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"Those who believe the study of the Scriptures to be alike their duty and their privilege, will surely grudge no pains when called upon to separate the pure gold of God's word from the dross which has mingled with it through the accretions of so many centuries."

MY object in the following pages has been to make some contribution towards an examination of the text in one of the most interesting of the prophetic books. A large part of my aim is indeed accomplished if I have succeeded in marshalling some of the evidence in a way that may assist the labours of other workers in the same field.

I have not sought to discuss, or even enumerate, exhaustively the variations between the M.T. and the LXX. I therefore from time to time omit to notice such small variants as the occurrence, unrepresented in the Greek, of מַלְאָךְ הָדָר, בֵּית יְהוָה, and the like, unless there be some local reason for drawing attention to them, e.g. if a passage is characterised by many such accretions—a word which, as it will be seen, I consider to represent, speaking generally, their nature. On the other hand accretions in the Greek, as rarer, are carefully noticed.
In chap. xi. and onwards I omit the letters prefixed in the previous chapters to most of the notes, and explained in the Introductory chapter (pp. 13-15, 18-22). I have assumed that the use of these letters in the earlier part of the notes is sufficient to convey information as to the proportions assumed by the different kinds of variation which may be observed in a comparison of the Hebrew and Greek Texts.

In consequence of an interval which unavoidably occurred between the printing off of my notes on the first ten chapters of the prophet and that of the remainder, three recently published critical works came into my hands too late to be consulted in the former part of the book, viz. the Commentaries of Giesebricht (Gi.)¹ and of Cornill (Cor.)² and the annotations on O. T. passages by Perles³. As will be seen in consulting my notes on chaps. xi.-lii., I have there made repeated reference to both Giesebricht and Cornill, often disagreeing with their views. As regards the earlier portion of these

¹ *Das Buch Jeremia übersetzt und erklärt*, von D. Friedrich Giesebricht, being part of the *Handkommentar zum A. T.* Göttingen, 1894.


³ See p. 150.
PREFACE.

notes (chaps. i.—x.), I would point out two passages, where Giesebricht appears to have hit upon the right emendation:

(a) In vi. 6 הר יי钢结构 is an ingenious and very possible conjecture. He compares Nah. iii. 1.

(b) In viii. 18 read פֶּה פֶּלְיָה = פֶּלְיָה. In v. 28 Cornill’s account (p. 47) of עָבָר (to be “emended to עַבָּר, in accordance with Deut. xxxii. 15”) is probably the right one.

In iii. 1 I accept Perles’ (p. 48) emendation of לִפְרָר to לַפְרָר (out of לִפְרָר). At a time when increased recognition has begun to be accorded to the importance of Versions, it is hoped that the Appendix on the Old Latin evidence to the text of Jeremiah may be of some interest and utility.

In a work containing such multifarious detail, I cannot hope that no errors remain undetected. I have used my best endeavours to secure accuracy, and take this opportunity of expressing my acknowledgment of the great help afforded me from the care and skill displayed by the printers and readers of the University Press.
CORRIGENDA.

P. 35, l. 24 for "all" read both.
P. 38, l. 15 for ἄπραξις read ἄπραξίς.
P. 39, l. 13 for (iv. 31, ) viii. 2, 20, x. 4 read (comp. iv. 31, viii. 2, ix. 4,) viii. 20.
The passages within the parenthesis, although not cases of transposition for the sake of sound, furnish us with parallel phenomena. See also p. 19.
P. 45, ll. 13, 14 for "superavi" read Desperavi.
P. 60, l. 12 after "verb" insert would give ὡς ἄλλοι.
P. 72, l. 19 dele "In I....παραλυθήσονται."
P. 77, l. 3 dele xii.
P. 85, ll. 23, 24 dele "SH. and St Jer....O."
P. 117, ll. 15, 16 for "they seem...(διανοητῶς)" read It is quite possible that it was absent from their Heb. text.
P. 150, l. 13 for "may" read might.
P. 150, l. 14 for "note" read note and App. ad loc.
P. 152, l. 10 insert (before מִזְרַח) בֶּן.
INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

To students of the Old Testament the phenomena presented by the earliest Greek version as compared with the Massoretic text, have always presented features of attraction. It needs but a slight amount of study of the Septuagint to perceive how very various were the qualifications and character as translators\(^1\) of those who had charge of the work. The general closeness of rendering which belongs, for example, to the greater part of the Greek Pentateuch stands in sharp contrast with the amount of blundering and inaccuracy found in Isaiah or in the Minor Prophets.

In the Book of Jeremiah the interest evoked by a comparison of the two texts has long been recognised as of a special type\(^2\), the nearest Biblical approximation to which is supplied by the double text of Tobit or of Judith.

\(^1\) Even in this Book alone inconsistencies of rendering (see e.g. critical notes on ii. 6, καὶ δὲ ἀρπᾷ, iii. 13, κατακριμένω, vi. 23, ἄβδον) point to the employment of more than one translator.


S.
In the Critical Notes, which form the body of the present work, I have sought to examine the variations between the two texts. Accordingly I have in the first place taken chapters i–x, and aim here (see p. 17) at "a tolerably minute examination" in order to classify as accurately as possible the causes of the variants. In the later chapters on the other hand I have been content with somewhat less minuteness of detail. In them accordingly the letters prefixed (see pp. 17 ff.) to most of the notes in the earlier chapters are omitted. But nowhere have I consciously passed over a deviation of text which presented any feature of interest.

In the Appendix I have arranged, in as succinct a form as seemed attainable, Old Latin authorities (MSS. or patristic quotations). The importance of this branch of evidence is, I think, undoubted. The clearly accidental character e.g. of Codex B's omission of ex μίτρας in i. 5 (see p. 28) is borne out by overwhelming O. L. testimony.

We may conveniently arrange the divergences between the two texts of this prophet under three headings:

1. There is a difference in the position (and in the order of sequence) of the prophecies uttered against foreign nations. In the Hebrew text these stand near the end of the Book, while in the LXX. they follow upon chap. xxv. 13, and are differently arranged among themselves.
2. Besides some passages of considerable length (the longest are chaps. xxix. 16–20, xxxiii. 14–26¹, xxxix. 4–13, lii. 28–30), there are a very large number of shorter expressions which are found in the Hebrew only. It will be convenient in practice to call these *omissions*, provided that the word be not understood to imply anything more than that they are absent from the LXX.'s text.

3. There are an immense number of other divergences between the two texts, viz. additions, transpositions, and substitutions of very various kinds, these last suggesting Hebrew, in some cases more or less resembling, in others quite unlike, the Masoretic Text.

Referring for the first of these three divisions to the discussion in the Critical Notes *in loco*, we proceed to deal with the others, so far as they concern chapters i–x, separately and in minute detail.

A. "*Omissions.*"

These (in common with other variations) have been ascribed to carelessness on the part of copyists (St Jerome), or to their ignorance (Hitzig, Umbreit), or to haste in their transcription of the LXX.'s Hebrew original (so Dean Payne Smith in *Speaker's*

¹ A Messianic passage. We may note that, as the Apocrypha indicates, the Alexandrian Jews do not seem to have been at all as much influenced as their brethren of Palestine by the hope of a personal Deliverer.
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Comm. Introd. to J., Vol. v. pp. 324 f.; or on the other hand to the translators' design, this last view finding numerous defenders (Naegelsbach, Keil, etc.)

The first two hypotheses have few, if any, supporters. Of the third I cannot but feel on a careful examination of the subject, that even were it admissible as an explanation of the "omissions," it would fail to explain the numerous other divergences. But neither is the view which attributes the variations to design on the part of the translators, by any means a satisfactory account of the case. For if we choose any passage of at least eight or ten verses in length, and compare closely the two texts, we shall, I think, be persuaded that the aim of the translators was on the whole to give a faithful and close rendering of the Hebrew before them, their literal reproduction of the original often amounting to a fault. Honesty and straightforwardness are stamped upon their work. Their general accuracy, unless when special reasons intervened which induced them to depart from it, although it is not of course to be judged from a nineteenth century standpoint, is in fact such that we become more and more convinced that in the case of that class of variations of which we are now treating, they must in the great majority of cases have been justified by the Hebrew text

1 For a fuller statement see Prof. G. C. Workman (= Wo. in the Critical Notes), The Text of Jeremiah, Edinburgh, 1889, pp. 6—10.
which they had before them. Their evident desire was to solve, not to shirk, difficulties. Those difficulties necessarily confronted them. For Hebrew had ceased to be a living language, and much was only known to them by tradition. Accordingly when under these circumstances there came a rare or difficult word to be dealt with, we look with interest for their treatment of it. The two methods, to which, as we can clearly see, they ordinarily had resort, were (a) conjecture (sometimes by the help of a cognate language or dialect), and (b) transliteration. When a translator deals in the main with difficulties thus, it is impossible to suppose that his reason for omitting whole passages is because it appeared to him that they were difficult or might easily be dispensed with.

1 Passages in these chapters, which seem to throw some light on the amount of grammatical knowledge possessed by the translators are ii. 6, 17 [Gk. 16], 20; vi. 16, 18; vii. 28, 32.

2 But when the difficulty lay in the construction, there is at least one instance in these chapters where they seem to have been not unwilling to cut the knot by omission (iii. 1, דִּשְׁכֶּה; comp. x. 13).

3 Probably a certain amount of lucky guess-work is latent in their translation.

4 e.g. iii. 5.

5 e.g. viii. 7.

6 See A. Scholz, Der Masoretische Text u. die LXX-Ubersetzung des Buches Ḥ., Ratisbon, 1875, pp. 22—25. Elsewhere (p. 105) in that work he adduces in support of the same view an argument, which is less convincing, viz. that, inasmuch as in the time of the LXX. translators Hebrew had ceased to be a living language, acquaintance with the Hebrew law of parallelism must also have died out. If then, he argues, the LXX. had abridged the
Again, we find frequent "omissions" of simple Hebrew words, such as must have been well known to the translators. It is hard to suppose that men who at any rate on the whole rendered with such an amount of literal accuracy would have arbitrarily omitted easy and appropriate words or sentences. Hence we are led to the conclusion that these were absent from the text with which they had to deal.\footnote{See Scholz, p. 17.}

But perhaps the strongest argument of all for the superiority of the text represented by the LXX. consists in the general character of many of their "omissions."\footnote{I have considered it sufficient for the present purpose, if the "omission" were attested by the Vatican ms. (B), as probably representing the original LXX. more closely than any other individual ms. Chap. i. 17 (om. α) is however almost the only case in these chapters, where that ms. stands unsupported.}

Hebrew text, they must have spoilt the parallelisms; whereas we find that they have not done so, and that in fact the Alexandrian text has sometimes the advantage in this respect. But surely, it may be replied, for the Jew this idiom did not cease with the familiar use of his national speech. The Apocryphal Books, e.g. Wisdom, abound in it. Moreover we may observe that idioms and other forms of speech survive even with those who have wholly lost their hold upon that which was the mother tongue of previous generations. Such expressions as "he did it, and he drunk" (i.e. while he was drunk), in common use among the less educated (English speaking) classes in Ireland, are a literal rendering into English of an Irish idiom. See Dr Douglas Hyde's *Irish Folk Tales* ('Beside the Fire'), London, 1890, p. xlix. The same writer gives as another illustration the phrase "to let on," meaning, to pretend.
And here we may distinguish

(a) Short expressions indicating that tendency to explanation or needless amplification so strongly marked in later Jewish (Palestinian or other) literature\(^1\), e.g. the words "Jeremiah," and "I see" in chap. i. 11 (comp. 13), and also such short epithets as "king of Babylon," "king of Judah," etc. Some placed in this class may well have been marginal glosses, e.g. v. 28 bis, or an accidental repetition, e.g. viii. 3 (הַבָאָלָּמָו) , x. 25 (יוּנֵסָרָי);

(b) Longer "omissions," viz. chaps. x. 6—8, 10, where the logical connexion of the Greek version is decidedly to be preferred to the unnatural arrangement of the Hebrew text\(^2\);

(c) Passages or expressions which are found elsewhere in this or other Books in both texts, e.g. viii. 10\(^b\)—12 (cp. vi. 13—15).

The manner in which this class of variants may have arisen will better appear, if we glance at the position occupied by the Jews resident in Egypt, and, in particular, in Alexandria.

---

1 Neh. chap. ix. on the one hand, and the Epistle of Jeremiah (= Baruch vi.), "certainly of Greek origin" (Schürer, The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Div. ii. Vol. iii. Edinb. 1885, p. 195), on the other supply us with abundant illustration.

As early as B.C. 650 Psammetichus I. is said to have employed Jewish mercenaries in his war against Ethiopia. There was also at an early period a strong Greek element in Egypt. We find Jer. (xlvi. 21) referring under the appellation of "fatted bullocks" to the "hired men," viz. Ionian and Carian soldiers, who according to Herodotus (ii. 163) were 30,000 in number, and lived in a fertile district on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile. After the overthrow of Egypt by Alexander and under the rule of the Ptolemies Greek influence and the Greek language became thoroughly established in Egypt; so that among the Jewish part of the population Hebrew as a living tongue disappeared, and was only retained for religious purposes, except so far as it was studied by the few from patriotic or literary motives.

It is clear that such of the sacred Books as depended for their preservation and study upon the devotion or literary interest of individuals only, would be liable to a far larger amount of alteration, intentional and otherwise, than those which, through their use in public worship, secured a larger amount of attention, and consequently, comparatively speaking, more of verbal accuracy in their trans-

mission. At first after the Return it would appear that the Torah alone had this 'fence' round it, and it is not quite clear at what time, and owing to what causes, the custom of reading a lesson from 'the prophets' took its rise. But whether this use sprung from Antiochus's prohibition of the reading of the Law, or from the protest on the part of the orthodox against the Samaritans, who rejected the remainder of the Old Testament, we can easily see that between Jeremiah's own day, and such a date as accords with either of the reasons we have just mentioned, there had elapsed quite enough time to account for the introduction of additions (some of them probably, to begin with, in the form of marginal glosses or comments) to the original text of the prophet, additions which, as we shall presently note, on the whole indicate an early date by being couched in good Biblical Hebrew.

1 Scholz strangely enough takes the opposite view (p. 226), considering that their use in the synagogue would directly induce additions to the text.

9 So Vitringa, De Symb. Vet. pp. 1008 ff. Elias Levita (end of the 15th century) there quoted, seems the earliest to maintain this opinion.

3 See Fürst, Der Canon des A.T. Leipzig, 1868, p. 51. There is no real authority for including, as he does, the Sadducees. The commencement of the Samaritans' formal schism may be placed in the time of Nehemiah (Neh. xiii. 28).

4 See also Dr Ryle's conjecture as to the possible influence of Hellenic culture (The Canon of the O.T., Macmillan, 1891, p. 108) where he also quotes Prof. Cheyne's suggestion (The Origin of the Psalter, London, 1891, p. 363), viz. "something like a reaction against the spirit of Ezra."
So far as we are warranted in forming an opinion from the very slender evidence in our possession, the reading of the later Books was not introduced into the public worship of the Egyptian Jews by any means so early as in Palestine. The decree of Antiochus would not be likely to have any direct operation on this branch of the nation. It is true on the other hand that there were Samaritans living in Egypt, and that in the course of the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (B.C. 181—146) the dispute as to the rival claims of Jerusalem and Gerizim was brought before the king's tribunal (Jos. Ant. xiii. 3. 4). But they do not seem to have entered Egypt earlier than the time of Ptolemy I. (Lagi, B.C. c. 323—285).

If then we are to suppose that the public reading of 'the prophets' (and consequent tendency towards the fixing of their text) in Palestine was a thing which long preceded their introduction into the Alexandrian worship, we may ask how it is that we do not find the state of the case with regard to

1 We may observe that the Book of Wisdom comments on the Mosaic history but on none other; also that Philo's quotations from Books other than the Mosaic are comparatively few.

2 See Jos. Ant. xiii. 1. 1. πολλοὶ αἰχμαλώτους λαβὼν ἄτυχος Σαμαρείτιδος...κατῴκησεν, ἀπάντας εἰς Ἀγγέλους ἀγαγών.

3 Philo gives three brief accounts of public worship in the synagogue (quoted by Schurer, Div. ii. Vol. ii. p. 76), in only one of which (Fragm. apud Euseb. Praep. Evang. viii. 7, 12—13, ed. Gaisf., from the first Book of the Hypothetica) he speaks, and even there somewhat vaguely (τῶν νῦν ἐκβασθαι), of the reading of the Scriptures.
"omissions" in the LXX., or, as we may now venture to call them, additions in the Masoretic text of Jeremiah, exactly the reverse of that which actually presents itself? How is it that these are many, while the cases where we find words or passages in the LXX. unrepresented in the M.T. are comparatively few?

The answer is a simple one. Hebrew, as we have seen, soon ceased to be a living language among the Egyptian Jews. Their brethren who remained in Babylonian exile, as well as those who returned, were but gradually losing their hold upon the tongue of their forefathers. At Babylon they doubtless lived to a large extent apart from, and out of sympathy with, their conquerors, while at Jerusalem the genius loci, if nothing else, would naturally impel a considerable number to keep up their study of the Hebrew text, and not satisfy themselves with the Aramaic rendering of its contents, which, although needful in Nehemiah's time (Neh. viii. 8) for the mass of the people, is shewn by a large part of the post-exilic Biblical Hebrew literature not to have been required for some time after the Return.

In Egypt the change would be much more rapid. In the first place we find that a general destruction "by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence" was prophesied for those who fled to Egypt on the overthrow of Jerusalem. It there-

1 Jer. xl. 17 ff.
fore appears that until Ptolemy I. (Lagi) introduced from Palestine captives and a large number of other settlers\(^1\), the number of Jews in Egypt was inconsiderable.

Again, with those few, active pursuit of commerce, not retrospection, the energy and excitement of city life, not resentment and regret, must have been the prevalent characteristic, occupying, as they did, those two out of the five quarters of the city, which were close to the river\(^2\). Accordingly the Hebrew text, at least that of ‘the prophets,’ thus neglected, and soon to become unintelligible to the vast majority, remained comparatively free from the particular class of corruptions which we are now considering\(^3\), while, even if the settlers, who arrived in Ptolemy Lagi’s time, brought Hebrew MSS. of the sacred Books with them (which may well be doubted), these would seem to have had little, if any, influence upon the text of the Prophet, as already existing in Egypt.

On the whole we may claim to have established

\(^1\) Jos. Ant. xii. 1 ff. So Schürer, as referred to on p. 8. Aristaeus’ words are, τοὺς μὲν μετάψις, οὐδὲ ἡμικαλώτισθι.

\(^2\) As early as the foundation of Alexandria rights of citizenship were bestowed upon Jewish settlers. See Jos. Ant. ii. 4, Ant. xix. 5. 2, referred to by Schürer, Div. ii. Vol. ii. p. 228. See him also on pp. 244 ff.

\(^3\) This seems a much more probable account than that of Scholz, who, as I have said, ascribes (p. 226) the number of additions found in the M.T. to the early use of it in Palestinian worship.
a good case against the M.T. in this respect; if we can shew, as the following list of "omissions" to be examined in the critical notes claims to do, (a) that in very few cases, if any, are they necessary, (b) that in one or more cases they form a disturbing element.

Thus we may conclude that the "omissions" to be observed in the LXX. of Jeremiah, speaking generally, exist only in consequence of its nearer approximation to the original form of the Hebrew text; or, to express it more briefly, that this class of variants is, as a rule, recensional.

"Omissions" (called om. in the Critical Notes) may be subdivided as follows:

1. See p. 3.
2. So nearly Scholz, p. 124. On p. 221 he compares the case of the additions to Esther and Daniel. Had these additions been composed earlier and written in Hebrew or Aramaic, they would have obtained Jewish recognition as canonical, just as the insertions in Jeremiah. An objection to the view which I am advocating might be considered to lie in the fact that those passages in the M.T. which have no counterpart in the LXX. are for the most part written in pure Hebrew. But among Palestinian Rabbis we have no reason to doubt that care would be taken to render the language of any such additions as a rule strictly Biblical. Yet the word נַטְנוּ in chap. x. 7 has a late appearance, while the use of יַנְשָׁמָה for יַנְשָׁמְהָ in the same verse (and perhaps in v. 6 also, lacking in the LXX.) points in the same direction.
3. Examples on the other hand of probably non-recensional variants of this kind, i.e. real omissions through accident or otherwise on the part of the LXX., will be found in ii. 7, iii. 1, iv. 11, viii. 21, and more or less probable ones in i. 3, vii. 26, x. 13.
4. In these and the following tables cases plainly doubtful as to
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a. Short expressions indicating a tendency to explanation or amplification, or to accidental repetition. Some examples of this class may well have arisen through marginal glosses.

i. 4, 10, 11 bis, 13, (17,) 18 ter. ii. 6, 9, 19, (21,) (22,) 34. iii. 9, 10, 11, 17, 25. iv. (1,) (5,) (8,) 10, *12, 19, 23, 30. v. 14, 17, 20, (28 bis). vi. 6, 9, 11, 13 bis, (28,) 29. vii. 1, 3, 4, 8, (10,) (11,) 13 bis, (15,) 16, (20,) 21, *24, (27,) 28. viii. 3 ter, (5,) 8, (13,) 14 bis, 17. ix. 2, 5, 6, 14 bis, 16, 17, 21, (23.) x. (3,) 5, 16 bis.

b. Longer "omissions."

x. 6—8, 10.

c. Passages or expressions which are found elsewhere in this or other Books in both texts.

i. 15. ii. 1—2, 17. iii. *7, 8, 10. v. 19. vii. 2 bis, 28. viii. 10—12. ix. 8, 9 bis, 12, 16 (x. 19).

class are placed within parentheses. An asterisk denotes some special feature of interest brought out in the critical notes. The numbering in all cases is that of the M.T. From viii. 23 to ix. 25 (inclusive) the numbering of O' differs by one from that of the Heb. Scholz's list (pp. 48 ff.) of "omissions" requires some sifting. Taking the first ten chapters of the Book, we should make the following corrections in his list of "Kleinere Zusätze zum hebräischen Texte."

iii. 22. The words he gives occur also in the LXX. with one variation. For "v. 14" read v. 24. viii. 11. Instead of an addition of one word to the Hebrew, there are absent from the LXX. part of v. 10 and the whole of vv. 11, 12. v. 17. "regulos" is represented in the LXX., though by a loose translation. x. 16.Prefix α to "Israel virga."
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\[d\]. "Omissions" which cannot be placed under any of the above.

i. 3, 5, 10 \textit{bis}. ii. 2, \textasteriskcentered2—3, \textasteriskcentered7. iii. 1, 8. iv. 7, 11. v. \textasteriskcentered1, 8, 15, 26, (28 \textit{bis}). vi. 23. vii. 26. viii. 21. ix. 4, 6. x. 13, \textasteriskcentered18, 25.

B. Other divergences.

By considering one particular class of variants which could be conveniently treated apart, we have attained to what is at least a presumption in favour of the form of the prophet's text represented by the \textit{LXX}. We now proceed to the other kinds of variation which may be observed on comparison of the texts (additions, transpositions, substitutions etc.), in order that we may enquire whether these also are (i) all recensional, or (ii) all non-recensional, or lastly, whether they are not (iii) a mixture of both, and capable to some extent of a corresponding classification.

The second of these three alternatives may be at once put aside, as failing to account for the phenomena. The first of them is virtually that adopted by Prof. Workman in the work already mentioned. His view is clearly given in the following sentences:

"In this discussion the variations are not in any sense, or, indeed, in any instance, regarded as intentional. They are regarded simply as textual characteristics, or as recensional peculiarities. This
theory assumes that the translator, in every case, endeavoured to reproduce the text before him, as literally and as faithfully as the genius of his language would justly allow.... An occasional instance of each class of variation may have arisen from oversight, on the part of the translator or transcriber, but not properly from intention. A variation, moreover, may have been due sometimes to accident, but never to design."

The latter part of Prof. Workman's book consists of a "Con spectus of the Variations," produced by printing so much as is needed of the M.T., and, in parallel columns with it, the text of the LXX. rendered literally into Hebrew. Thus, if his theory be sound, we have before our eyes side by side (so far as the two texts differ) the older (and better) Hebrew text, and its corrupt counterpart, which received Jewish sanction, and thus passed into the Christian Church.

Both Dr Driver and Prof. H. P. Smith have commented on this theory, and besides other criticisms have pointed out with abundant illustrations, to quote the words of the latter, that the "Con spectus contains a number of alleged readings of the Greek translators which are probably not variants at all." It does not, in fact, distinguish

1 pp. 16, 17.
4 p. 110.
between variations which are really, and those only apparently, recensional.

My object in the pages that follow is to deal with the question in a somewhat different manner, and, by a tolerably minute examination of the first ten chapters of the Book, to indicate the complex character of the problem, by calling attention to the many causes which have combined to produce divergences. At the same time I attempt to shew approximately the comparative share which each of these causes has had in the production of so striking a result.

Prof. Workman tells us* that "there must have been a worthy cause for such remarkable divergences." It is this assumption of a single cause which vitiates his whole result. He tells us in effect that the reason why we possess what amounts to a double text of Jeremiah is that the LXX. translated with the most admirable literalness and fidelity a recension which was immensely superior to the M.T., in fact, one which was well-nigh perfect.

On the contrary, as we shall see in detail, the divergences are to be attributed, not to one but to many causes; and it has seemed important to treat separately the "omissions," as being on a different footing from those other classes of variants, with which we now proceed to deal. These,

---

1 By means (as presently explained) of the letters prefixed to most of the critical notes. In the case of very minute additions however I do not intend the list to be quite exhaustive.

2 p. 11.
unlike the former class, we shall see to include a large amount of the non-recensional element, and to owe their origin to causes varying much in the extent of their operation.

They may be grouped as follows, while for detailed comment the reader is referred to the critical notes, the Greek letter at the head of the note in each case indicating the class under which the variant falls or appears to fall.

1. Additions in the LXX. (a).

It will be convenient to subdivide these as regards their origin. Some are obviously introduced from more or less parallel passages (Par.); others may be considered as interpretative or Midrashic (Midr.); while others again, conveniently classed under the above general heading, are really combinations of two readings or conflations (Confl.)

1 There are of course a few cases where the "addition" appears to be a part of the genuine text. Of these ix. 25 [Gk. 26] furnishes an interesting example.

It may here be noted that Scholz in his list (pp. 57 ff.) of "Kleinere Zusätze zum griechischen Texte," makes no attempt at any subdivision, and thus places under the same heading additions of very various origin. We may also make the following corrections in his list, so far as it deals with these chapters: i. 1 omit ὀς. iii. 18 insert καλ before ἀνα. For v. 22 read v. 21. iv. 28 is a case of transposition, not addition. v. 4 is a case of loose translation, not addition. vi. 1 is a misreading of the Heb. on the part of the LXX., not an addition. For v. 13 read v. 16. vii. 9, read τοῦ κακῶς ἐλθαί ὑμῖν. v. 16, a loose translation, not an addition. v. 26, a mistranslation, not an addition. ix. 4, a wrong division of words, not an addition. ix. 6, the word probably represents the original Heb. text. v. 22, read ἔτη γῆς ὑμῶν. x. 2, a misreading of the Heb. text, not an addition.
INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

a. Par. i. 15, 18. ii. 17, 19, 28. iii. *7, 8, 17.
viii. 23. ix. 12. x. 12.
i x. *15. x. 9, 20.
d. Other additions.
i. 1, 14. ii. 6, 13, 23. iii. *1, 8, (for 18 see λ, p. 21), (for 19 see η, p. 20).
iv. 4, 10, 26. v. 18.

2. Transpositions of words or letters, (θ). Here we may distinguish between

a. Transpositions which appear to have been made for the sake of sound:
ii. 19, 32. viii. 20, (comp. for parallel phenomena iv. 31. viii. 2. ix. 4 [5]).
b. Other transpositions:
vi. 9. ix. 1. x. 4, 5.

3. Variations arising solely from substitutions of words or letters (including ‹ or ‡ consonantal), with or without vowel change, (γ).
i. 2 bis, 4, 14, 18. ii. *6, 12, (15,) 16 bis, 19, 20, 21, (23.) 24 ter, 31, 33, 34. iii. 3 (bis), 4, 8, 15 bis, 20, 21, 22.

1 For Midrashic renderings which do not involve additions to the LXX. see p. 21.
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7, 10 bis, 17, 24. vi. 2 ter, *6, 9, 14, 18 bis, 19, 23, (27,) 29. vii. 29. viii. 3, 6 bis, 14. ix. 9, 10, 14, *16, 18. x. 2, 3, 4, *13, (17,) 18, 19 bis, 20 bis.

4. Inaccuracies (other than omissions) caused by ignorance of the meaning of the Hebrew word, and arising generally from its rarity, or rare use in the sense it bears in the individual passage, (δ).


5. Differences consisting only in vocalisation and pointing (including ֳ and ֲ vocalic), (ε).

i. 12. ii. 13, 17, 19, 23, 25, 27, 34. iii. 1, 5, 16 ter, 19 bis, *22. iv. 4, 5, 6, 11, 19, 21, 31. v. 6, 14. vi. 6 bis, 15, 18, (20,) 23 bis, 27 bis, 30. vii. 31, (*32). viii. 6, 7, 13, 16. ix. 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 19 bis. x. 3, 14, 24 bis.

6. Different division of words, (ζ).


7. Errors which may have arisen from words written in a contracted form, or wrongly supposed to be a contraction, (η).

ii. 2–3, (11,) 27 bis, 37. iii. 5, 6, 7, 19. iv. 17. v. (1,) 24. vi. 7, 11, (12,) 15. viii. 7, 14, 18, x. 17.

8. One root mistaken for another of kindred form, (θ).

9. A root taken in a wrong sense, which is borne however elsewhere by that root, (ι).
   viii. 15.

10. Error owing to the influence of Aramaic idiom, (κ).
    iii. 2, 5. vii. 8.

11. Inaccuracies arising from national or local feeling, deference to Egyptian susceptibilities, desire to avoid discredit or misconception, or other such considerations, (λ).
    ii. 16, 18, 29. iii. 18. v. 13.

12. Inaccuracies arising from the desire to avoid harsh language as to Jeremiah or Jews generally, (μ).
    i. 17. viii. 2. ix. 21, 25.

13. Midrashic changes, not being additions, (ν).
    ii. *23. iii. 1, 19. iv. 30. vi. 16.

14. Variations arising from miscellaneous, often unknown, causes, (ξ),
   a. from desire for parallelism, harmonizing, or smoothness.
      i. 7. ii. 19, 30. iii. 18. iv. 3, (8). v. 4, (28).
      vi. 4, 19, 23. viii. 2. ix. 18.
   b. from errors in the M.T.
   c. from errors of ear.
      ii. 18, 33. (v. 31). (x. 21).
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*d.* from liturgical reasons.
(iii. 16. v. 15).

e. from insertion or omission of the negative.
ii. 25, 31 bis. iv. 1. v. 2, 3, 10.

f. from motives of reverence.
v. 12.

g. from lack of grammatical knowledge.
vii. 28.

h. from the influence of Hebrew linguistic usage.
ii. 2.

*i.* from other causes.

i. 16 bis. ii. (11,) 13 bis, 17, 21, 22, 23 bis, 24, 25, 26, 28, 31. iii. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23. iv. 1 quinquies, 4, 5, 7 bis, 8, 10 bis, 11, 13 bis, 14, 15, 20 ter, 21, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31 bis. v. (1,) 13, (28,) *31. vi. 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 bis, 13, 15 ter, 21, *22 bis, 23, 29. vii. 4, 11, 16, 20 bis, 21, 23, 24, 25, 31, (*32,) 32. viii. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 16. ix. 2 bis, 3, 4, 7 bis, 9, 11, 15, 19, 21, 23. x. 1, 2, 15, 17, *18 bis, (19,) 20 bis, 23, 24.

It need scarcely be said that some of these variations are doubtless nothing more than corruptions of the original text of the LXX. Such cases we find e.g. in iii. 6 (πορεύεσθαι), v. 31 (ἐπεκρότησαν), vi. 4 (ἐκλεῖπον), vi. 19 (τῶν λόγων μου), and to these we might add ix. 21 [22] (ἐσονται). Nevertheless certain, or even highly probable, cases of corruption play but a small part
in these chapters. It follows that, so long as the sense offered us by the LXX. in any passage is a reasonable one, its comparative freedom from obvious corruptions strengthens its claim upon our acceptance of its reading.

We may note with regard to a conflation in particular, that it is composed (a) of two readings, in which case it may or may not present us with the LXX's original text, or (b) of two renderings, in which case we are certainly dealing with a corrupt reading of the Greek.

A few words should be said as to indications of illegibility in the MS. or MSS. used by the translators. Uncertainties in the text arising from this cause need not surprise us. While both the public reading of the Torah, and the careful preservation of its rolls in the synagogue, would tend to secure that portion of the Scriptures against corruption or other injury, we have reason to think (see p. 9) that such protective influences were not at work in the case of the other Books till a considerably later period. When we take into account the Jewish view of these Books, as inspired indeed, but inferior to the Law, and to be classed with oral tradition under the common title קַבְבָּלָה, when we consider the probable paucity of copies in Egypt, and further, how easily the letters on a huge roll of leather with ink of a kind to be easily

1 More rarely still do we find cases, e.g. 9, where both texts shew clear signs of corruption.
washed off, could be rendered obscure or illegible\(^1\), we shall have little difficulty in believing that the LXX. translators had to face obstacles arising from such causes as these.

Obviously it is impossible to do more than indicate cases where there seems ground for believing that variations between the Hebrew and Greek texts had for their origin ms. illegibility. Apart then from the many instances where we may well suppose a small portion of one word—it may be a single letter—to have been indistinct or obliterated, we find now and then a group of loose or faulty renderings, which suggest this as a very possible source of error. Such groups are to be found e.g. in ii. 21–23, iii. 3, 4, x. 25, and see especially x. 17–22.

To sum up briefly the most important conclusions to which we seem to be led by the above-mentioned considerations, as expanded and illustrated in the critical notes which follow:

1. The ms. or mss. upon which the translators worked shewed a fairly accurate text, though here and there in somewhat bad preservation.

2. The tendency to diffuseness, characteristic of later Judaism, began, probably soon after the prophecies were collected, to expand by means of slight additions the original Hebrew text.

\(^1\) See W. Robertson Smith, *O. T. in the Jewish Church* (2nd ed.), pp. 71, 161 with notes containing references to authorities for the above statements.
3. This tendency was likely specially to affect the writings of Jeremiah, as a prophet whose memory was of marked interest to the post-exilic Jews. Witness the well-known traditions which grew up around his name.

4. This tendency, though distinctly traceable in the Hebrew text upon which the LXX. worked, operated much more slightly among Egyptian Jews than with their brethren elsewhere, owing to differences (a) of language, (b) of surroundings and modes of life.

5. The character of the translators' work was on the whole good, ranging from fair accuracy to literalness even to a fault, wherever no reason intervened inducing or compelling them to be inaccurate. Among such reasons we may trace the following.

(a) Subjective reasons:
   (i) A desire for smoothness, e.g. a deviation induced by considerations of sound.
   (ii) A desire to interpret by alteration or addition (Midrashic changes).
   (iii) National or local feeling.
   (iv) A desire to avoid harsh language towards Jeremiah or Jews generally.

(b) Objective reasons:
   (i) Illegibility of the Hebrew text.
   (ii) Ignorance of the meaning of the Hebrew word or expression.
(iii) Misconception of the word, owing to the sense which it had come to bear in the Aramaic. This however was but very slight in its effects, as we might expect.

(iv) Slips of eye or ear.

6. They naturally were led into some errors in consequence of not always choosing wisely among two or more possible alternatives, e.g.

(i) Wrong vocalisation or wrong division of words.

(ii) Errors arising from contractions, or supposed contractions.

(iii) The mistaking of one root for another of kindred form.

In the notes which follow, I have taken the readings of uncial mss. (BNAQ) from Dr Swete's edition of the LXX.\(^1\), making use of his lettering also, on the few occasions when it has seemed needful to note alterations by later hands. For the evidence of cursive mss., of the other Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) as well as of the Syro-Hexaplaric (SH.) version\(^2\), I have made use of Field's *Hexapla*.

\(^1\) Cambridge, 1887—1894. In one or two passages, where there seemed a possibility of doubt, I have verified B from the autotype.

\(^2\) Except in a few cases where it has seemed important to verify afresh.
CRITICAL NOTES.

i. 1. a d. I. τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ. The balance is probably just in favour of the M.T., as being a somewhat unusual form, found however in the opening of Amos and Koheleth. O' gives us a very frequent introductory form, with this difference that we should have expected Κυρίου (Jesus) instead of θεοῦ. The θεοῦ of v. 2 (see note there) may account for this variation.

a b. ἀπεφεύγει. ὅσα κατῴκηκα. An interpretative (Midrashic) insertion, by no means implying a variant from the M.T.

2. γ. ἀπεφεύγει τοῦ θεοῦ (A θεοῦ). It is unlikely that O' would, without any apparent reason, violate their rule, carefully to distinguish the words for Lord and God. The Heb. may easily have altered an original ה' אלוהים, so as to correspond with the opening words of v. 4. Q, 22, 36, and others (and so SH.) have Κυρίου.

1 For the meaning of the letters thus prefixed to most of the notes see pp. 13 ff., 18 ff.
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γ. Ἄμως. So in 2 K. [4 K.] xxii. 18 ff. (but there A has Ἄμμων), 2 Chr. xxxiii. 20 ff., through the confusion on the part of O' between Ἄμως and Ἅ. Here Compl. (and so SH.) has Ἄμμων. It seems improbable that O's Hebrew text was wrongly spelt in all these places.

3. om. d. ἦν ὕπον. ἔως. The omission of ἦν probably arose from the recollection of such a passage as xxxix. [xlvi.] 2, or lii. 6 ff. We cannot be sure whether it was done by O', or had an earlier origin.

4. γ and om. a. πρὸς αὐτῶν. O's reading is the better of the two, that of M.T. being adopted for smoothness, and followed by AQ, iii. 23, 41, and others (πρὸς με, adding λέγων), and so SH. Compl. Ald.

5. om. d. ἦν ὕπον. O' vacat, but BΔNAQ repair the clearly accidental omission of ἐκ μήτρας.

6. (δ.) ὅ ὄν. So also in xiv. 13, xxxii. [xxxix.] 17, while iv. 10 has simply Ὄ. In Ex. iii. 14 (bis) ὅ ὄν translates ἔχων. But perhaps the original reading in Jeremiah was in all four places ὁ, whence came ὄν (comp. ἄκουεν for ἄκονεω in iv. 22, and τῶν λόγων for τῶν λόγων in vi. 19), and then ὅ ὄν. In favour of this view is the fact that Ἄ (though in Jud. vi. 22 it is Ἄ ὅ) is rendered ὅ in 2 K. [4 K.] iii. 10, vi. 5, 15 (in this last A omits); so Ἄ is ὅ ὅ in Ezek. xxx. 2.
CRITICAL NOTES.

δέσποινα Κύριε. See on ii. 22.

7. ξα. πρόσ. The frequent employment of ἔλα where ἔλα would be more usual is a feature which the M.T. of Jeremiah shares with the Books of Samuel. For instances in the latter see Dr Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Sam., p. 77, as well as for the much less frequent cases of the converse use, which the Hebrew text here illustrates. From this looseness of practice a translator would feel the more free to give the smoother rendering. Wo. however (p. 198) makes it a case "that may be explained by dictation or oral transmission."

8. άνασι τιθεῖ Κύριος. This is the normal rendering (ἐιπεν in i. 19, but AQ λέγει). It may be noted that in something less than one quarter of the total number of occurrences φησίν is the verb used (the only cases in chs. i—x. being ii. 3, and in Q ix. 2 [3], 5 [6]). Hence Wo. in those cases considers O' to have found ἐλά in their text. This seems quite unnecessary.

9. στὰ δρόμους. O' adds πρόσ με.

10. om. α. ἀναδείκτησεν ἀπολλύειν. Probably the briefer text is to be preferred both here and (still more clearly) in the similar passages xviii. 7, xxxi. [xxxviii.] 28. The natural shrinking which they would have from calling
the attention of foreigners to their own national sufferings at the hand of God, while it may account for the omission of a whole passage such as xxix. [xxxvi.] 16–20, would hardly form a sufficient reason for leaving out one only of a series of verbs, had they found it in their Heb. text. Aq. Theod. support M.T. SH. makes both verbs to be additions from the Heb. text; so St Jer.

om. d. ἐπὶ ἐθνη.

om. d. καὶ (AQ* vid. καὶ ἐπὶ βασιλείας) βασιλείας.

11. om. a. (B vacat) ἈΑΟ Ἱερεμία.

om. a. ἀνέρα (and so in v. 13). O’ vacat.

Probably both this and the preceding are Midrashic insertions in the Heb. (marked with an asterisk in 88 and SH. here and v. 13). In the somewhat similar passage xxiv. 3, as Wo. (p. 283, notes θ and η) somewhat obscurely points out, the words θ to are absent from the Heb. as well.

12. e. τοὺς λόγους μου, reading δίωρος.

13. om. a. ἀνέρα. See on v. 11.

14. a d. ἀπὸ προσώπου βορρᾶ.

γ. ἐκκαυθήσεται (Aq. Symm. ἀνοιχθήσεται). O’ desired to connect the Heb. word etymologically with the preceding ἐν (perhaps read by them ἐν Niph. ptcp. from ἐν), ὑποκαλόμενον
(Aq. Symm. φυσηδέντα or ἑμφυσηδέντα), pointed by Mass. as pass. ptcp. Kal of מְחַסְיָה although properly to breathe, to blow, is used in Hiph. of kindling in a literal (Ezek. xxii. 36) or metaphorical (Prov. xxix. 8) sense. Hence they may have chosen to read מַחְסִיָה, and then either cancelled one מ or else read the word as a Po'olal of מַחְסִיָה.

15. om. c. מַחְסִיָה. O' vacat. Aq. Symm. συγγενείας (a certain correction of εὐγενείας, which SH. gives as their reading). The Heb. seems to have been suggested by xxv. 9.

אא. מַכְסִיָה שלכיה...בַּיָּה. The addition, taken apparently from xv. 4, xxiv. 9 etc., may well have been in the first instance a marginal gloss. Accordingly its position is uncertain, O' putting it after בופית. There would appear to have been an early confusion in the Heb. text between מַכְסִיָה and מַכְסִיָה, of which 88 and SH. retain traces.


εἰ. ἔθυσαν. In Hos. iv. 13; 2 Chr. xxv. 14 alone elsewhere is ἐθύσαν rendered (without variant) by θύειν. θυμάν (θυμάζειν) mostly represents this root both in Jer. and elsewhere. See Hatch and Redpath, Concordance to LXX. etc., Oxford, 1892, s.v. θυμ.
17. (om. a.) בְּלַיְיָהוּ. B vacat. The word is not likely to have been omitted, if genuine. It is supported however by NAQ and SH.

μ. ποιήσῃς ἐναντίον αὐτῶν. SH. follows the Heb. in its text, O' in its margin. M.T. is plainly right. Its apparently harsh language doubtless led to the substitution, and would certainly not have been introduced by an 'improver' of the text. It survives in a Greek form only in ms. 88, and that corruptly, μὴ ποιῇς (corr. ποιῆσαι) σε. St Jer. however testifies to it as the reading of O' ("ne forte timere te faciam"), while giving apparently as a preferable alternative "nec enim timere te faciam vultum eorum." Compl. has μήδε ποιηθῆναι σε ποιῆσαι, not on the authority of any Greek ms., but simply by way of an attempt at rendering O' as given above in St Jer.'s Latin. So elsewhere; e.g. in ii. 1, 2. With a view further to mitigate harshness there was also added without substantial change (NAQ have the ἐγώ) the last clause of vv. 8, 19; all three verses being on the whole similar in thought, and of a specially encouraging, not threatening, character.

18. om. a. יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּרֶךְ. O' vacat.

γ. καὶ ὡς τεῖχος ( QLatin). The matres lectionis (see Scholz, pp. 38, 114) seem to have been less regularly inserted in the time of O'.
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α a. χαλκοῦν, to which is added ὄχυρον (but B6 AQ ρόν, Ν ὦ χυρόν), apparently to explain the preceding figure, and suggested by xv. 20, where ὄχυρον (M.T. בֵּשֶׁר) comes in O'. Here it spoils the parallelism.

om. a. לְכַלַּכְלֵּיהַר. O' vacat. Aq. ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.

om. a. לְכַלַּכְלֵּיה. O' vacat. Theod., 88, SH. supply, but with an asterisk; 22, 36, and others without one.

ii. 1, 2, om. c. בּוּה יֵבְרֵי-יוֹנָה יָאִי לָאָטוּר: הַלָּוָה בַּקְרָאתָ בְּאֶבְנָי. kai εἰπεν. SH. and St Jer. testify to the absence of the clauses from O' (inserted with asterisks by SH., and stated by St Jer. to be added from Theod.). Compl. under these circumstances (see on i. 17) retranslates St Jer.'s Latin. See Field ad loc. The Heb. may have been suggested to a transcriber from the many parallel expressions (xxix. 29; xxxvi. 6, 15, etc.).

2. om. d. יֹבֶל. O' vacat. Theod. has σοί.

ζ h. τελειώσεως αὐτοῦ (Ν* τελιώ-τητός σου τῷ. AQ τελειώσεως σου τοῦ). The translators have transferred to the Greek equivalent the special turn which Heb. usage has in this word given to the sense borne by the root form.

S.
SH. testifies virtually to νυμφέων σου as the rendering of Aq. and Symm., although owing to the form of spelling (νυμφίων) in the MS. which it used, it renders “thy betrothed.” So Field ad loc.

2, 3. om. d and η. O's MS. seems to have erred both in defect and excess, omitting בֵּן בָּנָי (whose genuineness it is hard to doubt), and writing twice over the words רָאוּרַי בֶּית יְשֵׁ־אֵל. Perplexed by the repetition, they read רָאוּרַי on its second occurrence as (רָאוּרַי = רָאוּרַי). For this and other indications in this Book and elsewhere that O' found abbreviations in their text, and so could assume them as something familiar, see Dr Driver, Notes on the Heb. Text of the Books of Samuel. Intro. p. lx.

6. δ. יְהוֹעִידָל. καὶ ἀβατὼς. The root seems to have troubled the translators of this Book. Comp. their rendering in xviii. 20, and (ך) 22 (its only other occurrences in Jer.). Hence they were willing to render as though it were יִשְׁנַה יְשֵׁר הָודָה, often elsewhere (vi. 8, xii. 10 etc.) rendered ἀβατως, and of very frequent occurrence.

Obs. that the M.T. supports בָּנָי against A for the order of the words ἀπό κ. ἀβ.

γ. יִזְכֹּּרִים. καὶ ἀκάρπῳ. Either the MS. was indistinct, or a different and less skilful translator may have been at work; for יִשְׁכַּר is rendered correctly (if we accept its Mass. pronunciation) in xiii. 16.
The word which אָכ. represents is clearly יִלָּכֶד, and it would be tempting to follow Wo. in assuming that this somewhat rare word (Is. xlix. 21; Job iii. 7, xv. 34, xxx. 3) was not only O's reading, but also the original Hebrew here. Unfortunately however for his view, everywhere else it is an adjective, and so (Job xv. 34 is not a case in point) would need the fem. ending, not likely to be omitted, especially in the face of the parallelism just preceding (כְּמוֹ מַעֲרֵי תַּשְׁאֲרָה). See specially Is. xlix. 21. If O' read the word as יִלָּכֶד (not יִלָּכֶד), it shews that even those Greek-speaking Jews who possessed a knowledge of their national tongue, had lost some of their feeling for grammatical Heb. usage. (For other passages which seem to throw light on the amount of grammatical knowledge possessed by the translators see Introductory chapter, p. 5.) Aq. Symm. Theod. had καὶ σκιὰ θαυμάτου. St Jer., quoting Theod., shews ("imagine mortis") that he himself considered the expression to be made up of the roots זְלָם and זָכַר.

*om. a and a d. שֵׁם. om. B* A (Q αὐτήρ. αὐτὸς), all adding however οὔθεν. שֵׁם is an easy amplification for a Heb. copyist.

שֵׁם. ἀνθρωπός ἐκεῖ (ΝΩ ἀνθρώ. ἐκ. νῦν ἀνθρῶ-ποῦ). MSS. 22, 23, 26, and others, and so SH. and
also Compl., have νὶὸς ἄνθρωπον, which St Jer. gives as the reading of O'.

7. om. d.  λεγεῖ. O' vacat. Taking 'λ as the name of the well-known hill, as they also do in iv. 26, they thought 'λ inappropiate. Were it not for the latter passage (where see note) one might be inclined (with Scholz) to consider the 'λ as an interpretative addition on the part of M.T. SH. in the text follows O', but in the margin agrees with M.T.

8. τοῦ νόμου, but ΝΑΩ add μοῦ and so SH.

9. om. a.  κύριος. Β*Ν* om. But λέγει κύριος is found in ΑΩ 23, 26, and others. So SH. and Compl. M.T. is an insertion by a copyist for clearness.

11. (ἐ ἢ or ἦ.  έθνη. This need not be anything more than a loose rendering. But O' may have read the word Ἰάω.

12. γ.  καὶ ἐφρίζειν (after ἐφρ. mss. 33, 36, and others, and so Ald., add ἢ γῆ. So SH. marg.) ἐπὶ πλεῖον. M.T. is clearly right; but the two imperatives with asyndeton were rough; so O' avoided the second by reading לֶבֶן, Aq. Symm. the first by reading לֶבֶן (καὶ πῦλαι αὐτοῦ).

13. a d.  λαβεῖν. καὶ πονηρά, probably reading a conjunction in their text, for they would scarcely
go out of their way to introduce so Hebraic a construction.

ζι. καὶ ὁρὐκαὶ, a free rendering.

ζι. ἡ ἀναρχία λάκκου. O’ practically deleted one of the words, as though they thought that it had been written twice over in their copy.

e. ἐνθ. δυσνήσουσαι...συνέχεια, reading ἔνθ. It so happens that nowhere else in O.T. except in x. 10 (which is lacking in O’) does the Hiph. of ἔνθ. appear with ἐνθ. defective.

15. ζ. ὑστ. οἱ ἑραξα, very possibly reading ἱστ. 

β β. κατεσκάφησαν, reading κατεσκάφησαν. It is noteworthy that conversely where M.T. has the expression ἔρχεται (iv. 26) O’ has ἐμπεπυρμεναῖ (AQ add πυρι), reading ἐμπεπυρμεναῖ (to which Wo. needlessly adds ἐμπεπυρμεναῖ). O’ s rendering of ἐμπεπυρμεναῖ in ix. 9 [10] is probably to be otherwise explained. See note there.

16. λ. Ἡμέρες. Μέμφεως. Noph was a colloquial form of Memphis. See Sm. Dict. of Bible, s. v. Noph.

γ. ἐγνωσάνσε, reading ἔγνωσάνσε for ἔγνωσάνσε. The text of A.V. (“have broken”) derives from ἔγνωσάνσε.

γ. καὶ κατέπαιξόν σου, either reading καὶ κατέπαιξόν σου, or seeing some form of the root
which appears (Hithp.) in 2 K. ii. 23, and is rendered καταπαίζον (so ἐμπαίξονται, Ezek. xxii. 5; comp. Hab. i. 10, and ἐμπάνυμος, Ezek. xxii. 4). This seems more likely than the hypothesis of Scholz, who (p. 36) connects O’s rendering with the root "אַיִם."

17. ἀνα ταῦτα ἐποίησέν σοι τὸ καταλπεῖν σε; Puzzled by the construction they rendered in defiance of grammar. Pesh. and Vulg. render the verb as 3rd p. fut. Niph. (אַבְּשָׁים).

e and a a. ἀνατιθειμέναι. (16) ἐμὲ (17) λέγει Κύριος, reading קählt and supplying מְלָכָה, perhaps in order to harmonize with the last part of v. 19.

om. c. בֶּטֶח מִלְבָּה בְּנָרָה. O’ vacat. An amplification, suggested by v. 6.

18. λ. פֶּרֶךְ. The root פֶּרֶךְ, to be black, muddy (“nigra seuundata arena,” Verg. Ge. iv. 291), is used in Cant. i. 5, 6 of a tanned face, in Job xxx. 30 of a diseased skin, in Lam. iv. 8 as a symbol of intense blackness of visage, as the result of starvation. It is significant that in all cases of the occurrence of the substantive (Jos. xiii. 3; Is. xxiii. 8; 1 Chr. xiii. 5) O’ avoids its transliteration, as though fearful of Egyptian disapproval. Here however, unlike the other cases where they have gone further afield for a rendering, they adopt the name of the river (Gen. ii. 13, where O’ reads
as here) which is identified with the Nile by Jos. Ant. i. 1. 3. The other Greek translators (see SH. marg.) had no such difficulty and gave Σιώρ.

ξ c. ποταμὸν. The plural is a slip, which may well have been caused by the occurrence of Γηών as the last word of the parallel clause.

19. β α. μαλακώσεις. The proper renderings (ἡ κακία σου and ἡ ἀποστασία σου) are transposed in O', it would appear for the sake of sound, inasmuch as thus the p, s, and t sounds come together, and then the k sounds. Similar transpositions occur ii. 32, (iv. 31,) viii. 2, 20, x. 4. Scholz (p. 110) makes them to be errors of 'ear' in dictation; but it seems unlikely that they are to be assigned indiscriminately to that source.

om. a. προφέρε. προφέρε and the conjunction were inserted, so as to carry on the duplication of expression existing in the earlier part of the verse.

ε and α α. ἔμε, λέγει Κύριος. See on 17.

γ. καὶ οὐκ εὐδόκησα (AQ* ἐπὶ σοί). O' did not perceive that the suffix of 'ς is objective, fear of (towards) me. Hence they seem to have chosen to read בַּרָחִית, in spite of the fact that that verb is not elsewhere found constructed with †.
N.B. θεός, suggested by Wo., looks a somewhat portentous word.

\( \xi \). Κύριος ὁ θεός σου 2ο.
This seems a tolerably clear case of harmonizing on the part of O'. There is no apparent reason why, if the expression here had been originally identical with that in the earlier part of the verse, it would have been altered by a Heb. copyist. See also on v. 22.

20. ἀδέλφαῖ and ἀδερφῶν. συνέτριψας and διέστρασας; but Q, 22, 23, 26, and others, apparently with SH. (Ἀγαματεύσας), have διέφρετας; and so Compl. Ald. M.T. is probably wrong in pointing these verbs as 1st p. s., instead of making them 2nd s. f., as M.T. itself has done in the case of ἀκούοντος in v. 33. Obs. that there is no καὶ in B or א connecting the verbs.

γ. "οὐ δουλεύω (ἐν αὐτῷ). ἦν was changed to ἦν when the preceding verbs were taken to be in the 1st person.

α. σοι is Midrashic (ἠνοικεῖτο οὖν).

ζ. διαχυθήσομαι, reading ἀπεκτάσομαι, which they seem to have considered a possible form of Hithp. of ἀπεκτάσαον. SH. gives Aq., Theod. as having συνεπιμείνη (probably a corruption of συν ἐπιμείνη) ἐν στρώματι πορνή.

ζ. κατασκιέναι (comp. ἀπολογίαν in iii. 6).
Wo.'s substitute ἄνθροπος (rendered by κατ. Ezek. xx. 28) is quite a needless change. Κατ. is sufficiently near the former in sense, as applied to a tree. So εὐσκειος occurs as rendering of 'יו in xi. 16.


(om. a.) ל. O' vacat.

γ. εἰς πικρίαν. The somewhat obscure substantival use of the pass. ptcp. puzzled O', while the simple participial use of the same word in (ט) xvii. 13 gave them no trouble. Hence they chose here to read either (a) מָלָה, or מָלָה, a word which they have also rendered by πικρία in Deut. xxxii. 32, or less probably (ב) מָלָה, myrrh, which is found once in the Pent. (Ex. xxx. 23), but is not either there or elsewhere rendered by them πικρία.

22. καὶ ἁμαρτάνει ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου. A free translation.

(om. a.) ναμι ἠλληνικος Ἰουδαϊς. λέγει Κύριος; A adds ὁ θεός σου. The hard and fast tradition perpetuated by the M.T. as to the pointing of the Sacred Name when in juxtaposition with מָלָה is clearly later than the time of O'. We find, corresponding to this combination in M.T., the following renderings:

(a) Κύριος (Κύριε or Κύριε μου), here and in vii. 20, xliv. 5 [xxx. 5], l. [xxvii.] 31; so Jos. vii. 7; 2 S. vii. 19 [1°], 20; Is. xliv. 22; Ps. lxviii. [lxix.] 21;
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(b) κύριος Κύριος (κύριε Κύριε or κύριε μου, Κύριε) e.g. Jud. vi. 22; 2 S. vii. 19 [2°]; 1 K. viii. 53; Is. xxviii. 16, xxx. 15, liii. 4; Am. v. 3; Ps. cix. [cviii.] 21, cxl. [cxxxix.] 8, cxi. [cxl.] 8;

(c) Κ. θεός (K. θ. σου), e.g. ii. 19; Deut. iii. 24; Am. iii. 11; Hab. iii. 19;

(d) δέσποτα Κύριε, e.g. i. 6, iv. 10;

(e) more loosely, O's Heb. text probably differing; e.g. Κύριε βασιλεύ τῶν θεῶν, Deut. ix. 26.

It is of course possible that in such cases as (a) one of the words in M.T. may have been afterwards added.

23. Υ i bis. הירש טבש אל. καὶ ὑπέσω τῆς Βaal. A loose translation.

η or Υ i. הירש. τὰς ὁδοὺς σου.

v. ἐν τῷ πολυναρτήρῳ. Suidas, Lex., s.v. has π. = μνήμα, τάφος, ξενοτάφιον. SH. here translates similarly, giving however Aq., Symm. as ἐν ταῖς φάραγξι (these may have rendered by ἐν τῷ φάραγγι. See Field ad loc.). The primary meaning of the Heb. word was necessarily well known to O (comp. vii. 31 f. etc.), but as the valley of Hinnom and its connexion with sepulture would be unfamiliar to the ordinary Gentile reader, this was interpreted for his benefit. On the contrary in vii. 32 (where see also note), owing to the fulness of the Heb., an interpretation was not so much

1 אינ, not פֶּן, or פֶּן, was the name specially given to that one among the valleys in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem. See Quart. Statement of Pal. Explor. Fund, Jan. 1889, pp. 38 ff.
needed. But although not there given, it appears (and so for ἡθη, διάπτωσις) in the parallel passage, xix. 6.

a d. ἤνε. καὶ γνώθι, freely.

8. ἐρήμος. ὁψέ. The Heb. word (occurring here only) puzzled O', who translated as though it were בֵּרֶב. The conjecture of Michaelis (Obs. Phil. et Crit. in Jer. etc., ed. J. F. Schleusner, Gött. 1793) that they read the Heb. as a verb בָּרֶב (comp. Arabic root), would surely rather require πρωτ.

e. יְהֹוָה. φονή αὐτῆς (כַּלָּה). For this with the previous word Aq. Symm. Theod. have δρομὰς κούφη.

γ or δ. מְשָׁכְתָה הַרְכִּי. ωλόλυσεν. (24) τὰς ὄδους αὐτῆς. The root יש is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. Hence O’ may have treated it as =ἀρκ, which occurs xix. 8, xlix. 17 [xxix. 18], l. [xxvii.] 13 (Lam. ii. 15, 16). In all these places however that root is uniformly rendered by συπίζ. Therefore there is much to be said for Döderlein’s view (Repert. Bibl. et Orient. Lit. i. 233), that ωλη is the rendering of a variant on ὅ, viz. בֲּבָה כְּלָה, where ὅ is probably intended for the fem. ptcp. כְּבָה (I should suggest, with less change, כְּבָה כְּלָה i.e. כְּבָה כְּלָה כְּבָה כְּלָה), while ὅ was passed over as inexplicable. Aq. Symm. (see Field’s note) have συμπλέκονσα ὄδους αὐτῆς.

24. γ. ἐπλάτυνεν. O’ read as from
the root מָסָר, thus rendered Gen. xxviii. 14, or possibly מָסָר, which πλ. represents in Gen. ix. 27; Deut. xi. 16; Prov. xx. 12, xxiv. 28.

γ. ἐφ' ὑδάτα, reading ἐν θάλασσαι. We may note that these two changes were consequent upon their commencing the sentence with ἕρχεται, which itself followed naturally upon their failure to understand 'משא.

γ. ἐπενεματοφόρειτο. O' saw here the root ἅπασα (so Wo.), which occurs in Niph. in xlvi. [xxvi.] 15. It may well have been the fault of their MS. Nevertheless ἅπασα is a word which has shewn itself to be unfamiliar to O' in other places, e.g. Ps. lvi. [lv.] 2, 3, lvii. [lvi.] 4, although the translator of xiv. 6, ἐλήμνασαν ἄνεμον, ἐλήμνασαν ἄνεμον (so Aq. here ἐλήμνασαν ἄνεμον), dealt with it successfully. It does not occur in the Pentateuch.

δ. παρεδόθη. Clearly (against Wo.) they connected with the root ἀνασκεφάλημα, known to them through Ex. xxi. 13, where it is rendered by the same verb.

ζ. iii. ἐν τῷ ταπεινώσει αὐτής (and so Theod.). O' either intend their rendering to be a euphemism for in menstruis eius, or, perplexed by the expression "in her month," connect with the root שָׁאר, conterere, which appears in Hoph. Is. xxviii. 27. Aq. has ἐν νεωμηνίᾳ αὐτῆς. 'O Ἐβραῖος has ἐν τῷ ἀροτριάν.
25. ἐὰν ὥστε τραχείας, freely.
Aq. Symm. (ἀπὸ) ἀνυποδεσίας.

ε. ἦν δὲ εἰπεν. Probably the ' had been lost or obliterated. Then, as consequential changes, the subsequent first persons were rendered as thirds.

δ and ε. Ἀνδριοῦμαι, while ἢ is omitted (see on v. 31), or ἢ read instead of it. O' connect the word both here and in xviii. 12 with ἢ. It is somewhat rare and does not occur in the Pentateuch. St Jer., seeking apparently to give some sense to O's rendering, expands to "In malo proposito agam viriliter," but in Vulg. has "superavi."

26. αἰσχυνθεσσονται. Aq. has ἢσχυναν (or κατ' ἡσχυναν). But it is only in 2 S. xix. 6 that this verb is transitive in Hiph. See Jer. vi. 15, viii. 12, xlvi. 24, xlviii. 1 (bis), 20, l. 2 (bis). Spohn's conjecture (in loco) that O' must have read would suggest that he also had failed to realise this fact.

ἐἰ. οἱ νικ. Wo.'s οἱ νικ. is a fair example of his many needless changes.

27. η. ἠμαζε μέτας. τῷ ὡλῷ εἰπαν. might easily be got from ἡμέρα.

ε. "ἐγένενος με (ὡράται τὰ). The plural is more likely in this case to have been
changed to the sing. (for the sake of harmonizing) than the converse. Consequently O’ and the 'י probably represent an early corruption, which never became universal.

η. ἐυλογοῦμεν. πρόσωπα αὐτῶν, easily got from 'ה. 28. ξ i. εἰ ἀναστήσωνται καὶ σώσοντες (ςΑQ add σε), freely.

a a. Ο’ adds καὶ κατ' ἀριθμὸν...Βααλ. The form of the clause is clearly suggested by the Heb. of xi. 13.

29. λ. ἀρρητα. λαλεῖτε. O’ shrank from what might savour of impiety. Hence we need not consider (with Wo.) that they had not our text before them. Aq. Symm. δικάζεσθε.

a c. πάντες ὑμεῖς ἁσβήσατε καὶ πάντες ὑμεῖς ἁνομήσατε (but A om. ἁσβ.....ὑμεῖς) and so SH. A double rendering. 'ד is translated by ἁσβεῖν in v. 8, iii. 13, and elsewhere, and by ἁνομεῖν in Is. xliii. 27; comp. Job xxxv. 6. St Jer. testifies to the present text of O’.

30. ξ a. ἥξεσθε. O’ changed the person for the sake of parallelism with ἐφοβηθητε in the next clause.

ξ b. μάχαιρα. Aq. Symm. μάχαιρα ὑμῶν. O’ suits the parallelism. The pron. suffix is evidently a slip, caused by the ending of the next word.
31 [Gk 30]. γ and ξe. καὶ οὐκ ἔφοβητε. O' saw in these words the root אָרַי, finding also, or supplying from the parallel clause, a negative; for which characteristic of O’ see further infra.

ξ i. ἀκούσατε, freely.

α b. ἡμᾶς. O’ adds τάδε λέγει Κύριος.

δ. ἐπεχερσωμένη. Aq. has ὑγιόνος, Symm. δύσιος, both connecting the Heb. (as Field points out) with לָיִלּ, for which O’ has δύσιος in Ex. ix. 32. ‘ם is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον and evidently not familiar to O’, who rendered by a guess.

