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PREFACE.

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, unrepresenting in the Greek, of וַיְהֵצֵר הָאָרֶץ וַיֶּהַלְכוּ, 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.
PREFACE.

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 Giesebrecht (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.-livi., I have there made repeated reference to both Giesebrecht and Cornill, often disagreeing with their views. As regards the earlier portion of these

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


³ See p. 150.
notes (chaps. i.–x.), I would point out two passages, where Giesebrecht appears to have hit upon the right emendation:

(a) In vi. 6 הַיְּדוּעַ יִוְּרִי הָעָרֶץ is an ingenious and very possible conjecture. He compares Nah. iii. 1.

(b) In viii. 18 read מִשְׁלִויָה.*<em><sup>2</sup></em> מִשְׁלִויָה.

In v. 28 Cornill’s account (p. 47) of יְבֵרָה (to be “emended to וּבֵי, in accordance with Deut. xxxii. 15”) is probably the right one.

In iii. 1 I accept Perles’ (p. 48) emendation of לֶאָם אָרֶץ to לֶאָם אָרֶץ (out of לֶאָם אָרֶץ).

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 גָּם read גָּם.
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 “supravi” read Desperavi.
P. 60, l. 12 after “verb” insert would give רֶפֶךְ.
P. 72, l. 19 dele “In l....פַּרְחַּוֹתָן.”
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...(ἀναμονή)’ 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 יְנַעְרֶךְ) יְנַעְרֶךְ.
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 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*, 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 ἀδρπυ, iii. 13, κατακερμίσσω, vi. 23, ζήνηρ) 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 ἐκ μὴ τρας 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.
INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

2. Besides some passages of considerable length (the longest are chaps. xxix. 16–20, xxxiii. 14–26, 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 Massoretic 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.)¹.

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\(^1\). Accordingly when under these circumstances there came a rare or difficult word to be dealt with\(^2\), 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\(^3\) (sometimes by the help of a cognate language or dialect\(^4\)), and (b) transliteration\(^5\). 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\(^6\).

\(^1\) 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, יונ; 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-Uebersetzung des Buches J., 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\(^1\).

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."\(^3\)

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.

\(^1\) See Scholz, p. 17.

\(^3\) 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. a) is however almost the only case in these chapters, where that *ms.* stands unsupported.
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) literature¹, 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 (יְרוֹמִית, x. 25 (יְרוֹמִית));

(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 text²;

(c) Passages or expressions which are found elsewhere in this or other Books in both texts, e.g. viii. 10b—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.

² See Workman, p. 126, and, for exhibition of the two texts of chap. x. 2—16 in parallel columns, Scholz, p. 60 ff. So for convenient comparison of the M.T. and LXX. in xxvii. 5—22 see W. Robertson Smith’s O.T. in the Jewish Church, 2nd ed., London and Edinburgh, 1892, p. 104, or (for vv. 16—22) Scholz, pp. 62 ff. On xxix. 16—20 see Scholz, p. 165.
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-

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.

2 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\(^1\). 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)\(^2\).

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\(^3\), 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. xii. 1. 1. πολλοίς αἰχμαλώτοις λαβὼν ἀπὸ...τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος...κατέχεσαν, ἀπαντάς εἰς Ἀγγέλου αγαγών.

\(^3\) Philo gives three brief accounts of public worship in the synagogue (quoted by Schürer, 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 (ῥώματα ἀκροαθαι), of the reading of the Scriptures.
"omissions" in the LXX., or, as we may now venture to call them, additions in the Massoretic 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. xlili. 17 ff.
fore appears that until Ptolemy I. (Lagi) introduced from Palestine captives and a large number of other settlers¹, 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 river². 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 considering³, 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. Aristeas’s words are, τοὺς μὲν μετέχοντας, ἀλλὰ ήχυμαλώτηκατ.

² As early as the foundation of Alexandria rights of citizenship were bestowed upon Jewish settlers. See Jos. Apion. 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.
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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 הַנְּהָנָא in chap. x. 7 has a late appearance, while the use of תְּנָא for תְּנָא 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.


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 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."\(^1\)

The latter part of Prof. Workman’s book consists of a “Conspectus 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\(^2\) and Prof. H. P. Smith\(^3\) have commented on this theory, and besides other criticisms have pointed out with abundant illustrations, to quote the words of the latter\(^4\), that the “Conspectus 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.

I. 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 δε. iii. 18 insert καὶ before ἄνδρ. 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.

v. 9, read τοῦ καθὼς εἶπα ὁμώ. 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 τὴν γῆς ὁμῶ. 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. 121.
ix. *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, (β).
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:

vii. 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. iv. 1, 4, 7, 20 bis, 29 bis. v. 2, *6,

1 For Midrashic renderings which do not involve additions to the LXX. see p. 31.
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 † or ‡ 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. 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, (ε).

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).
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 (πορνεύσαι), v. 31 (ἐπεκρότησαν), vi. 4 (ἐκλείπουσιν), vi. 19 (τῶν λόγων μου), and to these we might add ix. 21 [22] (ἐσονταί). 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 Kabbala, 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. x. 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. (B♭AQ) 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.) version², 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.

1. a d. ἶνενυ γενέθη τοῦ θεοῦ 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 ἱπρίον (ἲπρίον) instead of θεοῦ. The θεοῦ of v. 2 (see note there) may account for this variation.

   a b. ἶνε ὅσον κατέφερε. An interpretative (Midrashic) insertion, by no means implying a variant from the M.T.

2. γ. ἴπρίον 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 ἰπρίον, so as to correspond with the opening words of v. 4. Q, 22, 36, and others (and so SH.) have ἱπρίον.

---

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

3. om. d. Ἰαρὴν. Ἐως. The omission of τὴ 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. ἐνεπιλαθέντος. 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. Ἰαρὴν. O' vacat, but BπΝΑQ repair the clearly accidental omission of ἐκ μύτρας.

6. (δ.) θάνατος ὅ ὄν. So also in xiv. 13, xxxii. [xxxix.] 17, while iv. 10 has simply Ὡ. In Ex. iii. 14 (bis) ὅ ὄν translates Ἰαρὴν. But perhaps the original reading in Jeremiah was in all four places ὅ, whence came ὄν (comp. ἐκοῦν for ἐκοῦσε 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 Ῥ (though in Jud. vi. 22 it is ἸΑ ὅ) is rendered ὅ in 2 K. [4 K.] iii. 10, vi. 5, 15 (in this last A omits); so Ἰαρὴν is ὅ ὅ in Ezek. xxx. 2.
7. a. πρός. The frequent employment of ἔλθη where ἔλθη 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. λέγει. Κύριος. This is the normal rendering (*ἐπιφνευ* 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. 3 [3], 3 [6]). Hence Wo. in those cases considers O’ to have found ἔστω in their text. This seems quite unnecessary.

9. a b. οῦ. O’ adds πρός με.

10. om. a. ἀπολλυόμενοι. 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 ἐκείνην.

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

11. om. a. Ἰερεμία. (B vacat) ΑQ Ἰερεμία.

om. a. Ἀλεποῦ (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 h and k) somewhat obscurely points out, the words ‘ῥ’ ἰερεμία are absent from the Heb. as well.

12. ε. τοὺς λόγους μου, reading ἰερεμία.

13. om. a. αὐτῷ ἀνείπε. See on v. 11.

14. a d. ἀπό προσώπου βορρᾶ.

γ. ἐκκαυθησαί (ΑQ. Symm. ἀνοιχθη-σεται). O’ desired to connect the Heb. word etymologically with the preceding ἦν (perhaps read by them ἦν Niph. ptcp. from ἔνα), ἵπποκαυλόμενον
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(Aq. Symm. φυσηθέντα or ἐμφυσηθέντα), pointed by Mass. as pass. ptcpl. Kal of הָעפְּנ although properly to breathe, to blow, is used in Hiph. of kindling in a literal (Ezek. xxii. 36) or metaphorical (Prov. xxvii. 8) sense. Hence they may have chosen to read חָפָן, and then either cancelled one ה or else read the word as a Po'ulal of חָפָן.

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

α α. τῆς βασιλείας...τῆς γῆς. 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 βορρᾶ. There would appear to have been an early confusion in the Heb. text between מִלָּל וּמִלָּל and מִלָּל, of which 88 and SH. retain traces.


καὶ ἐθυμάσετο. In Hos. iv. 13; 2 Chr. xxv. 14 alone elsewhere is θυμάσετο rendered (without variant) by θύμω. Θυμάσετο (θυμιάζεων) 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.) בְּלַעֲם. B vacat. The word is not likely to have been omitted, if genuine. It is supported however by NAQ and SH.

μ. μηδὲ πτοηθῆς 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, μηττοτε ηππτοσεῖ (corr. πτοησω) 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 μηδὲ πτοηθῆναι σε πτοησω, 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. בְּלַעֲם בְּרֹח. O' vacat.

γ. καὶ ὡς τεῖχος (ὁλὴν). The matres lectionis (see Scholz, pp. 38, 114) seem to have been less regularly inserted in the time of O'.
II. 2] CRITICAL NOTES.

a a. ο xls, to which is added ὀξυρόν (but B*AQ -ρόν, Λ ὀξυρόν), apparently to explain the preceding figure, and suggested by xv. 20, where ὀξυρόν (M.T. בֵּר) comes in O'. Here it spoils the parallelism.

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

om. a. ὑπὸ τῶν. O' vacat. Theod., 88, SH.

supply, but with an asterisk; 22, 36, and others without one.

ii. 1, 2, om. c. ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν Λαβράντον, καὶ 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. ὀν. O' vacat. Theod. has οὐσία.

xi h. τελειωσεως αὐτοῦ (Ἀ τελειωσής 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.
THE DOUBLE TEXT OF JEREMIAH. [II. 2

SH. testifies virtually to νυμφέλων 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 בָּטֵנָה (whose genuineness it is hard to doubt), and writing twice over the words רָמָה, כָּרָתָתָא. Perplexed by the repetition, they read רָמָה on its second occurrence as (רָמָה=) רָמָה. 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. Introd. p. lxx.

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

Obs. that the M.T. supports בָּטֵנָה against A for the order of the words ἀπρ. κ. ἀβ.

γ. καὶ ἀκάρπῳ. Either the MS. was indistinct, or a different and less skilful translator may have been at work; for ἀκάρπῳ is rendered correctly (if we accept its Mass. pronunciation) in xiii. 16.
The word which \( au \) represents is clearly קְלֵשָׁה, 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 (בְּנֵיהָ נְרָה וְשָׁה). See specially Is. xlix. 21. If O' read the word as קְלֵשָׁה (not קְלֵשָׁה), 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 θανάτου. St Jer., quoting Theod., shews ("imagine mortis") that he himself considered the expression to be made up of the roots בֹּל and בָּל.

om. a and ad. שִׂנ. om. B* A (Q ἀνὴρ Αarrivée), all adding however ὑθέν. שִׂנ. is an easy amplification for a Heb. copyist.

אַנְthrọ epis ἐκεί (ἐν ἐκ. νῦν ἀνθρῶ-πον). MSS. 22, 23, 26, and others, and so SH. and
also Compl., have νίος ἀνθρώπου, which St Jer. gives as the reading of O'.

7. *om. d. τήν. O' vacat. Taking 'ν as the name of the well-known hill, as they also do in iv. 26, they thought 'ν inappropriate. Were it not for the latter passage (where see note) one might be inclined (with Scholz) to consider the 'ν 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. Ἡγοῦρα τοῦ νόμου, but ΝΑQ add μου and so SH.


11. (ἐ ἢ or ἢ). ἐθνη. This need not be anything more than a loose rendering. But O' may have read the word 'ν = ιν.

12. γ. ἐστίν ἥρα πίσω καὶ ἐφρίζειν (after ἐφρ. mss. 33, 36, and others, and so Ald., add ἡ 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 κάθῃ, Aq. Symm. the first by reading πάντα λαβὼν (καὶ πάλαι αὐτοῦ).

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

§ i. καὶ ὄρμην, a free rendering.

§ i. τὰ αὐτάκοι. Λ' practically deleted one of the words, as though they thought that it had been written twice over in their copy.

e. ἐπὶ τὰ. ὀνομάζονται...συνέχεια, reading ἐπὶ τὰ. It so happens that nowhere else in O.T. except in x. 10 (which is lacking in O') does the Hiph. of בול appear with כ defective.

15. (γ.) οPackageManager, very possibly reading ש UserManager.

β. ἐπὶ τὰ. κατακαφησαν, reading. It is noteworthy that conversely where M.T. has the expression σε αἵββα (iv. 26) Λ' has ἐμπεπυρισμέναι (AQ add πυρι), reading σε (to which Wo. needlessly adds κατού). Λ' s rendering of σε in ix. 9 [10] is probably to be otherwise explained. See note there.

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

γ. τινὶ. εὐνωσάν σε, reading τι for τι. The text of A.V. ("have broken") derives from τινὶ.

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

17. Εἰς Ἰ. εὐχλεῖ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν σοι τὸ καταλιπεῖν σε; Puzzled by the construction they rendered in defiance of grammar. Pesh. and Vulg. render the verb as 3rd p. fut. Niph. (עשתה).

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


18. Ἐρρεά. Ηρών. The root παίζομαι, to be black, muddy (“nigra secundat 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 Σωρ. 

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

19. β α. μεσαβοντάς τρυγ. The proper renderings (ἡ κακία σοι and ἡ ἀποστασία σοι) 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.

ομ. α. πρὸς. πικρῶν. πρὸς 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. ἐμὲ, λέγει Κύριος. See on 17.

γ. μετ' ἰθανάτου καὶ οὐκ εὐθοκησά (AQ* ητί.) ἐπὶ σοὶ. O' did not perceive that the suffix of 'β is objective, fear of (towards) με. Hence they seem to have chosen to read πορνή, in spite of the fact that that verb is not elsewhere found constructed with ἴν.
N.B. ἥν, suggested by Wo., looks a somewhat portentous word.

ξ a. ἧν ἡ τινὶ ἔχει τὸν αὐτὸν. 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. θάλαττας and ἱππικά. συνέτρυχας and διέσπασας; but Q, 22, 23, 26, and others, apparently with SH. (Ἄσομε), have διέρρητας; 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 ἔλευθη in v. 33. Obs. that there is no καὶ in B or Α connecting the verbs.

γ. ἀνεβορός καὶ οὐ δουλεύω (ανεβορός) ἦν was changed to ἦν when the preceding verbs were taken to be in the 1st person.

a b. σου is Midrashic (ἈΝῸ om.).

ζ. ἡ θάλαττα, διαχυθήσομαι, reading ἡ θάλαττα, which they seem to have considered a possible form of Hithp. of ἦσσε. SH. gives Aq., Theod. as having συνηγισμένη (probably a corruption of σὺ γινομένη) ἐν στρώματι πορνη.

κατασκίω (comp. ἀλσώδους in iii. 6).
Wo.'s substitute ἐσχις (rendered by καρ. Ezek. xx. 28) is quite a needless change. Καρ. is sufficiently near the former in sense, as applied to a tree. So εὐσκιος occurs as rendering of 'א in xi. 16.

21. § i. ἀληθινήν. A free rendering.

(om. a.) א. 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 (א) xvii. 13 gave them no trouble. Hence they chose here to read either (א) לֹּ֣שְׁרָה, or תֵּ֣שְׁרָה, a word which they have also rendered by πικρία in Deut. xxxii. 32, or less probably (ב) לֹּ֣שְׁרָ, myrrh, which is found once in the Pent. (Ex. xxx. 23), but is not either there or elsewhere rendered by them πικρία.

22. § i. κεκλιθώσαι ἐν ταῖς αἴδισιας σου. A free translation.

(om. a.) ב. 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 יְהוָה 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, xlix. 5 [xxx. 5], l. [xxvii.] 31; so Jos. vii. 7; 2 S. vii. 19 [1°], 20; Is. xlix. 22; Ps. lxviii. [lxix.] 21;
(b) κύριος Κύριος (κύριε Κύριε or κύριέ μου, Κύριε) e.g. Jud. vi. 22; 2 S. vii. 19 [2*]; 1 K. viii. 53; Is. xxviii. 16, xxx. 15, lii. 4; Am. v. 3; Ps. cix. [cviii.] 21, cxl. [cxxxix.] 8, cxlii. [cxl.] 8;
(c) Κ. ὁ θεὸς Κ. ὁ 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 βασιλεῦ 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.


η οὐ διστ. τὰς ὀδοὺς σου.

υ. ἐν τῷ πολυανδρίῳ. Suidas, Lex., s.v. has π. = μνῆμα, τάφος, ξενοτάφιον. SH. here translates similarly, giving however Aq., Symm. as εν τάς φάραγξι (these may have rendered by εν 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 Hinnom1 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 Νήν, not πρῶτον, or μέγας, 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 ἀνθρωπία, ἀνθρωποφαγία) in the parallel passage, xix. 6.

a. ἀνθρωπία. kai ἀνθρωπία, freely.

8. ἀνθρωπία. The Heb. word (occurring here only) puzzled O', who translated as though it were ἀνθρωπία. 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 ἀνθρωπία (comp. Arabic root), would surely rather require πρωτά.

e. ἀνθρωπία. φανή ἀνθρωπία (ἀνθρωπία). For this with the previous word Aq. Symm. Theod. have ἀνθρώπως κούφη.

γ or δ. ματρίτινα ὁμοίως. ὠλόλυξεν. (24) τὰς ὀδοὺς ἀνθρωπίας. The root ἀνθρωπία is ἀνθρώπως λεγόμενον. Hence O' may have treated it as = ἀνθρώπως, 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 συνελεύσα. Therefore there is much to be said for Döderlein's view (Repert. Bibl. et Orient. Lit. i. 233), that ὠλόλυξεν is the rendering of a variant on ἀνθρωπία, viz. ματρίτινα ὁμοίως, where ἀνθρωπία is probably intended for the fem. ptcp. ἀνθρώπως (I should suggest, with less change, ἀνθρώπως ἀνθρώπως i.e. ἀνθρώπως ἀνθρώπως ἀνθρώπως), while ἀνθρωπία was passed over as inexplicable. Aq. Symm. (see Field's note) have συμπλέκονσα ὀδοὺς ἀνθρωπίας.

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

γ. וִיהוּדָאָה, reading יִתְיָה or וַיֶּאֶר. We may note that these two changes were consequent upon their commencing the sentence with "וַיְהִי", which itself followed naturally upon their failure to understand הֵשָּׁנָה.

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

ε. בָּאָרָה. παρέδῳ. Clearly (against Wo.) they connected with the root עָנָה, known to them through Ex. xxi. 13, where it is rendered by the same verb.

ζ. ἡμᾶς. ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτῆς (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 עָנָה, conterere, which appears in Hoph. Is. xxviii. 27. Aq. has ἐν νεομηνίᾳ αὐτῆς. Ο'Εβραῖος has ἐν τῷ ἀροτρίαν (בַּיִשָּׁנָה).
25. Χ i. ἀπὸ ὀδοὺ τραχείας, freely. Aq. Symm. (ἀπὸ) ἀνυποδεσίας.

ε. ἦ δὲ εἶπεν. Probably the ′ had been lost or obliterated. Then, as consequential changes, the subsequent first persons were rendered as thirds.

δ and ε. ἁλαξυδίαρ. Ἀνδριοῦμαι, while ἄλ is omitted (see on v. 31), or ἄλ read instead of it. O′ connect the word both here and in xviii. 12 with ἁλαν. 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. οῖοι. αἰσχυνθήσονται. Aq. has γορχυναν (or κατορχυναν). 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.

Χ i. ὀι. ὦ υἱοί. Wo′s ὡν is a fair example of his many needless changes.

27. Ἡ. ἐκτὸς ἠμείρομεν ἰησου. ἦ ἦμερα ἐκπαύει might easily be got from ἦμερα.

ε. ἦ ἔγεννησάς με. ὁ ἀδήμων κ. 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 'l probably represent an early corruption, which never became universal.

η. πρόσωπα αὐτῶν, easily got from 'νπλ.  

28. ξ i. ei ἀναστήσονται καὶ σώσουσι (NAQ add σε), freely.

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

29. λ ῾Ερώτη. 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.

α c. πάντες ὑμεῖς ἤσεβήσατε καὶ πάντες ὑμεῖς ἴνομίσατε (but A om. ἤσεβ...ὑμεῖς) and so SH. A double rendering. 'B is translated by ἄσεβειν in v. 8, iii. 13, and elsewhere, and by ἄνομεῖν in Is. xliii. 27; comp. Job xxxv. 6. St Jer. testifies to the present text of O'.

30. ξ a. ἐξέδρασθε. O' changed the person for the sake of parallelism with ἐφόβησθε 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 ἐ. ἀκούσατε, freely. O' saw in these words the root ἀρι, finding also, or supplying from the parallel clause, a negative; for which characteristic of O' see further infra.

ξ i. ἀκούσατε, freely.

a b. Ὡν. O' adds τάδε λέγει Kύριος.

δ. μεσ. κεχεροσμένη. Aq. has ὑφίσταντα, Symm. ὑψίμος, both connecting the Heb. (as Field points out) with ἐφικμένος, for which O' has ὑψίμος in Ex. ix. 32. 'ι is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον and evidently not familiar to O', who rendered by a guess.

ξ e and δ. Ὡν. οὐ κυριευθησόμεθα (A δουλευθησόμεθα). Aq. has ὀπέστημεν, Symm. ἀνεκαρφησάμεν. O' seems to have taken the verb (a rare one) as though from ἀρι, but in a passive sense which occurs in v. 31 (see that passage), and to have conjectured that ἐφικμένος had been accidentally omitted or that it was to be understood from the following clause. Comp. note on ἀκούσατε above, and in general, for the freedom with which O' deals with small and frequently used words and specially ἐφικμένος, 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 κυριευθησόμεθα as a roundabout way of expressing the active sense of ἀκούσατε, but then probably it would have been rendered without such circumlocution.
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32. β a. μὴ ἐπιλήσεται νῦν φη τον κόσμον αὐτῆς καὶ παρθένος κ.τ.λ. The renderings of 'ב and 'כ 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 a and u sounds together), on the principle illustrated by Wellh. (Der Text d. B. Sam.) p. 10? See other examples in note on v. 19.

33. ξ c. oυχ οὐτῶς; probably an error of ear in dictation. Comp. 1 Sam. iii. 14 [13].

ξ and γ. ἵστατοι τοῦ μᾶναί, reading ἵστατοι λέγσαι. O' apparently supports 'כ (לָאָזח) archaic for the 'פ), for the ' is needed to complete the suggestion of the Α to their eyes, and their rendering very possibly presents the original text.

