STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

VOL. II

Studies in the Syntax of the King James Version

BY

JAMES MOSES GRAINGER

CONTENTS

STUDIES IN THE SYNTAX OF THE KING JAMES VERSION *

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In offering their new version of the English Bible to King James in 1611, the translators declared in the dedication that they were merely "poor instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people," and that to this end, in their translating they had "walked in the ways of simplicity and integrity, as before the Lord." On the title page we find the familiar words: "Appointed to be read in the churches." It seems, then, that the chief aim of the translators was to present Bible truth in a form (1) simple enough to be understood by illiterate people and (2) suitable for reading aloud with impressiveness and perfect intelligibility. These are in general the principles which control the syntax of the King James Version, and which have doubtless given our masterful Bible its influence upon the language. Since the thorough dissemination of this book among all classes and conditions of English speaking people, English syntax has certainly been developing along lines of simplicity and easy intelligibility.

Yet this version did more than to forecast future tendencies in English syntax: it recorded past development. It summed up in many ways the transition from Late Middle to Early Modern English. It is an epitome of the development of English syntax from Tyndale's time to 1611. First among the several reasons for this compendious nature of the syntax

of the version of 1611 was the use of the Bishops' Bible of 1568
as a common basis for the new version, by all of the six dif-
ferent companies who worked on the translation.   The code
of instuctions, given by the king to this body of biblical stu-
dents, directed them to follow the Bishops' Bible with as few
alterations as truth would permit and to use the translations
by Tyndale (1525–1535), Matthew (1537), and Coverdale
(1532–1537), the Whitchurch or Great Bible (1549), and the
Geneva Bible (1560), when these versions agreed better with
the text than the Bishops' Bible (1568).   As the dates show,
this chain of successive translations stretches over an impor-
tant transitional period in the history of English.   The Bish-
ops' Bible, the final link in the chain, being itself based to a
great extent on former translations, and being the chief basis
for the King James Version, naturally imparted to the new
version the synoptic nature of its own syntax, including the
main features of the English language at that time, the late
middle of the sixteenth century.   The new version in turn
reflected syntactic development from 1568 to 1611.   For this
was the time during which the translators themselves acquired
their mother tongue.   They, while retaining most of the
syntactic features of the older translations, naturally put
their own living syntax into their alterations.   Thus it came
about that Bible English is English of no fixed time but rep-
resents a long period when the language was in transition.

Another reason for the compendious nature of Bible syntax
was the above-mentioned popular aim of the translators.
Popular speech is at once the most conservative and the most
progressive element in a language.   It retains old idioms
longer and adopts new ones more readily than literary lan-
guage.   If the translators had been producing a work for
scholars, they would have used the medial literary language;
but in adapting their work to the ear of the people, they fa-
vored the popular style with all it embraces of both archaisms
and neologisms.

Yet the translators could not work without some norm by
which to regulate their style.   It was natural, therefore, that

they should set up, as their standard, either conciously or un-
conciously, the authors who were considered classic in their
time. Exactly who these would be can hardly be settled to-
day, but we are justified in assuming that, just as today an
author's work must have lived at least half a century before
the title of classic is assured, so in the first decade of the sev-
enteenth century the prose writers who would be taken as
models by the scholars translating the Bible, would most
likely be the best polemic and secular writers of at least two
generations earlier. This would be especially true in a time
when the language was shifting and nothing late could be
accepted as permanent. The conservative influence of relig-
ion, together with the natural dignity and impressiveness of
the archaic, would operate also toward the retention of the
older idioms. Therefore, while the translators must needs
have reproduced very late usages and followed recent tenden-
cies to some extent, their work in its main features presents
characteristics of times earlier than their own.

Because Bible syntax does represent transition English,
scarcely a rule can be fixed for any usage that was variable
during the period represented. A few general principles can
be pointed out, but no hard and fast laws of practice can be
established. The object of the treatment in hand is to show
some of these general principles by studying the use of cer-
tain constructions and forms. These studies make no pre-
tense to exhaustiveness. More particularly, the aim is to
show how the translators followed their expressed purpose of
making the Bible simple and intelligible for the illiterate,
and impressive when read aloud, and how, being little con-
stricted by rules of grammar, and using English as they
found it, they gave us a mosaic made up from transient stages
in the development of the language.

In this investigation no work on Bible syntax has been
available. Scholars seem to have avoided the subject because,
in the first place, the Bible being a translation, the ancient
tongues must necessarily have impressed their idiom upon the
language of the translation, and to a certain extent kept the

original genius of the English language from asserting itself strongly. In the second place, scholars have not cared to investigate closely the syntax of a translation that represents the individuality of no one man or period. The Authorized Version, however, because of its immense popularity, has exerted a greater influence upon the subsequent development of English syntax than any other body of literature. In view of this influence, any investigation of Bible syntax immediately justifies itself. Most of the books and treatises mentioned in the bibliography below have contributed to the results merely by suggestion. Cruden's Concordance, which has served mainly in locating words and passages, has practically no other use to the student of syntax. Particular reference to other works will appear at the proper places.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments. Oxford University Press.

The Holy Bible, an exact reprint page for page of the Authorized Version, 1611. Oxford University Press, 1833.

The Holy Bible, American Revision. New York, 1901.

Allen and Greenough, *Latin Grammar.* Boston, 1891.

C. S. Baldwin, *The Inflections and Syntax of the Morte d'Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory.* Boston, 1894.

Alexander Cruden, *A Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testaments.* London.

E. Einenkel, "Syntax". *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie,* I. Band. Strassburg, 1901.

W. Franz, *Shakespeare-Grammatik.* Halle, 1900.

B. L. Gildersleeve, *Latin Grammar.* New York, 1898.

H. W. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible.* London, 1902.

L. Kellner, *Historical Outlines of English Syntax.* London, 1892.

C. Alphonso Smith, *Studies in English Syntax.* Boston, 1906.

H. Sweet, *A New English Grammar, Logical and Historical*, II. "Syntax." Oxford, 1903.

L. R. Wilson, *Chaucer's Relative Constructions*. Chapel Hill, 1906.

W. Van der Gaaf, *The Transition from Impersonal to Personal in Middle English*. Amsterdam, 1904.

Westcott and Hort, Editors, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. London, 1903.

CHAPTER II

THE IMPERSONAL CONSTRUCTION

The transition from the impersonal construction, which prevailed with certain verbs in Middle English, to the personal construction of today appears almost as complete in Bible English as it is today. The "really impersonal"[*] constructions, as in *it rained* (Lu. 17:29), *it thundered* (John 12:29) are used in the Bible just as they are today and require no treatment here. The "quasi impersonal verbs"[*], however, which "have *it* for their grammatical, provisional subject, while the real logical subject is expressed in the form of a clause"[*], show differences from both the previous Middle English usage and the later, current English usage, as in,

> *It repented the Lord* that he had made man. Gen. 6:6.
>
> Judas . . . *repented himself.* Matt. 27:3.
>
> *The Lord repented* that he had made Saul king. 1 Sam. 15:35.

The first example shows the purely impersonal construction of Middle English; the second shows the intermediate or transitional, half personal, or reflexive construction; and the third shows the late purely personal construction. The three examples illustrate completely the change from impersonal to personal. Some verbs with which the impersonal construction was habitual in Middle English preserve the usage intact; others retain only remnants or reminiscences of it; while with most of them the usage has disappeared entirely. The following list represents the remnants:

Befall occurs once impersonally:

> And they that saw it told them how *it befell to him* that was possessed. Mk. 5:16.

Behove, used only impersonally, occurs twice:

---

[*]Van der Gaaf, *The Transition from Impersonal to Personal in Middle English.* Amsterdam, 1904.

It behoved him to be made like unto his brethren.   Heb. 2:17.

And thus *it behoved* Christ to suffer.   Lu. 24:46.

Grieve preserved both personal and impersonal usages as it does today.   Four examples of the impersonal occur:

For *it grieveth me* much for your sakes that the hand of the Lord is gone out against me.   Ruth 1:13.   Gen. 6:6, Neh. 2:10, Prov. 26:15.

Happen, usually personal, occurs four times impersonally:

As *it happeneth* to the fool, so *it happeneth* even to me. Eccl. 2:15.   2 Pet. 2:22, Eccl. 8:14.

Like occurs three times in the old impersonal sense now lost:

He shall dwell with thee . . . where *it liketh him* best.   Deut. 23:16.

Write ye also for the Jews, as *it liketh you.*   Esther 8:8.

For *this liketh you*, O ye children of Israel.   Amos 4:5.

Need occurs once impersonally:

And Esau said, Let me now leave with thee some of the folk that are with me.   And he said, *What needeth it?* Gen. 33:15.

Please shows the same adaptation to both personal and impersonal usage that it has today:

If *it please* thee, I will give thee another vineyard. 1 Kings 21:6.

Yet *it pleased* the Lord to bruise him.   Isa. 53:10.

If the Lord *were pleased* to kill us.   Judges 13:23.

They *please* themselves in the children of strangers. Isa. 2:6.

It shall accomplish that which I *please.*   Isa. 55:11.

Repent had three varieties, of use:

1. *Reflexive:* (5 instances)
   Judas . . . *repented himself.*   Matt. 27:3.
2. *Personal:* (numerous instances)
   The Lord *repented* that he had made Saul king. 1 Sam. 15:35.
3. *Impersonal:* (5 instances)
   It repented the Lord that he had made man on earth

. . . and the Lord said . . . *it repenteth me* that I have made them. Gen. 6:6,7.

It repented the Lord because of their groanings. Judges 5:18.

It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king. 1 Sam. 15:11.

Return, O Lord, how long? and let *it repent thee* concerning thy servants. Psalm 90:13.

Seem is used both personally and impersonally as today. Instances of impersonal use are:

And if *it seem* evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve. Joshua 24:15.

Seemeth it but a small thing unto you? Num. 16:9.

Think recalls its old impersonal use in several ways:

Me thinketh the running of the foremost is like the running of Ahimaaz. 1 Sam. 18:27.

He thought scorn to lay hands on Mordecai alone, (for the old *hym thought scorn*.) Esther 3:6.

Paul *thought* not good to take him with them. Acts 15:38.

The reflexive *bethink* occurs twice:

If they shall *bethink themselves*. 1 Kings 8:47, 2 Chron. 6:37.

The following formerly impersonal verbs, though never used impersonally in the King James Version, seem, in different ways, to preserve at least relics suggestive of their former use:

Ail preserves a questionable reminiscence of its former impersonal use only in the question, "What aileth (ailed) thee?" which occurs seven times:

They said to Micah, what *aileth* thee? Judges 18:23.