ξe and δ. οὐ κυριευθησόμεθα (Α δουλευθησόμεθα). Aq. has ἀπέστημεν, Symm. ἀνεχωρήσαμεν. O’ seems to have taken the verb (a rare one) as though from לָיִל, but in a passive sense which occurs in v. 31 (see that passage), and to have conjectured that לָיִל had been accidentally omitted or that it was to be understood from the following clause. Comp. note on בֹּלָל אָרַי above, and in general, for the freedom with which O’ deals with small and frequently used words and specially לָיִל, see Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, p. 26. See also note on v. 2, and comp. other instances within these chapters in v. 25, v. 3 (here also see note), 10, ix. 4 [5]. We might of course explain οὐ κυρ. as a roundabout way of expressing the active sense of לָיִל, but then probably it would have been rendered without such circumlocution.
32. β α. ἡ ἁλαθλία ἡ γεωργὸν ἠλίθεν· μὴ ἑπιλήσεται νῦμφη τὸν κόσμον αὐτῆς καὶ παρθένος κ.τ.λ. The renderings of 'β' and 'ε' are transposed. Both words are of frequent occurrence elsewhere in Jer. May they not here have been changed for the sake of alliteration (putting the α and η sounds together), on the principle illustrated by Wellh. (Der Text d. B. Sam.) p. 10? See other examples in note on v. 19.

33. ζ κ. ὅχος ὀντος; probably an error of ear in dictation. Comp. i Sam. iii. 14 [13].

ζ and γ. ἅτρωχρά ἂν πάλιν ἐπονθεύσω τοῦ μιᾶναι, reading ἀρχα ἄρα πάλιν ἐπονθεύσω. O' apparently supports 'β (λαμβάνοντας) for the 'κ, for the 'η is needed to complete the suggestion of the η to their eyes, and their rendering very possibly presents the original text.

34. γ. ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου. Aq. Symm. (καὶ ἐν τοῖς πτερνύλοις σου) agree with M.T., which is also the better reading in itself.

om. a. ἀλιτῶν. O' vacat. The Heb. may well be a gloss on the following words. Aq. Symm. Theod. have πεντήκων. So Vulg. pauperum.

e. δρυί, reading ἀλλά, but this is no improvement upon the obscurity of the Heb.

36. (θ.) κατεφρόνησας, viewing the
word as Hiph. of יָלַל or יָלָל, which voice appears also in Lam. i. 8. I have placed this in the class where one root has been mistaken for another of kindred form. But why should not O' be so far right that 'ה may be the Kal fut. (ינָל) of one of those roots? We should thus (a) avoid the Aramaic dropping of the א, so rare in Heb., (b) obtain a root whose meaning is at least as opposite as that of יָלַל. (c) fully justify the use of יָכַר, which, as M.T. stands, hardly accords with the sense of יָלַל.

37 [Gk 36]. יָלַל. וַיְאָכֵל (וַיְאָכֵל read as though יָכַר).

iii. 1. om. לָכְּר. O' vacat. The construction in the Heb. is somewhat harsh. יָלַל is probably to be connected with יָכַר of the previous verse.

a d. μὴ ἀνακάμπτοντας ἀνακάμπςει πρὸς αὐτῶν; Did O' (or their Heb. original) read יָכַר (= יָכַר), as finding (in marg. or text) a gloss יָכַר, with or without a consequential gloss יָכַר, and as considering יָכַר to be part of the original text, and as considering יָלַל to be a correction? Against this conjecture on the other hand is to be reckoned the fact that in no less than six other cases (xxii. 24, xxxi.[xxxviii.] 33, 39, xxxii.[xxxix.]
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28, xxxiv. [xli.] 2, li. [xxviii.] 57) O' presents us with a similar Hebraism, unrepresented in M.T. It may be said that this would scarcely be done by Greek-speaking Jews. Idioms however have a remarkable tenacity of life, as compared with the words of a language. See p. 6.

v. יָאֵל. יָאֵל. Midrashic. O' failed to recognise here an instance of the prophet's frequent intermingling of the image and the thing signified. SH. in its text follows the Heb.

e. רִיחַ. en ποιμέαν (רִיחַ).

ζ i. הָאָרָבָּה. kai âνεκαμπτες, apparently (rightly) taking Heb. as infin. abs. (not as Targ. Pesh. St Jer. as imperative), but giving it the meaning of a past tense. Better, And thinkest thou to return? literally, And is it (a matter of) returning?

2. κ. εὐθείαν. Comp. Numb. xxiii. 3, where εὐθείαν stands for פָּגָה (פָּגָה). The word seems to have had difficulties for O'. In xii. 12 they render by διεξελή, in xiv. 6, νάται, in iii. 21 and vii. 29, χειλη, but probably in these two cases reading בְּשַׁלְשָׁן. In iv. 11 they omit the word. They seem to have taken the notion of εὐθείαν from the Aramaic sense of אָשֶׁר (אָשֶׁר), trivit, fricuit. Comp. even in Heb. אָשֶׁר (Is. xiii. 2), mons lœvis, abrasus, nudus arboribus. So εὐθύς occurs in connexion with the clearing of a passage, Is. xl. 3, 4.
β b. Obs. BMA have εἰς εὐθ. τ. ὀφθ. σου (A adding λέγει κύριος). Q has τ. ὀφθ. σου εἰς εὐθ.

δ. ἀσεὶ καρώνη (בּוּרֶךְ). בּוּרֶךְ would be a fairly familiar word, as occurring three times in the Pentateuch, while בּוּרֶךְ (םַעֲבִי) does not appear outside the less well-known Is. Neh. Chr.

καὶ ἐμίλανας. Symm.'s rendering, καὶ ἐνοχον ἐποίησας, is strange, and suggests the root ἱβι. In Mic. iv. 11 he also translates in like manner ἱβικατακριθήνεται by κατακριθήσεται (κατακριθήσεται).

ε. καὶ ἔσχε καὶ ποιμένας πολλοὺς εἰς πρόσκομμα σεαυτῷ. מַלְעַל seems to have been read either מַלְעַל (yet for this πρ. is an unlikely rendering, inasmuch as in vi. 21 מַלְעַל is translated ἀσθενίαν, and מַלְעַל is frequently translated by ἀσθενέω) or מַלְעַל (so Wo.); comp. Exod. xxiii. 33, xxxiv. 12; the whole clause being thus read מַלְעַל רַבוּם לֵאמֶר לְךָ חָי.

ζ. ὀπέστη, freely.

(γ.) In the last clause of this verse προς πάντας perhaps arose from a marginal gloss intended by a Heb. scribe as a correction of, or variant for, יָכָלָם, which with the preceding word may have been read by O' (so Wo.) יָכָלָם. It is true, as
Dr Driver points out (Expositor, 3rd Ser. vol. ix. 1889, p. 325), that such Hebrew will not construe, but it does not seem certain that O' would have perceived this.

4. γ. μεθή. ως oikeov. MS. 88 (which is closely allied to SH.) has oikeiov, but this does not agree with SH. itself, which moreover in marg. preserves the Heb. reading. O' perhaps read כותיה (so Wo. with J. D. Michaelis, Obs. Phil. et Crit. in Jer. etc. ed. J. F. Schleusner, Göttingen, 1793), for כותיה is rendered κατοικητήριον in xxii. 13. It seems however quite as likely that they here read כותיה (so Scholz, p. 90). Perhaps O's Heb. MS. was here difficult to decipher. The latter part of the verse they translate loosely, as though they read כותיה.

5. ε. γελαλοχθησεται (NA diaph.), reading כותיה.

κ. לַעֲשׂ. eis νῖκος, from the Aramaic and Syriac sense of the root. Contrast eis τὸν αἰώνα in l. [xxvii.] 39; also their rendering of Niph. ptcp. in viii. 5.

ξ. ἀνάγοντα. τὰ πονηρὰ ταῦτα, not quite literally.

6. θ ter. ἡ κατοικία, apparently taking it to be = מַחֲסֶב, and so in vv. 8, 12, omitting the word in v. 11. Elsewhere (ii. 19, iii. 22, v. 6,
viii. 5, xiv. 7; Hos. xi. 7; Prov. i. 32) ἅσφαλε (ὢ - ) is an abstract noun. Read therefore (with Michaelis) ἅσφάλη (Hoph. ptcp. of ἅσφάλη). The root ἅσφαλε, occurring twice (ὢ, ἅσφάλε) in v. 7, and again (ὢ) in v. 12, may have helped towards the Mass. reading of the word. Perhaps we should also read ἅσφάλη.

§ i. ἄλσοδος. Διανοήσου. See on ii. 20. Aq. renders, more freely than is his wont, εὐθαλοῦς.

§. kai ἐπόρνευσαν (Ἀκριδ -σεν), apparently reading ἓνον ἥεθον as a contraction for ἔνων ἥεθον. The however of xviii. 23 for ἔπεμψα (2 p. m.) suggests that both that case and this are Aramaic forms. Comp. ἅληλα in Is. liii. 10.

7. § i. ἅσφάλη. οποιοῦ ἃπτήν. The construction of the following simple accus. (ταύτα πάντα) with this verb is harsh, and it is probably a corruption of ποιήσατι, which has arisen from the preceding ἐπόρνευσαν.

§. ἅσφάλη. ἀναστρεψον (ὢ, ἅσφάλη).

om. c and a a. ἄνωθεν ἁγιωτέρα ἡ ἑνέρε. ἄνωθεν ἁγιωτέρα ἡ ἁγιωτέτος Ἰουδά. ἅνωθεν, though confined to this passage, is probably an actual word, and the true reading in vv. 7, 10. Otherwise there would have been no reason for
not conforming to the בַּרְגָּה of v. 8. Was O’s reading בַּרְגָּה יְיוֹדָה, with (marg.) gloss suggested by the בַּרְגָּה of v. 8, but regarded by O’ as an accidentally omitted part of the text, and read by them בַּרְגָּה, as opposed to the pointing transmitted by M.T.? בֵּין, perfidia, occurs in xii. 1 (ἀδελφοματα). At any rate בַּרְגָּה would hardly have been omitted (and so in vv. 8, 10), if O’ had had it before them. It may therefore be taken as a subsequent amplification, suggested by Ezek. xxiii. 11 (bis), doubtless a very familiar passage to the earlier post-exilic Jews. The other Greek versions have ἡ ἀδελφὴ ἀυτῆς.

8. ἀλλά καὶ εἶδον. If we are to accept Prof. Cheyne’s proposal (so as to harmonize with the latter part of the verse) to read here (with Ezek. xxiii. 11) ἀλλά (so here Kenn. 137, and Pesh.), the corruption of the Heb. text will have been early enough to be adopted by O’.

a d. περὶ πάντων δὲν καὶ εἶδον, περὶ πάντων δὲν κατ. So B*. But Bab NAQ om. δὲν 1°...πάντων 2°. om. d. ἀλλά. O’ vacat.

γ. κατελήμφην, not reading ἀλλά (as Wo.; comp. 2 Chr. xxv. 23; Ps. lxxi. [lxx.] 11), but τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς. Comp. x. 19, where κατα is so rendered.

a a. ἀλλά. O’ adds εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, evidently a gloss, taken from Deut. xxiv. 1, 3.

om. c. ἀλλά. O’ vacat. See on v. 7.
9. θ. εἰς οὐδὲν, connecting the word somehow (ὦκλον, suggested by Mich., is otherwise unknown) with ἀκολούθ. Targ. Pesh. Vulg. interpret ἀκολούθισα as the preposition, and connect with the same root. So A.V. and R.V. "through the lightness." Ges. however (see Thes. s. v.), in spite of this consensus, inclines to ἀκολούθον, voice.

om. a. ὁ θυγόν ἀκολούθισα. O' vacat.

β b. ἀκολούθισα ἐν τῷ πόνῳ καὶ τῷ ὄλων.

10. om. c. ὁ θυγόν. O' vacat. See on v. 7.

om. a. ἀκολούθον. O' vacat. The Heb. insertion was either for a euphemistic reason (so as not to end the paragraph with ἀκολούθισα), or merely as amplifying or explanatory. MSS. 26, 36, and others (and so SH.) and Aq. Symm. Theod. have the words.

11. om. a. ἀκολούθον. O' vacat, doubtless rightly.


xi i. ὁ θυγόν ἀκολούθισα. O' adds ύμιν.

13. xi i. ὅτι ἀκολούθωσα (A ἀκολούθωσα). O' need not have read ἀκολούθωσα (as Wo. makes them do). Targ. and Pesh. favor M.T., and such a change of number is itself far from alien to the
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genius of Heb. (e.g. vv. 18, ב 19 (his); Numb. xiii. 22, xxxiii. 7; 1 S. ix. 4), and here would also quite fall in with J.'s tendency to mingle the image and the thing signified. (See on iii. 1.)


5 i. בִּלְתִּי בָּעַלְתִּי. εἰσέχω (A pref. ἔδω) κατα-
κυριεύω. Besides the strangeness of the tense here, we may contrast the verb used in xxxi. 13, ἡμέλησα. Yet the Heb. verb must have the same meaning in both places, and in favour of the sense husband is not only the context here, but the usage of the word elsewhere in O. T. Aq. Symm. have ἔσχον ὑμᾶς. Vulg. vir vester.

15. γ. ἡμέρα. ποιμαίνοντες (A ποιμαίνεις sic), reading ἡμέρα.

γ. μετ' ἐπιστήμης, as if through confusion between the sounds of ב and ג. For a similar interchange, comp. x. 3.

16. (5 d.) בֵּית יְהוָה. διαθήκης 'Αγγείου 'Іσ-
rαήλ. Probably not a recensational variation. It was known to SH. (marg.), which however agrees with M.T. It may have been suggested by some liturgical form.

ε and 5 i. נַלְתָּה יִבְרְעֶבָּא. οὐκ (A καὶ οὐκ) ὄνο-
μασθήσεται (אָבָּרָל). MS. 88 adds with asterisk ἐν
αὐτῇ. (So SH.)
e. ἐπισκεφθησέται (ἐπισκεφθησέται).

e. ποιηθησέται. This last (inconsistently omitted by Wo.) was very naturally, and perhaps rightly, read by O' ἔστησεν, and thereby determined the treatment of the two previous verbs.

17. a a. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ, agreeing with the Heb. of l. [xxvii.] 4, 20, and the earlier part suggested also by the preceding and following verses.

om. a. λόγος Ἰουλία Νικηφόρου. O' vacat. Probably a Heb. gloss, suggested by xxiii. 6, if with Prof. Cheyne (Pulpit Comm.) we read there ἥρ (to which Ν still testifies) for Νοικηφόρος.

δ. ἐνθυμημάτων (A ἐπιθ.). The study of this word in its eight occurrences in M.T. of J., together with its varying representation in O', in itself amounts to a disproof of Wo.'s theory\(^1\). In xi. 8, xiii. 10 O' does not render in any way. It is possible, though unlikely, that to these vii. 24 should be added. (See note there.) In ix. 13 [14], xvi. 12, xviii. 12 O' has τὰ ἀρεστά, in xxiii. 17 πλανή. Wo. accordingly 'retranslates' the Greek in each passage into the ordinary Heb. equivalents. But thus according to his principles the pre-Sevagintal text (to quote Prof. H. P. Smith) "did not contain the word at all, but always had some other word in its place," an hypothesis, which, utterly improbable in

\(^1\) See Dr Driver in *Expositor*, l.c. p. 328, and Prof. H. P. Smith in *Journal of Bibl. Lit.* l.c. p. 112.
itself, is rendered still more hopeless, as Dr Driver points out, by "the fact, that in the two other places where the word occurs in the Old Testament, Deuteronomy 29, 18 [19], Ps. 81 [80], 13, it is represented in LXX. by ἀποπλάνησις (as by πλανή in Jeremiah 23, 17) and ἐπιτηδεύματα." Doubtless the word was strange to O', and consequently they were in each case guided by the context.

We may note that words ending in פָּה, while somewhat rare in other Bibl. Heb., are favourites with J., and are very frequent in Aramaic. Comp. מֵלָהְת, בְּרֶיהָת (three times) for מֵלָהָת, הָנָהָת, מֶלָהָת (for מֶלָה, מֶלָה), מֶלָה (for מְלָה, מְלָה). For other examples see Knobel, Jer. Chaldaisans, Breslau, 1831.

18. λ. מִזְמֹח. O' adds καὶ (A om. καὶ) ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν χωρῶν. The tendency to supplement or expand existing, though to a less extent, in O', may here be explained as connected with a natural desire to include Jews living in Egypt.

ξα. דְּאָתָה עִבְרִית. τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν. O' s alteration is for the sake of smoothness. Heb. idiom however (see on v. 13) is very tolerant of such changes of person.

19. η. מִלַח. O' adds Γένοιτο, Κύριε, which is their rendering in xi. 5 of יְהוָה, and is introduced here, as following upon the translators' assumption that אלהי refers to the prophet, an assumption not altogether unnatural, when we consider that
the pronoun is emphatic, as though to indicate a
change of speaker. Aq. Symm. and SH. are against
the words, which O' (see Wo. p. 192, who refers to
Movers and Hitzig) probably got out of the י"ז
(אמוס י"ז, כיוון) which follows. See on ii. 2, 3.

v. θεοῦ. Midrashic. Misled by the
following יבנה (which they render Παντοκρά-
τορος) they did not perceive that יבנה is descriptive
of the inheritance, not of its Divine Owner. The
rendering of the other Gk. Verss. here is uncertain.

e. καλέσατε, ἀποστρα-
φήσεσθε (Ἀ τοστραφήση), following 'כ (בראשית,
תחומ). So Pesh. But SH. and Vulg. agree
with 'כ.

20. γ. מראת. εἰς τὸν συνόντα αὐτῷ. The
Heb. is suspicious, as the only case where נבג is
constructed with מ and ב were similar in ancient writing. See Wo., p. 273.

ζ i. בֹּנֶרֶת. ἡθέτησεν (ἡ-σαυ), a loose trans-
lation, by no means warranting us in assuming,
with Wo., a different text.

21. δ. σφιῶν. κειλέων, reading ספיה, as that
word is thus rendered in Ezek. xxiv. 17. See
further above on v. 2.

ζ i. הִוָנֵי. καὶ δεησεως, loosely.

γ. יְהוָה אֲלָלָיוֹ. θεοῦ Ἀγίου αὐτῶν, appa-
rently reading for the first word (perhaps owing to illegibility of MS.) בְּרָקֶה. I cannot construe Wo.'s conjecture אֲנָלָיוּ הַרְשֵׁמָה.

22. ἐπιστρέφοντες. See on v. 14.

ξ i. καὶ (probably not recensional, and perhaps introduced by a copyist) ἱάσομαι. We find above 30 mss. with אָמֵרָא (see Kenn.). Comp. Prov. xviii. 9, מָגְרוּת, ὁ μὴ ἱώμενος (obs. also the inserted negative; for which see on i. 31). Inasmuch as.Raw is a neuter verb in Kal, we cannot (with Mich.) translate אָמֵרָא by remittam, and the Mass. punctuation (as a רָם verb) also involves a borrowing of meaning from אָמֵר, as in xix. 11, ii. 9, and so in other Books. So we may comp. the subst. מִרְמָה in viii. 15 (in these the Heb. note suggests א as the more correct spelling), and אָמֵר v. in ii. 24 (so best editions) as against פָרָא in xiv. 6. Observe that, although אָמֵר (in Hiph.) may appear the more suitable of the two roots to be connected with such a word as מִשְׁבָּח, yet in Hos. xiv. 5 אָמֵר (with no variant) is joined with the same word.

η. μᾶς βαπτιζόμενον. πᾶς συντρίμματα υμῶν (A αὐτοῦ). Συντ. is used in vi. 14 to render אָמֵר (and so συντριμμός in iv. 20 and συντριβή in iv. 6); but the Heb. tempts the conjecture that O' read
a word used of waves, either literally (Jon. ii. 4) or as a figure for calamity (Ps. lxxxviii. 8; 2 S. xxii. 5, where the parallel in Ps. xviii. 5 has ἡμείς). I cannot find that מְשָׁרָה (suggested also by Mich.) "is a word in actual use" (H. P. Smith, l. c. p. 115).

a b and e. ἰδοὺ δοῦλοι (Q oide) ἡμεῖς (A υμ.) ἐσπάθα σοι. O' seems to have inserted δ. (omitted however by many mss. and by SH.) as epexegetical. To suppose, with Wo., that they had a different text, is wholly unnecessary. We may decline Prof. H. P. Smith's conjecture (l. c. p. 117) ἀναθηματίζω for ἀναθηματίζω, if we point a use of ἀναθηματίζω which can hardly be called impossible in itself, in the face of such a passage as Hag. ii. 17 s. fin., and which, even had it no Bibl. support, would probably have presented, as far as classical Heb. is concerned, small difficulty to the translators.

23. 3 i. μεμονωτὰ γὰρ ῥήμα ῥήμα. οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ ἡ δύναμις τῶν ὀρέων, loosely.

N.B. This verse furnishes a good example of O's readiness to render the same Heb. word, occurring twice (ὄρος), by different words, οὐρως and πλην.

24. ἀπὸ νεότητος ἡμῶν. NAQ have αὐτῶν and so SH.; Pesh. Vulg. as M.T., which is clearly right.
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25. om. a. ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.
iv. i. έξ i, quinquies. Probably O' found the Heb. somewhat illegible. At any rate they made a wrong choice here and at the beginning of v. 2, in the person of the five verbs (καὶ, τιμή, ἐστι, ἐν, τὰ), the first four of which however are in themselves ambiguous in this respect, and they failed to recognise the clue afforded by the suffix in ἐκατέρθη.

om. (a). δικήν. ἐὰν.
a c. ἐὰν (Q ἃπο τοῦ) στόματος αὐτοῦ (A om. ἐὰν στ. αὐ.) καὶ ἃπο τοῦ (A om. τοῦ) προσώπου (A Q add μοῦ; A adds αὐτοῦ). O's rendering is confl ate, as including the corruption μὴν. For loss of ι comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 12 (καὶ, φωνὴν σου) and so ἅρα for ἄρα on the Moabite stone.

γ and ξ e. ηλίκθιν (θνητ). For O's freedom in dealing with ἡ λ ἔτ c. see on ii. 31.

2. a b. O's addition (at the end), τῷ θεῷ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, found also (but ὠρακλᾶ has an asterisk) in SH., is apparently Midrashic.

3. ξ a. καὶ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἰερ.
(A om.), assimilating to the language of many other passages, viz. v. 4, xi. 2, 9, xvii. 20, xviii. 11, xxv. 2, xxxv. [xlii.] 17, xxxvi. [xlii.] 31.

We may note that in these wherever the word
occurs (viz. here and in the following v.; so xi. 2, 9, xviii. 11) Wo. considers Ο’ to have read ἄμαξ, although no Heb. sing. has a more undoubted claim to a collective sense, when the context so requires. (See Deut. xxvii. 14; Jos. ix. 6, x. 24; Jud. ix. 55, xv. 10, xx. 33, 36, 42; 1 S. xiv. 22; 2 S. xv. 13; 1 K. viii. 2 etc.) See H. P. Smith, l.c. p. 113, on this v., and p. 111, on ii. 6.

4. a d and γ. ἔδω τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν. Symm. has τῷ κυρίῳ, Vulg. Domino.

ξ i. καὶ περιτέμεσθε, but ἄρα Περιέλεσθε (A-θαι). The latter rendering was probably suggested by its occurrence in v. i.

e. ἐκαθιστός αὐτοῦ (AQ μου), as though the words of the prophet. This is not noticed by Wo.

5. om. (a). ἐιπατε (NA pref. καὶ).

ξ i. μέγα, freely.

τὰς τειχήρεις, and so SH. A has τ. ὀχυράς, adopted from viii. 14. Τειχ. occurs here only in J., while πόλεις ὀχ. is a frequent expression in J. and elsewhere.

6. e. ἕν. φεύγετε (ἡν or ἡν). See v. 21.

See on vi. 1.

7. γ. ἐκ (NAQ τὴς) μάνδρας αὐτοῦ, possibly reading ἔστη. Comp. Ps. x. 9 [ix. 30].

om. d. ἔγκληθάτω. ἔξολεθρεύω, an easy con-
fusion of eye, owing to the ending of the previous word.

ξ i. ἀράχνη. See following note.

ξ i. καὶ πόλεις (Q αἰ π. σου). Wo. (as H. P. Smith, l.c. p. 110, points out) in making O' read ἄραρεν, has failed to note that BNA all have καὶ πόλεις (without the article). Probably O' read it as ἄραρεν, and then made their rendering of the preceding ἀράχνη to conform to it.

θ. καθαρεθήσονται. The rendering is defensible, with the Heb. as it stands. Comp. the sense of לְכָּרָה (but in Niph.) in 2 K. xix. 25; Is. xxxvii. 26. If however we are to look on O' as translating a variant, H. P. Smith (l.c. p. 109) is doubtless right in thinking that as καθαρέω is used as the rendering of לְכָּרָה, it is probable that their copy had a word derived from that root. He does not however explain how the word לְכָּרָה, which he assigns to them as on the whole their probable reading, can possibly be formed from those root-letters.

8. εἰτο πρός, freely.

(ομ. a.) ἰσποράς (Q adds ὀργησ). In the face of Is. xiii. 13 we cannot feel at all sure that O's Heb. text was not the same as ours. MSS.

1 Not however, as he says, "twice" but once (lxxii. 14) in J.
23, 26, (so SH.,) Compl. Ald. have δ θ. ὀργής. ὀργήθη θυμῶν (obs. the order) is the rendering of ἵνα in v. 26.

(ξ a.) ἀφ' ὑμῶν (Ἀ * ἡμ.). An easy and frequent corruption of ἵμων, even if the reading be not original, and a free rendering by way of conforming to the earlier part of the v. Pesh. Vulg. agree with M.T.

10. Ἡμέρα. *Ω. See on i. 6.

ξ i. ἡμέρα. δέσποτα Κύριε. See on ii.

22.

om. a. ἔσται (AQ add ὑμῖν). O' would hardly have disregarded the second word.

a d. καὶ ἔδωκα (Ἀ * AQ om. id.) ἐγέρσατο (Q ἐγέρσαι).

ξ i. τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν, freely.

Π. ἐροῦσι, freely.

ξ i. πλανήσεως. None of the conjectures are quite satisfactory. Probably the word was more or less illegible. Aq. (πνεύμα) λαμπρόδωνος, Symm. (πν.) καυσώνος. St Jer. (ventus) uren sive roris (read erroris).

om. d. ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, thus omitting to render ἵνα. See on iii. 2.

12. om. a. *Μ. Ο' vacat. The Heb., however we may explain it, is awkward. Perhaps it represents a post-Septuagintal error, λεκχα not s.
properly erased, but accompanied by the marginal correction שָׁלוֹם. Either the subsequent copyist who inserted the latter in the text, or another one added the ה to מֶלֶךְ, so as to obtain a word of familiar appearance. Aq. Symm. Theod. have ἀπὸ τοῦτων, while MSS. 22, 36, and others have these words without, and 88 (so SH.) with, an asterisk.

κρίματα Β'Α (Q adds μου). Wo. (מַשְׁפִּיטֵה) is therefore on his own principles wrong in making O's Heb. ms. differ here from M.T.

13. ξ ι. οὕς νεφέλη, freely.

ξ ι. ταλαιπωροῦμεν. A free translation, but supported by several other instances in this Book alone (v. 20 bis, ix. 18 [19], x. 20, xii. 12). So שֶׁ is rendered by ταλαίπωρια in v. 20 (where see note), vi. 7, xx. 8, and רֶם in vi. 26, xv. 8, li. [xxviii.] 56.

14. ξ ι. ὑπάρχουσιν (ΑQ ὑπάρξε), freely.

15. α β. ἐκ Δαυδ ἤμεν. Midrashic. MS. 88 has ἤμεν ἐκ Δ. SH. relegates the verb to its marg. Vulg. om.

ξ ι. καὶ ἀκουσθήσεται, freely.

16. (α β.) οἴδαν ἡκασίων. This may be Midrashic, and part of O's genuine text, but rather
its origin would seem to be as a variant for the ἔρχονται of the later part of the v.

θ. Ἀρεία. Συντροφαί, bands, troops. O' connected with root צְרָל, which they translate by this substantive in Hos. iv. 19, xiii. 12; and by the corresponding verb in Ezek. xiii. 20; Prov. xxx. 4 [xxiv. 27].

17. η. Ἰδρα. ἡμέλησας. O’, as Wo. points out, has the support of the Targ. (סְרִיבֵה). But Aq. and the other Greek translators have 3rd pl., and so SH. If we assume the word to have been originally written מָרָת, it could be read (comp. v. 19) either as 2nd p. s. f. (מָרָת) or 3 p. s. f. (in sense of 3rd p. pl.). Comp. נָבִים, xiii. 19; מִשְׁמָת, Lev. xxv. 21, מְרֵא, Lev. xxvi. 34 (so as 'ב in 2 K. ix. 37). Among those who adopted the latter reading the ה final would naturally soon be added.

19. om. a. מִשְׁנָה 2o. O' vacat (AQ יְּהֹנֵנ כְּוִלְנֵנ μוֹע).

θ. בָּלִגְתָא. The 'ב, גָּוַלְתָא, seems, as Ges. says, to have arisen from a confusion of 'ק and of גָּוַלְתָא (גָּוַלָה) which some MSS. (Kenn. gives 19) exhibit. There is no parallel for this sense of גָּוַלָה. On the other hand גָּוַלָה (fem. ptcp. Niph. of גָּוַל) is twice in this Book (x. 18 [19], xxx. [xxxvii.] 12) rendered גָּוַלְתָא. It is therefore most probable that O' here saw that root.
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\[a\]  μαςασει ἡ ψυχὴ μου, ἵνα ἔσεσθαι ἡ καρδία μου (ἐν om. the whole). A conflate rendering.

e. ἤκουσεν. As soon as the ἦ of the old form of the 2nd s. f. was gone, as appears to have been the case in O's original, ἤκουσεν could be read as either person. Comp. v. 17.

20. γ. ἦσθαι 1ο. ταλαντωρίαν (Q -iaς), reading H. See on v. 13. 2ο is rendered συντριμμόν. See on iii. 22. In Is. lx. 18 ἤσθαι and ἦσθαι are rendered (in reversed order) by συντρίμμα and ταλαντωρίαν.

ξ i bis. ἔδρα (ἔδρα). τεταλαντώρηκεν bis. See on v. 13.

ξ i. ἡ σκηνὴ (A σκηναί), freely.

γ. ἔφερεν. διεσπάσθησαν. ἔφερε is (a) to frighten (Is. li. 15) or (b) to shrink, to be quiet through terror (Job vii. 5). I can find no authority for the assertion of Schlesusner (notes on Michaelis, in loco) that ἔφερε can mean discindere. O' clearly read the root letters of ἔφερε.

21. e. φεύγουντας. Comp. v. 6.

ξ i. ἀκοῦσα, a corruption of ἀκοῦω (so Q*), which is itself a loose rendering. SH. has fut., and so Vulg. audiam.

22. θ. ὅι. ὁ ἴγουμένοι (and so SH.),
explained by ἰσχυροῦς, which is their rendering of ἰἀλία (ἦμάλια), strong ones (i.e. chief men) in 2 K. xxiv. 15, a passage naturally very familiar to Jews of the Dispersion.

23. η. οὐθέν, similarly rendered 1 S. xii. 21 (bis); Is. xl. 17, 23; Job xxvi. 7.

_om. a._ Ἰωλά. O' _vacat._ The word is rendered ἀκατασκέψαστος in Gen. i. 2, and occurs elsewhere only in Is. xxxiv. 11, where also O' omits. This is very suspicious, as the word must have been quite familiar to them.

24. η. τραπεσομένους. As H. P. Smith (l.c. p. 113) points out (against Wo.'s desire to give O' a different original), the root is similarly rendered in Eccl. x. 10.

25. ἐπτοεῖτο; but Aq. μετηναστεύθη-σαν.

26. η. ἄριθμοι. O' disregarded the pronoun, as inconsistent with their view of the meaning of ἄριθμος. See on ii. 7.

_β b._ ἐνθάν. See on ii. 15.

_a d._ ἰ. O' adds ἡφανέρωσαν, which may well be a marg. correction of ἐμπέπτω.

28. _β b._ ἀφήνει ἴνα ὑμῖν ἐμπνεύσῃ. καὶ οὖ μετανοήσω, ἀρμηνα. O' s order is certainly a more natural one.
29. ἐντεταμένου. is translated by the same verb in Hos. vii. 16.

γ. πᾶσα (Q ins. ἡ) χώρα, probably reading πᾶσα. The Targum (בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל), "all the inhabitants of the country," points to this reading.

γ. πᾶσα πόλης.

These two together form a somewhat perplexing problem. At any rate the article, originally it would appear absent on both occasions, might easily creep in, with from the readiness with which the word would be supposed to refer to Jerusalem alone, with to increase the dramatic effect, assisted also by parallelism, and by the occurrence of this word in vv. 23, 27. While we thus obtain הַשְּׁרוֹן 2°, and (for הָעַר, the original reading for הָעַר 1°, the latter word, if written הָעַר, might easily, by confusion of eye with the next line, be copied as הָעַר.

καὶ εἰς τὰ σπήλαια, καὶ εἰς τὰ ἀλογη ἐκφύσησαν. The former clause of these may possibly represent a variant בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, of which however there is no trace otherwise. בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל on the other hand, as bearing an unusual sense, can scarcely fail to be the original reading of the Heb., and may, as Schleusner (in loco) suggests,
have been correctly rendered ἀλση, thickly wooded 
hills, which by a would be corrector, connecting it 
with an Arabic root, to be concealed, was altered to 
σπήλαια, thus giving rise to the present conflate 
rendering.

30. om. a. רֵדָשׁ is suspicious, as being ano-
malous in gender, and not represented in O', al-
though well known to them. See on v. 13. mss. 
23, 36, and others have ἡ ταλαίπωρος; Aq. Symm. 
tάλα, unless (see Field's note) Aq. had προνεομεν-
μένη, "vastata," which St Jer. attributes to him.

v. 30. ἐγχρύση. Midrashic.

ζητοῦσιν. So B, but אאQ have the 
harder and more accurate ζητήσουσιν.

31. ζητοῦσιν. τοῦ στεναγμοῦ σου, freely.

ζητοῦσιν. ἐκλυθήσεται. The Heb. root is 
probably connected with חבק, חות. O' translated 
freely.

(β a.) סֵרָעַ. παρήσει. Is this word (employed 
here only to render the Heb. root) an illustration 
of O's occasional tendency to use for translation a 
word of similar sound? See on ii. 19.

e. לָרֵנִים. ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνηρμένοις, reading לָרֵנִים.

v. 1. om. d. שֶׁאָדִין. ei ἔστιν. M.T. is 
probably a kind of conflation, being a combination
of the contracted (ש"נ נ) and full form of the second and third words (so Movers, mentioned by Wo.). Scholz's interpolation of נְתֵנָה is violent.

ξ i or η.אֵּאֵר (Q* αὐτή). This may well be considered as a rendering κατὰ σύνεσιν, although it may have been read as שַׁלְמָה = שַׁלְמָה.

2. γ. δεύτερον μέρος, reading בְּשַׁלְמָה, supplying its usual subject, and joining the expression to the previous words.

ξ τ. οὐκ...δύνασθαι. For the introduction of the negative see on ii. 31. Here it may possibly have arisen out of the ל of לֵבִי. In this and many other cases, by making the sentence interrogative, we may of course restore the sense to that of M.T.

3. ξ τ. μήλα πλησία, a case of the converse kind to the preceding.

4. δ. διότι οὐκ εἶδον ἐσήμασαν (A ηδον, AQ ηδυνηθ). In 1. [xxvii.] 36 παραλυθήσονται. The Heb. verb is somewhat rare, and therefore loosely translated.

ξ α. παρὰ θεοῦ, freely. The pron. is omitted for the sake of parallelism.

5. δ. διέρρηκαν. The Heb. root was rendered in ii. 20 by διάστάζω.

6. γ and ζ. ἐκ τῶν οἰκῶν, reading (not
with Wo. and so Driver, *Samuel, Introd.* p. xxxi, but) 'וְיָבֵית'. This accounts both for O's plural, and (by thus transferring the * from the verb which follows) for their rendering by a past tense (σωληνευσε). The only approaches to a parallel in the Heb. are in בַּיָּהָר in Hab. i. 8 and Zeph. iii. 3. In the latter passage O renders 'עַד צְּבָאָשָׁא. Prof. Cheyne (*Pulpit Comm. in loco*) points out that we have no reason to suppose that נַרְבּוֹת makes pl. נַרְבּוֹת. Understand therefore of the deserts (pl. of נַרְבּוֹת).

e. דְּקַקֵּנֵה. εὕρηγόρησεν, reading דְּקַקֵּנֵה.

7. יְשֶׁבַע. καὶ εὔχορτασα. Other mss. have מְשֵׁבָע, thus giving the meaning, I caused them to swear.

γ. יְנוֹגֵרָה. κατέλυνον (A-οντο), reading Hithp. of נְעוֹר (and so SH.). It may be noted that the root נֱוֹר, to drag, seize, supplies the only similar verbal form in J. (xxx. 23), viz. נֱנֶרָה.

8. θ. מִיָּהָנֵים καὶ θηλυμανεῖς, evidently connecting this difficult word with מַהֲנֵה.

om. d. is unrepresented in O. All proposed ways of construing it are beset with difficulties, and early tradition varies. Aq. Theod. have ἔλκοντες (Malachi), and so St Jer.; Symm. ἔλκομενοι (Malachi) and so ms. 88 and SH. It looks like an early (marg.) conjecture for indistinct letters in the text.
10. ἐπὶ τοὺς προμαχώνας αὐτῆς.
The word was unfamiliar to O, who however have
dealt with it with fair success.

γ bis. Ἡμεῖς ἐνυλ. O appear to have been
quite baffled by the latter part of this verse.
For they seem to have read (ὑπολίπεσθε;
AQ -λεῖπτ-) ἄνω, and for ἀνωτέρω (τὰ ὑπο-
στηργματα αὐτῆς) either ἄνωτέρω, or, less prob-
ably, ᾧ. The latter substantive, it is true,
occurs (ἵ) l. [xxvii.] 15 (O there rendering ἐπάλ-
ξεσ), but the former presents on the whole an
easier misreading of the Heb. consonants, if
somewhat indistinctly written. In either case the
1 seems to have been read as ἧ (ἡ is doubtless
vine-tendrils, as in xlviii. 32; Is. xviii. 5).

ξ e. ἁμ. O vacat. See on ii. 31.

11. β b. ἄνωτέρω. B has λέγει Kύριος earlier
in the verse; NAQ omit. The words therefore
were probably altogether absent from the original
text, though found in Aq. Symm. Theod., and with
an asterisk in ms. 88, SH.

12. κ f. ἀνωτέρω. Oυκ ἔστιν ταῦτα. The
natural meaning of the passage is, It is not really
God who speaks. O’s desire appears to have been
to get as far as possible from the irreverent sense
which the words might conceivably bear, viz. He
(God) is not.
13. καὶ λόγος Κυρίου. A free translation, which assumes the Heb. to be a substantive, which however is not found elsewhere (except possibly Hos. i. 2). To make the word to be a Pi'el ptcp. with מ omitted is of course possible, though the only undoubted instance of such omission (in Pi'el), except where מ is also the root letter of the verb, is that in Eccl. iv. 2 (יִשְׁזַהוּ).

א. צְרָה יִשְׁזַה לְךָ. BANQ have οὕτως ἐσται αὐτοῖς, but A omits. It is very possible that O or a copyist may have omitted the words, as thinking it to be too much to the national discredit that the formula of cursing should have been used towards the prophets. SH inserts them without an asterisk.

14. om. a. נָגַה. O vacat. ὁ θέσης is inserted with asterisk by ms. 88 (so SH.).

ב. יָנָה. דֶּבָּדֵא (נָתִים).

15. om. d. In the earlier part of this verse the omission of all from the second to the fourth שרב is a familiar kind of error which may well have been committed by transcribers, or, conceivably, by the translators themselves. Aq. Theod. and so ms. 88, SH., support M.T.

ג (ד). The latter part of the verse, if it be indeed meant to represent the present Heb. text, is a very free translation, closely conforming however to the Heb. of Deut. xxviii. 49, a passage which may have been specially familiar to the
Egyptian Jews for liturgical reasons. But when we notice that the first three words of v. 16 are also absent from O' (supplied with an asterisk in ms. 88, SH.), it looks as though their MS. was defective or illegible here. Possibly the omitted words may represent an accidentally dropped line of the original.

17. α α. έλαττόν τοις ἐλαττόνας υμῶν. O' adds (but * om.) καὶ τοῖς ἐλαττόνας υμῶν. The passage Ps. iv. 8, which Wo. (p. 75) adduces in defence of O' here, seems rather to weaken, than to support, his case. Not only is it unlikely that the words, if representing a Heb. original, would in both places have dropped out of the text used by O' between the time of that version and that of the M.T., but also, by disregarding them, the triple parallelism, so carefully maintained up to this point throughout the verse, is continued till the ear shall be satisfied by the comparatively long final clause. The addition would have been easily suggested to O' or a transcriber by any of the passages Ex. xxiii. 11; Deut. vi. 11; Jos. xxiv. 13; 1 Sam. viii. 14. SH., evidently by accident, marks the words as though υμῶν alone were unrepresented in the Heb.

γ. έλαττόν. αλοήσουσιν (Q -σωσ-) reading doubtless ἵ for ἵ, inasmuch as this verb is used more frequently than any other to translate άληθι (including subst. άληθι), viz. in Deut. xxv. 4; Jud. viii. 7 (in B); Is. xli. 15; Mic. iv. 13; 1 Chr. xxi. 20.
18. a d. Κύριος ὁ θεός σου.

19. om. c. ζωόμενος ἀνθίς ἔνα. O' vacat. 'εγκατ-έλειπτε με (καὶ) is found however in Q xii, 22, 33, 36, and others (so SH.) and appears in Compl. Ald. The Heb. may have been suggested by such passages as xxii. 9; Jud. x. 10, 13.

20. יִהוּדָה. ev τῷ Ἰουδα. οἰκή appearing in Q marg. is omitted in BNA. Wo. not only ignores this fact in his Conspectus, but also adduces this (p. 78) as one of the three passages which he cites to shew "superior parallelism due to the additions in the Septuagint."

om. a. לְאָל. O' vacat.

24. η and γ. κατὰ καιρὸν πληρωσεως προστάγματος (דוע, שבועה ו). The rendering of the first word suggests that contractions were familiar to the translators. For the next word, while they clearly read the initial letter as ש, the probability is that they understood it as the construct (whether sing. or pl.) of שבועה, occurring in three other places (Is. xxiii. 18, lvi. 11; Ezek. xxxix. 19) as against Wo.'s שבועה, which is otherwise ἀπαξ λεγόμενον (Ezek. xvi. 49). Theod. and Aq. (but apparently in his 2nd ed., see Field's note) read as ש, and so SH. (מְסֹכֶם). O' may have chosen ש, as finding some difficulty in recognising the 'coordinated' or 'suspended'
const. state in ש וְהָעֶשֶׁר, weeks of—appointed ones of—harvest. Other instances of this construction are found in xiv. 17, xlvi. 11; Gen. xiv. 10; Deut. xxxiii. 19; Jud. xix. 22; 1 S. xxviii. 7; 2 S. xx. 19; 2 K. x. 6, xvii. 13 ‘ג, xix. 21; Is. xxiii. 12, xxxvii. 22, xlvi. 1; Job xx. 17; Lam. i. 15, ii. 13.

26. om. d. יַשְׁרִיבָה בִּשְׁרֹשׁ. O' vacat. Aq. Symm. according to St Jer., connected 'with שׁ, upright, but made it a proper name "Iasir, quasi rete auctipis; quod etiam qui bonus inter eos videtur et rectus, instar auctipis tendat insidias." Although this is far from satisfactory, it is not easy to make anything better out of the present text. We may observe that O"s rendering of the rest of the v. is opposed to the accentuation of M.T.

27. a b. ἀπεσταμένη (_name with its tendency to 'improve' has συνεσταμένη). ἐφ. is Midrashic. παγισ is meant doubtless (not so Wo.) as a translation of 'ב, of which, as a rare word (elsewhere only in Am. viii. 1, 2) they inferred the meaning, and perhaps quite correctly, from the context. Prof. Cheyne (Pulpit Comm. ad loc.) says, "Hitzig seems right in inferring that the 'cage' was at the same time a trap (comp. Ecclus. xi. 30, 'Like as a partridge taken in a cage [ἐν καρτάλῳ, a peculiar kind of basket], so is the heart of the proud ')." For the word καρτ. see vi. 9.

28. om. (d bis and a bis). שָׁמָן לֹא בֹזָת.
O' vacat. It would seem that the marked divergence of the Heb. and Gk texts here is due to a combination of very various causes. Of the first two Heb. words י is so rare (only Hithp. Jon. i. 6, and there in quite a different sense) that, even if it was plainly written, it may well have suggested no meaning whatever to the translators. The same can scarcely be said of ש, as that verb at any rate occurs twice in Deut. xxxii. 15 (not elsewhere in the Pent.), a verse however where there is also a good deal of deviation between the two texts. On the whole in the case before us we may incline to suppose that it was indistinctly written. It is difficult to understand any reason for the omission of the remaining words, if they formed part of the text. On the other hand their presence dislocates the balance, and spoils the parallelism in both parts of the verse, while there is by no means a consensus as to either the meaning of the somewhat strange collocation of words י רבְרִי, or the pointing of the middle one, Symm. Theod. reading נְרַבִּר, and explaining παρέβησαν τῶν λόγων μου εἰς πονηρόν. So St Jer. Praeterierunt sermones meos pessime. Can these, together with ל, be an early gloss (or two separate glosses) "words of (concerning) a wicked man," "and they (enallage) prosper"?

א or ל. χρασ. ב in on its first occurrence in this Book (ii. 34) has no Greek
counterpart (see note there); in the two remaining
cases (xx. 13, xxii. 16) O' has found no difficulty,
rendering each time by πένης. The rendering
here is therefore probably a free one suggested by
the preceding hots, with which oλθη is so fre-
cquently coupled, specially in Deut.; and the variant
may have been suggested by Is. i. 23.

31. 3 (c). éπεκρότησαν ταῖς
χερσίν αὐτῶν. The o of the verb (N* éπεκρότησαν)
is evidently a slip for a. (It is worth noting that
the converse mistake occurs in Tischf.'s Roman
text of O' in Am. vi. 5, where the reading of the
Sixtine ed., 1587, and of B itself is ἐπικροτοῦντες).
In Aq. (éπεκρότουν ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν) the same error
appears. So Vulg. applaudabant, and SH. Symm.
has a different verb (συνεπίσχυσαν αὐτοῖς). Theod.'s
rendering (συνήμουν αὐτοῖς) is specially interesting,
both as shewing that the error, which it thus
implies and expresses by a synonym, was as old as
his day, and as illustrating the character of his
translation as a revision of O' rather than an
independent work. Wo. actually maintains the
correctness of éπεκρότ., making O' to have read
λήμνη, and relegating ἔρα to a parenthesis.

§ i. None of the Gk versions except Aq.
(ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν) seem to have got hold of the
exact sense of the Heb. expression לֶבֶז, viz.
under the direction, leadership. For examples see
Ezra iii. 10; 1 Chr. xxv. 3; 2 Chr. xxiii. 18. The other Gk renderings refer these words to the priests instead of the prophets, and indeed it would seem likely that it was in such a view that the change of α to ο (see preceding note) originated.

vi. 1. θ. ὑπερθέλε, taking the root to be ἀνα, to strengthen, which however, on the two other occasions on which it is found in Hiph. (Prov. vii. 13, xxi. 29), denotes shamelessness or obstinacy. On the other hand ἀνα, to take refuge (Is. xxx. 2), gives us here (and elsewhere, iv. 6; Ex. ix. 19; Is. x. 31) the sense of gathering (possessions etc.) into a place of safety or for flight, and thus harmonizes with the words that follow. Aq., less literal than usual, has ὀρμηθήτε.

The origin of the inaccuracy may well be the fact that in the passage iv. 6 (referred to in the last note) "the fenced cities," including Jerusalem, were to be the places of refuge. Here on the contrary they were to flee from Jerusalem southwards.

2 [Gk 1]. γ. ἁρπάξατε. γίνεται. O' read ἁρπάξατε, joining it with the preceding verse. Wo. apparently considers (contrary to his general principles) that the γίνεται had no corresponding Heb. in O' s text,

1 ἀναθήκη in xi. 15 was evidently read in O' (δαπεδύεται) ἀναθήκη from ἀνα, not, as Wo., ἀναθῆκη.
and that Ἄναμία was the original of their ἄφαιρεθησθαι.

γ' bis. καὶ ἄφαιρεθησηται τὸ ὦψος σου. must have been a sufficiently familiar root to O', as it occurs Deut. xxviii. 54, 56 (bis). Hence we must suppose that their MS. was indistinct, or that the present Heb. text is corrupt. The conjectural emendation which involves least change is that of Schleusner (Nov. Thes. in LXX. etc., Glasgow, 1822, s.v. ἄφαιρεω), ἡμῖνα. In the second word O', taking ἃ for ἄ, probably read ἅπαξ.

3. Ἡ χειρὶ (ἡ τῆς χειρᾶ) αὐτοῦ (A αὑτῶν). In almost all the places where ἃ means locus, Numb. ii. 17 (in Deut. xxiii. 13 O' vacat); Jos. viii. 20; Is. lvii. 8; Ezek. xxi. 24 [20] O' have failed to understand it. Is. lvi. 5 is about the only exception.

4. ἐκλείπουσιν, apparently an error for an original ἐκκλίνουσιν. Comp. the use of ἐκκλ. as the rendering of the same verb in xiv. 8. The Gk verbs becoming identical in the two clauses, this would help towards the other slip of still further assimilating this clause to its predecessor by ending it with τῆς ημέρας (so Bæk) instead of τῆς ἐσπέρας. The latter reading is still preserved in AQ, 23, 33,
and others, while 86, 88 (so SH.) have τ. ἐσπ. in text and τ. ἡμ. in margin.

ξ a. θῆς ἡμέρας. See preceding note.

5. δ. τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς, loosely.

The Heb. word does not occur in the Pentateuch, and but twice (1 K. xvi. 18; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 19) in the historical Books. It receives very varied treatment at the hands of O', viz. ἀμφοδα (so in xvii. 27, xlix. 27 [xxx. 16], where comp. the inconsistent treatment of the two in Wo.'s Conspectus), ἀντρον, βάρις, βασιλεῖον, γῆ (see on ix. 20), θεμέλιον, ναός, οἶκοι, πόλις, πυργόβαιρις, χώρα. Three only of these (βάρις, βασιλεῖον, πυργόβαιρις) can on Wo.'s principles be taken as a rendering of 'נים, while for the remaining eight, according to him, different words must be assumed as found by O' in their Heb. original. Looking therefore at these eight (which represent six separate Books and twenty-four passages), we see that an examination of O' treatment of the passages where 'נים occurs in M.T. supplies an argument against Wo. of the same nature, and at least as decisive, as that furnished us by the case of ἡρώιον (see on iii. 17).

It is true that the word θεμέλιοι (θεμέλια) is used in several cases to render ἡρώιον or ὑπολήμορον, one or other of which words Wo. considers to have stood

1 Read in Hatch and Redpath's list of cases (and so in both Trommius and Kircher) Ps. 136 (137), 10 (not 7); ἔως ἐν θεμέλιοι ἐν αὐτῇ.
in O’s Heb. text here. But this of itself proves nothing. In nine passages besides the present (seven of them occurring in Am. i. ii.) θεμ. corresponds to ‘אֻמַי. In all four occurrences in this Book Aq. Symm. render by βάρις.

6. om. a. יְהוָה צְבָאֹת. Kύριος. (Q adds τῶν δύναμεων.)

e. ἐκκοψάον (Q ψατέ), suggesting that in O’s copy it was written without the mater lectionis.

e. τὰ ξύλα (Q θεμέλη) αὕτης, reading the word as though it were the ἀφύνσις of Deut. xx. 19.

εἰ. ἐκχεόν, probably recensional. At any rate there is no apparent reason why O should have omitted the conjunction.

δ. δύναμιν. O’ seem to have been quite at sea as to the exact meaning of this word. In xxxii. [xxxix.] 24 they render by δχλος, and in xxxiii. [xl.] 4 by χάρακες.

γ. ψευδής. A case where a comparison of the other Gk versions yields interest. The construction in M.T. is far from smooth, and very possibly corrupt. It may have been for this reason that O’ was induced to read the word as ψευδής. Whether this variant actually existed in their time or not, Aq. seems to have found it.
He has ἀδικός, a frequent rendering of יָדָר by O' themselves in J. and elsewhere. Symm. on the other hand (τῇ πόλει τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς) testifies to our present M.T. in some shape.

7. בֵּרֵי בֵר (בר 'ב) פִּיתִיה יָבָשָׁה (Q adds αὐτοῦ). The Heb. root is either (a) יָבָשָׁה, found but twice elsewhere (2 K. xix. 24; Is. xxxvii. 25, both times in Kal and in the sense of digging for water), or (b) יָבָשָׁה, a root found in cognate languages only, to keep cool. The latter sense is followed not only by O' but by Symm. and St Jer., who also tells us that "pro racu...in Hebraico bor dicitur," thus giving no indication of the existence of the ק'ריא. The latter (which occurs nowhere else) may be intended to mean יָבָשָׁה, a well, fountain, and to indicate that the Mass. adopted the Rabbinic view; viz. that which makes the root יָבָשָׁה to have the sense of pouring forth, this interpretation certainly making the point of the comparison plainer.

η. ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς, apparently read as ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς. Mss. 22, 36, and others, as well as Aq., have μου. SH. and St Jer. on the other hand follow O'.

8. ἀποστῆ, a free rendering (so also in Ezek. xxiii. 17) of a word, which must have been known to O', as occurring in Gen. xxxii. 26 [25, ἐνάρκησεν].
9. om. a. דִּכְאָת. O' vacat (Q τῶν δυν.).

See on ii. 22.

γ. עִזְלֵלָה. Καλαμάσθε, καλαμάσθε (עִזְלֵלָה עִזְלֵלָה).

Comp. for this verb as rendering לְעֵדֵל עִזְלֵלָה

Jud. xx. 45.

ζ. καθ' ὢν. ἐπιστρέψατε.

κάρταλλων. O' may be right in identifying the Heb. word (which is ἀπαξ λεγ.) in sense with סִלָּם of Gen. xl. 16, but it seems at least as likely that it is another form of יְלָלָים, vine-tendrils (Is. xviii. 5).

11. η. λίγα ἡμῶν. τῶν θυμόν μου. See on ii. 2, 3.

ζ. καὶ ἐπέσχον καὶ οὐ συνετέλεσα αὐτοῦς, a very loose translation of M.T.

Ἐπ. has the same sense as in Gen. viii. 10 etc. (so Acts xix. 22).

ζ. ἐκχῆ. The Heb. imperative is harsh. Our R.V. however has gone back to it.

om. a. ἐπὶ 2ο.

β. νεανίσκων. The fact that Aq. Theod. seem (see Field's note) to have had πονηρευόμενον (?) would point to an early corruption, and possibly the original expression is lost.
12. (η.) Καὶ αἱ (ἢ οἵ ὁμ. αἱ) γυναῖκες αὐτῶν. Wo.'s (ἢ οἵ is an obvious slip) is quite uncalled for.

13. Ἐκ. ἴνα βεβαίως ἡ συντελέσαντο (Ἀ&omicron;&omicron; -σαυ) ἄνομα (Q τὰ ἄν.). A close parallel for this free rendering is found in Prov. i. 19 (ἄλλοι ὑπετέλεσαν τὰν συντελοῦντα τὰ ἄνομα). Comp. Is. xxxiii. 15 (ἀνομία).

ὀμ. a bis and β b and a b. ἀπὸ ἰερέως (Ἀ&omicron;&omicron; ins. καὶ) ἐις ἰεροπροφήτου. If this were the only case to be dealt with, we should be tempted to decide in favour of O"s order (SH. however agrees with M.T.), arguing thus. If M.T. had been the original form, we can see no reason why the translators should have objected to the priest being (as is implied by the parallelism of the verse) a more important person than the prophet, and so should have transposed these substantives. On the other hand, when the memory of the prophets had faded into the past, and priestly control over records had become paramount, the change from the Heb. text suggested by O' to the present one would be very conceivable. It may be objected that in three other passages, viz. xiv. 18, xxiii. 11, 33 (in 34 the variation of order does not occur) the same phenomenon presents itself, while this reasoning does not apply. The framers of M.T. however
may well have made their treatment of this passage their guide on the subsequent occasions. Ἡσυμδο(πρ.) is Midrashic; so on eight other occasions in this Book, once only (Zech. xiii. 2) elsewhere.

14. Ο' vacat. Symm. has τὴς θυγατρὸς, but the best Heb. Editions omit¹. The word is obviously an insertion from the parallel passage, viii. 11 (where Ο' vacat).

ἐξονθενοῦτες, making light of [it], an excellent rendering. From Aq.'s ἐν ἀτμίᾳ (especially if compared with Symm.'s μετ' εὐκολίας), it may be conjectured that here, as well as elsewhere (see on vii. 3, viii. 5), his knowledge of Heb., combined with extreme literalness, was overborne by a desire to differ from Ο', which, as the standard Version of Greek-speaking Christians, could not fail to be viewed with prejudice by a follower of R. Aqiba.

γ. μεν. ποῦ. Not a free translation; nor yet, as suggested by Spohn¹, a sign that they read ἔλεινη, but the rendering of μεν, to which Ποῦ corresponds in 1 S. x. 14 (so to ἔλεινη in Jer. xv. 2).

15. ἕξ. ἐξελίποσαν. Probably meant

¹ Over 20 Mss. are cited by Kenn. as omitting, and many are added by de Rossi.

as a loose rendering of the Heb., *failing* to heal a
wound, this being a continuation of the metaphor
of the preceding verse. 'ה at any rate was a word
with which O' had no difficulty in dealing on its
seven other occurrences in this Book.

η. רֶבֶלֶךְ. τὴν άτυμίαν αὐτῶν, reading 'מ
as רֶבֶלֶךְ, which is thus rendered by O' in iii. 25,
xx. 11, li. [xxviii.] 51.

e. שָׁנְנִים. ἐν τῇ πτώσει αὐτῶν (הֵנֶלֶךְ).
Comp. רֶבֶלֶךְ, πτώσεως αὐτῶν in xlix. 21 [xxix.
22].

ξ. י. פֶּּקֶּרֶכְס. ἐπισκοπής, a free rendering, un-
less we take the reading of AQ, ἔπ. αὐτῶν (הֵנֶלֶךְ),
and so explain on the analogy of the two previous
cases. The αὐτῶν however may better be con-
sidered as inserted from the parallel passage x. 15.

ξ. י. בָּרֶךֶל. ἀπολούνται. ἀσθενέω is the verb
used in v. 21 and five other places in J. as render-
ings of 'ה. This therefore seems to point to some
early Heb. variant, which may be connected with
the ἀπολούνται occurring in v. 21.

16. α β Βις and ν. Not only are O"s inser-
tions of קְרִיוּנ and καὶ ἰδετε Midrashic, but their
translation of מָרַכֵת by ἀγνισμόν (A ἀγιασμὸν) is
of the same character. The kindred מִרְשָׁנָה
of Is. xxviii. 12 is there rendered by them ἀνάπαυμα;
here the nature of that *rest* is explained as *divine* rest, sanctity. That even the translators of a Book so badly rendered as Isaiah should have recognised the usual sense of the root רֶפֶנֶן is so far against Schleusner's conjecture (notes on Michaelis *in loco*) that the Midrashic translation here arose from looking on the word as based upon a similar root found in Arabic, and meaning, *to return*.

18. ε. ἤκουσαν (עָשָׂבָה).

γ. καὶ οἱ ποιμαίνοντες (וּרְצִים).

γ. τὰ ποιμενὶ αὐτῶν, reading (for ἡρωθα γὰ σα ἔνα), a pl. however not found elsewhere. They render ἤρως by π. in xiii. 17, li. [xxviii.] 23. The remaining words with them doubtless coincided with M.T. We need not be surprised that the use of ἔμ ἡρωθα as virtually equivalent to a pronoun suffix did not prove a difficulty to them, inasmuch as Aq. himself here supplies a close parallel, rendering μαρτυρίαν τὴν οὕσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

19. γ. Ἰ. αποστροφὴς αὐτῶν, and so in xviii. 12, reading in both places מְשָׁבָת, which noun they render similarly in v. 6. It is somewhat singular that except in that instance and in ii. 19 and viii. 5 the word מַשָּׁבָת has been something of a stumbling-block to them in this Book
(iii. 6, 8, 11, 12, 22, xiv. 7), while 'תָּה has been accurately translated nine times.

יוֹלְדוֹת לָוִי. This strange construction seems to be a corruption of τῶν λόγων μου (אQ), which is read by Compl. Ald. (so SH.). A has τοὺς λόγους μου.

ξα. ἀπωσαντο, a free rendering, for the sake of smoothness.

20. (e) אָבָיָה. φέρετε, reading אָבָיָה, and perhaps using for this purpose the 1 which follows; or φ. may be a corruption (easy in uncials) for φέρεως (אָבָיָה), which agrees with Pesh. and Vulg.

21. ξι. καὶ ἀσθενήσουσιν (אQ add ἐν αὐτῇ), freely.

ἀναργεῖ. ἀπολοῦνται ('אָבָיָה).

We may observe that l. [xxvii.] 41—43 is a close adaptation of the three verses (22—24) which here follow.

22. ξι. καὶ ἔθνη (A ἔθνος μέγα), followed by the verb in the sing., (but Q ἐγερθη-σουται). Aq. Symm. Theod. have (καὶ) ἔθνος *μέγα καὶ βασιλεῖς πολλοί, shewing that by their time the text here had become completely conformed to that of l. 41. With their reading SH. agrees, but makes the κ. β. π. alone to be the additional matter supplied by the Heb. The ἔθνη (BאQ) is probably a conjectural emendation of a scribe, consequent
upon a removal from his copy of μ. κ. β. π. unaccompanined by a correction of the following verb from pl. to sing. The passage is interesting, in exhibiting a M.T. partially revised (as containing ἔσχατος θης), and in illustrating the character of B as shewing what Ceriani (quoted by Driver, Notes on Samuel, Introd. p. 1) calls 'the unrevised text of LXX., as it was before Origen.'

ε. ἐλεήσει. The mater lectionis at the end was absent.

χ. φωνὴ αὐτοῦ, so as to harmonize with ἐλεήσει.

om. d. ἐφ'.

γ. καὶ ἁρμασῖν παρατάξεται, reading ἑρᾶτῃ ἢρ ἡράτῃ.

ε. ὃς πύρ (ἐλαῖον). Similarly in l. [xxvii.] 42.
25. μὴ ἐκπορευέσθε (ἢ), and similarly for the following verb.

יו. ὑπὸ ὑπὸν παροικεῖ, not as Wo. (יו), but dividing the words differently, and so reading צבמ נר.

26. ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, probably a corruption for ἐφ' ἣμᾶς.

27. ε (and γ). ἐν λαοῖς δεδοκιμασμένοις. This rendering took the first word to be the pl. const., and read the second apparently as a subst. from the root ב. This latter word however has given rise to much difficulty. St Jer. testifies to the sense “clausum atque circumdatum” as that given to the word by O' as well as by Symm. who accordingly, by the testimony of ms. 86, had πολιορκομένως. Εν λαοῖς (μου) συγκεκλεισμένοις is the reading found in mss. 86, 88, 98 (so SH.), and ἐν λαῷ (μου) συγκεκλεισμένως in 22, 36, and others. Aq. διηημένως, but perhaps διημένως (see Field’s note). Vulg. has robustus. There is much to be said for the view, mentioned by Prof. Cheyne, that 'מע was a marg. gloss, intended as a reminder of the parallel passage in i. 18.

καὶ γνώσῃ με ἐν τῷ δοκιμάσαι με. All that is needed (not so Wo.) is to suppose that O' read it as הר עבת, and rendered rather freely.
28. om. (a). ἄνηκοοι. av. is used to render וְלֹחֶם in v. 23. In the face of such expressions as וְלֹחֶם בְּנֵי (Ex. xxix. 37 etc.), לֹחֶם בְּנֵי (Lev. xxi. 22 etc.), לֹחֶם בְּנֵי (Gen. ix. 25), we can scarcely suppose that the translators would have failed to recognise the force of this method of expressing the superlative. We must therefore consider לֹחֶם to have been absent, rightly or wrongly, from their original. 21 Heb. mss. have כֶּשֶָר, supported by Targ. (רָבְרִיב), Pesh. (הָלָךְ לְכָתֵב), Vulg. (principes). So Aq. ἄρχοντας.

29. ξ ι. וְלֹחֶם. ἐξέλιπτεν 1° (A ἐξέλιπτεν), a free rendering of Niph. of וְלֹךְ, to burn. A parallel occurs in Ezek. xv. 4. In the next clause ἐξέλιπτεν (A ἐξέλιπτεν) renders שָׁם. Obs. the identity of the Gk rendering of different Heb. verbs in the immediate context.

om. a and γ. πονηρία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐτάκη (Q -κησαν), reading λέσον λέσον. 16

30. ε. ἄνηκ. καλέσατε (κράσα).

vii. 1. om. a. O' vacat. The Heb. preface was introduced for the sake of smoothness, but purposely expressed in somewhat vague terms, so as not to commit its introducers to the identification
(in substance) of the following prophecy with that of ch. xxvi. Aq. Symm. Theod. (and so SH.) agree with M.T. in this and the following verse.