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

om. a. Αἰανίς. O' vacat. The Heb. may well be a gloss on the following words. Aq. Symm. Theod. have πενήτων. So Vulg. panperum.

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

36. (θ.) κατεφρονησάς, viewing the
word as Hiph. of הָלַל or הָלָל, 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 'ג may be the Kal fut. (יִלָּלָה) of one of those roots? We should thus (a) avoid the Aramaic dropping of the כ, so rare in Heb., (b) obtain a root whose meaning is at least as apposite as that of לַל, (c) fully justify the use of מָא, which, as M.T. stands, hardly accords with the sense of לַל.

37 [Gk 36]. מָא אוּטֵי (לֹא read as though לֹא).

iii. 1. om. v. מָא. O' vacat. The construction in the Heb. is somewhat harsh. לַל is probably to be connected with מָא of the previous verse.

a d. מַה אוּנָקַמְפָּנְוָא אוּנָקַמְפָּנְי נְפֹּס אוּנְטָו; Did O' (or their Heb. original) read הָשָׁב (= הָשָׁב), as finding (in marg. or text) a gloss הָשָׁב (= הָשָׁב), with or without a consequent gloss מָא, and as considering 'ג to be part of the original text, and מָא 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, xxiii.[xxxviii.] 33, 39, xxxii.[xxxix.] 33).
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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. לזרוס. מדרש. 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. ר輩ע. en πομέαν (רביונ).

xi. לזרוס. καὶ ἀνέκαμπτες, 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. רבע. εὐθεῖαν. Comp. Numb. xxiii. 3, where εὐθεῖαν stands for יקנ (יָקְנָה). The word seems to have had difficulties for O'. In xii. 12 they render by διεκβολή, in xiv. 6, νάπαυ, in iii. 21 and vii. 29, χελη, but probably in these two cases reading דנג. In iv. 11 they omit the word. They seem to have taken the notion of εὐθεῖαν from the Aramaic sense of נטס (נטס), trivit, fricuit. Comp. even in Heb. לזרוס (Is. xiii. 2), mons laevis, abrasus, nudus arboribus. So εὐθις occurs in connexion with the clearing of a passage, Is. xl. 3, 4.
b. Obs. ἔσθαι καρδιίACION (A adding λέγει κύριος). Q has τ. ὃθο. σου εἰς εὐθ.  

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

καὶ ἐμίανας. Symm.'s rendering, καὶ ἐνοχοῦ ἐποίησας, is strange, and suggests the root ἔφι. In Mic. iv. 11 he also translates in like manner ἐνοχοῦ by κατακριθήσεται (καταδικασθήσε- 
tαι).

καὶ ἀνέχεσ ποιμένας πολλοῦς εἰς πρόφερμα σεαυτῷ. seems to have been read either (yet for this πρ. is an unlikely rendering, inasmuch as in vi. 21 ἔμπροσθε is translated ἀνθενίαν, and is frequently translated by ἀνθενέω) or (so Wo.); comp. Exod. xxiii. 33, xxxiv. 12; the whole clause being thus read ἀνέχεσ ποιμένας πολλοῦς εἰς πρόφερμα σεαυτῷ.

δροῦ, freely.

(γ.) In the last clause of this verse πρὸς πάντας perhaps arose from a marginal gloss intended by a Heb. scribe as a correction of, or variant for, which with the preceding word may have been read by O' (so Wo.) מַכָּא וֹבֶלֶם. 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. ἰᾶθηναι. ὡς οἰκεῖον. MS. 88 (which is closely allied to SH.) has oikeion, but this does not agree with SH. itself, which moreover in marg. preserves the Heb. reading. O' perhaps read ἰῆγε (so Wo. with J. D. Michaelis, Obs. Phil. et Crit. in Jer. etc. ed. J. F. Schleusner, Göttingen, 1793), for ἰᾶθηναι is rendered κατοικηθηριον in xx. 13. It seems however quite as likely that they here read ἰὲθη (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

5. ε. ἐπλαχθησαται (NA διαφ.), reading ἐπλαχθησαται.

κ. ἐν ημῖν. εἰς νίκοι, from the Aramaic and Syriac sense of the root. Contrast εἰς τὸν αἰώνα in 1. [xxvii.] 39; also their rendering of Niph. ptcp. in viii. 5.

ξ. ἡ προντον ταῦτα, not quite literally.

6. θ τερ. κατοικία, apparently taking it to be ἡ μητέρ, 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) אֲבָדְתָה (תֹּא—) is an abstract noun. Read therefore (with Michaelis) אֲבָדָה (Hoph. ptcp. of אֲבָדָה). The root אַבָּד, occurring twice (עַבָּד, עַבָּד) in v. 7, and again (עַבָּד) in v. 12, may have helped towards the Mass. reading of the word. Perhaps we should also read יָבָד.

v. 1. אֵלָסְדוּנָה. See on ii. 20. Aq. renders, more freely than is his wont, εὐθαλαύσας.

η. καὶ ἐπόρνευσαν (Ἀπ' -σεν), apparently reading ἰτωνινα as a contraction for ἰτωνινα. The construction however of xviii. 23 for ἰτωνινα (2 p. m.) suggests that both that case and this are Aramaic forms. Comp. יָדוּל in Is. liii. 10.

7. v. 1. ἰτωνινα πορνεύσαμι αὐτὴν. The construction of the following simple accus. (ταύτα πάντα) with this verb is harsh, and it is probably a corruption of ποιήσαμι, which has arisen from the preceding ἐπόρνευσαν.

η. ανάστρεψων (עַבָּדָה).

om. c and a a. בֶּנְוָה אָחָת הָיָה יְדוּרָה. דְּרֵי ἀσύνθεσιν αὐτῆς ἢ ἀσύνθετος Ἰουδά. בֶּנְוָה, 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 $\text{בְּרָא}^\text{a}$ of v. 8. Was O's reading $\text{בְּרָא}^\text{b}$, with (marg.) gloss $\text{בְּרָא}^\text{c}$, suggested by the $\text{בְּרָא}^\text{a}$ of v. 8, but regarded by O as an accidentally omitted part of the text, and read by them $\text{בְּרָא}^\text{d}$, as opposed to the pointing transmitted by M.T.? $\text{בְּרָא}$, perfidia, occurs in xii. 1 (ἀδερθματα). At any rate $\text{בְּרָא}^\text{f}$ 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 $\text{ὁ} \text{ἀνυβ. ὁ} \text{ἀδελφ. αὐτῆς.}$

8. $\text{κώρ}^\text{f} \text{kai ἐλδον.}$ 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) $\text{κώρ}^\text{f}$ (so here Kenn. 137, and Pesh.), the corruption of the Heb. text will have been early enough to be adopted by O.

a d. $\text{περὶ πάντων óv καὶ ἐλδον, περὶ πάντων óv κατ.}$ So B*. But Bb\text{NAQ om. óv 1o...πάντων 2o. om. d. ἀνυβ. O' vacat.}$

γ. $\text{κατελήμφη, not reading}$ $\text{ὁ} \text{ἀνυβ.}$ (as Wo.; comp. 2 Chr. xxv. 23; Ps. lxxi. [lxx.] 11), but $\text{ὁ} \text{ἀνυβ.}$ Comp. x. 19, where $\text{ὁ} \text{ἀνυβ.}$ is so rendered.

a a. $\text{οἶνος.}$ O' adds eis τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, evidently a gloss, taken from Deut. xxiv. 1, 3.

om. c. $\text{κώρ}^\text{f} \text{οἶνος.}$ O' vacat. See on v. 7.
9. θ. eis outhev, connecting the word somehow (ἐπίς, suggested by Mich., is otherwise unknown) with ἀθλεῖν. Targ. Pesh. Vulg. interpret μ 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 ἀθλεῖν, voice.

om. a. ἀθλεῖν έκείνης έτεράσας. O' vacat.

β b. ἀνάπτυξι ἐκείνης ἀθλεῖν. τὸ ξύλων καὶ τὸν λίθον.

10. om. c. έκείνης. O' vacat. See on v. 7.

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

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

12. a b. ἡμαρ. O' adds πρὸς μέ.

ζ i. ἀνάπτωσιν. ou στηριῶ, freely. Comp. Vulg. avertam.

a b. ἐμμαρ. μηνιῶ. O' adds ὑμῖν.

13. ζ i. ἕπεικους (A ἕκους). O' need not have read ἕκους (as Wo. makes them do). Targ. and Pesh. favour 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.)


15. 

16. 

ε and ξ i. נַלְבָא. וַיִּבְרָא סֵב וַיַּעֲשֶׂה (A καὶ οὐκ) ὄνομασθήσεται (γεν.). MS. 88 adds with asterisk ευ αὐτῇ. (So SH.)
e. ἐπισκεφθήσεται (ἐπισκ.).

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

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

om.a. לֶשֶׁם ייִהוּדָה לִירָבִּים O' vacat. Probably a Heb. gloss, suggested by xxiii. 6, if with Prof. Cheyne (Pulpit Comm.) we read there יִרְי (to which א still testifies) for ייִרְבִּים.

d. 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. 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 ἁρεστά, 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-Septuagintal 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 יָּה, while somewhat rare in other Bibl. Heb., are favourites with J., and are very frequent in Aramaic. Comp. מַלְכָּה (three times) for מַלְכָּה, בּוּרִית (for בּוּרִית), נְהָה (for נְהָה). For other examples see Knobel, *Jer. Chaldaisans*, Breslau, 1831.

18. η. מַלְכָּה 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.

19. η. מַלְכָּה O' adds Γένοιτο, Kύριε, which is their rendering in xi. 5 of מַלְכָּה, and is introduced here, as following upon the translators' assumption that מַלְכָּה 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 אֶלֶף יְהוָה ב’ (אֶלֶף יְהוָה ב’) which follows. See on ii. 2, 3.

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

e. συνέστησεν, ἀποστραφήσεθε (ΝΟ οποστραφήση), following ‘ב (leanor, תשב)’. So Pesh. But SH. and Vulg. agree with מ.

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

ξ i. ἡθέτησεν (Ἀ-σαυ), a loose translation, by no means warranting us in assuming, with Wo., a different text.

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

ζ i. θανάτων. καὶ δεήσεως, loosely.

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

22. ὑποστρέφοντες. See on v. 14.

2. ἐπιστρέφοντες. See on v. 14.

3 i. ἐπιστρέφοντες. See on v. 14.

4. kal (probably not recensional, and perhaps introduced by a copyist) ἱσόμαι. We find above 30 MSS. with αὐτός (see Kenn.). Comp. Prov. xviii. 9, ἐπιστρέφοντες, ὑποστρέφοντες, ὑποστρέφοντες (obs. also the inserted negative; for which see on i. 31). Inasmuch as ἱσόμαι is a neuter verb in Ἰαπρ, we cannot (with Mich.) translate ἐπιστρέφοντες by remittam, and the Mass. punctuation (as a ἰσόμαι verb) also involves a borrowing of meaning from ἱσόμαι, as in xix. 11, li. 9, and so in other Books. So we may comp. the subst. ἱσόμαι in viii. 15 (in these the Heb. note suggests ἱσόμαι as the more correct spelling), and ἱσόμαι in ii. 24 (so best editions) as against μάθας in xiv. 6.

Observe that, although ἱσόμαι (in Hiph.) may appear the more suitable of the two roots to be connected with such a word as μάθας, yet in Hos. xiv. 5 ἱσόμαι (with no variant) is joined with the same word.

γ. τὰ συντριμματα ὑμῶν (A αὐτούς). Συντ. is used in vi. 14 to render ὑμῖν (and so συντριμμός in iv. 20 and συντριμμός 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. lxxviii. 8; 2 S. xxii. 5, where the parallel in Ps. xviii. 5 has מִשְבָרֵה). I cannot find that מִשְבָרֵה is a word in actual use (suggested also by Mich.) "is a word in actual use" (H. P. Smith, l. c. p. 115).

a b and e. ιδου δυνατα (Q οιδε) ημεσ (A υμ.) εσομεθα σοι. ω 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) ημεμαναντα for ἀνανεοντα, if we point ἀνανεοντα, a use of ἀνανεοντα 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. η i. μεμεναντα ὲμαναντα. οι βουνοι και ἡ δύναμις των δρεων, loosely.

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

24. ἀπο νεοτητος ημων. ΝΑΩ have αυτων and so SH.; Pesh. Vulg. as M.T., which is clearly right.
25. om. a. ἐπιλεύσατε τοὺς θεοὺς ημῶν.

iv. 1. ξ 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 (bis, ὁμολογεῖν, ἤφειν, ἄρα, ἐλέησεν), 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 ἤμων.

om. (a). ἐάν.

a c. ἐκ (Q ἀπὸ τοῦ) στόματος αὐτοῦ (A om. ἐκ στ. αὐτ., καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ (A* A om. τοῦ) προσώπου (Q add μου; A adds αὐτοῦ). O’ s rendering is conflate, as including the corruption ἠμῶν. For loss of ἀμ in comp. xlvii. [xxvi.] 12 (ὁλόκληρον, φωνῆν σου) and so ἢ for τὴν on the Moabite stone.

γ and ξ e. ἐνακοθηγή (τὴν). For O’ s freedom in dealing with ὁμ. etc. see on ii. 31.

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

3. ξ a. ὡσ μετὰ κατοικοῦσιν Ιερ. (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. [xliii.] 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 O' to have read , 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 y. Symm. has τῷ κυρίῳ, Vulg. Domino.

ξ i. καὶ περιτέμεσθε, but ἀνὰ περιέ-λεσθε (A -θαί). The latter rendering was probably suggested by its occurrence in v. 1.

e. ο ὁθμὸς ἀυτοῦ (AQ μον), as though the words of the prophet. This is not noticed by Wo.

5. om. (a). εἰπάτε (NA pref. καί).

ξ i. μέγα, freely.

tὰς τείχισε, and so SH. A has τ. ὀχυρᾶς, adopted from viii. 14. Τείχ. occurs here only in J., while πόλεις ὀχ. is a frequent expression in J. and elsewhere.

6. e. δι. φεύγετε (ὁν or θν). See v. 21.

See on vi. 1.

7. γ. μάνδρας ἀυτοῦ, possibly reading ἄνα. Comp. Ps. x. 9 [ix. 30].

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

ξ i. ἐτήν ἄν. 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 μανίσ, has failed to note that B NA all have καὶ πόλεις (without the article). Probably O' read it as μανίς, and then made their rendering of the preceding ἀνατάκλιναι to conform to it.

καθαρεθοῦσαι. The rendering is defensible, with the Heb. as it stands. Comp. the sense of ἅλλα (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\(^1\) as the rendering of ἄνα, it is probable that their copy had a word derived from that root. He does not however explain how the word ἀνατάκλιναι, which he assigns to them as on the whole their probable reading, can possibly be formed from those root-letters.

8. ξ i. ἐπὶ τούτοις. ἐπὶ τούτοις, freely.

(om. a.) οὐκ ὁμοί. οἱ θυμὸς (Q adds ὀργῆς).

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 (liii. 14) in J.
23, 26, (so SH.,) Compl. Ald. have ὁ θ. ἀργῆς. Ὄργη θυμῶν (obs. the order) is the rendering of ἃ ἂ in v. 26.

(ξ a.) ἐκεῖνος. ἀφ' ὑμῶν (Ἀμ ἡμ.) An easy and frequent corruption of ἡμῶν, 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. ἑρμῆν. Ο. See on i. 6.

ξ i. ἔνθισται Κύριε. See on ii. 22.

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

a d. ἦν τό νῦν καὶ ἴδον (Ἀμ ἡμ. ὑμῖν) ἤφατο (Q ἤφεται).

ξ i. τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν, freely.

11. ε. ἐρόσων, freely.

ξ i. τὴν πλανήσεως. None of the conjectures are quite satisfactory. Probably the word was more or less illegible. Aq. (πνεῦμα) λαμπρήδωνος, Symm. (πν.) καύσωνος. St Jer. (ventus) urens sive oris (read erroris).

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

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

κρίματα ΒΑ (Q adds μοῦ). Wo. א (מָלֵא) is therefore on his own principles wrong in making O’s Heb. ms. differ here from M.T.

13. וָתִכְנִים. וָשׁ וּפּ, freely.

14. ύπάρχουσιν (ΑQ ύπάρξει), freely.

15. a b. וָתִכְנִים. ἐκ Δὲν ἦξει. Midrashic. MS. 88 has ἦξει. ἐκ Δ. SH. relegates the verb to its marg. Vulg. om.

16. (a b.) וָתִכְנִים. ἴδον 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 ἐρχονταί of the later part of the v.

θ. ινί. Συντροφαί, bands, troops. O' connected with root νι, 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. μελησα. O', as Wo. points out, has the support of the Targ. (כַּרְבָּא). But Aq. and the other Greek translators have 3rd pl., and so SH. If we assume the word to have been originally written μελ, it could be read (comp. v. 19) either as 2nd p. s. f. (מַר) or 3 p. s. f. (in sense of 3rd p. pl.). Comp. רֹאֶה, xiii. 19; נֵחות, Lev. xxv. 21, נָשָׂא, Lev. xxvi. 34 (so נִזָּה as 'כ in 2 K. ix. 37). Among those who adopted the latter reading the נ final would naturally soon be added.


θ. 'א. מְזָנ. The 'א, מְזָנ, seems, as Ges. says, to have arisen from a confusion of ה and of מְזָנ (מִזָּנ) which some MSS. (Kenn. gives 19) exhibit. There is no parallel for this sense of מז. On the other hand מְזָנ (fem. ptcp. Niph. of מז) is twice in this Book (x. 18 [19], xxx. [xxxvii.] 12) rendered מְזָנַת. It is therefore most probable that O' here saw that root.
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α c. ἄναμματε ἡ ψυχή μου, σπαράσσεται ἡ καρδία μου (ἅ om. the whole). A conflate rendering.

e. ἤκονσεν. As soon as the of the old form of the 2nd s. i. was gone, as appears to have been the case in O"s original, ἀπακένθετο could be read as either person. Comp. v. 17.

20. γ. περί ταλαπωρίαν (Q -iaς), reading ταλαπωρίαν. See on v. 13. 2° is rendered συντρίμμων. See on iii. 22. In Is. lx. 18 and are rendered (in reversed order) by συντρίμμα and ταλ.

ξι bis. τεταλαπώρηκεν bis. See on v. 13.

ξι. ἡ σκηνή (A σκηνάι), freely.

γ. διεσπασθήσαν. 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 Schleusner (notes on Michaelis, in loco) that can mean discindere. O' clearly read the root letters of ὑφή.

21. e. ἐνί. φεύγωντας. Comp. v. 6.

ξι. ἀκούων, a corruption of ἀκούω (so Q*), which is itself a loose rendering. SH. has fut., and so Vulg. audiam.

22. θ. οἱ ἦγομενοι (and so SH.),
explained by ἵσχυρός, which is their rendering of

strong ones (i.e. chief men) in 2 K. xxiv. 15, a passage naturally very familiar to Jews of the Dispersion.

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

om. a. ὲβάζῃ. O' vacat. The word is rendered ἀκατασκεύαστος 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. .GetText. ἱθηκαί. ταρασσομένους. 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. TextWriter. ἐπτοείτο; but Aq. μετηναστευθήσαν.

26. .GetText. ἢεριν. αἱ πόλεις. O' disregarded the pronoun, as inconsistent with their view of the meaning of ἐφαρσ. See on ii. 7.

β b. Ἵ�ηθε. See on ii. 15.

a d. ἃοι. O' adds ἰἱφανίθησαν, which may well be a marg. correction of ἐμπεπυρ.

28. β b. ἰὑθι οὐ υποτῆσαν, ὄρμησα. O' s order is certainly a more natural one.
29. δὲ ἤρα, καὶ εὐπεραμένου. ἤρα is translated by the same verb in Hos. vii. 16.

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

γ. πᾶσα πόλεις.

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 πᾶσα ἡ χώρα from the readiness with which the word would be supposed to refer to Jerusalem alone, with πᾶσα πόλεις to increase the dramatic effect, assisted also by parallelism, and by the occurrence of this word in vv. 23, 27. While we thus obtain πᾶσα πόλεις 2°, and (for πᾶσα ἡ χώρα 1°, the latter word, if written πᾶσα ἡ χώρα, might easily, by confusion of eye with the next line, be copied as πᾶσα πόλεις.

α. eἰσέδωσαν εἰς τὰ σπῆλαια, καὶ εἰς τὰ ἀλογὴ ἐκρύβησαν. The former clause of these may possibly represent a variant οἶκος, of which however there is no trace otherwise. οἶκος 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. דָּרָשׁ is suspicious, as being anomalous in gender, and not represented in O', although well known to them. See on v. 13. MSS. 23, 36, and others have ἡ ταλαίπωρας; Aq. Symm. ταλ., unless (see Field's note) Aq. had προνεομενενη, "vastata," which St Jer. attributes to him.

v. εὐχπλοῆ. Midrashic.

ξ i. ὁ ἄρασμός σου, freely.

ζητόνσις. So B, but ΡΑQ have the harder and more accurate ζητήσουσιν.

31. ξ i. τοῦ στεναγμοῦ σου, freely.

ζ i. έκλυθήσεται. The Heb. root is probably connected with חנן, חוף. O' translated freely.

(β a.) שֶׁם. παρῆσει. 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. הָרִינוֹם. επὶ τοῖς ἀνηρρημένοις, reading הָרִינוֹם.

v. 1. om. d. שׁיוֹם שׁיא. εἰ εστίν. M.T. is probably a kind of conflation, being a combination
of the contracted (ש"א) and full form of the second and third words (so Movers, mentioned by Wo.). Scholz’s interpolation of עב is violent.

ξ εἰς or η. αὐτοῖς (Q* αὑτῇ). This may well be considered as a rendering κατὰ σύνεσιν, although it may have been read as 'לד = לחר.

2. γ. λέγει Κύριος, reading καὶ, supplying its usual subject, and joining the expression to the previous words.

ξ εἰς. οὖν...ομνύονν. For the introduction of the negative see on ii. 31. Here it may possibly have arisen out of the λ of לחר. 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 εἰς. οὑν...ομνύονν. εἰς πλατὺν, a case of the converse kind to the preceding.

4. δ. γ. διότι οὖν ἔδυνασθησαν (Nich. AQ ἔδυναθ.) In 1. [xxvii.] 36 παραλυθησονται. The Heb. verb is somewhat rare, and therefore loosely translated.

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

5. γ. διέρρηκαν. The Heb. root was rendered in ii. 20 by διαστάσω.