Dream, though not used impersonally, in ten occurrences out of thirteen is transitive and takes a cognate object:

Your old men *dream dreams*. Joel 2:28.

And Joseph *dreamed a dream*. Gen. 37:5.

Lack, though never quite impersonal, seems to hesitate about taking a personal subject when used in the sense of "to be absent," and avoids the difficulty three times, as far, at

least, as order of words is concerned, by inverting subject
and predicate and beginning the sentence with *there* in
place of the old impersonal *it:*

And there *lacketh* not one man of us.   Num. 31:49.

There *lacked* of David's servants nineteen men.   2 Sam.
2:30.

Peradventure there shall *lack* five of the fifty righteous
Gen. 18:28.

Want also suggests an impersonal reminiscence in inversion
with *there:*

In a multitude of words *there wanteth* not sin.   Prov. 10:19.

Impersonal usages that are exceedingly common in the Bible
are:

It shall come to pass.   Ex. 3:21, etc.

That *it* may *go well* with thee.   Deut. 4:40, etc.

With the verb *to be:*

Woe is me that I sojourn in Meshech.   Psalm 120:5.

It is better for me to die than to live.   Jonah 4:3.   (4 of
this type).

It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in
man.   Psalm 118:8.   (9 of this type).

Better it is that it be said to thee, come up hither; than
that thou shouldest be put lower.   Prov. 25:7.   (4 of this
type).

It is better I give her to thee than another.   Gen. 29:19.
(2 of this type).

Then *was it better with me* than now.   Hos. 2:7.

If *it be your mind*, that I should bury my dead.   Gen.
23:8.

How *is it* that ye are come so soon today?   Ex. 2:18.

Let *it now be dry* only upon the fleece.   Judges 6:39.

For *it was dry* upon the fleece only.   Judges 6:40.

CHAPTER III

DISTRIBUTIVE PHRASING

To overcome certain difficulties inherent in rendering the original tongues into English the translators frequently resorted to devices here grouped under the general head of distributive phrasing. What is meant by distributive phrasing becomes clear on comparing the use of the Latin distributive numeral *singuli* (one by one), as found in the Vulgate, with the device employed to render the same idea in the King James Version. The Vulgate translates Gen. 44:11, "Itaque festinato deponentes in terram saccos aperuerunt *singuli*." The English Bible has, "Then *they* speedily took down *every man his* sack." Here the pronoun *they* conveys the plural significance of the ending *i* of *singuli*, while *every man his* conveys the distributive sense of the word itself. This kind of distribution and several other kinds more or less related to it are illustrated below:

> Abide ye *every man* in *his* place. Ex. 16:29.
> Then the mariners were afraid and cried *every man* unto *his* god. Jonah 1:5.
> Take ye *every man his* censer and put incense in them, and bring ye before the Lord *every man his* censer, two hundred and fifty censers; thou also, and Aaron, each of you his censer.
> And they took *every man his* censer and put fire in them. Num. 16:17, 18.

While the use of *every man his* in apposition with a plural is not exactly redundant when considered from the point of view of distribution, it is nevertheless closely akin to the redundant use of the pronoun as in,

> Joshua the son of Nun, which standeth before thee, *he* shall go in thither. Deut. 1:38.

Here the use of the pronoun is resumptive of the force of the subject and is necessitated by the clause inserted between

the subject and its verb. The lack of suspensive power necessitates the distribution of the subject force between *Joshua* and *he*. Examples are numerous:

> And the coney because he cheweth the cud but divideth not the hoof, *he* is unclean unto you. Lev. 11:5.
>
> And the man whose hair is fallen off his head, *he* is bald; yet he is clean. Lev. 13:40.

The insertion of this apparently redundant pronoun serves to emphasize the subject and make it perfectly unmistakable. Therefore Adam found it very convenient in shirking the blame to say:

> The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, *she* gave me of the tree. Gen. 3:12.

No doubt this distribution of the subject's function between the real subject and a pronoun seemed to the translators to add emphasis enough to justify the redundancy:

> Ye shall not fear them for the Lord, your God, *he* shall fight for you. Deut. 3:22.
>
> The Lord thy God, *he* will go over before thee, and *he* will destroy these nations from before thee and thou shalt possess them: and Joshua *he* shall go over before thee, as the Lord hath said. Deut. 31:3.

In these cases *the Lord thy God* is almost exclamatory while the redundant pronoun functions in its stead in the sentence. The result is more emphatic than if *the Lord thy God* were simply subject of the sentence.

Pronouns are used redundantly in other cases with complete justification on account of the difficulty of translating from a highly inflected language, with comparatively free word order, into one of no inflections and rigid word order. In these instances the different case forms of the pronoun make the relation clear in a way that the noun could not for lack of declension:

> For all the wells which his father's servants had digged in the days of Abraham, his father, the Philistines had stopped *them* and filled *them* with earth. Gen. 26:15.
>
> And the leper in whom the plague is, *his* clothes shall

be rent and his forehead bare. Lev. 13:45.

In this sentence *leper* could not be made possessive without necessitating an awkward construction.

> And upon *them* that are left alive of you, I will send a faintness into *their* hearts. Lev. 26:36.

Frequently the redundant element is an adverb, a phrase, or a whole clause. The principle is the same.

In the cases quoted so far the redundant pronoun has a definite function in the sentence while its antecedent stands in a kind of exclamatory relation to the whole, but still without altogether forfeiting its functional relation. Many cases occur where this order is reversed so that while the antecedent has a definite function in the sentence, the pronoun stands independent. It is introduced thus in order to tack on to it something which relates to the antecedent, but which if placed beside the antecedent would make a cumbersome construction:

> Thou shalt rejoice, *thou* and thine household and the Levite that is within thy gates. Deut. 14:26.
>
> For the Lord thy God hath chosen him out of all thy tribes to stand to minister in the name of the Lord, *him* and his sons forever. Deut. 18:5.
>
> And he stood by his burnt sacrifice, *he* and all the princes of Moab. Num. 23:6.

Such usages as those just mentioned were necessitated by the comparative rigidness of the word order in English due to the lack of inflections. Yet Bible English varies the word order with more freedom than current English does today. It is well, here, to notice the distributive manner of grouping series of modifiers. When a noun has a number of modifiers, one or two of them are sometimes placed before and the rest after it:

> O foolish people and unwise. Deut. 32:6.
>
> I knew that thou art a gracious God and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repentest thee of the evil. Jonah 4:2.
>
> And thou shalt command the children of Israel that they shall bring *pure oil, olive, beaten,* for the light, to cause the lamp to burn always. Ex. 27:20.

Occasionally even a compound subject is divided and grouped around its predicate:

Aaron shall come and his sons.   Num. 4:5.

The distribution of the word *toward* is also interesting:

Be thou for the people *to* God-*ward*.   Ex. 18:19.

Even *to* the mercy seat-*ward* were the faces of the Cherubim.   Ex. 37:9.

Descriptive distribution or repetition for picturesqueness is well shown by:

And beneath upon the hem of it thou shalt make pomegranates of blue, and of purple, and of scarlet, round about the hem thereof; and bells of gold between them round about: A golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate, upon the hem of the robe round about.   Ex. 28:33.

Phrasing with distributive intent sometimes appears to violate the rule of numerical concord.   Thus Lu. 22:31:

Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have *you* that he might sift *you* as wheat.   But I have prayed for *thee* that *thy* faith fail not.

Here *you* the plural pronoun is used exactly in the sense of the Southern *you all* while the singular *thee* refers especially to Peter.   Satan had desired to have them all, but Peter especially on account of his bitter trial was in danger of losing faith.   A similar case is in John 14:9:

Have I been so long time with *you* and yet hast *thou* not known me Philip?

This kind of distribution, however, by no means explains all the violations of concord in number even in the pronoun of the second person.   In the laws of Moses we very often find a number of commands grouped together under one head.   In the first general command or prohibition the plural of the pronoun is used while in the specific commands under the general heading, the singular is used:

Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment: *thou* shalt not respect the person of the poor nor honor the person of

the mighty; but in righteousness shalt *thou* judge *thy* neighbor. Lev. 19:15.

The following verses, 16, 17, 18, have *thou* and *thy* in specific commands under the general one above.

Ye shall keep my statutes. *Thou* shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind; *thou* shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed. Ibid:19.

Furthermore Moses seems to think of the people, Israel, at one time as one person, Jacob, and again as many persons, Israel, and varies the number of his pronouns accordingly. English of today lacks this kind of distributive power on account of the loss of the distinction between the singular and plural of the pronouns of the second person and by its rigid adherence to the principle of concord.

The distributive phrasing treated above is of three general types: (1) that causing apparent redundancy, chiefly of pronouns, and due to lack of inflection, necessitating rigid word order; (2) distributive word order contrary to ordinary practice in English; (3) distribution embracing apparent violation of the rules of concord as recognized today. To these should be added a fourth type treated below under the subject of distributive *do-forms*, in which a form of the auxiliary *do* is introduced to share the burden of relations laid upon the verb. This distributive tendency is due partly to the genius of the original languages which the translators strove to transliterate as precisely as possible, and partly to the aims of the work. All four types of distribution constitute a positive advantage to Bible English in contributing to its easy intelligibility, emphasis, beauty, and dignity.

CHAPTER IV

DO–FORMS

The remark that the King James Version represents transition syntax is perfectly exemplified in the use of *do*-forms. For the Bible shows every variety of the use of *do* as an auxiliary, from the original half auxiliary *do* as a "pro-verb" down to emphatic *do*, which is the latest development of it. Furthermore, the Bible employs *do* in auxiliary senses peculiar to itself, grouped below under the head of *Distributive do*. The different usages are treated here approximately in the order in which they came into the language, according to the outline of their development given in sections 2172 to 2195 of Sweet's *New English Grammar*. The remarkable scarcity of the purely emphatic *do* in the Bible, however, by the side of plenteous examples of *do* in negations, necessitates the explanation of the presence of *do* in negations on other grounds than emphasis, which Mr. Sweet accepts as the reason for this use of *do*. *Do* was used with negatives before it was used for emphasis. In the examples given below it will be seen that the use of *do-forms* in the Bible, besides exemplifying transitional syntax, illustrates the continual effort on the part of the translators to attain a clearness, impressiveness, and dignity which would adapt the work to reading aloud to the people. The order of treatment here is:

    I.   *Do* as a "pro-verb."
    II. *Do* as an auxiliary.
    III. Emphatic *do*.

IV. Distributive *do*
- (1.) In inversions.
- (2.) With certain adverbs.
- (3.) With negatives.

  I. *Do* as a "pro-verb."
Do is sometimes used as a "pro-verb" to avoid repetition of an antecedent verb:

> Then he shall minister in the name of the Lord his God, as all his brethren the Levites *do*.   Deut. 18:7.