2. om. c. יִשְׂרָאֵל... O' vacat. The Heb. was suggested by the words which (in xxvi. 2) introduce what is at any rate a similar prophecy. The שָׁתָר here, as opposed to the שָׁתָר of the later passage, may easily have its source in the language of xxvi. 10. Comp. xxxvi. 10, where both are mentioned. Tradition also might easily influence the wording of such an insertion in reference to one, memories of whom were cherished, and whose connexion with the Messianic hope was marked (Matt. xvi. 14; comp. John i. 21, vi. 14, vii. 40).

om. c. לֶחֶם... O' vacat. The Heb. was suggested by such passages as xvii. 20, xxii. 2; just as O' (or a copyist) made a similar insertion in xix. 3.

3. om. a. צֵנָאָר. O' vacat (Q τῶν δυν.). See on ii. 22.

Aq., deviating from M.T., has καὶ σκηνώσω (Ἀνδρέας) σὺν ὕμιν.

4. a a. יְהוָה. O' (or a copyist) added ὅτι τὸ παράπαν οὐκ ὥφελήσοντι ὕμᾶς, suggested by the last words of v. 8.

om. a. יְהוָה 3°. O' vacat.
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§ i. ἐστίν, a loose translation. Comp. 2 Chr. viii. 11, where ἥν, referring, as here, to a building or group of buildings, is similarly rendered.

7. לָמָּא יִהְיָה בְּרֵאשֵׁית. εἰ αἰώνος καὶ ἐν αἰώνοις. The exact Heb. expression is not found elsewhere. The nearest approach is in Ps. ciii. [cii.] 17, where, as here, О' brings out that it is a parte ante, as well as a parte post.

8. κ. ἐκ δὲ (Q* adds καὶ), reading ἦν; and taking it in the Aramaic sense. Spohn's view (l.c. i. 114), that eἰ δὲ is a corruption of ἔδω, is less good.

om. a. לְבָם. О' vacat. The Heb. is apparently an insertion from v. 4, where the word is duly rendered.

9. ϒ b. О' (or a copyist) changed the order of the first three verbs to accord with that of the Decalogue.

10. α a. τοῦ κακῶς εἰναι ὑμῖν (belonging in sense to the preceding ν.), an insertion suggested by the Heb. which occurs in a similar context at the end of v. 6.

om. (a). ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ (A om.).

θ. Ἀπευθεῖμεθα, taking it as ἀναπληράω. This verb occurs in Niph. in Ezek. xl. 6. The root would be known to О' through Gen. xxvii. 36, while in Eccl. ii. 10 the Kal is found in a sense
still closer to that which they attribute to the verb in this instance. The loss of ἀ (if they read the same consonants in their text as we do) would probably not give them much trouble. Although they did not recognise ש物业服务 in ii. 36 (see note there) as a case of the kind, yet in xxii. 23 their rendering (καταστημάτως) of what M.T. gives as נסנה can only be explained by their reading it נסנה = נסנה.


5 i. וֹּֽהְיָה. כֹּלכּס מָוּ, freely.

α α. וֹּֽהְיָה. επ' αὐτῷ (αυτών) ἐκεῖ. The last word is probably suggested by such passages as 1 K. viii. 16, 29.


om. a. יָּשׁוּבָה נַרְבּר. O' vacat. יָּ, coupled with another infin., is frequent in J. In v. 25, xxv. 3, 4, xxvi. [xxxiii.] 5, xxxii. [xxxix.] 33, xxxv. [xliii.] 14, xlv. [li.] 4 it is represented in O', while in xxxv. 15, as here, it is found in M.T. alone. The remaining occurrences in M.T. (xi. 7, xxix. 19) are passages lacking in O'.

α δ. שְׁמֶשׁ. ἕκοισατέ μοι.

14. וֹּֽהְיָה. καὶ ποιήσω; but AQ τοιννν καὶγώ π.
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τῷ οἴκῳ; but A τῷ τόπῳ τοῦτο, freely.

15. om. (a). ἀδελφοῖς τῶν ὀμῶν.

16. ξ i. οἰκήσας διά θεὸν ἡ χάρα τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ καὶ μὴ ἔχον καὶ μὴ προσέλθης μοι περὶ αὐτῶν (A om. καὶ μὴ ἔχα...αὐτῶν) freely. The rendering on the later occurrence of the first clause (xi. 14) is closer (καὶ μὴ ἀ. περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν δεήσει καὶ προσευχῇ).

om. a. ᾿Ο vacat.

18. a d ter. αὐτῶν is three times inserted by O', probably only as a free rendering in each case.

ξ (b). ἡ στρατιά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, the other Gk Versions ἡ βασιλέσσῃ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. But in xlv. [li.] 17, 18, 19, 25 'מ (with note 'א תור) is rendered τῇ βασιλέσσῃ τοῦ οὗ, and so Symm. and presumably the others. Stade (Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wiss. 1886, pp. 123–132), holding that the context proves 'ישו 'מ to refer to the worship of the heavenly bodies, maintains that the difference of rendering on the part of O' suggests that they read here 'ישו. He considers however that 'ו (Malchith) was the original reading, and that it was perhaps owing to the new sense which the 'kingdom of heaven' came later to bear for the Jews, that the Mass. pronunciation arose,
and with it the interpretation, *queen of heaven*. In a later article however (ibid. pp. 289–339) he inclines to the belief that אָנָּה was the original word, altered as ‘eine euphemistische Correctur’ to the synonymous expression לְמֹלֶל שִׁשֶּׁה, with ‘א inserted in xliv. according to the requirements of the later and stricter orthography. He considers that this use of ‘א as synonymous with ‘א arose from the Rabb. exegesis of Gen. ii. 1, 2 (מֶלִיאָהוֹ=יִבְנַאָם).

He holds that the τῇ β. of xliv. may have arisen from the influence of later versions on O’s text. There are however, we may reply, many instances of O’s inconsistent renderings of the same Heb. pointing (suggesting different translators). Moreover on this later hypothesis the unanimity of the other Gk Versions in τῇ βασ. remains obscure.

Kuenen (Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Bibl. Wissenschaft, übersetzt von K. Budde, Freiburg in B. und Leipzig, 1894) controverts Stade, and maintains the sense ‘queen of heaven.’

καὶ ἔσπεισαν. A has καὶ σπείσαν. This, though in a sense more literal, is yet inferior as a rendering of the Heb. infin., which, as is shewn by the absence of ל, is not to be coupled with לְשׁוֹן.

20. *om. (a).* Κύριος. See on ii. 22.

ξι. πᾶν ξύλον, freely.
XI. ὁ ἄγιος αὐτῶν (Q om. αὐτ.).

A tolerably clear case of free rendering, as the presence of the article prevents us from conjecturing that O read Ἰσραήλ = Ἰσραήλ.

καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα (so Q πάντα) τὰ γενήματα (this is the spelling in B also) αὐτῆς, and at end of v. introduces from iv. 4 or xx. 12 καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ σβέσων. This however may represent a variant on M.T. here, as several of Kenn. and de Rossi’s MSS. have מַכְבֶּה.


εἰς νάσας (N om. πάσας.) ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου, freely.

καὶ οὐ προσέσχεν (A προσέσχον) τὸ οὖς αὐτῶν, a free rendering, repeated v. 26, where however N (not A) has -σχον, and so SH. there, though not here.

om. a. γενήματα τῶν κόσμων (A ἐπίθ.). It is probable that Ἰσραήλ is the contribution of a glossator, to explain the rare word 'ש, and so was not found in O’s text. If so, ἐνθ., as rendering of 'ש, agrees with iii. 17, where see note.

οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν, freely.
26. τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν. Wo., substituting ἵνα οἱ ζῳομενοι, is not only inconsistent (see xvii. 23, and xix. 15) but wrong. See further in Dr Driver, Expos. l.c. p. 328.

om. d. ὅτε. O' vacat. It is possible however that they may have read ὅτε οἱ ζῳομενοι. The M.T. has scarcely the air of an insertion.

27. om. (a). Θαυμάζων (28) ἀλλ' ἡμῖν. O' vacat. It may be a case in which it preserves the (shorter and) more genuine text, but on the other hand the similarity between the commencement of the two verses renders very conceivable an accidental omission from the first to the second ἀλλ' ἡμῖν on the part of the translator.

28. a b. ἀλλ' ἡμῖν. O' adds τὸν λόγον τούτων.

ξ g. ἤτε ἡμῖν. τούτῳ τῷ έθνος, illustrating weakness in Heb. grammar.

om. a. Κυρίῳ; Q adds τού θεοῦ αὐτῶν.

om. c. ἐπεραραθείς. O' vacat. The Heb. was perhaps suggested by Joel i. 5, where the verse ends with ἐπεραραθείς.

29. ἰπν. Χειλέων. See on iii. 2, 21.
γ. τὴν ποιοῦσαν (Q ποιήσασαν) ταῦτα, reading ἴ for ἴ.

31. ε. βουμὼν. The number may easily have been ambiguous from omission of ι. The Targ., also, as Wo. points out, took it as sing., but Aq. Symm. as pl.

a d. ἐνετειλάμην αὐτοῖς.

ξ i. καὶ οὐ (A οὐδὲ, without καὶ) διενοθήτην ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, a free rendering, and so in xix. 5. On the other hand we have the literal rendering of the same idiom in A in 2 K. [4 K.] xii. 5 [4], δὲ ἐὰν ἀνάβη (B has λάβῃ) ἐπὶ καρδίαν κ.τ.λ. Comp. ἀνέβη λασίς in viii. 22.

32. ξ i. οὐκ ἐρωῦσιν ἔτι, either reading ἔτι, or, more probably, rendering freely, while avoiding, as it is interesting to notice, the personal use of the verb in the sense of call, which would be incorrect Heb.

ξ i. τῶν ἀνηρτημένων, a free rendering.

θ. ἐν τῷ Ταφέθ, but Α ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Ταφέθ.

μ. διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπάρχειν τόπου, from want of room elsewhere. This is more accurate than A.V. (with which agrees text of R.V.).

33. οἱ νεκροὶ. So in xix. 7, but xxxiv. [xli.] 20 has τὰ θυησιμαία.
31–33 are found in substance again xix. 5–7. It is instructive to compare M.T. and O' in the two passages. In the later one (i) the expression "and their daughters" is absent from both Heb. and Gk, thus throwing a certain amount of doubt upon its genuineness here; (ii) גֶּלֶפֶת לֶבַשָּׁלָה is not represented in O'; and so for (iii) בְּרִית מְנָא (a few Gk mss. and SH. read it); while (iv) a different translator's hand is suggested by the fact that there חוֹן and מְנָא (see on ii. 23) are translated respectively διάπτωσις (but not so ms. 88, SH.) and πολυάνδριον (bis; so ms. 88, SH.), at which St Jer. records his surprise.

34. a d. נֵפְשֵׁיהָ. πᾶσα ἡ γῆ. So four mss. cited by Kenn. and one more by de Rossi.

viii. 1. יָזְבוּ מֵא. εξοικουσών, against 'ץבָיו מֵא.

2. מִשְׁפּוּתָם. καὶ ψυξουσίων. For this sense of ψ., to spread out to dry in the open air, see 2 S. [2 K.] xvii. 19, and comp. ψυχοίως in Numb. xi. 32.

a d. הָלְבָּשָׁה. O' adds καὶ πρὸς πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας.

ξ i. בְּרִית. (ὁν) ἀντείχοντο, a loose translation. The same Heb. root in xxxviii. [xlv.] 4 corresponds to χρησμολογεῖ. Here Wo. makes O' read בְּרֵכָּה בָּם; there by a still more violent substitution נָבָה.
κοπήσουνται. The Heb. root, as occurring frequently in a sense connected with burial in Genesis and elsewhere, must have been familiar to O'. It is natural to conjecture that either from illegibility in their ms. or for some other reason they (or an early copyist) imported the present rendering from the parallel passage, xvi. 4 (דָּמָיִים). It may be worth noting however that in xxv. 33 [xxxii. 19], where both verbs occur in a similar context in M.T., they appear to have been absent from O’’s text.

(β a and) μ. הָלַעַפָּנַיִם. eis παράδειγμα, apparently euphemistic (Wo. suggests הַלָּפָנַיִם, but xxv. 33 is against it); so in ix. 21 [22], xvi. 4, in both of which passages, as here, Jews are spoken of. O’ apparently did not think it necessary to be so tender of the feelings of other nations. At any rate in xxv. 33 [xxxii. 19] the rendering is eis κοπίρια.

3. γ. הָלַעַפָּנַיִם. ὦτι εἰλοντο (Ἄλαν-). The literalness of the translation in the case of the following words (καὶ πᾶσιν κ.τ.λ.) makes it probable that the same is the case here, and that O’ read πινοῦμεν. Conversely in xxxvii. [xliv.] 16 O’ (καὶ ηλθοῦν) has preserved the right reading, where M.T. has ἀνέβη. See further in Dr Driver’s note on 1 S. ii. 21.

ομ. a. הָלַעַפָּנַי. O’ vacat.
CRITICAL NOTES.

ξ i. ἐν παντὶ τῷ ὄς, freely.

om. a. ἡμείς 2°. O' vacat. Evidently an accidental repetition from the previous line, as Prof. Cheyne (Pulpit Comm. in loco) points out. His argument however against the word as violating grammatical concord cannot be maintained. ἡμείς occurs 17 times in O. T. On 13 of these occasions there is no such concord as would determine the gender; in 3 it is masc. In the remaining case (2 S. xvii. 12) the word whose gender is determined by it is fem. in 'כ, but masc. in 'כ.

om. a. ἕκαστος (4)....κόρην. O' vacat. From SH. however it would appear that of the five Heb. words now unrepresented originally found a place in O'. Kai ἐρείπ might easily be omitted by confusion with the immediately preceding ἐρείπ, the ὅτι being subsequently inserted to introduce the fresh utterance, which turns from the description of the punishment to dwell upon the conduct that has led to it.

4. ξ i. ἦν ὁ πρῶτον ouκ ἄνισταται; perhaps the Heb. was indistinct.

5. om. (a). ἡμέρας. O' vacat. ὥστε at once masc. and fem. (for fem. use comp. Ex. v. 16; Jud. xviii. 7) points to some early corruption.

ἄνωθεν. άνωθεν. The notion of perpetuity.
belonging to the root (comp. לְנֶא, eis τέλος in Pss. passim) is well expressed here by O's rendering (Ct. iii. 5 for rendering of לְנֶא). On the contrary Aq. Symm. (φιλόνεικον) and St Jer. (contentiosa) all translate as though the root were לְנֶא; from which however it would be difficult to derive M.T. Is it one of the cases (see on vi. 14) where we may suppose Aq. to have chosen to differ in spite of better knowledge, and so to have influenced the work even of Christians as Symm. and St Jer.?

εἰ. κατεκράτησαν, surely a loose translation as regards voice, yet acquiesced in by Wo.

δ. μακρόλυμα. ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει (αὐτῶν). So in xiv. 14 (א), while in xxiii. 26 the rendering is τὰ θελήματα. It is evident that O' was dependent upon the context for the meaning of this word, which, possessed of the frequent Aramaic ending נו, characteristic of J. (see on iii. 17), occurs but twice outside this Book, and is absent from the Pentateuch. So in Ps. cxix. [cxviii.] 118 they have ἐνθύμημα, while they are more fortunate in Zeph. iii. 13, ἵσταται.

ε. γ. ἐνωτίσασθε δὴ καὶ ἀκούσατε. By much slighter changes in M.T. than those which Wo. proposes (ברק נב נב נב) we
may obtain O's rendering. They took the first word to be 2nd p. s., then gave it (wrongly) a future (= imperative) sense, while for the second they read יָשֵׁשׁ. Wo.'s comment on the passage (p. 138) is far from convincing.

8. ἡλαθεῖν (a rendering of M.T. which Wo. defends. See preceding note). Comp. xxi. 10 (where, in order to maintain this rendering of ἕν, they were obliged to omit the negative particle) and xlviii. [xxxi.] 30: so in 2 K. [4 K.] vii. 9, xvii. 9; Is. xvi. 6. In Prov. xvi. 7 on the other hand we have oὐκ ἀσφαλεῖς (καρδίας). Here the Targ. (אבררש) and Pesh. (דונה) give the correct sense.

ζ. i and ε. διέλιπεν (reading בֶּלָה) ὁ τρέχων, a free rendering.

γ. ἡμελημένη. ἐν χρηματισμῷ (αὐτοῦ), reading מ зло is so rendered v. 16, xiii. 27.

7. δ. ησίδη, a transliteration (comp. χαυόνας in vii. 18). So in Job xxxix. 13, whereas Deut. xiv. 18 [17] has πελεκανά, Zech. v. 9 ἐποποσ, Ps. civ. [ciili.] 17 ἐρωδιοῦ.

ε. μάλαρ. τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῆς. Kenn. cites three MSS. which omit ἕ, to which de Rossi adds one, and two more pr. mantu.

α. c. ἐσμί (ὁμοῦ δ') ἑνετρά. καὶ κηλιδῶν ἀγροῦ,
στροφθία. These names of birds were evidently not familiar to O', whose addition of ἀγ. to χελ. hardly (with Wo.) points to an identification of it with the יִּּכְֹּּךְ of Ps. 1. [xlix.] 11, but is rather the result of conflation, the transliteration ἀγοῦρ being corrupted into the present form. The second conjunction has probably been lost in the process of corruption.

η. מְפָּשָׁתָא, reading מְפָּשָׁתָא, the more readily because of the יִּּכְֹּּךְ which follows.

8. om. a. לְשׁנָתָא. O' vacat. 'א may well be a marginal gloss on the first part of the verse, and י a an insertion suggested by the יִּּכְֹּּךְ of the next verse.

ζ. I. לְשׁנָתָא מְפָּשָׁתָא. eis μάτην ἐγενήθη, freely.

9. 1. מְפָּשָׁתָא. τὸν νόμον (ἈΝΩ τὸν λόγον).

10. om. c. From יִּּכְֹּּךְ to the end, also vv. 11, 12, O' vacat. The passage is almost identical with vi. 12–15, and is probably interpolated here.

13. a, d and e. מְפָּשָׁתָא (καί) συνάξονοι τὰ γενήματα αὐτῶν. O' read מְפָּשָׁתָא סְדָא, refusing to recognise the play on the roots חָסָק in Kal and חָסִי in Hiph., but making the second word a substantive known to them from Ex. xxiii. 16 (συνελείας), xxxiv. 22 (συναγωγής). Comp. חָסָק (συναγωγή), Is. xxiv. 22. As for the καί, a י may
have been suggested by an abbreviation of the previous word ("").

*om. (a). אִשָּׁה לֹא מִיבָרָה. O' vacat.* The Heb. words are as obscure as anything in the Book, and all proposed renderings of them as they now stand are forced, e.g. (i) And I deliver them up to those who pass over them, (ii) And I gave them that (viz. my Law) which they transgress, (iii) And I appoint unto them those that shall pass over them. The clause is perhaps a corruption of an interpolation. Prof. Cheyne would point the unction with Sh'vea. Adopting this punctuation, I would conjecture the clause to have read thus אִשָּׁה לֹא מִיבָרָה. The corruption of י into its present form would lead to the subsequent omission of the negative. In the time of Aq. Theod. the unction seems to have been absent from the last word. They render καὶ ἐδώκα αὐτοῖς καὶ παρῆλθεν αὐτοὺς (ἵππαικμεν).

14. י. καὶ ἀπορίσωμεν (AQ ἀπορρ.), reading ιερατεύεσθαι. Comp. xlvi. [xxix.] 5, li. [xxviii.] 6. Aq. Symm. (καὶ συγγέσωμεν) SH. apparently took the word as the Mass., viz. as chiefly, pointed in the Aramaic form (comp. יְרֵמה in Lam. ii. 10). On the other hand the Niph. (יְרֵמה; see xlix. 26, l. 30, li. 6), to which some (e.g. Keil in loco) consider this Mass. pointing to be equivalent,
would mean, *Let us perish*, whereas the Hiph. which follows (*has reduced us to silence*) agrees better with the former sense.

*om. a.* ֶשׁ. O' vacat.

*om. a.* רֶזָּהּ אלֹהִים. o theós.

η. ἐναυτίον (Q ἐνώπιον) αὐτοῦ (יו read as יְהו).  

15. i. הָיָה (Aram. for הָיָה, so xiv. 19). συνήχθησαν, taking the root in the sense borne by Niph. in iii. 17 (συναχθοὺνται).

δ. בִּיטָה. σπουδή (but in xiv. 19 ταραχή). Scholz (p. 89) suggests לַחֲמָה. Perhaps this is a typographical error for לַחֲמָה, inasmuch as the latter in xv. 8 (so Ps. lxxviii. [lxviii.] 33) is rendered by σπουδή.

16. ξ i. ἀκουσόμεθα (A -σομαι). The word is ambiguous, even when pointed. The subsequent verbs determine the sense, and shew that O' made the wrong choice.

δ. קְרָא. φωνήν ὁ εὐνήτος. The Heb. word occurs elsewhere (and there in a masc. form) only in Job xxxix. 20, where O' has στηθέων, perhaps connecting it with the Aram. מָר (στηθὸς in Dan. ii. 32). Here they apparently saw a substantive from the root קְרָא. This is easier than to suppose
(with Wo.) that they identified the word with ἄρτα of Jud. v. 22. It would hardly have suggested ὃς rather than some simpler expression such as they employed there (στοιχή ἐστευσαν).

a c. ἰππασίας ἵππων αὐτοῦ, a conflation of renderings. The Heb. is used of heroes (xlvi. [xxvi.] 15; but O’ there μόσχος) or oxen (Ps. xxii. 13 etc.), but is twice elsewhere used by J. for horses, where O’ has not been equally successful in perceiving its meaning (xlvii. [xxix.] 3, ποδῶν; l. [xxvii.] 11, ταῦροι).

e. ἤχων καὶ θέει καὶ καταφύγεται. The matres lect. apparently were absent.

17. 8. ἔφυλνε, evidently a loose rendering in the absence of more precise knowledge. Accordingly O’ varies on the other occurrences of the word (Is. xi. 8 ἐκγονοὶ ἀσηδῶν, lix. ἀσπίδας; Prov. xxiii. 32 κεραστῆς). Aq. characteristically has in his 2nd ed. σκοπεύοντας (or σκοπευτάς), the first two letters suggesting the root οὐ, while in the 1st ed. he has βασιλισκοῖς. Vulg. has regulos.

om. a. O’ vacat.

18. 9. מָלַלְנוּת, 'Aviata, reading the Heb. as two words מִלָּלְנוּת וַעֲבֹדָה, and the verse as a part of the sentence commenced in v. 17. The root מִלָּלְנוּת is used in a similar sense in Hos. v. 13, where
in the parallel clause to that containing it O' employs ἵσθαι. The Heb. here is ἀπαξ λέγ. and is almost certainly the result of some early corruption. Five MSS. (see Kenn.) read מָלַל יְתֵּח, and one מַלָל נֶחְלָה; de Rossi adds thirteen more. So apparently Theod. δὲ όμως ἐστιν ὤμοις, connecting the latter word with ἤλθο (xiii. 17). The Pesh. connected the word with הָלָה and הַנֶּחֶל (ḥākem) (סְתָּמ). On the other hand from the sense of הָלָה, to be joyful (Ps. xxxix. 14), we have the renderings of Aq. τέρψεις or ἱλαρότης and of Symm. ἐμφαίτεις μοι.

καρδίας ύμων. If we can argue anything as to a verse so corrupt as this appears to be, we may suppose that O' read 'לַב, and put on the wrong affix, an error which followed from their way of taking the earlier part.

SH. marks with an asterisk. H. and P. mention 23 MSS. as omitting the word.

βασιλεύς (Q* iatropos). It is unlikely that O' would have failed to render the pronoun. It is probably therefore a corruption in O''s Heb. ms., to which the sound of the corresponding Aram. would lend itself. Wo. is in error in saying that the Targ. (םלְבָּה) agrees with M.T.
20. β α. ἐρος generally corresponds to the second of these and ἄμιντος to the first. The two Gk words however are in this case reversed. It is by no means necessary to suppose that the order of O's Heb. text was not that of M.T. The transposition may be explained on the principle mentioned on ii. 32 (-α-η-, α-η-). See other references in note on ii. 19.

21. om. d. ὁ ἄνεμος vacat. Apparently an accidental omission. Συνέτριβην is found in mss. 22, 36, and others, and SH. agrees.

a.c. ἀγωγὴ ὑποκειμένη (22) ἄνεμος ὑποκειμένη. ἀπορία κατ-ισχυσάν με ὁδινας ὡς τιμωτοφής, (22) μὴ ἡπτίνη. O' combines the blunder and the correction. ἥπτην was first read in the sense which ἥπτην bears in l. [xxvii.] 43 (θλιψι; in xlix. 24 [xxx. 13] the l. word is lacking in O'), and afterwards corrected (in marg.) in accordance with the rendering of ἥπτην in xlvi. [xxvi.] 11, li. [xxviii.] 8 (ἡπτίνη), and so finally incorporated in the text.

22. ἅπαξ ἱασις, a Hebraism. Comp. on vii. 31. So Hiph. of ἤλθε is represented by ἀνέγειν in xxx. [xxxvii.] 17, xxxiii. [xl.] 6.


ix. 1 [2]. β β and e. ἐσχατον, reading ἐσχατον (as pl. of ἐσχατον), back regions. Comp. O's
mistake in Job viii. 13, where ἰδὼν is rendered ἡ ἐσχάτη.

2 [3]. ἡ ἰδ. τόκον (A τόκος), freely.

3 [4]. ἡ ἰδ. ἀδελφοῖς αὐτῶν (A ἅντων), freely.

4 [5]. om. d. ἀλήθεια. The 1 may easily have been inserted, owing to the ending of the previous word.

e. ἱμάθηκεν (reading ἱμάθηκεν, which could be pointed as sing. or pl.).

4 [5] and 5 [6]. ἱμ. and ἱμ. ἡμ. (5) (6) τόκος ἐπὶ τόκῳ. Scholz (p. 90) supposes that O' read ἡ and supplied 'das gewöhnlich nicht geschriebene Ν' (thus reading ἡμεῖς) Or they may have understood a negative before ἡ. The next word
they divided, so as to read נָּשָׁה֙ בּוֹתִ֣חַ, the suggesting this as a parallel arrange-
ment. The τόκος ἐπὶ τόκῳ shews that O’s ten-
dency pointed out by Wellhausen (Der Text der 
Bücher Sam., p. 10) to render a Heb. word by a 
familiar Greek one of similar sound is not confined, 
as in the examples he there gives, to unfamiliar 
Heb. words. Indications of the same tendency are 
pointed out on ii. 32.

5 [6]. om. a. נָשָׁה בּוֹתִ֣חַ. O’ vacat (Q φησὶν 
Kύριος).

6 [7]. om. a. יְרַחֵת בּשָׁאָה. Kύριος (Q adds 
τῶν δυν.).

om. d. יְרַחֵת. O’ vacat. They may have inter-
preted it as a contraction (נָּשָׁה בּוֹתִ֣חַ, see on iii. 
19), and considered it, in the face of the opening 
words of the v., a needless repetition.

(a d.) יְרַחֵת. O’ adds ποιμνίας (Α' substituting 
τῆς). This seems a tolerably clear case of a word 
having fallen out of the original Heb. text. If π. 
were merely introduced through the influence of 
יְרַחֵת in vii. 12, it is probable that they would have 
used the κακία, which had been employed there, 
while π. points to an independent rendering.

7 [8]. e. ‘יהוּ֣דָה נָשָׁה הַיָּדָ֣שָׁה, reading 
with ‘יהוּ֣דָה נָשָׁה. The Mass. emendation is not a 
happy one. The pass. ptcp. can only be explained 
sharpened (identifying with Aram. נָשְׁרֶה; so Targ. 
8—2
like an arrow that is sharpened, and so Pesh.  

8 [9]. om. c. מ. O' vacat. See the parallel expressions in v. 9, 29.

9 [10]. **καβερε**, apparently reading א

om. c. ט. O' vacat. Probably an insertion from vv. 17, 18, 19, inasmuch as the word presented no difficulty to O' there, or in xxxi. 14 [xxxviii. 15], although a somewhat rare one outside J. and confined to later Books.

8. **τὰς τρίσοντα.** The word seems not to have been familiar to O'. In xxv. 37 [xxxii. 23] they render **τὰ κατάλωσια**, if that be not a corruption. In xxiii. 10 however they have **νομαί**. We may observe that **ὁ** seems also to have been a difficulty to them. Besides **νομή** as its rendering, they have **κατάλυμα, κατάλυσις, τόπος**.

7. **ἐξέλιπον.** This is generally ex-
plained as a confusion between נפל and לנה. That confusion no doubt had its effect elsewhere, but another explanation seems here to have a higher claim to probability. Exactly the same Greek is found in Zeph. iii. 6 as a fair though somewhat free rendering of קָנָה, the Niph. of קָנָה, to lay waste. It therefore seems not too much to conjecture that O’ read י in the present case also. N.B. נָלָת is correctly rendered by them in v. 11 [12].

*om. c.* יוביר. O’ vacat. Probably inserted from v. 11.

10 [11]. γ. נָלָת, εἰς μετομικαν, apparently reading it as נָלָת, which in xxiv. 5 is rendered τούς ἀποκισθεντας. In li. [xxviii.] 37 they seem to have connected it with קָנָה (ἀφανισμόν). It is remarkable that in 2 K. [4 K.] xix. 25 (οἰκεσίαι) they have been equally unsuccessful with this word.

11 [12]. ε. ὁ λόγος (Ἀ ο λ.), reading ἡμ. αὐτογειλάτω ύμιν (AQ ημίν), loosely.

12 [13]. a b. ἱρά. Κύριος, adding πρὸς μέ.

*om. c.* לָא-הָלוֹחֵם בַּה יְהוָה. O’ vacat. M.T. was probably suggested by xxxii. 23.

13 [14]. δ. Ἰεραμία. τῶν ἐρεστῶν (Α ἐραστῶν).

See on iii. 17.
THE DOUBLE TEXT OF JEREMIAH. [IX. 13

a a. לָעַה. O' (supported by scarcely any Heb. mss.) adds רֶשֶׁה כַּשֵּׁה, suggested by vii. 24.

14 [15]. om. a. לָעַה. O' vacat (Q τῶν δύν.).

om. a. לָעַה. O' vacat. The words are absent from both texts in the parallel passage xxiii. 5.

γ. לָעַה. ἀνδρικά. In the parallel passage (xxiii. 15) the rendering is ὀδύνην (A ὀδύνας), which word is used Job xxx. 16 to represent גַּלוֹנ. It is therefore clear that in both passages of J. the לָעַה was ignored by O'.

15 [16]. Ξ i and a c. τῷ καὶ ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποι. ἐστιν τοῦ ἐξαναλώσατ (but Q ἐστιν ὑπὲρ ἐξαναλώσω τους ἐν αὐτῷ). The last two words suggest an erroneous reading of the following ἡρ = βία (καὶ ἡρ) preceding its right rendering as ῥάδη.

16 [17]. om. a. ἀλλάτω. O' vacat.

om. c. ἀλλάτω. καλέσατε. The insertion in the Heb. was apparently suggested by ii. 10. Some mss. (including 22, 36) have σὺνετε καὶ (with which SH. agrees).

γ. ἀναγεννάθ... ἤθελαν. καὶ ἐλθέτωσαν (καὶ ἐλθήτωσαν) καὶ φθέγξατο...καὶ φθέγξατο. It seems a little suspicious that the same Heb. verb and in the same part of it (in slightly different forms) should be used in both parts of the ν. Contrast the two imperatives Ἰσραήλ and Ἰσραήλ. We are thus pre-
pared to give favourable consideration to O', who seem to have read the Hiph. of נֵבֶל, which is found Ps. cxix. 171, while φθ. is used to render Hiph. of this root in Ps. lxxvii. [lxxvii.] 2, xciv. [xciii.] 4. Outside the Psalter the verb is very limited in its use (Prov. i. 23, xv. 2, 28; Eccl. x. 1). Hence the familiar root אָבָּא would easily be substituted.

17 [18]. om. a. ὑπηρέτητα. O' vacat (but MSS. 22, 36 have καὶ ταξινάτωσαν).

ἔφ' ὑμᾶς, but probably originally ἡμᾶς and altered for smoothness, and so for the two following suffixes, by a frequent change in MSS.

18 [19]. γ. στίζων (ἈΑQ Σ.). For confusions of מ and ב in the MSS. used by O' see Driver, Samuel, Introd. p. xxv, and comp. pp. lxv, lxviii.

ξ a. ἀπεριφαμεν (ἈΑQ ἀπερρ.), altering the person of the verb on account of the preceding γ. SH. has 3rd sing. (understanding מ as nom.) in text, and 1st pl. in marg.

19 [20]. ξ i. Ἰωάννης. θεό (A Κυρίου), and so SH.

e. ἔννοιας. τὰ ὀνόματα (Ἄφωνέω).

e. λόγοις (ῥῆμα). στόματος αὐτοῦ.

ἐνα. οἰκτόν, but Α have οἰκτρόν, while in
the previous verse BAN have ointpou, although Q and some cursives (so Compl.) have there ointpou.

20 [21]. 8. eis tēn ḥēn ἐμεν. For ἂ see on vi. 5, and for the 2nd p. pron. (bis) comp. v. 17 [18]. O' seem to have read ἦ for ἐ, and connected the word with ἔρημη.

21 [22]. om. a. ἔρημη γένος ἔρημη. O' vacat, but MSS. 22, 36, and others have θανάτω, reading the Heb. as רָבְרָב (just as they deal with רָבָר in Is. ix. 7 [8]), and connecting with the previous v. St Jer. ascribes this reading "morte" to O' and (so MS. 86) to Theod. SH. inserts with an asterisk this סכוסלא and the three words that follow. Prof. Cheyne's conjecture seems a happy one, that רָבְרָב has been misplaced, and that it originally stood in the second clause of v. 20 [21], thus balancing מַעַה, as in Ps. lxxviii. 50. As he points out, the four words which commence this v. in M.T. "are in three important respects contrary to the style of Jeremiah; (1) such a prefix as 'speak' is unique; (2) the phrase "לִבְּךָ לִבְּךָ is also unique in Jeremiah; (3) where our prophet does use the form "לִבְּךָ it is not at the beginning of a verse."

ξ i. ἐσονται. Possibly only a loose rendering. It is better to regard it as a very early error for ἐσονται (so Scholz, p. 2, note).

μ. ἐσονται. eis (AN* om. eis) παράδειγμα. See on viii. 2.
a d. ἐπί τοῦ πεδίου τῆς γῆς ὑμῶν.
a d. καὶ κρίμα. The Babylonian Jews read 'ל.

§ i. ὑπάρχει. τὸ θέλημά μου, freely.

25 [26]. μ. Ἰσραήλ. Ἰσσωμαίαν (κειν Ισ. 18.). The Targ. on this v. runs Ἰσραήλ Ἰουδαίων. Ἰσραήλ Ἰουδαίων ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων. There is therefore no justification for Wo.'s claim (see his note in Conspectus in loc.) that it supports O'. O' may have objected to the disgrace involved in placing Judah between Egypt and Edom in this list (MSS. 22, 23, 36 have Ἰουδαίων, while SH. reads Ἰουδαίων). It is more likely however that it was a transcriptional error, possibly made in good faith, but probably helped by the unwillingness referred to above. The result at any rate produced an absurd tautology.

a d. Ἰσραήλ. O' adds σαρκί. It seems unlikely that a word so much needed for the parallelism of the clauses should have been originally lacking, while it is not hard to see a reason for its disappearance from M.T. If the Ἰουδαίων of v. 24 [25] be understood, as seems necessary, of nations circumcised in the letter though not in the spirit, viz. all those enumerated in this v., it will follow that Ἰουδαίων in the literal sense could not be predicated of them. To any therefore who understood (as the Mass. appear to have done) Ἰουδαίων of this v.
to be merely resumptive of those already named, and not to refer rather (as St Jer. saw) to the others (unnamed and uncircumcised), בַּבַּשְׁרֵן (which appears also in the Targ. בַּבַּשְׁרֵן) would present a difficulty to be solved only by the omission of the word. St Jer. is decided as to the practice of the rite by Egyptians, Edomites, Ammonites and Moabites, together with "Israelitas in solitudine commorantes."

x. 1. § 1. ἔλειλθεν ὁ Κύριος Ἰσραήλ (AQ add Kύριος), freely.

2. § 1. τὰς ὁδούς, freely, so as to harmonize better with the next clause.

μανθάνετε (A πορεύεσθε, probably not implying a variant). The construction of ἔλειλθεν with Ἰσραήλ is strange, but O' appears to have had it, translating by κατά.

καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σημεῖων. Νο, though virtually identical in sense, has a noteworthy variant, θηρίων.

γ. ἃντε τοῖς προσωποῖς αὐτῶν, reading προσωπῶν ἃντε, perhaps owing to illegibility in the earlier word.

3. e. ἐκκεκομμένον. In view of the facility with which matres lect. might be misplaced, O' may be considered to have read ἐκκεκομμένον.

om. (a). O' vacat.
CRITICAL NOTES.

γ. καὶ χάνευμα, as though reading ἐνεμὴν = ἐμῆν is rendered χανεύτα in 1 K. vii. 16 [3 K. vii. 4]. For interchange of ב and ג comp. iii. 15.

4. γ. ἤτοίμα. κεκαλλωπισμένα (NAQ add ἐστίν), reading (so Wo.) αἰνοίμα.

β β. ἐν σφόρασις (hammers, used to render ספור in l. [xxvii.] 23) καὶ ἱλοις. The Heb. words can scarcely have been so unfamiliar, as to lead O' to an accidental transposition of their senses. It is very possible that it may have been done purposely by them or their Heb. original, by way of conforming to the similar passage, Is. xli. 7, where מְשָׁמַר is more closely joined with the verb. That the last part of that verse in O' is verbally identical with their v. 5 here, although M.T. in the two places does not lend itself to such identity, would be almost conclusive for the above mentioned view, were it not that the omission here of θησονων αὐτὰ in NA (so in 22, 23, 26, and other MSS. and Compl.) makes us doubtful whether it is genuine.

5. om. a and β b. אֲשֶׁר. O' vacat. The remainder of the v. in O' follows v. 9.

6-8. om. b. O' vacat. On a comparison of the shorter and the longer texts in the passage vv. 4-10, the logical superiority of the former and of the Greek order (see last note) will be apparent.
9. a c. ἀργύριον τορευτόν ἐστὶν, οὐ πορεύονται, ἀργύριον προσβλητόν (ν προβ. and adds ἐστὶν) ἀπὸ Θαρσείς (ν -σις) ἥξει. A conflate rendering, the earlier part representing a text in which ἀργύριον may have been illegible. In the later part of the verse there is probably in both texts corruption such as can scarcely now be disentangled.

10. om. b. See on vv. 6–8.

12. a b. ὥς Ὠ. O' prefixes Κύριος, it may be by way of clearness, and indeed it is almost needed here in consequence of the break in the logical connexion caused by v. 11, whose subject-matter no less than its language (Aramaic) indicates that in this place at any rate it is an intruder, although its history cannot now be traced with any certainty. In li. [xxviii.] 15–19 however, where the Heb. is all but identical with vv. 12–16 here, O' also introduces the same Midrashic Κύριος without equally good reason, and that too, although there are signs that their translation there is an independent one, e.g. in v. 15 ποιαν, ἐτομάξων, συνέσει, as against ποιήσας, ἄνορθώσας, φρονήσει here.

13. om. d. ἡ χυλὸν. O' vacat, perhaps on account of the difficulty of the Heb. expression, although such a method of dealing with difficulties was somewhat rare with them (see note on p. 5). They were bolder in li. [xxviii.] 16, εἰς φωνὴν ἔθετο, rendering ἡ χυλὸν by ἓχος instead of πλήθος as here.
Critical Notes

γ. φῶς, an early error (from parallelism) for ἀνεμοῖς, which is in Compl. Ald. (this combines ἀνεμοῖς φῶς) with MSS. Q, 22, 23, 36, and others, and so SH.

14. ε. ἐχώνεσεν (ἀνοι -σων), while li. [xxviii.] 17 has -σων (but there A -σεων). Probably -σαι (ἐνό) is O's genuine text in both places. Taking into account the generally independent character of the rendering in the two passages, we need not suppose that the Heb. consonants in them differed any more than in M.T.

15. εἰς. ἐνπεπαγμένα (ἈQ ἐμπ.). Aq. here has μεμωκημένα, vain, and so O' in li. [xxviii.] 18. MS. 233 has here the erroneous reading ἐμπεπαγμένα (and so SH.).

16. om. a. Ἰσραήλ μὴ. O' vacat. Ἰσραὴλ μὴ, without Ἰ, occurs in the parallel passage li. 19. O' rendering the clause there virtually as here. In both cases theirs probably represents the genuine text. In Ps. lxxiv. 2 the words θεοὶ are found in reference to Israel. A glossator who had these words suggested to him by the passage here, may easily have written in the margin of li. those two words, and here Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ, a subsequent copyist introducing into the body of the text as much as would make sense in each case. There was no reason in either passage why O' should have objected to the words, if genuine,
while that they can have been omitted by accident in both is very improbable, in view of the independent character of the rendering (see on v. 12).

om. a. תְּרוּם. O' vacat.

17. ה. דָּוָּה. סְווִיהָאָגֵּנ, reading דָּוְיָה, and understanding it as מְדָוְיָה.

ו. מְּדָוְיָה. דְּרוֹחֵב. This may be merely a free rendering, but as there are signs that O' found a difficulty in reading the v., this word as well as others may have been somewhat hard to decipher.

ח. תַּח. יִפְּדוֹסָאֵיָיוּ יָאָו, probably expressing the sense fairly well; St Jer. less well confusionem.

ט. מְדוֹרָא (A pref. ה).

(ו.) יִפְּדוֹסָאֵיָיוּ. אֶנֶּקֶלֶקֶטוֹוֵיֶּס, as though reading יָאָו (see xxii. 7, xlviit. [xxxii.] 15). So also SH. Aq. has אֶנֶּקֶלֶקֶטוֹוֵיֶּס, Symm. אֶנֶּקֶלֶקֶטוֹוֵיֶּס, St Jer. in munitione. But M.T. may after all have been O's reading. See 2 K. [4 K.] iii. 19, where A has (in a conflate reading) הָלֶכֶט as rendering of that word.

18. ט. סְקְלִּיָּו (Aq. Symm. סְקְלִיָּו). Prob. O' read ג for ה. The root יָאָו, to be lame, though a somewhat rare one, must have been known to them as occurring Gen. xxxii. 32 [31] (ַּיָּאָו). It is also found in the 1st ptcp. Kal in Mic. iv. 6, 7 (סְקְלִיָּו), Zeph. iii. 19 (סְקְלִיָּו). In each place it bears a neuter
signification. In the present case however they seem to have read into the Kal a Hiph. sense, or one suggested by גלע, costa, crus. St Jer. seems to have found a fut. tense in O’, interpreting supplantabo.

om. d. הָאַרְמָן בִּזְסָם הָיָה. τὴν γῇν ταύτην.

For omission of 'פ ב see following notes.

4 i. ἐν ὀλίψει. The ms. was probably only so far legible as to shew to O' the root of the verb. The subsequent recovery of it however enabled Q, 22, 23, 26, and others (so SH.) to add καὶ ἐκθέλεις αὐτοὺς, while Compl. substitutes these words.

4 i. λέοντι βιβλίῳ. ὁπως εὑρεθῇ ἡ πληθυνὴ σου.

The sense of the Heb. is obscure, whether with M.T. we take the verb as active, having its object expressed, or with O' as passive. Perhaps בָּםָק, accidentally omitted, it would seem, from the text of O's Heb. ms. (for the phrase דִּבָּם הָיָה gives them no trouble in xvi. 21) was so faintly indicated on the margin that while casting about for something to complete the sense, they were able to read in the word 'מְחַל (מְחַל), suggested as actually presenting itself to their eyes in the next ν., and suitable for the meaning here also (see a somewhat similar case in notes on 7. 20). Aq. Symm. have ὅπως ἐλεγχθῶσιν, while the words ἡ πλ. σου are wanting in mss. 23, 86, and in SH. and Compl. St Jer. renders (tribulabo eos) ut inveniantur.
19. *om. c or i.* ἄνευ. νομίζοντας ᾧ may easily be an insertion suggested by iv. 31, xv. 10, or xlv. 3. Of they found the second word at all, read it as though it were ἡ; and so for the two possessive suffixes (μακάριος, καλάριος) which follow in this v. They were forced to this by not perceiving that the prophet (not the Lord, as in the previous v.) is now speaking and identifying himself with his nation. Wo. (p. 140) refers to similar changes of person in xiii. 17, xiv. 17, xlviii. 31. As he points out, personal lamentations on the part of the prophet as a rule do not appear in O. In defence of their text as the better one in that respect he adds that the formula with which xiv. 17 begins “properly introduces a divine address, and not a human lamentation.” But the argument seems to have little force. It is quite easy, with M.T., to take the words ἡ ζωή etc. as put by the Lord into the prophet’s mouth.

γ. ἄνευ. τὸ τραύμα σου (A om. σου; Q μου). M.T. can scarcely be anything but a corruption of ἄνευ. Aq. Symm. have ἀρριθμοῦ μου, and so Targ., while St Jer. and SH. have the pron. of the 2nd p.

γ. καὶ κατέλαβέν σε (AQ με), as though ἄνευ.

a c. ἐταλαντώρησε, άλητο, a conflate rendering. Ῥαλ. has already on four occasions (iv. 13, 20 bis, ix. 18 [19]) represented the Heb. root, and occurs again (xii. 12). "Ολετο may have been placed in marg. by one who had in mind its use to render 'י in xlviii. [xxxii.] 1, 15, 18, 20, xlix. [xxx.] 3, 10 [xxix. 11]. St Jer. gives no sign of being acquainted with the doublet.

κα has (for άλετο) φικτο, a verb which is used for 'י in Hos. x. 14.

δ. ιερή. αί δέρρεις σου (Q μου). The Heb. word is one which seems to have caused much perplexity to O' in the Pentateuch. In Ex. xxxv. 18 they omit the whole v.; in xxxix. 40 [20] the portion of the v. containing 'י is omitted. In Numb. iii. 26, iv. 26 O' substitutes a vague generality for the names of articles enumerated. In Numb. iii. 37, iv. 32 they render by καλος, in Is. liv. 2 by σχοινίσματα. In the present case it was treated by them as = ἀνώτατος, as suggested by the end of the v. See on v. 18 (last note).

γ. ἡ μιας ἀνήκαν καὶ τὰ πρόβατά μου οὐκ εἰσὶν

(reading ἡμιάνακ).

γ. γόνη. τόπος, reading ἧν, which is rendered by τ. in xlix. 19 [xxix. 20].

ζ. θάλαττα. τόπος. The τ may have been swallowed up by the previous 'ε, these two letters being very like each other in MSS.
21. \(\text{καὶ διεσκορπίσθησαν.} \) The inaccuracy of rendering may have arisen from obscenity in the writing of the last words. On the other hand Scholz (p. 110) attributes it to an error of ear in dictation.


[xxviii.] 34 [38] is translated by \(\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\nu\) (so Theod. here), whereas in xlix. 33 [xxx. 11] it is represented as here by στρ. This last stands for \(\text{יָנָה} \) (or \(\text{יהי} \)) in Lev. xi. 16 [15]; Deut. xiv. 15 [14], besides Is. xliii. 20; Job xxx. 29.

23. \(\text{οὐδὲ} \) αὐτὸ πορεύεται καὶ κατορθῶσει πορείαν αὐτοῦ, freely.

24. \(\epsilon\) bis. \(\piαίδευσον \) ήμᾶς, reading \(\piαίδευσι\), and similarly in the last word of the ν.

25. \(\gammaενεάς, \) but Q, 22, 23, 36, and others with Compl. and Ald. have \(\betaασιλέιας\) (probably Midrashic).

om. d. \(\text{οὐ} \) vacat, doubtless rightly, \(\betaαλα\), being obviously superfluous and forming in connexion with the following word a case of \(\delta\iota\tau\omicron\gammaραφία\) in M.T.
xi. 2. ἀκούσατε...λαλήσεις. The people as well as Jer. were to hear; he alone was to speak. Hence O' is probably right in making the second verb sing. The same result may be attained by pointing רְבָרֹתֵן. The change of יִשְׂרֶאֵל to the sing. (so Pesh. מַשְׁמַר) would be more natural than that O' and M.T. should conspire, in the case of יִשְׂרֶאֵל and יִרְאֶה respectively, in turning a sing. to a plural.

6. ἐξωθεῖν. καὶ ἐξωθεῖν. So often, e.g. xliii. [li.] 6, 9, 17, 21 ; Aq. Theod. καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξόδοις.

7. This v. and all but the last clause of the following one are absent from O'. Gi. (p. xxxii) discusses O's manner of dealing with the passages which occur (in substance) twice in M.T. In about 30 cases (see Kuenen's enumeration1) O' contains them in both places; in seven cases (exclusive of xxxix. 4—10), it omits them in one. Those seven (some however exhibiting much difference of detail) are as follows: (1) vi. 13—15 = viii. 10b—12, (2) vii. 24—26 = xi. 7, 8, (3) xv. 13, 14 = xvii. 3, 4, (4) xvi. 14, 15 = xxiii. 7, 8 (but placed by O' at the end of the chapter), (5) xxiv. 8—10 = xxix. [xxxvi.] 16—18, (6) xxx. [xxxvii.] 10, 11 = xlvii. [xxvi.] 27, 28, (7) xlviii. [xxxvii.] parts of 40, 41 = xlvi. [xxix.] 22. (I have italicized the references where O' is

found. It may be added that xxxiii. 5, 6, as compared with xxxiii. [xl.] 15, 16, is yet sufficiently distinct from it to be excluded from this list.) See also on xv. 13.

In (1) Gi. maintains that the connexion in thought appears broken by O's insertion, and that it is therefore the earlier passage, not the later, which is the gloss. This however does not seem obvious. In (2) Gi.'s account is that O', considering that the substance of these vv. had already appeared in v. 4, omitted them for the sake of shortening. It seems rash, in the absence of better evidence, to assume this. The love of amplification may just as well have led to their insertion in the Heb. at an early date. An inducement to such amplification would be found in the abruptness of the brief historical clause "but they did them not" (v. 8) inserted in the account of the message with which the prophet was charged (vv. 2 ff.).

13. מִבְּחַת לְכֵלָה. O' vacat; an obvious gloss. For comments on use of לְכֵלָה as a substitute for לְכֵלָה, as well as for O's use (frequent in Jer.) of the fem. article with the word see Dr Driver's Samuel, p. 195.

14. בְּשָׁעָת 2°. ev καιρός, as at the end of v. 12 and in ii. 27, 28).

15. μὴ πεπεσθῆναι (πεπεσθήναι)...; but very possibly both M.T. and O's original represent
corruptions of ἀναφθής suggested (so Gi.) by Irenæus's words "non enim adipes et carnes pingues auferent a te injusticias tuas."

It is true that ἶλλος is rendered in xv. 17 by εὐλαβεῖσθαι, somewhat kindred in sense to the verb employed here, but the other explanation of O's reading is more natural. If however the loss of the Ἱ be objected to (but comp. for the loss of a letter such cases as vi. 19 ἀποστροφῆς, xxii. 22 τῶν φίλαυτῶν σε, xlix. 9 [xxix. 10] ἐπιθήσουσι) we may conjecture that they saw the root Ἰλλὲν.

16. ὅρ. O' vacat. The word is rather suspicious. It does not suit its context, and may have originated in a conjecture for an obscurely written ἱπτιμα.

ὑποίλη. περιτομῆς; as though deriving from ἱπτιμα. The Heb. subst. occurs elsewhere only in Ezek. i. 24, where of the three available chief MSS. B omits (giving the v. in a very abbreviated way), while A, and (as an insertion from Theod.) Q, rendering the whole more closely, read ἤρις (τοῦ λόγου).

ἀναφθής πῦρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς (A ἐν αὐτῇ), μεγάλη ἢ θλίψει ἐπὶ σε. Here, as in
the last case but one, conflation seems to have a hand in the reading of O'. Gi. suggests ἠλευθάρα Σεφυλή, as the text represented by the second clause of the Greek, while αὐ. πῦρ entered the text later as a correction.

19. ἡ Μήδος. λογισμόν, adding πονηρόν (Q om. πον.; A adds κατὰ σου), λέγοντες Δεῦτε καὶ. These words of O' are probably (against Gi. p. xxvi) an interpolation, the last part of which may well have been suggested by xviii. 18 (bis).

γευσόμενον; probably reading γευσόμενον. For the loss of η comp. vi. 19, xlix. 9 [xxix. 10].

βλέπομαι, probably (so Cheyne ad loc. and others) an early corruption for βλέπουμαι. Comp. for this word Deut. xxxiv. 7. See specially Gen. xxx. 37, Ezek. xvii. 24, xxi. 3, in which three passages the reference, as here, is to wood.

20. ἄνθρωπος. τὸ δικαίωμα μου; but in xx. 12 τὰ ἀπολογήματά μου.

22. οἱ νεανίσκοι αὐτῶν; a pretty clear case of somewhat loose translation on O's part. It is unlikely, if we consider the subsequent context, that an original ἄνθρωπος would have been altered. Here the evidence of a paraphrase like the Targum, quoted by Gi. in favour of the pron. aff., seems scarcely worth reckoning.

23. τὰς κατοικουμένας; although in v. 21 τοὺς ἄνδρας.
xii. 3. ἔκρυβον...λαβῆνα. O' vacat; probably by an inadvertence, for the words are wanted for parallelism. ἔκρυβον is a favourite verb with J. (ii. 20, v. 5, vi. 29, x. 20, xxii. 24, xxx. 8). Of MSS. which insert the clause 22, 36 (with ast.), 88, and others (so Theod. SH. with ast.) have ἀθροισοῦν (pointing to the reading ἀκριβῶς, so translated xviii. 21), while δησπάω, διαπρήγματι and the like are elsewhere O's renderings. So Targ. (אָסְרוֹנָא), Pesh. (יִשְׁבִּית), and St Jer. (congrega).

4. καὶ πᾶς ὁ χῶρος τοῦ ἀγροῦ (A om. ὁ and τ. a.). The disagreement as to the place of the adjective suggests that it is an addition. SH. and Pesh. agree with O'.

5. παρασκευάζῃ (א -ץ). The only other occurrence of ἱερό in Taph'el is in xxii. 15, where O' has παραθύρῳ. See note there.

O's reading was ours, and they did not hesitate to insert a negative (see on ii. 31, xviii. 18). We avoid that necessity, if with Hitzig we read בֵּיתָה.

6. SH. ascribes to Symm. the rendering προσδοκάν. Doubtless (see Field) his real reading was προέδωκαν, as given in ms. 86 (and 88).
THE DOUBLE TEXT OF JEREMIAH. [XII. 6

ἐκ τῶν ὁπίων σου ἑπισυνήθησαν. O' failed (in spite of success in iv. 5) to see the force of ἑπισυνήθησαν. Vulg. plena voce. αὐτοῖς from ἄτοι, arsit, given by SH. as Symm.'s interpretation of ὁπίων was probably due (as pointed out by Bensly; see Field) to a confusion between ἐνεπρήσθησαν and ἐνεπλήσθησαν.

9. μὴ σπίλαζον υάινης (A λήστων)...; deriving from Arabic roots. There is however no reason to doubt the ordinary rendering of the M.T.

Ḥitīn (Hiph. of ḫānān). ἐλθέτωσαν (ᾼA -θάτ-); taking it as Kal (חין).

11. הַשָּׁם, ἐτέθη (AQ ἐγενήθη); reading הַשָּׁם, pass. ptcp. Targ. Pesh. Vulg. render as though הַשָּׁם, with the pl. subject of v. 10 understood.

וַתַּחְנוּ. ἀφανισμὸς ἡφανίσθη (ἕος ὁφ.); thus dividing the v. differently, and reading וַתֵּחְנוּ.

12. מְלוֹן. διεκβολήν. See on iii. 2.


13. רְעַר... σπείρατε (A ἐσπείρατε)... θερίζετε (AQ θερίσατε). The pointing of M.T. is recommended on the whole by the context. The affix of ἀρκαίκυς, which forms the only objection, is probably an early corruption of the affix of the
3rd p., owing to the verbs having been taken as imperatives. M.T.’s reading is followed by mss. 22, 33, 41, and others, SH. Vulg. Compl. Ald. This will involve taking בּ as imperative, as does O’.

οἱ κληροὶ αὐτῶν. O’ read the root יְהִלָּה, הָלָה being often (e.g. Gen. xlviii. 6) thus rendered by them. It is remarkable that Aq. (ἐκληροδοτήθησαν) and Symm. (καὶ κληρονομήσετε) took the same view.

ἀπὸ κακῆσεως ὑμῶν; reading μακρακάμον, a word which O’ renders thus on several occasions in Ezek. (xvi. 12, 17, 39, xxiii. 26, 42, xxiv. 25).

ἀπὸ οὐειδίσμου ἐναυτὶ. The two Heb. words they seem to have read חַעַבַּה, and to have inserted ἐν to soften the harshness of the combination of this word with ὑμῶν.

14. τῶν γεωτόνων. O’ shrunk from this application of the pron., as anthropomorphic. So Gi. See on xxxi. 20.

xiii. 1. διελεύσεται; a tolerably clear example of a free rendering.

7. κατάρυξα (κα-αυ) αὐτό. This looks like a mistake (for κατέκρυψα) induced by the preceding ύρυξα. SH. has in marg. ἔσχατος?

9. 10. τῷ πολλῷ ταύτῃ
Taking the first word as part of v. 10, and reading (for הלאה (והלאה). The fact that thus the adj. preceded its subst. probably gave them but little trouble. SH. follows (but with an ast.) the M.T., which is doubtless right, later in v. 10 implying the existence of הלאה.

10. O' vacat. Probably a marg. gloss, intended to follow ליבם, after the analogy of the phrase 'ליב' in five out of its eight occurrences (see note on iii. 17).


11. A תורב תורב ייש אתחבלית היי. תונ oikou ton 'Israel και πάν (رأ marg. πάντα; AQ πάντα ton) oikou Iou'da. Here SH. has preserved to us an indication of the genuine text, by placing πάντα also before the first ton ol, while marking from that πάντα to και (inclusive) with an asterisk. Thus Judah, as v. 9 of itself suggests, is alone spoken of, and M.T. and O' alike represent a more or less full gloss upon the original Hebrew.

Between this v. and v. 14 (incl.) there are many traces of slight expansion of the original.

12. δεκτ. See on xlviii. 12 for the more accurate rendering κεράμια (corrupted to κέρατα).
14. καὶ διασκορπιῶν αὐτοῦς. This loose rendering of the Heb. root is consequential upon the inaccuracy referred to above.

16. καὶ ἐκεῖ (ῥήτορος). The affix refers to ἅγιος, which is fem. also in Job xxxvi. 32.

17. ἢ πυρπή ὑμῶν (thus even Aq.); so later ἤτοι. ὁ ὀφθαλμός ὑμῶν. The M.T. however is preferable, the pron. having perhaps been altered (see v. 14 “saith the Lord”) from fear of anthropomorphism. Comp. other cases in note on xxxi. 20.

18. ὅταν. O’ vacat. The verb occurs here only. This fact, emphasized by its absences from the similar passages in this context (where, as here, ἤτοι, ὅταν, ὅταν, and ὅταν are combined) may have induced the omission.

19. συνετρίβη (νῆσσα).

18. καὶ τοῖς δυναστεύουσιν (ἰδιοφήρει). The special sense of the word had been forgotten, as is shewn also by O’s rendering in 1 K. xv. 13 (ἡγούμενον); 2 Chr. xv. 16 (apparently λειτουργούσαν). For a concrete rendering of a noun read by them as an abstract see on xxiv. 5.

20. ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς (AQ ἡς κ.) ὑμῶν (μὲν) (μὲ σκληρώς). O’ is probably right, the subst. in M.T. expressing the place of the head (as
in Gen. xxviii. 11; 1 Sam. xix. 16, xxvi. 7), rather than the head itself.

19. ἀποκαίνω τελέιαν. Read, as in Am. i. 6, the 'י ה of M.T. arising from dittography of the ה ו of יגלה under the influence of the previous יגלה.

20. ἤσινες. (A τοὺς) ὀφθαλμοὺς σου. The M.T. is probably a slip, owing to the plural sense of the reference.

Ἰεροῦσαλήμ; an insertion (suggested by v. 27) to explain (so Gi.) the reference in the imperatives. The sing. number doubtless (rather than the קְרִי) represents the original.

21. μαθήματα (A μαθητάς); thus giving the Aramaic sense of the root, found once (Prov. xxii. 25) in M.T.

25. τοῦ ἀπεθανέων ἀναστάς (פָּרָצ). xiv. 3. בַּשְּׁל. O' vacat; perhaps an amplification in M.T.; yet, if so, it is strange that so unusual a word as בַּשְּׁל should occur. Thus it is more likely that the eye of the scribe passed accidentally from רָאוֹה to רָקִים.

4. נַעֲרָה. O' vacat.

6. νάπας. See on iii. 2. נַעֲרָה. O' vacat.
7. 

8. 

9. 

10. 

11. 

12. 

13. 

14. 

15. 

16. 

The clauses are found in Hos. viii. 13.

καὶ ὁ ἄντων. See on vi. 19.

σοῦ, δεῖ (Q om. δεῖ) σοι. έναν.

σοῦ, a marg. gloss, demanded, when it entered the text, the introduction of δεῖ for the sense.

καὶ ὡς αὐτὸχθων (κράνος).

(νεβέλιο).

O’ vacat (Aq. Theod. καὶ ἐπισκέψεται ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν). The clauses are found in Hos. viii. 13.

καὶ προσκέφαλος. See on viii. 5.

'Εν θανάτῳ νοσερώ ἀποθανοῦνται καὶ ἐν λιμῷ συντελεσθήσονται. Aq. Theod. have (for the whole of the above) ἐν ὑμνοισά καὶ λιμῷ τελευτήσουσιν. The first four words of O’ are apparently taken from xvi. 4 (μεσοτίθαι καί ἀλωνίς Ματθ., while, whether owing to their insertion or not, the Greek for μεσοτίθα, which is doubtless genuine, disappeared early.

καὶ εἴσονται (καί, easily corrupted in such a context).
17. τινί. ἐπὶ (O ἐπὶ τοὺς) ὄφθαλμον ὑμῶν. See on x. 19 for change of person.

For other instances of this construction see on v. 24.

18. οἱ προφήται ἡμῶν. i.e. ἡμῶν καὶ προφήτης. For the inversion of order see on vi. 13.

The notion of wandering to and fro, or trading, which belongs to this verb (e.g. Gen. xxxiv. 10, 21) seems here inappropriate. Hence Gi. suggests that we substitute ἢ for ὢ (for ὢ θρή see on ii. 18), taking the root in the sense of sinking (to the earth) in mourning garb.

19. ἀνέστη. See on xxxi. [xxxviii.] 32.

ὑπεμένωμεν; thus rendering more successfully than in viii. 15.

ταραχῇ. See on viii. 15.

21. μὴ ἀπολέσῃς. Gi. (p. xx) suggests with some probability that this rendering was influenced by the meaning of the somewhat similar root ἄπλην. It is remarkable on the other hand that the verb ἄπλην (which does not however happen to occur in Jer.) is never so rendered by O'. Thus it is after all very possible that O' here read ἀπλησθήσομεν.

xv. 1. πρὸς αὐτοῖς. Spohn's
conjecture (ad loc.) that the words τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον were removed from this place (αὐτῶν being substituted) and were inserted in the next clause, so that Moses and Samuel should become the objects of the preposition, involves a most improbable procedure on the part of an early editor or copyist. On the other hand if we take O's reading, as above, to be the genuine one, then a Heb. copyist, hesitating to admit that such persons as M. and S. could under any circumstances fail to obtain a hearing, would most naturally place his emendation (אלא וה הוא) in the margin. The words, which may well have been in the actual MS. used by the translator, met with varying treatment. In the Greek version they were made to belong to the later clause, while in the Heb., as represented by M.T., they took the place of an original לְלָשׁוֹן

6. נֶלְלָשׁוֹן הָעִירָה. καὶ υἱὲς ἀνήγοροι αὐτῶν; reading (נוה חמה), perhaps from fear of anthropomorphism. The Vulg. is remarkably inaccurate, laboravi rogans.

7. הָאָרֶץ. λαοῦ μου. Throughout the rest of the ν. also the rendering of O' is exceedingly loose. מַחְכִּיתָם לְאָלֶ֖א שָׁבָֽעַ. διὰ τὰς κακίας αὐτῶν; very freely.

8. וֹאֶרֶץ בָּֽרָא. τρόμον καὶ σπουδὴν. So in
R.V. "anguish and terrors," correcting A.V. "terrors upon the city." For ר"ע see on xlvi. 7, and for ה"ב on viii. 15.