6. γ and ξ. ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων, reading (not
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with Wo. and so Driver, Samuel, Introd. p. xxxi, but) 'יִּשְׂרָאֵל. This accounts both for O’s plural, and (by thus transferring the ו from the verb which follows) for their rendering by a past tense (ωμοθρευσε). The only approaches to a parallel in the Heb. are in יְהוּדָה in Hab. i. 8 and Zeph. iii. 3. In the latter passage O renders גַּז ‘Araβīs. Prof. Cheyne (Pulpit Comm. in loco) points out that we have no reason to suppose that makes πρόβατα. Understand therefore of the deserts (pl. of הָעָרֶב).

e. סֵכֶל. מְגִירָהוֹרְסֵא, reading לָשׁוֹן.

7. קִנְסֵי. קַהַל מְגִירָהוֹרְסֵא. Other MSS. have ש, thus giving the meaning, I caused them to swear.

γ. מְגִירָהוֹרְסֵא. קָטָל חַיִּים (A -ὄντο), reading Hithp. of נֵר (and so SH.). It may be noted that the root נֵר, to drag, seize, supplies the only similar verbal form in J. (xxx. 23), viz. מְגִירָהוֹרְסֵא.

8. θ. מִתִּינוּן. θηλυμανεῖς, evidently connecting this difficult word with מִתְנָה.

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

γ βις. Ο' appear to have been quite baffled by the latter part of this verse. For they seem to have read (ὑπολίπεσθε; AQ -λειπό-) τὰ ὑποστροφομάτα αὐτῆς, and for βιοτόχοι (τὰ ὑποστροφομάτα αὐτῆς) either λειπότα, or, less probably, λειπότα. The latter substantive, it is true, occurs (ἤ) l. [xxvii.] 15 (O' there rendering ἐπάλλειν), but the former presents on the whole an easier misreading of the Heb. consonants, if somewhat indistinctly written. In either case the ἴ seems to have been read as ἴ (ἵ is doubtless vine-tendrils, as in xlvi. 32; Is. xviii. 5).

ξε. οὐ. Ο' vacat. See on ii. 31.

11. ββ. ἡ θητή. B has λέγει Κύριος 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. ξφ. οὐκ 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.
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13. ἔ ᾿ ἐ ᾿ ἐ ᾿ ἐ ᾿. 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 נ omitted is of course possible, though the only undoubted instance of such omission (in Pi’el), except where נ is also the root letter of the verb, is that in Eccl. iv. 2 (הָֽשְׁבִית).

א. הָֽשְׁבִית. B א Q have οὗτος ἔσται autòs, 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. מְעַר. O’ vacat. ὁ θεὸς is inserted with asterisk by ms. 88 (so SH.).

e. מְעַר. δέδωκα (נָרְנָה).

15. om. d. In the earlier part of this verse the omission of all from the second to the fourth עַ had 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.

ן (ן). 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. a a. ἡμεῖς. O' adds (but * om.) καὶ τοὺς ἐλαιῶνας ὑμῶν. 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 ὑμῶν alone were unrepresented in the Heb.

γ. ψευδώ. ἀλοιπόσωσιν (Q -σωσ-), reading doubtless ἰ for ἰ, inasmuch as this verb is used more frequently than any other to translate ψυρ (including subst. ψυρ), viz. in Deut. xxv. 4; Jud. viii. 7 (in B); Is. xli. 15; Mic. iv. 13; 1 Chr. xxii. 20.
18. **a d.** ἐνέπεισεν τὸ θεῖος σου.

19. **om. c.** ἢ μὴ ἂν ἄνθις; **O' vacat.** ἐγκατ-
elιπτέ 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. **ἐν τῷ Ἰουνᾶ.** σετριπτι 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.** ἀνεκάθ. **O' vacat.**

24. η and γ. ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀναπληρώσεως προστάγματος (ἅρματος ἢ θρεπτείνει) 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 ἐ, the probability is that they understood it as the construct (whether sing. or pl.) of ἰδαν, occurring in three other places (Is. xxiii. 18, lvi. 11; Ezek. xxxix. 19) as against Wo.'s ἵδαν, which is otherwise ἀπαξ λεγόμενον (Ezek. xvi. 49). Theod. and Aq. (but apparently in his 2nd ed., see Field's note) read as ἐ, and so SH. (Δοκείμενος).

O' may have chosen ἐ, as finding some difficulty in recognising the ‘coordinated’ or ‘suspended’
const. state in  תב נים, 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 ’י, xix. 21; Is. xxiii. 12, xxxvii. 22, xlvii. 1; Job xx. 17; Lam. i. 15, ii. 13.

26. om. d. ינשא אפ分かる. Aq. Symm. according to St Jer., connected 'with ינשא, upright, but made it a proper name "Iasir, quasi rete aucupis; quod etiam qui bonus inter eos videtur et rectus, instar aucupis 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. יבכלב. ως παγίς έφεσταμένη (with its tendency to 'improve' has συνεσταμένη). έφ. is Midrashic. παγίς 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 καρπάλλω, a peculiar kind of basket], so is the heart of the proud ')." For the word καρη see vi. 9.

28. om. (d bis and a bis). יבכלב ב קם נושה.
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 יል 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 י, 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 ילב של, or the pointing of the middle one, Symm. Theod. reading ילב, and explaining παρέβησαν τοὺς λόγους μου εἰς πονηρον. So St Jer. Praeterierunt sermones meos pessime. Can these, together with ו, be an early gloss (or two separate glosses) "words of (concerning) a wicked man," "and they (enallage) prosper"?

א or א. נב幼儿 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 בְּיָהוּ, with which בְּיָהוּ is so frequently coupled, specially in Deut.; and the variant may have been suggested by Is. i. 23.

31. ἐπεκρότησαν ταῖς χερσίν αὐτῶν. The ὃ of the verb (Ν* ἐπεκρότησαν) is evidently a slip for α. (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. (ἐπεκρότουν ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν) the same error appears. So Vulg. applaudebant, and SH. Symm. has a different verb (συνεπικρότησαν αὐτοῖς). Theod.'s rendering (συνήμνουν 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 ἐπεκρότ., making O' to have read ἐκρότ., and relegating ἐκρότ. to a parenthesis.

κεί. None of the Gk versions except Aq. (ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν) seem to have got hold of the exact sense of the Heb. expression לָעַל רֹאִים, 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 a to o (see preceding note) originated.

vi. 1. θ. ἑαυτοῦ. ἑνσχύσατε, taking the root to be ἱσσυ, 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 ἱσσυ, 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 ὁμοθήτε.

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. ἔνεται. γενέται. O' read ῶνεται, joining it with the preceding verse. Wo. apparently considers (contrary to his general principles) that the γενέται had no corresponding Heb. in O'"s text.

---

1 [in xi. 15 was evidently read in O' (διάφωσα) ὰνέφη from ἱσσυ, not, as Wo., ἕνεται.]
and that נֵלָהּ was the original of their ἀφαίρεθη-
σεται.

γ bis. καὶ ἀφαίρεθησεται τὸ
ὑπὸς σου. ἢ must have been a sufficiently
familiar root to O', as it occurs Deut. xcviii. 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. ἀφαίρεω), נִמַּנְעַה. In
the second word O', taking ῥ for ῳ, probably read
רְפָתָה.

3. ḫ. τῇ χειρὶ (ἢ τῇ χεῖρᾳ) αὐτοῦ
(A αὐτῶν). In almost all the places where ἥ means
locus, Numb. ii. 17 (in Deut. xcviii. 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. ἔκλειπονοιν, 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 ἡμέρας (so Blinik) 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. ἡμέρα. 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. ἀμφότερα (so in xvii. 27, xlix. 27 [xxx. 16], where comp. the inconsistent treatment of the two in Wo.'s Conspectus), ἀντρον, βάρις, βασιλείαν, γῆ (see on ix. 20), θεμέλιον, ναός, ὅλκοι, πόλεις, πυργόβαρις, χώρα. Three only of these (βάρις, βασιλείαν, πυργόβαρις) can on Wo.'s principles be taken as a rendering of 'דוע, 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's treatment of the passages where 'דוע 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 הָרִים (see on iii. 17). It is true that the word θεμέλιον (θεμέλια) is used in several cases to render דוע or מַלְאָך, 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); ὅπως ὁ θεμέλιον 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 'אราม. In all four occurrences in this Book Aq. Symm. render by βάρις.

6. om. a. יְהוָה צְבָאֹת. Κύριος. (Q adds τῶν δυνάμεων.)

e. נַקְרָת. ἐκκοψου (Q -ψατε), suggesting that in O's copy it was written without the mater lectionis.

e. נַקְרָת. τὰ ἔξωθα (Q θεμέλια) αὐτῆς, reading the word as though it were the ἧλέα of Deut. xx. 19.

δ. ἐκχεον, probably recensional. At any rate there is no apparent reason why O' should have omitted the conjunction.

ε. 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. ψευδῆς. 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 ψευδῆς. Whether this variant actually existed in their time or not, Aq. seems to have found it.
He has ἀδικος, a frequent rendering of ἀλίκος by O' themselves in J. and elsewhere. Symm. on the other hand (τὴν πόλει τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς) testifies to our present M.T. in some shape.

7. βάθρος περί (βορ' c') πληθύν. ὁς ψέχει λάκκος ὑδωρ (Q adds αὐτοῦ). The Heb. root is either (a) ק'פ, 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) ק'ר, 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 lacu...in Hebraico bor dicitur," thus giving no indication of the existence of the K'ri. The latter (which occurs nowhere else) may be intended to mean בֵּית, a well, fountain, and to indicate that the Mass. adopted the Rabbinic view; viz. that which makes the root ק'פ to have the sense of pouring forth, this interpretation certainly making the point of the comparison plainer.

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

8. ξ. ἀπόστη, 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. עַבָּדוּ. O' vacat (Q τῶν διν.). See on ii. 22.

γ. דַלְלָלָל. קַלַּמַּמְּסָה, קַלַּמַּמְּסָה (דַלְלָלָל). Comp. for this verb as rendering י' Jud. xx. 45.

ξ i. ἐπιστρέψατε.

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

11. η. ἦπερ ιφθά. τὸν θυμόν μου. See on ii. 2, 3.

ξ i. καὶ ἐπέσχον καὶ οὐ συνετέλεσα αὐτούς, a very loose translation of M.T. 'Ἐπ. has the same sense as in Gen. viii. 10 etc. (so Acts xix. 22).

ξ i. ἐκχεῖ. The Heb. imperative is harsh. Our R.V. however has gone back to it.

om. a. אֵל. επὶ 2°.

גֹּאָרָי. νεανισκών. The fact that Aq. Theod. seem (see Field's note) to have had πονηρευομένων (וְרָמִים) would point to an early corruption, and possibly the original expression is lost.
12. (η.) καὶ αἱ (κ ομ. αἱ) γυναῖκες αὐτῶν. Wo.'s (ἡ γυναῖκα is an obvious slip) is quite uncalled for.

13. ξι. συνετελέσαντο (ΑQ -σαν) ἄνομα (Q τὰ ἄν.). A close parallel for this free rendering is found in Prov. i. 19 (ῥήματα πάντων τῶν συνετελοῦντων τὰ ἄνομα). Comp. Is. xxxiii. 15 (ἀνομία).

om. a bis and β b and a b. απὸ ἱερέως (ΑQ ins. καὶ) ἕως ψευδοπροφήτου. 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. \( \Psi e\nu\deltao(\pi\rho.) \) is Midrashic; so on eight other occasions in this Book, once only (Zech. xiii. 2) elsewhere.

14. \( \text{O' vacat.} \) Symm. has \( \tau\heta\varsigma \theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\rho\omicron\sigma \), but the best Heb. Editions omit\(^1\). The word is obviously an insertion from the parallel passage, viii. 11 (where \( \text{O' vacat} \)).

\( \hbar\lambda\nu\tau\nu \). \( \epsilon\zeta\omicron\nu\theta\ebo\nu\upsilon\tau\omicron\varepsilon, \) making light of [it], an excellent rendering. From Aq.'s \( \epsilon\nu' \alpha\tau\mu\iota\iota \) (especially if compared with Symm.'s \( \mu\epsilon\tau' \varepsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\lambda\iota\alpha\varsigma \)), 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 O', which, as the standard Version of Greek-speaking Christians, could not fail to be viewed with prejudice by a follower of R. Akiba.

γ. \( \pi\omicron\upsilon. \) Not a free translation; nor yet, as suggested by Spohn\(^1\), a sign that they read \( \zeta\nu\lambda\nu \), but the rendering of \( \zeta\nu \), to which \( \Pi\omicron\upsilon \) corresponds in i S. x. 14 (so to \( \zeta\nu\lambda\nu \) in Jer. xv. 2).

15. \( \xi \iota. \) \( \varepsilon\xi\epsilon\lambda\iota\pi\omicron\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu \). 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. רבד. τὴν ἀτιμίαν αὐτῶν, reading ἠρηλ as ὠμα, which is thus rendered by O' in iii. 25, xx. 11, li. [xxviii.] 51.

e. ἀπολογίας. ἐν τῇ πτώσει αὐτῶν (Τούτος). Comp. Ἀρηλ, πτώσεως αὐτῶν in xl. 21 [xxix. 22].

ζ. ἠρηλ. ἐπισκόπησ, a free rendering, unless we take the reading of AQ, ἐπ. αὐτῶν (Τῶν), and so explain on the analogy of the two previous cases. The αὐτῶν however may better be considered as inserted from the parallel passage x. 15.

ζ. ἠρηλ. ἀπολογιαται. ἀσθενέω is the verb used in v. 21 and five other places in J. as renderings of 'ה. This therefore seems to point to some early Heb. variant, which may be connected with the ἀπολογιαται occurring in v. 21.

16. α β bis and v. Not only are O's insertions of Κυρίου and καὶ ἴδετε Midrashic, but their translation of מְשֶׁח by ἀγνισμὸν (A ἀγιασμὸν) is of the same character. The kindred מְשֶׁח of Is. xxviii. 12 is there rendered by them ἀνάπταυμα;
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 יָרֶן 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. ηκουσαν (شعب). ηκουσαν (شعب).

γ. καὶ οἱ ποιμαίνοντες (וותך). καὶ οἱ ποιμαίνοντες (וותך).

γ. ἡ ημέρα ἀντιστράφησθαι, τὰ ποιμυνα ἀντῶν, reading (for ἡ ἡμέρα ἀντιστράφησθαι, τὰ ποιμυνα ἀντῶν, a pl. however not found elsewhere. They render ἡ ἡμέρα 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 בְּהַנְפָּת 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 αυτοῖς.

19. γ. μαχαβάθαν μαχαβάθαν, ἀποστροφῆς ἀντῶν, and so in xviii. 12, reading in both places μαχαβάθαν μαχαβάθαν, 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 מְשׁאֵבָה has been something of a stumbling-block to them in this Book.
(iii. 6, 8, 11, 12, 22, xiv. 7), while 'ם has been accurately translated nine times.

τῶν λόγων μου. This strange construction seems to be a corruption of τῷ λόγῳ μου (ANQ), which is read by Compl. Ald. (so SH). A has τοῖς λόγοις μ.

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

20. (e) σῆμα, φέρετε, reading ἃθιμ, and perhaps using for this purpose the ἢ which follows; or φ. may be a corruption (easy in uncials) for φέρεις (Ἀθιμ), which agrees with Pesh. and Vulg.

21. Καὶ ἀποσαντον (ΑQ add ἐν αὐτῷ), freely.

ἀποκολουθείται (Ἀβρων). Καὶ ἀποκολουθείται (Ἀβρων).

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

22. Καὶ ἔθνη (Ἀ ἔθνος μέγα), followed by the verb in the sing., (but Q ἐγερθήσουνται). Aq. Symm. Theod. have (καὶ) ἔθνος μέγα καὶ βασιλείας 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 ν. β. π. alone to be the additional matter supplied by the Heb. The ἔθνη (BNQ) is probably a conjectural emendation of a scribe, consequent
upon a removal from his copy of μ. κ. β. π. unaccompanied by a correction of the following verb from pl. to sing. The passage is interesting, in exhibiting a M.T. partially revised (as containing ἄνω), 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.'

ξ i. μὴ ἰσόποτος τῆς γῆς, freely; but so always elsewhere (xxv. 32 [xxxii. 18], xxxi. 7 [xxxviii. 8], l. [xxvii.] 41).

23. ξ i. ἐἴριζον, lance. In l. [xxvii.] 42 ο' renders ἐγχειρίδιον. This is possibly an example of their being influenced by the sound of the Heb. word (reading however in that case ἦ for ἔ). See on ii. 32 for transpositions arising from the same cause.

e. ἀφετέρου. The mater lectionis at the end was absent.

ξ a. θύλα. φωνὴ αὐτοῦ, so as to harmonize with ἀφετέρου.

om. d. ἄνω. έφ'.

γ. ἰδέα παρατάσσεται, reading ἰδέα παρατάσσεται.

e. οὐ πῦρ (ἠσιτε). Similarly in l. [xxvii.] 42.
25. μὴ ἐκπορευέσθε (ἅπαξ Κ.), and similarly for the following verb.

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

27. 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 בר. 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 πολιορκουμένῳ. 'Ἐν λαοῖς (μου) συγκεκλεισμένοις is the reading found in MSS. 86, 88, 98 (so SH.), and ἐν λαῷ (μου) συγκεκλεισμένῳ in 22, 36, and others. Aq. διηρημένῳ, but perhaps διηρμένῳ (see Field's note). Vulg. has robustus. There is much to be said for the view, mentioned by Prof. Cheyne, that 'ם 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 ἡρεῖν, and rendered rather freely.
28. om. (a). שֵׂר יָמִים, αὐτόκοιλ. αὐτ. is used to render מֶלֶך in v. 23. In the face of such expressions as נַחַל נַהַשׁ (Ex. xxix. 37 etc.), נַחַל נַהַשׁ (Lev. xxii. 22 etc.), נַחַל נַהַשׁ (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 שֵׂר to have been absent, rightly or wrongly, from their original. 21 Heb. mss. have שֵׂר, supported by Targ. (רבְּרָבְרָב), Pesh. ( tłum), Vulg. (principes). So Aq. ἀρχοντες.

29. εἰς τὸν ἐξελιπτέν (A ἐξελιπτέν), a free rendering of Niph. of הָרָה, to burn. A parallel occurs in Ezek. xv. 4. In the next clause ἐξελιπτέν (A ἐξελιπτέν) renders ἢ. Obs. the identity of the Gk rendering of different Heb. verbs in the immediate context.

om. a and γ. γενναῖον αὐτῶν ποιηρία αὐτῶν
οὐκ ἐτάκη (Q -κησαν), reading ἔσσεται αὐτῶν.

30. ε. ἁρπάζατε (ἁρπα).

vii. 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. יֵעַרְוֹר...קרא. O' vacat. The Heb. was suggested by the words which (in xxvi. 2) introduce what is at any rate a similar prophecy. The יֵעַרְוֹר here, as opposed to the יֵעַרְוֹר 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. יֵעַרְוֹר...קרא. 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. יֵעַרְוֹר. O' vacat (Q τῶν δυν.). See on ii. 22.

אָנַחְנוּ הַאֲחָלָה. καὶ (A ins. οὐ) κατοικῶν ὑμᾶς.
Aq., deviating from M.T., has καὶ σκηνῶσιν (ἀκατοικόν) σου ὑμῖν.

4. a a. יֵעַרְוֹר. O' (or a copyist) added ὅτι τὸ παράπαν οὐκ ὧφελήσονσιν ὑμᾶς, suggested by the last words of v. 8.

om. a. יֵעַרְוֹר 3°. O' vacat.
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4. ἔστιν, a loose translation. Comp. 2 Chr. viii. 11, where 'י, referring, as here, to a building or group of buildings, is similarly rendered.

7. λαός ἡ γῆ πρὸς τοὺς λαοὺς. εἰ αἰῶνος καὶ ἐκς αἰῶνος. The exact Heb. expression is not found elsewhere. The nearest approach is in Ps. ciii. [cii.] 17, where, as here, O' brings out that it is a parte ante, as well as a parte post.

8. κ. ἔστιν (Q* adds καὶ), reading ἔστι; and taking it in the Aramaic sense. Spohn's view (l.c. i. 114), that εἱ ἐστὶ is a corruption of ἱδοὺ, is less good.

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

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

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

om. (a). βεβαίω ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ (A om.).

θ. 'Απεσχήμεθα, taking it as ἔστι. This verb occurs in Niph. in Ezek. xlii. 6. The root would be known to O' 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 Ν (if they read the same consonants in their text as we do) would probably not give them much trouble. Although they did not recognise יִנְאַנְאִית in ii. 36 (see note there) as a case of the kind, yet in xxii. 23 their rendering (καταστευάξεις) of what M.T. gives as יִנְאַנְאִית can only be explained by their reading it יִנְאַנְאִית = יִנְאַנְאִית.


§ 1. הָיָה. ὁ οἰκός μου, freely.

a a. יִנְאַנְאִית. εἶν' αὐτῷ (Ν* αὐτῶν) εκεῖ. The last word is probably suggested by such passages as 1 K. viii. 16, 29.


om. a. נִאָסְיַדוּרְיָה. O' vacat. 'י, coupled with another infin., is frequent in J. In v. 25, xxv. 3, 4, xxvi. [xxxiii.] 5, xxxii. [xxxix.] 33, xxxv. [xlii.] 14, xliv. [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'.

a d. οὐκούσατε μου.

14. ἐσθίων. καὶ ποιήσω; but AQ τοιννν καγώ π.
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τῷ ὁίκῳ; but A τῷ τόπῳ τοῦτον, freely.

15. om. (a). ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν.

16. Ξ. i. καὶ μὴ ἀξιόν τοῦ ἐλεηθῆναι αὐτούς, καὶ μὴ εὐχοῦ καὶ μὴ προσέλθῃ μοι περὶ αὐτῶν (A om. καὶ μὴ εὐχ... αὐτῶν) freely. The rendering on the later occurrence of the first clause (xi. 14) is closer (καὶ μὴ ἀ. περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν δεήσει καὶ προσευχῆ). om. a. O' vacat.