Here *do*, being supplied by the translator, is in Italics.

> Lest peradventure he die also, as his brethren *did*.   Gen. 38:11.   (*did* in Italics).
>
> Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savor: so *doth* a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honor.   Eccl. 10:1.   (*doth* in Italics).

Occasionally the "pro-verb" does not reproduce the full transitive significance of the antecedent verb:

> And we utterly destroyed them, as we *did unto* Sihon.   Deut. 3:6.

An anticipative "pro-verb" in imperative sentences similar to that "found in Transition and Early Middle English," (Sweet 2173) appears occasionally in the Bible.

> This *do:*   Take your censers, Korah, and all his company.   Num. 16:6.
>
> As ye *do* the heave offering of the threshing floor, so shall ye heave it (the cake of dough).   Num. 15:20.

II.   *Do* as an auxiliary.

Do is used frequently as an auxiliary with other verbs (1) for *clearness* in distinguishing tenses, (2) for convenience of form, (3) for euphony or rhythm, dignity or impressiveness, and (4) for no apparent reason but merely as a matter of caprice.

(1)   *Do used for clearness in distinguishing tenses.*

Probably the most important auxiliary use of *do* is in the formation of the past tense of verbs whose past form was not clearly distinct in sound from the present.   This function of *do* has been overlooked by the philologians.   The most striking case is that of *eat* whose past is *did eat* in all but three cases.   Other pasts formed with *did* for clearness are *did set, did put, did spit, did beat, did cast, did bear, did swear, did offer*.   With weak verbs this usage is commonest with those ending in *-t* or *-d* where the addition of *-ed* would cause an unpleasant repetition of *t*-sounds, e.g.: *did separate, did mete,*

> She took the fruit thereof and *did eat*, and gave also unto her husband with her and he *did eat*.   Gen. 3:6.
> As they *did eat*.   Matt. 26:21.
> Therefore they *did set* over them taskmasters.   Ex. 1:11.
> And Jacob *did separate* the lambs.   Gen. 30:40.
> For my vesture they *did cast* lots.   John 19:24.
> And they *did beat* the gold into thin plates and cut it into wires.   Ex. 29:3.

(2)   Do *used for convenience of form*.

   In the second person singular of the past tense such verbs as *anoint* and *depart* had very awkward forms which were avoided by using *didst* with the infinitive.

> As thou *didst anoint* their father.   Ex. 40:15.   (to avoid *anointedst*).
> From the day that thou *didst depart* out of the land of Egypt.   Deut. 9:7.

Didst depart is better than *departedst*, easier to speak and more euphonious.   Yet this usage was not at all uniform, e. g.:

> Wherefore *passedst* thou over to fight against the children of Ammon, and *didst* not call us to go with thee? Judges 12:1.

(3)   Do *used for euphony, rhythm, dignity, or impressiveness:*

> A gift *doth* blind the eyes of the wise and pervert the words of the righteous.   Deut. 16:19.
> When all the workers of iniquity *do* flourish.   Psalm 92:7.
> I, the Lord, *do* sanctify him.   Lev. 21:15, 16, 23.
> And, behold, I, even I, *do* bring a flood of waters upon the earth.   Gen. 6:17.
> I *do* set my bow in the cloud.   Gen. 9:13.

(4)   *Capricious use of* do:

> And they   .   .   .   *did spit* upon him.   Mk. 15:19.
> And they *spit* upon him.   Matt. 27:30.
> I am among you as he that serveth.   Lu. 22:27.
> And he that it is chief as he that *doth serve*.   Lu. 22:26.

III. *Emphatic* Do.

While it is clear that three or four uses of the *do*-forms last mentioned are in emphatic connections, the purely emphatic *do* in the modern sense, where special vocal stress is given the form of *do* and not the principal verb, is very rare in the King James Version. The difficulty in determining whether *do* should really be stressed probably adds to the difficulty of discovering examples of this purely emphatic *do:*

> And the Lord said unto Abraham, Wherefore did Sarah laugh, saying, Shall I of a surety bear a child which am old? . . .
> Then Sarah denied, saying, I laughed not; for she was afraid. And he said, Nay; but thou *didst* laugh. Gen. 18:13–15.
> But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God: . . . And it shall be if thou *do* at all forget the Lord thy God. Deut. 8:18, 19.

An emphatic use of *do* akin to the auxiliary use of it to distinguish past from present tense is that in which the past character of the statement is emphasized, as in:
> In the year of the jubilee the field shall return to him of whom it was bought, even to him to whom the possession of the land *did* belong (that, is before it was sold). Lev. 27:24.
> For though I made you sorry with a letter, I *do* not repent, though I *did* repent (*did* here implies "at one time"). 2 Cor. 7:8.

IV. *Distributive* Do.

The auxiliary *do* is used in many sentences where the verb is so burdened with relations that another verb is needed to share the burden. The nature of the verb's relations to other sentence-elements requires its position before some, after others. When these related elements are multiplied in one sentence or the position of the verb is such that some modifier can not stand reasonably near its verb, the needed form of *do*

is introduced so that the relations may be distributed between the main verb and the auxiliary *do*. Though this distributive use of *do* accounts for the modern use of *do* in questions, inhibitions, and with negatives, it has not received consideration at the hands of philologians. The chief constructions in which this principle operates are (1) in inversions, (2) with certain adverbs, and (3) in negative sentences.

(1)   Do *in inversions.*

Mere inversion alone seldom justifies the introduction of a *do*-form, but when adverbs appear in the inverted sentences *do*-forms are used. In the question, "Seest thou a man diligent in business?" Prov. 22:29, the verb can sustain its two relations, viz., to subject and to object, just as well when at the head of the sentence as when in its usual position between subject and object. But in the question, "Requite ye thus the Lord?" a new element appears in the form of the adverb, *thus*, which also demands a place next to the verb. Therefore the translators split the verb in two by introducing *do* at the head of the sentence to effect the inversion, and placed subject, adverb, and object, each in its natural position relative to the main verb, *requite*, thus: "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise?" Deut. 32:6. Occasionally an ambiguity that would arise in an inverted sentence for lack of case forms of nouns was avoided by using *do* to effect the inversion, so that subject and object might stand respectively before and after the verb, as in, "Doth Job fear God for naught?" Job 1:9. But even in such cases an adverb is usually present as here. Practically everywhere that *do* occurs in inverions some distributive aim is evident, and usually the distribution is necessitated by the presence of an *adverb* or its equivalent.

(a)   Do-*forms in sentences inverted by adverbs at the beginning.*

Here the verb is usually transitive and is followed by its object:

> *Unto Adam also and his wife did* the Lord make coats of skin.   Gen. 3:21.

And *from thence did* the Lord scatter them abroad. Gen. 11:9.

Thus did he make for all the boards of the tabernacle. Ex. 36:22.

Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail.   Gen. 7:20.

Of my hand didst thou require it.   Gen. 31:39.

And he put the mitre upon his head; also *upon the mitre even upon his forefront did* he put the golden front. Lev. 8:9.

The negative conjunctions *neither* and *nor* treated below under the head of *Do in negative sentences* require *do* in the inversion just as adverbs at the beginning do.

(*b*) Do-*forms in sentences beginning with other elements than subject:*

The noise of them that sing do I hear.   Ex. 32:18.

(*c*)   Do-*forms in questions.*

Whenever *do* is used in questions some adverb or equivalent is present, which necessitates a distribution of the verb:

Do ye look on things *after the outward appearance?* 2 Cor. 10:7.

Did ever people hear the voice of God?   Deut. 4:33.

Why *do* ye look *one upon another?*   Gen. 42:1.

Why *dost* thou ask Abishag the Shumanite *for Adonijah?* 1 Kings 2:22.

Why *didst* thou *not* tell me that she was thy wife?   Why saidst thou, she is my sister?   Gen. 12:18, 19.

If thou sayest, behold, we knew it not; *doth not* he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul, *doth not* he know it?   Prov. 24:12.

*Doth Job fear God *for naught?*   Job 1:9.

*Do ye *not* know their tokens?   Ibid 21:29.

*Do ye *now* believe?   John 16:31.

* Quoted in Smith's *Studies in Syntax.*

(*d*) Do-*forms in imperatives.*

The only kind of imperative sentences in which *do* is used commonly to effect the inversion is the inhibition. The negative is merely the adverb which produces the demand for the *do*-form. Here the practice is less regular and operates only in the presence of an object or another adverb, though with certain verbs not at all:

Do not sin against the child. Gen. 42:22.

Do not drink wine or strong drink. Lev. 10:9.

Let *not* your hearts be faint, fear not, and *do not* tremble, neither be ye terrified because of them. Deut. 20:3.

Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father. John 5:45.

In the following command the adverbial phrases require a *do*-form:

And do ye abide *without the camp seven days.* Num. 31:19.

(2) Do *with certain adverbs.*

Some adverbs must stand next to the verb and yet will make an awkward sentence if placed between either subject and verb or verb and object. In such a case the verb is split in two by introducing a form of *do.* The adverb is placed between the *do*-form and the verb proper.

And if the people of the land *do anyways hide* their eyes from the man . . . . then I will even set my face against that soul. Lev. 20:4.

Therefore is the name of it called Babel because the Lord *did there confound* the language of all the earth. Gen. 11:9.

The adverb most commonly used in this fashion is the negative *not.* Its influence in bringing *do* into negative sentences is treated below.

(3) Do *in negative sentences.*

The negative words, *neither, nor,* and *not,* in sentences, call for *do*-forms on no other ground than as adverbs. As stated

above *neither* or *nor* at the beginning of a sentence produces
inversion and demands a *do*-form under the same considera-
tions that any sentence element other than the subject, at the
beginning of a sentence, does. Likewise *not* is an adverb
which can not well stand either between subject and its verb
or betweem verb and its object. For this reason the presence
of *not* in a sentence requires a *do*-form, so that *not* may stand
between the auxiliary and the main verb and not interfere
with the juxtaposition of either subject or object to the verb.
Furthermore, it was noticed above that in inversions *not* oper-
ates precisely like any other adverb in bringing *do*-forms into
interrogative and imperative sentences. This would seem to
indicate that *do* was used in negative sentences not for
emphasis primarily, but to afford a two-part verb upon which
to distribute the relations of the other sentence elements.

