the Old Greek Psalter', in R. T. McLay (ed.), *The Temple in Text and Tradition*, London: T & T Clark, pp. 48–70.
- Aitken, J. K., 2014b, *No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary*, Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible 5, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Aitken, J. K. (ed.), 2015a, *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Aitkin, J. K., 2015b, 'Introduction', in J. K. Aitkin (ed.), *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 1–11.

- Allan, R., 2013, 'Media Tantum', on G. K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, viewed online 11 September 2019.  
<<https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics>>.
- Bagnall R. S., and Cribiore, R., *Women's Letters from Ancient Egypt: 300 BC-AD 800*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Bakker, E. J. (ed.), 2010, *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Barr, J., 2003, 'Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve as a Dictionary for the Translation of the Later Books?', in M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of this Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Leuven: Peeters, pp. 523–543.
- Barthélemy, D., 1963, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, Leiden: Brill.
- Beekes, R. S. P., 2009, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden: Brill.
- Bennett Jr, E. L., and Melena, J. L., and Olivier, J., Forthcoming, *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia Volume IV: The Inscribed Documents*, Texas: The University of Texas Press.
- Bile, M., 2013, 'Cretan', on G. K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, viewed online 9 September 2019.  
<<https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics>>.
- Blass, F., and Debrunner, A., and Funk R.W., 1961, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Blomqvist, J., 1969, *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose*, Lund: Gleerup.

## Bibliography

- Bons, E., and Joosten, J. (eds.), 2016, *Handbuch zur Septuaginta*, vol. 3, *Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Boyd-Taylor, C., 2001, 'The Evidentiary Value of Septuagintal Usage for Greek Lexicography: Alice's reply to Humpty Dumpty', *BIOSCS* 34, pp. 47–80.
- Boyd-Taylor, C., 2006, 'Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot', *BIOSCS* 39, pp. 27–46.
- Brock, S. P., 1966, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel*, PhD Thesis, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, F. and Driver, S. R. and Briggs, C. A., 1907, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Browning, R., 1983, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 2nd edn., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Büchner D. (ed.), 2017, *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.
- Caird, G. B., 1982, 'Ben Sira and the Dating of the Septuagint', in E. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Evangelica, Vol. VII, Papers Presented to the Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies Held at Oxford, 1973*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, pp. 95–100.
- Campbell, D. A., 1982, *Sappho, Alcaeus. Greek Lyric, Volume I: Sappho and Alcaeus*, Loeb Classical Library 142, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Caragounis, C., 2013, 'Atticism', on G. K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, viewed online 15 September 2019.  
<<https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics>>.

- Chadwich, J. and Baumbach, L., 1963, 'The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary', *Glotta* 41, pp. 157–271.
- Clackson, J., 2007, *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conybeare, F.C. and Stock, St. G., 1995, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes*, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, reprinted from original 1905 edition published by Ginn and Company: Boston.
- Cox, C. E., 1981, "Εἰσακούω and Ἐπακούω in the Greek Psalter," *Biblica* 62, No. 2, pp. 251–258.
- Cunningham, I. C., 2003, *Synagoge: Συναγωγή Λέξεων Χρησίμων: Texts of the Original Version and of MS. B*, Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker (SGLG) 10, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Davidson, A. B., 1996, *An Introductory Hebrew Grammar: with Progressive Exercises in Reading, Writing and Pointing*, revised by J. Mauchline, 26th ed., Edinburgh: Bloomsbury.
- de Vaux, R., 1972, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, trans. D. McHugh, London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Deissmann, G. A., 1901, *Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity*, Trans. A. Grieve, Edinburgh: T & T Clarke.
- Denniston, J. D., 1954, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edn., Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dines, J. M., 2004, *The Septuagint*, London: T & T Clark International.



## Bibliography

- Dines, J., 2013, 'Was LXX Pentateuch a Style-Setter for LXX Minor Prophets?', in M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, HELSINKI 2010*, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, pp. 397–412.
- Evans, T. V. and Obbink, D. D. (eds.), 2010, *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, T. V., 2001, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, T. V., 2002, 'Some Alleged Confusions in Translations from Hebrew to Greek', *Biblica* 83, pp. 238–48.
- Evans, T. V., 2005, 'Approaches to the Language of the Septuagint', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, vol. lvi, no. 1, pp. 25–33.
- Evans, T. V., 2010a, 'The Potential of Linguistic Criteria for Dating Septuagint Books', *BIOSCS* 43, pp. 5–22.
- Evans, T. V., 2010b, 'Standard Koine Greek in Third Century BC Papyri', *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor 2007*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, pp. 197–206.
- Evans, T. V., 2019 (Forthcoming), Review of D. Büchner (ed.), *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction* (Atlanta, Georg.: SBL Press, 2017), in *Review of Biblical Literature*.
- Gehman, H. S., 1951, 'The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek', *Veuts Testamentum* 1, pp. 81–90.
- Gentry, P. J., 1995, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