10. אֶפֶלַהַס, אֶפֶלַהַס (Vulg. foeneravi, foeneravit), a corruption as early as Philo (who however reads -σαυ, De Confus. Ling. § 12 of the Tauchnitz ed., i. 411 of Mangey's, London, 1742. See Dr Ryle's Philo, p. 298 f.), for אֶפֶלַהַס, -σευ, the verb, which renders י in Deut. xv. 2; Is. xxiv. 2. Origen (in Jerem. Hom. xi. 3, § 3) says that the majority of the MSS. have אֶפֶל. but the most accurate and most in accord with the Heb. אֶפֶל.

בָּלָה (בֵּלָה מִשְׁפָּלָבּ). (So Baer and Delitzsch.) ἡ ἰσχύς μου ἔξελισθεν εν τοις καταρωμένοις με. See viii. 6, xx. 7 for the unwillingness of O' to put an affix to בָּלָה. Here they read בָּלָה, while for the nom. which they supply see next note. As regards מֶלך, a form so anomalous grammatically is extremely suspicious. Therefore we should probably read (with Gi.) בָּלָה מִשְׁפָּלָבּ.

11. מָסָא. The almost invariable form (xlvi. 25 is the only exception) is מָסָא בָּלָה. We trace its existence here (as Gi. points out) in O's ἡ ἰσχύς μου (בָּלָה) in the last clause of v. 10.

γένοιτο (γένοιτο). אֲבֵלָה אֶפֶלַהַס (אֶפֶלַהַס). κατευθυνόντων αὐτῶν. We can scarcely determine O's
reading of the word שָׁא לַע. They probably took to be a strong asseveration. Vulg. has "si non reliquiae tuae (in bonum)," understanding the word as שָׁא לַע = שָׁא לַע. So Targ. with Aq., but Pesh. has ל. The 'כ is doubtful in sense, שָׁא לַע, שָׁא לַע, thy deliverance, from שָׁא, or שָׁא, I have been hostile to thee, from שָׁא. There has probably been considerable corruption in the v. One of the two expressions introduced by בֵּית may well have stood earlier, while with O' לַע לַע comes immediately before שָׁא לַע.

12. ἐὰν Ἰωσήφησεν; reading ἦ for ἐ. It is remarkable that the Vulg. Numquid foecederabunt? is supported by Aq. (μὴ ἁμομοίη), who thus would read the word ᾱρέα, fut. Niph. of ᾱρέα. O' evidently were hopelessly confused over the v. They omit one בֵּית, read apparently יִפוּא (which in Numb. xvii. 3, 4 [xvi. 38, 39] they render περίθεμα) for מִן, and end the sentence with the first word of v. 13.


לא יִ indexPath. The parallel text preserves the genuine יִIndexPath (without לא). The
early corruption of this word involved the prefixing of a negative; so Aq. Targ. Vulg. ("gratis").

It is not needful to assume that of xvii. 3 was the original reading here also. As Gi. points out, all the versions agree so far as . The conjunction and the doubtless are accretions, to which accordingly the testimony outside M.T. and O' is more slender.

The v. is an important one, as bearing on the treatment of duplicate passages by O'. See on xi. 7. In the seven cases there enumerated in which such duplicates appear but once in O', it is always (taking O's order) on the second occasion that the passage is lacking. This seems hardly the result of accident. It is open to us to suppose that O' omitted either (a) because on each of the second occasions the passage was unknown to them, or (b) because they saw no need of giving it a second time. But against (a) we have just seen that the present passage is pretty clearly genuine in its second occurrence (xvii. 3), and hereby therefore disposes us in favour of (b). We are thus left free in these cases to consider on its merits the M.T. of both the earlier and later passage. Further, the corruption of a text such as this (whether we regard it as a very early interpolation from xvii. 3, or as a genuine part of the
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Book,) in despite of the neighbourhood of the uncorrupted text, testifies alike to the carelessness of the Book's guardians during some portion of its sojourn in Egypt, and to the faithfulness, even though not wholly according to knowledge, of the Greek translators in refusing to make the obvious change suggested by the parallel passage.

14. ἵνα ὁ ἄνθρωπος σε. Here, as in xvii. 4, the should be restored. Possibly a contracted mode of writing may account for the absence of the pron. affix which appears in the parallel place. In the later part of the v. it seems rash in the face of so many instances in which a verb occurs in the same voice with a trans. and an intrans. meaning, to assume with Gi. on the strength of Deut. xxxii. 22 that ἡρῴα should be used to correct in the parallel v.

15. εὐφραίων. O vacat. It is hard to suppose that they would have omitted words so simple and obvious in their relation with the context. May they not be a gloss, intended as a melancholy comment in the light of history on the of v. 14? on the other hand may easily be a case where O omits from perplexity as to the sense of the clause.

16. καὶ ὥσπερ τῶν ἀδετοῦντων; reading . Comp. 1 Sam. ii. 17. See Wo.'s somewhat
unconvincing defence (p. 259) of O's rendering of this v.

17. ἀλλὰ εὐλαβοῦμην. It is noteworthy that while O also mistook this verb in xi. 15 (διαφέυξη), and li. [xxviii.] 39 (καρωθῶσιν), they were more successful in l. [xxvii.] 11 (κατεκανχάσθε).

18. οἱ λυποῦντές με (†�行) koivousoin mou (†�行). Comp. the rendering of this word in viii. 5.

στεθα. The Heb. was evidently unfamiliar to O. Their attempt here however is good in comparison with that in xvii. 9.

xvi. 1, 2. O omits v. 1, but inserts 2 [1] (after γυναῖκα) λέγει Κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ. Thus with them the prophecy has the air of a fragment, of which the commencement has been lost, and which was subsequently altered for the sake of harmonizing with the form of M.T.

4. ἐις παράδειγμα. See on viii. 2.

πεσοῦνται suggests that either formed part of the original text, or more probably was a marg. variant for ἔλθε.

5. נאמ...ויה. O vacat. The Heb. is clearly an addition by way of comment on the unusual expression 'ס ה' כנא.
7. קֹלֶה. ἀργὸς (לְתִּן); rightly, as both the parallelism and Is. lviii. 7 shew. St Jer. seems to have read both ("inter eos...panem") and certainly the former words improve the sense. See Schwally, Leben nach dem Tode, Giessen, 1892, p. 22, quoted by Cor. (p. 58). The corruption in M.T. might arise through the influence of the repeated לְתִּן in v. 6.

יוֹנֵחַ. ἐν πένθει αὐτῶν. The pron. which M.T. attaches to the next word points rather to the reading יִכְלָל, to the existence of which however the Vulg. ("lugenti") alone testifies.

יוֹנֵחַ. εἰς παράκλησιν; thus rightly omitting the pronoun.

יוֹנֵחַ. αὐτῶν; probably rightly. The corruption in the Heb. would be a natural result of that of לְתִּן in the previous clause.

12. ἡραστα. τῶν ἀντιστῶν (Aεραστ.) See on iii. 17.

13. νομὸς Λεύδης. O' vacat.

14, 15. See on xi. 7, xv. 13, xxiii. 7, 8. Cor. (p. 65) considers the verses to form an authentic passage, but to be absolutely inappropriate here. For his proposal with regard to them see on xxxiii. 14—26.

17. נָשׁ הַמְאָרִים קַלִּים. O' vacat.

18. רָאוּתָהּ מְשָׁלֶה. διὰ πάσας, but BחאAQ
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dιπλᾶς. The first Heb. word seems to have been inserted in reference to the promise of vv. 14, 15. The second may be a reminiscence of Is. xl. 2, although the expression there is בְּעָל.

ἐπλημμέλησαν, a very possible corruption for ἐπλήσαν. See the latter verb in xix. 4.

19. Ως ψευδῆ (πραξεῖ); an example of O's tendency to disregard a weak letter like η. See on vii. 10.

xvii. 1, 2. O' vacat. St Jer.'s suggestion (Comm. in loco) that the Greek translators omitted the passage "ne scilicet aeterna in eos sententia permaneret" may well be accepted as correct. But see next note.

3, 4. O' vacat. See on xv. 13, 14. Cor. however (p. 59) thinks it probable that the omission of verses 1—4 here was caused by the scribe's eye wandering from הַיָּהָה of xvi. 21 to the same word in xvii. 5.

4. Perles¹ (p. 41) mentions the conjectural emendation הַשֶּׁבֶת וְהָנַךְ, which is ingenious, but leaves the meaning rather forced. No such objection attaches to his (p. 40) excellent הָהָה instead of הַרְחֵבָה in ii. 10.

5. καὶ στηρίσει σάρκα βραχίων αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῶν. This rendering indicates a

¹ Analecten s. Text-critik d. A. T., Munich, 1895.
certain lack of intelligence. They read יְהַנֵּא and referred it to the man who looks to another as more powerful, whereas the word clearly refers to the latter. Hence they had to insert ἐπ' αὐτῶν for the sake of the sense. Wo.'s defence of O's text (p. 87) is unsatisfactory.

8. יְהַנֵּא. φοβηθήσεται; following יְהַנֵּא, and rightly, as the parallel יְהַנֵּא shews. יְהַנֵּא is an adaptation to v. 6. So Vulg. timebit.

9. βασίλεια (א βασιλεία; MSS. 22, 36, and others βασίλεια). Vulg. has "pravum."

אָבָא. καὶ ἀνθρωπος. So in v. 16 and Is. xvii.

11. For another rendering see on xv. 18.

11. אָבָא. ἐφώνησεν πέρδικα; a conflate rendering. So Pesh. Rabbinic interpreters incline to the meaning heron. Gi. is unwilling to decide, rendering simply "ein Vogel."

The parallelism of the v. supports Gi.'s interpretation of the sentence. 'He that acquireth riches, but not by right, is a bird that guardeth those which she hath not borne (hatched).’ In Wo.'s discussion of the passage (p. 254) he seems to see no difficulty in his assumption of the loss of one אָבָא from the Heb. text.

12. יְהַנֵּא פִּיךְ. O' vacat, owing probably to homoiooteleuton. It is difficult to conceive the words to have been inserted as an expansion of the
Heb. They were read by Aq. Symm. SH. Pesh. Vulg. ("a principio, locus").

13. ἀφεστηκότες ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς γραφήτωσαν. We want ἀπὸ τῆς γης, and the Vulg. (Clem.) has indeed recedentes a te, but Cod. Amiat. omits a te. Ewald (quoted by Cor. p. 68) emends to ἀπὸ τῆς, and continues ἀπὸ τῆς, thus getting rid of an awkward figure, and at the same time improving the parallelism.

The omission of οἴδατος (found in the rendering of the same words in ii. 13) can only be ascribed to an early error. The corresponding Heb. word is essential to the passage.

16. μὴ ἀπεφεύγῃς ἐκποίησα κατακολουθών ὡσὶν σου. O's Heb. seems to have been the same as ours. Puzzled however by μή ἀπεφεύγῃς, but perhaps understanding it in the sense of feeding after thee, i.e. following thee as a sheep its shepherd, they rendered somewhat loosely. On the other hand, if we point μὴ ἀπεφεύγῃς, we improve the parallelism of the ν. So Aq. Pesh. Aq. renders ἐκποίησα (? ἀπεφεύγῃς).

17. μὴ ἔλθῃς φειδόμενός μου; taking it to be from the root μαθαίνω.

20. ἀκούσατε. O' vacat, but B[α] have ἀκούσατε.
21. καὶ μὴ ἐκπορεύεσθε. This appears to be a very early corruption, although there is no variant surviving. It evidently arose from some confusion with the similar collocation of words in v. 27. The same verb is rendered by ἐισφέρεσθε in v. 24. So here the Compl. has ἐισφέρητε.

23. ὑπὲρ τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν; an addition suggested by vii. 26. See however Wo. (p. 81) for another view.

24. ἐὰν εἰσακούσῃ (A ἄκουσ.; Q ἄκοψ. ἄκουσ.). The ἕθη, when viewed in the light of the facts commented upon in the note on iii. 1, would appear not to have been found by O’ in their Heb. text. Deut. xxviii. 1 or Zech. vi. 15 may have suggested its insertion here.

25. καὶ ἀρχοντες; interesting as a virtually certain example of a pre-septuagintal insertion in the Heb. text. Its spuriousness is shewn by ἑτέρος which follows. It has been suggested by parallel passages (ii. 26, xxv. 18, xxxii. 32, xliv. 17, 21), but has not been inserted in xiii. 13, xxii. 4.

26. καὶ ὑσίαν καὶ θυμιάματα καὶ μίννα. The first two substantives give us a conflate rendering. 'γ, although translated θυσ. i S. ii. 29, iii. 14; 2 K. x. 24 (in A), is yet ordinarily represented by θυσ., which accordingly found its
way into the text. *Márra* is meant as a transliteration of the Heb. (comp. viii. 7). St Jer. however (*Comm. in loco*) corrects the spelling to *µavád*. So here and in xli. [xlvii] 5 MSS. 22, 33, and others.

27. אָמִּפְפוֹד. See on vi. 5.

xviii. 2. ἀκούσθητω. It is noteworthy that while the Vulg. has *audies*, the Pesh. on the other hand follows M.T. O' however may have read the word as we do. Comp. in iv. 5 ἀκούσθητω, and similarly in iv. 15. In Deut. iv. 10; 1 Sam. ix. 27 the Hiph. of this verb is similarly rendered. Comp. xix. 9.

4. בַּחַר בְּאֶרֶז הַיִּנְתֵּר. *ἐν ταῖς ξεραίν αὐτοῦ*; reading בְּאֶרֶז, doubtless rightly. בְּאֶרֶז was an explanatory gloss, and its admission to the text drew with it, through the influence of the wording of v. 6, the addition of בַּחַר, which however Baer and Del. (see their *Adnot. crit. ad loc.*) read, as above, בַּחַר. So Aq. Theod. Vulg. ("e luto").

αὐτοῦ. See preceding note. The tendency to amplification in this context is specially illustrated in vv. 6, 8.

7. בֵּלֵבְתֶּה. O' *vacat*. See on i. 10.

8. אֵשׁ בֵּבְתֶּה עָלִיוֹ. O' *vacat*. The clause was inserted for the sake of parallelism. So Gi.
12. ἀνδρωύμεθα. See on ii. 25.

מרחשנה. For comment on O’s rendering see on vi. 19.

mploy. See on iii. 17.

14. The point of the v. seems to be to contrast the steadfastness of the snow and the springs of water with the fickleness of the people. Its obscurity however has caused much perplexity to translators. ἀπὸ πέτρας μαστοὶ (πέτροι), which Wo. (p. 261) renders “(Shall) protruberances (depart) from rocks?” an explanation however which appears to stagger even so uncompromising a defender of O’s text. See Field for Aq. ἀπὸ στέρεου ἴκανοù (στέρεος, the Almighty); Symm. πέτρας μαστῶν (so Pesh.). Cor.’s suggestions (p. 50) are good. See his whole note.

ὃς ἐκελευεῖ (ὡς ἐκκλίνη); reading ἐκκλινα, a root found in this sense in Is. xix. 5.

ἵππος βιάσως ἀνεμφ φερομένον. For ὅτι (supported by Aq. Symm. Pesh.) ὅτι (proud, occurring in xliii. 2) is one conjecture. Again in favour of considering O’ to have read γ for ἦ is the fact that ὅτι is rendered similarly by them in Is. lxi. 19. For the other
words they appear to have read רֶפֶם and פֶּתֶם (Ve). Best of all however is Perles’ view (l.c. p. 29) that O’ read רֶפֶם and understood it as a contracted form of רֶפֶם. (He compares for a somewhat similar mistake Ps. xi. 6 פֶּתֶם for פֶּתֶם.) The Targ. accordingly here, as he points out, renders וַיְרָשׁ הָיוֹם, translating in Ps. lxxvii. 18 by פֶּתֶם. See further in his note.

Cor. (p. 50) ventures to restore מִן מָ, מִנֵּא רא, פֶּתֶם מִּנֵּא. He compares for רא (the Mediterranean) Deut. xi. 24 and other passages, in all of which however the words have the article.

15. καὶ ἀσθένησουσιν (וְיקָלִישָׁא). So Symm. omits the suffix, as well as Pesh. and Vulg. (“impingentes”).

17. וַיִּהְיֶה הָלָּאֲפָנִים צָרָאָם בֵּיתוֹ צָרָאָם. The first words of the Heb. are unlikely to be an insertion from xxxii. 33, inasmuch as there they refer to the people, here to God. O’ therefore probably omitted them as anthropomorphic. The reading of צָרָאָם as Καλ changed the construction of בֵּיתוֹ from an accus. case to an abl. of time and hence induced the prefixing of ב.

18. καὶ ἰκουσόμεθα. Gi., al-
though no blind defender of O', thinks that here they may be right, the clause then meaning *Let us take hold of his words*. It is however more than doubtful whether usage will warrant any other meaning than *hearken* in a favourable sense. For the variants caused by O's insertion or omission of the negative see references given on ii. 31; see also on iv. 1, xxiii. 32, xxxi. 37, xxxvi. 25, xlix. 21, li. 3, 58.

19. "τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ δικαιώματός μου." The parallelism of the clauses supports O'. The first ' of 'ί may easily have arisen as an accidental addition to the preceding word.

20. ἦσασθαι. *συνελάλησαν ῥήματα* (deriving ῥ from ἤςιν); a Midrashic rendering (for O's treatment of ἦσασθαι in this Book see on ii. 6), which is followed by an alternative gloss (arising from disapproval of the extreme freedom of that rendering), viz. καὶ τὴν κόλασιν αὐτῶν ἐκρυψάν μοι. Its form may have been suggested by the last words of v. 22. Gi. (ad loc.; see also his p. xxv) goes so far as to make the Heb. clause itself a later addition, pointing out that in v. 22 it is differently rendered (ἐνεκείρησαν λόγον). Wo.'s defence of O' as it stands (p. 87) is quite inconclusive.

21. ἐνέργως. καὶ ἄθροισον αὐτούς; as though it were ἐνέργως. For this treatment of & see on vii. 10, xliii. 2.
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23. "εν στέφεια αὐτῶν; reading μεσλαμιν.

xix. 2. ἂν ὁ πολυάνδριον. See on ii. 23.

 văn τῶν τέκνων αὐτῶν; reading (so Wo.)

3. καὶ ἄνδρες Ἰουδα was suggested by xvii. 20,
while καὶ οἱ εἰσὶ...ταύταις was suggested by xvii.
20 or by xxii. 2. Conversely, for a similar insertion
in M.T. comp. vii. 2 with note.

4. ἐπλησαν. The conjunction has
dimed in, owing to ἐπλησαν being taken as part of
the preceding enumeration, and not as the subject
of this verb.

5—7. Comp. notes on vii. 31—33. There is
also a strong resemblance between ν. 5 and xxxii.
[xxxix.] 35.

5. ἡλαθὼν λέγει. O' vacat. For ὁ λέγει xxxii. 35
has ἡλαθὼν. ἡλαθὼν is not elsewhere used in reference
to the worship of Molech. This fact supports O' here.

6. λάβει. O' vacat (AQ οὐδὲ ἐλάλησα). The
words do not occur in vii. 31.

οὐδὲ διενοήθην ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. See on vii. 31.

7. καὶ σφάξον (Q κατασφάξετο); a
strange rendering, if genuine. St Jer. makes no comment, translating *Et dissipabo*. Spohn conjectures σπαράξω as O’s original rendering, pointing out that they represent the Heb. verb in Nah. ii. 3 (comp. v. 11) by ἐκτινάσσειν.

8. καὶ κατάξω; so BN, but AQ have καὶ τάξω, of which the other is a corruption.


9. καὶ ἐδονται. For the rendering, as though of Kal, comp. note on xviii. 2.

καὶ Ἇβα. O’ *vacat*. The words are probably repeated from v. 7. The expression is a frequent one in this Book (xxi. 7, etc.).

10. See on iii. 22.

קניא...לכינא. O’ *vacat*. The absence of connexion shews the clause to be an insertion borrowed in substance from vii. 32.

11. τοῦ δοθῶν. The 1 is an accidental repetition of the previous letter.

12. ἡλίθι. ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκαθαρσίων αὐτῶν. In M.T. this must refer *attributively* to יִת. But we want it as a predicate. If for this purpose we attach the נ to the end of the previous word, thus reading, as in Is. xxx. 33, יִת, the objection remains that יִת should occur earlier in the v., whereas O’ bears testimony at least to the present

position of the word. Cor. therefore, who argues (p. 69) as above, and Gi. decide (though the former somewhat doubtfully) for וְלָשָׁנָה (agreeing with לְשׁוֹנָה).

וְלָשָׁנָה. kai ἐσπευσαν, reading, as in xxxii. [xxxix.] 29, וְלָשָׁנָה

xx. 2. וְלָשָׁנָה. kai ἐπίστατεν αὐτὸν (ὕπερ; comp. xxvi. 23).

בְּנֵית. oικον ἀποτεταγμένον. According to Gi. O' read the word as though בְּנֵית. At any rate they connected the last part with the root מָשָׁה.

3. וְלָשָׁנָה. O' vacat.

מֵנָו. Μέτοικον; taking the other meaning of the root מָשָׁה. It is remarkable that while Aq. (see St Jer. ad loc.) did the same in his 2nd ed. ("peregrinum"), in his 1st ed. he strangely took it as "circumspicientem."

4. וְלָשָׁנָה. eis μετοικίαν. See previous note.

וְלָשָׁנָה. kai σὲ καὶ πάντα Ἰούδα; reading (not the startling Heb. which J. F. Schleusner adopts from Cappellus לְשׁוֹנָה, but) לְשׁוֹנָה, the accidental repetition of the four letters bringing about the loss of one of the groups.
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5. *O' vacat.*

6. *O' vacat.*

7. *O' vacat.*

8. *O' vacat.*

7. διεσέλθα; refusing to accept the combination of ἦλθεν with a pronoun. See on viii. 6, xv. 10.

8. πικρό λόγῳ μον (προ) γελάσωμαι; taking the verb in the sense of χαίρειν.


9. καὶ χλευασμὸν (κ αἰς χλεύασμα, ΑQ eis -μόν). So Να ART in Ps. xliiv. [xliii.] 14. is not found outside the two passages, (ἐπισανγμὼ) occurring Ezek. xxii. 4.

9. Οὐ μὴ ὄνομάσω (Q ins. έτι) τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου; Midrashic.

9. *O' vacat.*

9. φλέγων; MSS. 23, 26, and others φλεγό- 

9. μενον and so SH. A conflate rendering is given by mss. 22, 36, and others, φλεγόμενον καὶ συνεχό-

9. μενον.
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πάντωθεν; as though from ἐλλά
καὶ οὐ δύναμαι φέρειν.
10. συναθροίζομεν. They seem to connect with the unused μαρτυρία, to bind, collect.

'Επισυνηθίσε καὶ ἐπισυνηθίσαμεν.
The root suggested to them πάροι, a troop. Comp. σύντρεμμα as their rendering of this last word in 2 Sam. iv. 2; 1 K. xi. 24 (in A). This seems much preferable to Gi.'s view (p. xxii), that they may have seen the root πνέομαι.

τὴν ἐπινοεῖν αὐτοῦ; apparently to be explained as a very free rendering. The subst. ἐπισύνηθισε does not occur elsewhere in the O.T., except in the Apocryphal Books. The verb ἐπινοεῖν renders ἱππαίρεσις in Job iv. 18.

11. καὶ νοησαι οὐκ ἠδύνασθο; reading ἠδύνασθο, through the influence of the following ἠδύνασθο. For a misreading produced by a neighbouring influence of this kind see note on lii. 21 (κύκλῳ). So we may explain Is. xxxiv. 14, where ὅνοκένταυροι, used to render ἄπαντα, represents also ἄπαντα in the next line.

16. ἡμῖν. O' adds ἐν θυμῷ.

17. μετά. ἐν μῆτρᾳ (AQ add μητρός). א and ב were easily confused. See on iii. 4. See also xiv. 19 (ἅπαν, ἀπὸ Σιὼν), xvi. 4 (ἐν θανάτῳ),
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xxv. 9 (καὶ ἐξερημώσον αὐτοῦ), xxxviii. [xliv.] 24 (ἐκ τῶν λόγων), xlvi. [xxvi.] 10 (ἐν, ἀπὸ γῆς), 25 (ἐν, τὸν νῦν αὐτῆς), xlviii. [xxxi.] 32 (ἐν, ὡς κλαυθμόν), li. [xxviii.] 20 (ἐν, ἐκ σοῦ), lxi. 12 (ἐν).

18. ἵνα τι τοῦτο. The readiness to translate so very Hebraic an idiom may serve to indicate the vitality of Heb. turns of language among even the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria.

xxi. 2. Ο’ vacat.

3. Ἰερήμια. O’ adds βασιλεία Ἰουδα (Q om.); not so Targ. Vulg. SH. The Pesh. has simply פלך.

4. Μάλη εἰρήνα. O’ vacat, while Aq. Symm. Theod. have the words. Symm. has the words פִּירָמָה, which follow.

O’ vacat. Aq. Symm. Theod. have the words.

5. O’ vacat. Symm. has the words. Of these four groups of words it is specially unlikely that the last would have been omitted by O’, had they found it in their Heb. text. Again, if we admit the second and third to be later insertions in M.T., the ἵνα read without these additions, brings sufficiently near to ἱλαρία to avoid any suspicious harshness.
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5. ἀποθέω. krateiφ. But║ prefixe[s ὑψηλαφ, and so text of SH. St Jer. (in Comm.) has "forti" but adds "sive excelso." O' renders by ὑψ. in Exod. vi. 1, xxxii. 11, but almost every-where else has kρατ. or ἰσχυρός.

O' vacat (AQ in fine καὶ παροργίσαν τὸ μεγάλου).

7. άστραδισμ. O' om. 1. The omission makes the language to harmonize better with such pas-sages as viii. 3, xxiv. 8.

בֵּיר נבוצ ב', 1 O' vacat; an insertion from one of the following, xxvii. 36, xxxii. 28, xlv. 30 (in xxix. 21 נב' is probably a gloss).

בֵּיר 2Ø. O' vacat; against the testimony of similar expressions, e.g. xix. 7.

καὶ κατακόψαν αὐτῶν (ὁμβής).

λείναι. oυ φείσομαι. As Gi. points out, O' having read the previous verb in the pl., would have here read the existing M.T. in the same number. Thus they must have had ἵσαμεν ὁν', readings which are supported by xiii. 14. The corruption in the Hebr. was obviously induced by reading ἱδὼν, a change which itself arose from the intrusion of ἰδων ὁν', ὑπελ. See above.

9. יבּרִי. O' vacat; a frequent insertion. See on xxxviii. [xlv.] 2.
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10. Ο' vacat.

11. In the first clause understand ἂν ήταν from v. 8. The construction baffled O'. See p. 5, note 2.

12. καὶ κατευθύνατε, καὶ ἐξέλησθε. It is unlikely, in the face of the parallel passage, xxii. 3, that such a word as ἄφθαρτος has fallen out of the text. Rather, καὶ κατ. is a gloss on the words which follow.

ἀναφθά; reading ἄναφθά. Comp. ix. 11 [12], xi. 16, xvii. 27, 1. [xxvii.] 32.

Ο' vacat; an insertion from iv. 4, with which Κρ here agrees.

13. Σόρ. The word has been very variously translated (Aq. 1st ed. ? στέρεα, 2nd ed. Τύρος, Symm. πέτρα, Theod. συνεχομένη), probably owing in part to the obscurity of the reference. In xviii.

14 Ο' seems to have had no difficulty in rendering by πέτρα.

πτοησε; so Vulg. percutiat, taking it as Hiph. from יкова instead of Kal from ברו.

14. Ο' vacat.

xxii. 1. Ορ. Πορεύου καὶ κατάβησθι; probably
a combination of the original and an amended rendering.

2. καὶ ὁ οἶκος σου. καὶ ὁ ἡμείς prefixes καὶ οἱ παιδεῖς, and Q replaces ὁ οἶκος by οἱ π. Thus π. was probably the original word, with οἰκ. substituted. Cheyne (Pulpit Comm. ad loc.) however (from whose note it is not gathered that the combination “and thy servants and thy house” is at the best extremely doubtful) connects the οἰκ. with that of xxii. 11, 12.

4. αὐτοί (αὐτοὶ) κτλ. So Vulg. The pl. was suggested by xvii. 25, where see note.

5. ποιήσατε; through the influence of this verb in v. 4.

6. κατοικηθησόμενας (κατοικηθησόμενας). Mich. conjectures γῆρα, a bare floor (for γῆρα) in support of γῆ.

7. καὶ ἐπάξω (A eis.); Midrashic.

8. MSS. 22, 48, and others have κ. ἀγιάσω; so text of SH. In li. [xxviii.] 28 a different account (see note there) is probably to be given of the rendering of γῆ.

10. τοῦ τεθυμκότα. The passage xvi. 5 ff. seems responsible for M.T.’s omission of the article, which is here clearly wanted, as referring to Josiah.

12. μετάκισα (Q -σαν); so Vulg. trans.-
tuli. The Greek is however probably an early error for -σαν, which was read by SH. (So Compl.)
13. ὁ. O' vacat (AQ ὁ). Ω followed by OO might easily fall out. It is however very possible, as Perles says (l.c. p. 17), that O' may have read ἡ μάρτυς ὡς as ἡ μάρτυς ὡς ἡ μάρτυς.

14. ἐγερθέν. φίκοδόμησας. The repeated change of persons in this and the next v., though consonant with Heb. idiom, is reduced by O' to uniformity (φίκοδ....μη βασιλεύσεσι;).

15. Παντρέας. παροξύνη (Q παρωξύνθη). See on xii. 5. Here, as in that passage, the verb needs an object. Accordingly we must make the clause end with ἠλίμη.

ἐν Ἀχάτ, but A has Ἀχαῖ (and so Arabic. Comp. i K. xxii. 39), as though reading Ἀχαῖ. Cor. (p. 62) suggests that this was written without the second Ν (comp. v. 23 Ἐναντίον), and then was corrupted through ἠλίμη of v. 14. In the remainder of this v. and in the next O' evidently were hopelessly at fault.

16. οὐκ ἐγνωσαν at the beginning looks like the translation of a marg. Heb. gloss on the last clause of the v. Why should the words which Gi. conjectures as their “viell. ursprünglich” original, viz. ἦν ἱερό, have been lost?

17. οὐκ εἰσίν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ σου oide ἡ καρδία σου. O' adds καλη, thus injuring the force of the sentence.
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avra. φόνον. SH. read πόνον. Vulg. has cursum. Comp. the Greek in xxiii. 10.

18. άνθρωπος. O’ adds Καὶ (AQ Οὐαλ) ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. O’ vacat.

(ב) דוד. O’ vacat. The word does not suit the parallelism. The variants (e.g. A om. οὐδὲ... κύριο; Q adds to κύριον, καὶ οἴμοι ἀδελφόν) indicate a deep-seated corruption. SH. places an ast. before οὐ μὴν κόψῃ. The most probable account is as follows. As הָלָךְ is not likely to be an insertion, and as O’ would naturally feel a difficulty in understanding its application, they seem to have decided to cut the knot by omitting the second member of each division of the lament. This was the easier, if the last member (see above) had by their time become corrupt. See further on xxxiv. 5.

20. ἐν τῷ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης; reading πάρει. It is remarkable that in Numb. xxxiii. 44 they render, as here, by πέραν, while there, in vv. 47, 48, they transliterate (αβαρίμ).

21. ἐν τῇ παραπτώσει σου, and so SH. But the sense is undoubtedly as Aq. Symm. ἐν τῇ εὐθύνῃ τοῦ σου; so Vulg. abundantia.

22. τοὺς ποιμένας σου. Aq. Symm. (ἐταλπόν) read ρητο. Vulg. has pastores tuos, but St Jer. suggests “amatores sive amici tui.”
23. καταστενάξεις (καταστασία), Vulg. congreguisti. The omission of the א (אבים) led to the transposition of the י and ה, and thus to the connecting of the word with הָנֶל ("How gracious etc." A.V.).

24. γενόμενος γένηται. See on iii. i.

"The expression of a condition is often emphasized by the addition of the infin. abs." Driver, Samuel etc. Note on i. 11. A doubtful example (see note there) of the Heb. idiom, which O' thus preserves, is to be found in xvii. 24; not so Exod. xv. 26; Deut. xi. 13. For other instances see Gi. here, or Driver on 1 S. xx. 6.

25. יָבָי. O' vacat.

אֲבָי נֶבֶר 'מ 'ב יָבָי. O' vacat (Aq. Theod. hab.). Gi. would also reject יָבָי נֶבֶר.

26. אֲרָחְתָּה. eis γῆν. The grammar of the M.T. is dubious. Probably therefore entered the text before the article, which was inserted to harmonize with άλλα ρήμα of v. 27. Aq. Theod., while adding ἐτέραν, leave the γῆν anarthrous; and so SH.

27. לֶשֶׁב נְבֵה. O' vacat.

28. הָנֶל נַכֵּה נִפְתַּח הַאִישׁ הַיּוֹם בְּנֵי. הָנֶל.
μωβη 'Ιερονιας. Ἇν probably perplexed O', while the three words following 'ἐν' entered the text later.


29. ἐκκήρυκτον ἀνθρώπων. O' vacat. Comp. vii. 4.

30. This v. serves to illustrate more than one interesting point connected with the double text, viz. the tendency of M.T. to insert stock phrases, while yet it is unsafe to explain thus all O’s "omissions"; and again, the weakness in grammar shewn here and there by the translators, although on the other hand they were prepared to deal with a difficulty suggested by the subject-matter.

'אפקר ייה. O' vacat.

'אפקר ייה. ἐκκήρυκτον ἀνθρώπων. "Childless," as the natural sense of the Heb. adj., must have been familiar to O' from Gen. xv. 2 etc. But Jechnias appears to have had children according to 1 Chr. iii. 17 ff. Hence they gave the Midrashic rendering, proscribed, banished. Further, despite the order of the Heb. words, they connected them thus, as though reading י' י.

ל'אפקר ייה. O' vacat. Had נבך also (see last note) been absent from their text, we might have taken the clause 'אפקר ייה as an insertion, although (against Wo. p. 33) it much improves the balance of the sentence. As things stand however, it seems best to assume that the later words of the clause are genuine. The recurrence of י'אפקר ייה might
easily lead to the omission of those words by O'. Comp. the omission in xxiii. 2.

xxiii. 1. Μαρθüια. τῆς νομῆς αὐτῶν (AQ μου); reading Ἡμῶν, and understanding it as ἦν—.

2. Δήλου. O' vacat. See end of note on xxii. 30.

3. τοῦ λαοῦ μου; Midrashic.

ἐπὶ πάσης (but ἦν Ἀρτοῖς).

4. Ἐλα. O' vacat.

5, 6 are very similar to xxxiii. [xl.] 15, 16, where O' is lacking. See note on xi. 7.

6. καὶ Ἰσραὴλ, but Ν has κ. Ἰερουσαλήμ. The καὶ of the parallel passage xxxiii. 16 should probably be restored here. Cheyne (ad loc.) considers that xxxii. 30, 32, li. 49; Zeph. iii. 14 (in that passage O' supports him) afford parallels. See further his reference to Grätz's illustration from Zech. i. 19.

καλέσει αὐτῶν Κύριος Ἰωσεδέκ. Ν Ιωσείκιμ seems to be a trace of a misreading of the pron. suff. Here successive applications to individual leading men may well have caused varieties of reading. Ἰωσεδέκ (יוֹסֵדֵק) is mentioned Hag. i. 1 etc.; Zech. vi. 11; Ezra iii. 2 etc.; Neh. xii. [xxii.] 26. At the same time it is unsafe to assume that the translators would have
thought it needful to transliterate the suffix of י. Their ἑδὲ ἔκατον may therefore represent Ἰσραήλ. The virtual duplication of יוהו in the Greek (K. being the subject of the preceding verb) suggests that the passage had been tampered with even before the time of O'.

It is of course possible that the name of God may not have originally entered at all into the proper name placed in apposition with the suff. in יְהֹוָה, and may only have come into it through the accidental presence of the preceding יְהוֹ. See Wo.'s defence of this view in his discussion of the passage, pp. 239 ff. We cannot however let pass unchallenged his statement that "even the Massoretic accentuation seems to shew clearly that 'Jehovah' belongs to the word preceding." The accent is indeed in form identical with one of the Distinctives (נְהַנָּה), but in accordance with the somewhat intricate laws of Heb. accentuation must here be virtually a Conjunctive, לְהִי by name, whose function is to divide words, which, though connected in sense, "it might nevertheless seem desirable, for the sake of effect in the reading, to separate by a slight pause". Thus it is plain that

1 Wickes, Treatise on the Accentuation of the twenty-one so-called Prose Books of the O. T., Oxford, 1887, p. 120. See further on his pages following, and contrast the functions of לְהִי as given pp. 22, 119.
the accentuation, whatever its authority may be worth, is in favour of connecting ϋ 'ב.

7, 8. Ο' vacat, but the vv. appear after v. 40 with slight variations (on which see Cor.'s note on xxxiii. 14—26, p. 65), this discrepancy in their position falling in with the supposition of their spuriousness in this place. See also on xi. 7, xv. 13.

9. סֵבֶר. συντετριμένος; reading בַּלְמָלְנַו. They seem to have read (for ר) רָבָּר. Their Heb. ms. was perhaps blurred. Nowhere else does דִּיק represent וֹ. The nearest parallel is מַעֲרֵּב, דִּיקָא-זִישֵתא, Is. v. 16.

10. פִּי מַעֲרֵב מְלָאךְ רָאָר. O' vacat. There can be little doubt (against Gi.) that one or other of the two clauses of the v., which end in וֹ, is spurious. To the absence of the first of these from O''s text may be added the fact that it bears a sufficient similarity to the second to justify us in conjecturing it to be a gloss on a blurred text, and suggested by v. 14. Further, this harmonizes with the logical connexion of the whole passage, in which, if we follow O' as our guide, the iniquities of the prophets and priests become gradually more clearly indicated, till they are at last definitely specified in the last sentence (י. 14).

הַל. τούτων (יוו); quite justifiably. See
last note. That the familiar rule "Procli lectioni praestat ardua" by no means always applies in such cases is illustrated by v. 17. See note there on לַעֲרָה.

See on ix. 9 [10].

ο δρομός (but ΑQ δρόμος) αὐτῶν.

οὐτος (ΑQ οὐχ οὐτος). See on viii. 6.

14. χειρῶν πολλῶν (ΑQ ποιηρῶν);

dividing the words after the מ and reading the latter part as רָבִים.

יִלְלָה הַשָּׁבָע. To make the Heb. grammatical we must alter to שֵׁב (or יֵשָב).

15. See on ix. 14 [15].

16. רַבְגָּמִים לְכָּם. O' vacat. This presented no difficulty to O' in v. 25. We may therefore consider that the second word was absent from their text here.

17. λέγουσιν (Aq. Symm. add λέγουτες). This, as being a case the converse of those enumerated in note on iii. 1, makes it plain that the idiom, while surviving among the Alexandrian Jews, had ceased to have any real significance to their ears. Compare note on v. 39.

לַעֲרָהוּ יִרְבּרִים νεφֶלִים (לַעֲרָהוּ יִרְבּרִים) Kυρίον; much more smoothly.
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καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς πορευόμενοι τοῖς θελήμασιν αὐτῶν, παντὶ τῷ (Q om. τῷ) πορευόμενῳ πλανῇ καρδίας αὐτοῦ (Ἀ τῷ) ; by conflation. For πλ. as rendering of יְשָׁו see on iii. 17.

18. ἐν υποστήματί. The nearest parallel to this rendering is the υπόστασις of v. 22. On the other hand in vi. 11 we have συναγωγή and in xv. 17 συνέδριον.

לְשׁוֹן. O' vacat; obviously an insertion for the sake of smoothness.

alternate. O' vacat. MS. 88 and SH. agree with שֶׁ.


22. מְאָרָה מְאָרָה. O' vacat; inserted for the sake of improving the parallelism. Ezek. xiii. 22 may have suggested it.

23. O' makes this v. an affirmation, not a question; and rightly. God, as universally present, can never be at a distance. Such is the thought of v. 24. But later the v. was made interrog. in order to meet the difficulty presented by the later Jewish conception, viz. that God dwelt wholly apart from men. So Gi. M.T. however is followed by St Jer.

26. ηπίτια. τὰ θελήματα. See on viii. 5.

27. οἱ θαυματ. O' vacat.
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10. τοῦ νόμου μου; either an early error of ear, or a marg. gloss on פ.

28. ὁ Κύριος. (29) Οὗτος οἶ λόγοι μου, λέγει Κύριος. O' is to be preferred. A slight confusion in M.T. has carried פ into the next ν.

29. οὐκ ἴδου (Α oὐχί; ΑQ οὐχ) seems a double rendering, ἴδ. being the original one.

31. ΝΑQ have τοὺς ἐκβάλλοντας προφητείας (Α -τελαν) γλώσσης (Α -ση). This and ν. 30 are lacking in B. The expression puzzled the translators. They therefore gave a conjectural rendering, which can only be paralleled by that in Job xxii. 22 ἐκβάλε (but not so ΝΑ) δὲ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξηγορίαν.

32. ΝΑQ have καὶ νυσταζούντας νυσταγμὸν ἑαυτῶν (Q αὐτῶν). They connected the words with נו.
omit οὐ. For O's treatment of the negative see on xviii. 18.

33. ἡ ἱερεία ἡ προφητής (ὡς πρ.). See on vi. 13.

Τμεῖς ἐστε τῷ λήμμα; rightly dividing ἄρμα (ὡς ψεύτω). SH. attributes to Aq. (and so in Zech. ix. 1) the rendering ἄρμα (ὡς ψεύτω) instead of ἄρμα, to which St Jer. testifies.

36. ονομάζετε (Q -ζητε); reading ἄρμα. Comp. the Hiph. as rendered in Josh. xxiii. 7; Is. xix. 17, xxvi. 13; Am. vi. 10.

ὡς ἀνεθίνα. O' vacat; a later addition, as the accumulation of epithets suggests.

37. ι. ὁ Ἱβ. O' vacat (Q hab.); probably an insertion suggested by v. 35. The additional epithets of God in the Greek of vv. 37, 38 point however to corruptions in O' as well.

38. ἠμα...έρων. O' vacat.

39. λαμβάνω (ἤμαται). O' is clearly right, on account of the ἀλογο, which is the prevailing word in the passage. An original was wrongly ascribed to the root ἐσχατικός, and the ' inserted accordingly. It is remarkable that although O' were quite willing to represent, as far as might be done in Greek, the usage by which the finite verb is emphasized by an infin. abs., even
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when the Heb. text contained nothing to justify such representation (see instances on iii. 1), they yet were also not unwilling to ignore the idiom, when it did appear. Comp. note on v. 17.

אָשָׁלְחַנְי. O’ vacat (Q hab.); inserted from vii. 15.

For O’s insertion of vv. 7, 8 at the end of this chap. see on v. 7.

xxiv. 1. καὶ τοὺς δεσμώτας (Ἀ om.); as though reading μετ. The Heb. word occurs elsewhere in xxix. [xxxvi.] 2 (where O’ has δ. καὶ τεχνιτοῦ); 2 K. xxiv. 14, 16 (τὸν συν-κλείσαντα); Is. xxiv. 22 (ὁχύρωμα), xlii. 7 (δεσμῶν);
Ps. cxlii. [cxlii.] 8 (ϕυλακῆς).

3. See on i. 11.

5. τοὺς ἀποκυσθέντας Ἰου-δαίον (ἈQ Ἰουδα). For the tendency to substitute the concrete for the abstract comp. vii. 32 (ῥεμάζει), 34. xiii. 18, xix. 34, xxx. [xxxvii.] 19, xlvii. [xxix.] 7, xlviii. [xxxii.] 3.

6. οὖν. O’ adds eis ἀγαθά (Q om.) from the previous clause.

8. א. O’ vacat.

9. לַרְעָה. O’ vacat; a gloss on לֻעָה, or “merely a dittogram” (Cor. p. 61).

אָשָׁלְחַנְי. eis μίσος; as though μακαρίου. Yet in
Deut. xxviii. 37; 2 Chr. vii. 20 they render διήγημα. and in 1 K. ix. 7 ἀλήμα.

10. ἐκτὸς. O' vacat; perhaps an insertion from 2 Chr. vi. 25.

xxv. See Cor. (pp. 53 f.) for the extensive changes adopted by him in the main from Schwally (Zeitschrift d. A. T. Wissenschaft, viii. 177—190).

1. ἑω. O' vacat (Q hab.); a gloss.

2. ἡμισε. O' vacat; a gloss consequential on the preceding.

(20) ἑω. O' vacat.

3. מ. 'Ev. It is not likely that ל would here have been altered to ול, and as this preposition is written in full, the case differs from the simple confusion of letters dealt with in note on xx. 17.

אמות. See on i. 2.

ו. O' vacat; taken from i. 2.

ו. O' vacat; an insertion from such passages as vii. 13.

4. καὶ ἀπεστέλλων. This v. breaks the connexion, is unsuitable in its Greek form to the mouth of Jeremiah, as referring to past generations of prophets, and is therefore an interpolation in both texts. That the Greek gives
us the older form is shewn by (a) its coincidence with the language of vii. 25 f. (comp. xi. 7 f.) from which it is taken, (b) the absence of notification of a change of subject. M.T. seeks to remove this harshness, and, in doing so, alters the construction from that of 'I conversive,' as though indicating a date when that construction was at least obsolescent.

τους δουλους μου. See previous note.

5. Μόνον is a harsh construction, as the passage now stands, but not so (see note on v. 4) if joined to v. 3 (when שַׁלְמָל is there omitted).

ἐδωκα; by way of harmonizing with their form of the previous v. This is a clear indication (against Wo.) that O' were not in the habit of firmly adhering to the Heb. text before them when they saw what appeared to them to be an adequate reason for change.

6. με. Here the change by way of harmonizing affects both texts. The Heb. was originally 'י נא (= נָא).

τοῦ κακῶσαι ὑμᾶς. Here the harmonizing is confined to the Heb., O' giving us the rendering of לֵבִי לֵב, which strangely enough has only survived in its Heb. shape in the gloss forming the greater part of v. 7.
7. יִזָּהַת. O' vacat. The words were inserted through failure to perceive that the preceding יְהִי referred to the prophet, and that it was consequently connected with v. 3.

לְבָנָה...לְבָנָה. O' vacat; a gloss, suggested by the similar language of v. 6.

9. הפרתא להתרכפותה. πατριάς (NAQT prefix τῆς). πάσαν must have fallen out, as is shewn by the subsequent pl. suffix.

יאימ...עבירה. O' vacat; an obvious gloss. Observe the harshness of the construction of לָא. For O's non-recognition of this title of Neb. in M.T. see on xxvii. 6 [xxxiv. 5], xlIII. [l.] 10, and Wo. pp. 243 f.

הַרְחַל. O' vacat; a gloss.

הַרְחַל. και (A om. καὶ) ἔξερθεμένων αὐτοῦ; reading ב for מ. For other instances of this confusion see on xx. 17.

הלזרוח. καὶ εἰς οὐκεδίσιμόν; as though reading מִלֵּךְ. It is remarkable however that the Hiph. of דָּבַר is thus rendered in six instances.

10. הוֹלָה יֵתָחֵם. We can hardly imagine the Greek to be original. ר in the sense of millstones must have been sufficiently familiar
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to the translators through Exod. xi. 5; Deut. xxiv. 6, where they have μυλον. But the fact that ἰρ in its ordinary sense of *odour* was rendered generally by ὀσμῆ, coupled with the corruption of μυλον into μύρον, easy where the context seemed to suggest it, would lead to marg. glosses, in time taking the place of the text.

11. ἱστορήματα ἡμῖν ἀπαλοθετήθη ἀπὸ τῆς προστασίας καὶ

δουλεύσωμεν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Here and in v. 12 O preserves for us the original Heb. They read בְּנֵיה, but failed to understand the meaning of י in when constructed thus, viz. *to make to serve.* (Comp. xxxiv. 9.) The sense of the clause is that ‘the families of the north’ shall bring the Jews and the peoples who border upon their land into bondage. Later the Heb. copyist, failing also to perceive this sense, changed י ב into י בן, a change which, providing י with a subject, left it without an object. In order to supply one י was inserted.

12. And O' vacat. When, owing to the misunderstanding of v. 11, ἱστορήματα ἡμῖν ἀπαλοθετήθη ἀπὸ τῆς προστασίας καὶ δουλεύσωμεν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, had changed its subject, the reference of ἵνα ἦν ἡ Ῥώμας was no longer clear. Hence the addition י לום ב, ἵνα ἦν ἡ Ῥώμας καὶ μὴ ἔσται ἡ Ῥώμας. O' vacat (AQ φησίν Κύριος).

13. ἐνάμισθο ἰδὼν ἀρτοῦ τύμπου. O' vacat. See last note but one.
13 [14]. 

14. O' vacat. See following discussion.

At this point occurs the most marked discrepancy as to order between the two texts. Here follow in O' the prophecies against foreign nations, while in M.T. they form chaps. xlv.—li. Also the prophecies are quite differently grouped in the two texts.

Thus two distinct questions present themselves:

1°. Are we to prefer the position which O' assigns to the prophecies as a whole?

2°. Are we to prefer O's grouping?

To the first question we are disposed to answer, Yes; to the second, No.

1. In favour of the position which they occupy in O' are the following considerations:

(a) It is unlikely that the words "which J. hath prophesied etc." (end of v. 13) should be from the prophet himself. The most natural account of this clause is that it formed, as it now forms in O', the heading of the collection of prophecies against foreign nations, and therefore that these had their place here (as in Isaiah and Ezekiel) and not at the
end of the Book. When Heb. editors of the text removed them to the end, the clause in question was by mistake left behind (comp. the converse proceeding pointed out in the note on li. 64), and considered to be the conclusion of the preceding sentence.

(b) v. 14 implies such a removal, for it can only be reasonably explained as an editorial comment (otherwise O' would have it) afterwards inserted for the sake of smoothness.

(c) We should a priori expect the prophecies to appear in the company of the kindred matter which here follows (vv. 15—38).

(d) O's general respect for their Heb. text and scrupulousness in dealing with it (see p. 5) does not accord with the supposition that they made so striking a change.

On the other hand against O's text may be pleaded:

(a) It is not unnatural that the earlier and later portions of this chapter should be thus divided.

(b) That by the Greek arrangement the passing of sentence upon the nations (vv. 15—38 [xxxii. 1—24]) is made to follow (whereas it should naturally precede) the announcement of punishments as set forth in detail in the prophecies themselves.

Neither of these arguments seems very weighty as against the probabilities on the other side. They are both mentioned by Gi. (p. xxxiii), who however, following Kuenen (l. c. p. 218) and Orelli
(Kursgeft. Comm. iv. 217) is inclined for a third position, viz. immediately after chap. xxv. But in the absence of clearer evidence than these authorities can adduce, we may well hesitate to suppose that the prophecies have been displaced in both texts.

2. Taking now the second of the above questions, we consider the grouping of the prophecies.

It may prove convenient to exhibit in parallel columns (a) the grouping in M.T., (b) that in O', (c) the order adopted in the somewhat imperfect summary found in xxv. 19—26.

(a) M.T. xlvi.—li. (b) O' [xxv. 14— (c) M.T. vv. 19—26.

| 1 Egypt     | 8 Elam  | Egypt        |
| 4 Phil.     | 1 Egypt | [Uz (near Idum. & Eg.)] |
| 9 Moab      | 9 Bab.  | Phil.        |
| 6 Ammon     | 2 Phil. | Edom         |
| 5 Edom      | 5 Edom  | Moab         |
| 8 Damascus  | 4 Ammon | Ammon        |
| 7 Kedar and Hazor | 7 K. and H. | Tyre and Sidon |
| 1 Elam      | 6 Damascus | “the islands” |
| 3 Bab.      | 3 Moab  | [Arabia and] “mingled people” |
|             |        | [Zimri]      |
|             |        | Elam         |
|             |        | Medes        |

It is obvious that columns (a) and (c) are in close correspondence as regards order, especially

1 The figure prefixed to each name in the columns (a) and (b) refers to the position occupied by the name in (b) and (a) respectively. In column (c) [ ] indicate that the name is lacking in O'.
when we eliminate the names in [ ]. It is also clear that the names, as gathered from vv. 19—26, given in (c), were not liable to any such regrouping as might befall the prophecies themselves. In favour of that order there is thus (a) a strong presumption to start with, (b) the fact that Egypt is the most natural country, with which to begin such an enumeration, inasmuch as it was “the nation whose overthrow by Nebuchadnezzar would be the signal to the rest of a similar fate”.

(c) If we regard the geographical position of the places mentioned, it is plain that there is no comparison between the orderly arrangement of the M.T. and the confusion exhibited by the grouping in O'.

We therefore conclude in favour of the M.T. in this respect. It is hard in fact to believe that the prophecies originally standing (if the results of the first part of our discussion be admitted) immediately before xxv. 15, were in anything resembling O’s present order. If we put the further question, Why then was the alteration made? it is true that we can obtain no very satisfactory reply. We may

---

1 *Camb. Bible for Schools and Colleges, Jer. and Lam.* p. 184. Wo. (p. 113) objects to this statement on the ground that the prophecy “would not necessarily be so understood, until after the events predicted had transpired (sic).” But surely a prophecy uttered in such close connexion with the victory at Carchemish, might well have suggested this thought either to the prophet himself or to those who first collected his prophecies.
with Kuenen\(^1\) consider that it was in part caused by the historical point of view belonging to the time of the translators. We may on the other hand (to take the two most striking examples of the displacement in O') suppose that the position of Elam (a short prophecy of six vv., as compared with the twenty-six vv. to which Egypt, thus displaced, extends) may be merely the result of so slight a consideration as the available amount of room at the end of a roll, while again the large space still occupied by Babylon in the Jewish mind might easily suggest a much earlier position in the sequence.

We must however remember in any conjectural answers to this question that after all the word *alteration* may be an unsuitable one. O's disorder conceivably arose simply because the prophecies existed in Egypt in a more or less detached form, and were put together without conscious reference to the grouping in any copies of the collective works of Jeremiah.

xxv. 15 [xxxii. 1]. τοῦ ἀκράτου (ῥακραί).

is rendered thus in Ps. lxxv. [lxxiv.] 9.

O' vacat. The object, as being evident, was not expressed, or it may have been included in the verb, then to be read ῥακραί.

16 [xxxii. 2]. ἢ μῆκος. O' vacat (AQ* kai πιονται); a gloss.

καὶ ἐξεμοῦνται; a free rendering.
The word is more literally translated by the pass. of ταράσσειν in v. 22 and by κυμαίνειν in xlvi. [xxvi.] 7.

18 [xxxii. 4]. οὐκ ἐποίησαν τοὺς ἡκτορ. O' vacat.

20 [xxxii. 6]. ἐπιτελεῖται αἱρὴμ ἀναλ. O' vacat. Gi. considers this clause to be a gloss. On the other hand O' may easily have omitted it through an error of the eye. SH. read (and without an ast.) καὶ πάντας τοὺς βασιλεῖς, the last words being an easy corruption for τῆς γῆς Οὐδ.

22 [xxxii. 8]. ἡμισταίρως. O' vacat.

23 [xxxii. 9]. ἡμῖν and ἡν are represented in O' by Ὁμαμ ἢ Θνμαμ and Ὑμας (ᾠ Πωθ) doubtless through error.

24 [xxxii. 10]. ἡμῖν...(τὸ) ἱερών. O' vacat.

25 [xxxii. 11]. ἡμῖν...(τὸ) ἱερών. O' vacat.

Zimri would here be out of place. "Durch die Stellung sind Araber, Phoenicien, Aethiopen ausgeschlossen" Gi. ad loc. See also Wo. p. 44.
The word is evidently an alternative rendering of יְהָלָם. It may, as introduced from the marg. into the wrong place, have supplanted an original מַעֲשַׁים (which Compl. has), or perhaps the words מַעֲשַׁים...יְהָלָם have been added to the Heb. text by those who were dissatisfied at the omission of the Medes (mentioned in li. [xxviii.] 11, 28), in which case the whole clause, καὶ π. β. Π. will be a dittography of יְהָלָם...יְהָלָם.

26 [xxxii. 12]. αἰγλαυστοῦ (A τοῦ αἰγλαυστοῦ).

Ὁ uses the word elsewhere only in Ezek. xxi. 3 [xx. 47], xxi. 9 [4], each time in the expression ἀνά τοῦ ἀν. ἐως βορρᾶ (-translate), apparently taking it as the quarter of the wind which blows from the midday sun. Hence its use here is inexplicable, unless we suppose that the full reading was ἐξαθάρα, and that the Greek translators omitted the latter part, because it made ἐξαθάρα the recipient, and not (as in v. 9, and i. 15) the executor, of vengeance.

Ὁ vacat; obviously an insertion, spoiling the grammar.

Acts...αὐτοῖς. O’ vacat; a clause suggested by the latter part of v. 25, making use of the cipher form (called technically Atbash, because in it
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\(\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{s},\) etc.), which probably came into existence later than J.'s time. See Wo., pp. 245 ff.

29 [xxxii. 15]. \(\beta\nu\varepsilon\nu\nu \tau\varepsilon\kappa\eta \lambda\tau\varepsilon\kappa\kappa\nu\). \(\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\varphi\rho\varepsilon\iota\) (Q \(\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\varphi\rho\mu\nu\delta\)) ou \(\mu\eta\ \kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\varphi\rho\iota\sigma\vartheta\eta\tau\varepsilon\). O' failed to comprehend the interrogative '\(\eta\); so omitted it.

30 [xxxii. 16]. \(\tau\iota\nu \rho\iota\). \(\iota\iota\delta\varepsilon\); corrupted from 'Ανδάδ, a transliteration of the Heb. Comp. xlviii. [xxxii.] 33. The last four words of this v. are transferred by O' to the next sentence.

32 [xxxii. 18]. \(\varepsilon\kappa\pi\rho\rho\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\alpha\iota\); less literal than the rendering in vi. 22 (\(\varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon\rho\theta\iota\sigma\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\alpha\iota\)).

\(\sigma\iota\iota\chi\iota\tau\o\iota\ \tau\heta\ \gamma\heta\). See on vi. 22.

33 [xxxii. 19]. \(\pi\iota\iota\ \tau\heta\iota\nu \ K\nu\iota\iota\nu\); probably a slip, original or otherwise, in the Greek.

\(\alpha\iota\iota\ldots\alpha\iota\iota\).

\(\eta\nu\tau\iota\). O' vacat. M.T. is an insertion drawn from viii. 2.

\(\epsilon\iota\iota \kappa\o\pi\rho\iota\). See on viii. 2.

34 [xxxii. 20]. \(\rho\iota\omega\nu\lambda\iota\nu\sigma\iota\ \kappa\iota\ \kappa\o\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\varepsilon\ (Q \(\kappa\ \kappa\o\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\varepsilon\)). But in vi. 26 they render by \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\varphi\alpha\rho\alpha\varphi\sigma\varepsilon\iota\nu\), and in Ezek. xxvii. 30 by \(\sigma\tau\rho\omega\nu\nu\iota\varepsilon\iota\nu\).

\(\tau\heta\iota\omega\zeta\theta\alpha\tau\iota\). O' vacat. If we read the Heb. thus as a subst., it shipwrecks the grammar; if as a verb in Taph., \(\tau\iota\heta\iota\zeta\theta\alpha\tau\iota\) (so Baer and Del.) or \(\tau\iota\heta\iota\zeta\theta\alpha\tau\iota\), it somewhat harshly introduces the Lord as speaking. The word is probably corrupt.

34 [xxxii. 20]. ἡσπερ οἱ κρύοι (οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ). As Schwally (l. c. p. 137 note) points out, ἦλθε occurs in Hos. xiii. 15; Nah. ii. 10; 2 Chr. xxxii. 27, xxxvi. 10, and the variant might easily arise through the influence of אדיד ידוע. Grätz however (quoted by Gi. *ad loc.*) suggests that [the original read] הולא, comparing xviii. 4.

37 [xxxii. 23]. ημῖν. τὰ κατάλοιπα. The Greek is possibly a corruption for καταλύματα, but in face of the circumstance that the latter word renders פָּלִים in v. 38, this is improbable. For O' s treatment of see on ix. 9 [10].

38 [xxxii. 24]. τῆς (AQ om. τῆς) μακαίρας τῆς μεγάλης; reading ἦλθε, and doubtless rightly. Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 16, l. [xxvii.] 16, where הָלִין occurs in this phrase. In those two passages
is rendered 'Ελληνικός, as though מַעְלֵּנָה from מַעְלֵ. Here O's treatment is less easy to explain. Possibly they read מַעְלֵ, and translated freely. So Pesh. reads (פַּסְמָה), and one of Kenn.'s mss. has מַעְלֵ, מַעְלֵ. St Jer. renders by columba, i.e. Nebuchadnezzar, in reference to the Jewish belief that his standards bore that device.

O' vacat. The clause is an insertion. Accordingly the pron., as Gi. remarks, "schwebt in der Luft."

xxvi. [xxxiii.] 1. βασιλέως. O' is doubtless a corruption of βασιλείας. The Heb. itself however (see Wellhausen, Der Text d. Bücher Sam. 1 S. xv. 28) is in all probability a corrupt form of מלכה.

O' vacat (Q hab.); a gloss.

2. ἀπάσι (AQ πάσι[ν]) τοῖς ὑπόδαιοις καὶ πάσι (νQ om. κ. π.) τοῖς ἔρωμένοις. ἦν has been introduced from xi. 6.

3. καὶ παύσομαι; euphemistically, as in vv. 13, 19. See xxxi. [xxxviii.] 20. On the other hand μετανοεῖν is the rendering in iv. 28, viii. 6, xviii. 8, 10.

6. (ך) הָנֵא. O' vacat (AQ תָּתַנ); probably an accidental omission. See vv. 9, 12.
7. καὶ οἱ πρεσβυπρόφηται. So in vv. 8, 11. See on vi. 13.

8. συνέταξεν αὐτῷ (ἠμ; comp. xx. 2).

9. δὲ. See xxii. 28.

10. πύλης (A adds Κυρίου and οἶκου K.) τῆς καωσ. SH. testifies to Ἰ. Pesh. and Vulg. read Ἰ. Ἰ. but there seems no sufficient ground for rejecting the genuineness of O’s reading, especially as the words Ἰ. Ἰ. having just preceded, were wholly needless to repeat.

19. καὶ ἐπαύσατο. See on xxxii. 20.

20. πολλοὶ Ἰ. O’ vacat. Gi. defends the Heb. as agreeing with the wording of v. 6. But the argument seems precarious.

21. πολλοὶ Ἰ. O’ vacat. The expression is not found elsewhere in Jer.

καὶ ἐζήτουν (Q -τησαν); reading ἐζήτησεν. O’ vacat.

22. Ἰ. Gi. points out that what we read of Elnathan in xxxvi. 12, 25 would make such an act as this on his part unlikely.

23. λαοῦ αὐτοῦ; misunderstanding the S.
Heb. expression, for which comp. 2 K. xxiii. 6. In xvii. 19 on the other hand (comp. 2 Chr. xxxv. 5, 12, 13) seems to mean the laity.

xxvii—xxix. [xxxiv—xxxvi.]. These chapters are specially interesting in connexion with the problem of the double text. As Wo. (p. 221) says, "The peculiarities appear not only in the frequency, but also in the form, of the divergences." To these peculiarities (to be dealt with in due course) we add (i) such forms as (a) בָּלַע (xxvii. 1 etc.) for so בָּלַע (xxvii. 12 etc.), חַכֹּת (xxviii. 4 etc.), חַכֹּת (xxviii. 1 etc.), (b) the later form בְּנָכַרְבֵּוֹ (frequently; e.g. xxvii. 6, but not in xxix. 21), as against the form with ר which occurs elsewhere in this Book, (ii) the epithet רָבָּה, which is added to J.'s name to an extent out of all proportion to the rest of the Book. If, as Gi. suggests, these chaps. were copied out and sent to Babylon for the especial behoof of the exiles, it is easy to understand that just such divergencies might appear from the influence of the errors and additions (e.g. the greater part of xxvii. 22 [xxxiv. 18]) naturally arising in such MSS., as compared with the copies remaining in Palestine.

xxvii. [xxxiv.] 1. O' vacat (Q marg. hab.; reading βασιλέως. See on xxvi. 1); obviously a later insertion, either in its present form, or more probably with Zedekiah's name (see on xxviii. 1),
to whose time these three chaps. without doubt belong. In the latter case the substitution of Jehoiakim arose through the influence of xxvi. 1. We may note, as agreeing with the spuriousness of the ν., the peculiar spelling both of this name and of Josiah in the original.

2 [1]. ἐν δὲ τοῖς. O’ vacat; rightly, in accordance with the style of the narrative sections. So Cor. (p. 70).

3 [2]. καὶ ἀποστελέεις αὐτοὺς. Both texts seem corrupt in the matter of the pron., which has crept in through the influence of the preceding ἀνέθηκεν.

(Α τῶν) ἄγγελων αὐτῶν. The absence of the article would of itself make the Heb. suspicious. Read therefore ἀνέθηκεν.