(a)   Do *with* neither (nor).

   Neither standing at the head of a sentence was followed by
a *do*-form only when the verb had an object or was modified:
   Neither did he set his heart to this also.   Ex. 7:23.
   Neither with you only *do* I make this covenant.   Deut.
   29:14.
   Neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his
   children.   Deut. 33:9.

(In the last clause the absence of an expressed subject simpli-
fies matters so that the *do*-form is unnecessary.)

   Neither do men light a candle and put it under a
   bushel.   Matt. 5:15.
   Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, *neither did* thy
   foot swell, these forty years.   Deut. 8:4.

(b)   Do *with* not.

   In the majority of negative sentences with *do* it will be
found that the regular verb is already either modified or so
fortified before and after by subject and object that the nega-
tive cannot get at it. Therefore, in order to enable *not* to

stand next to the verb as it demands, the form of *do* is intro-
duced and *not* is placed between the auxiliary and the verb:

The Lord *did not* set his love upon you.   Deut. 7:7.

For they hated knowledge and *did not* choose the fear of
the Lord.   Prov. 1:29.

Thou *dost not* enquire wisely concerning this.   Eccl. 7:10.

For though we walk in the flesh, we *do not* war after the
flesh.   2 Cor. 10:3.

CHAPTER V

Relative Pronouns

That, which, and *who.*

The common relatives of Bible English are *that, which,* and *who.* *That* occurs oftener than *which* and *who* both together; while *who* occurs least frequently of all. No rules, however, can be discovered which governed the use of these pronouns with even an approximate invariability. In fact it is exceedingly doubtful whether the translators themselves could distinguish at all clearly between the three relatives in reference, meaning, or usage. *Who,* of course, always refers to persons except in the case of *whose,* which, being the only form of possessive* relative, refers to both persons and things. *That* and *which* constantly refer to both persons and things. Though no marked regularity appears in the use of these pronouns certain general principles which were probably the result of unconscious habit, seem to be followed. To point out some of these tendencies, without even attempting to establish any fixed rules for the use of *that, which,* and *who,* is the object of the following discussion.

The most general line of distinction between the relatives of the Bible is that which separates *restrictive* from *non-restrictive* relative pronouns. A *restrictive pronoun* introduces a clause which simply places a limitation upon a general or generic antecedent without characterizing it particularly:

> To make a difference between the unclean and the clean, and between the beast *that* may be eaten and the beast *that* may not be eaten. Lev. 11:47.

A *non-restrictive,* or progressive, pronoun does not restrict, but rather *characterizes* its antecedent:

---

* *Of which* does not occur with possessive significance.

> Other sheep I have, *which* are not of this fold. John
> 10:16.

A still freer variety of non-restrictive relative, which occurs
frequently in Bible English, neither restricts nor primarily
characterizes the antecedent, but introduces a clause which
logically bears on the whole sentence:

> How then shall Pharaoh hear me, *who* am of uncircum-
> cised lips? Ex. 6:12.

That, *which*, and *who* all appear in both restrictive and non-
restrictive senses. *That*, however, is used restrictively so
much oftener than *which* and *who*, that it may be considered
the usual restrictive relative. When *that* is used in a non-re-
strictive sense, some special circumstance, such as a pronom-
inal antecedent, will usually be found to have permitted its
use.

Which, though actually occurring nearly as often in restric-
tive as in non-restrictive clauses, may be considered the usual
non-restrictive relative of characterization, because its substi-
tution for *that* in restrictive clauses is usually due to some
particular circumstance which prevents the use of *that*.

Who, especially in the nominative, often introduces clauses
which either are coördinate with the main clause, or logically
modify the whole sentence rather than the antecedent of the
pronoun itself. It may often be replaced by a conjunction
and a personal pronoun with an obvious improvement of the
sense. Therefore *who* has much the nature of a conjunction-
pronoun and is the least restrictive and the most progressive
of all three relatives.

I. THAT.

That appears as a relative pronoun in Bible English in
restrictive sense four or five times as often as non-restric-
tively.

1. That *Restrictive:*
> Art thou the man *that* spakest unto the woman. Judges
> 13:11.

(a) *after generic antecedents:*

Because of its predilection for restrictive usage, *that* naturally assumed the position of relative after such generic and indefinite antecedents as *all, every, any, anything, some, none, the day, the time.* This is one of its most common uses, though *which* and *who* also occur occasionally after such words:

> And Abraham took Ishmael his son and all *that* were born in his house and all *that* were bought with his money. Gen. 17:23.
> I will not take anything *that* is thine. Gen. 14:23.
> In the *day that* God created man. Gen. 5:1.
> Even at the *time that* women go out to draw water. Gen. 24:11.
> There was *no man that* would know me. Ps. 142:4.
> Or compare ourselves with *some that* commend themselves. 2 Cor. 10:12.

Exceptions occur:

> And they took them wives of all *which* they chose. Gen. 6:2.

Usually such exceptions can be accounted for by the special conditions which enable some other relative to assume the place of *that* as in:

> Nothing will be restrained from them *which* they have imagined to do. Gen. 11:6.

Here *which* is introduced because of its greater carrying power, the relative being too far separated from its antecedent, *nothing*, to allow *that*.

> For the children of Israel walked forty years in the wilderness till *all* the people *that* were men of war, *which* came out of Egypt, were consumed, because they obeyed not the voice of the Lord: unto *whom* the Lord sware that he would not show them the land. Joshua 5:6.

Herein the second clause *which* replaces *that* because of separation and in the last clause *that* could not be used after the preposition *unto* even if the separation did not require

some more suspensive relative and the clause were not really coördinate.

(b) *after demonstrative or personal pronoun antecedents:*

Likewise when the antecedent is a *demonstrative* or *personal pronoun* the relative usually becomes *that* unless some special reason intervenes to give the place to *which* or *who*.

> It is not the voice of *them that* shout for mastery, neither is it the voice of *them that* cry for being overcome: but the noise of *them that* sing do I hear. Ex. 32:18.
>
> This is *it that* belongeth unto the Levites. Num. 8:24.
>
> He shall gently lead *those that* are with young. Is. 40:11.
>
> What is *this that* thou hast done unto us? Judges 15:11.
>
> *They that* are thrust through in her streets. Jer. 51:4.
>
> What part hath *he that* believeth with an infidel? 2 Cor. 6:15.

Exceptions:

When a personal pronoun or a demonstrative antecedent is followed by other relative than *that* the reason for the substitution is usually evident, the substitution being due usually to some such particular circumstance as separation of the pronoun from the antecedent, which usually demands *which* on account of its greater power to bridge over the gap. Sometimes when a special circumstance requires a relative with a different form for the objective case *whom* is used, as after a preposition:

> It was little *which* thou hadst before I came. Gen. 30:30.

Here the separation of antecedent and relative necessitates a relative of greater carrying power than *that*. So in:

> It shall be well with *them that* fear God, *which* fear before him. Eccl. 8:12.
>
> And the vessel of earth that *he* toucheth *which* hath an issue shall be broken. Lev. 15:7.
>
> He with *whom* it is found shall be my servant. Gen. 44:10.
>
> For not he that commendeth himself is approved but *whom* the Lord commendeth. 2 Cor. 10:18.

They were more *which* died with hailstones than they
whom the children of Israel slew with the sword.
Joshua 10:11.

Whom may be used here to avoid excessive alliteration:
than they that the.

Sometimes *which* seems to be used instead of *that* to avoid
repetition of *that* in different senses in the same sentence.
Compare:

The same (river) is *it that* compasseth the whole land of
Ethiopia.   Gen. 2:13.
That (river) is *it which* goeth toward the east of Assy-
ria.   Gen. 2:14.

This is obviously one reason for using *which* so commonly
after *that* in *that which* meaning *what*, instead of *that that*, a
construction which was formerly more frequent than in Bible
times:

Besides those things *that* are without, *that which* cometh
upon me daily, the care of the churches.   2 Cor. 11:28.
And God granted him *that which* he requested.   1 Chron.
4:10.
Bake *that which* ye will bake today.   Ex. 16:23.

Examples of *that that* are rare:

I will pay *that that* I have vowed.   Jonah 2:9.
Besides *that that* his hand shall get. Num. 6:21.

2.   That *omitted:*

And he knew not ought he had save the bread. Gen. 39:6.

Sometimes the relative *that* is omitted apparently to avoid
repetition in different senses:

God doth know *that* in the day ye eat thereof, then your
eyes shall be opened.   Gen. 3:5.
In *that* day thou seest my face thou shalt die.   Ex. 10:28.

3.   That *with antecedent omitted:*

Sometimes *that* is used to introduce a relative clause with-
out an expressed antecedent, usually in the sense of *all that*,
(*what*):

Have ye called us to take *that* we have?   Judges 14:15.

> And sent over *that* he had.   Gen. 32:23.
>
> Keep *that* thou hast unto thyself.   Gen. 33:9.
>
> According to *that* he hath done.   2 Cor. 5:10.

It is doubtful, however, whether *that* in these cases is really the relative or the demonstrative.   Evidence seems to favor the latter, e. g. :

> Bake *that which* ye will bake today and seethe *that* ye will seethe.   Ex. 16:23.

Here the word omitted is evidently the relative *which.* *That* in the instances given above therefore may be the demonstrative pronoun performing the joint function of relative and demonstrative in ἀπὸ κοινοῦ.   Yet instances occur occasionally of the demonstrative *that* followed by the relative *that* (see above); and the relative omitted in the following is evidently *that:*

> God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened.   Gen. 3:5.

That is the regular relative pronoun after *day.*

4.   That *with antecedent implied:*

> For also there is *that* neither day nor night seeth sleep with his eyes.   Eccl. 8:16.
>
> Thou shalt deliver it unto him by *that* the sun goeth down.   Ex. 22:26.   (antecedent implied = the time).

5.   That *with posseesive antecedent:*

> According to *his* ability *that* vowed shall the priest value him.   Lev. 27:8.
>
> Water to wash *his* feet and the *men's* feet *that* were with him.   Gen. 24:32.
>
> I did it not for *his* cause *that* had done the wrong, nor for *his* cause *that* suffered wrong.   2 Cor. 7:12.