- Gerber, A., 2010, *Deissmann the Philologist*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 171, New York and Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Gerber, D. E., 1999, *Greek Iambic Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC: Archilochus, Semonides, Hipponax*, Loeb Classical Library 259, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gerleman, G., 1946, *Studies in the Septuagint, II, Chronicles*, Lund: Gleerup.
- Goodwin, W. W., 1877, *Syntax of the Moods & Tenses of the Greek Verb*, Boston: Ginn & Heath.
- Hatch, E. and Redpath, H. A., 1897–1908, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, 3 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hatch, E., 1889, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Hauspie, K., 2016, ‘Transcriptions of Hebrew Words’, in E. Bons and J. Joosten (eds.), *Handbuch Zur Septuaginta: band 3 Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, Gütersloher: Verlagshaus, pp. 172–181.
- Hiebert, R. J. V. and Boyd-Taylor, C., 2017, ‘A Short History of Septuagint Studies in Canada’, *JSCS* 51, pp. 37–54.
- Horrocks, G., 2010, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2nd edn., Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Horrocks, G., 2016, ‘The Phases of the Greek language’, in E. Bons and J. Joosten (eds.), *Handbuch zur Septuaginta*, vol. 3, *Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, pp. 71–88.

## Bibliography

- Horsley, G. H. R., and Lee, J. A. L., 1994, 'A Preliminary Checklist of Abbreviations of Greek Epigraphic Volumes', *Epigraphica* 56, pp. 129–169.
- Hugo, P., 2009, 'Text History of the Books of Samuel: An Assessment of the Recent Research', in P. Hugo and A. Schenker (eds.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 132, Leiden and Boston: Brill, pp. 1–19.
- Hugo, P., 2015, '1–2 Kingdoms (1–2 Samuel)', in J. K. Aitken (ed.), *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 127–146.
- Humbert, J., 1930, *La disparition du datif en grec*, Paris: Édouard Champion.
- Janse, M., 2002, 'Aspects of Bilingualism in the History of the Greek Language', in J. N. Adams and M. Janse and S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 332–90.
- Jobes, K. H. and Silva, M., 2000, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Johnson, S. R., 2015, '3 Maccabees' in J. K. Aitken (ed.), *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 292–305.
- Joosten, J., 2008, 'The Impact of the Septuagint Pentateuch on the Greek Psalms', in M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana 2007*, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, pp. 197–207.
- Joosten, J., 2012, *Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Jorro, F. A., and Adrados, F. R., 1999, *Diccionario Micénico*, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Lampe, G. W. H. (ed.), 1961, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Law, T. M., 2011, 'How to Not Use 3 Reigns: A Plea to Scholars of the Books of Kings', VT 61, pp. 280–297.

Law, T. M., 2013, *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Law, T. M., 2015, '3–4 Kingdoms (1–2 Kings)', in J. K. Aitken (ed.), *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 147–166.

Lee, J. A. L., 1983, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*, SBLSCS 14, California: Scholars Press.

Lee, J. A. L., 1997, 'Translations of the Old Testament I. Greek', in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.-A.d. 400*, Leiden: Brill. pp. 775–783.

Lee, J. A. L., 2003a, 'A Lexical Study Thirty Years On, with Observations on "Order" Words in the LXX Pentateuch', in S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman and W.W. Fields (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 94, Leiden: Brill, pp. 513–24.

Lee, J. A. L., 2003b, *A History of New Testament Lexicography*, New York: Peter Lang.

Lee, J. A. L., 2004a, 'The Present state of lexicography of Ancient Greek', in B. A. Taylor and J. A. L. Lee and P. R. Burton and R. E. Whitaker (eds.), *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

Lee, J. A. L., 2004b, 'Review of: T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (2002)', BIOSCS 37, pp. 127–39.