τῶν ἑρχομένων εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῶν (ἐν τῷ) εἰς Ἰερ. (Q εἰς Ἰερ. εἰς ἀπ. αὐ.). The words εἰς ἀπ. αὐ. are clearly a gloss, as the variation in their position helps to shew.


καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐπιχείρῳ (Q βραχιώνι) μου. So in xlviii. [xxxi.] 25.

6 [5]. θεᾶται. O’ vacat. They would scarcely have omitted the word, had they found it in their text.

τὴν γῆν (A adds πᾶσαν; Q π. τ. γ.). O’ (against Gi.) preserves the genuine
reading, which thus perfectly fits in with the previous 
Subsequent scruples as to the attributing of a world-wide dominion to the king of Babylon
induced various modifications. Accordingly Aq.
Symm. have πᾶσας τὰς γαλας (ταύτας), Vulg. "omnes
terras istas," and so Pesh.; while SH. adopts πᾶσαν
τὴν γην ταύτην.

δουλεύων αυτῷ; reading ἐνω, and
rightly. The subsequent loss of the ἐ was easy,
owing to the ending of the previous word. For
the title given by M.T. to Neb. see on xxv. 9.

7. O' vacat; Q marg. hab. with slight variations
and with ὅργης instead of γῆς, in which it is sup-
ported by SH. "The idea that the dominion of
the Chaldeans is to be merely transitory, and is
to fall to pieces after the third generation, is de-
cidedly inappropriate in this place, where it is much
more to the interest of the prophet to depict the
power of Nebuchadnezzar as terribly as possible"
(Cor. p. 70).

Evil-Merodach, son and successor to Nebuchad-
nezzar (c. 562 B.C.) reigned two years (Abydenus,
Fr. 9, Berosus, Fr. 14), or two years and a few
months, according to the tablets dated in his reign.
He was killed in a rebellion led by his sister's
husband, Neriglissar (= Nergal-sharezer), who in
three or four years was succeeded by a young
son Laborosoarchod, murdered after nine months'
reign (Sm. Dict. of Bible, Evil-Merodach and
Nergal-sharezer).
Thus the v. taken literally is not in accordance with history. It is possible that this may account for its omission by O'; but the view seems much preferable that the definite fixing of a termination to the power of Babylon, an announcement which is quite out of harmony with the context, stamps the v. as a gloss. In that case it will either be very early, i.e. before the commencement of Neriglissar's reign, or on the other hand sufficiently late for the exact relationship of the above series of rulers to have been forgotten.

8 [6]. Ἐκτελεσθήσῃ...Ἄχαι. O' vacat; a gloss, in the earliest form of which Neb. was referred to by the pron. only (Ἄχαι). The Ἐκτελεσθήσῃ, as Gi. suggests, may be explained as having lost a subsequent ἔνα taken from v. 7.


ἦν ἔκτελο πυθήν (καὶ A -λείπ.). The transitive use of ἔκτελο is unusual (occurring however in Ps. lxiv. 7). O' seems to have omitted the suffix and ἦν. Possibly (as Gi. thinks) the Targ. preserves for us here the original reading ἐγγίζῃ, for which we may comp. similar expressions in this context (xxvi. 24, xxvii. 6).

9 [7]. ἡλεθμίως. τῶν ἔκτελομένων ὑμῖν; reading apparently ἡλεθμίως, which the context seems to demand. The M.T. may have been introduced here from xxix. 8.
10 [8]. O' vacat. The words were suggested by v. 15.

12 [10]. O' vacat. See next note.

14 [11]. O' vacat. Probably it is owing in some degree to the recurrence of that this omission has come about. M.T. has every appearance of being genuine, and receives a general support from Pesh. SH. Vulg.

15 [12]. ιμοι; adding εν' ἄδικῳ ἐνεδέῃ. The gloss, introduced to prevent any possible misapprehension, is a double one, both words rendering ὅτι. O' begins v. 16 [13] with a second rendering of ἐν (ιμοι). Probably the above-mentioned gloss was in some of O's MSS. introduced after the ιμοι of v. 15 [12], in others before it. In the latter case the pron. might easily be transferred to the beginning of the next sentence.

16 [13]. Ιησούς Χριστός. O' vacat; obviously an explanatory gloss.

17 [14]. O' vacat, but it substitutes οὐκ ἀπεστειλα αὐτοῖς. M.T. harmonizes both in substance and style with the rest of the passage, and is therefore probably to be accepted. In that case we can only conjecture that O's MS. may have been worn or otherwise illegible.
18 [15]—22 [18]. Nowhere is the discrepancy between the two texts more marked than in this passage, and nowhere is it more dangerous to dogmatize. In favour of M.T. it may be urged (a) that its amplifications suit the general style of these chapters, (b) that O' bears signs (notably in the grammar of v. 16 [19]) of omission, (c) that, inasmuch as the vessels here enumerated were in point of fact returned to Jerusalem, there was an obvious inducement for O' to omit the latter part of v. 22.

On the other hand it may be said that the amplifications in M.T. are quite of a nature to be introduced at Babylon or elsewhere by people keenly interested in every circumstance connected with the Captivity, and that inasmuch as the non-fulfilment of the prophecy of 22⁴ was no hindrance to its retention in the text which has come down to us, we need not be hasty in assuming that it would disappear from the Greek version, which on the whole exhibits signs of faithfully minute translation. O' is however doubtless somewhat corrupt in its present form.

18 [15]. ἀπανθησάτωσάν μοι; reading, very possibly rightly, יב, which was afterwards (comp. xxv. 37) taken as a contraction (לְיִדוּתָה = לְיִדּוּת). O' vacat.

לֶבֶךְ; O' vacat. The absence of any
actual mention of that which should be the subject of their prayer involves a harshness which would naturally lead to some such clause as M.T.

19 [16]. Καὶ τῶν ἐπίλοιπῶν (καὶ ὑπολ.) σκευῶν. It is clear from considerations of grammar that one or more of the objects specified in M.T. have fallen out of the Greek, unless as Cor. (p. 71) proposes, we read κ. ἐπὶ τ. λουτρὸν σκ.

θανάτους...ὁμᾶς. O' vacat.

20 [17]. Νομιμών. O' vacat.

η' ἡ' ἔρινθος μ' ἧ. O' vacat.

βολάθ...ὁρισθέν. O' vacat.

21. O' vacat.

22 [18]. στρατευ...να. λέγει Κύριος (καὶ adds ὁ θεὸς). See introductory note on these verses.

xxviii. [xxxv.] 1. βασιλεὺς ἦν... marzo. O' vacat. The first two words were lost through a confusion of the eye (between βασιλε and βασιλν). The rest correspond to the Heb. of xxvii. 1 in its earlier and more accurate form. See note there. Cor. (p. 70) considers this ν. to be out of place and transfers it to the head of xxvii.

3. πᾶ τὰ σκέψει. ἐὰν would of course be easily lost before ἐὰν. On the other hand its absence from O' in the next ν. cannot be thus explained.
CRITICAL NOTES.

אֶלְּכֶה. O' vacat.

בַּלֶּם...גִּבּוּר. O' vacat.

4. בַּלֶּם...זְרֻעָה. O' vacat.

בֶּן עֲלֵה. O' vacat.

לְשׁוֹנִי...גִּבּוּר. O' vacat.

5. אוֹפְּדָלִיםָּוָא פָּנָדַּהַוָא הַלָּוָא וְכַּנּוֹ קַטַּה אוֹפְּדָלִיםָּוָא הַיִּרְפְּאָוָא. O's transposition of the substantives may well have been caused by the last words of the v.

6. אֲלִלְגֵה דַּלֶּבֶּר. O' vacat.

10. אוֹפְּדָלִיםָּוָא פָּנָדַּהַוָא הַלָּוָא וְכַּנּוֹ קַטַּה אוֹפְּדָלִיםָּוָא הַיִּרְפְּאָוָא; reading the last word in the pl., as also in v. 12, in accordance with its other occurrences in the M.T. of this section. The earlier words are suggested by v. 11.

11. בִּשְׁוֹאֶר סְגּוֹלּוֹט יָמְא. O' vacat. The words are introduced from v. 3.


אֲרוֹנְבָּא. O' vacat. M.T. gives us accordingly the later form of the name. See introductory note on xxvii—xxix.

וְסָבְרַר...לָ. O' vacat; an insertion suggested by xxvii. 6.

15. נָעְשְׁנָא תַּנְנָה. O' vacat; but perhaps owing only to an error of the eye.

16. בְּ. O' vacat; introduced from
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Deut. xiii. 6, where however (as Gi. points out), unlike the present passage, actual idolatry is spoken of.

xxix. [xxxvi.] 1. הָיָה. O' vacation. See Gi., who supports the omission. His reasons do not seem quite conclusive; for the word might well be used by one like Jer., if, as is probable, there were already gaps in the number of those whom he thus addressed. Still O' would scarcely have omitted the word, had it been genuine.

O' adds ἐπωστολὴν εἰς Βαβυλώνα τῇ ἀποκάλυψ. There could scarcely be a more obvious interpolation. Yet see Wo., p. 86.

וַיֵּלֶךְ... אֶלֹהַי. O' vacation. The persons addressed are (against Gi.) quite sufficiently defined by both the preceding and following words, without this extension. SH. inserts the clause, but marks with ast. only the words ἀπὸ...Βαβυλώνα. Aq. Theod. have the words.

2. הָיָה... אֶלֹהַי. O' vacation; possibly an accidental omission.

καὶ παντὸς ἐλευθέρου καὶ δεσμῶτος καὶ τεχνίτου (Q τ. κ. δ.). The first words look like a rendering of עלlarınız as a variant upon והי. This is less disturbing to the present Heb. text than to suppose that they stand for צ barring (as a variant for יְהוָה).

5. yapıוה. παραδεσώς; but rendered κέπους in v. 28.

6.הנהלתה בָּשָׁם בְּנָה. **O' vacat.**

7.גדיריו. תִּכְנָה. This rendering reminds us of iv. 29. Either they read here (as probably there) יְהֹודְעַי, or their interpretation is Midrashic.

8.틱ייקו. καὶ μη ἀναπειθέτωσαν ὑμᾶς οἱ μάντες ὑμῶν.

**ὑμεῖς ἐνυπνιάζεσθε.** The Hiph. is not found elsewhere, its form is Aram. rather than Heb., and the causative sense is not needed. Hence, and inasmuch as O' seems to have read Kal, we may conjecture with some confidence that the case is one of dittography. Cor. however (p. 61) would further change Ν to רָע, because in xxiii. 25, 27, 28 (so in O' v. 32, where see note; comp. O' in xxvii. 9) it is "the false prophets who have dreams and use them as the vehicle of their false prophecies."

10.רבך. **O' vacat.**

**τὸν λαὸν ὑμῶν (Q τ. λ. μου).** Pesh. SH. Vulg. agree with M.T. Gi. suggests that the Greek may be due to the reflection that at the end of the 70 years those now addressed would be dead.

11.אֶלֶף. **O' vacat;** an accidental omission, arising from the recurrence of אֶלֶף.
12. O' vacat. Illegibility, as in the last case, may explain the omission. However, as the M.T. stands, הָלַּחַת looks strange. Symm. has instead καὶ εὐρήσετε, Targ. לָאַבָּא. Hence M.T. seems corrupt.

14. καὶ (Q om. κ.) ἐπιφανοῦμαι ὑμῖν. This may be a rendering of the present Heb. שָׁנְּא. O' vacat. The tenor of the v. shews it to be a later addition, relating, as it does, to a general dispersion, unsuitable to the present context.

16—20. O' vacat. It is difficult to believe that a passage so thoroughly apposite in its method of dealing with the circumstances of the earlier period of the exile could be a later composition. We note also that Theod. (and apparently Aq. Symm.) Pesh. SH. Vulg. place it here. A grave objection however to that position is that it severs the logical connexion existing between vv. 15 and 21. A clue to the solution of the problem is given by those MSS. (Lucianic) which place the passage before v. 15. It is impossible to say how the dislocation arose. Gi.'s suggestion (see his careful note on the whole passage) that the cause was the
occurrence of מַעַלְבָּד followed by מַעַלְבָּד at the beginning of vv. 15 and 16, seems dubious. The omission by O' is more easily accounted for, if we attribute it either to the occurrence of the substance of most of these vv. already in xxiv. 8—10, or to the translators' dislike to call Egyptian attention to the detailed threats of punishment directed against Israel, or last and perhaps best (with Cor., p. 61, who however condemns the passage as an early insertion), to the passing of the writer's eye from מַעַלְבָּד (v. 15) to מַעַלְבָּד (v. 20).

21. O' vacat.

22. O' vacat.

23. O' vacat; introduced from v. 21.

24. μάρτυς. The Heb., as it stands, is ungrammatical, while the 'ב can only be explained as equivalent to וּלָא עֲבָד. Probably the word is a gloss.

25—29. O' misunderstands this passage, failing to see that what we have to deal with in the earlier part of it is a letter from Shemaiah to Zephaniah and others at Jerusalem. This is so clearly put in M.T. that we can only attribute the bulk of the variations to the state of O's Heb. text. Hence the straits to which they are reduced, e.g. in making the prophet speak of himself in the 3rd p. (v. 27), in the omission (ibid.) of a negative,
in the mention (v. 29) of an unexplained βιβλίον, and in general in the utter lack of logical connexion which prevails throughout their version of vv. 25—29.

25. O' vacat; but substitutes Οὐκ ἀπέστειλα σε τῷ ὄνοματί μου, suggested by v. 31.

25, 26. εἶπεν Κύριος (so Bдр; AQ εἶπεν Κ.).

26. έπιστάτην. The sing. is supported by Symm. Targ. Pesh. Vulg., but M.T. can scarcely have arisen from it. The thought includes the duties of Zeph. and his predecessor. Hence the plural.

27. Οὐκ εἶπεν καὶ εἰς τοῦ καταράκτην; a case of transposition, inasmuch as οὗτος is rendered by κατ. in xx. 2.

28. ὡς οὖν εὐφνεῖται (ἢ εὐφνεῖται). οὐκ εὖτεμισθητεί (Q ἐλοιδ.; Q οὐκ εὐπερμεσθαίτε).
Unless we suppose that these particular words were illegible in the text used by O', there seems no reason why they should not have rendered them. On the other hand M.T. in each of the two cases is an easy expansion.

O' vacat.

M.T. was suggested by Deut. xiii. 6 (see on xxviii. 16). O' here substitutes ovk δηξονται, a marg. gloss on τοι ἰδεῖν.

xxx. [xxvii.] 5. ἀκούσεσθε; a change arising obviously from the difficulty of reconciling the use of the 1st p. with the utterance as spoken by the LORD.

6. εἰ ἐτεκεύν ἄρσεν. We may note that this use of the Kal in a sense emphatically limiting it to the female is by no means in universal accordance with Heb. usage, e.g. ii. 27; Gen. iv. 18, x. 8, 13 etc.; Ps. ii. 7. O' adds to the above the following gloss: καὶ περὶ φόβου ἐν ὧ δακτέξοντον ὥσφύν καὶ σωτηρίαν.

διότι. This, as a substitute for διατί, is often presented to us elsewhere, e.g. by Q in ii. 31, by ἀθέτω AQ in viii. 19.

eis λυτερον (jaundice). ἰδεῖ is rendered ἄχρα in Deut. xxviii. 22.

7. ἐγένηθη (as the last word of v. 6); connecting with ἰδεῖν. So ἐγένοντο in Mic. ii. 1.
8. ἀπὸ τοῦ (ἈΝΩ om. τοῦ) τραχηλοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν. O', reading the 3rd p. in both cases, harmonizes with the rest of the v. The Heb. is easily accounted for, the language being suggested by ii. 20 (and perhaps Is. x. 27), while the variation of person is far from unusual. However the two cases of that variation here are by no means on all fours as regards support from other versions. ἡ is supported by Aq. Symm. Theod. Pesh. Vulg. In the case of '垸 Pesh. (not Vulg.) supports the 2nd p., against which reading can also be pleaded the parallelism which might be expected with ἴπται.

9. καὶ οὖν ἔργαντας αὐτοῖς ἄλλα στράτευμα (A ἐν ἄλλοις) ; failing to understand the Heb. idiom. Comp. xxv. 11.

10, 11. O' vacat. The vv. occur in both texts in xlvi. [xxvi.] 27, 28. See on xi. 7, and on xv. 13. Their language suggests that they are made up from various passages of this and other prophets. For the solemn introductory Ἄνατολα see Is. xlii. 8. Neither is Israel elsewhere in this Book (except in the parallel passage) called Ἰσραήλ (an expression found Ezek. xxxvii. 25). For the language of v. 11 comp. xv. 20, xliii. [xlix.] 11, and for other arguments (perhaps less convincing) against the
genuineness of the vv. See Gi. and Cor. ad loc. The latter (p. 66) calls attention to "the sudden appearance here of Jacob-Israel, while elsewhere throughout the whole speech only Judah-Israel is mentioned, and Jacob alone occurs in vv. 9, 18."

12. ἀνέστησα σύντριμμα (A adds σου); thus connecting the first word with ἁλὰ. See on iv. 19.

13. οἰς ἀληθῶν ιατρεύθης. In Hos. v. 13 ἃὶ (οἰδὸν) is parallel to ἀλὴ. This, while so far justifying O’s rendering, leaves the use of the word here in the opposite sense unexplained. The division of the v. in M.T. is supported by xlvi. 11, which supplies the second clause here.

οὕτω (Q -eia); connecting with the Hiph. of ἐμ, as in xlvi. [xxvi.] 11.

15. O’ vacat; but see next note. The first part is suggested by x. 19, xv. 18; the second is identical with the latter part of v. 14; for the third see below.

16. ἐλπὶ δικαίων σου ἡμετέραι. Yet in xxii. 22 O’ rendered ἵνα correctly. O’ proceeds to insert here a rendering of 15 b, viz. ἔπειτα πλήθος ἀδικων (τὶ δικαιῶν; A ἀδικίας) σου ἐπηλθόνθησαν αἱ ἀμαρτιαί s.
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σου, ἐπολήσαν ταῦτα σοι, the last three words representing M.T.'s conclusion to v. 15.

17. οἰκή. τὸ ἱαμα. Comp. ιαν in viii. 22.

τῇρευμα ὕμων; reading ἧμιν or Χρίστῳ ἦν. But this does not suit the context. Other conjectural emendations are θῖν, a monument, a (mere) way-mark for the traveller (so J. D. Michaelis), θῖν (Is. xxv. 5, xxxii. 2), a desert, a dried-up place (Graetz), θῖν, pitiable (Gi).

18. ἄγιλ. O' vacat. The translators were puzzled, probably as being unaware that this term was not necessarily used in its literal sense. Comp. 1 K. viii. 66.

καὶ (Q τὴν) αἰχμαλωσίαν (A τὴν ἀποικίαν) αὐτῶν; reading apparently αἷμα τῶν. Compare O's treatment of the actual ἱεραρχή in this Book. See on iii. 6.

καὶ ὁ λαός (Q ναός); to be added to the list of renderings of 'Α given in note on vi. 5.

19. ἡ ἡγούμενος; a loose rendering (see on xxiv. 5); but comp. xxxiii. [xl.] 11 for one still more free.

20. ἡμνήσθησιν ἡμῖν. O' vacat.

καὶ εἰσελησθούσαι; Midrashic.

καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτῶν (ὡρᾶν).
21. ἱσχυρότεροι; perhaps reading Ἀνδριμὼ (= Ἀνδριμ) .

This v. bears conspicuously the marks of an unskilled translator. In the middle the reference of the obj. pron. is changed from the sing. to the plural. ἔργον is rendered καὶ ἀποστρέψουσιν (Q however has ἐπιστ.) and ἐν ὑπόθεσις by ἀποστρέψαι (AQ ἐπιστρέψαι). Comp. on vv. 23, 24.

22. O' vacat.

23, 24. Repeated almost verbatim from xxiii. 19, 20. The variations in O' are sufficient to make a different and less skilled translator to be probable; e.g. ἂρετα is here rendered δὴ ὁργὴ Κυρίου ἐξῆλθεν θυμάθησι, ἐξῆλθεν (ὡ ἐπήλθεν) ὁργὴ, but there ίδον σεισμὸς παρὰ Κυρίου καὶ ὁργὴ ἐκπορεύεται eis συνσεισμόν.

23. οὐσομένη; in xxiii. 19 and συστρεφομένη. Gi. considers that was the original reading in both places.

24. γνώσεσθε (ὡ ἐπινυ.) αὐτά.

Comp. xxiii. 20.

N.B. In some Heb. Bibles xxxi. 1 (בּות וּנְ) is given as xxx. 25, and xxxi. 2 as xxxi. 1, and so on to the end of that chapter.
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cum עַשְׂרִי, reading עַמְּרִי (or possibly עַשְׂרַי).

βαδίσατε καὶ μὴ ὀλέ-
σητε τὸν Ἰσραήλ. Possibly the ἦ (see Perles, p. 74)
is the old nominative ending. O’ may have seen
the root ἱρ in the word, but it is more likely that
they read ἵν[Ἀ]. The best emendation (so
Gi.) seems to be ἱπάρχω (so Vulg. ad requiem
suam). For sense of ἡ ῥήματι see on iv. 20, l. 34.

3. ἐντα. The following ἦ (not rendered by
O’) may have produced this variant. Cor. however
(p. 66) suggests that the Heb. copyist “stumbled
at ἦ, which would refer to Ἰσραήλ in v. 2, because
the whole subsequent address, after ἰδεῖν Ἰσ-
ραήλ, is in the feminine.”

4. ἐντα 1°. ὅτι (but ΝΑΩ ἐτι).

Ωτό ἐντα 2°. O’ vacat (ΑΩ ἐτί. Comp. next note).

εἰπέληψε (Ἀ — η; ΑΩ λήψη). Comp.

iv. 30, where κοιμεῖν is the verb used.

5. ἐντα. ὅτι (Ἀ · οτι ἐτι; ΑΩ ἐτι).

καὶ ψαλεῖμ. φυτεύσατε (but Ν · ΑΩ φυτεύσαν-
tες φυτ.; ΑΩ φύσαντες φυτ.); reading simply ἱπάρ.

καὶ αἰνέσατε; reading ἱπάρειλ. But
even if, with O’, we substitute ἦ for the ἦ of M.T.,
it is very possible that the verb may be used in a
special sense corresponding to the subst. ἱλαρία used (Lev. xix. 24; Jud. ix. 27) of harvest or vintage gatherings.

6. ἵλαρις. ἀπολογούμένων (Ἄ -νου); an unexplained rendering. Gi. suggests an original ἵλαρις, vine-dressers, from the previous context.

7. Ἡσσωζεν Κύριος τού λαὸν αὐτοῦ; reading Ἡσσωζεν ἥ το ᾳ έμνο. As Gi. points out, from the use of the expression liturgically (Hosanna) the 2nd p., as in M.T., might easily arise. O’s form is therefore to be preferred, the more so, as Targ. supports it. Cor. (p. 66) considers M.T. to be an intentional alteration, owing to the non-fulfilment of the promise.

8. ἐν ἐορτῇ φάσει; reading ἐν ἐορτῇ φάσει.

καὶ τεκνοποιήσῃ; rendering very loosely, and omitting the other two words.

9. ἐξηλθον; reading ἐξηλθον.

καὶ ἐν παρακλήσει; perhaps reading ἐν παρακλήσει, but on the other hand we find the kindred subst. ἐξηλθον always rendered by ἐλεος in this Book (xxxvi. [xliv.] 7, xxxvii. [xliv.] 20, xxxviii. [xliv.] 26, xlii. [xlix.] 2).

αὐλίζων and οὐ μὴ πλανηθῶσιν; renderings not found elsewhere.
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10—14. See Cor.'s reasons (p. 66) for believing these vv. to be spurious.

12. The v. is remarkable for its loose renderings; ἔκοσις for הָדָמִים (though used four words earlier for אֵל), καρπῶν for הָדָמִים, δύο δεκατοιον for הָדָמִים, here (as J. F. Schleusner observes ad loc.) giving the species for the genus, as in the previous case the genus for the species.

13. χαρίσσουσιν; reading מְרִיתָה. Pesh. represents both (אַסִּירָא אֶמְבָּא). O' vacat. The parallelism is against the word.

14. מְרִיתָה. O' vacat. Some such word however is needed. See next note.

15. Μεγαλοῦμα καὶ μεθύσω. The first word probably represents the מְרִיתָה of v. 13, which they seem to have connected with מְרִיתָה.

The last words are evidently a gloss.

16. O' vacat; perhaps from the difficulty which the word presents in connexion with מְרִיתָה.

17. O' vacat (AQ hab.). Pesh. omits the words on their second occurrence. The other authorities are in favour of them. It is of
course possible that an accidental omission of these words in some MS., followed by an insertion of them from the margin in different places in two copies, may be the origin of their recurrence here in M.T. If we are to choose between their two positions, the first seems preferable.

17. μόνιμον τοῖς σοῖς τέκνοις. These words are clearly meant as a rendering of ἡ κόκκος τῆς λαβρίας, while the remainder of the M.T. is unrepresented. MSS. 22, 36, and others however agree to prefix καὶ ἔσται ἐπὶ τῆς ἐσχάτης σου, as though considering the preceding words to be the rendering of the second part of the v. We can scarcely understand the brevity of O', combined with lack of correctness in grammar, unless by supposing some injury to have befallen their Heb. text; for the parallelism demands two clauses.

19. αἰχμαλωσίας μου; reading ἵναι, but wrongly.

μετενόησα. This suits the parallelism, as opposed to παρεκκλήσῃν of Aq. (but see Field); with which agree Targ. (מרנהו יולא) Pesh.

ἐστίναι ἐφ' ἡμέρας αἰσχύνθης; reading apparently פּוּרְיָהו יְלַיִיָה נֵשְׁתֵה, פּוּרְיָהו יְלַיִיָה נֵשְׁתֵה. καὶ υπέδειξα.

20. O' ignores the interrogative character of
the first part of the ν., apparently because to their minds it expressed a doubt, or more than a doubt, of God's power.

Gi. suggests that the context rather requires a word expressing indignation, and suggests ἔμμεναι, Even if we retain the text, we may safely give Β' a hostile sense, as in Numb. xxii. 7; Ps. l. 20.

έπευσα; Midrashic. Compare the treatment of a similar phrase in iv. 19, and for the fear of anthropomorphism xxvi. 3 with references; also xii. 14, xiii. 17, xviii. 1, xxvi. [xxxii.] 19, xxxvi. [xlii.] 26, xlii. [xlvi.] 10, (xliii. [xxxii.] 31), xlix. 35 [xxv. 15].

21. ζειων (NAQ Σιών). But St Jer. (see Field ad loc.) seems to have found ζειωνίς, a transliteration (through ignorance of the meaning of the word) which might easily be corrupted to the present text.

τιμωρίαν. The same sort of corruption (arising from a transliteration) has taken place here. We cannot however accept M.T., ἆ not being found except in the sense which it bears v. 15 (and which O' had no difficulty in dealing with there). Read therefore (with Gi.) ἔμμεναι, literally, palms; here in the sense fixed by the ξ of the parallel clause, but not recognised by O'. Aq. has πικρασμοῦς, Vulg. amaritudines.
22. ὃ νόημα ἔχειν. ἑυγάτηρ ἡ τιμωμένη. Comp. xlix. [xxx.] 4, ὑγ. ἵταμιας. Aq. in both places has ἡ ἰμβευόνσα.

23. ἄρσεν γενόμενον καὶ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα. ἐν (ἡ ἐς) σωτηρία (AQ ἦ σωτ.; ἡ -πία) περιεπέσωνται ἀνθρώποι; a Midrashic rendering, which is intended to indicate that such shall henceforth be the freedom from danger of attack, that women will suffice for the land’s defence, while men discharge the avocations of peace. It is clear however that O’s present text is somewhat different from that which St Jer. speaks of, “quoniam te creavit Dominus salute in plantationem novam, in salute tua circuibunt homines.” Vulg. accords with M.T.

24. ἔπει δίκαιον ὅρος τὸ ἀγιον αὐτοῦ; ignoring the first word, possibly as so much resembling the ending of the previous one, and setting Heb. grammar at nought in their rendering of ἴν ἀνέχετο. καὶ (ἡ ἐς AQ οἱ) ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν Ἰουδα (A om. τ.; AQ τῇ Ἰούδα) καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ; not seeing that Ἰουδα refers
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back to the ἐν of the previous v., and not understand how ἔν could be the subject of the verb. The words καί ἐν π. τ. γ. αὐ. represent a gloss.

ηῤῥία ἀνείρισιν ἁφεῖς ἐνέργει. There is a good deal to be said (see J. D. Michaelis ad loc.) for pointing the first of these words either ἡρον, laetaeuntur, or ἡρον, arabunt, thus closing the v. with two short and well-balanced clauses of appropriate meaning. ἀρθ. represents the root נָלָא (comp. Numb. ii. 17, ἀρθήσεται; 1 K. v. 31 [3 K. vi. 2], 2 K. iv. 4) in the sense of journey, advance, which verb however O' read in the sing. Aq. Symm. Pesh. Vulg. (minantes) read it as the ptcp.

25. ἔνειωσαν. See on v. 12.

28. καθαρείν καὶ κακοῦν. See on i. 10.

32. ἡμέλησα (so in Heb. viii. 9). See on iii. 14. The clear sense of M.T. there forbids us to accept O' as a rendering of the Heb. We may read therefore מ for מ (comparing O's translation of מ in xiv. 19), a change which is com-
mended by the improved sense thus obtained.

33. διδοῦς δοῦσω (AQ om. δοῦσω). See on iii. i, xxii. 24.

35 [36]. Ο' vacat. The word may be
a gloss upon נִשְׂמַת of the next v. It may also however, as Gi. suggests, be a corruption of בֶּן, borrowing the מ from מִשְׂמַת. This would much improve the balance of the clauses, but it assumes that the corruption had taken place before O’s time, who accordingly omitted the word.

καὶ κραυγὴν, but ὁ ταράσσων in Is. li. 15, where M.T. is word for word the same as in this clause. O’ seems here to have read מִשְׂמַת (so Wo., with מִשְׂמַת as an alternative). For the meaning of מִשְׂמַת see on iv. 20.

37 [35]. ἱερὰ. ὅπως ὁδικαί; as though reading ὅπως ὁδικαί. Their failure to understand the general drift of the v. led to their subsequent mistranslations. For their introduction of a negative see on xviii. 18.

39. καὶ περιμεκλωθῆσαι κύκλος ὕπερ ἐκλεκτων λίθων. For περιμεκλ. κύκ. see on iii. 1. In Ezra [2 Esd.] v. 8 ἡλίων ἐκλεκτοὶ is rendered λίθοι ἐκλεκτοὶ. Accordingly O’ probably saw the same root here. Targ. has בְּרֵכוֹת דַּנַּל, the pool of the calf, Pesh. מַסֵּס, to the hill.

40. לֵיל (16). O’ vacat, probably owing to the recurrence of לֵיל, rather than (with Gi. p. xxxi) to the unintelligibility of the words.
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xxxii. [xxxix.] 2. יִּשַּׁלֵּק. Kal.

5. וַיַּקְרָא יְהוָה נַחֲרֵךְ יְהוָסֵד. eiselenesthai Sedeías; perhaps reading ἀλλήλων, and disregarding the ἔνθα. There can be however but little doubt that the Hiph. is right. This may be an example of O's tendency, with which Wellhausen (Text. d. Bücher Sam. p. 10) deals, to use the same Greek verb for the rendering of Kal and of other voices indifferently.

יְרָשׁ. O' vacat. The Heb. is all but identical with xxvii. 22 [xxxiv. 18], where O' is also lacking.

כֹּל. O' vacat; a natural gloss to creep into the text in the time of the exile.

6. Clearly the original form of the v. began with יִּשַּׁלֵּק, (omitting יִּשַּׁלֵּק יְהוָסֵד). Of the two changes natural on the part of those who desired greater clearness, M.T. represents the one, O' the other.

7. מַשִּׁיסְמֵן הַנָּמָלָה לְכָנֻת. κρίσις (NAQ κρίμα) paralabein eis κτήσιν. This would stand fairly enough as a somewhat free rendering of the M.T. When however we find that 'לָה in v. 8 (see note there) meets with such different treatment, we must conclude that in the earlier case O' either failed to understand it (which is unlikely, as the word occurs frequently in Lev. xxv.), or did not find it in their text.
8. ἀνεφηματίσθη οὖσα εἰς ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἑν γὰρ Βενιαμῖν τὸν ἑν Ἀναβάθῳ (Q τὸν ἑν Ἀν. ἑν γὰρ Βεν.). The words 'ἐν γὰρ Βεν' in themselves superfluous, are further condemned by the variation in position.

καὶ σὺ πρεσβύτερος; reading ὦ for ἥ.


11. ἀναφηματίσθησαν τῷ ἔσφραγισμένῳ; but A ἀνεφηματίσθησαν (Q pref. ἀνεφηματίσθησαν καὶ). ὅμως ὡράτα are probably a gloss, while on the other hand ἡργάλεια will be observed to have considerable support. See Field's note, which also mentions Cappellus's conjectural variant ἀναφηματίσθησαν. See also Stade's discussion of the passage in Zeitsch. d. A. T. Wissenschaft v. pp. 175—178.

12. καὶ γραφόμενον (Q γραφόμενον). It is remarkable that Targ. (Pesh.) and Vulg. (qui scripti erant) all represent רביים, a reading which is found in 14 of Kenn.'s MSS. and 34 of de Rossi's. Can O' have had originally γραφόμενον?

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל. O' vacat.

The word was introduced from v. 11.

τὸ ἀνεγνωσμένον. See on v. 11. Stade l. c. gives as resultant text of v. 14.

ך אש ישה יב管线 לוה תאמ ספר המקנה
יהו יא יתימא יא יגולא יתמה בצל חרש
ל조사 ימע יימ רכש : 17.

" אנה. 'O o. See on i. 6.

τῷ ἄνεγνωσμένῳ καὶ τῷ μετέφρασε (N om. k.
τ. μετ.; Q om. τῷ 2ο); a conflate rendering.

18, 19. יוהו יב管线 יסמא : ב' לא. O' has (with slight variations in NQ), as second clause of v. 19, ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ μεγαλώνυμος Κύριος. The last five words of the Greek represent in the main the four Heb. words given above, the variant arising in some way from a scribe's error, while the words ὁ θ. ὁ μ. seem to be an accidental repetition from v. 18. See Wο., pp. 76 f.

19. יב管线. O' pref. Κύριος.

יסמא. O' vacat.

אנו ברלא. O' vacat. The words come from xvii. 10.

20. נאראיא. καὶ ἐν τοῖς γῆγενέσιν; a remark-
able rendering, as though hinting at the derivation of the Heb. word. The nearest parallel is in Ps. xlix. [xlviii.] 3, where γηγ. renders ἐν ἀραὶ 

21. (22) καὶ ἐν ὁράμασιν μεγάλοις. The words agree with Deut. xxvi. 8; comp. Deut. iv. 34. It is noteworthy that O’s rendering of them in both those passages is precisely the same as here; thus connecting μὲ with ἔργα.

23. συμβῆναι, but Βασ. א(מ) ת. A Q pref. καὶ ἐπολέσαν. In either case O’s rendering, if not corrupt, is peculiar.

24. ὁδηγεῖν. See on vi. 6. O’ vacat. The word is introduced from such passages as xxi. 7, xxiv. 10. O’ vacat; a natural accretion.

25. θεοῦ οὗτος. O’ vacat, but substitutes καὶ ἐγράψα (καὶ εἰς) βιβλίον καὶ ἐσφραγισάμην, καὶ ἐπεμαρτυράμην μάρτυρας.

26. μέ; rightly.

28. Κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ (Nom. ὁ θ. Ἰ.). Ἰδρὺς. Δοθεῖσα παραδοθῆσαι. See on iii. 1. They may possibly have read ἰδρὺς (comp. v. 4); but this is made very improbable by the fact that they render the same Heb. similarly elsewhere, viz. xxxiv. [xli.] 2.

30. μόνος; apparently a very early error
for μόνον. Aq. πλὴν, Symm. 1st ed. and Theod. μόνον, Symm. 2nd ed. διόλου. See Field.

καὶ γέν...δόθη. O' vacat. This part of the v. is weak. Also why should its reference, in spite of the preceding clause, be confined to Israel? It may therefore be safely taken as a gloss.

33. ἕλπις. καὶ εἰσίδακα (BbA om.). It is possible that O' may have found ἑλπίζειν, as Gi. suggests, but their giving to 2ο ἕλπις precisely the same rendering would make it probable that with them, as with us, the two words were identical in form. This argument is however somewhat weakened by the fact that BbA do not recognise 2ο ἑλπίς.

34. ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ αὐτῶν (ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἀυτῶν) or (ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἰδίῳ).

35. τῷ Μωλὼν βασιλεί (Q om. β.); a double rendering.

36. ὁλῇ. O' vacat.

ἐν λέγειν (ἐν πάραλληλὶ); probably rightly, and so in v. 43. The M.T. would arise, as an emendation, out of xxxiii. 10, and, as regards the second word, would only involve the difference between ἰδίῳ and ἰδίῳ.

καὶ ἐν ἀποστολῇ. Everywhere else ἰδίῳ is rendered θάνατος or λοιμὸς. The present render-
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ing may be illustrated by the same word as representing מְשַׁלֶּה (Ps. lxxviii. [lxxvii.] 49), apparently in the sense of a pestilence as sent by God. Comp. the use of ἀποστ. in Baruch ii. 25.

39. ἔτεραν ἄρα. *b*is. ἔτεραν ἄρα (ἁνάρ). O' *vocat.* Gi. suggests that the words may have been inserted as the result of a corruption in those immediately preceding, where accordingly he proposes the emendation ἄρα *πρὸς* Ἰ*δ* *α* *ν* *ο* *τ* *ο* *μ* *ε* *μ* on the ground that the expression in M.T. rather suited the people's relation to God than His to them.

40. ἑστίν. καὶ ἐπισκέψομαι; a remarkable rendering. The Heb. expression is supported, as Gi. points out, by Deut. xxviii. 63, xxx. 9.

41. ἐστὶν. καὶ κτηθησόμεθα ἐτι άρχοι; as though reading ἐν τούτῳ ἰδών ἠττά. The sing. may have come through the influence of the ἰδών of the earlier part of the chapter.

42. νῦν λέγεις. See on ν. 36.

xxxiii. [xl.] 2. ἦσαν ὑδάτων γνή. The Heb. pron., as it stands here and later in the ν., has no definite reference, unless, as is proposed by Gi., we transpose ν. 2, 3. Accordingly O' gives a rendering, which may have been suggested by Is. xlv. 18, but is more likely to be an indication that they read ἦσαν ἔτωιν.
4. χάρακας (Q -κα). See on vi. 6. 

5. ηρωρ. προμαχώνας; Midrashic. 

6. νεόκομη. μάχεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς Χαλδαίους. M.T. seems corrupt. We want the Chaldeans to be the subject of this, as they must be of the next clause, and this almost certainly involves the excision of ηρωρ (though read by O'), as it is difficult to find a clear case of that particle accompanying the subject of any but a passive verb. Neh. ix. 32 is perhaps the most plausible instance. 1 S. xvii. 34 (see Driver there) is best explained otherwise. In the present passage by the omission of νεόκομη O' does not after all to any appreciable extent get rid of the obscurity in the sense. (So generally Cor. p. 64. See his further remarks.) 

6. μελέλ. ἀνάγω (A ἐπ.). See on viii. 22. 

καὶ φανερώσω αὐτοῖς καὶ ιατρεύσω αὐτὴν (καὶ ιατ. αὐτήν κὲν εἰρήνη καὶ φαν. αὐτοῖς εἰσακούειν καὶ ιατ. αὐτήν; A καὶ ιατ. αὐτοῖς καὶ φανερώσω αὐτοῖς εἰσακούειν καὶ ιατ. αὐτοῖς; Q is as A, except that it reads φανεροῖ); reading the first word ἀνάγω, from which the form in M.T. would easily arise owing to the neighbouring λή. 

ο' vacat (νεόκομη).
'איל is ἀπ. λεγ. It is taken to mean abundance, as connected with the root which occurs in that sense in Ezek. xxxv. 13; Prov. xxvii. 6. This sense is however dubious here, and has not the support of any early authority. Aq. has (? 1st ed.) εἰσακοῦσεν, and (? 2nd ed.) ιασεν. Symm. has προσενεχήν; so Vulg. deprecationem. Although the root frequently bears that sense, it seems to have no relevancy here.

8. καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθῆσομαι (καὶ μνησθῶ); although as lately as xxxi. 34 they rendered ἴλεως ἐσομαι.

9. καὶ ἔσται εἰς εὐφροσύνην; thus omitting ἴλεως and ἴλεος. Inasmuch as in sense Jerusalem is the subject of ἴλεως, Gi. ingeniously conjectures that in ἴλεως we have fragments of that word. If so, the case is an interesting one, as presenting a corruption which O' dealt with by omission and Heb. scribes by unsuccessful emendation.

10. καὶ ἔξωθεν.

11. ὁ τῶν τῶν. O' vacat.

12. δῶρα (AQ add aίνεσεως). See on xxx. 19. In xvii. 26 'ὴ appears as aίνεσις, but there the context would exclude the sense of gifts, which is at least a possible one here.

13. πᾶσαν τὴν ἀποκάλυψα (A τ. ἀπ. πάσης).
14—26. O' vacat. Whether these vv. are to be attributed to the prophet himself, or whether we are to see in their language (e.g. v. 18 חֵרְבָּנִים, and the absence of a single definite personage as the object of Messianic expectation) traces of a subsequent writer, it is very improbable that O' would have designedly omitted them. The proclamation of the Messianic hope, and of the permanence of David's line, the emphasis placed upon the priestly office, as well as the renewal of the assurance to the people as a whole, given in the concluding vv., would have all appealed strongly to such men as the translators. We must therefore conclude that they were wanting in their Heb. text.

As to the question whether they were rightly so wanting, see Gi.'s summary of the opinions of previous commentators, and discussion of the evidence. He decides against the genuineness of the passage, but points out that the expressions (v. 21), (v. 22) הֵלֵל הָבוּ (v. 18) are so well adapted to the time of Jer., though not used by him elsewhere, that if the writer is to be placed much later than the time of Malachi, we must allow that he is purposely employing an archaism.

Cor. (p. 65), summarily rejecting the present passage in M.T., would substitute xxiii. 7, 8, as
being \( (a) \) most appropriate here in respect of subject-matter, \( (b) \) authentic in itself, as supported by all the versions in xvi. 14, 15 (see note there), in which particular place however it interrupts the sense, \( (c) \) at least suspicious in xxiii. in view of its varying position in M.T. and O'. See note on v. 7 there.

In this passage not only are vv. 14—16 almost a repetition of xxix. 10, xxiii. 5, 6, but v. 17 is closely connected with xxxv. [xlii.] 19, while there is a likeness between 20, 22, 25, 26 and xxxi. [xxxviii.] 35—37.

xxxiv. [xli.] 1. מִשָּׂרָה. O' vacat; and so SH. But the Heb. which remains is still rough and probably needs some correction.

גָּלַל הַעַשׁיָּם. O' vacat.

גָּלַל הַעַשׁיָּם. ἐπολέμουν αὐτὸν (but ΝΑΩ om. αὐτὸν).

tàs πόλεις Ἰουδα; an amplification suggested by i. 15. Comp. Zech. i. 12.

2. 1° ἠκριβήτω. O' vacat. It is true, as Gi. says, that we have but one other instance in this Book (xxxv. 2) of ἠκριβήτω, whereas 'י joined by י to a verb of speaking is frequent. It by no means follows however that this is an adequate defence of M.T. here; for the very rarity of the one, combined with the frequency of the other con-
struction might well be the cause of the introduction of ἧν.

Παραδόσει παραδοθήσεται. See on xxxii. 28.

καὶ συλλήμψεται αὐτὴν καὶ καῦσει αὐτὴν (Q* om. κ. κ. αὐ.) ἡλίκοιν, which O' seems to have read, may be genuine (so Gi. p. xxvi), but again such passages as v. 22, xxxviii. 8 (comp. xxxii. 3, xxxviii. 3) suggest an interpolation.

3. τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ.

O' vacat; but AQ have καὶ τὸ (A om. τὸ) στόμα αὐτοῦ μετὰ τοῦ στόματίς σου λαλήσει. In Pesh. the pronouns change places, evidently in order to harmonize more closely with the previous clause. The expression in xxxix. 5 (בְּדוּרֵה אַחַת מַשְׂפִּיסו) used of Nebuchadnezzar is sufficiently like this to justify us in accepting the words and so in conjecturing that the omission in BN is accidental, while at the same time the two expressions are sufficiently different to make it improbable that they are an insertion suggested by that passage. The form given in Pesh., as introduced for an obvious purpose, is clearly the later.

4. ὑλὰ καὶ θησαυρὸς βαθρᾶ. O' vacat (Q ὥς ἀποθανῇ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ). It is hard (against Gi.) to see a sufficient reason for O’'s omitting these words, if genuine.
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5. καὶ ὅς ἔκλαυσαν. O' read ב, and translated as though it were the root מְלָע; so below, הָלֵב, καύσονται. Aq. has τοὺς ἐμπυρίσμοις and ἐμπυρίσοντι. This rendering was incumbent upon him, owing to his extreme literalness. It is unlikely that the original form of O' was ἔκλαυσαν, καύσονται.

6. τοὺς βασιλεύσαντας πρότερον σου.

καὶ ἔως άδου; looking like the corruption of a transliteration. But B* mas. adds ω κυριε, and AQ* insert the same before κ. ἥμ. This may be, as Perles (p. 83) suggests, a reminiscence of xxii. 18, where however אָלָה was left untranslated. See note there.

7. οὐκούρασε. O' vacat (AQ* τὰς καταλελιμένας; Q*-λειμ.).

8. לְדָם. O' vacat. So Vulg.

9. πρὸς τὸ μὴ δουλεύειν ἄνδρα (κας) ἐξ Ἰουδα (A Ἰσραήλ). O' read Ἰουδαῖος, and apparently had not Ἰσραήλ. They also failed, as in xxv. 11 (see note there) to perceive the sense of בר. Gi. considers that neither Ἰσραήλ nor Ἰουδαῖος represents the original reading, and that the v. ended with Ἰουδαίος (comp. v. 10), while the latter word was corrupted to Ἰουδαίος, the מ arising from dittography, through ב, and then being
altered, as in M.T., to ב in order to harmonize better with the sense of that word. Thus according to him both והיה and שָׁנָה are glosses. The latter however is distinctly represented in O', and is in all probability genuine.

10. הָיָה. kai ἐπεστράφησαν; apparently by confusion of eye with כִּי יָשַב which begins v. 11. לָבַת...וְ/by יִשְׁתַּמֶּשׁ. O' vacat; a mistake owing to the recurrence of יִשְׁתַּמֶּשׁ, while the omission would be rendered all the easier, since the word had been already dealt with (see last note) by the scribe. It is curious that מְדִים itself has not been rendered in either v., although represented in vv. 9, 16 (ἐλευθερούς). It should be added that לָבַת...וְ/by יִשְׁתַּמֶּשׁ here may well be an accidental repetition of the same words as ending v. 9 (see note there) and beginning v. 10.

14. שֵׁשֶׁת. ἕξ; to harmonize with the numeral that follows, and not to be accounted for by any difference in their Heb. text.

ἀποστέλλεις (ἐστάς); thus agreeing more closely with the words of Deut. xv. 12.

וְ/by מָצָא. O' vacat. The word may easily have been introduced later from the v. in Deut.

אֲנָפָיו. O' vacat.

15. ἔπεστρεψαν (A ἐστρ.).
and so for συνετέλεσαν which follows. We can only suppose that this retention of the person of the former verbs was caused by a failure of attention on the part of the translator or a copyist.

16. ἡμικράσεως Αἰτία. O' vacat. The clause is suggested by v. 11.

17. οἷος λέγω τι. O' vacat.

'eis διασποράν, but in xv. 4 eis ἀνώγκας.

18. ἠπείρωθεν λαχάνῳ ἄτραβρῳ ἄτραβρῳ. These words, though appearing in O' (but not A), are clearly an early interpolation, meant as an explanation of the immediately preceding ἄτραβρῳ, which was thus erroneously interpreted to refer to the broken covenant with the released slaves.

ἵνα ἐποίησαν κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου, τὸν μόσχον. If we read לפלינ', and alter O' to correspond, the grammatical difficulty in connexion with עִבְרִית disappears. The traditional pointing of לפלינ' seems to have arisen from the pron. aff. in בֵּיתוֹ.

ונ (א om. ונ) ἐποίησαν ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτῷ. O' did not find לְ, and in the absence of these words gave a vague rendering to the remainder. לְ were the addition of a scribe whose eye sprang from
3° אֲנָשָׁה to 2° אֲנָשָׁה, and, writing in consequence of this mistake רָשָׁה over again, completed the sense (having regard to the subsequent context) by inserting לָשֵׁי. So apparently Gi.

19. אֵלֶּה יְמִינָלְמ. O' vacat.

καὶ τὸν λαὸν. O' vacat. Gi. considers (but quite needlessly) that O's omission is because of the consciousness of their foregoing ill-success, "da sie nach v. 18 mit dem Kalb nichts anzufangen wussten."

20. בְּנֵי מָמֵת נְפֹשַׁת. O' vacat. The words would naturally be inserted, as being suggested by such passages as xix. 7, xxi. 7 etc., and the parallelism of the v. is affected by their absence only so far that the latter section thus becomes considerably longer than the former. It is true that there is otherwise a general consensus of authority for them (SH. without an ast., Targ. Pesh. Vulg.), but we can hardly suppose that O' would have intentionally omitted them, while their accidental disappearance is extremely improbable, when we consider that they are absent also from v. 21.

τὰ θυσιμαία αὐτῶν. See on vii. 33.

21. בְּנֵי מָמֵת נְפֹשַׁת. O' vacat. The words receive the same support from other versions as in v. 20 (see note there). The two occurrences thus
stand or fall together. The question however of their effect on the parallelism in this ν. involves that of the treatment of the words which follow. See next note.

καὶ δύναμιν βασιλέως Baβυλωνος. O' omits ἔν, and treats ἐν as nominative, thus shipwrecking the grammar of the Greek clause. Thereby however they have preserved for us, as Gi. says, an indication of the original shape of the Heb. text; viz. that it formed the beginning of a new sentence (making ν. 22)

“And as for etc.” It is true that this change, if we also omit the words dealt with in the preceding note, leaves ν. 21 with but one member, but this does not seem to be a very serious objection to the arrangement.

tοὺς ἀποτρέχουσιν (A ὁ ἀποτρέχοντες) ἀπ’ αὐτῶν; as though reading ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.

xxxv. [xlivi.] 2. ἐκλείψαντα. τῶν αὐλῶν; but in ν. 4 both παστοφόρου (and so in 1 Chr. ix. 26) and οἴκος (so in xxxvi. [xliii.] 10, 20).

4. בְּנֵי הַן. נוֹי וֹי נוֹוי 'Aνανίου (נ 'Aנניא, נ 'Aנניאו, but Q om. 'I. נוֹוי.

5. לָפָל בֵּית-הָרָקָבִים. κατὰ πρόσωποι
Here only is used in their designation.

See vv. 2, 3, 18. O' therefore is to be preferred.

7. O' vacat.

8. O' vacat.

11. Naβouχodovnosóp. See introd. note to chaps. xxvii.—xxix.

των 'Aσσυρίων; not reading άντελ, but giving this sense to ἀντελ, inasmuch as it formed an important portion of the Assyrian Empire, and these bands were sent by Nebuchadnezzar.

12. πρὸς μέ. It is more natural to retain the 1st p. in accordance with the previous context, thus taking 'νερ as a gloss.

14. έστησαν ῥήμα viοι 'Ιωαδᾶβ; freely, and not implying a different text.

15. O' vacat; introduced from such passages as vii. 25. See on vii. 13.

16. O' vacat.

17. Κύριος; “an altogether unparalleled accumulation of Divine names, in which M.T. stands entirely alone.” Cor. p. 59.
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18.ויהו וּרְכָבָה אֶפֶר יְרֵיהוּ. O' vacat.

The spuriousness is indicated by this use of the 3rd p., as compared with the preceding context.

ב. διὰ τούτο οὕτως (לַכְּן בָּה); taken by confusion of eye from the opening of the next v.

שקָטֵה. ἤκονσαν νῦν Ἰω. νῦν Ἄ. P.; and so the remaining 3rd persons in the v. appear as 2nd persons. Gi. defends M.T., considering the change in O' to be consequential (but how so?) upon the error of eye referred to in the last note. Rather we may say that the introduction of the gloss (לַכְָּלָה וָלָ) at the beginning of the v. led to the change in the persons.

19.וְלַכְָּלָ יִשְׂרָאֵל. O' vacat.

Having accidentally given לַכְָּלָ (see note on לַכְָּלָ, v. 18), they did not repeat it. The rest is a gloss.

נוּרְב. τῶν νῦν Ἰωανάδιβ; Midrashic.

בלורס. πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς γῆς; Midrashic.

xxxvi. [xliii.] 1.הַי הַנַּבֶּרֶךְ חָוָה אֶלְיוֹרְפִימָה. γένειζη λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς μέ. The rest of the chapter is in the 3rd p. The Greek
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however has very much the air of the original opening as written by the prophet himself, while M.T. gives us the same as altered to agree with the form of the sequel.

2. ירושלם (but AQ as M.T.);
rightly.

3. O adds βασιλέως 'Ιουδα.

6. O vacat.

בָּשָׂאל אֶפְרָיָה מַשְׁלֵם אַדְּבָּרְךָ לְדָהוֹ.
εν τῷ χαρτίῳ (NAQ χάρτη) τούτῳ. Gi. thinks that O’s omission is to be accounted for by their having failed to understand the construction. It is true that some Greek mss. (and the Vulg.) wrongly place "יַדְּרַשׁ in the relative sentence, but this is a very different thing from omission. Rather, the six Heb. words seem to be a badly combined pair of glosses. The aff. in בָּשָׂאל is no objection to this view, as its antecedent has been virtually mentioned in the previous clause (בָּשָׂאל). Gi. (ad loc. and p. xxxi) says that the claim of the words "יַדְּרַשׁ to stand in the Heb. text is shewn by the fact that the pronoun referring back to them in the concluding word of the v. (בָּשָׂאל) is rendered by O. Since however O’s rendering there is ἀναγγείλων αὐτοῖς, to them (the hearers), it is plain that his argument falls to the ground.

9. τῷ ὀγδώπῃ, but AQ τῷ πέμπτῳ,
and so text of SH. If before the time of our oldest Heb. mss. numbers were expressed by letters, there is nothing surprising in the confusion of ה and כ. "[The number eight] seems to tally with the notices in 2 K. xxiv. The vassalage of Jehoiakim is there said to have lasted three years; [upon] this followed the rebellion; while the siege of Jerusalem was reserved for the short reign of Jehoiachin. Now, as this siege must have been the punishment of Jehoiakim’s rebellion, and as the reign of the latter king lasted eleven years, we are brought to the same date as that given by Josephus [Ant. x. 6. 1] for the commencement of the vassalage, viz. the eighth year.” Cheyne ad loc.

2ο καὶ (A pref. ὁ) ὀίκος Ἰουδα. The Heb. is altered to accord with the end of v. 6.

12. Ἁλεμίου (ἈSeleκίου). Apparently the error arose under the influence of the Ζ. of v. 14.

καὶ Ἰωναθὰν (AQ* Naḥān). In v. 25 we find Ἰωναθὰν (A Naḥān). (In xxvi. [xxxiii.] 22 O’ omits the name.) Accordingly in the present case Ἰων. seems an early lapse into the common name, while, as the error was not repeated in v. 25, A in both places and Q* here, puzzled at the diversity, omitted the sacred part of the name.

13. O’ vacat.
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14. נֶבֶר תּוֹם. πρὸς Βαροῦχ νῦν Νηριοῦ; a gloss.

15. פָּלָמ (פָּלָמ). O' vacat (A τὸν 'Ιουδαί; Ο τὸν 'Ιουδαίν); apparently an accidental omission.

16. פִּידוּר. ουσβουλευσαντο; loosely.

17. הָרַנְנוּ נַע. O' vacat.

18. פִּידוּר. O' vacat; a gloss, which spoils the sense, and has been introduced from v. 18.

19. נָרָנְמ (Q נָרָנְמ) μοι 'ירמיה (Q om. 'Ie.).

20. נָרָנְמ. O' vacat. They may easily have been ignorant of the meaning of this ἀπ. λεγ. As however they do not very frequently resort to omission by way of escaping a difficulty, we should probably read (so Gi.) by metathesis of letters בַּרְנָו, but at the same time consider (not so Gi.) that the word is a gloss. See Wo., pp. 47 f.

21. נָרָנְמ (A Q -σαμá), and so in v. 21.

22. נָרָנְמ. פָּנָתος τοὺς λόγους, but A (not, as Gi. says, "LXX") adds τοῦτοις.

23. נָרָנְמ. O' vacat.
doubtless rightly. The ทร is in itself suspicious. O' vacat.

23. ἀπέτεμεν (A ἀπέτεμεν) αὐτάς (NA αὐτά). The pl. pron. is not after all inaccurate, inasmuch as the Heb. tense indicates that this operation was performed for every three or four leaves. In the Targ. the pronoun is altogether unrepresented. Pesh. Vulg. have it in the sing.

24. εἴητησαν; but AQ and others have εἴητ., and so SH. These point to the original εἴηστησαν, which appears in MSS. 41, 87, and is adopted in Compl.

25. Ελναβάν (A Nαθάν). See on v. 12.

The misunderstanding which induced the omission of the negative (for such omissions see on xviii. 18) probably was caused by the ב. We can hardly however suppose that O' would have failed to be corrected in their view by the following clause, had it stood in their Heb. text.

O' vacat (Q καὶ οὐκ ἔκουσεν αὐτῶν; so MSS. 86, 88). See last note.

26. οἱ ἀρταλματίων ἔστησαν. O' vacat.
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καὶ κατεκρύβησαν (Q* adds ἐντὸν Κυρίου); softening the expression, in order to avoid anthropomorphism. Comp. xxxi. [xxxviii.]

20. O vacat.

31. οὖν. O vacat.

ἐπὶ αὐτῶν, but ΝΑQ* αὐτοὺς (perhaps read as ἀλλα).

γῆν Ἰουδα (Α* τὴν Ἰσραήλ, Νκα τ. Ἰουδα; Q τ. γ. Ἰουδα); an early error.

32. καὶ ἐλαβὲν Βαροὺχ χαρτίων ἐτερων. The M.T. (against Gi.) has probably arisen from the influence of the command in v. 28.

xxxvii. [xlv.] 1. ἄλλο. O vacat. Here the absence of the article is in itself suspicious.

_against ἧν Ἰωάκιμ (but AQ pref. Ἰεχώνιου νικοῦ); an accidental omission.

4. τὴς πόλεως (reading Ἰεριχώ). MSS. 23, 62, 88, 233 have τοῦ δύκλου, and so SH.

5. ἤφαιτον ἐλπίδων. O vacat.

ἐντὸς (but Νκα AQ ἐντὸ); an obvious error.

7. ἐπείτε (perhaps ἔστω ἢ ἔστομεν ἐν χείλεσθε). Hence O’s reading, as given in the next note.

8. πρὸς σέ. O were thus led (see last note) to read as ἔστω ἢ ἔστομεν ἐν χείλεσθε, and ignore ἐλπίδων, as though an error in their Heb. text.
9. μὴ ὑφολάβητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν; confusing Hiph. of ἄφη with Kal of ἔφη (although they recognised the former in iv. 10); so in xlii. 16 [xxix. 17] ἔφη, ἐνεχέλησεν.

12. τοῦ ἄγοράσαι ἐκεῖθεν (Ν.α. marx. adds ἄρτον; so MSS. 22, 36, and others, and so SH. marg.). This supports the possibility that here (as in v. 13) we have a case of transposition of letters, and that O' read ἔφη, a verb which they thus render in 2 Chr. i. 16 (comp. Neh. x. 32 [2 Esd. xx. 31]). Aq. Theod. have μερισθῆναι, and Symm. μερίσασθαι; thus taking it (rightly) to refer to an inheritance.

13. κατέλυεν. ἀνθρωπος παρ' φ κατέλυεν (AQ κατέλυσεν); reading the root κατ. by transposition, inasmuch as καταλύον corresponds to κατάθηκα in Is. xxxviii. 12.

15. O' vacat.

16. καὶ (Ν.α. φτι) ἤλθεν (Σάβ): obviously rightly. For a converse case see on viii. 3. τὴν χερᾶ (MS. 88 τὴν ἀναφό); thus making no attempt to get rid of the word (see on xxxviii. 14 and p. 5). Aq. has ἐργασθεῖα, Vulg. (in) ergastulo.

17. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτῶν; a free rendering.

O' vacat.
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ο λόγος (but ΝΑQ om. .INSTANCE); inaccurately, the Heb. being indefinite.

19. יָלָֹֽךְ. O' vacat.
20. אָמַֽעְתֶּנְּ. O' vacat.

καὶ τί ἀποστρέφεις με;

xxxviii. [xlv.] 1. ἡμέρα ἐν Μεσοποταμίᾳ. O' vacat; apparently an accidental omission, helped by the occurrence of '.displayName' already in the enumeration.

2. χρῆμα. O' vacat; as often, e.g. xxi. 9, xxvii. 8 [xxxiv. 6], xxxii. [xxxix.] 24, xlii. [xlxi.] 17, xlv. [li.] 13.

3. ὁτι οὐτος (ⲥⲓ, ⲟⲩⲩ); probably rightly.

4. χρησιμολογεῖ, but Bb NAQ have χρησμ. See on viii. 2.

5. οὐκ ἦδύνατο ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς αὐτοῦς; reading ἡμᾶς, and thus making the clause a remark of the narrator. The tense of ἐκβάλλει will then be explained as denoting the permanent condition of the king. The endeavour to make the words part of Zedekiah's speech would easily lead to the change to ἀνακτάμενος.

6. ἵκωθη ἁπατομένῳ. O' vacat.

Ἄξιον (but ΝΑQ τὸν λ.). The anomalous insertion of the article in the Heb. perhaps arose from the 'وبة of xxxvii. 16.
CRITICAL NOTES.

καὶ ἔχαλασαν αὐτὸν (Q sub "πάντες" with ast. adds ἐν σχοινοῖς) εἰς τὸν λαῖκον. The last words of both texts are probably glosses.

καὶ ἦ (Q* om. ἦν); reading ἦν, afterwards supplanted by the gloss.

7. Ο' vacat.

8. πρὸς αὐτὸν. Each is probably a gloss.

9. Ο' vacat.

εἰπονεῦσώ ἀ ἐποίησας τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι τὸν ἀνθρωπον τοῦ; altered thus in order to express more literally and fully the actual facts.

10. Ο' vacat.

12. ς ἦν... θεῖα ταῦτα (Q θεῖα ταῦτα); M.T. (but not so Gi. p. xxxi) constructing its gloss by the help of v. 11.

14. εἰς οἰκίαν ἀσέλεισθη (Q ἀσαλεῖ, A σαλαθί, Q* ἀσιλισθη). Whatever may have been the precise nature of O's perplexity, their treatment of the word may make us hesitate to assume (with Gi. and others) that in many of the preceding passages they arbitrarily altered and shortened the Heb. text with which
they were dealing. Gi. conjectures that as in 2 S. xxiii. 8 is an error for (but this is by no means certain; see Driver there), so here too we should add a , and understand the expression as referring to the entrance of the king’s body-guard. See 2 K. vii. 2 etc.

16. vacat.

20. (A om. τον) λόγον. Here only in O.T. is a representative of , which with very few exceptions appears as φωνή. Thus O’ seem to have read ; a fact which is important in relation to v. 27. See note there.

22. καταλύσουσιν (Q κατισχύσουσιν); reading , and making the object.

23. κατακαυθήσεται (τηρείται).

So Targ. Pesh., suit the parallelism. The is of course by no means a conclusive objection.

25. τι λαλησέν. (Q τι λαλησας προς τον βασιλεύς). This is only a slip; for the converse words at the end of the v. are correctly translated.

27. λόγος Κυρίου. Whether O’ actually read the Divine Name, or only inserted it as Midrashic, there is a good deal to be said (against
Gi.) for their rendering, taken in connexion with τὸν λόγον of v. 20, where see note. It was this word which was not reported. See Wo.'s sensible remarks (pp. 92 f.) on O's reading here.

28 and xxxix. [xlvi.] 1. Kai ἐγένετο. The Heb. words clearly belong to the beginning of the next ch., as even the marg. note suggests. The omission of all but the first may be due either to their absence from O's Heb. text, or to failure to perceive their connexion with xxxix. 3, owing to the long digression. Vulg. has et factum est ut caperetur Jerusalem.

xxxix. [xlvi.] 1. יִבְנָה יְהֹוָה יְתֵשׁ...בְּרֹדֶר הָיֶשֶר. τῷ ( clit. pref. εν) μηνὶ (AQ εν τῷ έτει) τῷ ἐνάτῳ τοῦ Σεδεκία (so B*; Bκντ., AQ -ιου) βασιλέως Ιουδα (AQ add εν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ δεκατῷ). Bκ thus exhibit an early error, which acted upon their rendering of lii. 4. (See note there.) Verses 1, 2 here, over long for a parenthesis, break the connexion and are apparently an abbreviated edition of lii. 4—7 (so Gi.). Unlike vv. 4—13, they appear to have come into the text by O's time.