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

ζ (b). τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, the other Gk Versions τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. But in xliv. [li.] 17, 18, 19, 25 'ס (with note 'א) is rendered τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ οὐ. and so Symm. and presumably the others. Stade (Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wiss. 1886, pp. 123-132), holding that the context proves 'שה 'ס 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 'שה ל. He considers however that מְלָכָה (מְלָכָה 'מלכה) 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 in-
clines to the belief that הַלּוּלִּים was the original word, altered as ‘eine euphemistische Correctur’ to the
synonymous expression דַּלָּלִים, with הַ לּo inserted in xliv. according to the requirements of the later
and stricter orthography. He considers that this
use of הַ לּ as synonymous with הַ לּ arose from the
Rabb. exegesis of Gen. ii. 1, 2 (ךְלִיאֶלְעָתָה לָכֵּם).
He holds that the יא 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). More-
over on this later hypothesis the unanimity of the
other Gk Versions in יא ᾿σαρ. remains obscure.
Kuenen (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Bibl. Wis-
senschaft, übersetzt von K. Budde, Freiburg in B.
und Leipzig, 1894*) controverts Stade, and main-
tains the sense ‘queen of heaven.’

καὶ ἐσπεισαν. A has καὶ σπεισαν.
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

20. *om. (a).* Κύριος. See on
ii. 22.

ξ i. πᾶν ξύλον, freely.
a tolerably clear case of free rendering, as the presence of the article prevents us from conjecturing that O' read \( \text{γράμματα} \).

A differs from M.T., having \( \text{kai } \epsilon\pi\iota \text{ πάντα} \) (so Q \( \text{πάντα} \)) \( \tau\alpha \text{ γενήματα} \) (this is the spelling in B\( \text{α} \) also) \( \text{αὐτής} \), and at end of \text{v}. introduces from iv. 4 or xxii. 12 \( \text{kai } \omega\nu\iota \text{ ἔσται } \delta\sigmaβ\epsilon\sigma\omega\nu \). This however may represent a variant on M.T. here, as several of Kenn. and de Rossi's mss. have \( \text{σβέσων} \).

21. om. \( \text{α} \). ' \( \text{αὐτής} \). O' vacat.

22. \( \text{κρέα} \), freely.

23. \( \text{ἐν πάσαις} \) (Q om. \( \text{πάσης} \)) \( \tau\alpha\iota \text{ ὁδοῖς} \) \( \text{μου} \), freely.

24. a d. \( \text{ηκουσάν} \) (AQ \( \text{εἰσήκα} \)) \( \text{μου} \).

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

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

27. om. (a). ἐξακμέλεται (28) ἀλλαθείς. 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 ἀλλαθείς on the part of the translator.

om. a. ἱὼν ἀλλαθείς. Kupiou; Q adds τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν.

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

29. δ. σέβας. χειλέως. See on iii. 2, 21.
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γ. ὑπάρχω. τὴν ποιοῦσαν (Q ποιήσασαν) ταῦτα, reading ἥ for ἦ.

31. ε. βομον. The number may easily have been ambiguous from omission of 1. The Targ. also, as Wo. points out, took it as sing., but Aq. Symm. as pl.

α δ. ἐντειλάμην αὐτοῖς.

ξ i. ἀλλά ἠλπίζατε ἵνα λήφητε. καὶ οὐ (A οὐδὲ, without καὶ) διενοθήσετε 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], ὅ ἐὰν ἀναβῇ (B has λάβῃ) ἐπὶ καρδίαν κ.τ.λ. Comp. ἀνέβη λας in viii. 22.

32. ξ i or ε. οὐκ ἐροῦσων ἔτι, either reading μίν, 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. ὁρᾶμα. τῶν ἀνυμημένων, a free rendering.

ἐν τῷ Ταφέθ, but A ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Ταφέθ.

μετὰ μικρὸν, διὰ τὸ μὴ υπάρχειν τόπον, from want of room elsewhere. This is more accurate than A.V. (with which agrees text of R.V.).

33. γελά. οἱ νεκροὶ. So in xix. 7, but xxxiv.

[xli.] 20 has τὰ θυσιμαία.
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) לֹא וּבָטַלְתָו is not represented in O'; and so for (iii) לֹא רֵבִרְבֵּית (a few Gk mss. and SH. read it); while (iv) a different translator's hand is suggested by the fact that there לֹא וּבָטַלְתָו and לֹא תּו (see on ii. 23) are translated respectively διάπτωσις (but not so ms. 88, SH.) and πολνάνδριον (bis; so ms. 88, SH.), at which St Jer. records his surprise.

34. a d. מַעְרָא. פַּאָם הַיְּה. So four mss. cited by Kenn. and one more by de Rossi.

viii. 1. מַעְרָא. מֵדָא שָנְעֵנ. against 'נָשָׁה.

2. מַעְרָא. קָאֵי יִשּׁוּעַ. For this sense of יִשּׁוּעַ, *to spread out to dry in the open air*, see 2 S. [2 K.] xvii. 19, and comp. יִשְׁמֹרֵא in Numb. xi.

32. a d. מַעְרָא. O' adds קָאֵי פָּרָס פָּנָתָא; קָאֵי יִשּׁוּעַ. a loose translation. The same Heb. root in xxxviii. [xliv.] 4 corresponds to χρησιμολογεῖ. Here Wo. makes O' read בֵּית נֶבֶק; there by a still more violent substitution נֶבֶק.
xi.  

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 (יוֹדֶה). 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.

(βα and) μ. έλαμ, apparently euphemistic (Wo. suggests בִּן, 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 εἰς κόπτρα.

3. γ. ὅτι εἰλοντο (Ἀ Λαυ). The literalness of the translation in the case of the following words (καὶ πᾶσι κ.τ.λ.) makes it probable that the same is the case here, and that O read ιν περα. Conversely in xxxvii. [xliv.] 16 O’ (καὶ ἡλθον) has preserved the right reading, where M.T. has ἐπὶ πέρα. See further in Dr Driver’s note on 1 S. ii. 21.

ομ. α. Ηράσ. O’ vacat.
**om. a. [**om. a.**]**

1. ev παντὶ τοῦ ἕλεγχος, freely. 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. ἔλεγχος 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 'ב, but masc. in 'פ.

2. O' vacat. From SH. however it would appear that of the five Heb. words now unrepresented originally found a place in O'. Kai ἐπεὶς might easily be omitted by confusion with the immediately preceding ἐκεῖ, 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.

3. [**om. a.**]...מַגְּלָה (4). O' vacat. Perhaps the Heb. was indistinct.

4. ἞ρπαζεν οὖν ἡ πλήρης ἀνίσταται; perhaps the Heb. was indistinct.

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

The notion of perpetuity
belonging to the root (comp. לָוכֶה, eis τέλος in Pss. passim) is well expressed here by O's rendering (Ct. iii. 5 for rendering of לָוכֶה). On the contrary Aq. Symm. (φιλόνεικον) and St Jer. (contentiosa) all translate as though the root were לָול, 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.? 

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

ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει (αὐτῶν). So in xiv. 14 (ἢ), 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 ה—, 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, ἰδία. 

ἐνωτίσασθε ὅτι καὶ ἀκούσατε. By much slighter changes in M.T. than those which Wo. proposes (הָבְשִׁבָךְ, N. דִּבְשֵׁשַׁע) 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 \( \text{אָשֶׁר} \). Wo.'s comment on the passage (p. 138) is far from convincing.

8. \( \nu \chi \nu \tau \circ \) (a rendering of M.T. which Wo. defends. See preceding note). Comp. xxiii. 10 (where, in order to maintain this rendering of \( \text{בֵּית} \), they were obliged to omit the negative particle) and xlviii. [xxxii.] 30: so in 2 K. [4 K.] vii. 9, xvii. 9; Is. xvi. 6. In Prov. xv. 7 on the other hand we have \( \nu \chi \) \( \alpha \varsigma \phi \alpha \alpha \varepsilon \zeta \) (καρδίας). Here the Targ. (ברטש) and Pesh. (חָנָא) give the correct sense.

5 i and e. \( \text{בֵּית} \) \( \text{אֶל} \). διελιπεν (reading \( \text{בֵּית} \)) \( \text{τρέχων} \), a free rendering.

γ. \( \text{בֵּית} \) \( \text{אֶל} \). \( \epsilon \nu \chi \rho \varepsilon \mu \sigma \mu \) (\( \text{αὐτοῦ} \)), reading \( \text{μετάφηλα} \). This is so rendered v. 16, xiii. 27.

7. 8. \( \eta \) \( \text{σίδα} \), a transliteration (comp. \( \chi αυνός \) in vii. 18). So in Job xxxix. 13, whereas Deut. xiv. 18 [17] has \( \text{πελεκάνα} \), Zech. v. 9 \( \epsilon \pi \omega \rho \pi \sigma \), Ps. civ. [ciii.] 17 \( \epsilon \rho \omega \delta \iota \sigma \tau \nu \). 

e. \( \text{μαυρίνη} \). \( \tau \circ \nu \) \( \text{καιρῶν} \) \( \text{αὐτῆς} \). Kenn. cites three MSS. which omit \( \text{τροπία} \), to which de Rossi adds one, and two more pr. manu.

a c. \( \text{ἐλιμ} \) (\( \text{μεθ} \) \( \text{εἴρη} \)). \( \kappa \alpha \iota \chi \varepsilon \lambda \iota \delta \alpha \nu \) \( \alpha \gamma ρού \),
στροφδία. These names of birds were evidently not familiar to O', whose addition of ἄγ. to χελ hardly (with Wo.) points to an identification of it with the י נ of Ps. I. [xxix.] 11, but is rather the result of conflation, the transliteration ἄγουρ being corrupted into the present form. The second conjunction has probably been lost in the process of corruption.

7. η διάφορα. τὰ κρύματα, reading ἐπεστείλα, the more readily because of the ἦ ("") which follows.

8. om. a. O' vacat. 'Ν may well be a marginal gloss on the first part of the verse, and η an insertion suggested by the ἐγεῖς of the next verse.


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

13. d and e. ομοιοί ποιός, (καὶ) συνάξουν τὰ γενήματα αὐτῶν. O' read ποιός ἐμθανέ, refusing to recognise the play on the roots ἐμθανέ in Kal and ἐμθανέ in Hiph., but making the second word a substantive known to them from Ex. xxiii. 16 (συντελείας), xxxiv. 22 (συναγωγής). Comp. ἐμθανέ (συναγωγής), Is. xxiv. 22. As for the καὶ, a ı may
have been suggested by an abbreviation of the previous word ("‘")

*om. (a).* יִתְנָה לֵחַם יִשְׂרָאֵל. 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 י with Sh'va. Adopting this punctuation, I
would conjecture the clause to have read thus
לָא יִתְנָה לֵחַם יִשְׂרָאֵל. The corruption of ‘י into its
present form would lead to the subsequent omis-
sion of the negative. In the time of Aq. Theod.
the י seems to have been absent from the last
word. They render καὶ ἐδώκα αὐτοῖς καὶ παρῆλθεν
αὐτοὺς (τοὺς πολεμοῦτα).

14. γ. καὶ ἀπορισθῶμεν (AQ ἀπορρ.),
Aq. Symm. (καὶ συγκρίσωμεν) SH. apparently took
the word as the Mass., viz. as Kal, pointed in
the Aramaic form (comp. לָא in Lam. ii. 10).
On the other hand the Niph. (לָא; 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. ἀνεώμεθα. O' vacat.

om. a. ὁ θεὸς.

η. ἐναντίον (Q ἐνώπιον) αὐτοῦ ("ν read as "ν).

15. οὐκ (Aram. for ἡ, so xiv. 19). συννήχησαν, taking the root in the sense borne by Niph. in iii. 17 (συναχθοῦσανται).

δ. οὐκ. στούδη (but in xiv. 19 ταραχή).
Scholz (p. 89) suggests ἠλαθή. Perhaps this is a typographical error for ἠλαθη, inasmuch as the latter in xv. 8 (so Ps. lxxviii. [lxxvii.] 33) is rendered by στούδη.

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

δ. φωνήν ὑπένθησα. The Heb. word occurs elsewhere (and there in a masc. form) only in Job xxxix. 20, where O' has ἄπειθεν, perhaps connecting it with the Aram. יָהוּ (στῆθος in Dan. ii. 32). Here they apparently saw a substantive from the root דָּרַך. This is easier than to suppose
(with Wo.) that they identified the word with 

of Jud. v. 22. It would hardly have sug-
ggested ὄξι rather than some simpler expression
such as they employed there (σπούδη ἐσπευσαν).

a c. ἕππασιας ἱππῶν αὐτοῦ, a con-
flation 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;
I. [xxvii.] 11, ταῦροι).

e. ιὶβος ἤ κινει καὶ καταφάγεται.
The matres lect. apparently were absent.

17. d. θανατοῦντας, evidently a
loose rendering in the absence of more precise
knowledge. Accordingly O' varies on the other
occurrences of the word (Is. xi. 8 ἔκγονοι ἄπιδων,
lxx. 5 ἄπιδες; Prov. xxi. 32 κεραστής). Aq.
characteristically has in his 2nd ed. σκοπεῦντας
(or σκοπευτάς), the first two letters suggesting the
root νεέ, while in the 1st ed. he has βασιλισκοῦς.
Vulg. has regulos.

om. a. οὐκ ἔζην. O' vacat.

18. א.א. מְכַלִּינִית, 'Aviata, reading the Heb.
as two words מְכַלִּי נִתָה, and the verse as a part
of the sentence commenced in v. 17. The root
וֹרָה is used in a similar sense in Hos. v. 13, where
in the parallel clause to that containing it O' employs iασθαι. The Heb. here is אֲפַחֵלָהּ and is almost certainly the result of some early corruption. Five MSS. (see Kenn.) read מָלַל יִוָחִי and one מָלַל יִוָחִי; de Rossi adds thirteen more. So apparently Theod. ὅτι οὐκ ἐστιν ὁμοίως, connecting the latter word with ἑαυτῷ (xiii. 17) = מָלַל יִוָחִי. The Pesh. connected the word with מָלַל יִוָחִי and מָלַל יִוָחִי (םָלַל יִוָחִי). On the other hand from the sense of מָלַל יִוָחִי, to be joyful (Ps. xxxix. 14), we have the renderings of Aq. τέρψις or ἑλαρότης and of Symm. ἐμπαίζεις μοι.

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

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

βασιλεύς (Ο* ἰατρός). 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. (םָלַל יִוָחִי) agrees with M.T.
20. **β a.** ἑρὸς... The word generally corresponds to the second of these and ἀμφοτερος 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.** Ω vacat. Apparently an accidental omission. Συνετριβην is found in MSS. 22, 36, and others, and SH. agrees.

a. **c.** ἀπορία κατεχευόμενη (22) ἡ ἀπορία κατεχευόμενη με αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τιτωνοῦσα, (22) μὴ ἢτινη. O' combines the blunder and the correction. ἡ ἦν was first read in the sense which ἡ ἦν bears in l. [xxvii.] 43 (ἡλέχη; in xlix. 24 [xxx. 13] the l. word is lacking in O'), and afterwards corrected (in marg.) in accordance with the rendering of ἢτιν in xlvi. [xxvi.] 11, li. [xxviii.] 8 (ἡτινη), and so finally incorporated in the text.

22. **δὲπη δεὶσις, a Hebraism.** Comp. on vii. 31. So Hiph. of ἦλεξι is represented by ἐνέχειν in xxx. [xxxvii.] 17, xxxviii. [xl.] 6.

23 [Gk and A.V. ix. 1]. **a b.** ἄναβας. O' adds τον λαὸν μου τοῦτον.

ix. 1 [2]. **β b and e.** ἔσχατον, reading ἔσχατον (as pl. of ἔσχατον), back regions. Comp. O"s
mistake in Job viii. 13, where जिये is rendered तद एतकाता.

2 [3]. § i. μησθή. ὡς τόξον (A τόξος), freely.

§ i. Δεικνύειν οὖν τὰς λαμβανόμενα ἰδιώματα. Φθυδόι καὶ οὖ πίστις ἐνίσχυσεν. Ο' thus (i) stops the verse differently from M.T., (ii) omits the of ἡλασσω, which very probably was an accidental insertion in the Heb. induced by the neighbouring juxtaposition of ἦ and ά, (iii) perhaps found ἐνμ (βαρ) and read it as sing. From (ii) it follows that ἦ and ά are to be connected in sense with the preceding, not the following, words.

om. a. Ιησους. Ο' vacat (Q φησιν Κύριος).

3 [4]. § i. Φλάρ. αδελφῶις αὐτῶν (A αὐτῶν), freely.

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

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

4 [5] and 5 [6]. § i and § and e. Φλαρ. καὶ οὖ διέληπον τοῦ ἐπιστρέψατ. (6) τόκος ἐπὶ τόκῳ. Scholz (p. 90) supposes that O' read ι as ἦ and supplied 'das gewöhnlich nicht geschriebene ά' (thus reading जिये जिये). Or they may have understood a negative before ά. The next word
they divided, so as to read נַבְּרֵה הָוֹחַ, the
suggesting this as a parallel arrange-
ment. The ῥόκος ἐν τῷ ῥόκῳ 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. Ναμον βολη. O' vacat (Q &νιν
Κύριος).

6 [7]. om. a. βολη ηπαιναια. Κύριος (Q adds
των δυν.).

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

(a d.) Χρα. O’ adds πονηπιας (K substituting
της). 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
ἡσο in vii. 12, it is probable that they would have
used the κακια, which had been employed there,
while π. points to an independent rendering.

7 [8]. ε. 'ἡμετίνης νωρικόντες, reading
with 'ἡμετίνης νωρικόντες. The Mass. emendation is not a
happy one. The pass. ptcp. can only be explained
sharpened (identifying with Aram. κακια; so Targ.

8—2
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1. like an arrow that is sharpened,
and so Pesh. מְתַנְנָה).

2. δόλια τὰ ρήματα τοῦ
στόματος αὐτῶν, a loose rendering, but, so far as
the division of clauses is concerned, more symme-
trical than M.T.

3. τὴν ἔχθραν. Wo.'s proposal
(דִּבְרֵי) seems quite needless, when we have בְּר
translated by ἔχθρος in 1 S. xxii. 8.

4. See the parallel
expressions in v. 9, 29.

5. ἔλαβε, apparently reading

om. c. קֶרֶי. 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.

6. τὰς τριβους. The word seems not
to have been familiar to O'. In xxv. 37 [xxxii. 23]
they render τὰ κατάλοιπα, if that be not a corrup-
tion. In xxiii. 10 however they have νομαί. We
may observe that ἔπη seems also to have been a
difficulty to them. Besides νομὴ as its rendering,
they have κατάλυμα, κατάλυσις, τόπος.

γ. ἔκθεσιν. This is generally ex-
plained as a confusion between \( \text{גָּלְתָּה} \) and \( \text{הַנַּעַם} \). 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 \( \text{לִבְרֹת} \), the Niph. of \( \text{לַמְחָה} \), to lay waste. It therefore seems not too much to conjecture that O’ read \( \text{ר} \) in the present case also. N.B. \( \text{לְלַחֲךָ} \) is correctly rendered by them in v. 11 [12].

om. c. ἀναγγείλατω. O’ vacat. Probably inserted from v. 11.

10 [11]. γ. Καὶ ἐις μετοκίαν, apparently reading it as \( \text{לִבְרֹת} \), which in xxiv. 5 is rendered \( \text{τοὺς ἀποκειόμενας} \). In li. [xxviii.] 37 they seem to have connected it with \( \text{לָלָה} \) (\( \text{ἀφανισμὸν} \)). It is remarkable that in 2 K. [4 K.] xix. 25 (οἰκείαι) they have been equally unsuccessful with this word.

11 [12]. ε. ἰδιός. λόγος (\( \text{όλος} \), \( \text{οἶκος} \)), reading ἰδιός. \( \text{ἀναγγεῖλατω} \) \( \text{ὑμῖν} \) (\( \text{ΑΟ} \) \( \text{ημῖν} \)), loosely.

12 [13]. a b. Ἰησώ. Κύριος, adding \( \text{πρὸς} \) \( \text{με} \).

om. c. \( \text{λόγος} \) ἢ \( \text{βῆκα} \). O’ vacat. M.T. was probably suggested by xxxii. 23.

13 [14]. δ. ἴσως. \( \text{τῶν ἀρεστῶν} \) (\( \text{Α ἐραστῶν} \)). See on iii. 17.
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14 [15]. om. a. ναηας. O' vacat (Q των δυν.).

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

γ. ἄνδρας. In the parallel passage (xxiii. 15) the rendering is ἄνοιγμα (A ἄνοιας), which word is used Job xxx. 16 to represent λόγος. It is therefore clear that in both passages of J. the θάνατος was ignored by O'.

15 [16]. ἐν ἐν τού ἐξανάλώσας (but ἐν ἐν τού ἐξανάλώσας) αυτῶς ἐν αὐτῷ. The last two words suggest an erroneous reading of the following ἐν ἐν (Α = ἐν) preceding its right rendering as τάδε.

16 [17]. om. a. ἥκουσα. O' vacat.

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

γ. ἀναπνεύσας...καὶ ἐκθέτωσαν (καὶ οὐκ αὐτὰ.)...καὶ φθεγμένοις. 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 v. Contrast the two imperatives ἔσθη and ἦλθα. We are thus pre-
pared to give favourable consideration to O', who seem to have read the Hiph. of יבתכלא, which is found Ps. cxix. 171, while φθ. is used to render Hiph. of this root in Ps. lxxviii. [lxxviii.] 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 זב would easily be substituted.

17 [18]. om. a. נתייראתה. O' vacat (but MSS. 22, 36 have και ταχυνάτωσαν).

לולא. φ' υμᾶς, but probably originally υμᾶς and altered for smoothness, and so for the two following suffixes, by a frequent change in MSS.

18 [19]. γ. בֵּיתוֹ. εν Σειών (NAQ Σε). For confusions of מ and ב in the MSS. used by O' see Driver, Samuel, Introd. p. xxv, and comp. pp. lxxv, lxviii.

6 a. ἀπερίψαμεν (NAQ ἀπερρ.), altering the person of the verb on account of the preceding סלע. SH. has 3rd sing. (understanding $ק$ as nom.) in text, and 1st pl. in marg.

19 [20]. 6 i. Ἰωάννης. θεοῦ (A Κυρίου), and so SH.

e. Ἰωάννης. τὰ ὅτα υμῶν (ἐνόμισε).

e. Ἰωάννης. λόγου (ἔρημος) στόματος αὐτοῦ.

οἶκων, but Ν. A have οἶκρῶν, while in
the previous verse BκA have oiktropou, although Q and some cursives (so Compl.) have there oiktrov.

20 [21]. 9. eis τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν. For 'א see on vi. 5, and for the 2nd p. pron. (bis) comp. v. 17 [18]. O' seem to have read ἓ for ἓ, and connected the word with κράτος.

