

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

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



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

beginning with its first statement, has Lamedh with the accusative, and is otherwise unclassical.

4. The paragraph following the proposed division, telling how Solomon was made king a second time, while Zadok became priest—in some different sense from that in which he had previously been priest—and the captains and the heroes and the sons of David “gave hand under Solomon the king,” is evidently a summary of the account given in the first chapter of 1 Kings. It follows that the anointing of Solomon described in that chapter was his being made king the second time; his being made king the first time was his being proclaimed king at the great assembly described in 1 Chronicles. See especially 1 Chron. xxiii. 1 and xxix. 1. Merely to notice this is to harmonize the accounts in Kings and in Chronicles, for this part of the history, and in many other ways to throw light on the history of the later years of David.

The Revised Version of Dan. ix. 24-27.

BY PROF. FREDERICK GARDINER, D.D.

IN connection with the notes given on some points of the Revision of the Old Testament, attention may be called to another passage. It is well known that according to the traditional and general interpretation of Dan. ix. 24-27, this prophecy of the “Seventy weeks” has been referred to the Messiah, and that the expression in vs. 27, translated in the A.V., “He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease,” has been referred to the earthly ministry of Christ and the short period immediately following in which the new covenant was proclaimed only to the chosen people, before the doors of the Church were opened to the Gentiles; and that the phrase, “in the midst of the week,” indicates the time of the death upon the cross, when “the sacrifice and the oblation” was caused to cease through its being supplanted by the one all-sufficient sacrifice. On the other hand, many writers have proposed to interpret the whole passage of Antiochus Epiphanes, and to refer this clause to his profanation of the temple and altar which continued just three and a half years, or “for the half of a week.” The revisers appear to have indicated a preference for the latter interpretation, and in fact it is the almost necessary inter-

pretation of their translation, "and for the half of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease." The Hebrew is **וַחֲצִי הַשָּׁבוּעַ יִשְׁבֹּת זֶבַח** translated in the LXX *καὶ ἐν τῷ ἡμίσει τῆς ἑβδομάδος κ.τ.λ.* Of course the choice between the translations turns upon the meaning of **וַחֲצִי**. The word itself is quite capable of either sense, and is frequently rendered in both ways in the A.V. and the Revision alike. As examples, the translation *in the midst* is retained by the revisers in Jer. xvii. 11; Zech. xiv. 4. In later Hebrew, in the Masoretic notes at the end of the several books, it is the ordinary word for "the middle." The choice of translation in Dan. ix. 27 must be determined by the interpretation of the prophecy. Fidelity to the Hebrew did not require a change in the Authorized Version, which is sustained by the LXX.

Eίμί and γίνομαι with Participles in the New Testament.

BY PROF. G. H. SCHODDE, PH.D.

PROBABLY, with the sole exception of the strange use made of the conjunction *ἵνα* by the New Testament writers, no syntactical peculiarity of Biblical Greek is more striking than the construction of *εἰμί*, and less frequently of *γίνομαι*, in connection with a participle, as auxiliary verbs, or at least with the virtual force of auxiliary verbs. The instances in which this occurs are so frequent, especially in the gospels and the Acts, that the mere mention of the fact will suffice to make clear what is meant.

An analysis of the cases here under consideration shows that not in all instances is the auxiliary force of the verb equally pronounced. The clearest instances are those where *εἰμί* is used with the participle as a mere circumlocution for a finite form of the verb. Thus, *e.g.* with the pres. part. *ἐστὶ προσαναπληροῦσα . . . καὶ περισσεύουσα*, 2 Cor. ix. 12; much more frequently of the imperfect and aorist, as *ἦν πράγων*, Mark x. 32; *ἦν κοθεύδων*, iv. 23; *ἦσαν καθήμενοι*, Luke v. 17; *ἦν ἐκβάλλον*, xi. 14: then of the future, as *ἔσονται πίπτοντες*, Mark xiii. 25; or with the perfect, as *ἦν ἐστώς* for the aorist; and very frequently with the part. perf. pass., as *ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπιγεγραμμένη*, Mark xv. 26, etc.

Somewhat different from these instances are those where the writer evidently intended that this construction is to express continued or