3. In both M.T. and O' no less than six princes are enumerated. In the M.T. of v. 13 on the other hand (O' is there lacking) four only (besides Nebuzar-adan) are given, one of them differing in name from any of those in v. 3. The great variation in the spelling of the names in the Greek MSS., both as compared with each other and
with M.T., makes it evident that they were sufficiently unfamiliar to the Jewish ear. Gi.'s proposed restoration of the text reduces the number of names to two. He argues thus.

1°. Nergal-sharezer stands in both vv. 2°. The first part of Samgar-nebo is a confusion for Sar-mag = Rab-mag, chief of the magicians (the title of 1°), while the latter portion, as never ending a name, is to be transferred to the beginning of the 3rd name. (With this arrangement Septuagint MSS. agree, prefixing καὶ to the Ναβου., while in ΝΑQ the καὶ before Σαμαγ. is absent.) 3°. Sar-sechim, thus becoming Nebo-sarsechim, is an error for Nebo-shasban of v. 13. 4°. Rab-saris is a title, chief of the eunuchs. According to this view, 5° and 6° are a gloss, perhaps a marg. note introduced for the purpose of correcting the Samgar.

4—10. O' vacat. The vv. interrupt the train of thought, and seem an abbreviated edition of lii. 7—16 (= 2 K. xxv. 4—12).

11—13. O' vacat. This passage we may also consider a gloss, though not with the same absolute confidence as that which precedes. According to lii. 12 Nebuzar-adan did not enter Jerusalem till four weeks later than this time, while xxxviii. [xlv.] 28 seems to imply that immediately upon the taking of the city the prophet was set free. See further discussion of the question in Gi. יִרְבָּךְ (v. 13) is itself a word which in this sense rarely, if ever, occurs as early as Jeremiah's time. Comp. xli. 1.
14. καὶ ἐξῆγαγον αὐτὸν. It sounds obscure, but must mean Jer.'s house. It is probably a gloss, embodying some tradition.

16. O' vacat.

xl. [xlvi.] 1. O' vacat.

3. O' vacat.

5. O' vacat.

Gb. (ἀλλ' ἄλλος) καὶ (A om. κ.) θῆσον.

4. 5. ἔσται... ἐσθήσῃ. ei δὲ μὴ, ἀπότρεησ (ἈQ ins. καὶ) ἀνάστρεψον (A ei δὲ μὴ, ἀπόστρεψον καὶ ἀπότρεησ). We may take this to represent an original ἔσται ἄλλος γι' αὐτῷ by way of harmonizing with the earlier part of the v. ηλίσ is rendered by ἀποτρ. xxxvii. [xlv.] 9. The remainder of v. 4 in M.T. was suggested by Gen. xiii. 9, while the words are a picturesque gloss.

5. ἐν γῇ (בְּאֶרֶן); to be preferred.

6. τοῦ λαοῦ ἐν γῇ Ἰσραήλ: eis ἀπαντα τὰ ἀγαθά ἐν ὑφαλμοῖς σου, but η Q τοῦ λ. eis πάντα τὰ ἁγ. ἐν γῇ (ἈQ om. γῇ); Q τοῦ λ. eis π. τ. ἁγ. ἐν.

O' vacat (Q ἐστιατορίαν καὶ).
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7. kal ἐναίκας αὐτῶν.

8. Thus "Jonathan...scheint nur ein Doppelgänger seines Bruders," Gi. He appears no more here nor in M.T. or O' in 2 K. xxv. Another trace of his absence from the earliest text remains in the fact that בִּֽיְנָא is represented in Targ. by a singular. So also many mss. in Kenn. and de Rossi.

9. ἀπὸ προσώπου (AA ins. τοῦ) παῖς; reading מטעב, which is found in 2 K. xxv. 24. It is remarkable that there O' seem to have read מְעֶת, rendering πάροδον.

10. O' adds ἐναυτίου ὑμῶν (Q om.).


15. מַהוּ עָבֹת נַפְשׁוֹ. μή (AQ add ποτε) πα-

tάκη σου ψυχήν; freely.

xli. [xlviii.] 1. וניב דִּינוֹ. O' vacat; probably a gloss. For רְבִי see on xxxix. 13.

2. O' vacat.

3. μετ' αὐτοῦ.

5. kal (Q om. κ.) ἀπὸ Σαλίμ (A Σαλώμ).
is mentioned as "משה לְעֵר" in M.T. of Gen. xxxiii. 18, but perhaps there is not a proper name. See Cheyne on the present verse. Wo. (pp. 254 f.) adduces the Genesis passage to confirm O’s reading here. But the influence of a passage doubtless familiar to Alexandrian scholars may have induced the rendering "_masks μ" here, and A’s variant strengthens this view.

6. ἐκλαίον (A καὶ) τὸν ἑαυτόν καὶ ἐκλαίον (ἐκλαίον). Failing to understand that apparent and not real mourning is meant, O’ felt bound to ascribe it to those who had just been spoken of as κοπτόμενοι. Cor. (p. 73) strangely remarks in support of O’, “It is impossible to see any motive for Ishmael’s weeping.”

7. Ὀρν... Ο’ vacat.

8. ἕξει (ἐκεῖ); but Q om.

9. πάντας. Gi. (p. xxxi) denies that M.T. is a gloss.

The Heb. is scarcely intelligible, while the Greek is probably right.

10. καὶ ἀπεστρέψεν (ἐπὶ). O’ vacat.

O’ vacat, but Q marg. has καὶ
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which may be the original form of the gloss. For that reading Kenn. and de Rossi adduce several MSS.

12. τὸ στρατόπεδον αὐτῶν; reading

13. Ο’ vacat.

14. Ο’ vacat.

15. Ο’ vacat.

16. Ο’ vacat.

possibly reading the word

as οὐ βοῦριος. Comp. xliii. [l. 6, xliv. [li.] 20.


17. έν Γαβρι-ρωχαμά (χ sup. ras. B'), ά έν γη Βαρωχαμά, A έν γη Βαρωχαμάμ, Q έν γη Βαρωχαμάμ. All these, M.T. included, are doubtless corruptions of the original. Gi. conjectures the first word to have been Γαβριώτης. So Aq., and Josephus, whose words (Ant. X. 9. 5) are “εἰς τινα τόπουν, μᾶνδραν λεγό-μενον.”

xliii. [xlix.] 1. καὶ Ἄσαρίας

vids Μασσαίου (Ν 'Ανναίου, Ν 'Ωσαίου, A Μασσαίου). 'Ασρ., as in xliii. [l.] 2, where M.T. itself has Ἰερώτης, is probably right. M.T. may be
due to the idea that the names of captains should correspond as closely as possible here to those given in xl. [xlvii.] 8. Maas. is as in xliii. 2, where M.T. is as here.

2. עונן. O' vacat.

9. אלוהי...לבן. O' vacat.

10. אומן שוב חשב (reading חשב).

12. ורוהוס. καὶ ἐλεησοῦ; so הושיב, καὶ ἐπιστρέψω. Apparently the Heb. words were read as infin. abs., and so considered as carrying on the person of לְאָנָא.

14. לאפר לא. O' vacat. It is almost too vivid for a gloss, and was probably omitted by O', through their failure to understand the construction of the solitary לא.

15. שטח' ירוחם. O' vacat.

דֶּאֶש. See on xxiii. 39.

17. ראֶשֶׁ. οἱ ἀνθρώποι (Q οἱ ἄνδρες). O' adds καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄλλογενεῖς, as though reading וְלַהַרְשָׁם. This was perhaps suggested to them (so Gi.) by רומם of xliii. 2, although it is scarcely probable, as the Greek for that word (see note) survives for us only in Q.

18. בֵּית. O' vacat. See on xxxii. 24, xxxviii. 2.
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σωζόμενος; so for ἵστρὲ in xlv.

[li.] 14, σεσωσμένος.

18. ὁμοθάν. O' vacat.

eis ἀβατον (Ἄβατον) καὶ
(ἀ* om. καὶ) ὑποχείρωι; thus omitting ἥν. καὶ
ὑπ. may well be a gloss.

19. ἄλπησεν Κύριος. Probably
the Heb. has early lost an opening
through an error of eye. For the formula see x. 1,
xlv. 1, xlvii. 13, l. 1. O', feeling the abruptness,
supplied the relative. Vulg. has Verbum Domini.

O' vacat; through confusion of eye.

20. ἡπονευσάσθ; reading

O' vacat.

21. O' vacat.

O' vacat. Gi.'s view that O'
purposely omitted ἐλλείπει is unlikely, as thereby
they would have wantonly made their rendering
harsher.

22. ὅτι ἡ ἁρπάζῃ κι.

O' vacat. See v. 17.

xliii. [l.] 2. Ἀξαπίας υἱὸς
Μαισσαῖον (Bব Mαισσαῖον, ἁ* Μασίον, ἁ* Μασ-
σέου, A Μασσαίου, Q Ὀσαίου). See on xlii. 1.
CRITICAL NOTES.

ἀρνεί. O' vacat (Q οἱ ὑπερήφανοι).

οἱ εἴπαντες (Ἁ -πόντες, Q* εἴπαν). We can recover the art. in M.T., if (with Gi.) we emend to ᾱρνεί, and the rebellious. That O's rendering is consistent with such a reading, in other words that the loss of the Ν, which is involved in referring the word to ᾱρνεί, would not be a very serious difficulty with them, we gather from such passages as vii. 10 (see note there) and xliii. 8 [xxix. 9].

ἀρνεί. O' vacat.

πρὸς ἡμᾶς; reading ᾱρνεί. M.T. however is on the whole the more probable, when we compare the language of xliii. [xliii.] 20.

5. ἱλαστήριον... ἡμῖν. O' vacat.

6. ἄνδρας. O' vacat (A 'Ιουβα).

tous δωνατοὺς ἄνδρας. See on xlii. 16.

καὶ τὰ λοιπά (A καὶ τὰ νήπια κ. τ. λ.; Q τὰ νήπ. λ.). So in xlii. [xlviii.] 16.

9. ἐν (Ἀ ἐπὶ) προθύροισ, ἐν πύλῃ. O' have omitted ἄνθρωποι (which occurs here only), perhaps as being unknown to them. We may however adopt Gi.'s suggestion that they read ἰδσ, with Aq. Symm. Theod., who
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have ἐν (τῷ) κρυφίον or ἐν ἀποκρύφων; so (with ast.)
SH. and mss. 88 and (without ast.) 22, 36, and
others. If O' read thus, they may have considered
the word as already sufficiently expressed by their
κατάκρυφων. ἐν is a subst. which occurs else-
where only in Nah. iii. 14 (πλύσθων) and 2 S. xii.
31 (τοῦ πλυσθέντος). MS. 88 with ast. (so Qmarr. ἐν τῷ
π.) has ἐν πλύσθιον in the present passage. Probably
(so Gi.) it is a corruption of ἐν ἀποκρύφων, and stood
immediately before ἐν. After the word had
thus been corrupted to a subst., ἐν was inserted
for the sake of the sense, and O', finding this form
of text, omitted ἐν and took ἐν as though it
were misplaced.

10. מ"תע. O' vacat. See on xxv. 9.

tai θησεῖ; rightly, as the following
shews. M.T. arose from the influence of
κατάκρυψε (Ἁσ. -ψα). M.T. is pro-
bably right, as the reading from which the other is
more likely to have come. Not so however Gi. or
Cor. (p. 73).

τὰ δύνα (AQ add αὐτοῦ). The
word is ἀπ. λέγ. and was doubtless not familiar.
The present is not the only instance of a strange
use of δύνα in this Book. See li. 12.
12. καὶ καὐσεὶ. See on ἴπτεθη in v. 10.

καὶ φθείρεί (A φθερ); and so ὑπερασφαλεί, φθεύρει (A φθερ.); a decidedly unsuccessful guess, although Cor. (p. 73) confidently defends it. O’ failed to conjecture any suitable application of a word which must in its ordinary sense have been familiar. For Aq. and Symm. (?καὶ ἐξερευνήσει τοὺς βόλους Αἰγύπτου) see Field’s full note.

13. Βιτίς. Ἡλίου πόλεως τούς ἐν Ἡλίου (AQ* ἐν Ἔνων); a double rendering.

ἀναστάτως. O’ vacat; a gloss, to distinguish from Beth-shemesh in Palestine (so Gi.).

καὶ τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν. The form in M.T. arose through v. 12.


2. ἡσε ἡσ. O’ vacat.

ἀπὸ ἐνοίκων (AQ* ἐνοικοῦντων); as though reading Ἐνοίκων.

3. λατάζ. O’ vacat. The occurrence of the word in this connexion (contrast v. 8) and its construction (ἁλάζ) are in themselves suspicious.

ῥέμα...ἀπαχθήμ. O’ vacat.

6. ἐν πῦλαις. Considering the number of cases, in which O’’s rendering suggests the loss
of a letter from the present Heb. text, we may decide to consider that they here read בבלם, rather than that πυλαίς is an error for πόλεων. If the latter had been O’s rendering (now found, according to Holmes and Parsons, only in MS. 106; so Compl.), there would have been the less reason for the corruption, as בבלם is rendered by ἐν πόλεωσι (without a variant in H. and P.) in v. 17.

8. לָמָה תָּבְרָה לְכָּם; reading doubtless לְם תָּבְרָה לְכָּם. The prep. in M.T. comes from v. 7.

9. τῶν ἀρχων ὑμῶν. Read (with Gi.) שֵׁשִׁירי, comparing the language of vv. 17, 21, viii. 1.

אַשָּׁת רֵעְתֵיכֶם. O’ vacat.

καὶ τῶν κακῶν τῶν γυναικῶν ὑμῶν; but, as Gi. points out, this may be a gloss by way of correcting ἀρχων ὑμῶν above, and thus the words may not have a rightful place in either text.

10. ἀνά. καὶ οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο; freely.

אַשָּׁת רֵעְתֵיכֶם. O’ vacat.

בָּתָרְתָּה. O’ vacat.

לִפְנֵיכֶם. O’ vacat.

11. בָּכָם לַצְּתַה. O’ vacat.
11, 12. ἡ πάντας τοὺς καταλογοῦσαν.
O' vacat.

12. οὐκ ἠθέλαν "εἰς τὰ λατρεῖαν.
O' vacat. Most of this is a gloss suggested by xlii. [xlix.] 17.

13. ἔπεσον. O' vacat (AQ καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ).
See on xlii. 17.

14. σεσωμένος. See on xlii.

15. ἡ θεότης ἠθέλας. O' vacat (AQ θεοὶ ἐτέρωσαν).
O' vacat.

16. τῇ βασιλίσσῃ τοῦ ὁμοδαλῶσαι. See on vii. 18.

17. θεότης ἠθέλας. O' vacat.

18. ἡ ὅπως ἐν βεβαίῳ.
O' vacat.

19. ἡ ἀντίδειπνη. O' vacat. According to Gi. (p. xxx) the word was unintelligible to them. It probably means, to represent her (by the shape of the cakes. Comp. ἀνέβαλε γυναικὲς, Job x. 8). Vulg. ad coelendum eam, Aq. εἶν κακόσει (or εἰς κάκωσεν).

17—2
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κῆμαμ; but בַּנָּא εὐνασαν,

A. εὐνάσατε, A. εὐνάσατο.

O' vacat; but they may have found

κῆμαμ, referring to קֶבֶרָה. See above.

22. יפלו. ἴδονατο; reading μεῖον ἢν.

O' vacat.

23. καὶ.  Ο' vacat.

24. בָּלְיָהוֹ...מְצֶרִים. O' vacat.

25. ינאמ (א adds αι) γυναίκες, as though reading ינאמ הינשím. This is better, on

account of the gender of the following יַבְרֶנֶה.

It is not absolutely necessary that the three masc. affixes which follow should be altered. Comp.  
Exod. i. 16 (חיה), ii. 17 (ברשהím)  and קָנָנָה

Cant. vi. 9  bis; Ruth i. 8, 9, 11, 13, 22.

2° קַנְטִירִים. O' vacat.

27. יַרְחֵלֹתָם. אֵדָנ (בַּנָּא וּאֵדָנ) εὐλαμ-  

σιων (A - λειμτ.).

28. מַרְאֵים מְצָרִים. O' vacat.

מַסְרִים מְצָרִים. O' vacat. The earlier form was
doubtless מ. מ בְּ.

29. בַּקְסָם...לַלְכָם. O' vacat; by an error

of eye.
30. 

O' vacat.

Xlv. 3 [li. 33]. κόπον ἐπὶ πόνον μου (Q. μου). We should rather read (so SH.) κόπον ἐπὶ πόνον μου with Compl.

4 [li. 34]. O' vacat.

Xlvi. 1 [xxv. 14]. 

Α ἐπροφήτευσέν 'ἱερεῦς ἐπὶ τὰ (A. om. τὰ) ἔθνη. See on xxv. 13 [14].

3 [xxvi.]. ὁ θελα. So v. 9, and in 1 K. x. 17, xiv. 26, 27, and elsewhere.

5 [xxvi.]. O' vacat; thus saving us from the difficulty, or according to Schwally (l.c. p. 191, note), the impossibility of taking ἐλεήμων as equivalent to ἡμι.

Ἐνδολα. ἐλα elsewhere is a place of refuge (Ps. cxliii. 5; Job xi. 20), not the act of flight. If therefore we are to accept O's rendering (so A.V. and R.V. "are fled apace") we should read, as they probably did, the infin. abs.

7 [xxvi.]. ἐπιμείν; perhaps by confusion of eye with the ἤνι of the next v.

8 [xxvi.]. ἐνδατα Αιγύπτου; perhaps meant as Midrashic (comp. the figure as used in Is. viii. 7), and not as translating a variant on the οὐκ ἦν of v. 7.
O' vacat. The words are wanted for the parallelism. O' may have omitted them under the impression that they were an erroneous repetition.

9 [xxvi.]. παρασκευάσατε (A κατεσκ., AQ* pref. καὶ). They have been more successful in xxv. 16 [xxxii. 2], καὶ μανήσωνται, and li. [xxviii.] 7, ἐσαλεύθησαν.

20 ρήμα. O' vacat; but see next note.

9 [xxvi.]. O' pref. ἀνάβησθε; but this may be a corruption of ἀναλάβετε, as a rendering of καὶ. ἥ occurs again with ἡCTR in Am. ii. 15.

10 [xxvi.]. ἤ (Q om. ἢ) μάχαρα Κυρίου (Q om. Κ.).

9 [xxvi.]. απὸ γῆς ('Ἁ). For other examples of the confusion of ב and ב see on xx. 17.

11 [xxvi.]. Βασιλέα δέντρων. For examples of this construction, see on v. 24.

12 [xxvi.]. κόλλων. φωνὴν σου (ἡ τοῦ); most probably rightly, as better suiting the parallelism. For other examples of the loss of τ see on iv. 1.

14 [xxvi.]. οπήmetroν ὑπολίθυτο. O' vacat.

9 [xxvi.]. eis Μέμφιν. See on ii. 16.

9 [xxvi.]. O' vacat (Q hab.).

9 [xxvi.]. τὴν σμιλακά σου. In xlvi. [xxxii.]
17, 39 O' had no difficulty in rendering ἑπιλέψις by κυκλόθεν αὐτῶν and τοῖς κύκλῳ αὐτῆς. Their reading here was probably ἐμείωσεν from ἐμείωσεν. The only occurrence indeed of this last word in M.T. of the Book (iv. 7; where see note) does not here help us, as O' may have had a different reading there. Nevertheless it seems better to conjecture that they thus translated somewhat freely in this passage, than that their Heb. text was read by them with a nearer approach to the sound of this Greek word, and that they were thereby led to adopt it as their rendering. For examples of this latter tendency see iv. 31, ix. 4 [5], xlviii. [xxxvi.] 26.

15 [xxvi]. ἑρμήν. ἐφυγεν ἀπὸ σοῦ (ἈQ om. ἀπὸ σοῦ) ὁ Ἀπίς; reading ἡ ἠ. As Cheyne (ad loc.) remarks, "The authority of the Egyptian-Jewish version in a prophecy relative to Egypt is not slight." ἡ Προβολία, which in M.T. is found elsewhere only Prov. xxviii. 3, is Aramaic, and in the Targ. of Prov. x. 3 represents הדיב. Considering then that this last root occurs in the parallel clause here, the reading הדיב is a very natural error.

ἐμείωσεν. ὁ μοῦσχος ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς σου οὐκ ἐμείωσεν; a duplicate rendering of an original ἐμείωσεν. That the word should be sing. is shewn by what follows. If anything were needed to
confirm this emendation, it would be found in the occurrence of the roots כל (see preceding note) and רָעָה in close connexion in v. 21.

16 [xxvi.]. קֶלֶה בֶּיתָלָה. קֶלֶה (Q o.m. קֶלֶה) תַּנֶּה בֵּיתָלָה, πληθός σου ἔστιν ἐπεξεργασιά. But י is elsewhere rendered by σύμμικτος (xxv. 20, 24 [xxxii. 6, 10], l. [xxvii.] 37). It is thus more likely that they recognised the root רָעָה (Schwally, l.c. p. 193 proposes רָעָה), reading the next word בֶּיתָלָה.

תַּנֶּה. See on xxv. 38.

17 [xxvi.]. כַּרְאֵשׁ שֵׁם כַּרְבָּא. καλέσατε τὸ ὄνομα (כַּרְבָּא שֵׁם). This gives a much better sense. So Pesh. שֵׁם, and Vulg. nomen.

כַּרְבָּא נְכַרְבָּא. פָּרוּא נְכַרְבָּא.

כַּרְבָּא. סָאָו, desolation, “the fittest name for the fallen monarch.” So Cheyne (ad loc.), who for this naming with a symbolic sense compares xx. 3, Is. xxx. 7.

שֶׁבֶת הָעָוִיבָה הַפּוֹחֵר. סָאָו 'Eσβει (AQ 'Eσβει) 'Eμω'δ. Gi. suggests that for י they read הָעָוִיב or הָעָוִיָה.

18 [xxvi.]. בֵּיתָלָה יֵיחֵה יָבָאָה. קְיָרִים ʻו ʻו (Q o.m. ʻו). בֵּיתָלָה. So in Hos. v. 1, and in Jos. Bell. Jud. iv. 1. 8, Ant. v. 1. 22, xiii. 15. 4.
19 [xxvi.]. καὶ κληθήσεται Οὐαί; a paraphrase of the text, either as it stands, or with the letters ἅ and ἂ transposed. See on ii. 15, ix. 9 [10].

20 [xxvi.]. ἵππωσπασμα; Vulg. stimulator. The Heb. is אֲיֹן לֵּאַג.

21 [xxvi.]. ἡλθεν ἐν τῷ αὐτήν (הָלֵב); doubtless rightly. So Pesh. (םהל לָלֵג) and Vulg. (veniet ei).

22 [xxvi.]. ὁς διῆκεν συριπτόντος (Α* ρίδ -τες); evidently an early error for σύρωντος (so Spohn). For σύρω used of serpents comp. Deut. xxxii. 24; Mic. vii. 17.

23 [xxvi.]. εἰκασθῇ. Spohn suggests ἐτασθῇ.

25 [xxvi.]. 'יסו. See on xv. 11.

26 [xxvi.]. O' vacat, owing to a confusion of eye, through the recurrence of 'ספָּן.

26 [xxvi.]. O' vacat. The expression לַעֲלַי קִרְעָם is at least suspicious in the mouth of Jeremiah. The whole is doubtless a gloss, inserted by one who
desired somewhat to soften the dismal forecast for Egypt, especially as words of corresponding comfort follow for his own people. Similar glosses occur xlviii. [xxxvi.] 47, xlxi. [xxxv.] 6. In xlvi. 39 [xxv. 19] this gloss has effected a lodgment in both texts.

27, 28 [xxvi.]. These vv. in M.T. are substantially identical with xxx. [xxxvii.] 10, 11, which are lacking in O’. See on xi. 7.

27 [xxvi.]. ἐπιτίθενται (external). Comp. xlviii. [xxxvi.] 11, ἀνεπαύσατο.

28 [xxvi.]. ἰδέα. O’ add ἡ ἀπτίθετος καὶ τρυφερὰ παρεδόθη; a gloss erroneously introduced from xxvii. [1.] 2, which in O’ immediately follows.

xlvii. [xxix.] 1. בָּשִּׂים...אֶרֶנְבַּי. O’ vacat.

If this, like the other prophecies against foreign nations, is (as seems clearly shewn by xxv. 1, 13) to be assigned to the 4th year of Jehoiakim (B.C. 604) that date conflicts with these words of M.T., inasmuch as Herod. (ii. 159) makes Necho capture Gaza (Κάδυτος) after the battle of Megiddo (c. B.C. 608). Cor. (p. 55), though not noticing this discrepancy of date, points out that the M.T. “can hardly have formed part of the original text, since from the whole style of description...and from the analogy of the other oracles forming part of this group, Nebuchadnezzar is the only enemy with whom the Philistines can here be threatened.”
3. ἐπὶ φωνῆς ὀρμής αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλῶν (καὶ) τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. Thus O’ read or understood a Ἰ before Ἰ, and did not see the reference of Ἰ to steeds. See on viii. 16.

4. οὖν, O’ vacat; a gloss on the following words.

τοὺς (A τὰς) καταλοίπους τῶν νησίων. This suggests that O’ closed the v. with (ἴ =) Ἰ, and that Ἐ is a gloss, owing to the connexion of the Philistines with that place (Deut. ii. 23; Am. ix. 7). Gi. on the contrary thinks that they omitted it from the geographical difficulty involved in taking it to mean Cappadocia, as do Aq. Theod. Targ. (Ἐκάκαβ) Pesh. Vulg.

5. νομίματα. ἀπερίφη; reading Ἰ for Ἰ. Comp. viii. 14. Vulg., taking M.T. as though from Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ, has conticuit.

Ἐκάκαβ. ‘Ενακέιμ; probably rightly, M.T. being harsh. Aq. (τῶν κολάδων) read Ἰππαῖοι. Similarly in 1 Chr. xii. 15 we should correct M.T. Ἰππαῖοι. Comp. the statement in Josh. xi. 22. Krochmel (quoted by Cheyne ad loc.) proposes Ιππαῖοι.

6. Ἰαν. O’ vacat, also connecting the last three words of v. 5 with Ἰαν, to which the reflexive sense of Ἰαν is unsuited.
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καὶ ἐπάρθητι (ὢ ρήμα).

7. ἤσυχάσει (ἡσύχασεν), but Α -σεις.
M.T.’s error was caused by the preceding ἅσβεστα.

καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς παραθάλασσιν.
For concrete in place of abstract see on xxiv. 5.

ἐπὶ τὰς καταλοίπους, ἐπεγερθήναι; reading for the first word ἐπὶ, and in the second
seeing the root ῦιο, to be hot, excited, which appears
as a substantival form in xv. 8; (Hos. xi. 9).


ἀμαθείας, ἤσυχάσεις. Ἄμαθ (ἐν τὸ κραταίωμα; Α
’Ἀμ. τὸ κρ.) καὶ ’Αγαθ (ἈΑQ καὶ ἡττήθη). O”s
MS. seems to have been in some way defective.
The testimony of Aq. Theod. is not clear. Symm.
has τὸ κραταίωμα (? καὶ ἡττήθη). That Ἰ should
be joined with fem. verbs renders M.T. also suspi-
cious. Gi. proposes some such emendation as

2. ἴατρεία (Q ἄγανρίαμα)
Μωάβ (A ἐν M.). They read ἴατρεία, although this
word is rendered by ὧφελία (ὡφελεία) xxx. [xxxvii.] 13, xlvi. [xxvi.] 11.

ὄπισθεν. O’ pref. ἄγανρίαμα (Q om.); a gloss
corrective of the preceding ἴατρεία.

ἐκοψάμεν (Q δεῦτε καὶ ἐκκόψω-

μεν) αὐτήν.
CRITICAL NOTES.

καὶ παῦσιν παῦσεται. So Vulg. ergo silens conticesces, but Symm. (probably) ἔτι, Μαδμηνά, σωπήσῃ.

3. ἔκκραγότων. For concrete in place of abstract see on xxiv. 5.

4. ἀναγιελάτε εἰς Ζώορα; very possibly rightly. Aq. (and probably) Symm. support M.T. as to 'א. "Zoar and Horonaim are mentioned together, not only in υ. 34, but also in Is. xv. 5." Cheyne (ad loc.). See next note. The 'ק is suggested by xlix. 20, l. 45.

5. ἐπιλήθος Αλὼθ ἐν κλαυθμοῖς; thus reading the first word ἐπιλήθος, taking the 'כ as a proper name, and including the next word in the clause (against M.T.). The υ. is almost identical with Is. xv. 5, which supports the 'ק.

κλαίων. The 'כ looks like ditto-ography, and O' considered it as such. Is. xv. 5 has simply וַיְבָלָה, which probably is the original reading here also.

ן. וַיְבָלָה; loosely.

ח. וַיְבָלָה. O' vacat. The word is absent from Is. xv. 5 (see last note).

6. ὀσπερ ὄνος ἄγριος; reading rightly ὄσπερ.
7. ἐν ὀχυρώμασίν σου (see v. 41). So Vulg. in munitionibus tuis. was easily corrupted into צְא, while the first word is an insertion referring to the idol Chemosh mentioned later in the v. So Cor. (pp. 55 f.). Compare for מָעַ in this sense, מָעַ, Deut. iv. 28 and elsewhere.

8. οὐ μὴ (AQ pref. καὶ πόλεις); apparently an accidental omission.

9. σημεῖα (A -εῖν); reading or understanding τὸ (comp. iv. 6) or better (so Gi.) τὸ (xxxvi. 21), a waymark. Aq. ἀνθρω, Symm. βλαστῆμα.

ἀπῇ ἀφθῆσται (AQ ἀναφθjsp.; as though from a root equivalent to הָעַ, to kindle. Aq. ἀνθωπος ἔφελενσται, Symm. (better) ἔφεστο ἔφελ. and so Targ. This makes הָעַ = נַעַ, and such a root would suit well enough נַעַ (see last note). The neighbourhood however of שְׁרֵחַ here suggests that we should emend (so Schwally, l.c. p. 197) in accordance with iv. 7, to שְׁרֶפָּה.

πόθεν ἐνοικος αὐτῇ (AQ αὐτῆς; A ἀπὸ ἐνοικονωτῶν αὐτᾶς); an unusual rendering. See iv. 7, 29, ix. 10 etc.

10. ο’ vacat.
11. ἀνεπαύσατο. Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.]

27, ὑπολάβει.

καὶ πεποιθώς. Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 27, ἡσυχάσει.

ἐπὶ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ; apparently connecting the subst. with δόξα. In its two other occurrences they either ignore it, rendering very loosely (Is. xxv. 6) or translate φυλάγματα (Zeph. i. 12).

12. καὶ τὰ κέρατα (a corruption of κεράμα) αὐτοῦ; reading κεράμα. The pl. aff. of M.T. is unaccountable. Aq. has αὐτοῦ, but Symm. αὐτῶν.

13. ἐλπίδος αὐτῶν, πεποιθότες ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς. ἔλαβε appears as ἔλαβε in ii. 37 [36]. Here we have a double rendering.

15. πόλει αὐτοῦ. The word following ἦν seems to have been early dubious. Accordingly O’ omitted it, while M.T. read ἦν in spite of the lack of grammatical concord. Either ἦν is to be accepted in spite of this, and explained, are gone up in one mass of smoke (in which case O’’s omission was occasioned by failure to understand it), or, which seems more likely, the verb governed by ἦν early became defective, and was supplied conjecturally by M.T. Vulg. is
ascenderunt. To read the first word of the v. מִּמַּיִם is tempting, and has the further advantage that it saves us from making מַלְאֲכֵי of both genders. It does not however account for the difficulty which causes, as discussed above.

O' vacat.

16. אֲנַי. ημέρα. Gi. conjectures a misreading of the consecutive letters בָּדוּ, and nothing better than this seems forthcoming.

17. זָרֹה. κινήσατε. So xviii. 16, but in xv. 5 δειλάω is the verb used.

אָדוֹת, but Q has εἰδότες and so MSS. 22, 23, 36, and others, and SH.

18. בְּלִים. εὖ ὑπρασίᾳ. One text or the other seems corrupt. Gi. conjectures קָרָם, comparing Is. xlvii. 1. This does not however help us with υγ. Another hypothesis is that O' read בָּבָאָה = בָּבָאָה (see Job viii. 11, xl. 21), or that their original word was ἡπρασίᾳ. SH. however agrees with their present reading.

בְּרֵיחָה. Δαιμῶν (א דָּבָו, Q א דָּבָו, AQ pref. θυγάτηρ) ἐκτριβεται (א Q ῳ; Q om.). הֶבֶן is perhaps a duplication of the ending of הֶבֶן, which in O' ends its clause. Hence Δ. was thought to lack a verb, and ἐκτρ. was supplied.

בּוּר שׁוּדוּ מָאָסָא לֶבַד בֵּית שָׁחָה מְבָאָרָה.
CRITICAL NOTES.

20. ολόλυθον (Q -λυθὲ) καὶ κέκραξον; reading wrongly (with 'ב) the sing. fem. See last note.

21. καὶ (NAQ pref. ἐπὶ) 'Ρεφᾶς (Ἀ'Ραφᾶθ; Q Ἰασσα).

24. O' vacat.

25. καὶ τὸ ἐπίχειρον αὐτοῦ. See on xxvii. 5.

26. έν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. The Heb. word is rightly translated Is. xix. 14; Prov. xxvi. 11. Here O', failing to understand it, adopt the expedient of representing it by a Greek word of which its sound reminds them. See on xlvi. 14.

27. έις γελοιασμὸν; reading, probably rightly, έις λαβάκι.

'. ἐνίσχαζεν εὗρέθη (but Q -θησαύν); reading (with 'ב).

O' vacat; possibly, owing to their s.
not understanding the sense; but rather, the words were suggested by the מְרָאִים מְרָאִים of xxxi. 20.

οὐσιωτέρας οὗτος τῷ κλαίοντι; reading ἔστηκε στὰ τῷ κλαίοντι. But M.T. is very possibly right in the sense of shaking the head in mockery. Comp. the Hiph. in xviii. 16.

28. κατέλυσαν; -κειπ. Α. A (עבז). A and so for the imperatives that follow.

πέτραις στόματι βοσύνου. פֶּרֶת. is perhaps a corruption of πέρασω.


kai ὑψώθη (ןט). פְּרָה.

30. ἔργα αὐτῶν; reading עֲבֵרָה. הַלֶּאָרִים בִּכְיָם לָא קְרִי בָּשָׁא.

οὐχὶ τὸ ἵκανον αὐτῷ (ΣΑQ αὐτῶν) οὐχ οὕτως ἐποίησεν; In Is. xvi. 6, which is substantially identical with this v. as far as לְאָרִים בִּכְיָם are connected, not as here separated, by the accents. Doubtless we should emend this v. accordingly. The last three words of M.T. are a gloss, although early enough to be recognised by O'. They read here בִּכְיָם but evidently were quite as much at sea with regard to the meaning as they were in Is. l.c., where they
have ἡ μαυτία σοῦ. (See note on viii. 6.) Aq. has here (but see Field, and comp. his note on l. [xxvii.] 36, where O' vacat) καὶ οὖτως τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ αὐτοῦ, and Symm. οὖτως ὁ βραχίων αὐτοῦ.

31. ἐπὶ ἀνδρας κειράδας (Ἀκίδαρας) αὐχμοῦ. ἐπὶ ἀνδρας κειράδας (Ἀκίδαρας) αὐχμοῦ, as in Is. xvi. 7, may very well have been the original here also. The αὐχ. seems a duplicate rendering of ἥ, which is already represented in the transliteration κειρ. here and in v. 36. Vulg. muri fictilis; Aq. Symm. τοιχον ὀστρακίνου. It is possible however that κειρ. may be a rendering of κρήνη, bald-headed, shaven.

32. ἐπὶ ἀνδρας κειράδας (Ἀκίδαρας) αὐχμοῦ. ἐπὶ ἀνδρας κειράδας (Ἀκίδαρας) αὐχμοῦ, as in Is. xvi. 7, may very well have been the original here also. The αὐχ. seems a duplicate rendering of ἥ, which is already represented in the transliteration κειρ. here and in v. 36. Vulg. muri fictilis; Aq. Symm. τοιχον ὀστρακίνου. It is possible however that κειρ. may be a rendering of κρήνη, bald-headed, shaven.

If we hesitate to change to κρήνη, we must consider the subject to be indefinite (one will mourn). Vulg. lamentantes, and so Targ. Pesh. have the plural. Theod. καὶ μελετήσει; Aq. Symm. καὶ μέλος ἑρεί.
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πόλεος (Ἑβρ. πόλις) Ἰακωβ. The is clearly an accidental repetition, but it may be earlier than O'. In that case they read πολις (with 'I. in apposition); otherwise

οἶκος. διεθρός; as in v. 8. In v. 3 it is (and more accurately) the rendering of Ἰσραήλ. Is. l.c. has Ἰσραήλ, of which πολις may be a corruption.

33. O' vacat; taking ὼ for a proper name (see on ii. 7), and so omitting it as geographically distant from the subject of the prophecy.

προτικ οὐκ ἐπάτησαν (Ἀ οὐκ ἐπηγόησαν), οὐδὲ δεῖλης οὐκ ἐποίησαν αἰών. Gi. suggests that προτικ has arisen from a gloss ὄποιον, introduced here through the influence of the parallel, Is. xvi. 10 (ἐπηγόησαν), and taken as μετέχει, with the help of the subsequent corruption of αἰών to δεῖλης. It seems however much easier to suppose that ὼ (which Gi. makes O' to omit) was read by them ώς. This done, they became hopelessly confused as to the remainder of the v. In M.T. we should probably amend (from Is. l.c.) Ἰσραήλ to Ἰακωβ. The last word in O' is a corrupted transliteration.

34. αἱ πόλεις (Α ἡ πόλις) αὐτῶν
(Ἑβρ. αὐτῶν).
CRITICAL NOTES.

καὶ ἀγγελαῖα (ΑΩ -λα) Σαλασεία (ἀ* om. κ. ἀγγ. Σ.). The ἀγγ. is probably a corruption of a transliteration, the word being originally taken, and rightly, as a proper name. Ἀ on the other hand is the ordinal, "the third" Eglath, i.e. as having two neighbours of the same name.

36. καὶ ἱερά. κειράδας (κ* κιδάρ, Α κειδά- ρεις). See on v. 31.

ἐπειπονήσατο ἀπώλεσα ἀπὸ ἄνθρωπον; the last two words being inserted as an attempt at interpretation.

37. Ἄρα. Ο' add ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ.

38. ἔμφασις ἔλθε (Q ταῖς) πλατείαις αὐτῆς. But mss. 22, 33, 36, and others (without ast.), and so SH., add ὅλαις κοπτέω. The latter word, if not also the former, seems therefore to have been early omitted by accident.

νομισάτω. Ο' vacat; but it has φησίν Κύριος earlier (after σωτηρίσα). This difference of position in the two texts illustrates the character of the insertion, as a frequent gloss.

39. πῶς κατηλλακέτεν; The least change possible is (on account of the masculines that follow) to read ἄν, understanding Moab as the subject. So Gi. Possibly ἔλθε is a gloss. There remains κατηλλακέτεν. Cappellus (Notae Crit.
ad loc., quoted by J. F. Schleusner) suggests that it is a corruption of κατάξευ; Spohn ad loc. that O' had 'Αγαθ (see v. 1), άνόλυξον. Thus ἀλλὰ would be retained as part of the original text. In v. 1 however 'A. represents ἁρμόδια, not ἁρμόδιον.

40. ἄλδη...Μᾶλαμ. O' vacat; a gloss, supplied by xlix. 22 [xxix. 23], as is the latter part of v. 41.

41. Διηθώ...Μάρα. O' vacat. See last note.

43. πανγάς καὶ φόβος καὶ Βώθυνος, transposing the order of the words. In the parallel passage, Is. xxiv. 17, the arrangement of the three subs. is as M.T. there and here, thus giving the order required for v. 44.

44. Ῥαύτα (Ῥαύτα). Vulg. omits the word.

45, 46. O' vacat. The verses are taken from Numb. xxii. 28, 29, xxiv. 17.

47. O' vacat; doubtless a gloss. ἱάρ β' μ', as Gi. points out, is a formula otherwise unknown, and apparently suggested to the glossator by v. 21.

xlix. [xxx.] 1. Μελχόλ (Q Μολχόλ, and so SH.). It is evidently the proper name, and not "their king," and so in v. 3.

τῇ Γαλαάδ (Q τὸν Γάδ); possibly rightly, and supported by Am. i. 13.

2. Ἰδοντες. O' vacat. The passage, Am. i. 14, which resembles this, does not contain the words.
CRITICAL NOTES.

4.  

\textit{en tois pediios 'Evekeim} (\textbf{N}° om. 'Ev.). O' thus doubly represents the first word, omitting the others. These latter look also like a somewhat corrupted dittography of the previous letters. \textit{MS. 88} (and so \textit{SH.}) \textit{en t. \pi. Z\eta\beta}
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πεδίους σου, 22, 36, and others 'Ευ. διέρρευσε τὰ πεδία σου, Symm. εν ταις κοιλασι διέρρευσεν ἡ κοιλας σου.

(Ω τῆς) ἤταμιας. See on xxxi. 22.

is rendered by ἑτ. in xlix. 16 [xxix. 17].

5. οὐκ (ἈQ pref. καὶ) ἔστιν (ἈQ ἔσται) ὁ συνάγων; thus omitting λόγος, which may easily be a later addition, as the same phrase is used without it in Is. xiii. 14; Nah. iii. 18.


7 [xxix. 8]. ὁν. O' do not recognise the interrogation. The ὁ may be conjectured to have arisen from the last letter of ἱδιαία immediately preceding, for, as O' shew us, ἱδιαία, which now separates the two words, is an insertion in M.T.

ἐκ συνετῶν. O' read the word as we do, but made it the Kal ptcp. (not elsewhere found) of ἔκ. Otherwise we must suppose them to have read ἐκ συνετῶν or ἐκ συνετῶν.

7, 8 [xxix. 8, 9]. ἐκείνη ἤκειμεν. ἄχτετο σοφία αὐτῶν, ἔπατήθη ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν, but ἢ τῆς. τὸ πρός (Ἀ' τόπος) αὐτῶν. Schwally, l. c. p. 201, considers ἦπ. (a corruption of ἦπ.) ὁ τ. αὐ. to represent a variant of ἦπ. (not elsewhere found), viz. ἦπ.
CRITICAL NOTES.

(Gi. prefers יִכְנָה, while according to him יֵכְנָה is a gloss, and therefore unrepresented in O'. It is so far in favour of Schwally's view that it seems impossible to substitute for יֵכְנָה any word of similar appearance which shall at all answer to τόπος. אָרֶב's rendering suggests קָו. But surely O' read קָו, and saw in it the root קָו, which is rendered by the same verb in iv. 10. For their willingness to assume the disappearance of the א, see on vii. 10, xliii. 2.

דֵּסֶכְוָל אֶפְּוִיתָא (פְּאָא, rendered, for the sake of the following words, as sing.). אָרֶב is translated τροπή in v. 32 [xxx. 10] and by ἀπώλεια in xviii. 17, xlvii. [xxvi.] 21.

9 [xxix. 10]. אֶפְּוִיתָא וַחֲפָרְא (אָאִּק נְס רָס) אַוְטָו (לִשָּׂתְיוּת הָלֵם). In the passage, Obad. 5, from which this is probably drawn (לִשָּׂתְיוּת הָלֵם), O' were more successful (οὐκ ἀν ἐκλειψαν τὰ ἱκανὰ ἐαυτοῖς). That passage seems to have influenced the Vulg. here, "rapuissent quod sufficeret sibi." Comp. in Obad. "Nonne furati essent sufficientia sibi?"

10 [xxix. 11]. katάσυπρα (A κατή-ραύνησα). As הֵשָּׂתְיוּת is the word in Obad. 6, we may (with Gi.) conjecture here הֵשָּׂתְיוּת, as better suiting the idea of a hiding-place. O' however seem to have read as we do, inasmuch as they
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represent הָעַר (not, as Kircher, by ἀνασύρεως Is.
xlvii. 2, but) by περισύρεως Gen. xxx. 38, while A's
variant points in the same direction. (See Joel i. 7.)

ץָהְבִּי. κρυβκήναι; taking it as Niph. infin.
abs. (ץָהְבִּי).

טָעְרֶד וְזָהְבִּי אֵת הַוֹדְיָה. מְלֻבָּהוּ δִּמְיָא
אֶדְלֵפֹהוּ אֵלָיו (אֱ כָּכִי; AQ καὶ) γέλτονος μου (AQ
אֶדְלֵפֹהוּ); reading (with other obvious changes)
and pointing to the overthrow as caused by a
neighbour, Israel; so too Obad. 18—21.

10, 11 [xxix. 11, 12]. οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑπολυπέσθαι. M.T. is clearly right both in
the stopping and in taking ἕν as an imperative.

11 [xxix. 12]. ἵνα ζήσσεσθαι καὶ εὐγώ
ζήσσαςι (Q om. κ. ἐ. ζ.); a duplicate rendering.

Theod. hab.

אֵשׁ יָהְבִּי אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁתֶּהָה. O' vacat, but AQ δς πισθ
πιστάς, and so (but with πιστῶν) MSS. 22, 33, and others;
36, 48, and others (and so SH.) δς πιστῶσα πισ.


בֵּין μέσῳ אֵיתָה. Probably בֵּין had
fallen out of O's Heb. text (בֵּין μ. או. being only a
gloss). Hence they took לֹהְבָּב as the 2nd p.
They had no difficulty in dealing with 'ב in 22
[xxix. 23], taking it however there as a common
noun. MSS. 22, 36, and others have Βοσρ ἐν μέσῳ μέρους αὐτῆς. Ἁ is also supported by Aq. Symm. Theod.

16 [xxix. 17]. ἡ παννία σου; perhaps connecting the word with ἀπόλλα, the idol mentioned in 1 K. xv. 13; 2 Chr. xv. 16. Ἡ, according to Gi., is a corruption of a gloss, ἰταζότιά.

αἰσχρα. ἐνεχεῖρησεν. See on xxxvii. 9.

ἐσκινί. κατέλυσεν. is similarly rendered xxv. 24 [xxxii. 10].

ἐν τῷ βουνῷ ὑψηλῷ; including doubtless a gloss.

17 [xxix. 18]. ἡ...συμφόρα (Q ἐκ-

στήσται καὶ συν. ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν πληγήν αὐτῆς). The clause ἢ...ἐστὶ is a gloss from xix. 8.

18 [xxix. 19]. Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ.

19—21 [xxix. 20—22]. This passage is to a large extent identical with l. [xxvii.] 44—46.

19 [xxix. 20]. ἐκ μέσου (ἢ om. μ.). In xii. 5 ἐν φραγματί, while in l. [xxvii.] 44 ἀπὸ alone, expresses the word.

eἰς (A τῶν) τόπον. See on ix. 9 [10].

ἐκδιώξον αὐτοὺς; as though reading, with M.T. ('ט) in l. [xxvii.] 44, ἱερεῖς.

καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους; a free render-
ing. So in l. [xxvii.] 44 we have καὶ πάντα νεανίσκον.

ἐπιστήσατε (A -σταὶ); perhaps an error arising from the sound of the following ἀντιστήσεται. In l. [xxvii.] 44 O' have ἐπιστήσω.

ἀντιστησέται μοι; and so in l. [xxvii.] 44. So in Job ix. 19 is ἀντιστησέται; Dan. xi. 2 (probably we should read ἀνθέσθηκας) (Theod. ἀναστήσονται).

Apparently in each case they connect with the root ἱερ, appearing, e.g. Ps. xx. 9 (Ἄγνωστόν).

20 [xxix. 21]. συνψηθῶσιν (A συνωσίων; AQ συνψηφισθῶσιν); as though reading συνωςίων. In the parallel passage (l. [xxvii.] 45) M.T. is as here, and O' have again a passive (διαφθαρῇ).

κατάλυσις αὐτῶν. See on 19 [xxix. 20].

In l. [xxvii.] 45 the rendering is νομῇ.

21 [xxix. 22]. Καὶ κρανῆθα βαλάσσῃς οὐκ ἡκούσθη, but AQ καὶ (Q om. καὶ) κρ. σου ἐν θαλάσσῃ οὐκ ἦν. MS. 88 κρανῆθα σου ἐν θ. ἐρυθρᾷ ἐξηκούσθη ἡ. φωνῇ αὐτῆς; so (but om. ἦ and with σου for αὐτῆς) 22, 36, and others. So would appear to be a corruption of Σοῦφ, while ἡ is probably an early gloss. For O's insertion of the negative see on xviii. 18.
22 [xxix. 23]. \( \text{o vacat.} \)

\( \text{δψεται; reading } \text{r for } \text{l}. \)

\( \text{δχυρώματα αὐτῆς. See on } \text{v. 13 [xxix. 14].} \)

23 [xxx. 12]. \( \text{ο vacat; perhaps from perplexity as to the meaning. Schwally, l. c. p. 202, suggests that } \text{δψεται may have been a gloss on } \text{δχυρώματα. Cor. (p. 57, where see his discussion of other conjectures) considers that the primitive reading in this part of the } \text{v. was } \text{δχυρώματα.} \)

\( \text{δχυρώματα (δχυρώματα)} \). This seems an early error for \( \text{ηθυμώθησαν} \) \( \text{(θυμώθησαν)} \); for elsewhere in this Book \( \text{θυμώθησαν} \) is rendered by \( \text{φοβεῖσθαι} \) \( \text{(xvii. 8)}, \text{λόγου ἐχεῖν (xxxviii. [xlv.] 19, xlii. [xlix.] 16).} \)

24 [xxx. 13]. \( \text{ο vacat.} \)

\( \text{Aq. Theod. represent the clause from } \text{θυμώθησαν onwards. SH. also omits } \text{θυμώθησαν. This portion therefore is probably a gloss. The remainder is needed for the parallelism.} \)

25 [xxx. 14]. \( \text{κόρη (κόρη)} \) \( \text{πόλων ἐμήν; καμηθην ἡγίστησαν. O' had} \)

either a different or a defective text.

26 [xxx. 15]. \( \text{πεσοῦνται; reading } \text{r for } \text{p. as is shewn by l. [xxvii.] 30, where } \text{ρυφήσονται represents } \text{r. See on viii. 14 for other instances.} \)
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27 [xxx. 16]. ἡμοῖοι τιένηται. See on vi. 5.

υιοῦ Ἀδέρ. So elsewhere (1 K. xv. 18, 20, xx. [xxi.] 1; 2 K. xiii. 3, 24; Am. i. 4). Wo. (p. 265) defends the form, both on the ground of its uniform occurrence in O', and on that of its being akin, or equivalent, to the title of an Assyrian deity appearing in the word Adrammelech (2 K. xvii. 31, xix. 37).

28 [xxx. 6]. (Aq τῇ) βασιλείας τῆς αὐλῆς (ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ?).

καὶ πλήσατε; but O' rightly πλήξατε.

30 [xxx. 8]. οὐρ. O' vacat; probably a gloss; for they do not fail to render it (though variously) elsewhere in this Book.

ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ. See on v. 28.

31 [xxx. 9]. οὐ (A οὐδὲ) μοιχλοί; a double rendering.

32 [xxx. 10]. eis ἀπώλειαν. Σ receives diverse renderings; in xxii. 9 σκῦλα, in xxxviii. [xlv.] 2, xxxix. [xlvi.] 18 εὐρεμα.

κεκαρμένος (BabQ kekarméνος) πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν. The same Heb. in ix. 26 is rendered περικεφαλομενον τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν. This of itself corrects the kekram. ἀνα in both places was connected by O' with ἔτε.
33 [xxx. 11]. ἡ αὐτή. See on v. 28.
στροφάδων. See on x. 22.

34. This v. is in the main equivalent to O’s xxvi. 1, which is however there the end of the Elam section.

35 [xxv. 15]. ἡ ἕκβατος. Συνετριβήσε (ἈΝΟ συν-τριβήσετω); to avoid anthropomorphism. See on xxxi. 20.

36 [xxv. 16]. οἷς. οἴδατος. The ὅ arose by dittography, ἥ ἐκτὸς preceding.

37 [xxv. 17]. ἡ ὑπό. O’ vacat; κακα (ὃ hab.) having fallen out before κατά.
1. [xxvii.] 1. "Ὁ ἀνὴρ...κυβίστων. O’ vacat.
2. ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἡμών. O’ vacat; owing to the recurrence of ἰημᾶ.

ὣς. O’ add ἡ ἄντοντος, ἡ τρυφερά.

Ῥα. παρεδόθη; possibly a corrupt form of παρελύθη. Comp. v. 36 ἔτη, καὶ παραλυθήσονται.

ὥσαν...βάλλεται. O’ vacat.

3. ἔρχεται ἡλιόν. O’ vacat. The words are suggested by ix. 9.

5. καὶ ἔδουσιν καὶ καταφεύξονται. Probably neither text is right. Read, with Cor. (p. 76) כ, שֵׁלֶךְ. So Pesh. (ט פֶּשֶׂך). He compares li. 10, xxxv. 11.
7. אַבְּמוֹן אָבָטָא (reading אַבְּמֹן). Comp. Is. ii. 9.
   νομὴ δικαιοσύνης. See on ix. 9 [10].
   τῷ συναγαγόντι (ἐναντίον).
   Ὠ ναχα. O' vacat.

8. ἐσεπερ δράκοντες; apparently a corruption of τράγοι, inasmuch as the word 'νατ is
   shewn to be not unfamiliar to O', by their rendering
   ἔριφοι in li. [xxviii.] 40.


10. ἐκάλι. O' vacat.

11. ἐκάλι (thus and not ἐρα. See Baer and Del. Adnot. Crit.). ὡς βοίδα ἐν βοτάνῃ
    (אֵבָּא). So Pesh. (אִבָּא) and Vulg. Yet this
    wrecks the Heb. grammar, which demands the
    ptcpl. (trampling). Targ. (בֶּנֶס לְבַקָּה) is right.
    Correct Gi.'s note accordingly, and see, for the use
    of Ῥβκα in connexion with threshing, Levi, Neuheb.
    u. Ch. Wörterb. s. v.
    ὡς ταῦτα. See on viii. 16.

12. ἰδρύση ὑπεριδημίας. O' vacat (Α ἐνεργάθη ἡ
    τεκοῦσα ἡμᾶς; Q with ast. ἐν. ἡ τ. ὑμᾶς). The
    words are also absent in MSS. 23, 26, 86, 106, and
    in SH. They appear (in Q's form) in Symm. and
    Theod. For ἐν. MSS. 22, 36, and others have
κατωφύγη. Comp. Symm. in Ps. lxx. [lxxi.] 24. See Field on both passages.

ὃς. μὴ τηρ ἐπʼ (Q eis) ἀγαθά. Gi. suggests Mic. i. 12 as the source of ὦ, which, as compared with M.T. here, appears incapable of explanation.

ἵνα ὄρθρον. ὦ vacat.

14. ἤτε...ὀτάω. ὦ vacat.

15. ἔριγεν θλιν. καὶ κατακρατήσατε (AQ ἐπʼ) αὐτήν. ὦ’s choice of verb is strange. Κατακροτ. has been suggested (comp. v. 31). It is otherwise unknown in ὦ, although Liddell and Scott give it without reservation as occurring there. Elsewhere in this Book κατακρατεῖν renders the Hiph. of ἰπί (v. 43, vili. 5), or Kal of ἰπά (xl. [xlviil.] 10).

ὁ' ἵππος αὐτής. See on v. 10.

16. ἠρξα τῆς σθής. μαχαίρας Ἑλληνικῆς. See on xxv. 38.

17. τὰ οὕτω αὐτοῦ (Εὐαγγελίου).

18. ἐπὶ τὸν Βασιλείαν; but Bab mark. ΑQ insert βασιλέα.

19. ὀστὶ. ὦ vacat.

20. τῷ γε, λέγει Κύριος. Προῖος ἐπὶ βεβαίο ἐπʼ αὐτήν. ὦ, not understanding ὅ, divided the sentences wrongly (finding also ὅρα in their text). Although they read the last two words as
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we do, Gi. proposes to substitute 

καὶ επὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας επὶ αὐτὴν
(Q εν αὐτῇ; A* om. the whole; A om. επ’). 'יִשְׂרָאֵל may have been read, and taken to represent

יִשְׂרָאֵל.

ἐκδίκησον; failing to recognise the
proper name, which occurs also in Ezek. xxiii. 23,
and there is treated as such by O’.

μάχαιρα (ῥῆρ) καὶ ἀφάνισσον. 'ה
is very possibly a gloss (as Gi. suggests) on the
following imperative. The transitive sense which
it here bears can be paralleled only by v. 27.

O’ vacat.

22. אָבָר. O’ vacat.

23. אֵבָר. O’ add εν γῇ Χαλδαῖων.

24. ἐπιβῆσονται; but ἩβοQ ἐπιβῆσονται. The verb does not occur elsewhere in this
Book. The corresponding substantive is correctly

בַּבּ. וָאָבָר (Q om. וָאָבָר) 바ֶבֶל; doubtless a
corruption of ו ב., perhaps induced by the sound
of γνῶσις dwelling on the ear.

26. אָבָר. ὁτι ἐληλύθασιν οἱ καιροὶ
αὐτῆς. O’ seem to have read as we do, or possibly
34] CRITICAL NOTES.

31. Kaiρος is their rendering also in Gen. vi. 13; Lam. iv. 18 [19] (bis); Dan. viii. 17 (and ? ix. 26); 2 Chr. xxii. 19.

Vulg. has ut exeat qui conculcent eam, as though the word were connected with בְּנָו.

27. ἀναξηράνατε. See on v. 21.

28. נֹכְתָא נוֹכְלָא. O' vacat.

29. şeđ ov ἁγιὸν (Ἄρσ κω). See on li. 5.

30. ὤρη. μιθήσονται. See on xlix. 26.

31. ἐκδικήσεως (ἈΑ pref. τῆς) σου (Q* om. σου); reading Φάραήν.

32. μετάρρυθμα. ἐν τῷ δρυμῷ αὐτῆς; reading יִשְׁרֵר. Comp. (where M.T. agrees with O') xxii. 14.

34. πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιδίκους αὐτοῦ (ἐπὶ Εβραίων).
For the Heb. root see on iv. 20, and for ἐξαίπευ in an active sense, xviii. 7, where it renders the root נחשים.

36. ορός ἀλαμπρὸν ἀλώλεστόν. O' vacat. See note on xlviii. 30. Wo. is going too far, when, in maintaining the absence of the clause from O’s Heb. text, he says (p. 46) “they are all simple words and easy to translate.” קְרָב is used but once elsewhere (Is. xlv. 25) of persons (comp. too O’s difficulty in xlviii. [xxxii.] 30), while נל also is somewhat rare.

37. Βασιλεία. O’ pref. μάχαιραν ἐπὶ τοὺς μαχητὰς αὐτῶν; an accidental repetition from the similar words of v. 36.

38. ορός. O' vacat. The O' was read by SH., with which mss. 22, 36, and others agree. It is hard to imagine that O' would under the circumstances have omitted the word, had it stood in their Heb. text.

οἰκία. καὶ κατακαυκυνθησόνται (οἰκία), which is supported by Ps. xcvi. 7. See next note.

καὶ ἐν ταῖς νῆσοις οὖ (Ἡ σου; AQ om.) κατεκαυκυνθητο. Gi. points out that Ps. xcvi. 7 serves to correct both these words. οἰκίαι ἐν ταῖς νῆσοις οὖ here. O’ read ἐν οἰκίαι, thus testifying to
an early corruption. Kenn. has as variants רֶהֶמָּה, וַעֲבֵר מִימָוֹן, וּבְאֵל מָזָּה, מָזָּה. Symm. supports M.T.
(ἰσχυρῶι), and Vulg. portenta. Aq. has εἶδωλα, Targ. אִמְסָה, by which, as Gi. points out, יַאִל is
without exception rendered in the prophets.

39. Ἰουδάματα. In Is. xiii. 21 we find
θηρία, xxxiv. 14 δαιμονία.
ἐν ταῖς νῆσοις; taking the wrong
sense. Is. xiii. 22, xxxiv. 14 have ὄνοκένταυροι.
θυγατέρες σευρήνων. So in Mic.
i. 8.
elατον. See on iii. 5.
O' vacat.

41—43. This passage strongly resembles vi.
22—24.
42. ἰππάσονται παρεσκευασμένοι (B* παρασκ.; Ν παρεσκ. ιππ.). Comp. the rendering
in vi. 23.

44—46. See also notes on xlix. 19—21.
44. Ο' vacat (ΑQ τοῦτον).

li. [xxviii.] 1. Χαλδαίως; doubtless
representing the original reading, subsequently
altered by the figure of Atbash. Other instances
are found in v. 41, xxv. 26 [xxxii. 12], where see
note. As Wo. says (p. 246), this species of cipher-writing may have been adopted during the time of the Babylonian captivity. There is no reason to suppose that it was known to the prophet, or even after his time employed outside Palestine.

2. ἀνεμογν καύσωνα.

2. ὑβριστάς, καὶ καθυβρίσων (A -βρίσων; Q -βρίσων) αὐτήν; reading ἑ for ἑ. M.T. however is so far right (comp. xlix. 36), but we should read ἢ, in order that both verbs may be from the same root.

3. οὐαι ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνα (reading ἔρᾳ).

It seems tempting to read ἢ, and so ἢ later. We then omit 2οντῳ in accordance with ἢ (For O"s omission of negative see on xviii. 18.) Doubtless there is some corruption in the text. The M.T. is harsh indeed in its construction (Ἀλαβίος ἡμῖν = ἀλαβίος ἡμῖν), even when we connect with ἢ of v. 2, but yet it has the advantage over the reading of the negative (with 2οντῳ retained), that it makes the same persons to be addressed throughout the sentence, and does not, like the other, require that the first part should refer to the besieged, the second to the besiegers.
1. περιθέσω; reading apparently ἐπιθέσο. Wo. also suggests ἐπιθέσο. Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 4, θώρακας. Cor. (p. 77) says that O’s rendering of this and the preceding word points to a reading "θαύματοι μέρη", whence he conjectures as the original, "θαύμα (the enemy) χριστοῦ".

5. ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων Ἰσραήλ; as though the adjective (in defiance of grammar) were applied attributively to Israel. In 1. [xxvii.] 29 the context Ἰσραήλ saved them from this particular error, and so in ii. 2 (where however see note). The frequency of the expression in Isaiah should of itself have guarded the translators sufficiently.


7. 2οίο. O vacat.

8. ῥητίνην. See on viii. 21.

9. ἄρει. See on iii. 22.

10. τὸ κρίμα αὐτοῦ; not implying any difference of text. In illustration of the thought that the rights of the holy nation (or individual) involve judgment upon the enemy comp. (so Gi.) the use of ἔρις in Is. lxii. 1; Ps. xvii. 1.
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11. τὰς φαρέτρας. So in Ezek. xxi. 11. In 2 S. viii. 7 we find χλιδὼνεσ (bracelets), in 2 K. xi. 10 οἱ τρίσωλ (the triple things), in Cant. iv. 4 βολίδες (missiles), in 2 Chr. xxi. 9 τὰ δομα. Thus the word was for the most part a puzzle to the translators. The probable meaning is none of these, but shields.

βασιλέως (Ἀ -ον, Ἀ -ος). Comp. v. 28.


λαοῦ αὐτοῦ; but MSS. 26, 36, 41, and others (and so SH.) have ναοῦ αὐτοῦ. The reading of the uncials seems to have been an early error.

12. οὖν. οὐμεῖον; and so in v. 27. See on the other hand the rendering in iv. 6, 21.

φαρέτρας (Ἀ -τραν, Ἀ -τρα). The word seems, owing to the influence of v. 11, to have been accidentally substituted for φυλακας, a frequent rendering, found here in MSS. 22, 96, and others, (and so SH.).

δολα. See on xliii. 10.

13. ἐνθεός εἰς (Ἀ εἰς) τὰ σπλάγχνα σου; (ὁ χρήματα βασιλέως σου. Symm. renders ἀπό by πιστός. Vulg. pedalis præcisionis tuae. The expression in M.T. is however a strange one. Gi. proposes Ἰσραήλ ντε. occurs
in Niph. Job vi. 17, xxiii. 17, in the sense to be extinguished.

14. κατὰ τοῦ βραχίους αὑτοῦ; apparently an accidental substitution of an equally familiar formula.

διότι Πληρώσω σε; thus supporting the simple ἔν αὐτῷ, which latter it is difficult to take in the sense of surely. Gi. suggests ἔν αὐτῷ.

οἱ καταβαίνοντες (ἢ καὶ καῖροι). But possibly κ. is a corruption of καταπατοῦντες. In Is. xvi. 9 ἀνίφωρος is rendered by καταπατήσω.

15—19. This passage is almost identical with x. 12—16, where see notes.

17. ἄματαιότη; but AQ (as in x. 14) ἐμφοράνθη.

