

admissible reading. In 1 Kings xiii.12, for example, the sense requires the Hiphil וַיִּשְׁלַח instead of וַיִּשְׁלַח , and we ought to render as in the margin, or in the LXX, $\text{καὶ ἐεικνύουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.}$ "And his sons shewed him what way the man of God went."

For a practical illustration suggested by this distinction turn to Ex. xxxii.29. The A.V. renders, "For Moses had said" - the pluperfect implying that the injunction to consecrate themselves to Jehovah was at least parallel, if not anterior, to the divine commission in verse 27; so that the consecrating act and the avenging deed were really one and the same. There is nothing to show, however, that this was the intention of the Hebrew leader. And within the verse itself it fails to do justice to the particle וְ , which is signalised by a disjunctive accent. In reality, the act of consecration is posterior, not anterior, to the avenging deed (ver. 28), while וְ furnishes the reasons for the all-important addition. Translate, "And Moses said, consecrate yourselves to-day to the Lord; for every man hath been against his son (R.V. margin) and against his brother: and that he may bestow (וַיְבָרֵךְ) upon you a blessing." The infin. construct with וְ is here used, simply as a shorter way of continuing the preceding verbal action. It adds a second reason for the act of consecration.