6.   That *with prepositions:*

Though the form, *that*, represents both *nominative* and *objective* cases, it seldom appears with prepositions, probably because of its tendency to follow immediately upon its antecedent.   Wherever *that* is governed by a preposition, the

preposition has dropped to the end of the clause and become practically a part of the verb:

> Every place *that* the sole of your feet shall tread *upon*, that have I given unto you.　Joshua 1:3.
>
> Whatsoever uncleanness it be *that* a man shall be defiled *withal*.　Lev. 5:3.
>
> He shall give again the price of his redemption out of the money *that* he was bought for.　Lev. 25:51.
>
> For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is in all things *that* we call upon him *for*.　Deut.　4:7.

One example occurs of *that* with a preposition before it:

> Thou shalt deliver it unto him *by that* the sun goeth down.　Ex. 22:26.

II. WHICH.

Which, though often used restrictively in place of *that* when desirable, appears most commonly in simple non-restrictive clauses expressing some characteristic of the antecedent. It refers to both persons and things; but as *who* refers only to persons, except in the possessive *whose*, *which* has a neuter antecedent oftener than either other relative.　In English of today *who* has occupied the gap left by *which* when tne latter relinguished its power to refer to persons.

1. Which *as the relative of characteristic:*

> Our Father, *which* art in heaven.　Matt. 6:9.
>
> Arise, take thy wife and thy two daughters, *which* are here.　Gen. 19:15.
>
> And the Lord delivered Lachish into the hand of Israel, *which* took it on the second day.　Joshua 10:32.
>
> But thanks be to God *which* put the same earnest care into the heart of Titus for you.　2 Cor. 8:16.
>
> And Judas Iscariot, *which* also betrayed him. Mark 3:19.
>
> And made him to ride in the second chariot *which* he had.　Gen. 41:43.
>
> In the vale of Siddim *which* is the salt sea.　Gen. 14:3.

2. *Carrying power of* which.

Which is often used in restrictive sense where *that* might be expected, though usually under circumstances and for reasons that hinder the use of *that.* *That* is seldom used even in restrictive clauses, when the antecedent is separated from the relative pronoun. *Which* has a greater power to bridge over words intervening between the antecedent and itself. Many examples illustrate this:

> And the Lord thy God will put all these curses upon thine enemies and on *them that* hate thee, *which* persecuted thee. Deut. 30:7.
>
> And they buried him in a hill *that* pertained to Phinehas his son, *which* was given him in mount Ephraim. Joshua 24:33.
>
> Other sheep I have, *which* are not of this fold. John 10:16.
>
> Deliver me, O Lord, from the evil *man;* preserve me from the violent *man; which* imagine mischiefs in their heart. Psalm 140:1-2.

The plural in the relative clause shows that *which* refers back to "the evil man" as well as to "the violent man."

3.   Which *and* that *overlapping:*

Which in the restrictive sense is not limited, however, to clauses where separation from the antecedent requires it. It often occurs where every circumstance would seem to require *that,* if any rule were followed invariably:

> So *all* the *cities which* ye shall give to the Levites shall be forty and eight. Num. 35:1.
>
> I shall bewail *many which* have sinned already. 2 Cor. 12:21.
>
> *He which* soweth sparingly shall reap sparingly and *he which* soweth bountifully shall reap bountifully. 2 Cor. 9:6.
>
> From them *which* desire occasion. 2 Cor. 11:12.

And so notably many other cases in the writings of Paul.

And gave change of garment unto *them which* expounded the riddle. (Late *those who*).   Judges 14:19.

That occasionally usurps places usually reserved for *which*:

Hear, I pray you, this dream, *which* I have dreamed. Gen. 37:6.

What is this dream *that* thou hast dreamed.   Gen. 37:10.

The Lord God of heaven *which* took me from my father's house and from the land of my kindred, and *which* spake unto me, and *that* sware unto me saying—.   Gen. 24:7.

4.   *That which.*

That which has almost completely supplanted *that that* in Bible English, while *what* in this sense barely shows a trace of the tendency by which today it has nearly displaced *that which*.   *That* occurs in the sense of our relative *what*.   The following examples show the usage in the King James Version:

(a) *that that = that which:*

I will pay *that that* I have vowed.   Jonah 2:9.

Beside *that that* his hand shall get.   Num. 6:21.

(b) *that = that which:*

According to *that* a man hath and not according to *that* he hath not.   2 Cor. 8:12.

And sent over *that* he had.   Gen. 32:23.

Bake *that which* ye will bake today and seethe *that* ye will seeth.   Ex. 16:23.

But now I forbear lest any man should think of me above *that which* he seeth me to be, or *that* he heareth of me. 2 Cor. 12:6.

(c) *that which:*

And God granted *that which* he requested.   1 Chron. 4:10.

That which was from the beginning, *which* we have

heard, *which* we have seen with our eyes, *which* we have looked upon.   1 John 1:1.

A time to plant and a time to pluck up *that which* is planted.   Eccl. 3:2.

The tendency is to have *which* follow *that* immediately: witness the dropping of prepositions to the end of clauses, as in:

Until I have done *that which* I have spoken to thee *of*. Gen. 28:15.

But juxtaposition is by no means requisite:

All *that* about *which* he has sworn falsely.   Lev. 6:5.

Let *that* therefore abide in you *which* ye have heard from the beginning.   1 John 2:24.

(d) *what = that which:*

What as the equivalent of *that which* occurs occasionally though usually with a suggestion of indirect interrogation.

God hath showed Pharaoh *what* he is about to do, Gen. 41:25.

But *what* they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves.   Jude 1:10.

5.   Which *with prepositions:*

The suspensive or carrying power of *which* naturally enabled it to substitute for *that*.   *Which*, however, is never used with a preposition unless the antecedent is neuter; otherwise *whom* is used:

And he called their names after the names by *which* his father had called them.   Gen. 26:18.

Thou hast eaten of the tree *of which* I commanded thee, saying.   Gen. 3:17.

But the tendency of prepositions to drop to the end of their relative clauses is quite independent of the pronoun used. *Of* is the preposition most commonly dropped to the end of the clause, though any preposition may drop:

And they came to the place *which* God had told him *of*. Gen. 22:9.

This is the fashion *which* thou shalt make it *of* Gen. 6:15.

Moreover he will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt, *which* thou wast afraid *of.* Deut. 28:60.

Which we have looked *upon.* 1 John 1:1.

They turned quickly out of the way *which* their fathers walked *in.* Judges 2:17.

6. *Adverbial substitute for* which *with prepositions.*

Adverbial substitutes for *which* with prepositions occur in great variety in the Bible. They are for the most part combinations of the conjunction *where* with various prepositions. The chief ones are *wherewith* and *withal* for *with which*, *whereby* for *by which*, *whereof* for *of which*, *whereinto*, *whereunto*, *whither*, *from whence*, *when*, *whereon*, *whereupon*, *wherein*, *where*, *wherefore*.

7. Which *omitted:*

The tribe of Danites sought them an inheritance to dwell in. Judges 18:1.

And put water there to wash withal. Ex. 40:30.

8. *The which.*

In Bible English *the which* occurs almost exclusively after prepositions:

I have given you every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of the earth, and every tree *in the which* is the fruit of a tree yielding seed. Gen. 1:29. (vs. 30 uses *wherein*).

I will not destroy the city *for the which* thou hast spoken. Gen. 19:21.

He overthrew the cities *in the which* Lot dwelt. Gen. 19:29.

By the way *in the which* ye go. Gen. 42:38.

Yet are there five years *in the which* there shall be neither earing nor harvest. Gen. 45:6.

And I will bring you unto the land *concerning the which* I did swear. Ex. 6:8.

Until the days be fulfilled *in the which* he separated himself unto the Lord.   Num. 6:5.

Thou hast had pity on the gourd *for the which* thou hast not laboured, neither madest it grow; *which* came up in a night.   Jonah 4:10.

9.   Which *with antecedent in possessive.*

Which sometimes has for its antecedent a possessive noun or pronoun:

For the *truth's* sake, *which* dwelleth in us.   2 John 1:2.

Abram called his *son's* name, *which* Hagar bare, Ishmael.   Gen. 16:15.

And by *their* prayer for you, *which* long after you for the exceeding grace of God in you.   2 Cor. 9:14.

10.   Which *used to refer to whole sentences or sentence members:*

Which is the only relative pronoun used in the Bible to refer to a whole sentence or sentence member as antecedent:

And there came a fire out from before the Lord and consumed upon the alaar the burnt offering and the fat: *which*, when all the people saw, they shouted and fell on their faces.   Lev. 9:24.

And they shall fill thy houses, and the houses of all thy servants, and the houses of all the Egyptians; *which* neither thy fathers nor thy fathers' fathers have seen since the day that they were upon the earth unto this day.   Ex. 10:6.

Neither shalt thou set thee up any image, *which* the Lord thy God hateth.   Deut. 16:22.

The dust is turned into lice, *which* the magicians could not do.   Heading to Ex. 8.

11.   Which *as a relative adjective.*

Which, alone of the relative pronouns, occurs occasionally as a relative adjective modifying sometimes (a) a preceding noun repeated, (b) a noun identical in meaning with one preceding, or (c) a word which sums up the idea preceding.

(a) *With noun repeated:*

> For unto this day remaineth the same *vail* untaken
> away in the reading of the old testament; *which vail* is
> done away in Christ.   2 Cor. 3:14.
> From the river of Arnon unto mount *Hermon*, (*which
> Hermon* the Sidonians call Sirion; and the Amorites call
> it Shenir.)   Deut. 3:8-9.
> And the name of Hebron before was Kirjath-*Arba,
> which Arba* was a great man among the Anakims.
> Joshua 14:15.
> For the *glory* of his countenance; *which glory* was to be
> done away.   2 Cor. 3:7.
> And they gave them the *city* of Arba the father of
> Anak, *which city* is Hebron.   Joshua 21:11. Joshua 15:13.

(b) *With a noun identical in meaning with one preceding:*

> Again a new *commandment* write I unto you, *which
> thing* is true in him and in you.   1 John 2:8.

(c) *With a word to sum up a preceding idea:*

> And they were very wroth, because he had wrought
> folly in Israel in lying with Jacob's daughter, *which
> thing* ought not to be done.   Gen. 34:7.
> And all Israel went thither, a whoring after it; *which
> thing* became a snare unto Gideon.   Judges 8:27.
> For all things are for your sakes, . . . for *which
> cause* we faint not.   2 Cor. 4:15-16.

A faint analogy to the use of *which* as an adjective may be
seen in the following example with *what* meaning *at which:*

> When that company died, *what time* the fire devoured
> two hundred and fifty men.   Num. 26:10.