20. ἐκ σοῦ (Q ἐν σοι, and so MSS. 22, 23, 26, and others, and SH., this last with the other reading in marg.) βασιλεῖς. If the first ἰ were by accident taken into the previous word, this with the confusion of ἢ and ὁ (for this see xx. 17) would combine to produce ἰβασιλεῖς, and would go a good way towards explaining βασιλεῖς. The same mistranslation of ὁμιθήματος however recurs in v. 27 in B."
translators also make the preceding and following clauses to change places.

23. καὶ τὸ γεσάργιον αὐτοῦ. Elsewhere in O' γ. is not used in this sense. In Gen. xxvi. 14 it renders ἣπε, in Prov. xxiv. 30 [45], xxxi. 16 [xxix. 34] ἐν, while ἐν appears elsewhere as δύο (θῖος, 1 S. xi. 7), κοχλαξίω (1 S. xiv. 14), ἡγεύτη (θοῦ, Is. v. 10).

25. ἡ διεσθαρμένων; probably taking the word as a subst. (?) τῷ ἰσαχα βαλαχ ο of Ezek. ix. 1).

ἐπὶ (but ΝΑQ ἀπὸ) τῶν πετρῶν.

27. βασιλεῖς ἀπάτη; but AQ βασιλείας Αραρέθ (Q -ρέθ). ms. 88 βασιλείας Αραρέθ, and so SH. (with -ράθ). "Ἀπάτη is doubtless a corruption.

παρ' ἐμοῦ; a similar mistake to that of Ps. xlv. [xliv.] 9, where σφῆς, stringed instruments, appears as ἐξ ἕν.

βελοστάσεις. The word is used to render בַּקֵל, a battering-ram, in Ezek. iv. 2, and בַּקֵל, a watch-tower, in Ezek. xvii. 17, xxii. 27 [22]. In Nah. iii. 17 (its only other occurrence) מָספִּים appears as ὁ συμμικτός σου. О' was thus unacquainted with the word.

ὡς ἀκριδῶν πλῆθος. οὗ occurs
here only, and the verbal root is found but twice
(Ps. cxix. [cxviii.] 120, καθήλωσον; Job iv. 15,
ἐφρεῖταν). Hence O’s failure to interpret rightly.
See Field’s note for discussion of the word.

28. ἀναβεβάσατε; corrupted from ἀγιάσατε (read by
MSS. 22, 36, and others, and by
SH.), and arising from the ἀναβ. of the previous
clause. But see on xxii. 7.

τῶν βασιλέα.

τῶν Μῆδων καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς. It is clear that O’
cannot have had these words, when
rendering מַלְיָא by a sing. They are therefore a
gloss, probably suggested through the absence
from their text of the gloss which now ends the v.
in M.T. See next note.

O’ vacat (A καὶ πάσης
tῆς γῆς ἔχουσις αὐτοῦ); clearly a gloss. The
masc. pron. has no antecedent. Wo.’s comments
on this v. (pp. 83 f., 143) are by no means con-
vincing.

30. ἐθραύσθη; loosely. The verb
occurs but three times in M.T. O’ were more
successful in Is. xli. 17 (Kal), ἐκηράνθη, but see Is.
xix. 5, πίνονται.

ἐνεπυρίσθη; reading ἐνεπυρίσθη. The
Hoph. does not, it is true, occur elsewhere, but on
account of the parallelism is probably right here.
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31, 32. ἀν' ἐσχάτου τῶν διαβάσεων αὐτοῦ.

32. καὶ τὰ συστήματα (Bęk Q -στημ-) αὐτῶν (AQ αὐτοῦ). It is strange that O' should have rendered the word rightly (אֶל), not only in its two occurrences in the Pentateuch (which would naturally from the subject-matter be specially familiar to Jews dwelling in Egypt, viz. Exod. vii. 19, viii. 1 [5]), but also in Is. xxxv. 7, xlii. 15. In the only other occurrence of the word (Ps. cvii. [cvi.] 35) it appears as λιμένας or λίμνας.

ἐξέρχονται; loosely. The verb does not occur elsewhere in this Book. For O's treatment of בְּלָה see on viii. 15 and xv. 8.

33. Οἶκοι (Q -κος) βασιλεὺς Βαβυ-
λωνος; reading בַּי. Bas. seems a gloss, suggested by such passages as xxxiii. [xli.] 4, (xliii. [l.] 12, 13).

34. קָטָלוּ (פָּטָלוּ) בֶּשֶן (ק) בְּנֵבּוֹרָא אֶרֶץ ב. ב.

κατέφαγεν με, ἐμερίσατο με,
κατέλαβεν με σκότος λεπτῶν, Ναβουχοδ. β. B. The verb 'אֶדֶם occurs here only in this Book. Elsewhere O' renders it mostly by ἐκταράσσω or ἐξοσ-
τημ. Gi. (p. xxii) proposes נִדָמ. The variety in position of בָּשָׁם 'נ, as it suggests that the words are a gloss in both texts. σκότος λεπτῶν seems a corruption for σκεῦος κενόν. MSS. 22, 36, and others
give both these as a conflate rendering, κατέλαβε με ὡς σκότος λ...κατέστησε με ὡς σκένος κ. SH. also gives κατέλαβεν (before ἐμερ.), apparently as a corruption of κατέφαγεν.

34, 35. ἡρίπιν (ὁ) Ἰεμαχίμ (35) εἶχονάν με οἱ μόχθοι (οἱ ἐχθροί) ὑμων καὶ οἱ ταλαιπωρμοί ὑμων; reading ὑμνήστηρ ἤσβι (for ἦσβι) is barred by O’s usage elsewhere. See on iv. 13, 20.

37. ὅλοι... O’ vacat. The remaining words at any rate were in all probability absent from their Heb. text. For ‘הל see on ix. 10 [11]. ἦσβι. O’ vacat.

38. ἔγγερβησαν. MS. 88 (supported by SH.) adds οἱ παιδες αὐτῶν (τῶν). So 22, 36, and others, οἱ νεανίσκοι αὐτῶν. The root ἔγγερβησαν in this sense is not found elsewhere in M.T., and hence may have been omitted by O as unintelligible. ἔγγερβησαν is rightly rendered in ii. 15 (ἀφύντῳ) and loosely in xxv. 30 [xxxii. 16] (κρημματεῖ bis). In Hos. xi. 10; Am. iii. 4, 8 it is translated ἐρευξεταί. It is thus possible that the present Greek text may be corrupted from ἐρευξεταί. So Aq. Theod. render here in the second clause.

39. ᾱνδιγμά. καρωθῶσιν (καθαρῶσιν); a word not found elsewhere in O’. Gi. suggests that they read ἠνδιγμά.
40. kal (AQ om. kal) καταβιβάσων (νο -σω) αυτούς (θαρσής).
41. O vacat. See on v. 1.
43. O vacat.
44. לַלֵּילָה בֵּבָלָ. εἰς Βαβυλῶνα. The shorter reading is probably right. Gi. points out that בִּלְלָו might, it is true, easily fall out before בִּבְלָ. Yet inasmuch as (a) it was not Bel but Babylon (v. 34) which had been the devourer, and (b) the parallelism of the clause לַלֵּילָה with the language used in Is. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1 in reference to Jerusalem, indicates a city or nation here also, he thinks it best to consider M.T. to contain a gloss, perhaps facilitated by the letters of בִּלְלָ.

44—49. וּמָזוּבָה... יִשְׂאֵל. O vacat. The cause of the omission was the similarity between נָמֶלֶבָל נֶפֶלָה נָמֶזֶת בֵּבָל נֶפֶלָה and מַתָּרָב.
50. וּמָתָרָב. We can only conjecture that the word was obscurely written, and that under these circumstances the influence of the following word לַלֵּילָ determined the rendering.
52. πεσοῦται. The verb and corresponding subst. have been successfully dealt with by O' in their other occurrences. Here probably
obscenity of writing was the cause of the mistranslation.

53. ὠξυρώσῃ (Q ὠψώσῃ) τὰ τείχῃ (Bab τὰ ψῆ, Ν* πῆ, Ν* AQ ψὸς) ἰσχύι (Ν* AQ χύος) αὐτῆς; apparently reading for ἤμι by an early error ἡμῶν. Comp. (i. 18;) xv. 20; Deut. xxviii. 52; Is. ii. 15, xxii. 10 for the connexion of ἢν and ὡ.

55. ὄρος ἐκεῖνος. ἦμι may easily be a gloss, introduced under the influence of v. 22, xxxi. 34, where ἦμι and ἦμι are connected.

56. ἐπὶ Βασιλῶνα. ἦμι may have been a gloss upon ἦμι, and then by O' already incorporated in the text. They thus omitted the wrong word.

ηπώρ. ταλαιπωρία. See on iv. 13.

ἐπτόται.

τὸ τὸξον αὐτῶν (κατ' θεόν). We may note that this is the form (_hex with and ἰν without Dagesh) adopted by Baer and Del. here as well as in Ps. xxxvii. 15 and Is. v. 28. See their Adnot. Crit. on the last-named v.

ὁ θεὸς αὐταποδίδοσιν αὐτοῖς (Ν* om. αὐτοῖς); reading ἢμι ἐιρθόνι...

57. Κύριος αὐταποδίδοσιν (Ν*
om. Κύρ. αὐτ., Νκα hab.; Qα pref. αὐτός; AQ add αὐτῇ τὴν αὐταπόδοσιν. O"s apparent omission of שָׁלֹשׁ by no means implies necessarily that they had not the present M.T. See on xxiii. 39.

57. καὶ μεθύσει μέθη (see on iii. 1).

The change to the 3rd p. was consequential on the wrong division of the verses, as it involved the close connexion of this verb with the preceding one.

O' vacat.
O' vacat.
O' vacat. The clause is borrowed from v. 39.

58. τείχος; thus agreeing with M.T. of v. 44.
επλατύνθη (ῥηθήναι).
καὶ οὗ κοπιάσουσιν. For the insertion of a negative see on xviii. 18.

In the similar passage, Hab. ii. 13, O" were slightly more successful with the somewhat infrequent εἰς (λαοὶ εἰς κενὸν, καὶ ἑθνη εν ἀρχῃ). In the similar passage, l.c. p. 50 of ἄν to ἄν (comp. this root in Niph. in ii. 25, xviii. 12) is a good one. The ἄ may easily have fallen out through the ἄν preceding, while we shall moreover gain a parallelism with πολλά.
59. ἐνετείλατο Κύριος Ἰερεμία τῷ προφήτῃ εἶπεῖν τῷ Ἱσαὰ; altering in order to agree more nearly with the language of such passages as xxvi. [xxxiii.] 8.

παρὰ Σεδεκιου.  ἀρχων δωρῶν (ἢν). So Targ. (ארכו דבורה). Vulg. princeps prophetiae is obscure. נטוא seems too daring a conjecture. Doubtless as to the sense of מ Symm. is in the right, (Σαραίας δὲ ἦν) ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναπαύσεως (thus SH. corrects mss. 86, 88, which represent Symm. as ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναβάσεως), (prince of) the camping-place, quarter-master-general.

60. ὁρᾶ. O' vacat; ΝΑQ add ἐνὶ.

62. ὑπάρχει Κύριε (ΝΑQ om. K. 2°).

64. τῶν Χαλδαίων (ΝΑQ τῶν κακῶν, Q* κακῶν); an early gloss, substituted for the text. ἐπέφυγε... Ἰρώθ. O' vacat. ἦ clearly has to do with ἦ which ends v. 58. As Gi. suggests, ιδὲ... ὑμῖν may have originally stood there, and if so, on the removal of those words to their present place, ἦ may either intentionally or by accident (Cheyne, Introd. to chaps. l. l., says the latter) have been transferred with it. The sense will be "To they shall be weary," thus far are etc."

S. 20
lili. 2, 3. O' vacat.

4. τῷ ἐνατῷ (A ἐβδόμῳ; Q δεκατῷ).

'Ev. seems to have come in here through the mistake in xxxix. [xlvi.] 1, where see note. While both A and Q have there the right reading, A is here unsuccessful in its emendation.

τετραπόδοις (Q adds λίθοις). In 2 K. xxv. 1 ἦ is translated by περίτειχος.

6. ἐν τῇ (AQQ* om. ἐν τῇ) ἐνατῇ τοῦ μνημόνευ (Q pref. with ast. ἐν μνημόνευ τῷ τεταρτῷ). O's rendering is accidentally defective, xxxix. 2 supplying the words which are here lacking.

7. ἐξηκληθοῦν; rightly, thus keeping closer to the Greek of Kings (v. 4).

ιὸν ἐκτίμητε (A τῆς πύλης) καὶ τοῦ προτειχίσματος; explanatory.

8. αὐτόν.

9. ἐλευθερία. eis Δεβλάθα. ἦ ἦν are absent also from Kings (v. 6).

11. μύλωνος. So in xxxix. [xlvi.]

7 Q⁴₄⁴ inserts (after Βαβύλωνα) καὶ δοῦναι αὐτόν eis oikos τοῦ μύλων; a trace of tradition.

12. ὁ οὖν...καὶ. O' vacat; an insertion perhaps suggested (so Gi.) by 2 K. xxiv. 12.

ἔστηκώς κατὰ πρόσωπον; thus
reading יָרְפֶּה. Both however should probably be emended (so Gi.) to (יָרְפֶּה יָרְפֶּה), as in Kings (v. 8). For confusion of 'ב and 'מ see on xx. 17.

13. ῥήξ πόλεως. M.T. is borrowed from Kings (v. 9).

14. καὶ πᾶν τεῖχος. In Kings the corresponding verse (v. 10) is lacking.

17. ἡπτέσιν. O' add καὶ ἀπηνεγκαυ (QΓ om.). Kings (v. 13) has ἡπτέσιν.

18. τοῖς ἑταῖροι καὶ τὴν στέφανην. So also Exod. xxvii. 3, apparently taking the word as equivalent in sense to רֵע, which they render in the same way in Exod. xxv. 24, 25 [23, 24]. O's ordinary rendering of מְלָא is λέβης, e.g. i. 13. So apparently Aq. Symm. here.

καὶ τὰς φιάλας. In Kings (v. 14) O' transliterate (loosely) the word. Φ. however appears with them as its rendering in Numb. iv. 14. O' here add καὶ τὰς κρεάγρας. This word generally renders מְלָא or מְלָא. Once (2 Chr. iv. 11) it represents מְלָא. It may therefore (as an alternative rendering to στέφανη) do the same duty here. In that case מְלָא will be unrepresented.
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τὰ πρὸς τὴν ὀρκυνίαν. Ο’ vacat. This word is ordinarily rendered by φιάλη. In Kings however (v. 14) it is lacking, and so may well be a gloss here and genuine in v. 19.

τὰ ἐντός. Ο’ vacat. The word occurs in the next v.

The above account of these words seems preferable to that adopted by Gi. According to him the first two substantives in M.T. are those which are not represented in O’.

καὶ τὰ (κ τάς) σαφφόθ καὶ τὰ (κ·Α τάς) μασμαρωθ (κ·τάς μασμαρωθ); thus pointing to a considerable corruption of text, and to the omission of ἐντός.

τὰ ἐντός. Ο’ vacat. The words καὶ τοὺς ὑποχυτῆρας, which stand in this place, seem to be a second rendering of ἐντός. It is in itself unlikely that ἐντός would occur in both v., and if it did, Ο’ would scarcely render it differently in the two.

καὶ τὰς θυίας. So in Kings (v. 14); Numb. vii. 14 etc.

20. τῆς θαλάσσης. In Kings also (v. 16) the subst. troubled O’, who there trans-
literate (μεξωνωθ'). In the Temple as built by Solomon the 'בש ("bases") were under the layers, while the bulls supported the "sea" (1 K. vii. 25, 43). Hence O's substitution of δαλ. here. As however there is no mention of the bulls in the parallel place in Kings (v. 16), they may be an early interpolation in the M.T. here.

O' vacat. The words occur in Kings (v. 16) in M.T. and O'.

21. τρίακοντα πέντε πηχῶν. Both texts of Kings (v. 17) agree with M.T. here as regards the number, which also corresponds with that given in 1 K. vii. 15 [3]. It is hard to account for the error, even on the assumption that numbers were at any period of the history of the text represented by letters (ח and ק).

מ_unicode_5709. κύκλῳ (Γ om.); reading שביב, which occurs in vv. 22, 23. For O's tendency to adopt this mode for getting out of a difficulty see on xx. 11.

22. τὸ μῆκος; an explanatory insertion.

2ο. ὀκτὼ ῥόας τῷ πῆχει τοῖς δώδεκα πῆχεσιν; probably a gloss in both texts. That in O' apparently rests upon the statement in v. 23 that the total number of pomegranates was one hundred. This, allowing one for each corner, would leave eight for each of the "twelve cubits," specified in v. 21.
23. ἄν μέρος (B א AQ pref. τὸ); a free and indeed inaccurate rendering of the Heb., which, as it stands, must mean on all (four) sides, i.e. towards each wind, but is in all probability corrupt.

24. אֲחֵרָיו and אֲחֵרִים. O' vacat (Q Ἴαπαλαν and Σοφονλαν).

25. καὶ (AQ ins. εκ τῆς πόλεως ἐλαβεν) εὔνοικον.

26. ἐκ Δεβλασθα. So in Kings (v. 20), but there in v. 21 we have 'Πεβ. (A Δεβ.).

27. ημεθα. O' vacat; probably a gloss. If so, it was inserted in the Heb. of Kings (v. 21) early enough to be represented in O'.

28—30. O' vacat. M.T. is an insertion from some other source, as appears from the discrepancy in the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as well as in the numbers of the captives, when compared with the accounts in 2 K. xxiv. 12, 14, xxv. 8.

31. εἰς τῷ τετράδι καὶ εἰκάσι. In Kings (v. 27) the number is twenty-seven in both texts. Probably there was a difference in this detail of the tradition.
καὶ ἐκείρεν αὐτῶν (ἌΑΩ om. κ. ἐκ.
αὐτ.), καὶ ἐξῆγαγεν αὐτῶν. As Gi. points out, the
first Greek verb seems to represent a corruption of
ὡς ἁλάδη (reading ἕ for the ἔ), and so far to
represent a (probable) gloss.

34. ἀρχή. O' vacat; perhaps considering
the word superfluous or an accidental repetition.

וַיִּמְנַע. O' vacat.
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ON THE OLD LATIN EVIDENCE, WITH NOTES ON THE LUCIANIC RECESSIN OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

In the following notes a colon divides each reading from that which succeeds it; spaced letters are used to call attention to a rendering which differs in sense from both M.T. (ך) and B (even where such rendering does not necessarily imply a variant); small capitals call attention to an agreement with M.T. (ך) against B. In all but the above-mentioned cases simple italics are used for the Latin. The reading of the Vulg. (Cod. Amiat.) heads each note and is preceded by an asterisk. When part of a reading appears within ( ), that part is only introduced in order to furnish a more ready clue to the state of the evidence, and not as implying a variant. Otherwise ( ) indicate that the testimony thus given is attended by circumstances (e.g. of possible or certain spuriousness) which weaken its force. In readings marked [ ] the quotation is apparently not meant as a formal one.

1 In the case of Sang [ ] indicate a lacuna in the MS.
Evidence in the form of Biblical mss. for the O. L. text of this prophet is but scanty. It consists of (a) the Würzburg fragments (W in the following notes), a portion of which was brought to light by Münter¹ and the whole more recently edited in a facsimile form by Ranke², who (praef. p. ix) places them "medio circiter saeculo"; (b) the St Gallen palimpsest (Sang), a fragment, of which an inaccurate version appeared in the 2nd ed. of Tischendorf's *Monumenta sacra et profana*, but which has just been freshly transcribed by F. C. Burkitt, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge³.

The early patristic references, although sometimes failing us for a considerable space, yet occasionally are fairly numerous. In these the numbers in thicker type denote the Book, Sermon etc. referred to, any following figures the chapter or section or both, as the case may be. "Hier," when not followed by a specific reference, denotes St Jerome's rendering of the passage in his Comm. on Jeremiah, while "tr hom or" means his translation of the Homilies of Origen upon this Book, the number following in () here and in some other citations of St Jer. being that of the Benedictine page. Reference to a passage of


² *Par Palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium, Antiquissimae V. T. versionis Latinae fragmenta*, ed. Ernestus Ranke, Vienna, 1871. The fragments are as follows: xii 12—xiii 12; xiv 15—xv 11; xv 13—17; xvi 14—19; xvi 21—xvii 6; xviii 8—10; xviii 16—xx 4; xx 6—xxii 39; xxxv 15—19; xxxvi 211; xxxvi 28—xxxvii 11; xxxviii 23—xl 5; xli 1—17.

³ It contains xvii 10—17 (somewhat mutilated); xlix [xxix] 13—17. Mr Burkitt has kindly permitted me to use his transcription for these notes.
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the Bible is made by Arabic figures, e.g. Ps 2 i2 = Ps ii i2 (but Ps 2 § 39, Ps ii section 39). In such cases the second number indicates the last verse mentioned in the edition used, not necessarily that on which the patristic authority is at the moment commenting. In Priscillian the number refers to the page of Schepss¹, in Tycon. to Mr Burkitt's edition².

The references to Philo are those of Dr Ryle's ed.³, in which "the sections are taken from the Tauchnitz edition, but the column and page of Mangey's edition are always added" (Ryle, p. xlvi).

Here and there in the following notes I have added the Benedictine pagination ("Bened. pag.") where it seemed advisable.

In citing patristic authorities I have included some, e.g. Cassiodorus (ob. c. 570), who flourished considerably later than St Jerome's time. They serve in some measure to illustrate the gradual acceptance of the Vulgate, and the mixed character of Latin texts.

In chapters i—v I have added in the form of footnotes readings supplied by mss. (as given by Holmes and Parsons) which have been held to represent Lucian's recension. Of the 12 mss. available for the purpose in these chapters (22, 23, 36, 48, 51, 62, 82, 90, 108, 144, 231, 233) six (22, 36, 48, 51, 82 and 108) have stronger testimony from experts than the rest as to their claim to a Lucianic character. I have kept the two classes distinct; thus Luc 4 + 2 (+ 1) means that the reading is

¹ Priscilliani quæ supersunt, etc. 8vo. Vienna, 1889.
³ Philo and Holy Scripture, 8vo. London, 1895.
supported by four of the more strongly attested and two
of the less strongly attested, together with another of
the latter class, whose evidence is in some way weak-
ened.

For particulars as to the editions here used, as well
as for general results of the subjoined examination of
O. L. and of Lucianic evidence see the latter part of this
Appendix.

i. 2. *Domini Hier\(^1\).
i. 3. *Usque ad consummationem Hier\(^2\).
i. 4. *Ad me dicens\(^3\) Hier.
i. 5. *De vulva Hier in Cyp
test 1\(2\) de lap 10 Vict Pett Apoc 11\(5\) Hil Ps 119\(5\) Hier tr hom or i
(746) s/ix (747) (but de v. matris tuae ib i (750)) id am 4\(13\) Ambr
exp Luc 3\(15\) (ib 25 in v.) de fide 1\(2\), 4\(112\) Aug ep 3\(3\) 187 op imp con lul 4\(134\)
Auc qu. ex vet test ap Aug 44 Pros Aqu de voc 2 11 Leo Mag
ser 30 Mar Merc hypog 3\(26\) s/s : in utero [Hil trin 6 80] Aug
retract 1\(26\) de div qu 68 6 (comp de pec mer 1 30): in vulva Faust et
m. Ambr de ben pat 51 de int lob et D 9 91.
*et (prophetam) Auc quaest ex vet test ap Aug 44: om
et Hier.
i. 6. *A A A: AH AH AH Hier: quies Hil de trin 4 8
Hier 3 4: quis es? Ambr Ps 118 3\(26\), but comp Ps ib 4\(34\),
where we find (without an interrogation) juvemis (bis) for
puer and per for secundum. See also tr hom or i (747,
753). Quies is doubtless a genuine O. L. reading. In
Jer iv 10 (see Hier’s Comm. ad loc.) O. L. had O. O. L.

\(^1\) Luc 0 + 1. \(^2\) Luc 4 + 3. \(^3\) Luc 1 + 1: πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγων Luc 3 + 2.
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elsewhere has *qui est* (Ex iii 14 bis; so Hil etc.) or O (2 K vi 5 Hil) or *Oo* (Ezek xxx 2 Hier) or is lacking (2 K iii 10, vi 5). The reading ὅ ὡν of this and three other passages in this Book (see critical notes) is probably an early corruption, and, as representing the Ineffable Name, it suggested as one of its Latin renderings an interrogation which should refer to the uncomprehended nature of God.

i. 9. *om* (after manum suam) ad me Hier¹: hab id tr hom or i (747, 754, 755) Cassiod Ps 50 12.

i. 10. *et super* (before regna) Hier: om super Ambr Ps 43 3 Hier Soph 1 13 tr hom or i (747, 755 bis etc) Vigil Taps c varim 3 71 Fac Herm pro def tr cap 5 5 Cassiod ib.²

*ut evellas et destruas et disperdas et dissipes Hier Aug de doct chr 3 17 Joh Cass coll (xiv) de spir sci 3 2 Eugip exc Aug 667: eradicare suffodere evertere DISPERDERE Aug Ps 50 8: [ad destructionem et aedificiationem] id Ps 88 3: erad et disp Hier tr hom or i (747): e. et suff. ib: erad ib 755 9/3, and erad et subvertere et disp ib xi (756, 844), erad et suff et disp ib i (758) Ezek 1 18 Soph 1 13, ut ante eradicare et suffoderet et perderet Hier Eccles 3 (406) (but ? a loose quotation of xviii 7, 9): ut evellas et destruas Vigil Taps ib: eradicare et effod et disp Fac Herm ib: eradicare et demolire et perdere ET EXTERMINARE Cassiod ib: [ut aedifices et destruas] id Ps 88 2.

i. 11. *IEREMIA* Hier id Eccles 12 (491).³

*EGO VIDEO* Hier*: om id Eccles ib.

i. 12. *VERBO MEO: VERBUM MEUM* Hier id Eccles ib.

i. 13. *ollam succensam...a facie Aquilonis* Hier Eucher form spir int 8: *olla succensa ab Aquilone* Aug Ps 59 10.

*EGO VIDEO* Hier*: om id 18 41 25 Ezek 24 1.

¹ Luc 9 + 1.
² Luc 4 + 2 (+ 1).
³ Luc 4 + 6.
⁴ Luc 4 + 4.
⁵ Luc 4 + 3.
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i. 14. *AB AQUILONE Hier id Is 14 14 (359) Ezek 40 81 Joel 2 18 Soph 2 12 Tit 2 9 Eucher form spir int 3 2/2: a facie Aquilonis [Hier Ezek 1 4 Os 4 1 Zech 2 6].

*PANDETUR Eucher ib s/2: APERIERTUR Hier, who adds sive exardescit: exardescit id Is ib Joel ib Soph ib Tit ib: exardescunt id Ezek 40 20, 41 8, 42 1, Os ib: succeditur (in ref to theolla) id Is 14 32 (364): accenditur id Ezek 1 4.

i. 15. *COGNATIONES Hier id Is 22 (322).1

*OM τῆς γῆς Hier id Is ib.9

i. 16. *et loquar IUDICIA MEA CUM EIS Hier.9


*AD EOS Hier: om Lucif Cal de non parci in D. del 13 s/2: ad populum Gaud Brix ib.

*ne formides (timeas Hier) a facie eorum: nec enim timere te faciam vultum eorum Hier: ne timeas a fac. eo nec (al ne) form. in conspectu eorum Lucif Cal ib 3/3: so with faciem Ps Aug spec 119. Thus the corruption seems to have appeared early in the Greek, for of the accuracy of its original rendering (see critical note) we have sufficient evidence.

i. 18. *ET IN COLUMNAM FERREAM Hier (om in Hier ep 66 6 but the context there is very loose); om Lucif Cal ib 13 et 14. For Joh Cass's form of vv. 18, 19 see remarks on him at the end of these notes.

*aerenum: aeneum Hier.

*OM firmum Hier: hab Lucif Cal ib.

1 π. τ. βασιλείας τῶν βασιλέων (thus differing from both) Luc 4 2.

3 καὶ λαλῆσον μετὰ κρατεῖν μου πρὸς αὐτούς Luc 3 2.

4 Luc 4 6. 6 Luc 4 4.
*SUPER OMNEM TERRAM Hier: om Lucif Cal ib.
*et SACERDOTIBUS Hier¹: om Lucif Cal ib.
ii. 1. *ET FACTUM EST VERBUM DOMINI AD ME DICENS, VADE ET CLAMA IN AURIBUS IERUSALEM Hier Gildas 47.⁸
ii. 2. *DICENS Hier: et dices Gildas ib.
*miserans adolescentiam tuam Hier.
*et caritatem tuam (om et c. l. Hier) et caritatem de- sponsationis tuae Hier.
*IN DESERTO, IN TERRA QUAE NON SEMINATUR Hier².
ii. 3. *delinquunt: -quent Hier.
*mala venient: mala inducam Lucif Cal athan ² i, ⁴
ii. 5. *in me patres vestri Lucif Cal de non conv c haer ⁸ Gildas 47: p. v. in me Hier Gildas ⁸o.
*ET IMAGINEM MORTIS Hier³: et sine fructu Lucif Cal ib.
(for oδδίων) *VIR Hier Lucif Cal ib.
*neque habitabit homo (om ἵκεξ) Hier: neque commo- ratus est ibi filius hominis Lucif Cal ib.⁶
ii. 7. *IN TERRAM Carmeli Hier: in Carmelum Lucif Cal ib.
*optima: bona Hier Lucif Cal ib.
ii. 8. *dominus Hier Lucif Cal ib Gildas ⁸o: deus Ps Aug spec ⁴⁶.
*et tenentes legem Gildas ib: et seniores legis meae

¹ Luc 4 + 4. ² Luc 4 + 4. ³ Luc 4 + 2. ⁴ διάδεξι (διάδεξι), thus differing from both M.T. and B, and supported in so doing by O. L. evidence.
⁵ Luc 4 + 2.
⁶ οδος διὸ. Luc 4 + 4, thus differing from both M.T. and B, and supported in so doing by O. L. evidence.
Lucif Calib: et cultores legis meae Ps Augspecib: et t. legem meam Hier: t. l. m. id Zech 11: 8.1

ii. 9. *Ait DOMINUS Hier Gildasib.2


*et considerate vehementer et videte Hier: interro-gate minis Tertadv iud 13,

ii. 11. *GENS Hier Fulg Rusp ep 18: 8: gentes Tertib.3

*populus vero meus mutavit glori mismum in idolum Hier, who adds sive de quo ei nihil proderit; as Hier (but om vero and idolo) Joh Cass coll (a) de or 3 5.


1 Luc 2 + 5. 2 Luc 4 + 6.
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* cisternas : cisternas Hier (Cassiod ib) : lacus (id est cisternas) Hier Ezek 32 17 : lacus Tert adv ind 13 Cypr test 1 3 3 59 de cath eccl un 11 ep 70 1 Carth Conc A.D. 255 Lact div inst 4 30 Ambr Ps 61 5 Zen Ver ib Philast ib Opt Mil ib Aug con ep parm 2 20 Ps Aug spec ib Paul Nol ib Hier Ezek 47 1 Os 1 1, 10 10 Am 4 7 Na 2 9 Vigil Taps de trin ib Bened pag 324 id con varim ib : similarly Philo de prof 5 36 5 575.

* quae continere non valent aquas Hier (Cassiod ib) : qui non poterunt aquam continere Tert adv ind 13 Ps Aug spec 36 comp at ou δυνασται σωκεῖν ὑδροι Philo ib : qui non poterunt aquam portare Cypr test 13 ; so with potuerunt Vigil Taps 12 Bened pag 324 : so with possunt Cypr de cath eccl un 11 ep 70 1 Zen Ver ib Aug con ep parm 2 20 Carth Conc A.D. 255 : qui non poterant aquam continere Cypr test 5 59, but comp poterent portare id ib 13 : qui non habent venam lact 4 30 : qui non possunt capere aquam Philast ib : qui non possent aquam continere Opt Mil ib : so with possunt Hier Na 2 9 : quae aquas continere non possunt Hier Ezek 32 17 : so with qui id Am 4 7 : so with qui and aquam id Ezek 47 1 : quae aquas non valent continere id Os 1 1 : qui non possunt aquas continere id ib 10 10 : qui non tenent aquam Aug ep 2 121 12 Paul Nol ep 50 12 : qui aquam non possunt continere Vigil Taps con varim ib.

i. 18. *TURBIDAM Joh Cass coll (xxiv) de mortif 24 (J C is quoting the original and discussing its application to "t. atque coenosum") : Sier Hier : geon Ambr Tob 58 Ps 1 3 : aquam geon turbidam id ep 51 5 : aquam geon id Is 52 4 Ezek 29 3 (comp 31 introd) Os 5 5 Ab 15 15.

*FLUMINIS Hier Joh Cass ib : fluminum Hier Is 50 2.

ii. 19. *arguet te malitia tua et aversio tua increpavit (-pabit Hier) te Hier, who adds sive erudiet te praec.
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varicatio tua: emendabit te abscessio tua Ir chae 4 37 7: derelictio tua et nequitia tua Cypr test 3 59: arg. te pr. t. et malitia tua corripiet te Hier Is 19 18 Bened pag 994: corr. te pr. tua id Ezek 5 17: M. tua et versio tua Joh Cass ib et coll (xxiii) de velle bon ets q.


*te DOMINUM Deum tuum Hier Joh Cass coll (xxiv) de mortif 24: me, dicit Dominus Cypr ib.

*et non ESSE TIMOREM MEI APUD TE Hier: so, with meum, Joh Cass ib: et non speraveris in me Cypr ib.


ii. 20. *confreristi...rupisti Hier Gildas 47: contribu-lasti...dirupisti Cypr ib.

*non servium (om cor) Hier Cypr ib Gildas ib.

*prosternebaris Hier: confundar Cypr ib: diffundar Hier Os 4 10.


*omne SEMEN verum Hier id Faust ib Gildas ib: om Ambr de fide 4 165 Prim Adrum ib: totam feracem Ruf Aqu ib: totam veram Ambr Ps 36 9 Hier Is 5 1, 39 9 Mic 4 8 Ab 3 17 Zach 14 15: universam v. Hier tr hom or xiii (866): vineam veram

1 πῶιπὸν καὶ τὸν. Luc 3 + 1.
Hier Mat 15 13, 26 29, 27 34: veram Ps Aug spec ib: omnem veram (Hier Ezek 15 2) Hier Mal 3 7: om πᾶσ. αληθ. (Ambr Luc 6 20, but see above) Paul Nol ep 10 2 Fulg Rusp ib.

*om mihi Ambr de fide ib Ruf Aqu ib Paul Nol ib Hier tr hom or ib Is 5 1, 39 9 Ezek 15 1 Ab 3 17 Mat ib Ps Aug ib Faustus de grat 1 12 Fulg Rusp ib Prim Adrum ib Gildas ib: hab hier.

*IN PRAVUM vinea aliena Hier Gildas ib: in amaritudo

*VITIS ALIENAE Ambr de fide ib Ruf Aqu ib Hier Is 5 9 Ezek 15 1 Ab 3 17 Mat ib Ps Aug spec ib Paul Nol ib Faustus ib Fulg Rusp ib Prim Adrum ib: in am. vinea aliena Hier Is 5 1: in am. vitis aliena Hier tr hom or ib Aug Ps 55 1 Joh 8 80 1 Faustus ib.

ii. 22. *in iniquitate tua Hier: in iniquitatis tuis id

tr hom or 18 (867 bis): contritiones vestras Ps Aug spec 23: iniqu.
tua Gildas ib.


*ambulavi: abii Hier Prisc ib.

*viias suas Hier: v. tuas Prisc ib.

ii. 24. *ASSUETUS IN solitudine: ASS. solitudini Hier.

ii. 25. *A NUDITATE Hier: ab aspera via Lucif Cal

de non conv cum haer 8 Hier ep 122 1: a v. aspera Hier ep 12 2

Is 57 10.

*et DIXISTI Hier: quae autem dixit Lucif Cal ib.

*DESPERAVI, NEQUAquam FACIAM Hier: confortabor Lucif Cal ib.1


*DOMUS Hier: filii Lucif Cal ib.

ii. 27. *DICENTES ligno, Pater meus es tu; et lapidi,

Tu me genuisti Hier Aug Ps 65 17, 113 4: ligno dixerunt quia
pater meus es tu; et lapidi: Tu g. me Cypr test 3 59: dicit

1 of ἁμαρτωμας Luc 4 2, thus agreeing with M.T. rather than B.
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lap., P. m. es tu Ambr de off min 1 117 [noli ligno dicere, P. m. es tu id Luc 7 13 Bened pag 1465]: lig. dixerunt, P. m. es tu; et lap., Tu gen. me Hier ep 152 i.

*verterunt ad me tergum et non faciem Hier Jus Urgell in Cant expl 49: so, with dorsa sua Hier ep pach 5: so, with dorsa and f. suas id Zach 7 8: converterunt ad me dorsum et n. f. suam (loosely) Cypr ib: so, without suam, Aug Ps 113 introd: convert. ad me dorsum Ruf Aqu ben lud 2: v. contra me scapulam recedentem (loosely) Hier Eek 8 15.

ii. 28. *SURGANT et LIBERENT Hier: RESURGANT et SALVAM...FACIANT Hier Is 57 15.

*TE Hier id ib.¹

ii. 29. *quid vultis mecum IUDICIO CONTENDERE Hier id ep 138 so Aug Ps 142 2 de pecc mer 2 14 Eugip exc aug 1 Gildas 47: ut quid loquimini ad me Lucif Cal de non conv cum haer 8.

*omnes dereliquistis me (me der. Gildas) dicit Dominus Hier Aug Ps 140 9 Gildas ib: omnes vos impie egistis et o. vos deliquistis in me, d. D. Lucif Cal ib.

ii. 30. *frustra Hier Am 4 4 Aug ep 93 3 Joh Cass coll (vi) de nece san 11 Gildas ib: sine causa Cypr ad dem 7 Hier Is 1 5 9 8 Soph 8 Mal 3 6 Aug con ep parm 8 89 Ps Aug spec 32.

*RECEPERUNT Hier Aug ep ib con ep parm ib Gildas ib: EXCEPERUNT Cypr ib: recepistis Hier Is 1 5 9 8 Am ib Soph ib Mal ib Ps Aug spec ib Joh Cass ib.

ii. 31 [30]. *VIDETE Hier: audite Gildas 47.

*OM τοῦδε λέγει Kvp. Hier Gildas ib.

*terra SEROTINA Hier Gildas ib: t. in incultum dere-licta Tert marc 4 31.

*recessimus Hier Gildas ib.

ii. 33. *MALITIAS TUAS DOCUISTI Hier: tu maligna-tus es ut coinquinares Lucif Cal pro ath 2 1.

¹ Luc 4 4.
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ii. 37. *nihil habebis prosperum Salv de sub 7.11: n. in ea hab. pr. Hier.

iii. 1. Si reliquerit uxor virum suum, et alii nupserit, et voluerit postea reverti ad eum: numquid suscipiet eam, et non detestabitur? pro quo scriptum est iuxta Hebraicam veritatem, quod in Graecis et Latinis codicibus non habetur Et tu reliquisti me; tamen convertere, et suscipiam te, dicit Dominus Hier ep 122 2, an extraordinarily loose rendering.

iii. 2. *(in) directum Hier 1.

iii. 3. frons Hier: facies Hier ep 117 9 Ezek 7 18 Os 2 5 Eucher form spir int 6 Vigil Taps con eut 1 4.

*om pρός πάρτας Hier id ib 2.

iii. 4. *ergo saltatem AMODO voca me: pater meus, dux virginitatis meae tu es (es tu Hier) Hier: non ut Dominum me vocasti neque ut patrem et principem virg. tuae Hier 18 54 1 (very loose): *non ut Dom. me invocasti aut pat. aut prin. v. tuae id Os 2 19: *non ut Dom. me voc. et patr. et prin. v. t. id 10el 1 8. Comp. οὐχ ὃς οἶκον με ἐκάλεσας, καὶ πατέρα, καὶ ἄνδρα τῆς παρθενίας σου Philo de cherub § 14 i 148, where Dr Ryle (p. 298) points out that Philo is laying stress on the reading ἄνδρα.

iii. 6. *aversatrix Israel Hier: habitatio domus Israel id tr hom or xiv (869 et 873) Gaud Brix ser 8.

*frondosum Hier: nemorosum id ib Gaud Brix ib: (frondoso Hier Os 4 10, but this is rather a citation of ii. 20. See crit. note there).

*et fornicata est ibi Hier: so, with illie for ibi id ib Gaud Brix ib: et fornicati sunt ibi (Hier ep 92 1. See previous note) 2.

1 om eis eιθ. Luc 3 + 1. 2 Luc o + 1.
2 ἔπορενησεν Luc 3 + 5, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.
iii. 7. *FECISSET Hier: *fornicata est id ep ib Gaud Brix ib: *forn. es ib de ponit ap ambr 10, but *forn. est ib 22: *fornicati sunt Hier Os 4 10.

*convertere Hier: *revertere Gaud Brix ib Hier ep ib Os ib.

*SOROR EIUS Iuda Hier 1.

iii. 8. *OM eis τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς Hier (so Gaud Brix ib, but his omission is not significant, as these closing words are not wanted to complete the sense): in manu eius id tr hom or xiv (870): so with manus id ib.

*SOROR EIUS Hier id (870) but om id ib (870 et 875). 3

iii. 9. *et facilitate fornicationis suae contaminavit terram Hier: et facta est fornicatio eius in nihilum id ib.

*CUM LAPIDE ET LIGNO Hier: lignum et lapidem Cypr ep 63 18: in lignum et lapidem Hier 18 57 4.

iii. 10. *SOROR EIUS Hier: om id tr hom or (870 et 876 ter). 4

*AIT DOMINUS Hier: om id ib 5

iii. 11. *AVERSATRIX Hier: om id (870). 6

iii. 12. *OM πρὸς μή Hier: hab Tycon reg 7 (p. 73) Hier Zach 6 6 Auct qu ex utr test 10a.

*AVERSATRIX Hier: *habitatio Hier Zach ib.

*ait: dicit Hier id Zach ib Auct qu ex utr test ib.

*avertam Hier, who adds sive firmabo: firmabo Auct qu ex utr test ib.

*OM ὑπὰ Hier: hab Auct qu ex utr test ib.

iii. 15. *SCIENTIA Hier Ferreolus reg ad mon 37: pas
centes Cypr test 1 14 8 66 de hab virg 1 ep 4 1: Lucif Cal ath 1 1 22 2 3
de non parc in D. del 11 ib 22 Aug con cresc don 3 8: om Aug ser 46 23 3
ib 313 2.

1 *Ioua ἡ δελφὴ αὐτῆς Luc 4 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T.
2 Luc 4 + 2, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.
3 Luc 3 ( 1) + 1 ( 1).
4 Luc 4 + 2 ( 1).
5 Luc 3 + 3.
6 Luc 4 + 2.
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*et doctrina Hier Ferreolus ib: cum disciplina Cypr ib
Lucif Cal ib Aug con cresc don ib ser 46 a3 ib 313 a.

iii. 16. *NEQUE (NEC Hier) RECORDABUNTUR ILLIUS
Hier1.

iii. 17. *IN TEMPORE ILLO Hier: in illis diebus et in
 t. i. Prim Adrum in Apoc 8.

*IN NOMINE DOMINI IN IERUSALEM Hier8: om in
Ier Prim Adrum ib.


*vocabis, cessabis Hier Joh Cass coll (iii) de prob dei 8.

iii. 20. *amatorem suum Hier Joh Cass ib: virum
 suum Hier ep 69 5.

*contempsit Hier Joh Cass ib: despicit Hier ib.

iii. 22. *et sanabo Hier id Ezek 47 6 Na 2 9: et ego sanabo
id Is 51 9.

*AVERSIONES vestras Hier: contritiones v. id Is ib Ezek ib
Na ib; tribulationem vestram lib de poenit ap ambr 25.

*ECCE NOS VENIMUS AD TE Hier4.

iv. 3. *ET IERUSALEM Hier: et qui inhabitant Hier.

Cypr test 1 8: et qui inh. in Hier. Lact de div inst 4 17: et om-
nibus qui habitant in Ier. Zen Ver 1 13 6: et habitator (al.
ibus) Hier Joh Cass coll (iv) de conc car et spir 19.

iv. 4. *DOMINO Hier: deo vestro Tert marc 1 20 Cypr ib
Lact ib (one MS. dom. deo v.: Hier Eph 2 12: deo Tert adv iud 3:

*ET AUFEfte Hier: (circumcidimini deo) et circumci-
dite Tert adv iud 3: et circumcidimini id marc 1 20 6 1 4: (cir-
cumcidite vos deo vestro) et circumcidite Cypr ib Lact ib: et

1 Luc 4 2 add ἐν αὐτῷ. 2 Luc 3 ( + 1) + 3.
3 deoquiLuc 4 1, agreeing with M.T.
4 αὐτῷ (with Q; see critical note) Luc 2 4, thus agreeing with
M.T. rather than B.
nolite circumcidere carnem praeputii vestri Hier
Eph 2:12: om Zen Ver ib.

*indignatio mea Hier: ira mea Cypr ib Lact ib Zen
Ver ib.

iv. 7. *de cubili suo Hier: de Iordane Hier Zach 11.3.
*et praedo Hier.
*terram tuam Hier.
*civitates tuae Hier.


iv. 10. *heu heu heu Hier. See on i. 6.
*erit vobis Hier.
*et ecce pervenit Hier.

iv. 11. *urens Hier, who adds sive roris: but see
crit. note.

iv. 12. *ex his Hier.
*loquar Hier (ἐλάλημ, λαλό; Q has -λησο).

iv. 14. *MORABUNTUR Hier Joh Cass coll (vii) de an mob 4:
ergunt Ps Aug spec 23.

iv. 19. *ventrem meum 2o Hier id Ezek 33 Ambr ob
val 29 fug saec 42: om Ambr ep 36 Eucher form spir int 7.
*sensus cordis mei turbati sunt in me Hier: s. c. m.
conturbant me id Ezek ib: s. c. m. conturbati sunt Eucher ib.

---

1 τὴν ἀκροβ. τ. καρδιάς ὑμῶν (ἡμῶν) Luc 3 + 3, thus agreeing with
M.T., but one Luc ms. (51) has τὴν ἀκαρδιὰν τ. κ. ὑμ.

2 Luc 1 + 2.

3 τὴν γῆν σου, Luc 3 + 6, thus agreeing with M.T.

4 ins. σου Luc 3 + 5.

5 Luc 1 + 5.

6 Luc 4 + 6.

7 om lbo Luc 0 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T.

8 Luc 4 + 4.

9 λαλῆσαι Luc 4 + 6.

10 ὑπαρκοντίν Luc 3 ( + 1) + 4.
iv. 20. *tabernacula mea Hier\textsuperscript{1}.
iv. 21. *audiam Hier\textsuperscript{2}.
iv. 22. *stultus Hier Gildas 47: duces Hier Mic 77.
iv. 29. *omnis civitas (יווילור) Hier, who adds sine regio.

*universae urbes Hier\textsuperscript{3}.
iv. 30. *vastata Hier\textsuperscript{4}.
*quaerent Hier\textsuperscript{5}.

v. 1. *et considerate et quae rite Hier: om et cons. id adv pel 2 26: et quaer....et cognoscite, inverting order, Aug quae est in hept 1 40 Eugip exc Aug 74.
*virum Hier id adv pel ib: hominem Aug ib Eugip ib.\textsuperscript{6}
*om ה נ Hier id adv pel ib Aug ib Eugip ib.
*eis: ei Hier\textsuperscript{7}: propter eum id adv pel ib: peccatis eorum Aug ib Eugip ib.

v. 2. *quodsi etiam Hier: quamvis enim id adv pel ib.
*et hoc falsa irurabunt Hier: fraudulentem (=ו ל)

iurant, et hoc ipsum in mendacio id adv pel ib.

v. 3. *respiciunt fidem Hier Gildas 48.

v. 4. *dei sui Hier\textsuperscript{8}.

\textsuperscript{1} ins μου Luc 3 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T.

\textsuperscript{2} Luc 4 + 5 against the ptep διωκω, but two mss. (23, 90) have διώκω instead of the future. Thus on the whole Luc agrees with M.T.

\textsuperscript{3} τοσα χωρα Luc 4 + 2 (thus agreeing with B against M.T.).

\textsuperscript{4} ἢ ταλαιτ. Luc 4 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

\textsuperscript{5} Luc 0 + 3.

\textsuperscript{6} ἡδηρα Luc 4 + 5, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

\textsuperscript{7} ἀντρε Luc 4 + 4, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

\textsuperscript{8} Luc 3 + 2.
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v. 6. *AD VESPERAM Hier Cassiod Ps 101 11: usque ad domos id \(\text{Na}^2\) 11.1

v. 7. *saturavi Hier².

v. 8. *emissarii Hier: om Ir c haer § 41 3, § 8 2 Hier de perp. virg. 8 adv Iov 37 Esai 8 10 Zach 9 5 Ps Aug spec 45 Salv de gub § 4,

but id \(\text{ib}^4\) 24 has insanientes (without emiss) and so Hier ubique.

v. 11. *Ait (dicit Hier) DOMINUS Hier².

v. 13. *haec ergo venient (even. Hier) illis Hier⁴.


v. 17. καὶ τοὺς ἀλάωνας ὑμῶν⁶.

*TU HABES fudiciam (TU fid. HAB. Hier) Hier (ἡμῖν ἐγώ, ὑμεῖς περιθάνετε)⁷.

v. 19. *DERELIQUISTIS ME ET⁸.

v. 22. *et a facie mea non dolebitis Hier who adds, sive timebitis Gildas 4⁸: om Ambr hexam § 3 11 (shewing that he sometimes quoted from memory): a f. m. n. formidabilis Hier § 5 13.

v. 23. *recesserunt (ἡὲν, καὶ ἐξεκλίναν; B* vid Q om kai) Hier Gildas ib⁹.


1 εἰ τῶν οἰκῶν (MS. 144 has ὡς τ. ol.) Luc 3 + 1, an example of a conjectural emendation, supported by Luc mss. and based on O, without any connexion with the Heb.

2 καὶ ὡριστὸν αὐτῶν Luc 3 + 2.

3 om Luc 4 + 5.

4 So Luc 4 + 3 (+ 1), thus agreeing with M.T. and B.

5 Luc 3 + 1 (+ 1), thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

6 Luc 1 (+ 1).

7 ὁ πέταλος Luc 3 + 2, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

8 Luc 3 + 6, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

9 om καὶ Luc 3 + 4.

10 ἐν καὶρῷ αὐτῷ (a double rendering of ἔρασ) inserted between ὡς. and καὶ οἰκῶν by Luc 4 + 2.

*INSIDIANTE QUASI AUCUPES lagueos (נשא לֵאָמ עַעָפִּים) Hier Gildas ib: et loquentes vana Epp Decret S. Stephano adscr. This rendering appears to represent some such Heb. as על יְשָׁע. If so, it has the interest of preserving an attempt at the emendation of a deeply-seated corruption in M.T.

v. 28. *INCRAVATI SUNT ET IMPINGUATI Hier Gildas ib. 1

*SERMONES meos pessime Hier Gildas ib. 2


v. 31. *applaudebant manibus suis Hier Gildas ib: plausum dederunt m. s. Aug ib (with whom the whole v. differs a good deal in detail from Vulg.): plauserunt m. s. Ps Aug spec ib.


vi. 14. *et NON Hier id adv iov 3 37 Aug Ps 147 14: et ubi Ambr Ps 118 D 14 Hier ep 8a Aug con litt pet 2 157 Ps Aug spec ib Faust et Marc ib Gildas ib: cum NON ESSET Fac ep Herm con moc.

1 ἄνδρας, ιστέανδραν Luc 4 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

2 τῶν λέγων μου εἰς παρθένο (before πρεσς 1°) Luc 3 + 2, thus supporting a modified form of M.T. against B.
vi. 15. *quia (qui Gil) ABOMINATIONEM FECERUNT Hier Gildas ib: defecerunt Faust et Marc ib.
   *ERUBESCERE Hier Gildas ib: ignominiam suam Faust et Marc ib.
   *INTER RUENTES Hier Gildas ib: in ruina sua Faust et Marc ib.
   *visitationis suae Hier: om s. Faust et Marc ib: so, with eorum, Gildas ib.
   *CORRUENT Hier Gildas ib: infirmabuntur Faust et Marc ib (see critical note).
   vi. 16. *OM Kupiov Hier id Na 8 2 Ambr Ps 118 17 22: Domini Hil Ps 118 3 Hier Is 3 13 Ps Aug spec 5 Cassiod Ps 127 1: dei Hil Ps 127 1. 137 4.
   *OM kai 2 Hier id Is 15 ib: et quaerite Hil Ps 118 3: et videte Ambr ib Hil Ps 127 1. 137 4 Hier Na ib Ps Aug spec ib Cassiod ib: quaerite (viam bonam; loosely) Hier Is 57 10.
   *refrigerium Hier: purificationem id Is 57 10: sanctificationem Ps Aug spec ib.
   vi. 18. *AUDITE Hier, who adds sive audierunt: audierunt Ir c haer 4 36 2; audient Cypr test 1 21.
   *CONGREGATIO, quanta ego faciam eis Hier, who adds to congres... qui passitis greges: et qui pastunt pecora in eis Ir ib: so with pascent Cypr ib.
   vi. 20. *affertis (εφέρετε) Hier Ir c haer 4 17 2.
   vi. 29. *defecit Hier Joh Cass coll (vi) de nece san 11 Gildas ib.
   *consumptum est plumbum Hier: om Joh Cass ib Gildas ib.
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*malitiae enim (autem for enim Gildas) eorum non sunt consumptae Hier Gildas ib: so with vestrae for eorum Joh Cass ib.

vi. 30. * vocate Hier Joh Cass ib: (argentum vestrum) reprobum est Ambr Luc 28 57.

vii. 2. * QUI INGREDIMINI PER PORTAS HAS, UT ADORETIS DOMINUM Hier: om Ir 4 17 2.


vii. 4. * OM ἐν . . . ὑπάς Hier Salv de sub 7 11: quia (quoniam Ir) in totum non proderunt vobis Ir ib Ps Aug spec 5.


* est Hier Ir ib Salv ib: om Hier adv iov ib.


vii. 11. * FACTA EST Hier: est Lucif Cal ib.

* domus ista Hier, who adds sive mea: d. mea Lucif Cal ib.


* MANE CONSURGENS ET LOCENS Hier Gildas ib: ante lucem Cassiod Ps 196 3, but this perhaps is a reminiscence of v. 25 or of xxv. 4.

*AUDISTIS Hier Gildas ib Cassiod ib.


* domui huic Hier Gildas ib: domui Ambr ib.


vii. 16. * nec assumas pro eis laudem et orationem (om κ. μ. εὐ.), et non obsistas mihi Hier: et ne postulaveris pro his in prece et oratione (om κ. μ. εὐ.) Tert pud 2: et noli postulare illis misericordiam (om κ. μ. εὐ.) Ambr ib: nec assumas pro eis deprecationem (om κ. μ. εὐ.) et non
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obsistas mihi (much closer to M.T. than to O') Hier adv
iov 2 30: et ne postulaveris misereri illius, et non accesseris
ad me pro eis Fac ep Herm pro def tr 12 5.

*TR Hier id adv iov ib Dan 9 2 Ambr ib Fac ep Herm ib:
om te Tert ib.

vii. 18. *REGINAE coeli Hier, who adds sive militiae:
militiae c. id Is 57 6.

vii. 21. *EXERCITIUM, DEUS ISRAEL Hier: om Ir
c haer 4 17 3 Auct qu ex utr test 103.

vii. 23. *IN OMNI VIA HIER: in omnibus viis meis
Ir ib Tert marc 4 31.

vii. 24. *(et non) AUDIERUNT Hier Tert ib: oBAUDI-
ERUNT Ir ib.

*nec inclinaverunt aurem suam Hier: nec intend-
erunt Ir ib: et non adverterunt au. s. Tert ib, the last
adding however exegetically, et non intendit auribus suis.

*in VOLUNTATIBUS suis (om suis Hier) et in (om in
Hier) pravitate Hier: in cogitationibus (cordis militiae
suae) Ir ib: in iis quae concipierunt (corde suo malo)
Tert ib.

vii. 25. *(et misi Hier Ir 4 36 5 Ambr Luc 15 17: et emisi
Tert ib: mittebam Max Taur ser 4.

*per (hanc Hier) diem, consurgens diluculo Hier: inter
diem et ante lucem Ir ib: ante lucem [Tert ib] Ambr ib Max
Taur ib Cassiod Ps 156 3, but this perhaps is a reminiscence
of xxv. 5. (See on v. 13.)

vii. 26. *(et PEIUS OPERATI SUNT (quam patres eorum)
Hier: om et peius...eorum Ir ib: om et p. o. s. Tert ib.

vii. 27. *OMNIA...EOS Hier Gildas 49: hunc sermon-
em Ir ib.

vii. 28. *HAEC EST GENS Hier Gildas ib: hoc genus
Ir ib.
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*Domini Dei sui Hier Gildas*: *Domini* Ir* Ps Aug* spec 32.

*ET ABLATA EST* Hier Gildas*: om Ir* Ps Aug* spec ib.


viii. 4. *numquid qui cadet (al. cadit) non resurget?* Hier id Am 8 11 Ps Aug spec 23: so with cadit Hier tr hom or Is 51 12 Ezek 27 Mic 7 8 ep 78 Lucif Cal de reg apos 12 Joh Cass coll (xiii) de prof dei 3 Prosp Aqu adv coll 2 Bach Mon de rep 21 Fulg Rusp ep 7 8 Gildas 49: *qui ceciderit resurget* Tert poenit 8:

*numquid qui cadit (but Cod A has cadet) non resurget?* Cypr test 3 14: *n. g. cadit non adiciet ut resurget?* Ambr Ps 36 24: *nonne qui ceciderit resurget?* Pac ep 1 5 par ad poenit 12 *n. g. cadit non resurget?* Hier Is 51 9.

viii. 5. *IN IERUSALEM* Hier Fulg Rusp* Joh Cass* ib and 7 Gildas*: om Ps Aug spec ib.

*contentiosa Hier* (see critical note) Joh Cass* 3 et 7* Fulg Rusp* Gildas*: *malignam* Ps Aug spec ib.

*APPREHENDERUNT Hier Gildas*: *TENUERUNT* Ps Aug spec ib: *INDURAEVUNT* Joh Cass* 3 et 7* Fulg Rusp*.


viii. 6. *ATTENDI ET AUSCULTAVI Hier Gildas*: *praebe et ergo aurem et audite* Ps Aug spec ib.

*NEMO QUOD BONUM EST* (loquitur) Hier Gildas*: om Ps Aug spec ib.

*OMNES CONVERSI SUNT Hier Gildas*: *defect quia currebat* Ps Aug spec ib.

*IN PROELIO: AD PROELIUM Hier*: *in hinnitu suo* Ps Aug spec ib: *IN PROELIUM Gildas*.

viii. 7. *et hirundo ET CICONIA Hier id Is 38 15 Gildas*
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49: et hir. (hyr Cypr) ruris (agri for ruris Ambr) Cypr test 1 3
Ambr hex 6 4 so ep 93 6: et hir. et ru. (pass.) Lact div inst 4 11:
et hir. cui cellae agri Ps Aug spec ib.

*iudicium Hier Cypr ib Lact ib Ps Aug spec ib Gildas ib:
iudicia Ambr hex 6 4 so.

viii. 8. *vere (ὡς ἄρα ἦν) Hier: om Cypr ib Lact ib
Ps Aug spec 46.

*mendacium operatus est Hier: in cassum facta est
Cypr ib Lact ib: in vanum f. e. Ps Aug spec ib, (adding me-
tatura vestra).

N.B. scribæ confusi sunt Cypr ib Ps Aug spec ib differing
from M.T. and O’s division ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἄκριτη.

viii. 9. *verbum Hier Cypr ib Lact ib Ps Aug ib Salv
de gub 4 1.

viii. 16. *auditus est Hier (id de ben iac patr): au-
diemus Ir 6 30 a.

*fremitus Hier (id de ben etc): vocem velocitatis Ir ib,
adding equorum eius).

*(hinnitium) Pugnatorum eius Hier: hinnitus (de-
cursio) equorum eius Ir ib.

*et venerunt et devoraverunt Hier: et veniet et
manducabit Ir ib.

viii. 17. *regulos Hier Joh Cass coll (xviii) de trib gen
mon 16 bis.

viii. 21. *contritus sum Hier Gildas 49, but G.
omits *et contristatus of Hier.

viii. 22. *(quare igitur non) est obducta cicatrix Hier
Joh Cass coll (iii) de trib abren 8: ascendit sanitas Ambr de
lap virg 33: asc. curatio Hier ler 28 8 Esek 27 17: asc. sanatio
Esek 47 6: obd. est cic. Gildas ib.

viii. 23 [ix. 1]. *om τὸν λαὸν μου τοῦτον Hier id ep 39
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et 98 25 Joh Cass coll (ix) de orat 29 Gildas 35 et 49 Siric ep 17: hanc plebem Chrom Aqu Mat Tract 3 3: populum istum Hier ep 122 1: pop. hunc Cypr apol adv Theod ap Mar Merc xi resp orth Dion Exig. ep decr p sir 7: (et plorabo) istud Fac ep Herm pro def tr 3 4.


ix. 2 [3]. *extenderunt Hier Gildas ib: extendit Lucif Calathan 2 1: extendit (lingua eius mendacium et non fide) Fac ep Herm pro def tr 3 4.

*quasi arcum Hier Gildas ib: sicut a. Lucif Cal ib.

*mendacii Hier Gildas ib: in falso Lucif Cal ib: mendacium Ps Aug spec 43.

*et non veritatis: confortati sunt Hier Gildas ib: et fides non invuluit Lucif Cal ib: et non f. inv. Ps Aug spec ib.

*quia de malo ad (in Hier) malum egressi sunt Hier Gildas ib: quia de (a Ps Aug) malis mala exierunt Lucif Cal ib Ps Aug spec ib.

*dicit Dominus Hier Gildas ib: om Lucif Cal ib Ps Aug spec ib.

ix. 4 [5]. *et veritatem Hier id Zach 8 10 (but he goes on loosely, non loquitur): om et Lucif Cal ib.

*docuerunt Hier, who adds, sive didicit Aug Ps 139 10: didicit Hier Zach ib Lucif Cal ib.

ix. 4 [5], 5 [6]. *(ut inique agerent) laboraverunt (so Aug ib). Habitatio tua in medio (doli) Hier: reverti voluerunt et non obreliqu(erunt usuram super usuram (dolum super dolum) Lucif Cal ib: ut...lab. (as Vulg.) Joh Cass coll (xxiii) de velle hon etc 1 5: laborant (ut inique agant) Gildas 68.

ix. 5 [6]. *dicit Dominus Hier Lucif Cal ib.

s. 22
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ix. 6 [7]. *Dominus exercituum Hier: om exerc. Lucif Cal ib.

*quid (enim aliud faciam)? Hier: (quia) sic faciam Lucif Cal ib.

*om παρπίας: (a facie filia sive a fac.) malitia (fil.) Hier: malignitatis Lucif Cal ib.

ix. 7 [8]. *vulnerans Hier Lucif Cal ib Ps Aug spec 15.

*dolum locuta est; in ore suo Hier: maligna verba oris eorum Lucif Cal ib: dolosa v. o. e. Ps Aug spec ib.

*insidias Hier: inimicitiam Lucif Cal ib Ps Aug spec ib.

ix. 8 [9]. *visitabo Hier Lucif Cal ib Ps Aug spec ib.

*om δὲ Hier Lucif Cal ib Ps Aug spec ib.

ix. 9 [10]. *assumam Hier, who adds sive assumite:

accipite Ambr de sde 3 119 Vigil Taps Trin 5 Bened pag 247 c. varim 1 44: accipe (al. accipite) Vict Vit de pers 3 2.

*ac lamentum Hier: om Ambr ib Vigil Taps ib Vict Vit ib.

*incensa sunt Hier, who adds sive defecerunt: defecerunt Ambr ib Vigil Taps ib Vict Vit ib.

*pertransiens Hier: om Ambr ib Vigil Taps ib Vict Vit ib.

ix. 12 [13]. *om πρός μέ Hier Gildas 49.

*et non ambulaverunt in ea Hier Gildas ib.

ix. 13 [14]. *pravitatem Hier Gildas ib.

*om τῆς κακῆς Hier Gildas ib.

ix. 20 [21]. *(fenestras) nostras Hier id ep 22 56 adv liov 2 8 Ioel 8 1 Abd 11 Na 3 13 interp hom or in Cant 2 Bened pag 549 (but in all but Ioel there is a variant vestras): per fenestram (om. pron) Ambr de fug spec 1 3: so -stras id Ps 118 42: fen. vestras Hier Exek 20 7 Paul Nol ep 41 2 (but one ms. nostras) Maxim Taur hom 78.

ix. 23 [24]. *(nosse) me Hier Salv de sub 7 11: om me Ir c haer 4 17 3 Cypr text 3 10 Hil Ps 193 9 Zen Ver 1 3 8 Aug
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339

ep 55 6 Ps Aug spec 22 et 75 Hier Zach 10 12 tr hom or iv (791) vii (811) (Leo Mag ep ad demetr 19) Fulg Ferr ep 7 4 Prim Adrum Apoc 8: scire et intelligere Deum, et facere iudicium et iustitiam in medio terrae Lucif Cal athan 1 10: int. et sc. in D. (dominium) gloriari (3/3) et iud. et iust. super terram (2/2) id athan 2 2.