## Bibliography

- Lee, J. A. L., 2007, 'ἐξαποστέλλω', in J. Joosten and P. J. Tomson (eds.), *Voces Biblicae: Septuagint Greek and its Significance for the New Testament*, Leuven: Peeters, pp. 99–113.
- Lee, J. A. L., 2010, Review of T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2009), *BIOSCS* 43, pp. 115–125.
- Lee, J. A. L., 2016, 'The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Documentary Evidence', in E. Bons and J. Joosten (eds.), *Handbuch Zur Septuaginta: band 3 Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, Gütersloher: Verlagshaus, pp. 98–108.
- Lee, J. A. L., 2018, *The Greek of the Pentateuch: Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint 2011–2012*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Louw, J. P. E, and Nida, E. A, 1989, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, 2 vols, 2nd ed., New York: United Bible Societies.
- Lust, J., 2001, *Syntax and Translation Greek*, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 77, pp. 395–401.
- Lust, J., 2017, 'Septuagint Studies in Belgium', *JSCS* 51, pp. 31–36.
- Mandilaras, B. G., 1973, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*, Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences.
- Marcos, N. F., 2000, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, Trans. W. G. E. Watson, Leiden: Brill.
- McLean, P. D., 2007, 'The Kaige Text of Reigns to the Reader', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 271–276.

Mellazo, L., 2013, 'Imperative', on G. K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, viewed online 9 September 2019.

<<https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics>>.

Moulton, J. H., 1901, Review: Deissmann's Bible Studies, *The Expository Times* XII, pp. 362–363.

Moulton, J. H., 1908, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol 1, *Prolegomena*, 3rd ed., Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Mozley, F. W., 1905, *The Psalter of the Church: The Septuagint Psalms Compared with the Hebrew, with Various Notes*, London: Cambridge University Press.

Muraoka, T., 1983, 'The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity?', *Abr-Nahrain* 21, pp. 76–78.

Muraoka, T., 2006, 'On the Syntax of Verba Jubendi in the Septuagint', in R. Pierri (ed.), *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae: Saggi Filologici di Greco Biblico*, Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, pp. 69–80.

Muraoka, T., 2009, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Leuven: Peeters.

Muraoka, T., 2016, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*, Leuven: Peeters.

North, M. A. and Hillard, A. E., 1978, *Greek Prose Composition for Schools*, 9th edn., London: Duckworth.

Oakley, S. P., 1985, 'Single Combat in the Roman Republic', *CQ* 35 (ii), pp. 392–410.

Oates, J. F., et. al., 2001, *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets*, 5th ed., (updates available at <<http://papyri.info/docs/checklist>>).

## Bibliography

- Page, D., 1974, *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Palmer, L. R., 1980, *The Greek Language*, London: Faber.
- Papanastassiou, G. C, 2001a, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', in A. F. Christidis and M. Arapopoulou and M. Chriti (eds.), *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, , trans. W. J. Lillie, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 610–617.
- Papanastassiou, G. C, 2001b, 'General Characteristics of the Ancient Greek Vocabulary', in A. F. Christidis and M. Arapopoulou and M. Chriti (eds.), *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, trans. W. J. Lillie, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 654–666.
- Perkins, L. J., 2007, 'Exodus', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 43–81.
- Pietersma, A. and Wright, B. G. (eds.), 2007a, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pietersma, A. and Wright, B. G., 2007b, 'To the Reader of Nets', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. xiii–xx.
- Pietersma, A., 2002, 'A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint', in J. Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique "From Alpha to Byte"*, University of Stellenbosch 17-21 July 2000, Brill, Leiden, pp. 337–364.

- Pietersma, A., 2006, 'LXX and DTS: A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies', *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Vol. 39, pp. 1–12.
- Pietersma, A., 2007, 'Psalms', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 542–620.
- Pietersma, A., 2017, 'The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint: Basic Principles' in D. Büchner (ed.), *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, pp. 1–16.
- Porter, S. E., 2013, 'Septuagint', on G. K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, viewed on 03 September 2018  
<[http://dx.doi.org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.1163/2214-448X\\_eagll\\_COM\\_000029](http://dx.doi.org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_000029)>.
- Powell, J. E., 1938, *A Lexicon to Herodotus*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Race, W. H., 1997, *Pindar, Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*, Loeb Classical Library 56, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rafiyenko D. and Seržant A., forthcoming, 'Postclassical Greek: An Overview', in D. Rafiyenko and A. Seržant (eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Postclassical Greek*, Berlin and New York; Walter De Gruyter.
- Rahlfs, A., 2006, *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes edidit Alfred Rahlfs. Editio altera quam recognovit et emendavit Robert Hahnhart*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Rajak, T., 2009, *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rothe, R., 1863, *Zur Dogmatik*, Gotha: F.A. Perthes.