21 [22]. om. a. οὲρ φην Καιρός. O' vacat, but MSS. 22, 36, and others have θαυμάζω, reading the Heb. as הוב (just as they deal with הוב 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 (סטמא) and the three words that follow. Prof. Cheyne's conjecture seems a happy one, that קְּרַב has been misplaced, and that it originally stood in the second clause of v. 20 [21], thus balancing הוב, 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 הָיְךָ לֹא is also unique in Jeremiah; (3) where our prophet does use the form הָיְךָ it is not at the beginning of a verse."

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

μ. ἐκ (ἈQ om. ἐκ) παράδειγμα. See on viii. 2.
CRITICAL NOTES.

a d. ἴδεν. τοῦ πεδίου τῆς γῆς ὑμῶν.


a d. μήπω. καὶ κρίμα. The Babylonian Jews read 'ל.

ξ i. θελημά μου, freely.

25 [26]. μ. ἴδον(ἸΔΟΝ την '18). The Targ. on this v. runs ἤλι Εµπίς ὑπὸ Ηρώδη. 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 'Ιουδαί, while SH. reads 'Ιουδαίαν). 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. ἵλιν. 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 ἱλιστέας βύς 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 ἰς in the literal sense could not be predicated of them. To any therefore who understood (as the Mass. appear to have done) ἱλιστέας 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), מִסְחָרָה (which appears also in the Targ. מִסְחָרָה) 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. § i. Χρῖον ὑπὸ ἐξελίσσεν (AQ add Χρῖος), freely.

2. § i. τὰς ὀδοὺς, freely, so as to harmonize better with the next clause.

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

καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων. αὐτὸ, though virtually identical in sense, has a noteworthy variant, θηρίων.

γ. λόγος ἐνεμέθη. αὐτὰ τὸν προσώπων αὐτῶν, reading άνάπηδρα ἐνεμέθη, perhaps owing to illegibility in the earlier word.

3. ε. 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 χώνευμα, as though reading is rendered χώνευμα in 1 K. vii. 16 [3 K. vii. 4]. For interchange of β and γ comp. iii. 15.

4. γ. ἐκεκαλλωπισμένα (NAQ add ἐστίν), reading (so Wo.) καὶ μὴν.

β β. ἐν σφύραις (hammers, used to render ἔσσεται in 1 [xxvii.] 23) καὶ ἡλκίς. 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 'ΣΩΜΑ 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 θησοντα 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. ὁ Ἰσραήλ. 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. ἀγαύριον τοπεύτων ἐστίν, 
οὐ πορεύονται, ἀγαύριον προσβλητόν (ὢ προβ. and 
adds ἐστίν) ἀπὸ Θαρσέλ (ἢ -σίς) ἰθεὶ. A conflate 
rendering, the earlier part representing a text in 
which παράθυρον 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. Ἀρβοῦ. 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 ποιῶν, ἔτοιμάζων, 
συνήσει, as against ποιήσας, ἀνορθώσας, φρονήσει 
here.

13. om. d. ἀυθαλής. 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 ἐθετο, 
rendering ἰδίων by ηχος instead of πλῆθος as here.
CRITICAL NOTES.

16. 1. has ἰχώνευσεν. τὰς γῆς. ἰχωνευσεν has ἰχωνευσεν. γ. ἰχώνευσεν. φῶς, an early error (from parallelism) for ἰχώνευσεν, which is in Compl. Ald. (this combines ἰχώνευσεν φῶς) with mss. Q, 22, 23, 36, and others, and so SH.

14. ἐχώνευσεν (AQ -σαν), while li. [xxviii.] 17 has -σαν (but there A -σεν). Probably -σαν (οὐκαί) 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. ἐνπεπαγμένα (AQ ἐμπ.). Aq. here has μεμωκημένα, vain, and so O' in li. [xxviii.] 18. MS. 233 has here the erroneous reading ἐνπεπαγμένα (and so SH.).

16. om. a. שִׁמְרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁנַה. O' vacat. שִׁמְרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁנַה, without 'ש', 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. 1xxiv. 2 the words שִׁמְרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁנַה 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 יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁנַה, 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 inde-
pendent character of the rendering (see on v. 12).

om. a. ἐξεθεν. O' vacat.

17. ἂν ἴσον, reading ἴσον, and
understanding it as ἴσον.

ς i. οὖν ἴσον. ἴσον. 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.

ἐὰν ἴσον. τὴν ἐπὶστασίν σου, probably ex-
pressing the sense fairly well; St Jer. less well
confusionem.

κατοικοῦσα (A pref. η).

(γ.) ἐν ἐκλεκτοῖς, as though reading

ἵσον (see xxii. 7, xlviii. [xxxii.] 15). So also
SH. Aq. has ἐν περιοχῇ, Symm. ἐν πολιορκίᾳ,
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) ἐκλ. as rendering of
that word.

18. ἦν ἴσον. σκελίζω (Aq. Symm. σφεν-
δονήσω). Prob. O' read ἦν for ἦν. The root ἴσον, to
be lame, though a somewhat rare one, must have
been known to them as occurring Gen. xxxii. 32
[31] (ἐπέσκαξεν). It is also found in the 1st ptp.
Kal in Mic. iv. 6, 7 (συντετριμένη), Zeph. iii. 19
(ἐκπεπιεσμένη). 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 רולה, costa, crus. St Jer. seems to have found a fut. tense in O', interpreting supplantabo.

om. d. יהוה תחתים. דוע משים. For omission of 'ב see following notes.

§ i. מeterangan לוה. εν θλιψει. 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 Qm, 22, 23, 26, and others (so SH.) to add kal εκθλιψεω αντον, while Compl. substitutes these words.

§ i. מראה יניא. ὅπως εὑρέθη ἡ πληγή 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 בקוש, accidentally omitted, it would seem, from the text of O's Heb. ms. (for the phrase יבשות נוחה 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 'ת (ס السبت), suggested as actually presenting itself to their eyes in the next v., and suitable for the meaning here also (see a somewhat similar case in notes on v. 20). Aq. Symm. have ὅπως ἔλεγχθωσιν, while the words ἡ πλ. σου are wanting in MSS. 23, 86, and in SH. and Compl. St Jer. renders (tribulabo cos) ut inveniantur.
19. om. c or \(\xi\) i. \(\text{ovai}\). \(\text{ovai}\) may easily be an insertion suggested by iv. 31, xv. 10, or xlvi. 3. O', if they found the second word at all, read it as though it were \(\text{ov}\); and so for the two possessive suffixes (\(\text{mēn, shēr}\)) 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, xlvi. 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 \(\text{ov}\) etc. as put by the Lord into the prophet's mouth.

γ. \(\text{to τραύμα σου (A om. σου; Q μου)}\). M.T. can scarcely be anything but a corruption of \(\text{ov}\). Aq. Symm. have \(\text{ἀρρώστημα μου, and so Targ., while St Jer. and SH. have the pron. of the 2nd p.}\)

γ. \(\text{kai katelαβεν σε (AQ με), as though}\)

20. \(\xi\) i. \(\text{σκηνὴ σου (Q μου)}\). See on v. 19.
a c. ἐταλαιπάρησεν, ὁλετο, a conflate rendering. Ταλ. has already on four occasions (iv. 13, 20 bis, ix. 18 [19]) represented the Heb. root, and occurs again (xii. 12). ὁλετο may have been placed in marg. by one who had in mind its use to render י in xlviii. [xxxvi.] 1, 15, 18, 20. xlix. [xxx.] 3, 10 [xxix. 11]. St Jer. gives no sign of being acquainted with the doublet.

κε has (for ὁλετο) φξετο, a verb which is used for י in Hos. x. 14.

8. ἰδερες σου (Q mom). 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 σχοινισματα. In the present case it was treated by them as =τηλευτατι, as suggested by the end of the v. See on v. 18 (last note).

γ. Θεονιχον αναθηναι και τα προβατα μου ουκ εισιν (reading ἄναθηνην).

γ. τῶς, reading ἀπ, which is rendered by τ. in xlix. 19 [xxix. 20].

ξ i. τῶς, τῶς. The ι may have been swallowed up by the previous ι, these two letters being very like each other in MSS.
21. οὐκ ἐνόησεν πᾶσα ἡ νομή, καὶ διεσκορπίσθησαν. The inaccuracy of rendering may have arisen from obscurity in the writing of the last words. On the other hand Scholz (p. 110) attributes it to an error of ear in dictation.

22. στροφόν. In ix. 10 [11], li. [xxviii.] 34 (τί ημερής) is translated by δράκων (so Theod. here), whereas in xlix. 33 [xxx. 11] it is represented as here by στρ. This last stands for πρεπήν (or 'πέν') in Lev. xi. 16 [15]; Deut. xiv. 15 [14], besides Is. xliii. 20; Job xxx. 29.

23. οὐδὲ 

24. e bis. παίδευσον ἡμᾶς, reading ἰδειω, and similarly in the last word of the v.

25. γενέως, but Q, 22, 23, 36, and others with Compl. and Ald. have βασιλείας (probably Midrashic).

om. d. ἄνελθε. O' vacat, doubtless rightly, 'ἀνελθαν being obviously superfluous and forming in connexion with the following word a case of διττογραφία in M.T.
xi. 2. ἀκούσατε...καλήσατε. 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 ἀκοῦσατε. The change of ἀκοῦσατε to the sing. (so Pesh. וַכֹּל) would be more natural than that O' and M.T. should conspire, in the case of 'י and 'ר respectively, in turning a sing. to a plural.

6. καὶ εἰσώθεν. So often, e.g. xliv. [li.] 6, 9, 17, 21; Aq. Theod. καὶ εἰν τοῖς εἴσωθεν.

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. 10—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 = xlii. [xxvi.] 27, 28, (7) xlvi. [xxxvi.] parts of 40, 41 = xlix. [xxix.] 22. (I have italicized the references where O' is

found. It may be added that xiii. 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. מָבוּחַת לָפֶשָׂ. O’ vacat; an obvious gloss. For comments on use of בֶּשֶׂ as a substitute for בְּנֵלֶ, 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. בְּנֵחָה 2°.  מַעַּשֶׂ (בְּנֵחָה, as at the end of v. 12 and in ii. 27, 28).

15. רֶדֶבָּה. מַעַּשֶׂ (רֶדֶבָּה)…; but very possibly both M.T. and O’s original represent
corruptions of מַלְכִּים suggested (so Gi.) by Irenæus's words "non enim adipes et carnes pingues auferent a te injustitias tuas."

It is true that לָע 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 ל be objected to (but comp. for the loss of a letter such cases as vi. 19 מַחְשְׁבוֹת, ἀποστροφῆς αὐτῶν, xxii. 22 πορτ, τῶν φίλοντων σε, xlix. 9 [xxix. 10 ἐπιθήσουσι] we may conjecture that they saw the root ἡλ."16. O vacat. The word is rather suspicious. It does not suit its context, and may have originated in a conjecture for an obscurely written ἦν.

περιτομῆς; as though deriving from מָלַע. 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 רֹאֵל (τοῦ λόγου).

אֵעְפְּרוּת πָּרֶּפֶן אֵין אִינוּ (A εῦ αὐτή), μεγάλη ἡ θλίψις ἐπὶ σέ. Here, as in
the last case but one, conflation seems to have a hand in the reading of O'. Gi. suggests לְאָרֵץ נָעָלָה, as the text represented by the second clause of the Greek, while ἑν. πῦρ entered the text later as a correction.

19. ἄναθήσῃ. λογισμόν, adding πονηρόν (Q om. που.; A adds κατά σου), λέγοντες Δέητε καί. 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).

בַּנְשֹׂרֶה. ἐμβάλωμεν; probably reading בֵּנְשֹׂרֶה. For the loss of א comp. vi. 19, xlix. 9 [xxix. 10].

בֵּנְשֹׂרֶה, probably (so Cheyne ad loc. and others) an early corruption for בַּנְשֹׂרֶה. 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. ἀντίλειβι. τὸ δικαίῳμα μου; but in xx. 12 τὰ ἀπολογιματά μου.

22. ἄνθρωπις; oi 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 ἄνθρωπις 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. συνίσταται. τοὺς κατοικοῦντας; although in v. 21 τοὺς ἄνδρας.
xii. 3. ἤθεκα...λαμβάνει. O’ vacat; probably by an inadvertence, for the words are wanted for parallelism. ἤθεκα 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 ἀθροισον (pointing to the reading ἀθροισία, so translated xviii. 21), while διαστάω, διαρρήγγυμι and the like are elsewhere O’s renderings. So Targ. (אֵנָךְ) (אֵנָךְ), Pesh. (אֵנָךְ), and St Jer. (congrega).

4. καὶ πᾶς ὁ χόρτος 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’. ἀραθορίνια οὗτος ἡμῶν (אְרָחוֹרִינִי נְנָו). The change from M.T. would be a tempting one, but we can hardly decide with confidence.

5. παρασκευάζῃ (א -ג). The only other occurrence of παρασκευάζῃ in Taph’el is in xxii. 15, where O’ has παρασκευάζῃ. 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 בורא.

6. SH. ascribes to Symm. the rendering προσδοκάν. Doubtless (see Field) his real reading was προσδοκάν, as given in ms. 86 (and 88).
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\[ \text{ failed (in spite of success in iv. 5) to see the force of } \text{ and } \text{ Vulg. } \text{ from } \text{ arsit, given by SH. as Symm.'s interpretation of } \text{ was probably due (as pointed out by Bensly; see Field) to a confusion between } \text{ and } \text{ and } \text{. }

\[ \text{; deriving from Arabic roots. There is however no reason to doubt the ordinary rendering of the M.T. }

\[ \text{ (Hiph. of ) } \text{; taking it as } \text{. }

\[ \text{; reading } \text{, pass. ptcp. Targ. Pesh. Vulg. render as though } \text{ with the pl. subject of } \text{ understood. }

\[ \text{; thus dividing the } \text{ differently, and reading } \text{. }

\[ \text{. See on iii. 2. }

\[ \text{. See on iv. 13. }

\[ \text{... } \text{ (A } \text{)... } \text{. The pointing of M.T. is recommended on the whole by the context. The affix of } \text{, which forms the only objection, is probably an early corruption of the affix of the} \]
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 ἄναβε as imperative, as does O'.

οἱ κληροὶ αὐτῶν. O' read the root ἄναβε, 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 καυχήσεως ὕμων; reading μαθαίνετε, a word which O' renders thus on several occasions in Ezek. (xvi. 12, 17, 39, xxiii. 26, 42, xxiv. 25).

ἀπὸ ὀνειδισμοῦ ἐναντί. The two Heb. words they seem to have read ἤματηρ, and to have inserted ἢν to soften the harshness of the combination of this word with ἄναβε.

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

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

7. κατώρυξα (καὶ-αὐτό) αὐτό. This looks like a mistake (for κατέκρυψα) induced by the preceding ὀρυξα. SH. has in marg. σιδήρου?

9. 10. τὴν πολλὴν ταύτην.
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νβρων; taking the first word as part of v. 10, and reading (for בָּנֶא) אָבָנָא. 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, אֶלְכָּנָא later in v. 10 implying the existence of אָבָנָא.

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


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

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

17. ἡ στυφιζόμενη ὑμῶν (thus even Aq.); so later π. οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ 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. οὐ vacat. The verb occurs here only. This fact, emphasized by its absences from the similar passages in this context (where, as here, ἡ κρατεῖ, ὑμῖν, and ὑμῖν are combined) may have induced the omission.

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

O’ is probably right, the subst. in M.T. expressing the place of the head (as ἰνακασθινήμεν).
in Gen. xxviii. 11; 1 Sam. xix. 16, xxvi. 7), rather than the head itself.

19. "אָפֹן יאָבָן רְאֵהַי. Read, as in Am. i. 6, יָאָבָּה, the 'גָּזְּר' of M.T. arising from dittography of the ה of זְּרָה under the influence of the previous הָרָה.

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

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

21. "אָפֹן מָתָאָה (A μαθητας); thus giving the Aramaic sense of the root, found once (Prov. xxii. 25) in M.T.

25. "אָפֹן אָפֹתְּבֵּייוּ עַמָּס (מַרְזִק).

xiv. 3. "בְּךָה...בְּךָה. O' vacat; perhaps an amplification in M.T.; yet, if so, it is strange that so unusual a word as זְּרָה should occur. Thus it is more likely that the eye of the scribe passed accidentally from רַבְּךָ to בְּךָּחָ�רִיךְ.


6. "נָפָס. See on iii. 2.

7. οἴσασθείνα. ai ἁμαρτιάς ἡμῶν. See on vi. 19.

8. ὤς αὐτόχθων (ὁ βασιλεύς).

9. ἐπινοοῦν (ἵνα).

10. O vacat (Aq. Theod. καὶ ἐπισκέψεται ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν). The clauses στίκται...καὶ are found in Hos. viii. 13.

11. ὁ λόγος. 'O ὁ. See on i. 6.

12. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ; apparently suggested by v. 15.

13. γνωρίζεται. καὶ προσαρέσεις. See on viii. 5.

14. ὁρίζεται. Ἔν θανάτῳ νοσερῷ ἀποβανοῦνται καὶ ἐν λιμῷ συντελεσθήσονται. Aq. Theod. have (for the whole of the above) ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ λιμῷ τελευτήσονται. The first four words of O' are apparently taken from xvi. 4 (ἔσω ἡ γῆ ἡ ἀποκάλεσμα ἡμῶν), while, whether owing to their insertion or not, the Greek for ἐπιρέικτος, which is doubtless genuine, disappeared early.

15. καὶ ἐσονται (καὶ, easily corrupted in such a context).
17. επι (Q ἐπὶ τοὺς) ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν.
See on x. 19 for change of person.

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

18. ἴπευς 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 ὃ for δ (for ἴπευς see on ii. 18), taking the root in the sense of sinking (to the earth) in mourning garb.

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

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

ταραχή. 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 ἱβλη. It is remarkable on the other hand that the verb ἱβλη (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 ἱβλη.

xiv. 1. πρὸς αὐτοῖς. Spohn’s
conjecture \( (\text{ad loc.}) \) that the words \( τὸν \ λαὸν \ τοῦτον \) were removed from this place \( (\text{αὐτοὺς} \) 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 \( (\text{ liable to error}) \) 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

6. \( \text{καὶ οὐκέτι ἄνθρωπος αὐτῶν} \); reading \( \text{Νόμος} \) (\( \text{γνώμη} \)), perhaps from fear of anthropomorphism. The Vulg. is remarkably inaccurate, \textit{laboravi rogans}.

7. \( \lambda αύ μού \). Throughout the rest of the v. also the rendering of O’ is exceedingly loose.

8. \( τρόμων καὶ σπουδήν \). So in
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R.V. "anguish and terrors," correcting A.V. "terrors upon the city." For יָאֱשָׁר see on xlvii. 7, and for יָנִים on viii. 15.

10. יבֹּלֶת, יָפֶלֶת (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 φελησα, -σευ, the verb, which renders יָל in Deut. xv. 2; Is. xxiv. 2. Origen (in Jerem. Hom. xi. 3, § 3) says that the majority of the mss. have φελα, but the most accurate and most in accord with the Heb. φελα.

בָּלֶת (בָּלֶת, בָּלֶת) יָפֶל (Vulg. foeneravi, foeneravit). (So Baer and De- litzsch.) ἡ ἵσχυς μου ἐξελιπτεν ἐν τοῖς καταρωμένοις με. See viii. 6, xx. 7 for the unwillingness of O’ to put an affix to בָּלֶת. Here they read בָּלֶת, while for the nom. which they supply see next note. As regards בָּלֶת, a form so anomalous grammatically is extremely suspicious. Therefore we should probably read (with Gi.) בָּלֶת בָּלֶת בָּלֶת.

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

γένοιτο (γένοιτο). καταφθανόν- των αὐτῶν. We can scarcely determine O’s
reading of the word 'ם. נא ל-ל they probably took to be a strong asseveration. Vulg. has "si non reliquiae tuae (in bonum)," understanding the word as א-לא = 'ס-לא. So Targ. with Aq., but Pesh. has א-مص. The 'ב is doubtful in sense, or ו-ת-ת, or ו-ת-ת, I have been hostile to thee, from ו-ת-ת = ו-ת. There has probably been considerable corruption in the v. One of the two expressions introduced by ב-ת may well have stood earlier, while with O' ל-ת-ת comes immediately before ו-ת-ת.

12. ה-ת-ת. ei ηπωσθησεται; reading ι for ι. It is remarkable that the Vulg. Numquid foederabitur? is supported by Aq. (μη ἀρμόσει;), who thus would read the word ו-ת, fut. Niph. of ר-ת. O' evidently were hopelessly confused over the v. They omit one ו-ת, read apparently ו-ת (which in Numb. xvii. 3, 4 [xvi. 38, 39] they render περίθεμα) for ו-ת, and end the sentence with the first word of v. 13.


ו-ת. א-נדה-נמה. The parallel text preserves the genuine ו-ת (without ו-ת). The
early corruption of this word involved the prefixing of a negative; so Aq. Targ. Vulg. ("gratis").

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

The 3. 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
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. καὶ καταδοκλάτος. Here, as in xvii. 4, the ί 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 ηῷ should be used to correct ηῷ in the parallel v.

15. This. 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. Comp. 1 Sam. ii. 17. See Wo.’s somewhat
unconvincing defence (p. 259) of O’s rendering of this v.

17. ἀλλὰ εὑλαβοῦμην. It is noteworthy that while O’ also mistook this verb in xi. 15 (διαφεύξη), and li. [xxviii.] 39 (καρωθόων), they were more successful in l. [xxvii.] 11 (κατεκαυχάσθη).

18. οἱ λυποῦντες με (Ῥαβ). Comp. the rendering of this word in viii. 5.

στερεά. 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 in 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. εἰς παράδειγμα. See on viii. 2.

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

5. ὅταν. O’ vacat. The Heb. is clearly an addition by way of comment on the unusual expression Ἰнные Ἰнные.
7. ἐν τέθει αὐτῶν. The pron. which M.T. attaches to the next word points rather to the reading ἔν τέθει αὐτῶν, to the existence of which however the Vulg. ("lubenti") alone testifies.

8. εἰς παράκλησιν; thus rightly omitting the pronoun.

9. αὐτῶν; probably rightly. The corruption in the Heb. would be a natural result of that of ἔν τέθει in the previous clause.

12. τοῦ ἀρεστῶν (Ἀμαρσ.). See on iii. 17.

13. ὅμοιοι λίτλιτί. 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. φανερώθησαι μητρώμενοι. ο' vacat.

18. διὰ πᾶσας, but B\textsuperscript{b}NAQ
δυπλάς. 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 נָבֹא.

ἐπλημέλησαν, a very possible corruption for ἐπλησαν. See the latter verb in xix. 4.