III.   WHO.

From the above discussion it appears that although *that* as
a relative pronoun occurs more frequently than either *which*
or *who* and is the chief restrictive relative, its sphere of

activities is more limited than theirs. *Which*, though used less often, frequently replaces *that* even in restrictive clauses, has greater freedom with regard to position on account of its greater carrying power, and is the usual progressive or non-restrictive relative pronoun. *Who*, as remains to be seen, though the least used of the three pronouns and though limited to personal reference in which it seldom appears restrictively, commands a greater freedom in use and significance than either of the others. It frequently departs from the usual sphere of relative pronouns in English — the introduction of clauses which merely define or characterize the antecedent — and acquires the function of a conjunction with a demonstrative or personal pronoun, thus introducing clauses which bear logically on the whole sentence. Clauses thus introduced may be logically either coordinate with or subordinate to the main clause. In either case a marked improvement in sense may usually be noted by the modern ear, if a demonstrative or a personal pronoun with an appropriate conjunction is substituted for the relative.* In this usage, as must be readily seen, *who* departs still further from the restrictive function of relative pronouns, and acquires a new field of activities. The use of *who* in current English does not approach the freedom which it exercises in the King James Version.

1. Who *as a conjunction-pronoun:*

    (a) *Equivalent to a coordinate conjunction and a pronoun:*

    And the Lord delivered them into the hand of Israel *who* smote them, and chased them into great Zidon, and into Misrephothmaim, and into the valley of Mispeh eastward;. *and they* smote them, until they left them none remaining. Joshua 11:8.

---

*"The awkwardness, or impossibility, of a literal translation (of many relative pronouns in Latin) may generally be relieved by the substitution of a demonstrative with an appropriate conjunction." Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar*, Art. 610, R. 1. See Franz's *Shakespeare-Grammatik*, Art. 206, a, b.

In this sentence *who* is exactly parallel with *and they* below it.

> *And he* is the head of the body, the church; *who* is the beginning, the first born from the dead.   Col. 1:18.
>
> She returned unto her father, *who* did with her according to his vow.   Judges 11:39.
>
> And he shall bring them unto the priest, *who* shall offer that which is for the sin offering first.   Lev. 5:8.
>
> For she had neither father nor mother, *and the maid* was fair and beautiful; *whom* Mordecai, when her father and mother were dead, took for his own daughter. Esther 2:7.
>
> The watchmen that go about the city found me; *to whom* I said.   (to whom = and to them)   Songs 3:3.
>
> And Caleb said unto her, What wouldest thou?   *Who* answered, Give me a blessing.   (who = and she)   Joshua 15:18-19.
>
> But he himself turned again from the quarries that were by Gilgal, and said, I have a secret errand unto thee, O king: *who* said, Keep silence.   (who = and he)   Judges 3:19.
>
> How that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, *who* should walk after their own ungodly lusts.   (who = and that they)   Jude 1:18.
>
> (Lest) thou forget the Lord thy God *which* brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage, *who* led thee through that great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents and scorpions, and drought, where there was no water: *who* brought thee water out of the rock of flint: *who* fed thee in the wilderness with manna.   Deut. 8:14-15-16.
>
> He had thirty sons and thirty daughters, *whom* he sent abroad, *and* took in thirty daughters for *his sons.* Judges 12:9.
>
> My servant Moses is not so, *who* is faithful in all mine house.   (who = for he)   Num. 12:7.

In the following sentence *who* really has no place in its own clause except that of a conjunction:

> And they said unto them, Go, search the land: *who* when they came to mount Ephraim to the home of Micah, *they* lodged there. Judges 18:2.

(b) *Equivalent to a subordinate conjunction with a pronoun:*

Who is the relative pronoun usually employed after personal antecedents when the relative clause conveys some such meaning as *cause, concession,* or *purpose,* it being equivalent in such cases to some subordinate conjunction, such as *because, since, seeing that, as, although, in order that,* and a personal or demonstrative pronoun. In this use *who* serves somewhat the same function as the subjunctive mood serves in relative clauses in Latin;* and we find the distinction between clauses introduced by *who* and those introduced by *which* or *that* even less clearly drawn than the distinction between *subjunctive* and *indicative* relative clauses in Latin. Yet it seems evident that *who* at the head of a relative clause often gives its clause a peculiar prominence:

> Yea better is he than both they, which hath not yet been, *who* (because he) hath not seen the evil work that is under the sun. Eccl. 4:3.

Here *which* merely defines the antecedent while *who* explains the statement.

> And the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders that outlived Joshua, *who* (because they) had seen all the great works of the Lord that he did for Israel. Judges 2:7.

> I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes, *who* (because he) loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not. 3 John 1:9.

> But our sufficiency is of God, *who* (since he) also hath made us able ministers of the new testament. 2 Cor. 3:6.

---

*"A simple relative, introducing a merely *descriptive* fact, takes the *indicative,* as any demonstrative would do. , . . But many relative conjunctions take the *subjunctive* to indicate a closer logical connection between the relative clause and the main clause." Allen and Greenough's *Latin Grammar,* p. 339.

And there builded he an altar unto the Lord *who* (because he) appeared unto him. Gen. 12:7.

Be merciful, O Lord, unto thy people Israel, *whom* thou hast redeemed. Deut. 21:8.

(seeing that . . . them)

And he sent messengers throughout all Manasseh; *who* (as it) also was gathered after him. Judges 6:35.

And thou shalt speak unto all *that* are wise hearted, *whom* (since them) I have filled with the spirit of wisdom. Ex. 28:3.

Not as Cain,·*who* (for he) was of that wicked one and slew his brother. 1 John 3:12.

And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, *whom* (for him) the Lord knew face to face. Deut. 34:10.

Even so thou knowest not the works of God *who* (for he) maketh all. Eccl. 11:5.

There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, *who* (for he) rideth upon the heaven in thy help. Deut. 33:26.

And the children of Israel remembered not the Lord their God, *who* (although he) had delivered them out of the hands of all their enemies. Judges 8:34,

For he hath made him to be sin for us, *who* (although he) knew no sin. 2 Cor. 5:21.

He that loveth not his brother *whom* he hath seen, how can he love God *whom* he hath not seen. (whom = when him) 1 John 4:20.

They sacrificed unto devils, not to God; to gods *whom* (although them) they knew not, to new gods *that* came newly up, *whom* your fathers feared not. Deut. 32:17.

Compare the use of *whom* and *that* above.

This day will I begin to put the dread of thee and the fear of thee upon the nations *that* are under the whole heaven, *who* (so that they) shall hear report of thee, and shall tremble, and be in anguish because of thee. Deut. 2:25.

Here *that* introduces a mere relative clause of characteristic, while *who* introduces one expressing result.

And the man Micah had an house of gods, and made an ephod and teraphim, and consecrated one of his sons, *who* became (that he might become) his priest. Judges 17:5.

I would lead thee and bring thee unto my mother's house, *who* would (that she might) instruct me. Songs of Solomon 8:2.

Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, *who* (while they) dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years. Ex. 12:40.

For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, *who* (as he) was preached among you by us, even by me and Silvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay, but in him was yea. 2 Cor. 1:19.

In many cases, although it is difficult to give the exact equivalent of *who* in the form of a conjunction and pronoun, it is clear that the clause bears a more intimate logical connection with the sentence than the mere definition or characterization of the antecedent of the pronoun:

Now I Paul myself beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, *who* in presence am base among you, but being absent am bold toward you. 2 Cor. 10:1.

And so I saw the wicked buried, *who* had come and gone from the place of the holy. Eccl. 8:10.

Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, *whom* thou lovest. Gen. 22:2.

Even by the God of thy father, *who* shall help thee, and by the almighty *who* shall bless thee. Gen. 49:25.

But we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God *which* raiseth the dead: *who* delivered us from so a great a death; in *whom* we trust that he will yet deliver us. 2 Cor. 1:9-10.

For what nation is there so great, *who* hath God so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for? Deut. 4:7.

Who is like unto thee, O people! saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help, *and who* is the sword of thy excel-

lency. Deut. 33:29. (Relative clause coordinate with apposition.)

Frequently the clause introduced by *who* states a fact which is either generally known or has just been explained. In these cases *who* carries with it some such significance as "as you know" or "of course." The sixth chapter of Judges explains Gideon's surname, Jerubaal, and chapter seven begins:

> Then Jerubaal, *who* is Gideon, and all the people that were with him, rose up early.   Judges 7:1.
>
> These are the sons of Esau, *who* is Edom.   Gen. 36:19.
>
> Sihon, king of the Amorites, *who* dwelt in Heshbon. Joshua 12:2.
>
> They took Lot, Abram's brother's son, *who* dwelt in Sodom.   Gen. 14:12.
>
> And Moses told Aaron all the words of the Lord *who* had sent him.   Ex. 4:28.

Though *who* vastly preponderates in this particular field, the following examples show that it is not the only pronoun so used:

> A nation *whose* tongue thou shalt not understand, a nation of fierce countenance, *which* shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young: *and he* shall eat the fruit of thy cattle . . . *which* also shall not leave thee either corn, wine, or oil.   Deut. 28:49-50-51.
>
> That the cruelty done to the threescore and ten sons of Jerubaal might come, and their blood be laid upon Abimelech their brother, *which* slew them; and upon the men of Shechem. *which* aided him in killing his brethren.   Judges 9:24.
>
> I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, *which* (although I) am but dust and ashes.   Gen. 18:27.
>
> The Lord sent a prophet unto the children of Israel, *which* said unto them.   Judges 6:8.
>
> And the men *which* Moses sent to search out the land, *who* returned and made the congregation to murmur,

. . . even those men *that* did bring up the evil report on the land, died by the plague. Num. 14:36-37.

2. Who *as a regular relative.*

Who occurs occasionally as a regular relative introducing a clause which simply characterizes or defines the antecedent. In this use it is usually non-restrictive though sometimes restrictive.

(a) *Non-restrictive:*

And Hadad the son of Bedad, *who* smote Midian in the field of Moab, reigned in his stead. Gen. 36:35.
Better is a poor and a wise child than an old and foolish king, *who* will no more be admonished. Eccl. 4:13.
The elder unto the elect lady and her children, *whom* I love in truth. 2 John 1:1.
Tell me, O thou *whom* my soul loveth. Songs 1:7.
And there he put the man *whom* he had formed. Gen. 2:8.
These be they *who* separate themselves. Jude 1:19.
And there was a young man out of Bethlehem-Judah, of the family of Judah, *who* was a Levite, and he sojourned there. Judges 17:7.