## Bibliography

- Shenkel, J. D., 1968, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, M. F., 1996, *The Philosophical Inscription of Diogenes of Oinoanda*, Ergänzungsbände Zu Den Tituli Asiae Minoris Nr. 20, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Smyth, H. W., 1956, *Greek Grammar*, rev. G. M. Messing, Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Soisalon-Soininen, I., 1987, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Sollamo, R., 1996, 'The Origins of LXX Studies in Finland', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 159–168.
- Sollamo, R., 2016, 'The Study of Translation Technique', in E. Bons and J. Joosten (eds.), *Handbuch zur Septuaginta*, vol. 3, *Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, pp. 161–171.
- Stefano, V., 2015, *The Antiatticist: Introduction and Critical Edition*, Sammlung Griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 16, Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter.
- Stolk, J. V., 2015, *Case Variation in Greek Papyri: Retracing Dative Case Syncretism in the Language of the Greek Documentary Papyri and Ostraca from Egypt (300 BCE – 800 CE)*, PhD Thesis, University of Oslo: Oslo.
- Swete, H. B., 1900, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Szemerényi, O. J. L., 1996, *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Taylor, B. A., 1992, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns*, 2 vols, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Taylor, B. A., 2006, 'Semitic Influence on Greek Syntax: The Greek Middle Voice', in R. Pierri (ed.), *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae: Saggi Filologici di Greco Biblico*, Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, pp. 49–68.
- Taylor, B. A., 2007a, 'To the Reader of the Old Greek Text of Kingdoms', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 244–248.
- Taylor, B. A., 2007b, 'Kingdoms (Old Greek)', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 249–319.
- Thackeray, H. St. J., 1907, 'The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings', *JTS* 8, pp. 262–278.
- Thackeray, H. St. J., 1909, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint, Vol I. Introduction, Orthography and Accidence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thenius, O., 1864, *Die Bücher Samuelis erklärt*, Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Thumb, A., 1901, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der κοινή*, Strassburg: Trübner.
- Tjen, A., 2010, *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax*, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 515, New York and London: T & T Clark.
- Toury, G., 1995, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

## Bibliography

- Tov, E. 2008, 'Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere,' in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta–Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, pp. 369–393.
- Tov, E., 1999a, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 72, Leiden: Brill.
- Tov, E., 1999b, 'The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books', in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 72, Leiden: Brill, pp. 183–194.
- Tov, E., 2015, 'Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations', in E. Tov (ed.), *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint, Collected Essays, Volume 3*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 167, pp. 429–448.
- Ulrich, E., 2010, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 134, Leiden: Brill.
- Ulrich, E., 2015, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 169, Leiden: Brill.
- van der Meer, M. N., 2010, 'Papyrological Perspectives on the Septuagint of Isaiah', in A. van der Kooij and M. N. van der Meer (eds.), *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives*, Leuven: Peeters, pp. 107–133.
- van der Merwe, C. H. J. and Naudé, J. A. and Kroeze, J. H., 2017, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 2nd ed., London: T & T Clark.
- van Emde Boas, E. and Rijksbaron, A. and Huitink, L., and de Bakker, M., 2019, *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Veitch, W., 1887, *Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective: Their Forms, Meaning and Quantity*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Voelz, J. W., 1984, 'The Language of the New Testament', in H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forschung*, Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, pp. 893–977.
- Voitila, A., 1996, 'What the Translation of Tenses Tells About the Septuagint Translators', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, 10:2, pp. 109–118.
- Voitila, A., 2001, *Présent et imparfait de l'indicatif dans le Pentateuque grec: Une étude sur la syntaxe de traduction*, Helsinki: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Voitila, A., 2016, 'Septuagint Syntax and Hellenistic Greek', in E. Bons and J. Joosten (eds.), *Handbuch zur Septuaginta*, vol. 3, *Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, pp. 109–118.
- Wasserstein, A., and Wasserstein, D. J., 2006, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, M. L., 1998, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, Vol. 1, 2nd Ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wevers, J. W., 1993, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Wirth, R., 2016, *Die Septuaginta der Samuelbücher: Untersucht unter Einbeziehung ihrer Rezensionen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Wright, B. G., 2007, 'Sirach', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 715–762.

## Bibliography

- Wright, B. G., 2010, 'Moving Beyond Translating a Translation: Reflections on A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)', in R. J. V. Hiebert (ed.), *Translation is Required: The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, pp. 23–39.
- Wright, B. G., 2015, 'Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)', in J. K. Aitken (ed.), *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 410–424.