19. Ὁ ποιεῖ (πικρί); 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 הָיוֹת of xvi. 21 to the same word in xvii. 5.

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

5. καὶ οὕτῳ σάρκα βραχίωνος αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῶν. This rendering indicates a

¹ Analecten zu. Text-critik d. A. T., Munich, 1895.
certain lack of intelligence. They read וּלְכָּל 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 εἰς αὐτὸν for the sake of the sense. Wo.'s defence of O's text (p. 87) is unsatisfactory.

8. 'פ אַלְאִי. φοβήθησεται; following 'פ אַלְאִי, and rightly, as the parallel אַלְאִי shews. 'פ is an adaptation to v. 6. So Vulg. *timebit.*

9. בֶּשֶׁךְ. βαθεία (α δόνθια; MSS. 22, 36, and others βαρεία). Vulg. has "pravum."

10. καὶ ἄνθρωπος. So in v. 16 and Is. xvii.

11. For another rendering see on xv. 18.

11. εφώνησεν πέρδικ; 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 אַלְאִי from the Heb. text.

12. O' *vacat,* owing probably to homoioteleuton. 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 (κ', ἀπαλλατισθείς) ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς γραφήσεως. We want just ἀπαλλατισθείς, and the Vulg. (Clem.) has indeed recedentes a te, but Cod. Amiat. omits a te. Ewald (quoted by Cor. p. 68) emends to ἀπαλλατισθείς, and continues ἀπαλλατισθείς, thus getting rid of an awkward figure, and at the same time improving the parallelism.

The omission of ὅδατος (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. οὐκ ἐκοπίασα κατακολούθῳ ὁπίσω σου. O’s Heb. seems to have been the same as ours. Puzzled however by 'אֶּתְרָה, 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 הַעָבָר, we improve the parallelism of the v. So Aq. Pesh. Aq. renders יִקְרָאָבָנָה (אָבָנָה).

17. φειδόμενός μου; taking it to be from the root הָוָה.

20. דְּנָנָה. O’ vacat, but אֶּתְרָה have דִּקְוָשָה.
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 εἰσφέρεω in v. 24. So here the Compl. has εἰσ-
φέρητε.

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

24. ἔδω εἰσακούσθητε (A ἀκούσ.; Q ἀκοῤῥ ἀκοῦσ.). The ἔδω, 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 which follows. It has been suggested by parallel passages (ii. 26, xxv. 18, xxxii. 32, xliiv. 17, 21), but has not been inserted in xiii. 13, xxii. 4.

26. καὶ θυσίαν καὶ θυμίαματα καὶ μίννα. The first two substantives give us a conflate rendering. י, although translated θυμ. 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. Māvva is meant as a transliteration of the Heb. (comp. viii. 7). St Jer. however (Comm. in loco) corrects the spelling to 

μαυδ. So here and in xli. [xlviii.] 5 MSS. 22, 33, and others.

27. ἀμφοδα. See on vi. 5.

xviii. 2. ἀκούσῃ. 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 ἀκοῦσῃτω, 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. ἐν ταῖς περαίν αὐτοῦ; reading, doubtless rightly. ἂν ὑμῖν 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 ἡμῖν, which however Baer and Del. (see their Adnot. crit. ad loc.) read, as above, ἡμῖν. 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. O' vacat. See on i. 10.

8. Ἀρνεῖται ἡμῖν. O' vacat. The clause was inserted for the sake of parallelism. So Gi.
12. ἀνδριουμεθα. See on ii. 25.

For comment on O's rendering see on vi. 19.

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 μαστοι (πέτρα), which Wo. (p. 261) renders "(Shall) protuberances (depart) from rocks?" an explanation however which appears to stagger even so uncompromising a defender of O's text. See Field for Aq. ἀπὸ στερεοῦ ἱκανοῦ (στρογγυλοῦ, the Almighty); Symm. πέτρας μαστῶν (so Pesh.). Cor.'s suggestions (p. 50) ἔφη and ἐγείρον are good. See his whole note.

13. μὴ ἐκκλίνει (ἐκκλίνη); reading ἐκκλίνη, a root found in this sense in Is. xix. 5.

14. Πεσσαὶ βαιῶς ἀνέμωφ φερόμενον. For Πεσσαὶ (supported by Aq. Symm. Pesh.) ἀνέμωφ (proud, occurring in xliii. 2) is one conjecture. Again in favour of considering O to have read Ι for τ is the fact that Πεσσαὶ is rendered similarly by them in Is. lix. 19. For the other
words they appear to have read תְבִלְיָהָה and תְבִלְיָהָה. Best of all however is Perles' view (l.c. p. 29) that O' read וְרָם and understood it as a contracted form of וְרָם. (He compares for a somewhat similar mistake Ps. xi. 6 מִי מֵאָה for מִי מֵאָה.) The Targ. accordingly here, as he points out, renders מֵאָה, translating in Ps. lxxvii. 18 by מֵאָה. See further in his note.

Cor. (p. 50) ventures to restore מֵאָה מֵאָה to מֵאָה פָּדָה. He compares for מֵאָה פָּדָה (the Mediterranean) Deut. xi. 24 and other passages, in all of which however the words have the article.

15. καὶ ἀσθενήσουσιν (יוֹכִּלְהָם). So Symm. omits the suffix, as well as Pesh. and Vulg. ("impingentes").

17. "אָלֶּחָא שְׁאֹבָה יָרָם בֵּיתָם אֲדוּרָם. 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 מֵאָה as Kal changed the construction of מֵאָה from an accus. case to an abl. of time and hence induced the prefixing of ב.
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. ἥν ἦν τοῦ δικαιώματός μου. The parallelism of the clauses supports O'. The first ' of ἦν may easily have arisen as an accidental addition to the preceding word.

20. ὡς συνελάλησαν ρήματα (deriving ἔ from ἔσι); a Midrashic rendering (for O's treatment of ἔσι 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 ἐκρυφᾶν 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 (ἐνεχείρησαν λόγον). Wo.'s defence of O' as it stands (p. 87) is quite inconclusive.

21. καὶ ἀθροίσαν αὐτῶν; as though it were ἄθροισαν. For this treatment of ἄ see on vii. 10, xliii. 2.
23. γενέσθω ἡ ἀσθένεια αὐτῶν; reading ἀποθέληται.

xix. 2. τὸ πολυάνθρωπον. See on ii. 23.

3. καὶ ἄνδρες Ἰουδα ᾄστη περιαγγελία. See on xvii. 20, while καὶ οἱ ἔστης...ταύτας was suggested by xvii. 20 or by xxii. 2. Conversely, for a similar insertion in M.T. comp. vii. 2 with note.

4. ἐπηλθεῖν. The conjunction has crept in, owing to ἀποθέληται 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 v. 5 and xxxii. [xxxix.] 35.

5. ἡ λάβη τῆς εἰρήνης. O' vacat. For 'ἡ λαβή xxxii. 35 has ἡ λάβη is not elsewhere used in reference to the worship of Molech. This fact supports O' here.

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

7. οὐδὲ διενοθησάται εν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. See on vii. 31.

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

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

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

'אָבָב וּמְב. O' vacat. The words are probably repeated from v. 7. The expression is a frequent one in this Book (xxi. 7, etc.).

11. אָבָב. See on iii. 22.

בָּאָבָב...אָב. O' vacat. The absence of connexion shews the clause to be an insertion borrowed in substance from vii. 32.

12. אָבָב. τοῦ δοθήναι. The 1 is an accidental repetition of the previous letter.

13. אָבָב. ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκάθαρσιῶν αὐτῶν. In M.T. ηῦ must refer *attributively* to ηο. But we want it as a predicate. If for this purpose we attach the η to the end of the previous word, thus reading, as in Is. xxx. 33, ἀπὸ τῶν, the objection remains that ηο 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 נָשָׂא (agreeing with טַקּוּם).

καὶ ἐσπειράων, reading, as in xxxii. [xxxix.] 29,

xx. 2. καὶ ἑπάταξεν αὐτῶν (ἅθει; comp. xxvi. 23).

οἰκον ἀποτεσταγμένον. According to Gi. O' read the word as though ἐφίσμεν. At any rate they connected the last part with the root מַה.

3. Ὁρία μεθάρα. O' vacat.

Μέτοικον; taking the other meaning of the root מָה. 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. ἔις μετοικίαν. See previous note.

καὶ σὲ καὶ πάντα Ἰούδα; reading (not the startling Heb. which J. F. Schleusner adopts from Cappellus כֹּל נַחֲל, but) הנָחֲל, the accidental repetition of the four letters bringing about the loss of one of the groups.
CRITICAL NOTES.

5. O' vacat. Aq. Symm. have the words.

6. O' vacat.

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

8. πικρό λόγο μου (πρ' χελάσομαι; taking the verb in the sense of πρ'.

μεθ' νοστή αδέρ 

και ταλαϊπωρίαν. See on iv. 13.

και χλευασμόν (κ εἰς χλεύασμα, ΑQ εἰς -μόν). So ΝΑ αRT in Ps. xliii. [xliii.] 14. 

is not found outside the two passages, 

(ἐμπανγμός) occurring Ezek. xxii. 4.

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

O' vacat.

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

μένον and so SH. A conflate rendering is given by MSS. 22, 36, and others, φλεγόμενον καὶ συνεχό-

μένον.
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1. πάντοθεν; as though from ἐκ.

2. καὶ οὗ δύναμαι φέρειν.

10. συναθροίζομένων. They seem to connect with the unused ἐπισυνάθρωμα, to bind, collect.

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

16. οἴδα. O' adds ἐν θυμῷ.

17. ἐν μῆτρα (AQ add μητρός). ב and מ were easily confused. See on iii. 4. See also xiv. 19 (אַחַר, απὸ Σιων), xvi. 4 (אַחַר, ἐν θανάτῳ),
xxv. 9 (καὶ ἐξερημόων αὑτοῦ), xxxviii. [xlvi.] 24 (ἐκ τῶν λόγων), xlvi. [xxvi.] 10 (ἀπὸ γης), 25 (Συμ., τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς), xlviii. [xxxii.] 32 (公报, ὡς κλαυθμόν), li. [xxviii.] 20 (ἄριος, ἐκ σοῦ), lli. 12 (ἄριο.)

18. ἡ ἄρην, ινα τῷ 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. ὄνομάται. O' vacat.

3. ἀρκοντας. O' adds βασιλέα Ἰουδα (Q om.); not so Targ. Vulg. SH. The Pesh. has simply ᾧ.

4. τινὶς ὀνομά. O' vacat, while Aq. Symm. Theod. have the words. Symm. has the words ὁ θρίψις ὑμῖν, which follow.

5. ἄρει ἂν μὴ. O' vacat. Aq. Symm. Theod. have the words.

8. ἄρην μὴ ἁρπάζει. 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 v. read without these additions, brings sufficiently near to ἀρεῖ to avoid any suspicious harshness.
5. κραταφ. But κεφ prefix(es υψηλά, and so text of SH. St Jer. (in Comm.) has “forti” but adds “sive excelso.” O’ renders by υψ. in Exod. vi. 1, xxxii. 11, but almost everywhere else has κρατ. or ἱσχυρὸς.

Ο’ vacat (AQ in fine καὶ παροργισµοῦ μεγάλου).

7. ἀναράδεστ. O’ om. 1. The omission makes the language to harmonize better with such passages as viii. 3, xxiv. 8.

ιβρ. νολ μ’ β’, 1. Ο’ vacat; an insertion from one of the following, xxvii. 36, xxxii. 28, xliv. 30 (in xxviii. 21 νόλ is probably a gloss).

νβρ. 2ο. Ο’ vacat; against the testimony of similar expressions, e.g. xix. 7.

καὶ κατακόψουσιν αὐτοῦς (τόθεν). Ου 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 οὰς νόλ, readings which are supported by xiii. 14. The corruption in the Heb. was obviously induced by reading ἰβρ., a change which itself arose from the intrusion of ιβρ νόλ. Ωα. See above.

9. νβρ. Ο’ vacat; a frequent insertion. See on xxxviii. [xlv.] 2.
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(2) 

eis σκύλα; adding καὶ ἔσσεται (ὃν) from xxxviii. [xlv.] 2.

10. ἀνατρέχω. O' vacat.

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

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

ἀναφή; reading ἀναφίατο. Comp. ix. 11 [12], xi. 16, xvii. 27, l. [xxvii.] 32.

Σοφ. O' vacat; an insertion from iv. 4, with which ἐρέα here agrees.

13. Χρ. The word has been very variously translated (Aq. 1st ed.? στερεά, 2nd ed. Τύρος, Symm. πέτρα, Theod. συνεχομένη), probably owing in part to the obscurity of the reference. In xviii. 14 O' seems to have had no difficulty in rendering by πέτρα.

ποιήσει; so Vulg. percutiet, taking it as Hiph. from ποιήσα allowing instead of Καλ from τάνα.

14. ἀναπή... ἀναπήθην. O' vacat.

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

2. καὶ ὁ οἶκος σου. Νεανίδης prefixes καὶ οἱ παῖς, and Q replaces ὁ οἶ by οἱ π. Thus π. was probably the original word, with οἱ 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 οἱ with that of xxvii. 11, 12.

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

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

6. κατοικηθεὶσσομένας (γίνομαι). Mich. conjectures ἄμαν, a bare floor (for ἄμαν) in support of ἄμαν.

7. καὶ ἐπάξω (A eiσ). Midrashic. 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 ἄμαν.

10. τὸν τεθνηκότα. 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. μετέκισα (Q -σαυ); so Vulg. transfüli. The Greek is however probably an early error for -σαυ, which was read by SH. (So Compl.)
13. א". O' vacat (AQ א). 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 נבנה 'ד בונית as νομον η 'ד בונית.

14. נבנה מזאמה. ψικοδόμησας. The repeated change of persons in this and the next v., though consonant with Heb. idiom, is reduced by O' to uniformity (ψικοδ... μυ βασιλεύσεις;).

15. מזאמה פאראξύνη (Q פאראξύנথ). See on xii. 5. Here, as in that passage, the verb needs an object. Accordingly we must make the clause end with נאיבי.

גארא. εν 'אחר, but A has 'אחרב (and so Arabic. Comp. 1 K. xxii. 39), as though reading גארא. Cor. (p. 62) suggests that this was written without the second נ (comp. v. 23 נבנה), and then was corrupted through גארא of v. 14. In the remainder of this v. and in the next O' evidently were hopelessly at fault.

16. ουκ ξυνωσαν 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. פֵּלֶד, have been lost?

17. גארא. ουκ εἰσὶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ σου οἴδε ἡ καρδία σου. O' adds καλή, thus injuring the force of the sentence.
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φόνον. SH. read πόνον. Vulg. has cursum. Comp. the Greek in xxiii. 10.

18. Ὁ ἄλλος. O' adds Kai (AQ Οὐαὶ) ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦν.

O' vacat. O' vacat. The word does not suit the parallelism. The variants (e.g. A om. οὐδὲ… κύριε; Q adds to κύριο, καὶ οἴμοι ἀδελφέ) indicate a deep-seated corruption. SH. places an ast. before οὐ (μὴ) κόψ. The most probable account is as follows. As Ὁ ἄλλος 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. ἔτοιμος. εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης; reading ἔτοιμος. It is remarkable that in Numb. xxxiii. 44 they render, as here, by πέραν, while there, in vv. 47, 48, they transliterate (ἀβαρίμ).

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

22. τοὺς ποιμένας σου. Aq. Symm. (ἐταῖροι) read τοὺς. Vulg. has pastores tuos, but St Jer. suggests "amatores sive amici tui."
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23. ητανεναξις (καταστημαντιν), Vulg. congeneristi. The omission of the Ν (καταστημαντιν) led to the transposition of the ι and η, and thus to the connecting of the word with ην ("How gracious etc." A.V.).

24. γενόμενος γένηται. See on iii. 1. "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. Βλας 1. O' vacat.

26. ἐστιν ην. The grammar of the M.T. is dubious. Probably therefore entered the text before the article, which was inserted to harmonize with ην of v. 27. Aq. Theod., while adding ἐπεξετέλεσα, leave the ην anarthrous; and so SH.

27. Λατανάν ην. O' vacat.

28. ἀνατεθήκας, etc. O' vacat.
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μώδη 'Iexovías. 'בּ ה probably perplexed O', while the three words following 'בּ ה entered the text later.


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.

גּ הֵּּאלּ הֵי. O vacat.

ἐκκαποιαν ἀθάνατον. "Childless," as the natural sense of the Heb. adj., must have been familiar to O' from Gen. xv. 2 etc. But Je-chonias 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.

לָא יִצְלָצַל בֵּיתו. O vacat. Had נֶבֶר also (see last note) been absent from their text, we might have taken the clause 'י יִצְלָצַל לָא 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 יִצְלָצַל might
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easily lead to the omission of those words by O'. Comp. the omission in xxiii. 2.

xxiii. 1. τὰς νομῆς αὐτῶν (AQ μου); reading 'ἱμηρίᾳ, and understanding it as ἡ.

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

3. τῷ λαῷ μου; Midrashic.

but εἰπεῖ πάσης (but NAQ ἀπὸ).

4. ἔδρα. O' vacat.

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

6. καὶ Ἰσραὴλ, but א has ק. Ἱερουσαλήμ. The 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* Ἰωσεικείμ 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 (Ῥηδεύκ) 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 נ. Their σεδέκ may therefore represent נְסָדְקִין. The virtual duplication of נְהַוָה 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 נְהַוָה, and may only have come into it through the accidental presence of the preceding נְהַוָה. 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 (מְנָרָה), but in accordance with the somewhat intricate laws of Heb. accentuation must here be virtually a Conjunctive, וֹתָשָׁם 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 מְנָרָה as given pp. 22, 119.
the accentuation, whatever its authority may be worth, is in favour of connecting χ. χ.

7, 8. O' 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. שֵׁבֶת. סְעַתְּרָמְמִיָּהָ; reading אָבֶּר.מֶשֶׁה. אֶעֱסְפּוּה אֵת אֹתוֹ. They seem to have read (for χ) הֵר. Their Heb. ms. was perhaps blurred. Nowhere else does דַּקָּה represent χ. The nearest parallel is שֶֽׁקֶר, דַּקָּסְרָא, Is. v. 16.

10. פִּי מַנְּאָפִים מְלָאָה קָרָי. O' vacat. There can be little doubt (against Gi.) that one or other of the two clauses of the v., which end in שֶֽׁקֶר, 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 (v. 14).

רַלָּא. רְוִיָּה תָּוָּתָנָה (דּוּלָא). quite justifiably. See
last note. That the familiar rule "Proclivi lectioni praeestat ardua" by no means always applies in such cases is illustrated by v. 17. See note there on 1. See on ix. 9 [10].

ο δρομὸς (but ΝΑQ δρόμος) αὐτῶν.
οὖτως (ΑQ οἰχ οὖτως). See on viii. 6.

14. χειρῶν πολλῶν (ΑQ ποληρῶν);
dividing the words after the μ and reading the latter part as οὐν.

τού μη ἀποστραφῆναι. To make the Heb. grammatical we must alter to שֶׁב (or שֶׁב).

15. See on ix. 14 [15].

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

17. λέγουσι (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.

τοῖς ἀπωθομένοις τοῦ λόγου
(κυρίου) Kυρίου; much more smoothly.
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So? 

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

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

אברהם, קריבי (קריבי?) ב. O' vacat. ms. 88 and SH. agree with ב.

20. ונהבון הב פינה. νοῇσον αὐτῷ (AQ αὐτά); reading Ῥαῤῥά. Comp. xxx. 24.

22. מִרְפֵּס רֵאץ 1. 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. ἡ θελήματα. See on viii. 5.

27. Ο' vacat.
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1°. τοῦ νόμου μου; either an early error of ear, or a marg. gloss on 'י.

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

29. '"". οὐκ ιδοὺ (Ὡ οὐχί; AQ οὐχ) seems a double rendering, ἰδ. being the original one.

31. ΝΑΩ have τοὺς ἐκβάλλοντας προφητελας (Ἀ -τελαν) γλώσσας (Ἀ -σοσ). 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 ἡ θυρήματα τῆς γένους (but not so ΝΑ) δὲ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξηγορίαν.

32. λεγεται. ΝΑΩ have καὶ νυστάζοντας νυσταγμὸν εαυτῶν (Q αὐτῶν). They connected the words with νον.

32. πρὸς τοὺς προφητας τοὺς προφητεύοντας εὐπνεία πνευμα (Ἀ πν. ἐν.). Cor. (p. 62) considers an original λέγεται to have been omitted from the Heb. text, not accidentally, but by way of support to the idea (see note on xxix. 8) that "dreams...are entirely outside the province of all prophecy, whether false or true."

καὶ οὔ διηγούντο αὐτά; but ΝΑΩ
omit οὐ. For Ο’̄s treatment of the negative see on xviii. 18.

33. ἀβαβεῖναι ἁγίων. η ἰερεύς η προφήτης (Ν ὁ πρ.). See on vi. 13.

34. Τμεῖς ἐστε τὸ λήμμα; rightly dividing ἀπὸ τῆς μορφῆς. SH. attributes to Aq. (and so in Zech. ix. 1) the rendering ἄρμα (Ἄρμα) instead of ἄρμα, to which St Jer. testifies.

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

37. ιο ὁδὸν... ἐν. O’ vacat; a later addition, as the accumulation of epithets suggests.

38. μέθοδος... οἵ. 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.

39. ἐγὼ λαμβάνω (‟λαμβάνω). O’ is clearly right, on account of the ἁγίον, which is the prevailing word in the passage. An original ἁφταὶ was wrongly ascribed to the root ἁφτα, 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
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.

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 δεσμῶτας (N* om.); as though reading ἐπειδὴ. The Heb. word occurs elsewhere in xxix. [xxxvi.] 2 (where O' has δ. καὶ τεχνίτου); 2 K. xxiv. 14, 16 (τὸν συγκλείοντα); Is. xxiv. 22 (ἄχρισμα), xlii. 7 (δεσμῶν); Ps. cxlii. [cxli.] 8 (φυλακῆς).

3. See on i. 11.

5. τοὺς ἀποκινοθέντας Ἰουδαίον (NAQ Ἰουδα). For the tendency to substitute the concrete for the abstract comp. vii. 32 (ὁμορ. 34. xiii. 18, xix. 34, xxx. [xxxvii.] 19, xlvi. [xxix.] 7, xlviii. [xxxi.] 3.

6. Ἀπανθ. O' adds εἰς ἄγαθά (Q om.) from the previous clause.

8. ἢ. O' vacat.