(b) *Restrictive:*

All the Canaanites *that* dwell in the land of the valley have chariots of iron, both they *who* are of Bethshear and her towers and they *who* are of the valley of Jezreel. Joshua 17:16.
The man, *who* is lord of the land, spake roughly to us. Gen. 42:30.
And this commandment have we from him, That he *who* loveth God love his brother also. 1 John 4:21.
For not he *that* commendeth himself is approved, but *whom* the Lord commendeth. 2 Cor. 10:18.
Come and I will show you the man *whom* thou seekest. Judges 4:22.
Did I make a gain of you by any of them *whom* I sent

unto you?   2 Cor. 12:17.

Live joyfully with the wife *whom* thou lovest.   Eccl. 9:9.
(Restrictive for Solomon.)

3.   Whose, *the only possessive relative.*

Whose serves as possessive for all three relative pronouns
in Bible English and refers to both persons and things.   *Of
which* is never possessive:

She also bare him a son *whose* name he called Abimelech.
Judges 8:31.

And all the women *whose* hearts stirred them up in wis-
dom spun goats' hair.   Ex. 35:26.

The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, thou *that*
dwellest in the, clefts of the rock, *whose* habitation is
high; *that* saith in his heart.   Ob. 1:3.

Joseph is a fruitful bough . . . *whose* branches run
over the wall.   Gen. 49:22.

These (sinners) are . . . trees *whose* fruit wither-
eth.   Jude 1:12.

A land *whose* stones are iron, and out of *whose* hills thou
mayest dig brass.   Deut. 8:9.

Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, *whose* top may
reach unto heaven.   Gen. 11:4.

And the bullock . . . and the goat for the sin offer-
ing, *whose* blood was brought in.   Lev. 16:27.

Whose is sometimes equivalent to a conjunction and a pos-
sessive pronoun:

Art thou better than populous No, *that* was situated
among the rivers, *that* had the waters round about it,
whose rampart was the sea, *and her wall* was from the
sea?   Nahum 3:8.

Now these are the kings of the land which the children
of Israel smote *and* possessed *their* land on the other side
Jordan.   Joshua 12:1.

4.   Whom *with prepositions.*

Whom is the relative pronoun always used after preposi-

tions when the antecedent is a person. *Which* with prepositions does not refer to persons:

> Give me my wives and my children *for whom* I have served thee. Gen. 30:26.
>
> The Lord *before whom* I walk will send his angel with thee. Gen. 24:40.
>
> This is the law of him *in whom* is the plague of leprosy. Lev. 14:32.
>
> There be just men *unto whom* it happeneth according to the work of the wicked. Eccl. 8:14.
>
> Wandering stars *to whom* is reserved the blackness of darkness forever. Jude 1:13.

5. Whom *in ἀπὸ κοινοῦ:*

> How shall I curse *whom* God hath not cursed? or how shall I defy *whom* the Lord hath not defied? Num. 23:8.

6. Who *with antecedent in possessive:*

> I would lead thee and bring thee unto my *mother's* house, *who* would instruct me. Songs 8:2.
>
> Laid it upon *Ephraim's* head, *who* was the younger. Gen. 48:14.
>
> Am I in *God's* stead *who* hath withheld from thee the fruit of the womb? Gen. 30:2.

CHAPTER VI

Subjunctive Mood

The use of the subjunctive in the King James Version is characterized by great looseness and irregularity due to the unfixed state of English syntax during the period from which the English Bible drew its idiom, 1535-1611. By 1611 the use of *may*, *might*, *would*, and *should*, as auxiliaries to express the subjunctive, was almost as fully developed, though not so prevalently used, as today. The Bible, while showing a marked preference for the old direct subjunctive forms on account, no doubt, of their brevity, archaic dignity, and more popular sound, nevertheless admitted the newer periphrastic forms in practically all constructions requiring subjunctive. This freedom of choice, practiced in a work so authoritative and so widely and thoroughly disseminated as the authorized Bible, doubtless did much to preserve the old as well as to propagate the new forms in the subsequent development of the language. Although in the natural levelling of inflections, the place of the old one-word subjunctive forms has been practically occupied by the auxiliary or periphrastic forms in plain English of today, nevertheless the old forms are still permissible and not rare in some kinds of writing, especially poetry. This preservation of two styles of subjunctive is a distinct advantage to the language.

The tendency, which is now well developed, to substitute the indicative outright for the subjunctive appears just incipient in the King James Version, which no doubt has thrown the weight of its influence against this tendency. The commonest verbs, such as *be*, *go*, and *do*, use the subjunctive almost invariably, though even with them an indicative form is sometimes seen masquerading where a subjunctive would be expected and might seem more regular. Such substitution often seems merely a matter of caprice, some-

times of euphony, and sometimes the result of particuar influences. No absolute rules can be laid down for the practice.

The examples given below show the principal usages and constructions in which the subjunctive appears, under the following heads:

1. Subjunctive in conditional sentences.
2. In concessions.
3. In temporal clauses with a sense of suspense.
4. In final clauses.
5. In consecutive clauses.
6. In substantive clauses.
7. Optative subjunctive.
8. In indirect questions.
9. In main clauses.
10. "As it were", "if it were."

1. *Subjunctive in conditional sentences.*

A. In *unreal conditional sentences*, the subjunctive is regular in the protasis and often appears in the apodosis also, though usually displaced in the latter by a periphrasis with *would* or *should*. A periphrasis rarely displaces the subjunctive in the protasis of an unreal condition.

(*a*) *Subjunctive in protasis:*

If thou *do* these things, shew thyself to the world. John 7:4.
Tell the stars, if thou *be* able to number them. Gen. 15:5.
If the Lord *were* pleased to kill us, he would not have received a burnt offering at our hands. Judges 13:23.

(*b*) *Subjunctive in apodosis:*

If the whole body *were* an eye, where *were* the hearing? If the whole *were* hearing, where *were* the smelling? 1 Cor. 12:17.
If we had been sold for bondmen and bondwomen, I *had* held my tongue. Esther 7:4.

If thou hadst been here, my brother *had* not died.   John
11:21.

(c)   *Subjunctive in protasis:*

The verb *be* in the protasis of unreal conditions is regu-
larly subjunctive.   Less common verbs, however, on which
the subjunctive has a weaker hold, sometimes permit the
indicative:

> Jesus answered and said unto her, if thou *knewest* the
> gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to
> drink, thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would
> have given thee living water.   John 4:10..
>
> Lord, if thou *hadst* been here, my brother had not died.
> John 11:21 and 32.
>
> Why dost thou as if thou *hadst* not received it.   1 Cor.
> 4:7.

In these cases the indicative form may have displaced a
regular subjunctive on account of the proximity of the pro-
noun, *thou*, which, of course, in the vast majority of cases
required the second personal ending *st* in the verb.   In such
case the indicative form is used in obedience to the law of
analogy and for the sake of sound, the influence of person
being stronger than that of mood in determining the form of
the verb.   The subjunctive is clearly losing ground and the
cases of indicative forms in subjunctive territory, quoted above,
are sporadic lapses in favor of the new tendency*.   There is
a feeling also in each case that the tense of the verb, where-
by the unreal significance is conveyed, carries something of a
subjunctive effect without the subjunctive form.

---

*The verb *have*, also, which appears in two of the examples quoted above,
was wavering between the habits of the independent verb, which it had
been, with full subjunctive forms, and an auxiliary verb, which it was
fast becoming, with none but indicative forms.   As the auxiliary of the
perfect tenses it later displaced *be* with many verbs, witness: the verb *come*,
which in the Bible occurred with *be*, as in, *is come*, *was come*, etc., but
now uses *has come*, *had come*, etc.   As it gained in strength as an auxiliary
verb, it lost the power of an independent verb to conjugate in the sub-
junctive.   Though in the *Morte d'Arthur*, *have* stood alone with *be* as an

B. In *ideal and anticipatory conditions*, where nothing is
implied as to reality or unreality, the mood of verbs varies
between the subjunctive, the periphrasis with auxiliaries, and
the indicative. The subjunctive mood, however, rules. The
following examples show the different modes of expression:

(*a*) *Subjunctive mood in ideal conditions*:

> If thou *be* the Christ tell us plainly.   John 10:24.
> If it *please* the king, let it be granted to the Jews.
> Esther 9:13.
> If the cloud *were* not taken up, then they journeyed not
> till the day that it was taken up.   Ex. 40:37.
> If a man *love* me, he will keep my words.   John 14:23.
> If thou *refuse* to let them go, behold, I will smite all thy
> borders with frogs.   Ex. 8:2.
> If a woman *have* conceived seed.   Lev. 12:2.
> I will give you for your cattle, if money *fail*.   Gen. 47:16.
> If he *repent*, forgive him.   Lu. 17:3.
> If thou *be* a great people, then get thee up to the wood
> country . . . if Mount Ephraim *be* too narrow for
> thee.   Joshua 17:15.

---

exception to the tendency toward the disuse of the subjunctive, (Baldwin,
Inflections and Syntax of Malory's Morte d'Arthur), the following examples show
how in Bible English it was wavering between the fully conjugated inde-
pendent verb and the subjunctiveless auxiliary:

> But if the ox *were* (subjunctive) wont to push with his horns in time
> past, and it *hath* (indicative) been testified to his owner, and he *hath*
> (indicative) not kept him in, but that he *hath* (indicative) killed a
> man or a woman, the ox shall be stoned.   Ex. 21:29.
> If no man *have* (subjunctive) lain with thee, and if thou *hast* (indic-
> ative) not gone aside to uncleanness, . . . be free . . . But if
> thou *hast* (indic.) gone aside . . . and if thou *be* (subj.) defiled,
> and some man *have* (subj.) lain with thee beside thine husband . . .
> the Lord make thee a curse.   Num. 5:19.
> If the witness *be* (subj.) a false witness and *hath* (indic.) testified falsely
> againt his brother.   Deut. 19:18.
> Sir, if thou *have* (subj.) borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid
> him.   John 20:15.

(*b*)   *Mood varying.*

If any man *be* a worshipper of God and *doeth* his will, him he heareth.   John 9:31.

If there *arise* among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and *giveth* thee a sign or a wonder,   .   .   .   thou shalt not hearken.   Deut. 13:1-3.

And if a soul *sin*, and *hear* the voice of swearing, and *is* a witness, whether he hath seen or known of it, if he *do* not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity.   Lev. 5:1.

