as the Word. $\lambda \epsilon_{ff} \epsilon l$ here and in v.15 is in the present tense. Probably not simply historical present, but rather continuous. The statement of God is considered as present and enduring. "My word shall not pass away".

Yaprefers back to v.14, placing this verse parallel to v.15. The quotation does not begin with $\delta \tau ($, which simply introduces it. It is from Ex.9116, where God declares to Pharaoh, through Moses, how easily He might have destroyed him and his people from off the earth, "but in very deed for this cause have I made thee to stand, to show thee my power, and that my name may ht be declared throughout all the earth" (quoted from A.R.V.) Paul quotes the LXX in the main, but he alters the first part of the verse, which reads, in the IXX, Kai ÉVEKEN TOUTON SIETAPHONS, ÉVA ÉVSEL Sumai...... In the rest of the verse Paul follows the LXX verbatim, except that he uses Sivanivwhere our commonly accepted version of the LXX reads io you. But this latter is not necessarily an alteration, for many copies of the LXX have Surapily. In his alterations, Paul translates the Hebrew more accurately. Els adjo routo brings the meaning into stronger relief than does EVEKEV TOUTOW of the LXX. In the LXX the passive form, $\delta(\epsilon \tau \eta \rho \eta \theta \eta s$ does not accurately reproduce the grammar of the Hebrew J70 y77, which brings out more clearly the personal nature of the divine causation. (There is a reading of the LXX in the Hexapla with $\delta(\epsilon \tau \eta \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \sigma \epsilon$. But Paul uses the more general word, $E f \eta \gamma \epsilon l \rho q$, a change which the Hebrew justifies but does not render necessary. Regarding St. Paul's use of the Septuagint, it would be in point here to quote from Tholuck: 1.

"It is a remarkable fact that, although all the authors of the "Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer," Beilage I.,p.37.