9. τρεῖς. O' vacat; a gloss on ἦλθ, or "merely a dittogram" (Cor. p. 61).

εἰς μίσος; as though ἡ ὄρχεσιν. Yet in
Deut. xxviii. 37; 2 Chr. vii. 20 they render διήγημα, and in 1 K. ix. 7 λάλημα.

10. מְבָרָכָה. 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. הָיוֹת...בֵאל. O' vacat (Q hab.); a gloss.

2. יָרָּמֹת וְבְנֵי. O' vacat; a gloss consequential on the preceding.

(2) לֵלַע. O' vacat.

3. תֶל. 'Ev. It is not likely that ב would here have been altered to ℸ, and as this preposition is written in full, the case differs from the simple confusion of letters dealt with in note on xx. 17.

אֲפֹס. See on i. 2.

רה...לָא. O' vacat; taken from i. 2.

לָא שָׁמַע. O' vacat; an insertion from such passages as vii. 13.

4. אֱלֹהִים וּלְךָ. καὶ ἀπεστέλλον. 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 '1 conversive,' as though indicating a date when that construction was at least obsolescent.

τῶν δοῦλων μου. See previous note.

5. Ἰᾶρ is a harsh construction, as the passage now stands, but not so (see note on v. 4) if joined to v. 3 (when ἦν ἦλθεν is there omitted).

ἐσωκα; 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 (=כתרוֹךְ).

του κακουσαι υμᾶς. Here the harmonizing is confined to the Heb., O' giving us the rendering of לוח לוֹכֶנ, which strangely enough has only survived in its Heb. shape in the gloss forming the greater part of v. 7.
7. O' vacat. The words were inserted through failure to perceive that the preceding referred to the prophet, and that it was consequently connected with v. 3.

8. O' vacat; a gloss, suggested by the similar language of v. 6.

9. πατριάν (NAQT prefix την). πάσαν must have fallen out, as is shewn by the subsequent pl. suffix.

10. O' vacat; an obvious gloss. Observe the harshness of the construction of Ἰακ. 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.

11. O' vacat; a gloss.

12. kai (A om. kai) ἑξερχώσω αὑτοῖς; reading ב for מ. For other instances of this confusion see on xx. 17.

13. kai eis οὐνειδισμόν; as though reading ἐνθρώπῳ. It is remarkable however that the Hiph. of וְר ב is thus rendered in six instances.

14. ὡς μήν μύρον. We can hardly imagine the Greek to be original. 'א in the sense of millstones must have been sufficiently familiar
to the translators through Exod. xi. 5; Deut. xxiv. 6, where they have μυλον. But the fact that ιν in its ordinary sense of odour was rendered generally by σμη, coupled with the corruption of μυλον into μυρον, easy where the context seemed to suggest it, would lead to marg. glosses, in time taking the place of the text.

11. 

Here and in v. 12 O' preserves for us the original Heb. They read בון, but failed to understand the meaning of 'ע 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 'ונ into 'ו, a change which, providing 'ע with a subject, left it without an object. In order to supply one 'א was inserted.

12. O' vacat. When, owing to the misunderstanding of v. 11, עבד had changed its subject, the reference of 'ל הלן was no longer clear. Hence the addition 'ל ה and later in the v., of הלחנ וカフェים.

O' vacat (AQ φησὶν Kυρίος).

O' vacat (AQ φησὶν Kυρίος).

O' vacat. See last note but one.
13. δ' ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἰερεμίας ἐπὶ τὰ (N* om. τὰ) ἔθνη. Thereupon follows τὰ Ἀλάμ, Q adding ἐν ἀρχῇ βασιλέως Σεδεκίου βασιλέως Ἰουδα λέγων, all this now standing in xlix. 34 of M.T., and there forming the heading of one of the prophecies against foreign nations. See the discussion which follows as to the position of those prophecies.

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. xlvi.—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
(Kurzgeft. 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\(^1\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) M.T. xlvi.—li.</th>
<th>(b) O’ [xxv. 14—xxxii.]</th>
<th>(c) M.T. vv. 19—26.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Egypt</td>
<td>8 Elam</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Phil.</td>
<td>1 Egypt [Uz (near Idum. &amp; Eg.)]</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Moab</td>
<td>9 Bab.</td>
<td>Edom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ammon</td>
<td>2 Phil.</td>
<td>Edom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Edom</td>
<td>5 Edom</td>
<td>Moab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Damascus</td>
<td>4 Ammon</td>
<td>Ammon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kedar and Hazor</td>
<td>7 K. and H.</td>
<td>Tyre and Sidon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Elam</td>
<td>6 Damascus [Arabia and] “mingled people” [Zimri]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bab.</td>
<td>3 Moab</td>
<td>Elam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

\(^{1}\) *l. c. p. 218, note 14.* "Als der griechische Übersetzer lebte, war Persien—welches zwar nicht mit Elam identisch ist, aber doch daran angrenzt—von den Griechen unterworfen; es ist nicht unwahrscheinlich, dass der Übersetzer—oder der Besitzer der Handschrift, welcher er folgte—darin eine Erfüllung der Prophetie des Jeremia sah, und sie deshalb als höchst beachtenswert voranstellte. Aus denselben oder ähnlichen Gründen kann er den Weissagungen wider Egypten und wider Babel den zweiten und dritten Platz angewiesen haben, während er die übrigen in der Reihenfolge aufnahm, in der sie ihm in die Hände oder vor die Augen kamen."
xxv. 15 [xxxii. 1]. ὁ ἄδρατος (ὅρως).

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 ἡ ἀδράτης.

16 [xxxii. 2]. ὡς. O' vacat (AQ* καὶ πιονται); a gloss.

καὶ ἐξεμοῦνται; a free rendering. The word is more literally translated by the pass. of ταράσσεν in v. 22 and by κυμαίνειν in xlvi. [xxvi.] 7.

18 [xxxii. 4]. ἀδράτης ἔσω ἡ ἡμέρα. O' vacat.

20 [xxxii. 6]. ἐλάχιστως ἄριστος ἦσαν. 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 βασιλέας νήσους, the last words being an easy corruption for τῆς γῆς Οὐδέν.

22 [xxxii. 8]. ὡς. O' vacat.

23 [xxxii. 9]. οἱ and ηθ are represented in O' by Θασμᾶν (Ἄ Θασμᾶν) and 'Pων (Ἄ 'Pων) doubtless through error.

24 [xxxii. 10]. προέρχεσθαι... (Ἰαν...). O' vacat.

25 [xxxii. 11]. προέρχεσθαι... (Ἰαν...). O' vacat.

Zimri would here be out of place. "Durch die Stellung sind Araber, Phoenicier, Aethiopen ausgeschlossen" Gi. ad loc. See also Wo. p. 44.
The word is evidently an alternative rendering of מְלָא. It may, as introduced from the marg. into the wrong place, have supplanted an original מְדֹא (which Compl. has), or perhaps the words מְלָא...מְדֹא 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 מְלָא...מְדֹא.

26 [xxxii. 12]. ἀπηλιώτου (A τοῦ ἀπ.).

O' uses the word elsewhere only in Ezek. xxi. 3 [xx. 47], xxi. 9 [4], each time in the expression ἀπὸ ἀπ. ἐως βορρά (מרובב צפונה), 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 'סחֹר, and that the Greek translators omitted the latter part, because it made 'ס the recipient, and not (as in v. 9, and i. 15) the executor, of vengeance.

וָאֲרוּ. O' vacat; obviously an insertion, spoiling the grammar.

וָאֲרוּ...אֲרוֹנִים. 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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which probably came into existence later than J.'s time. See Wo., pp. 245 ff.

29 [xxxii. 15]. Καθάρσει καθήμερον λειτουργίαν. O' failed to comprehend the interrogative 'τι; so omitted it.

30 [xxxii. 16]. οἶδε; corrupted from 'Αιδαδ, 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]. ἐπιρρεφέται; less literal than the rendering in vi. 22 (ἐγερθησέται).

M. T. is an insertion drawn from viii. 2.

33 [xxxii. 19]. ἐν ἡμέρα Κυρίον; probably a slip, original or otherwise, in the Greek.

O' vacat. M.T. is an insertion drawn from viii. 2.

eis κόπρια. See on viii. 2.

34 [xxxii. 20]. kai κόπτεσθε (Q κ. κόψασθε). But in vi. 26 they render by καταπάσσειν, and in Ezek. xxvii. 30 by στρωνυσειν.

O' vacat. If we read the Heb. thus as a subst., it shipwrecks the grammar; if as a verb in Taph., ἀφαίρεσθαι (so Baer and Del.) or ἀφίσθαι, it somewhat harshly introduces the Lord as speaking. The word is probably corrupt.
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34 [xxxii. 20]. ὀσπερ οἱ κριοὶ (ἱερὰ) οἰ ἐκλεκτοὶ. As Schwally (l. c. p. 137 note) points out, ἃ ἐξιθῆκεν occurs in Hos. xiii. 15; Nah. ii. 10; 2 Chr. xxxii. 27, xxxvi. 10, and the variant might easily arise through the influence of ἀνερίου. Grätz however (quoted by Gi. ad loc.) suggests that the original read ἁλῆ, comparing xviii. 4.

37 [xxxii. 23]. τὰ κατάλοιπα. The Greek is possibly a corruption for καταλύματα, but in face of the circumstance that the latter word renders ἐπί in v. 38, this is improbable. For O's treatment of 'י see on ix. 9 [10].

38 [xxxii. 24]. τῆς (AQ om. τῆς) μαχαίρας τῆς μεγάλης; reading μαχαίρα, and doubtless rightly. Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 16, l. [xxvii.] 16, where ἅρμα occurs in this phrase. In those two passages
is rendered 'Ελληνικός, as though νεολαία from ἡ. Here O’s treatment is less easy to explain. Possibly they read ἡ δρά, and translated freely. So Pesh. reads (אא), and one of Kenn.’s MSS. has ה. 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. Μισκλήως. O’ is doubtless a corruption of βασιλείας. The Heb. itself however (see Wellhausen, Der Text d. Bücher Sam. i S. xv. 28) is in all probability a corrupt form of Μισκλήως.

O’ vacat (Q hab.); a gloss.

2. οὐλίσθεν οὐδένα καὶ πάσι (AQ πάσι[v]) τοῖς ἱουδαίοις καὶ πάσι (ἈQ om. κ. π.) τοῖς ἐρχομένοις. 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. (κ) ἡμῶν. O’ vacat (AQ ταύτης); probably an accidental omission. See vv. 9, 12.

8. οὖν. εὑρεταῖον αὐτῷ (ἔπιλος; comp. xx. 2).

9. μήτε. οὕτω. See xxii. 28.

10. πῦλης (A adds Kuplov and Q oikou K.) τῆς καυχῆς. SH. testifies to ἡ. Pesh. and Vulg. read ἡ ἔν τις ἔν ἔν; but there seems no sufficient ground for rejecting the genuineness of O"s reading, especially as the words ἔν ἔν, having just preceded, were wholly needless to repeat.

19. καὶ ἐπαύσατο. See on xxxxi. 20.

20. ἄναληπτορά θάνατο. O' vacat. Gi. defends the Heb. as agreeing with the wording of v. 6. But the argument seems precarious.

21. νεκροσθεῖσαν. O' vacat. The expression is not found elsewhere in Jer.

καὶ έξήγουν (Q -ηςαν); reading τινί. O' vacat.

ὅρα λοβὰ. O' vacat.

22. ἁγιασμύν μισθίῳ. O' vacat; doubtless a gloss. Gi. points out that what we read of Elhanathan 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) יֵלֵי (xxvii. 1 etc.) for יִרְמָי (xxvii. 12 etc.), יַעֲנַה (xxviii. 4 etc.), יַעֲנַה (xxviii. 1 etc.), (b) the later form נַהֲיוֹנַה (frequently; e.g. xxvii. 6, but not in xxix. 21), as against the form with ל which occurs elsewhere in this Book, (ii) the epithet נַהֲיוֹנַה, 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 υ, the peculiar spelling both of this name and of Josiah in the original.

2 [1]. ἄνι. O' vacat; rightly, in accordance with the style of the narrative sections. So Cor. (p. 70).

3 [2]. καὶ ἀποστέλεται αὐτοῖς. Both texts seem corrupt in the matter of the pron., which has crept in through the influence of the preceding ἥν.

(Δ τῶν) ἄγγελων αὐτῶν. The absence of the article would of itself make the Heb. suspicious. Read therefore מַלְאָךְ.

τῶν ἐρχομένων εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῶν (Ἄ -τῶ) 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.

5 [4]. ἰναι...καὶ ἀν. O' vacat.

καὶ εἶν τῷ ἐπικείμενῳ (Q βραχιονί) μου. So in xlviii. [xxxi.] 25.

6 [5]. ᾿Οροσ. 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 v. Subsequent scruples as to the attributing of a world-wide dominion to the king of Babylon induced various modifications. Accordingly Aq. Symm. have πάσας τὰς γαλάς (ταύτας), Vulg. "omnes terras istas," and so Pesh.; while SH. adopts πάσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην.

δουλεύων αὐτῷ; reading ὠλεύῃ, and rightly. The subsequent loss of the ἦ was easy, owing to the ending of the previous word. For the title given by M.T. to Neb. see on xxv. 9.

7. Ο' vacat; Q marg. hab. with slight variations and with ὀργῇς instead of γῆς, in which it is supported by SH. "The idea that the dominion of the Chaldaeans is to be merely transitory, and is to fall to pieces after the third generation, is decidedly 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 Nebuchadnezzar (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]. ἔκλεισεν... ὦ vacat; a gloss, in the earliest form of which Neb. was referred to by the pron. only (ἢ). The ἔκλεισεν, as Gi. suggests, may be explained as having lost a subsequent βοῶν taken from v. 7.

O' vacat.

The transitive use of ἔκλεισεν is unusual (occurring however in Ps. lxiv. 7). O' seems to have omitted the suffix and ἔκλεισεν. Possibly (as Gi. thinks) the Targ. preserves for us here the original reading ἔκλεισεν, for which we may comp. similar expressions in this context (xxvi. 24, xxvii. 6).

9 [7]. ἔνυππεναγόμενων ὑμῖν; reading apparently ἔνυππεναγόμενων ὑμῖν, 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.

15 [12]. O' begins v. 16 [13] with a second rendering of לכב (ךנפ). Probably the above-mentioned gloss was in some of O's MSS. introduced after theךנפ 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]. O' vacat; obviously an explanatory gloss.

17 [14]. O' vacat, but it substitutes οὐκ ἀπέστειλα αὐτούς. 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 22b 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]. ἅπαντας ἀπὸ τοῦ μοι; reading, very possibly rightly, יְנֵ, which was afterwards (comp. xxv. 37) taken as a contraction (יבָּדָהוּ = יְנֵ). O’ vacat.

עַבָּדָה. 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 ἐπιλοίπων (καὶ υπόλ.) 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. λοιπῶν σκ.

20 [17]. Ο' vacat.

21. O' vacat.

22 [18]. λέγει Κύριος (α' adds ὁ θεός). See introductory note on these verses.

xxviii. [xxxv.] 1. Ο' vacat. The first two words were lost through a confusion of the eye (between בְּשֵׁלָה and מִשְׁלָה). The rest correspond to the Heb. of xxvii. 1 in its earlier and more accurate form. See note there. Cor. (p. 70) considers this v. to be out of place and transfers it to the head of xxvii.

3. "would of course be easily lost before כָּל. On the other hand its absence from O' in the next v. cannot be thus explained."
CRITICAL NOTES.

1. O' vacat.

4. O' vacat.

5. O' vacat.

5. kat' ὀφθαλμοὺς παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς τῶν ἱερέων. O's transposition of the substantives may well have been caused by the last words of the v.

8. O' vacat.

10. ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τοὺς κλοῖοὺς; 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. O' vacat. The words are introduced from v. 3.


O' vacat. M.T. gives us accordingly the later form of the name. See introductory note on xxvii—xxix.

15. O' vacat; an insertion suggested by xxvii. 6.

16. O' vacat; but perhaps owing only to an error of the eye.

O' vacat; introduced from
Deut. xiii. 6, where however (as Gi. points out), unlike the present passage, actual idolatry is spoken of.

xxix. [xxxvi.] 1. יְהוָה. O' vacat. 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 ἐπίστολην εἰς Βαβυλῶνα τῷ ἀπομένον. There could scarcely be a more obvious interpolation. Yet see Wo., p. 86.

וּלְכָּל...יְשָׁר. O' vacat. 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...Βαβυλῶνα. Aq. Theod. have the words.

2. לְכָּל...וּרְדָה. O' vacat; possibly an accidental omission.

καὶ πάντος ἐλευθέρου καὶ δεσμῶτος καὶ τεχνίτου (Q τ. κ. δ.). The first words look like a rendering of בָּאִירִים as a variant upon יְהוָה. This is less disturbing to the present Heb. text than to suppose that they stand for יְשָׁר יְרֵד (as a variant for יְרֵד הָאָרָים).
CRITICAL NOTES.


5. παραδέλπους; but rendered κήπουσ in v. 28.

6. οὐκ ἔδωκεν ἑαυτόν μου. O' vacat.

7. τῆς γῆς. This rendering reminds us of iv. 29. Either they read here (as probably there) Λαοῦ, or their interpretation is Midrashic.

8. καὶ μὴ ἀναπειθεῖτεσαν ὑμᾶς οἱ μάντες ὑμῶν.

υμεῖς ἐννυπιάζεσθε. 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 Ἰ, 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. אב高职. O' vacat.

τὸν λαὸν ὑμῶν (Q τ. λ. μοῦ). 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. ייִנְיָנֵ(1)ָנֶר. O' vacat; an accidental omission, arising from the recurrence of ייִנְנֵן.
The words were perhaps illegible in O's Hebrew text.

12. Illegibility, as in the last case, may explain the omission. However, as the M.T. stands, יְרֵא הַיָּא looks strange. Symm. has instead καὶ εὐρήσετε, Targ. וַתֵּלְבֹּשׁ. Hence M.T. seems corrupt.

14. καὶ (Q om. κ.) ἐπιφάνειαν ὕμν. This may be a rendering of the present Heb. וְנַעֲשֵׂה. 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 רָצוּ 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 בַּכָּל (v. 15) to בַּכָּל (v. 20).

21. אָרִיקוּלִי. O' vacat.

22. בֹּוּזֶשֶׁה . . . שׁקָר. O' vacat.

23. רֶשֶׂא. O' vacat; introduced from v. 21.

ןִיְרֶס (ב) וּלְר. μάρτυς. The Heb., as it stands, is ungrammatical, while the י can only be explained as equivalent to קַזָּה. 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 Ὅνκ ἀπέστειλά σε τῷ ὄνοματί μου, suggested by v. 31.

25, 26. εἶπεν Κύριος (so BN; AQ εἶπεῖν K.).

26. επιστάτην. 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. συνελοιδορήσατε (,cp. el. Q οὐκ ἕπετιμήσατε).

28. οὐ (ἐκσ. om. οὐ; AQ οτι) διὰ τοῦτο ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (Q ημᾶς). See v. 5.

32. O' vacat.

ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν. τοῦ ὦσών; reading ἄναγκαι.
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 oυx δψονται, a marg. gloss on του ἰδείν.

6. ei ἐτεκεν ἀρσεν. We may note that this use of the Ἰαλ 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 ἕ καθέξουσιν ὄσφυν καὶ σωτηρίαν.

This, as a substitute for διατί, is often presented to us elsewhere, e.g. by Q in ii. 31, by άκρεν AQ in viii. 19.

6. eis λυτέρον (jaundice). ἦν is rendered ὀξρα in Deut. xxviii. 22.

7. ἥν. ἑγενήθη (as the last word of v. 6); connecting with ἦν. So ἑγενόντο in Mic. ii. 1.
8. ἀπὸ τοῦ (NAQ om. τοῦ) τραχύλου αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς δειμοὺς 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. Ἰο is supported by Aq. Symm. Theod. Pesh. Vulg. In the case of Pesh. (not Vulg.) supports the 2nd p., against which reading can also be pleaded the parallelism which might be expected with θεό.

καὶ οὐκ ἔργωντας αὐτοί ἀλλοτρίων (A ἐν ἅλλα.) ; failing to understand the Heb. idiom. Comp. xxv. 11.

9. Ἡ. O’ vacat; thus restoring the balance of the clauses.

10, 11. O’ vacat. The vv. occur in both texts in xli. [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 ἡ δὲ νὼ 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, xlii. [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. 'אֶהָרְשַׁת שׁיִּבְרָה (A adds *σου*); thus connecting the first word with אָלַ֣ם. See on iv. 19.

13. תַּחַתּוֹ הָרְבָּה. *eis ἀληθρὸν ἱατρεύθης.* In Hos. v. 13 ἡλ (ὁδύνη) is parallel to הוּ. 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.

14. ἀφέλια (Q -εια); connecting with the Hiph. of יִלֵּל, 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.

210 THE DOUBLE TEXT OF JEREMIAH. [XXX. 16
σοι, ἐπολύσαν ταύτα σοι, the last three words representing M.T.'s conclusion to v. 15.

17. τὸ ἱαμα. Comp. ἱας in viii. 22.

But this does not suit the context. Other conjectural emendations are πάντα, a monument, a (mere)
way-mark for the traveller (so J. D. Michaelis), πάντα
(Is. xxv. 5, xxxii. 2), a desert, a dried-up place
(Graetz), πάντα, pitiable (Gi.).

18. ὀπετ, 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) αἰχμαλώσιαν (A τὴν
ἀποκιναν) αὐτῶν; reading apparently
Compare O’s treatment of the actual μάσχα in
this Book. See on iii. 6.

καὶ ὁ λαός (Q ναὸς); to be added to
the list of renderings of Χ given in note on vi. 5.

19. ἀδεται; a loose rendering (see on
xxiv. 5); but comp. xxxiii. [xl.] 11 for one still
more free.

καὶ ἡ ἄνθρωπος Φλαντήρι.

O’ vacat.

20. καὶ εἰσελευσονται; Midrashic.

καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτῶν
CRITICAL NOTES.

21. ἴσχυρότεροι; perhaps reading ἴσχυρότεροι (= ἴσχυροι).

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. ἵνα is rendered καὶ ἀποστρέψουσιν (Q however has ἐπιστ.) and ἰδίᾳ by ἀποστρέψαι (AQ ἐπιστρέψαι). Comp. on vv. 23, 24.