If the witness *be* a false witness and *hath* testified falsely against his brother, then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his brother.   Deut. 19:18, 19.

If he *thrust* him suddenly without enmity, or *have* cast upon him anything without laying of wait,   .   .   .   and *was* not his enemy   .   .   .   the congregation shall judge.   Num. 35:22-24.

If a soul *sin* and *commit* a trespass   .   .   .   and *lie* unto his neighbor   .   .   .   or *hath* deceived his neighbor; or *have* found that which was lost and *lieth* concerning it, and *sweareth* falsely;   .   .   .   then it shall be that, etc.   Lev. 6:2, 3, 4.

And if thou *sell* ought unto thy neighbor, or *buyest* ought of thy neighbor's hand, ye shall not oppress one another. Lev. 25:14.

(*c*)   *Condition with* if that = if:

Thou shalt be above only and thou shalt not be beneath, *if that* thou hearken unto the commandment.   Deut. 28:13.

If the priest look on the plague of the scall, and behold it be not in sight deeper than the skin, and *that* there is no black hair in it, then the priest shall shut him up. Lev. 13:31.

(*d*)   *If so be* = *if:*

If so be the Lord will help me, then I shall be able to drive them out.   Joshua 14:12.

(*e*)　*And = if:*

For how shall I come up to my father, *and* the lad be not with me?　Gen. 44:34.

(*f*)　If *omitted with inverted protasis:*

I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men, *were it* not that I feared the wrath of the enemy.　Deut. 32:26, 27.
Were it not that I regard the presence of Jehoshaphat, . . I would not look toward thee.　2 Kings 3:14.

(*g*)　*Subjunctive in double conditions:*

Whether he *have* gored a son or *have* gored a daughter, according to his judgment shall it be done unto him.　Ex. 21:31.
Therefore whether it *were* I or they, so we preached and so ye believed.　1 Cor. 15:11.
Whether it *be* beast or man, it shall not live.　Ex. 19:13.

(*h*)　*Subjunctive with the indefinite relative:*

Whosoever he *be* that doth rebel　.　.　.　he shall be put to death.　Joshua 1:18.
Or if he touch the uncleanness of man, *whatsoever* uncleanness it *be*　.　.　and it *be* hid from him,　.　.　. he shall be guilty.　Lev. 5:3.

(*i*)　*Subjunctive after* unless *or* except = if not:

(Indicative rare: four examples.)
The soul which hath touched any such shall be unclean . . . *unless* he *wash* his flesh with water.　Lev. 22:6.
Except your youngest brother *come* down with you, ye shall see my face no more.　Gen. 44:23.
Except a corn of wheat *fall* into the ground and *die*, it abideth alone; but *if* it *die*, it bringeth forth much fruit.　John 12:24.

2. *Subjunctive in Concessive Sentences.*

In concessions introduced by *though* and *although**, the mood is regularly subjunctive if the reference is general or to future time; and even when the reference is definite or refers to an assured fact in present or past time the subjunctive sometimes occurs, though usually the indicative or a periphrastic subjunctive:

> Though he *slay* me, yet will I trust him.   Job 13:15.
> Though he *fall*, he shall not be utterly cast down.   Ps. 37:24.
> He that believeth in me, though he *were* dead, yet shall he live.   John 11:25.
> Although my house *be* not so with God, yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant.   2 Sam. 23:5.
> Though thou *detain* me, I will not eat.   Judges 13:16.
> Though he (Jesus) *were* a son, yet learned he obedience.   Heb. 5:8.
> Though I *be* absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit.   Col. 2:5.

3. *Subjunctive in temporal clauses with a sense of suspense.*

In temporal clauses with an idea of suspense or condition or doubt or contingency, introduced by such words as *until*, *till*, *against*, etc., the subjunctive mood appears when the tense looks toward the future.   With the past tense, of course, there being no contingency, the mood is indicative:

> They shall pursue thee until thou *perish*.   Deut. 28:22.
> I will tarry until thou *come* again.   Judges 6:18.
> He shall not lie down until he *eat* of the prey and *drink* the blood of the slain.   Num. 23:24.
> Until the day *break* and the shadows *flee* away, I will get me to the mountains of myrrh.   Songs 4:6.

---

*Although is used only with concessions in which the fact referred to is assured and real, the mood being almost altogether indicative (one exception); and with *though*, when the sense of it is rather *even though*, the mood is generally subjunctive; when it is simply *although*, the mood is generally indicative.   *Although* occurs 8 times; *though* occurs 80 times.

Thou shalt stand by the river's brink against he *come.*
Ex. 7:15.
So do God unto me and more also, if I taste bread . . .
till the sun *be* down.   2 Sam. 3:35.
Now I tell you before it *come.*   John 13:19.
Doth our law judge any man before it *hear* him and
know what he doeth.   John 7:51.
Remember thy Creator . . . or ever the silver cord
be loosed.   Eccl. 12:1-6.
And we, or ever he *come* near, are ready to kill him.
Acts 23:15.

4.   *Subjunctive in final clauses.*

In final clauses auxiliary periphrases with *may*, *might*, and
should are used most frequently.   The subjunctive appears
mostly in commands or exhortations containing a negative
or introduced by *lest* implying a negative.

And they shall bind the breastplate . . . that it *may*
be above the curious girdle of the ephod, and that the
breastplate *be* not loosed from the ephod.   Ex. 28:28.
Sin no more lest a worse thing *come* unto thee.   John
5:14.
Let us make us a name lest we *be* scattered abroad.
Gen. 11:4.
They shall wash with water that they *die* not.   Ex. 30:20.
Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing *be*
lost.   John 6:12.
I cannot escape to the mountains lest some evil *overtake*
me and I *die.*   Gen. 19:19.

5.   *Subjunctive in consecutive clauses.*

In consecutive clauses the subjunctive is well nigh confined
to the expression "that he die" which occurs repeatedly
in laws of punishment and elsewhere.   Auxiliary peri-
phrases are usual and the indicative occasional.

Thou shalt stone him with stones that he *die.*   Deut.
13:10.

He that smiteth a man so that he *die*, shall be surely put to death.   Ex. 21:12.

Who can tell if God will repent and turn away from his fierce anger that we *perish* not?   Jonah 3:9.

6.   *Subjunctive in substantive clauses.*

In noun clauses the subjunctive appears sporadically, though usually yielding place to a periphrasis.   The following varieties have been observed with the subjunctive: (a) clauses of apposition or expectation, (b) complementary final clauses, (c) after *would:*

(a) *Clauses of apposition:*

It were better for him that a millstone *were* hanged about his neck.   Lu. 17:2.

Lest   .   .   .   it come to pass that he   *bless* himself. Deut. 29:18-19.

(b) "*Complementary final clauses:*"*

Take heed that thou *speak* not to Jacob.   Gen. 31:24.

Pray unto the Lord that he *take* away the serpents from us.   Num. 21:7.

Speak unto Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest; that he *take* up the censers.   Num. 16:37.

See that thou *do* all these wonders before Pharaoh.   Ex. 4:21.

Be sure that thou *eat* not the blood.   Deut. 12:23.

Beware that thou *pass* not such a place.   2 Kings 6:9.

(c)   After *would:*   (See also *Optative Subjunctive* below.)

I *would* there *were* a sword in mine hand.   Num. 22:59.

Would God my lord *were* with the prophet.   2 Kings 5:3.

7.   *Optative Subjunctive.*

Optative sentences, being the objects of verbs of wishing understood, might be considered a variety of substantive

*Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar,* Sec. 546.

clause, and they no doubt take the subjunctive mood from something of the same feeling, though of course the actual relation does not appear. Besides ordinary wishes this group includes blessings, curses, permissions, etc.

Therefore God *give* thee the dew of heaven. Gen. 27:28.

O that there *were* such an heart in them. Deut. 5:29.

O that I *were* as in months past. Job 29:2.

This heap *be* witness and this pillar *be* witness. Gen. 31:52.

Would God it *were* even. Deut. 28:67.

Peace *be* unto you. John 20:19.

Blessed *be* he that enlargeth God. Deut. 33:20.

Now he that ministereth seed to the sower both *minister* bread for your food, and *multiply* your seed sown. 2 Cor. 9:10.

Cursed *be* every one that curseth thee, and blessed *be* he that blesseth thee. Gen. 27:29.

Cursed *be* Canaan. Gen. 9:25.

God *do* so to me. 1 Kings 2:23.

His blood *be* upon us and on our children. Matt. 27:25.

8. *Subjunctive in indirect questions.*

In indirect questions the subjunctive appears occasionally, though usually displaced by the indicative:

All men mused in their hearts of John, whether he *were* the Christ or not. Lu. 3:15.

Come near I pray thee that I may feel thee, my son, whether thou *be* my very son Esau or not. Gen. 27:21.

When Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked whether the man *were* a Galilean. Lu. 23:6.

The Pharisees had given commandment that if any man knew where he *were*, he should shew it. John 11:57.

9. *Subjunctive in main clause.*

In sentences containing a substantive clause expressing a hypothetical or contemplated action the preterit subjunctive sometimes occurs in the main clause:

It *were* better for him that a millstone were hanged
about his neck .... than that he should offend one
of these little ones.   Lu. 17:2.
Were it not better for us to return unto the land of
Egypt?   Num. 14:3
That *were* a reproach unto us.   Gen. 34:14.
I *had* rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God,
than to dwell in the tents of wickedness. Ps. 84:10.
I *had* rather speak five words with my understanding
.... than ten thousand words in an unknown
tongue.   1 Cor. 14:19.

10.   "*As it were*", "*if it were*".

The subjunctive mood appears repeatedly in the clause "*as
it were*". apparently with a limiting significance or a toning
down of an exaggerated or figurative expression.   *"It were"*
could usually be omitted without destroying the connection,
but not without losing a certain apologetic turn of sense.
This use seems entirely in keeping with the usual signifi-
cance of the subjunctive mood.   "*If it were*" occurs once
with somewhat the same meaning.

Woe unto them that draw iniquity with cords of vanity,
and sin *as it were* with a cart rope.   Isa. 5:18.
And his sweat was, *as it were*, great drops of blood.   Lu.
22:44.
At even there was upon the tabernacle, *as it were*, the
appearance of fire.   Num. 9:15.
He hath, *as it were*, the strength of an unicorn.   Num.
23:22.
Then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but *as
it were* in secret.   John 7:10.
I speak .... *as it were* foolishly.   2 Cor. 11:17.
They besought him that they might touch *if it were* but
the border of his garment.   Mk. 6:56.