*haec enim PLACENT MIHI Hier: in his est voluntas mea Cypr ib Lucif Cal athan 2 2 (a/s) Ps Aug spec ib.

N.B. Hil Ps 51 5 quoting loosely ends with sed qui gloriatur, in Domino glorietur.

ix. 25 [26]. *om carne Hier Lucif Cal ib: hab Hier Is 52 1 Eph 2 12.

x. 2. *vias Hier Cypr test 3 34 Ps Aug spec 44.

*(nolite) discere Hier (see critical note): ambulaveritis Cypr ib: (nolite) incedere id ib 3 59: (nolite) ambulare Ps Aug spec ib.

*(quaes timent) gentes Hier: (quia timent) illa in personas suis Cypr test 3 59; (timentes) a conspectu facies eorum Ps Aug spec ib.

x. 3. *PRAECEVIDIT Hier: excissum Cypr ib Ps Aug spec ib.

*manum (sic); MANUM Hier: om Cypr ib Ps Aug spec ib.


x. 4. *DECORAVIT ILLUD Hier: speciose composita sunt Cypr ib: exornata sunt Ps Aug ib.

*CLAVIS ET MALLEIS Hier: in malleis et in clavis Cypr ib: et m. et cl. Ps Aug ib.

*compegit Hier: om Cypr ib.

22—2
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x. 5 [9]. *in similitudinem palmae fabricata sunt, et non loquentur Hier: quia confixilia sunt Cypr ib: quia fixa sunt Ps Aug spec ib.

*portata tollentur (al. tolluntur Hier) Hier: tollentes tollunt illa Cypr ib.

x. 6—8. vacat (ut O’) Cypr ib.

x. 9. *de Tharsis afferitur, et aurum Hier: a Tharsis. venit aurum Cypr ib (who adds Moab for *de Opas, Mephut).

*et manus aerarii Hier: om Cypr ib.

x. 11. *eis: om Cypr ib.

*de terra et de his quae sub caelis (caelo Hier Aug) sunt Hier Aug Ps 47 15: de t. et de sub caelo id Ps 98 1 2: a terra et de sub caelo id con faust 18 7: de t. quae est sub caelo Ir c haer 3 6 3: a t. et de sub caelo isto Cypr ib Ambr hex 1 3 9: de sub c. Fulg Rusp ep 12 8.

x. 12. *OM Dominus Hier id tr hom or v (793) but hab ib (793): hab Ambr ib Ps Aug spec 54 et 56 et 139.

*preeparat orbem in sapientia sua Hier: et correxit in sap. sua or. Ambr ib: erexit orbem in sap. s. Hier tr hom or v (793): om Ps Aug 54 et 56 et 139.

N.B. The Spec. is clearly quoting this passage and not, as Weihrich ad loc., li. [xxviii.] 15, 16.

x. 13. *AD VOCEM SUAM Hier: om Ambr ib Ps Aug spec ib.

x. 14. *stultus factus est omnis homo ab scientia sua Hier: infatuatus est homo a sci. sua Ambr ib.

x. 20. *tabernaculum MEUM Hier: t. tuum Ps Aug spec 46 et 140.

*vastatvm est Hier (al. destitutum est): miserum factum est, perii Ps Aug spec ib.

*funiculi MEI Hier, who adds sive...pelles MEAE: pelles eius Ps Aug spec ib.
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x. 23. *nec viri est ut ambulet et dirigat gressus suos
Hier id adv pel 1 39 Joh Cass coll (iii) de trib abren 13: neque viri ibit et corriget cogitationem suam Lucif Cal athan 2 s: (non est in hom. via eius) et a Domino gressus hominis diriguntur
Hier ep 17: neque viri ibit et corriget v. s. Aug Ps 118 12: (non est in homine via eius) nec viri est ut ambulet et dirigat gressus suos id de pecc mer 27 et 26: nec viri est ut dirigat iter suum Prosp Aqu de voc 1 8 et 24: neque viri est ut corrigat viam suam Fulg Rusp ep 17 41.

x. 24. *corripere ME Hier Aug de pecc mer 2 26 Fulg Rusp ad mon 1 8: dece nos Lucif Cal ib: corripere nos Ambr Ps 118 9
Hier Is 5 25 Ezek 13 9 Zach 1 2 Joh Cass coll (vi) de nece san 11 3: emenda nos anon tract adv novat.


*et devoraverunt eum: om Hier Lucif Cal ib.


xi. 15. *multa Hier Gildas 81. See critical note for Ir c haer 4 17 3.

xi. 16. *fructiferam Hier id Is 17 8 Bened pag 88 Gildas ib.

xi. 19. *consilia Hier: cogitatum Tert marc 4 40 Cypr
text 2 15 Jul Firm Mat de err prof rel 97: cogitationem Lact div
inst 6 18: consilium Ambr de fde 4 165 Hier tr hom or viii (814 etc):
cognitionem malam Fulg Rusp ad tras 1 18.

*mittamus Hier id tr hom or ib Commod carm apol 274 Tert
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marc 8 19 (al. coniciamus or iniic.) Cypr test 2 15 et 20 Lact ib Jul Firm Mat de err prof rel 27 Eucher form spir int 4 Fulg Rusp ib: coniciamus Tert ib 4 40: immittamus (al. mittamus) id adv iud 10: iniiciamus Ambr Ps 35 1 de fde 6 165 Ruf Aqu in symb apos 29.

* in panem eius Hier id tr hom or ib Tert marc 8 19 4 40 adv iud 10 Cypr test 2 15 et 20 Lact ib Jul Firm Mat ib Ambr Ps 35 1 de fde 6 165 Ruf Aqu ib Eucher form spir int 7 Fulg Rusp ib: in pane eius Commod ib Eucher ib.

xii. 3. *SANCTIFICA EOS IN DIE OCCISIONIS Hier: S. EOS IN D. INTERFECTIONIS eorum id Soph 1 7 tr hom or viii (818).

xii. 9. *AVIS DISCOLOR Hier: speleuxa hyaenae id Is 65 5 tr hom or viii (830).

xii. 13. *hereditatem acceperunt Hier: cleri eorum Hier ep 51 1, 52 5 Os 5 7 Am 8 4. Comp. cleri eorum non proderant eius id tr hom or vii (809 bis).


*propter iram furoris Hier, who adds sive ab opprobrio in conspectu id ib (810): et in properia (sic) ante Dm W: ab opprob. in consp. Ps Sulp Sev ib.


xii. 1. *INFERES ILLUD Hier: transibis W; Hier tr hom or vii (811).

xiii. 7. *ABSCondEAM ILLUD: defoderam W.

xiii. 9, 10. *MULTAM. POPULUM (et pop. Hier) Iustum Hier: (sic dispergam contumeliam Hierusalem) multam istam W.

xiii. 10. *PESSIMUM Hier: om W.

*ET AMBULANT IN PRAVITATE CORDIS SUI Hier, who adds sive in directione c. s.: om W.
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xiii. 11. *OMNEM domum Israel et omnem domum Iuda Hier: d. Istr. (Isr.) et o. d. I. W; Hier tr hom or vii (812).
xiii. 20. *oculos VESTROS Hier id Mal 3 3.
Bened pag 223.
xiv. 15. *IN (om in Hier) GLADIO et fame consumentur Hier Gildas b: morientur et in fame consummabuntur W.
xiv. 16. *ERUNT Hier Gildas b: et erint W.
xiv. 17. *virgo filia populi mei: f. plebis meae W.
xiv. 18. *PROPHETA QUOQUE et SACERDOS Hier:
sacerdotes et profetae W.
xiv. 19. *ABOMINATA EST Hier: (a Sion) recessit W.
xiv. 21. *NEQUE FACIAS NOBIS CONTUMELIAM (solii) Hier: ne perdas W.
xv. 6. *laboravi rogans Hier: etiam non parcam W; et ultra non sinam te Hier tr hom or x (831).
xv. 7. *TERRAE Hier, who adds sive populi mei: plebis meae W.
*A VIIS SUIS NON SUNT REVERSI Hier Joh Cass coll (vi) de nece san ii : propter malignitates eorum W.

XV. 10. *non FOENERAVI, nec FOENERAUIT (FEN. Hier) Hier: non profui, neque profuit W; Ambr de exc frat 2 34 Hier ep 96 4 tr hom or i (747) xi (841 etc). Comp. οὐ ψηλτίγησα, οὐδὲ ψηλτίγησαν με Philo de confus ling 8 12 i 411.

*OMNES Hier: virtus mea defecit W; Ambr ib Hier tr hom or xi (846 etc terr). Comp. η λογίς μου ξέλαιρεν Philo ib.

XV. 11. *DICIT Hier: fiat W.
*SI NON RELIQUIAE TUAE Hier: consummatio illorum W.

XV. 13. *(dabo) GRATIS Hier, adding sive absque pretio
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id tr hom or xi (848), but without gr. ib (849): (dabo) immutat- 
tionem W.

* in omnibus peccatis tuis Hier: propter omnia peccata 
tua W; Hier tr hom or xi (849).

xv. 14. *et adducam (inimicos tuos) Hier, who adds 
sive servire te faciam inimiciis tuis: et dabo te in servitui-

din. t. id tr hom or xi (850): et tradam W.

xv. 15. *TU SCIS Hier: tu cognovisti id ib: om W;

Aug con litt pet 2 835.

xv. 16. *INVENTI SUNT Hier, who adds sive ab his 
qui reprobant: a contemnentibus id tr 

hom or xi (851 bis): ab 
his qui spernunt Aug ib.

* ET COMEDI EOS Hier: consumma (al. -mavi) eos id tr 
hom or xi (851): so, with illos Aug ib.

xv. 17. *et GLORIATUS SUM Hier, who adds sive 
metuebam: sed verebar W: sed timebam Hier tr hom or xi 
(853 bis) Aug ib.

xv. 18. *DOLOR MEUS Hier, who adds sive...qui con-
tristant me: (ut quid) iniurantes me W: qui contristant 
me Cypr ep 73 6 Aug de bapt con don 8 so con litt pet ib.

* factus est...PERPETUUS Hier, who adds sive...confor-
tantur: convalescent W: praevent Cypr ib Aug de bapt 
c etc ib con litt pet ib.

*DESPERABILIS Hier, who adds sive...fortis: solida est 
W; Cypr ib Aug de bapt etc ib: valida est id con litt pet ib.

N.B. Obs. at end of v. *facta est mihi quasi menda-
cium aquarum infidelium Hier, comp. with facta est mihi 
sicut aqua mendax, non habens fidem Hier tr hom or xi (853); 
so, with facti sunt Aug ep 108 6. These renderings are much 
closer to O' than is Vulg.

xvi. 2. *(om et) non accipies uxor: noli accipere ux. 
Hier: et tu ne accipias ux. id ep 29 21.
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xvi. 18. *PRIMUM DUPLICES Hier id \textit{tr hom or xii (860 etc)}: DUPPLICITER W (but see crit. note).

*IMPLEVERUNT Hier id \textit{ib}: RELEV. W.

xvi. 19. *vere mendacium Hier: \textit{quoniam falsa Hier tr hom or ib (863 \textit{bis})}: quam f. Aug con faust man 137 Ps Aug spec 44.

xvii. 1. *SUPER ALTITUDINEM (al. LATIT. Hier) CORDIS EORUM Hier, who adds \textit{sive in pectore c. e.} (SCRIPTA EST, JUDA, CULPA TUA GRAPHIO FERREO ET UNGUE ADAMANTINO, ET SCRIPTA EST) IN PECTORE ET IN CORDE TUO Ambr de spir san 3 14: \textit{in p. cordis tui id apol dav alt 6a: super pectus cordis eorum Hier tr hom or ib (864)}.

xvii. 1—4. om W.


xvii. 8. *timebit: \textit{erit sollicitum Hier, who adds sive \ldots timebit; W; Aug con faust man ib Fulg Ferr ep 7 4}.

xvii. 9. *PRAVUM Hier id Am 4 13 adv pel 1 39: grave W; Aug con faust man ib de civ Dei xviii 33 1.

*et INSCRUTABILE (quis cognoscat illud?) Hier id Am 4 13: et homo W; Ir c haer 3 18 3 Tert marc 3 7 de car chr 15 Cypr test 2 10 Lact div inst 4 13 inst epit 39 (44) Hil Trin 4 42 Ambr Ps 39 5, 43 80, 61 8, 118 1 3 de inst virg 99 de poenit 1 12 Zen Ver 2 7 3 Hier eccles Bened pag 417 1a 17 11 Ben pag 282 Aug con faust man ib 2 3 de civ Dei ib Vigil Taps con eut 1 13 Eugip exc Aug 50 Commod carm apol 370: \textit{homo Ir c haer 3 19 3, 4 33 11 Tert adv iud 14 (al. et h.) Vigil Taps trin 3 Bened pag 222}.

xvii. 11. *PERDIX Hier id \textit{tr hom or iv (780 etc) 4/4: clam-
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avit perdix Sang; Ambr hex 6 13 ep 1 38 : Hier ep 134 4 Aug con faust man 18 18 Philast praef in lib de haer Eucher lib form spir int 5 : [p. qui c. Ambr ep 1 45 14].

xvii. 12. *(solium gloriae) altitudinis Hier: (thronus virtutis) exaltatus est Ambr Luc lib 6 60 thr. gl. exaltatus (AB INITIO LOCUS) Hier tr hom or iv (781 etc.) 3/3 : (sedes autem g.) ex. est (sanctificatio nostra) Aug con faust man 18 13 : om Sang.

Thus Sang Ambr Aug omit 'ך פ 'ית.


*(venam) AQUARUM VIVENTIUM Hier, who adds (to venam) sive fontem Salv de sub 4 1 : [fon]tem vitae Sang Hier tr hom or ib (788, 791) Ps Aug spec ib Vigil Taps de trin 13 Bened pag 325.

xvii. 16. *(et) ego (ego autem for et ego Hier) non sum turbatus, te pastorem sequens Hier, who adds non laboravi sequens te: ego autem non [laboravi subsequens [te] Sang: non l. sequens post te Ambr de virginit 10 a ep 2 85 8 : non l. sequens te Hier ep 130 7 Esek 13 3 : ego autem non l. subsequens te Aug de cons evang 8 16 : so, inserting post Hier tr hom or iv (781, 791, 790) ego autem non l. te sequens Joh Cass de coen inst 1 10.

*(et) diem hominis non desideravi Hier: [et diem] h.
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non de[sideravi] Sang: (et) d. h. non concupivi Hil Ps 51 3
Ambr de virginiti  ib Hier  ib Aug de cons evang  ib Ps 36 33, 67 14, 140 9:
et d. hominum non c. id Ps 137 8.
xvii. 21. *nec inferatis per Hier: et nolite exire
Tycon  ib.
xvii. 23. *om super patres suos Hier: hab Tycon  ib.
xvii. 24. *si audieritis (me) Hier: si (me) aud. (al.
quaesieritis) Tycon  ib.
xvii. 25. *et principes Hier Tycon  ib.
xvii. 26. *et victimam (-mas Hier, who adds sive thymianata) et sacrificium (Hier adds sive manua) Hier:
et incensa et manna (thus reducing the conflate to a single reading) Tycon  ib.
xvii. 27. *domos Hier: itinera Tycon  ib s/a.
xviii. 2. *audies Hier Hil Ps 2 § 39 Ambr de int lob et dav
2 20 Vigil Taps con eut § 60 (VicT Tun de poenit ap ambr 87).
xviii. 4. *e luto manibus suis Hier: in m. eius Hil
Ps 2 § 39 Vigil Taps  ib: in m. s. Ambr  ib Hier 18 45 9 (VicT Tun  ib). The presence in the Vulg of e luto shews (see crit. note) that St Jerome’s reading of the two following words was identical with our own. It is thus interesting to see how he was led, apparently by considerations of smoothness, to retain contrary to his wont the text which was in possession, although it was at variance with the form which the Heb. had already assumed in his day. Comp. xxii. 12.
xviii. 7. *(ut eradicem) ET DESTRUAM (et disperdam)
Hier id ep 133 3 adv pel 3 6: ut feriam eos (et perdam) Hil  ib:
ut tollam eos (et ut perdam eos) VicT Tun  ib: (ut) auferam
ecam (et disperdam) Hier Am 9 12: (eradicavit) DESTRUXIT
( et perdidit) id Ab 3 9: et auferam (et disp. eos) id Seph 2 12:
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(ut evellam) ET DESTRAVM (et disp.) Joh Cass coll (xvii) de
deus (ut evellam) ET DESTR. (et eradicem) Faust R heg
de grat.Dei 2 10; (ut evellam et dissipem) ET DESTRAVM (et
disp.) Gildas 35.

xviii. 8. *QUOD LOCUTUS SUM ADVERSUS (-SUM Hier)
EAM Hier: om Hil ib Faust R heg ib Vict Tun ib Hier
Am 9 20 (comp. his very loose quot. Soph ii 12) Aug ser 22 6: quod
l. s. ut facerem ei Hier adv pal 8 6 ep 122 3 Joh Cass ib Gildas ib.

xviii. 12. *DESPERAVIMUS Hier, who adds sive con-
fortabimur id ep 122 3: DESPERAMUS Gildas 50.

*COSITATIONES...nostras Hier id ib Gildas ib.

*pravitatem Hier, who adds, sive quod placuit id ib
Gildas ib.

xviii. 14. *de petra AGRI Hier, who adds as the
rendering of O' Numquid deficiunt de p. ubera (aut nix de
Lebano, aut declinabat aqua violenter sublata vento)? Gildas
ib: de p. ubera Ambr Ps 128 D 31 de virginibus 1 32.

*aquae erumpentes FRIGIDAE et (om et Gildas) delu-
entes Hier Gildas ib: aqua quae tertur valido vento Ambr
Ps ib: val. ven. quae portatur id de virg ib.

xviii. 15. *et impingentes Hier, who adds sive

xviii. 17. *DORSUM ET NON FACIEM ostendam eis
IN die perditationis eorum Hier: ost. eis diem perd. eor.
W.

xviii. 18. *et NON attendamus Hier: et audiemus W.

justitiae meae W.

xviii. 20. *FODERUNT FOVEAM Hier: locuti sunt
verbam W.

xviii. 21. *et DEDUC eos Hier: et confringa (sic)
illos W.
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xviii. 23. *FIANT CORRUENTES Hier: fiat infirmitas eorum W.

xix. 2. *VALLEM Hier Eucher lib form spir int 4: multitudinem virorum W.

*filii ENNOM Hier: filios filiorum meorum W: filiorum ENNON Eucher lib.

xix. 3. *OM κ. ἄν. Ἰούδα Hier W.

*OM καὶ οἱ ἐλο...ταῦτας Hier W.

xix. 4. *ET repleverunt: repleunt W.

xix. 5. *IN HOLOCAUSTUM BAHALI (BAALIM Hier) Hier: om W.

*nec ASCENDERUNT in cor meum Hier: neque cogitavi in corde meo W.

xix. 7. *ET DISSIPABO Hier: et interficiam W.

xix. 8. *ET PONAM Hier: et statuam W.

*obstupescet Hier: contristabitur W.

xix. 9. *ET CIBABO eos Hier: et edent W.

*ET QUI quaerunt animas eorum: om W.

xix. 11. *ET IN THOFETH...AD SEPELIENDUM Hier: om W.

xix. 12. *ut (et Hier) ponam Hier: ut detur W.

xix. 13. *IMMUNDAE Hier: immunditarum W.

*ET libaverunt libamina Hier: et immolarunt hostias W.

xx. 2. *ET percussit PHASSUR (PHASUR Hier) IER. PROPHETANTEM (PROPHETAM IER. Hier) Hier: et p. cum W.

*Beniamin Hier: domus abieca (sic) W.

xx. 3. *CUMQUE ILLUXISSET IN CRASTINUM Hier: om W.

*PAVOREM UNDIQUE Hier: translationem W.

xx. 4. *IN PAVOREM Hier: in translationem W.

*ET OMNEM IUDAM Hier: et te et om. Iu. W.
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xx. 6. *VENIENS (-NIES Hier) et ibi Hier: om W.

xx. 7. *OMNES Hier: consummavi W: exegi Hier ep 18 15: complevi id tr hom or xi (851).

xx. 9. *IN CORDE MEO Hier Ambr Ps 118 4 et 3 66 off min 3 102: om Hier tr hom or xi (841).

* (ignis exaestuans) CLAUSUS(gue) Hier: (i. ardens) flammigerans W: (i. ard.) flammans Ambr Ps 118 4 et 3 66: so, with flammigerans id Luc lib vii 4 132 off min ib: (i.) flammig. id Ps 38 4. 118 2 19 ep 1 43 15: (i.) inflammanis id de is et an 77: i. ard. Hier tr hom or ib.

*(et defeci) FERRE Hier, who adds (to defeci) sive dissolutus sum; undique W; Ambr de is et an ib ep ib Ps 118 4 et 3 66 off min ib Hier tr hom or ib.

* non sustinens Hier: et non possum ferre W: et f. non p. Ambr de is et an ib ep ib Ps 118 ib off min ib Hier tr hom or ib.

xx. 10. ET TERROREM Hier: tumultuantium W.

*PERSEQUIMINI et PERSEQUAMUR eum Hier: adstate et superstemus ei W.

xx. 16. *OM in θυμό Hier id adv pel 2 77.


xx. 18. *quare (ива τι τουτο) Hier id adv pel ib: ut quid ergo W.

xxi. 2. *NABUCHODONOSOR Hier: om W.

xxi. 3. *OM βασ. Ῥ. Hier W.

xxi. 4. *DEUS ISRAEL Hier: om W.

*ADVERSUM REGEM BAB. ET Hier: om W.

*ET CONGREGABO EA (EOS Hier) Hier: om W.

xxi. 5. *forti Hier: valido W.

xxi. 6. *ET BESTIAE: et pecora W.

xxi. 7. *qui (derelicti sunt) Hier: quae etc. W.

*IN MANU N. REGIS BAB. ET Hier: om W.
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*ET IN MANU 2° Hier: om W.
*et PERCUTIET eos Hier: et contrucidabunt eos W.
*non MOVEBITUR (FLECTETUR Hier) Hier: non parcam W.

xxi. 9. *ET PESTE Hier: om W.
*vivet Hier W.
*QUASI SPOLIUM Hier: in utilitate et vivet W.
xxi. 10. *Ait Dominus Hier: om W.
*(ne forte) EGREDIATUR Hier, who adds sive ut non egred.: succendatur W; Ps Aug spec ib.
*PROPTER MALITIAM STUDIORUM VESTRORUM Hier: om W; Ps Aug ib.
xxi. 13. *solidae Hier: (qui inhabitas) Sor (in campestri) W.
*percutiet Hier, who adds sive terrebit: pavorem... incutiet W.

xxi. 14. ET VISITABO...DOMINUS Hier: om W.
xxii. 1. *DESCENDE Hier: vade et des. W.
xxii. 2. *et SERVI TUI Hier: et pueri W.
xxii. 4. *ipsi et Hier: IPSE et W.
xxii. 5. *AUDIERITIS Hier Gildas 50: fueritis W.
xxii. 6. *inhabitabiles Hier: quae non inhabitantur W.

xxii. 7. *et SANCTIFICABO Hier, who adds (aedificabo): et SANCIAM W.
xxii. 10. *mortuum Hier: defunctum W.
xxii. 12. *TRANSTULI Hier: transmigravi W.
xxii. 13. *VAE Hier: o W; Ambr 1 30 4 Ps Aug spec 118.
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xxii. 15. *CONFERS TE Hier: tu exacerbatis es W.
*CEDRO Hier: in acham W.

xxii. 15, 16. *iustitiam TUNC CUM BENE ERAT EI?
(I6) IUDICAVIT Hier: iust. bonam nescierunt. non iudiciasti W.

*CURSUM Hier: homicidium W; Ir ib.

xxii. 18. *ad Joachim (-cim Hier) filium Iosiae regem Juda Hier: ad istum virum W.
*(frater) ET VAE frater (soror Hier) Hier: om W.
*ET VAE INCLYTE Hier: om W.

xxii. 20. *ad TRANSEUNTES: trans mare W.

xxii. 21. *in ABUNDANTIA tua Hier: in lapsu tuo W.

xxii. 22. *pastores tuos Hier, who adds sive amatores

et W (רֶפֶץ).

*MALITIA TUA (רְפֶץ) Hier: amatoribus tuis W.

xxii. 23. *congemuisti Hier: congemisce in eo W.


xxii. 25. *ET IN MANU 1° Hier: om W.
*ET IN MANU N. REGIS BAB. ET Hier: om W.


xxii. 27. *UT REVERTANTUR ILLUC Hier: om W.


*QUARE Hier: propter quod W; Ambr Luc ib: quoni-
am Ir ib.
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xxii. 29. *terra terra (TERRA again Hier) Hier W; Ambr Luc ib ep 1 25 4 Hier Is 26 19 tr hom or Ezek 4: terra Ir ib Ambr de int iob etc ib.

xxii. 30. *HAEC Dicit DOMINUS Hier: om W; Ir ib Ambr Luc ib de int iob etc ib.

*(scribe virum istum) STERILEM Hier: (s. v. i.) repubatum hominem W: (s. v. hunc) abdicat hom. Ir ib: (v. i.) abdicatum Ambr Luc ib de int iob etc ib.

*IN DIEBUS SUIS NON PROSPERABITUR Hier: om W; Ir ib Ambr Luc ib.

xxiii. 1. *(gregem) pastuae meae Hier Gildas 82: (oves) a pastionibus suis W: oves meae (but rest of v. very loosely quoted) Ps Aug spec 46.

xxiii. 2. *QUI PASCUNT Hier Gildas ib: (ad eos) qui pastores sunt (plebis suae) W: QUI REGUNT Ps Aug spec ib.

xxiii. 3. *GREGIS mei Hier: plebis meae W.

*DE omnibus (terris) Hier: AB omni (terra) W.

xxiii. 4. *ET NULLUS QUERETUR (QUAER. Hier) EX NUMERO Hier: om W; Ps Aug spec 46.

xxiii. 6. *et Israel Hier W (et Istrahel); Hil Ps 131 4; Aug de civ Dei 18 33 1.

*quod vocabunt (Hier adds sive vocabit) eum, Dominus iustus noster Hier Aug ib: q. v. eum Dom. Iosedec W.

xxiii. 7, 8. om W. N.B. After v. 39 W is lacking.

xxiii. 9. *EBRIUS Hier: contritus W.

*a facie VERBORUM SANCTORUM eius Hier, who adds sive et facie decoris gloriae eius: a specie honore eius W.

xxiii. 10. *QUIA ADULTERIIS (al. ADULTERIS Hier) REPLETA EST TERRA Hier: om W.

*MALEDICTIONIS Hier, who adds sive iuramenti: is-torum W.

*CURSUS eorum Hier W.

S.
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*Dissimilis Hier: non sic W.


xxiii. 16. *qui prophetant vobis Hier Gildas ib: om W; Cypr de cath ecl un 11 ep 43 5 Ps Aug spec 50.

xxiii. 17. *dicunt Hier W Cypr ib Ps Aug spec ib Gildas ib.

*his qui blasphemant ad (om ad Hier: qui me bl. Gildas) me Hier Gildas ib: locutus est Dominus Hier, who adds (to bl. me) sivi abiciunt verbum meum: eis qui abigunt v. Domini W: eis qui abiciunt v. Dei Cypr de cath etc ib: so with Dom. ep ib: his qui repellunt v. Dom. Ps Aug spec ib.

*et omni qui ambulat (et omnibus qui ambulant Gildas) in pravitate cordis sui Hier Gildas ib: et omnibus ingredientibus in voluntatibus suis, omni cuncti in errore cordis sui W: et omn. ambulantibus in vol. suis Cypr de cath ecl un 11.

xxiii. 18. *in consilio Domini Hier Gildas ib: in substantia Dom. W (so subs. for consilio in v. 22); Mar Vict Aser adv ar 1 30, 2 3 Ambr de fide 3 122 Ps Aug spec 104 Foegad de fil div 4 Vigil Taps de trin 5 Bened pag 4 4 con variam 44 con pall ar 2 4 Vict Vit de pers 3 2: in s. mea Mar Vict Aser adv ar 1 39 Vigil Taps con ar sab etc 2 19.


xxiii. 20. *intelligitis (-getis Hier Gildas) con-
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SILVUM EIS HIER GILDAE ib: intelligent ea W; Ir c haer 4 26 1: cognoscitis ea Cypr test 1 4.

xxiii. 22. *A VIA SUA MALA ET HIER VICT VIT DE PERS

3 2: om W; Cypr de cath eccl un 11 Ambr de side 3 22 Ps Aug spec 104 Vigil Taps con ar sab 2 19 de trin 5 Bened pag 248 con varim 1 44 con pall ar 2 4 Prim Adrum in Apoc 2 (Migne p 322).

xxiii. 23. *(Putasne) Deus (Numquid D. Hier) e vicino ego sum, dicit Dominus (om d. D. Ir) et non Deus de longe? Hier: Deus adpropinquans (aprop. Ir Cassiod) ego sum, d. Dom. (om d. D. Ir), et non Deus a (Ir Ps Aug de for a) longinquo W; Ir c haer 4 19 2 Ps Aug spec 8 Cassiod Ps 138 9: ego D. adpropinquans et non D. de longinquo Cypr test 3 56 de laps 27 de dom or 4 Fulg Rusp 16 (id ser 16): so with proximans Fulg Rusp ib 2 7: so with sum D. approx.


xxiii. 26. *SEDUCTIONES Hier, who adds sive voluntates cordis sui: voluntates W.

xxiii. 27. *POPULUS MEUS Hier: om W.

*NOMINIS MEI Hier: legis suae W.

xxiii. 28. *DICIT DOMINUS Hier id adv pel 1 13 13 30 25

23—2
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Am 99 Zach 48 Eucher lib form spir int 4: sic etiam verba mea, d. D. W.

xxiii. 29. *Numquid non Hier: nonne W; Cassiod Ps 17 32.

xxiii. 31. *qui assumunt linguas suas Hier: qui accipiunt sibi linguas W.

*et aiunt: dicit (Dominus) Hier: et dormiant somniantes W.

xxiii. 32. *ad prophetas (om qui prophetant) somniantes mendacium Hier: ad prof. qui profetant somnia falsa W.

*qui narraverunt (al. narrant Hier) ea Hier: et enarrant ea W.

xxiii. 33. *vel propheta aut sacerdos Hier: aut sac. aut profetes W.

*ut quid vobis onus: vos estis onus adding sive assumption Hier: vos estis dictio W.

xxiii. 36. *(non) memorabitur Hier: (nolite) nominare W.

*et pervertitis (al. pervertisti Hier)...Dei nostri Hier: om W.

xxiii. 37. *haec dices...Dominus 1°: haec dices, adding sive dicetis (al. dicitis)...Dom. Hier: om W.

xxiii. 38. *si autem...dixeritis Hier: om W.

xxiv. 5. *transmigrationem Iuda Hier: translatos I. Ambr hex 3 59.

xxiv. 6. *om eis ἀγαθά 2° Hier Auct qu ex utr test 102: in bona Ambr hex 3 59 Prosp Aqu de voc om gest 1 44.

xxiv. 8. *om ἦ Hier (Cypr de pasch comp 11).

xxiv. 9. *Afflictionemque Hier: (om Cypr ἱb).

*in proverbiwm Hier: (in odium Cypr ἱb).

*et patribus eorum Hier: (om Cypr ἱb).

xxv. 4. *et misit Dominus Hier: misi Cypr test 1.
Lact div inst 4 11. N.B. Sabatier's citation of Cassiod. should read Ps 126. See my note on vii. 13, 25.

*omnes servos suos Hier: servos meos Cypr ib Lact ib.

xxv. 5. *cum diceret (-rem Hier) Hier: dicens Cypr ib Cassiod Ps 126 3, but see on vii. 13, 25: cum dicerem vobis Lact ib.

*dedi Dominus Hier: dedi Cypr ib Lact ib.

xxv. 6. *me Hier Cypr ib et ad fort 3 (de aequat 8) Lact ib Iul Firm Mat de err prof rel s28 Zen Ver 1 15 8.

*et non affligam vos Hier: ad disperdendos vos Cypr ib Lact ib Iul Firm Mat ib: et disperdam vos Zen Ver ib.

xxv. 9. *mittam...AD (om AD Hier) N....SERVUM MEUM Hier: [vocavi N. s. m. Hier Soph 1 7].

xxv. 15. *(vini) FURORIS Hier, who adds sive meri: (v.) meri Tycon reg 4 (p 53) Ambr Ps 37 2 Hier ep 18 15 Is 51 17 Ezech 23 8 tr hom or 9 (822): om Hier Is 6 8.

*DE ILLO Hier: om Tycon ib Ambr ib Hier ep ib Is 6 8 (but earlier part of v. is also very loosely quoted in that passage) Is 17 Ezech ib tr hom or ib.

xxv. 16. *et bibent Hier id ep ib Is 51 17 Ezech ib tr hom or ib ib: om Tycon ib Ambr ib.

*et turbabuntur (inebriabuntur Hier, who adds sive voment) et insanient Hier: et voment et ins. Tycon ib Ambr ib Hier ep ib Is ib Ezech ib tr hom or ib.

xxv. 18. *et in maledictionem, sicut dies ista Hier: om Tycon ib Hier ep ib.

xxv. 20. *cunctis regibus terrae Ausitidis Hier: om Tycon ib.

xxv. 22. *terrae insularum Hier: om Tycon ib.

xxv. 23. *Theman et Bus Hier: Theman et Bosor Tycon ib.
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*MAEDORUM Hier: Persarum Tycon ib.


*TERRAE Hier Tycon ib.

*ET REX SESACH BIBET POST EOS Hier: om Tycon ib.

xxv. 29. *QUASI INNOCENTES INMUNES ERITIS? NON ERITIS INMUNES Hier: purgatione non eritis purgati Tycon ib s2.

xxv. 38. *EX FACIE IRAE COLUMBAE Hier, who adds sive a f. gladii magni: a. f. gl. col. id Soph 1 7.

xxvi. 2. *AD OMNES CIVITATES IUDA, DE QUIDUS VENIUNT Hier: omni Iudae, iis qui v. Ambr de poenit 1 30.

xxvi. 3. *ET PSEUTATE ME (mali) Hier, who adds sive quiescam a malo: et poenitabit me Ioh Cass coll (xvii) de deบรรยากาศ 51.

xxx. 8. *DE COLLO TUO, ET VINCULA ILLIUS Hier: a service illorum et v. illorum Cypr test 1 13: so, with eorum in both places, Hil Ps 131 1.

*ET NON DOMINABUNTUR EI (eis Hier) AMPLIUS ALIENI Hier: et non operabuntur aliis Cypr ib: et non op. ipsi adhuc aliis (al. aliis dis) Hil ib.

xxx. 9. *QUEM Hier: om Cypr ib Hil ib Cassiod Ps 131 1.


xxxi. 2. *invinit GRATIAM IN DESERTO POPULUS, QUI REMANERAT GLADIO Hier: quasi calidum in desert, inveni Israel cum occisis gladio id 15 65 8.

xxxii. 8. *INTER QUOS ERUNT COECUS ET CLAUDUS
Hier: in die festo (adding, Paschae diem significat) Tert de bapt 19.

xxxii. 9. *VENIENT Hier, who adds sive egredientur: exierunt Ambr de int iob et dav 8 7.

*ET IN PRECIBUS: et in misericordia Hier: et in consolatione Ambr ib.


*ET OLEO Hier: fructuum Ir ib.

*HORTUS IRRIGUUS Hier, who adds sive quasi lignum fructiferum: lignum fructiferum Ir ib.

*esurient Hier Ir ib.


*ET CONSO LABOR EOS Hier: om Ir ib.


*SACERDOTUM Hier, who adds sive filiorum Levi: sac. filiorum Levi Ir ib.

*PINGUEDINE (דַּעְלָו) Hier: om Ir ib.

xxxii. 15. *plorans (-rantes Hier) FILIOS SUOS Hier id Mat 2 17 Bened pag 15 Ambr Ps 37 1 [R. ploravit f. s. Ambr cp 44 9].

O.L., like Pesh, (see crit. note) omits לְעַל on its second occurrence in M.T. The evidence is as follows:

*super eis: super filii suis Hier: om Hil Mat 2 7 Ambr Ps 37 1 Eucher hom de bland lugd Vict Cap de harm int 10.

xxxii. 19. *CONVERTISTI ME Hier: captivitatis meae Ambr de poetit 2 36.

*egi poenitentiam Hier: poenit. egi Ambr ib.

*PERCUSSI FEMUR MEUM. CONFUSUS SUM Hier, who adds (after meum) sive ingemui and (after cons. s.) sive ex die confusionis: ingemui super dies confusionis Ambr ib.

*et ERUBUC Hier, who adds et ostendi te: et subiectus sum tibi Ambr ib.

xxxiii. 22. *FEMINA CIRCUMDABIT VIRUM Hier (id de ben lac patr): in qua salute circuibant homines Aug op imp con ful 3 84: faciam novum in femina, quod omnes mirabimini (very loosely) Rust diac con aceph.

xxxiii. 32. *DOMINATUS SUM Hier: neglecti (-cl-) Cypr test (1 11) 3 90 Lact div inst 4 80 Aug Ps 118 33 de civ Del 17 3 9 de spir et litt 33 Prosp Aqu de voc om gent 9.

xxxiii. 33. *DABO Hier id adv iov 2 17 Aug Ps 45 3. 118 33 de civ Del ib de spir et litt ib Prosp Aqu ib Leo Mag ser 95 1 Fulg Rusp ep 17 49: dans Cypr ib Hier Is 51 8, 54 12 Aug quaeest in hept 8 11 ser 155 6 Opt Mil 7 1 (de sch don 7): dando Aug ser 212 9: scribam Chromat Aqu Mat 3 1.

xxxiii. 37. *MENSURARI POTUERINT Hier: exaltatum fuerit Cypr test 3 90.


*EXTENTO Hier, who adds sive excelsus: excelsus Vigil Taps c varin 1 11.

xxxii. 41. *et LAETABOR Hier, who adds sive et visitabo: et visitabo Aug con duas ep pel 4 14 Prosp Aqu de voc om gent 1 9 (Leo Mag ep ad demestr 15).

N.B. St Jerome's Comm. is lacking after xxxii. 44.

xxxiii. 25. *SI PACTUM MEUM INTER DIEM ET NOCTEM ET LEGES COELO ET TERRAE NON POSUI: si non esset testamentum meum in custodia die ac nocte, praecipua coeli et terrae non dedissem Cassiod Ps 38 11.

xxxv. 7. *NON PLANTABITIS Joh Cass coll (xxi) de rem quin 4.

xxxv. 15. *CONSURGENS DILUCULO: om Ir chaer 3 5.
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xxxv. 16. *QUOD PRAECEPERAT EIS: om W.
xxxv. 17. *Dominus exercituum, Deus Israel:
Dom. W.
xxxv. 18. *obedistis: audierunt filii Nadab filii
Rachab W.
*et custodistis omnia mandata eius: om W.
xxxv. 19. *haec dicit Dominus exercituum Deus
Israele Joh Cass coll (xxi) de rem quin 4 : om W.
*de stirpe Ionadab (-bab W) W; Joh Cass ib.
*cunctis diebus (om terrae) Joh Cass ib: omnibus d.
terrae W.
xxxvi. 2. *Israel: Hierusalem W.
*Iosiae: I. regis Iuda W.
xxxvi. 6. *ingredere ergo tu: om W.
*de volumine...Domini: carchas istas W.
xxxvi. 9. *et universae multitudini...in Ier: et in domo Iuda W.
xxxvi. 31. *iniquitates suas: om W; Ir chae 3 31 19.
*super eos W; Ir ib.
xxxvi. 32. *Ieremias autem...scribae: et accipit
Baruch chartam aliam W.
xxxvii. 1. *rex: om W.
*(pro) Iechonia filio Ioiachim: (pro) Ioachim
W.
xxxvii. 4. *(in medio) populi: (per medium) turbam
W.
*qui obsidebant Ierusalem: om W.
xxxvii. 5. *ab: ad W.
xxxvii. 8. *haec dicit Dominus Deus Israel; sic
dicetis regi Iuda qui misit vos: sic d. Dms Des (sic) ad
regem Iuda quum miserunt ad te W.
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xxxvii. 8. *nolite decipere animas vestras: n. praesumere animis vestris W.

xxxvii. 17. *(putasne, est) sermo (a Domino)?: (ubi est) verbum (Domini? veniat) Ambr *p 85 3.

xxxviii. 23. *comburet igni: comburetur W.

xxxviii. 25. *quid locutus sis cum rege: quid locutus est rex W.

xxxviii. 27. *nihil enim fuerat auditum: quia non est auditum verbum Domini W.

xxxviii. 28. *et factum est...Ierusalem: om W, which also omits xxxix. 1, 2, 4—10, 11—13.


xxxix. 16. *et erunt in conspectu tuo in die illa: om W.

xl. 1. *de Ierusalem et: om W.

xl. 3. *et adduxit: om W.

*et factus est vobis sermo hic: om W.

xl. 4. *hodie: om W.

*veni et ponam W.

xl. 4, 5. *si autem...sed habita: et si malum est oculis tuis venire te mecum in Babyloniam, revertere W.

xli. 1. *et optimates regis: om W.

xli. 2. *filium Ahicam...eum: om W.

xli. 3. *cum Godoliam (sic. Ἰωάννης Ἰναίων): cum eo W.

*et viros...Ismael: om W.

xli. 5. *et de Selō: a Salem W.

xli. 5, 6. W is confused. in domum Domini, Et exierunt in obviam eis et euntes flebant et dicebant, introite etc.

xli. 7. *ipse et viri qui erant cum eo: om W.
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xli. 8. *INTER EOS: *ibi W.
xli. 9. *OMNIA CADAVERA VIRORUM: omnes W.
*PROPTER GODOLIAM, (IPSE EST): magnus est W.
xli. 10. *ET CAPTIVAS DUXIT: et revocabit W.
*ET UNIVERSUM POPULUM, QUI REMANSERAT IN MAS-
PHATH: om W.
*et abiit ut transiret ad filios Ammon: et abiit trans
Ammon W.
xli. 12. *VIRIS: exercitum eorum W.
xli. 13. *LAETATI SUNT: om W.
xli. 14. *ET REVERSUS EST...IN MASPHATH: om W.
*(reversusque) abiit ad (Iohanan) filium Caree:
(reversi sunt) ad Iohan W.
xli. 15. *A FACIE IOHANAN: om W.
xli. 16. *FILIO NATHANIAE...FILIUM AHICAM: om W.
*fortes: potentes W.
*et pueros: et reliqua W.
xli. 17. *(peregrinantes) in Chamaam: in Chaber-
cila W.
xlii. 2. *PRO NUBIS Hier 1a 50 1.
xlii. 10. *si quiescentes manseritis Hier ib.
xliii. 2. *TU LOQUERIS Hier ib.
*DEUS NOSTER Hier ib.
xliii. 10. *SERVUM MEUM Hier ib.
*et ponet: et ponam Hier ib.
*abscondi Hier ib.
*SOLIUM SUUM Hier ib.
*ET AMICIETUR...AMICIETUR Hier ib.
xlv. 21. *HORUM (recordatus est...?) Salv de sub Dei 645.
xlv. 22. *POTERAT Salv ib.
*EO QUOD NON SIT HABITATOR: om Salv ib.
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*veniet ei Hier ib.

xlvii. 3. *a strepitu pompae armorum, et bella-
torurn eius: a voce impetus eius, ab armis et a pedibus eius
Ps Aug spec 130.

xlvii. 6. *o: om Hier Zach 5 1.

xlviii. 2. *(non est ultra) EXULTATIO in Moab Hier
Is 15 2 Bened pag 184.

xlviii. 7. *in munitionibus tuis ET IN THESAURIS TUIS
(a double rendering. See crit. note) Hier Is 15 2: in mun.
t. id Ezek 25 8.

xlviii. 11. *requievit Eucher lit form spir int 8.

*in FAECIBUS suis Eucher ib.


xlviii. 25. *abscisum est cornu Moab, et brachium
eius confrizem est: quomodo fracta est virga fortis,
baculus gloriosus Hier Is 15 1 Bened pag 184.


xlviii. 27. *in derisum Hier ib.

*reperisses eum Hier ib.

xlviii. 29. *superbus est valde (ὤσπωρ, ἦς) Hier ib.

xlviii. 31. *eiulabo: clamabo Hier Is 16 7 Bened pag 190.

*ET AD MoAB Hier ib.

*AD viros muri fictilis Hier ib.

*LAMENTANTES Hier ib.

xlviii. 32. *DE planctu: sicut fletum Ambr de el et leium 61.

*AD MARE IASER: civitas I. Ambr ib.

xlviii. 33. *SUSTULI: nequaquam calcator uvae
solitum celeuma cantabit; mane non calcaverunt,
meridie autem non fecerunt (om aix) Ambr ib.1

1 The note in Migne points out that the Roman ed. for meridie etc.
has neque vespere fec. tel.
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xlvi. 37. *OM d v π. r. Hier Is 15 a Bened pag. 185: hæb id
xlix. 7. *NUMQUID NON est...? Hier Abd 1.
xlix. 9. *rapuisset QUOD SUFFICERET SIBI Hier Abd 4.
xlix. 10. *DISCOPERUI (karaûpa): DISCOOP. Hier ib.
*celari: celare (al. -ri) Hier ib.
xlix. 12. *et tu quasi innocens RELINQUERIS? non eris
inn.: et tu dum mandata videberis non mundaberis
Sang.
*Sed bibens bires: om Sang.
*Bosra: in parte tua Sang.
*civitates eius: c tuae Sang.
*DECEPIT Hier ib: adquisivit (hoc tibi) Sang.
*QUI HABITAS Hier ib: habitavit Sang.
*ALTITUDINEM collis Hier ib: munitionem c. excelsi
Sang.

duabit et sibilabit super omnes plagas
eius: sibilabit Sang.
*ad pulchritudinem Hier ib.
*(subito) currere eum faciam Hier ib.
xlix. 22. *ASCENDET ET Hier ib.
*EVOLABIT: VOLABIT Hier ib.
*Bosram Hier ib.

diustia...parturientem Hier Is 17

Bened pag. 193.
xlix. 27. *MOENIA Hier ib.
*Benadad: Benadab Hier ib.
*et vastate Hier ib.
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xlīx. 31. *non vectes Hier ib.
xlīx. 32. *qui sunt attonsi in comam Hier ib.
xlīx. 33. *Asor Hier ib.
l. 17. *exossavit eum : confringet ossa illius Hier Is 36 8 : (comedit...) ossa eius Ps Aug spec 114.

li. 7. *inebrians omnem terram Hier Ion 3 6 tr hom or 2 3/2 (765, 766) : inebriam omnes gentes id Am 5 35.
*om Dn 2 0 Ambr de el et isium 36 : propter hoc (prop-tereas) commotae sunt gentes Hier tr hom or 2 (765), but om gentes (766 et 767) [(a quo inebriatae sunt) gentes Ambr Ps 118 7 40].

li. 8. *resinam Ambr de ios pat 17 Hier tr hom or 2 (768) Joh Cass coll (vii) de an mob 31 4.
li. 9. *(non) est sanata Hier Ezek 47 6 : (non) est curata id Eccles 7 : s. (n.) c. Ambr ib.
li. 11. *regum Hier Is 21 1.
*mens eius Hier ib.
*templi sui Hier ib.
*insidias Hier ib.


li. 25. *(mons) pestifer : m. corrupte Ambr Luc ib
8 6 29 de fide 3 118.

li. 27. *regibus Ararat Hier Is 21 1 Bened pag 213.
*Menni Hier ib.
*thapsar : Tapsar Hier ib.
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* quasi bruchum aculeatum Hier ib.
li. 28. * sanctificate Hier Is ib Dan 5 30.
* reges Hier ib.
* om κ. π. τ. γῆς Hier ib.
* cunctamque...eius Hier Is ib: so with illius for eius id Dan ib.
li. 33. * filia Babylonis Hier Dan ib.

We may add a few general remarks upon the character of citations from the Latin in the fifth century, as found in John Cassian and Leo Magnus. In the case of the former there is little or no trace of Old Latin influence. A good illustration of the fact that his quotations were from the Vulg. is the following: i. 18, 19

Ego quippe dedi te  Coll xviii 13. Ecce enim...  Ecce enim dedi te
hodie in civitatem...             in columnam serream
munitam et in columnam serream, et in
murum aereum, super
omnem terram, regi-
bus Iuda, principibus
eius, et sacerdotibus,
et populo terrae. Et
bellabunt adversum
te, et non praevale-
bunt; quia ego tecum
sum, ait Dominus, ut
liberem te.

1b xxiv 25.
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We further see from the above that he was willing to trust in some degree to his memory.

So in v. 3 (‘percussisti...reverti’) Joh Cass col (vi) de necemman 11 is virtually identical with the Vulgate.

In the case of Leo Magnus on the other hand there are plain traces of O. L. influence. The passage last referred to (v. 3) supplies an interesting example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulg.</th>
<th>Cypr ep ad Dem 7</th>
<th>Leo Mag 28 (ad 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percussisti eos et non doluerunt; attrivisti eos et reuerunt</td>
<td>Verberasti eos, Flagellasti eos et nec doluerunt; flagellasti eos, nec vocet non dol.; castigasti accipere disciplinam.</td>
<td>accipere disciplinam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here Leo was evidently following (from memory) the O. L.

In his citation of Joel ii. 12, 13, there is an indication of a mixture of texts. The omission of in before fletu and planetu—so at least Cypr de lap 29 ep 55 22 (comp. ad Novat. 9) and others—suggesting the O. L., while the same is more clearly indicated in v. 15 by praedicate curationem (so Hier cites more than once, and for cur. see Cypr test 3 19 while Vulg. has vocate coetum). At the same time the latter part of v. 12 presents an inaccurate recollection of both versions.

If we might assume the genuineness of Leo's Epistola ad Demetriadem, we should find other examples of the influence of O. L. in his case.

(a) Ep ad Demetr 4 (Ps xciii. 11) 'sapientium' (but Amiat has hominum) with Tert. marc 5 6 and Cypr de bene patient. 9.

(b) Ib 4 (Ps ix. 23 [x. 3]) 'et qui iniqua gerit' (so
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St Augustine and Cassiodorus in their Commentaries *ad loc*. Vulg. has *et iniquus*. On the other hand, in the immediate neighbourhood of these (ib 5) we have him (Job ii. 3) in substantial agreement with the Vulg., while the O. L. (ms. Maj Monast) there has 'Animadvertisti ergo famulum meum Job, quia non est quisquam similis illi super terram, homo innocens, verax, Dei cultor, abstinentis se ab omni malo.' The citation of Job i. 3, which immediately succeeds, is as obviously taken from the Vulg., while that of ii. 7 clearly shews acquaintance with both versions. A summarizing of xlii. 10, 13 follows, and cannot be reckoned to either side. Then comes vii. 1, a conspicuous case of indebtedness to O. L.

From the above examination of evidence supplied from O. L. sources we may deduce the following general results.

1. The O. L., as we should naturally expect from its origin, gives in general its support to the Septuagint, where that Version differs from the Massoretic Text.

2. Where O. L. evidence favours the M.T. against the Septuagint as represented by B, there is generally a fair amount of other strong evidence, whether of Greek mss. or of Versions, in support of the former. E.g. xvi. 18, xvii. 20, xix. 8, xxii. 7, 13, xxiii. 10 (*bis*), 14, 29, xxxvii. 4. On such occasions W is supported by AQ rather than $\mathcal{N}$. In xl. 4 however (*veni, $\mathcal{N}\beta\lambda\nu$, $\gamma\tau\epsilon$; see crit. note) we have a case of support from $\mathcal{N}$.

3. Now and then however we find O. L. supporting M.T. against B (or an otherwise strongly supported Septuagint reading), without any such collateral evi-
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dence on the side of the former. Instances are xviii. 21, xxiii. 31.

4. Very rarely do we find a tolerable amount of O. L. evidence in support of any of the best Greek uncial for a reading which is opposed both to M.T. and to B. In xxxi. 33 the omission of δῶσω (with AQ) is a case in point, supported by Cypr Aug and Opt Mil (as well as by Hier twice).

In respect of the character of O. L. manuscript evidence we may note the following points:

(i) As regards W.

(a) It sometimes supports B against obviously right readings of other principal uncial (e.g. xxxvii. 1, 5).

(b) Its support of Ambrose suggests an Italian type of text (e.g. xxii. 28 bis; comp. 29).

(c) It is clearly non-African. Obs. in xxiii. 17 how a Greek (BNAQ) conflation, adopted by W, is rejected by Cypr, and comp. W's support of O in xxiii. 28 [29].

(ii) As regards Sang.

It is too scanty to speak with much confidence as to details. It is however obviously a form of O. L. text, but in one passage at any rate (def[iderant] xvii. 16) it seems influenced by the Vulg. and in three cases (xvii. 13, xliv. 13 bis) gives us a unique reading.

LUCIANIC MSS.

In chapters i—v. the Lucianic evidence differs from B as follows:

1 We may observe how in xxiii. 6 (ταλ 'Ισρ.) O. L. supports M.T. and RAQ against R, although this last probably preserves the true text.
(i) It agrees with M.T. in supplying omissions.
In such cases it is
(a) supported by one or more principal Greek mss.
i. 4 (AQ), 11 (NAQ), 17 (NAQ); ii. 6 (Q), 9 (AQ),
28 (NAQ); iii. 10 (Q supports γνΩ); iv. 7 ter (Q), 8 (Q),
10 (AQ), 20 (γνΩ is partially supported by A); v. 1 (Q),
19 (Q) = 15 cases.
(b) Not so supported.
i. 3, 11, 13, 18 bis; ii. 1, 2, 19; iii. 7, 8, 10 ('ι'), 11,
16, 17; iv. 12 (NAQ), 30; v. 4 (γνΩ), 14, 28 bis (but see
crit. note) = 20 cases.
(ii) It agrees with M.T. otherwise.
(a) Supported etc.
i. 2 (o + 1; Q), 4 (i + 1; AQ); iii. 6 (A* vid), 9 (N),
22 (Q); iv. 10 (ει NAQ), 12 (λαλησω Q), 14 (AQ), 30
(o + 3; NAQ); v. 1 (Q) = 10 cases.
(b) Not so supported.
i. 9 (o + 1); ii. 6, (25); iii. 3 (o + 1), 19; iv. 4 = 6
cases.
(iii) It differs from both M.T. and B.
(a) Supported by O. L. evidence.
i. 3, 6 (vi. ανθ. but in this case ΝQ agree with Luc.),
8 (but here ΝAQ have μοι) = 3 cases.
(b) Not so supported.
i. 15, 16; iii. 2; v. 6, (7), 11 (but in this last Luc
receives some support from B); v. 24 = 8 cases.
N.B. In i. 10 Luc 4 + 2 (+ 1) agree with B against
M.T. in omitting τπι 2°.
In iv. 29 Luc 4 + 2 agree with B against M.T. in
reading πασα χωρα.
In v. 17 Luc 1 (+ 1) agree with B against M.T. in
reading κ. τοις έλα. υμων.
The summary of cases given above shews

(a) that a large proportion of the total number of Lucianic variants consists in the assimilation of the Greek to the Heb. text by the supply of "omissions";

(b) that of these variants again a large proportion (in these chapters it is as 4 to 3) are without support from any principal Greek uncial:

(c) that many Lucianic variants of other kinds receive support from one or more principal Greek uncials.

(d) that in a few cases Lucianic readings, differing from M.T. and B, receive O. L. support. There is however but one case in these five chapters (ii. 3) where such a reading is without support from at least one principal Greek uncial.

This last point, viz. a connexion between O. L. and Lucianic readings, seemed to justify an examination of the remainder of the Book with this special subject in view. The result of such an examination gives Luc mss. supporting O. L. evidence in

x. 25. Luc 4 + 3 βασιλείας (but so too Q).

xvii. 13. Luc 3 (+ 1) + 2 ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς (so Νεα).

xxi. 9. Luc 3 (+ 1) + 2 εἷς ὕψιλον.

xxxix. [xlvi.] 14. Luc 2 + 0 εἷς Ἰακώβ.

xl. [xlvi.] 4, 5. Luc 4 + 1 have additions like those of W.

xlviii. [xxxi.] 31. Luc 3 + 1 have τείχος κεφάλας (—Δος).

It will be seen therefore that in the last four cases we have Luc and O. L. readings unsupported by any principal Greek uncial.
LIST OF LATIN AUTHORITIES USED IN THE APPENDIX.

** The numbers following the names of writers indicate, unless fl. be prefixed, the year of death. Parentheses enclosing numbers denote uncertainty. Where no edition is specified, Migne has been used.

Altercatio Simonis et Theophili
Ambrosius 397; de Off and Hex are taken from Gilbert, Leipzig, 1839
Anonymi Tractatus adv. Novatianum
Arnobius Afer (313)
Auctor lib de voc gent
Auctor quaestionum ex utroque Testamento
Augustinus 430
(Ps) Augustinus Speculum
Bachiarius Monachus fl 401
Breviarium Fidei adv. Arianos post 300
Cassianus (Johannes) (443); Petschenig, Vienna, 1886—88
Cassiodorus (575)
Chromatius Aquileiensis (407)
Commodianus (250); Dombart, Vienna, 1887

1 Liber de Div. Script. sive Speculum quod fertur S. Augustini, the second of the two edited by Weirich, Vienna, 1887, and "generally considered to contain a degenerate African text" (Burkitt, Tyronius p. lxi, quoting Sanday's opinion in Stud. Bibl. i. 249 and S. Berger, Vulgate, p. 6).
LATIN AUTHORITIES

Cyprianus 258; Hartel, Vienna, 1868
Dionysius Exiguus 550
Epistolae Decretales S. Stephano adscriptae
Eucherius 450
Eugippius (520); Knoell, Vienna, 1885, 1886
Facundus Episcopus Hermeianensis (571)
Faustinus Presbyter (400)
Faustinus et Marcellinus (400)
Faustus Rheiensis c. 492
Ferreolus Uceticensis 581
(Julius) Firmicus Maternus (360); Halm, Vienna, 1867
Foegadius (or Phoebadius) c. 392
Fulgentius Ferrandus c. 549
Fulgentius Ruspensis 533
Gaudentius Brixienensis fl. 405
Hieronymus 420
Hilarius 368; the Psalms are taken from Zingerle, Vienna, 1886
Irenaeus 202; Stieren, Leipzig, 1848
Justus Urgellensis (550)
Lactantius (325); Brandt, Prague, Vienna, Leipzig, 1890
Leo Magnus 461
Lucifer Calaritanus 371; Hartel, Vienna, 1886
Marius Mercator (452)
Novatianus c. 255
Optatus Milevitanus fl. 411; Ziwsa, Prague, Vienna, Leipzig, 1893
Orosius fl. 415
Pacianus ante 392
Paschasius diaconus c. 512
Paulinus Nolans 431; Hartel, Vienna, 1894
Petrus Chrysologus 454
Philastrius (387); Oehler, Berlin, 1856
Praedestinatus (460)
Primasius Adrumatanus c. 554
Priscillianus 385; Schepss, Würzburg, 1886
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Prosper Aquitanus (465)
Rufinus Aquileiensis 410
Rusticus diaconus fl. 550
Salvianus fl. 429; Pauly, Vienna, 1883
Siricius 398
(Ps) Sulpicius Severus; Halm, Vienna, 1866
(Maximus) Taurinensis (470)
Tertullianus c. 240; Reifferscheid and Wissowa, Vienna, 1886;
but his books against Marcion are taken from Oehler,
Leipzig, 1854
Tyconius ante 383; Burkitt, Cambridge, 1895
Victor Capuanus 554
(Marius) Victorinus Afer fl. 360
Victor Vitensis c. 490; Petschenig, Vienna, 1881
Victorinus Pettavensis c. 290
Vigilius Tapsensis fl. 484
Zacchaeus Christianus fl. 420
Zeno Veronensis c. 380
INDEX.

8, O's readiness to omit a radical, 255
Additions in LXX., classification of, 18 f.
anthropomorphism, O's fear of, 216
Aramaic idiom, error arising from, 21
Aristeas, 8

Bensly, 136
Books other than Torah, position of, 8, 23
Burkitt, 314 f.

Cappellus, 160, 221, 277
Cassian, character of citations in, 367 f.
Ceriani, 92
Cheyne, Prof., 9, 54, 57, 73, 78, 93, 105, 109, 120, 134, 166, 171, 239, 251, 263, 264, 267, 269, 305
cipher-writing, 293
conclusions, summary of, 24 ff.
conflate renderings in LXX., 19, 23
contractions, differences arising from real or supposed, 20
corruptions of LXX.'s text, 22 f.

Daniel, additions to, 13
difficult words, LXX.'s method of dealing with, 5
division of words, differences arising from, 20
Döderlein, 43
Driver, Dr, 16, 29, 34, 52, 57, 73, 92, 101, 104, 119, 132, 226, 246
duplicate passages in M.T., O's method of dealing with, 131, 146 f.

ear, errors of, 21
Egypt, early Greek element in, 8; Jews' position in, 11 f.
Egyptian susceptibilities, etc., deference to, 21, 265 f.
Elias Levita, 9
errors in Mass. Text, variations arising from, 21
Esther, additions to, 13
INDEX.

Euseb., Præp. Evang., 10
Ewald, 152

Field, Hexapla, 33, 34, 42, 43, 47, 71, 77, 86, 93
foreign nations, position of the prophecies against, 2, 183 ff.
Fürst, Der Canon, etc., 9

Graf, 279
grammatical knowledge, the translators' lack of, 5, 22, 170, 295
Grätz, 171, 191, 210

harsh language towards Jer., or Jews, fear of using, 21
Heb. special sense transferred to Greek equivalent, 22
Herodotus, 266
Hitzig, 59
Hody, 8

illegibility of Heb. MSS., 23 f.
Irish idiom, illustration from survival of, 6

Jer., influence of traditions connected with, 25
Josephus, 10, 12, 252, 264
Judith, double text of, 2

Keil, 109
Knobel, Jer. Chald., 58
Kuenen, 99, 131, 184

Latin authorities, list of, as quoted in Appendix, 373 ff.

Leo Magnus, character of citations in, 368 f.
lesson from 'the prophets,' suggestions as to origin of, 9
liturgical causes of variations, 22
Lucianic evidence, 315 ff.; general results of examination of, 370 ff.

Michaelis, 43, 52, 53, 55, 60, 68, 90, 210, 218
Midrashic additions, 19; other M. changes, 21
Moabite stone, 62
Movers, 59, 72
Münter, 314

Nebuchadnezzar's successors, 196
negative, insertion or omission of the, 22, 157

Old Latin MS. evidence, 314, 370; general results of examination of, 369 ff.
"omissions," discussion as to origin of, 3 ff.; light thrown by history on origin of, 7 ff.; non-recensional omissions, 13; classification of, 14 ff.
Orelli, 184

parallel passages, additions from, 19
parallelism, desire for, 19, 21
Perles, 150, 156, 167, 212, 231, 304
Philo, 10, 144, 315
INDEX.

Psammetichus I., 8
Ptolemy I. (Lag.), 10, 12
Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus), 8
Ptolemy Philometor, 10

Ranke, 314
rare words, LXX.'s method of dealing with, 5, 20
reverence, changes from motives of, 22
Robertson Smith, 7, 24
Ryle, Dr, 9, 315

Sangallensis (codex), 314
Schlesner, J. F., 43, 53, 68, 70, 90
Schlesner, Thes., 82
Scholz, criticisms on, 5, 14, 18;
other references to, 6, 7, 9, 12,
13, 32, 36, 38, 39, 52, 114,
120, 130
Schürer, 7, 8, 10, 12
Schwally, 149, 179, 191, 261,
170, 180, 285
Smith, Prof. H. P., 16, 57, 61,
63, 64, 69
sound, 0's tendency to render by a word of similar, 263
Spohn, 45, 88, 96, 143, 159, 265,
278

Stade, 98 f., 191
substitutions of words or letters, 19 f.
summary of reasons inducing inaccuracy on the part of LXX., 25 f.

Tetragrammaton, LXX.'s method of dealing with, 41 f.
Tischendorf's text of LXX., 80
Tobit, double text of, 2
Transpositions, classification of, 19

Vergil, Gr., 38
Vitringa, 9

Wellhausen, 47, 48, 115, 192,
220
Wisdom, 10
Workman, theory of, 15 f.; criticised by Driver, 16, 58; by H. P. Smith, 16, 57, 64, 69;
W.'s fundamental error, 17;
other references to, 4, 7, 29,
30, 37, 40, 41, 44, 46, 50, 52,
55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 66, 72,
73, 76, 77, 81, 83, 93, 102,
103, 104, 106, 121, 128
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