22. Ο' 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. ἵνα... ἐστὶ ὑπὲρ Κυρίου ἐξήλθεν θυμός... ἐξήλθεν (κ. ἐπήλθεν) ὑπὲρ, but there ἰδοὺ σεισμὸς παρὰ Κυρίου καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐκπορευέται εἰς συνσεισμόν.

23. στρεφομένη; in xxiii. 19 and συστρεφομένη. Gi. considers that Μακωλά as the original reading in both places.

24. ἡ τῆς Βεντζίου. γνώσεσθε (κ. ἐπιγν.) αὐτὰ.

Comp. xxiii. 20.

N.B. In some Heb. Bibles xxxi. 1 (בֵּן וַה) is given as xxx. 25, and xxxi. 2 as xxxi. 1, and so on to the end of that chapter.
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συν εις την θεοτοκιν, reading ου *ευριν (or possibly ου *ευριν).

βαδισατε και μη ολησθε των Ισραηλ. Possibly the υ (see Perles, p. 74) is the old nominative ending. O' may have seen the root רִבְרָ ה in the word, but it is more likely that they read לְקָרָה [ץ]. The best emendation (so Gi.) seems to be לָכֹרָה (so Vulg. ad requiem suam). For sense of רִבְרָ ה see on iv. 20, l. 34.

3. י' aυτω. The following υ (not rendered by O') may have produced this variant. Cor. however (p. 66) suggests that the Heb. copyist “stumbled at י', which would refer to לְקָרָה in v. 2, because the whole subsequent address, after נֹלַה שֵׁרְאֵל, is in the feminine.”

4. י' øτι (but AQ øti).

וּל י' vacat (AQ øti. Comp. next note).

י' επτήμψει (א - ψη; AQ ψήψη). Comp.

iv. 30, where κοσμεῖν is the verb used.

5. י' øτι (א* øτι ετι; AQ ετι).

י' φυτεύσατε (but א* Q* φυτεύσαντες φυτ.; AQ φύσαντες φυτ.); reading simply י' נֹלַה שֵׁרְאֵל.

כַּא אינְשָׁשָׁא; reading נֹלַה שֵׁרְאֵל. But even if, with O', we substitute י for the י of M.T., it is very possible that the verb may be used in a
special sense corresponding to the subst. ἅλαλαμι used (Lev. xix. 24; Jud. ix. 27) of harvest or vintage gatherings.

6. ἀπολογούμενον (ἀ-νομ); an unexplained rendering. Gi. suggests an original ἄλαλαμι, vine-dressers, from the previous context.

7. Ἐσωσεν Κύριος τὸν ἁδὸν αὐτοῦ; reading ἄν Τέμο. 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 ἑορτῇ φάσει; reading γαλεται ἡ ἑορτή τῆς νόμου τοῦ Κυρίου; rendering very loosely, and omitting the other two words.

9. ἐκχαλθόν; reading ἐκχάλθτυ; perhaps reading ἐκχαλθόν, but on the other hand we find the kindred subst. ἀλαλαμι always rendered by ἀλαλαμι in this Book (xxxvi. [xlii.] 7, xxxvii. [xliv.] 20, xxxviii. [xlv.] 26, xlii. [xlix.] 2).

αὐλίζουν and οὐ μὴ πλανηθῶσιν; renderings not found elsewhere.
10—14. See Cor.'s reasons (p. 66) for believing these vv. to be spurious.

12. The v. is remarkable for its loose renderings; ἤρησιν for ἄνωθεν (though used four words earlier for ἀνάβας), καρπῶν for ἀνάβας, κύλων ἐν καρποῖς for ἀνάβας, here (as J. F. Schleusner observes ad loc.) giving the species for the genus, as in the previous case the genus for the species.

ῥεῖνα. πευκάςουσιν; reading Ῥάβα.

13.

χαρῆσοντες; reading ἄνοιξιν (or ἄνοιξιν). Pesh. represents both (אכברתא ונכברתא).

καὶ μεθὺς. O' vacat. The parallelism is against the word.

οὐν. O' vacat. Some such word however is needed. See next note.

14.

Μεγαλυτρὶ καὶ μεθὺς. The first word probably represents the νάλομα of v. 13, which they seem to have connected with ἄνοιξιν.

ηδονίς. τῶν ἑρεθῶν νῦν Λευεί (ὥ τινι Λ. τ. ἱερ.). The last words are evidently a gloss.

ὁση. O' vacat; perhaps from the difficulty which the word presents in connexion with ἄνοιξιν.

15. ἱερ. 1ο. 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. μόνον τοῖς σοῖς τέκνοις. These words are clearly meant as a rendering of ηὐχή ἄνεπιτι ἵνα, while the remainder of the M.T. is unrepresented. MSS. 22, 36, and others however agree to prefix καὶ ἐσται ἐλπὶς 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. αἱσθαλωσίας μου; reading ἵνα μοι; but wrongly.

μετενόησα. This suits the parallelism, as opposed to παρεκλήθην of Aq. (but see Field); with which agree Targ. (מְסֵהוּשׁ עֲנוֹנָה) Pesh.

εἰσίναξα ἑφ' ἡμέρας αἰσχύνης; reading apparently μερήσα τῆς ἐσχάτης σου καὶ ὑπέδειξα.

20. O' ignores the interrogative character of
the first part of the v., 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 וֹרֶה. Even if we retain the text, we may safely give it a hostile sense, as in Numb. xxii. 7; Ps. 1. 20.

The same sort of corruption (arising from a transliteration) has taken place here. We cannot however accept M.T., 'ח 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.) וֹרֶה, literally, palms; here in the sense fixed by the י of the parallel clause, but not recognised by O'. Aq. has περασμοὺς, Vulg. amaritudines.
CLITICAL NOTES.

22. ἡ γάτη τῆς πόλεως.  θυγάτηρ ἡττυμωμένη.
Comp. xlix. [xxx.] 4, θυγ. ἰταμίας. Aq. in both places has ἡ ἰτμεθεοῦσα.

23. ἐπὶ δίκαιον ὄρος τὸ ἁγιον 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 ἦ ἢ.

24. καὶ (N. A Q. o. i) ένοικούντες εἶν ταῖς πόλεσιν Ἰουδᾶ (A om. τ.; Ν. Q. τῇ Ἰουδαλαὶ) καὶ εἶν πάση τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ; not seeing that ἡβ refers
back to the of the previous v., and not understanding how could be the subject of the verb. The words καὶ ἐν π. τ. γ. αὐ. represent a gloss. There is a good deal to be said (see J. D. Michaelis ad loc.) for pointing the first of these words either laetabuntur, or arabunt, thus closing the v. with two short and well-balanced clauses of appropriate meaning. Ἄρθ. represents the root לְמַעְט (comp. Numb. ii. 17, ἀρθησάται; 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. πεινώσαν. See on v. 12.

28. καθαρεῖν 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 י for ב (comparing O's translation of יִנַל in xiv. 19), a change which is commended by the improved sense thus obtained.

33. διδοὺς δῶσω (AQ om. δῶσω). See on iii. 1, xxii. 24.

35 [36]. O' vacat. The word may be
a gloss upon ד"ה of the next v. It may also however, as Gi. suggests, be a corruption of מ"ה, borrowing the מ from מ"ה. 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 θαυμάσσων, 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 מ"ה (so Wo., with מ"ה as an alternative). For the meaning of מ"ה see on iv. 20.

37 [35]. ἐπέστη; as though reading מ"ה. 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 περικυκλοθήσεται κύκλος ἐκλεκτῶν λίθων. For περικυκ. κύκ. see on iii. 1. In Ezra [2 Esd.] v. 8 מ"ה is rendered λίθων ἐκλεκτωί. Accordingly O’ probably saw the same root here. Targ. has מ"ה, the pool of the calf, Pesh. אסב, to the hill.

40. מ"ה... O’ vacat, probably owing to the recurrence of מ"ה, rather than (with Gi. p. xxxi) to the unintelligibility of the words.
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5. הַלְּךָ יִשָּׁמָעֵל הָאָדָם; perhaps reading הַלְּךָ, and disregarding the כּ. 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.

וּכּ וּכּ. O' vacat. The Heb. is all but identical with xxvii. 22 [xxxiv. 18], where O' is also lacking.

וּכּ וּכּ. 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 יִנְאֵם יְרֵם (omitting יִנְאֵם יְרֵם). Of the two changes natural on the part of those who desired greater clearness, M.T. represents the one, O' the other.

7. מַסִּיסֵנ מַסִּיסֵנ לְקַנְתָּה. κρίνως (NAQ κρίμα) παραλαβεῖν εἰς κεφαλ. This would stand fairly enough as a somewhat free rendering of the M.T. When however we find that יֵה 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. τὸν ἐν γῇ Βενιαμεὶν τὸν ἐν Ἀναβῶθ (Q τὸν ἐν Ἰν. ἐν γῇ Βεν.). The words 'ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ' in themselves superfluous, are further condemned by the variation in position.

καὶ οὐ πρεσβύτερος; reading ἦ for ἦ.

9. Ο' vacat.

11. τὸ ἤσφραγισμένον; but ΝΑ add καὶ τὸ ἀνεγραμμένον (Q pref. ἀνεγραμμένον καὶ). 'ὅτι ἤρθα' ὑπερτάσσεται are probably a gloss, while on the other hand ἤγοινίζοντας will be observed to have considerable support. See Field's note, which also mentions Cappellus's conjectural variant ἀνεγραμμένον. See also Stade's discussion of the passage in Zeitsch. d. A. T. Wissenschaft v. pp. 175—178.

12. τῶν ἄνδρῶν τῶν παρεστηκότων (Q μαρτύρων). Καὶ γραφότων (Q γραψάντων). It is remarkable that Targ. (Pesh.) and Vulg. (qui scripti erant) all represent יְהוּדִים, a reading which is found in 14 of Kenn.'s MSS. and 34 of de Rossi's. Can O' have had originally γραφέτων?

O' vacat.
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The word was introduced from v. 11.

to ἀνεγνωσμένων. See on v. 11. Stade l. c. gives as resultant text of v. 14

cαὶ ἀναπτύσσεται σφήνα σε πνεύμα αὐτοῦ γῆς

ὁ θεὸς ἀληθείας ἐπήρθη ἄφθονα·

λέγει ὁ θεὸς ἀληθείας ἐπηρθήναι ἄφθονα·

17. O o. See on i. 6.

tο ἐνυψηλό καὶ τὸ μετέφρασε (/io om. κ. τ. μετ.; Q om. τῷ 2ο); a conflate rendering.

18, 19. O' has (with slight variations in ΝΩ), as second clause of v. 19, ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ μεγαλόνυμος 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 Wo., pp. 76 f.

19. O' pref. Κύριος.

The words come from xvii. 10.

20. kai εν τοῖς γηγενέσιν; a remark-
able rendering, as though hinting at the derivation of the Heb. word. The nearest parallel is in Ps. xlix. [xlvi]. 3, where γηγ. renders בַּלֵּי אָרֶץ.

21. ἐκ οἴραματι μεγάλοις. (22) καὶ ἐν οἴραματι 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 Ἐ with Ἡβα.

23. ἀλλήλοις. συμβῆναι, but Bφ ancestry AQ pref. καὶ ἐπολῆσαι. In either case O’s rendering, if not corrupt, is peculiar.

24. δόχλος. See on vi. 6.

25. οὐχοῦτοι. O vacat. The word is introduced from such passages as xxv. 7, xxiv. 10.

26. μέ; rightly.

28. Κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ (καὶ ὁ θ. Ἰ.).

29. Δοθείσα παραδοθήσεται. See on iii. 1. They may possibly have read Ἑβαν Θεοῦ (comp. v. 4); but this is made very improbable by the fact that they render the same Heb. similarly elsewhere, viz. xxxiv. [xlii.] 2.

30. μόνοι; apparently a very early error
for μόνον. Aq. πλην, Symm. 1st ed. and Theod. μόνον, Symm. 2nd ed. διόλου. See Field.

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. έν ἀκαθάρσεις αὐτῶν (B&B A om.). It is possible that O' may have found αὐτῶν, as Gi. suggests, but their giving to έν τοίνικα διάδοχα προς αὐτόν 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 B&B A do not recognise έν τοίνικα.

34. τοῦ Μολῶν Βασιλεί (Q om. β.); a double rendering.

35. έν ἀποστολῇ. O' vacat.

36. έν ἀποστολῇ. οὐ λέγεις (B&B A); 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 έν τοίνικα and έν τοίνικα.

καὶ έν άποστολῇ. Everywhere else έν is rendered θάνατος or λοιμός. The present render-
ing may be illustrated by the same word as representing מַלְאָאֲלָה (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. διὰ δύο bis. ἐτέραν bis (רַבָּה).

40. לְהִשִּׁיבֵנוּ אֵל. O' vacat. 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 לְאַשְׁבֵּנוּ מְרַגְּשָׁם, on the ground that the expression in M.T. rather suits the people's relation to God than His to them.

41. καὶ εἰποκέψωμαι; a remarkable rendering. The Heb. expression is supported, as Gi. points out, by Deut. xxviii. 63, xxx. 9.

43. καὶ κτηθῆσονται έτι ἀγροί; as though reading τίνες μέσῳ Σαρα. The sing. may have come through the influence of the ἀρχή of the earlier part of the chapter.

οὐ λέγεις. See on v. 36.

xxxiii. [xl.] 2. οὗτος ἢ δὲν. ποιῶν γῆν. The Heb. pron., as it stands here and later in the v., has no definite reference, unless, as is proposed by Gi., we transpose iv. 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 ἢ δὲν ἡμῖν.
4. χάρακας (Q -ka). See on vi. 6.

5. τοῦ μάχεσθαι προς 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 ἡ (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.

6. ἀνάγω (A ἐπ.). See on viii. 22.
' מיוחד is אָתָך. 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.) εἰσακού- ειν, and (? 2nd ed.) λαοῦ. Symm. has προσευχήν; so Vulg. deprecationem. Although the root frequently bears that sense, it seems to have no relevancy here.

8. יִלָּחַת. kai ou μὴ μνησθόμα αι (κ μνησθῶ); although as lately as xxxi. 34 they rendered ἰλεώς ἑσομαι.

9. ἤρθεν ἐὰν λέσσεσθαι ἐν οἴνου; thus omitting ἦν and ἐν. Inasmuch as in sense Jerusalem is the subject of ἤρθεν, Gi. ingeniously conjectures that in ἰσθενεῖ we have fragments of that word. If so, the case is an interesting one, as presenting a corruption which ὦ dealt with by omission and Heb. scribes by unsuccessful emendation.

10. ἡγιάσατα. kai ἐξωθεν. ο vacat.

11. δῶρα (AQ add ἀνέσεως). See on xxx. 19. In xvii. 26 ἦν appears as ἀνείσεως, but there the context would exclude the sense of gifts, which is at least a possible one here.

πᾶσαι την ἀποκλίαν (A τ. ἀπ. πᾶσης).
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 חֲרַבִּים, 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. 18) חֲרַבִּים and (v. 21) חֲרַבִּים, (v. 22) חֲרַבִּים 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. סֹלֶל הָוַדָּו. O' vacat; and so
SH. But the Heb. which remains is still rough
and probably needs some correction.

יִלְּדָה אֲפֵמָה. O' vacat.

טְפָפוּס תְפָפוּס. ἐπολέμουν αὐτὸν (but ἌΑΩ om.
αὐτὸν).

τὰς πόλεις Ἰουνία; an amplification
suggested by i. 15. Comp. Zech. i. 12.

2. 1° וָקַבַּר. O' vacat. It is true, as Gi.
says, that we have but one other instance in this
Book (xxxv. 2) of הָלָּל, whereas הָלָּל 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 'א.

3. **Paradósei paradóθεται.** See on xxxii. 28.

καὶ συναλλημμέναι αὐτὴν καὶ καύσει αὐτὴν (Q* om. κ. κ. αὐ.) τὸ Μαύρον, which O' seems to have read, may be genuine (so Gi. p. xxvi), but again such passages as v. 22, xxxvii. 8 (comp. xxxii. 3, xxxviii. 3) suggest an interpolation.

3. οἱ ἀριθμοὶ τῶν καλέσθεντος. O' vacat; but AQ have καὶ τὸ (A om. τὸ) στόμα αὐτοῦ μετὰ τοῦ στόματι σου λαλῇσθε. In Pesh. the pronouns change places, evidently in order to harmonize more closely with the previous clause. The expression in xxxix. 5 (ניבר יאדו חספיטש) used of Nebuchadnezzar is sufficiently like this to justify us in accepting the words and so in conjecturing that the omission in ב 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. **τῶν καὶ τῆς ἤμας ἔδρας.** O' vacat (Q οὐκ ἀποθανῆ ἐν ρομφαίᾳ). It is hard (against Gi.) to see a sufficient reason for O's omitting these words, if genuine.
5. καὶ ὁς ἐκλαυσαν. O' read ב, and translated as though it were the root ב ל; so below, קרא, κλαύσονται. Aq. has τοὺς ἐμπυρισμοὺς and ἐμπυρίσουσι. This rendering was incumbent upon him, owing to his extreme literalness. It is unlikely that the original form of O' was ἐκαυσαν, καύσονται.

6. τῶν βασιλεύσαντας πρῶτοι του σου.

καὶ ἐώς ἄδον; looking like the corruption of a transliteration. But B* marc* adds ὁ κύριος, and AQ* insert the same before κ. ἐ. θ. This may be, as Perles (p. 83) suggests, a reminiscence of xxii. 18, where however ἡ ἡλίθιος was left untranslated. See note there.

7. οὐκ θυσία. O' vacat (AQ* τὰς καταλελιμένας; Q* λειμ.).

8. לֹא. O' vacat. So Vulg.

9. לְבלְתֵּי בְּנֵי בֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר נִשְׂרָה אַשְׁרָף. O' read מִידָה (A 'יושרים). O' read יִשְׂרָאֵל, and apparently had not נְח. They also failed, as in xxv. 11 (see note there) to perceive the sense of בַּעֲר ב. The word was not perceived to be 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 אַלְוָה and שִׁירָם are glosses. The latter however is distinctly represented in O', and is in all probability genuine.

10. καὶ ἑπεστράφησαν; apparently by confusion of eye with בּוֹרָבִים which begins v. 11.

ласт (II) ... לָשׁוֹם. O' vacat; a mistake owing to the recurrence of לָשׁוֹם, while the omission would be rendered all the easier, since the word בּוֹרָבִים had been already dealt with (see last note) by the scribe. It is curious that מִשֶּׁה itself has not been rendered in either v., although represented in vv. 9, 16 (ἐλευθέρους). It should be added that לָשׁוֹם בּוֹרָבִים here may well be an accidental repetition of the same words as ending v. 9 (see note there) and beginning v. 10.

14. שָׁבַע. אֶפְסֹד; to harmonize with the numeral that follows, and not to be accounted for by any difference in their Heb. text.

ἅπαντεσθείς (ἀλλήλων); thus agreeing more closely with the words of Deut. xv. 12.

מִשֶּׁה. O' vacat. The word may easily have been introduced later from the v. in Deut.

גָּלְתִּים. O' vacat.

15. Καὶ ἑπεστρέψαν (Α 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. ἡβασμένος. O' vacat. The clause is suggested by v. 11.

17. οὐ γίγνεται. O' vacat.

εἰς διασποράν, but in xv. 4 εἰς ἀνάγκασιν.

18. ἵνα κατά τὸν μόσχον. These words, though appearing in O' (but not ΝοA), are clearly an early interpolation, meant as an explanation of the immediately preceding ἀπεδήμησαν, which was thus erroneously interpreted to refer to the broken covenant with the released slaves.

κατὰ πρόσωπον μου, τὸν μόσχον. If we read ὅν, and alter O' to correspond, the grammatical difficulty in connexion with ὅν disappears. The traditional pointing of ἵνα seems to have arisen from the pron. aff. in προφήτη.

ὅν (א om. ὅν) ἐποίησαν ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτῷ. O' did not find ὅν, and in the absence of these words gave a vague rendering to the remainder. 'ος, ὅς was the addition of a scribe whose eye sprang from
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3° יִשָּׁע, and, writing in consequence of this mistake בֵּיתָו, completed the sense (having regard to the subsequent context) by inserting לוֹ. So apparently Gi.

19. הֶזְרִי יִשָּׁע. O' vacat.

καὶ τὸν λαόν. 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. בָּנָי מְבָנָי נְפָשׁוֹ. 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.

21. אָבִיר מְבָנָי נְפָשׁוֹ. 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 v. involves that of the treatment of the words which follow. See next note.

καὶ δύναμις βασιλέως Βασιλείων. O' omits Βασιλείων, and treats 'H 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 v. 22)

"And as for etc." It is true that this change, if we also omit the words dealt with in the preceding note, leaves v. 21 with but one member, but this does not seem to be a very serious objection to the arrangement.

toῖς ἀποτρέχουσιν (A οἱ ἀποτρέχοντες) ἀπ′ αὐτῶν; as though reading ἔλαβον.

xxxv. [xlii.] 2. τὼν αὐλῶν; but in v. 4 both παστοφόρου (and so in 1 Chr. ix. 26) and οἶκος (so in xxxvi. [xliii.] 10, 20).

4. νίὶ νιῶν 'Ιωνίων νιῶν 'Ανανίου (Ν 'Αννίων, Ν' 'Αννάνιου), but Q om. 'Ι. νιῶν.

5. κατὰ πρόσωπον.
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autòv. Here only is used in their designation. See vv. 2, 3, 18. O’ therefore is to be preferred.

7. ἐκάθισεν ο. O’ vacat.

8. ἐστίν ο. O’ vacat.

11. ἐκαθισμένας. See introd. note to chaps. xxvii.—xxix.

τῶν Ἀσσυρίων; not reading ἐκαθισμένας, but giving this sense to ἐκάθισεν, inasmuch as it formed an important portion of the Assyrian Empire, and these bands were sent by Nebuchadnezzar.

12. ἔκκλησα. It is more natural to retain the 1st p. in accordance with the previous context, thus taking ‘τί’ as a gloss.

14. ἔστησαν ἑναμ. vioi ἵνα ἐστήσαν ἑναμ. vioi ἵνα ἐστήσαν ἵ

15. ἐστήσαν ἑναμ. O’ vacat; introduced from such passages as vii. 25. See on vii. 13.


I. O' vacat.

18. O' vacat. The spuriousness is indicated by this use of the 3rd p., as compared with the preceding context.

The tact in the opening of the next v.

f. *dii τούτῳ οὕτως (ἐλπὶ δὲ) taken by confusion of eye from the opening of the next v.

ς. ηκούσαν νιὼ Ιω. νιὼ '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 (ἐλπίς οὖν) at the beginning of the v. led to the change in the persons.

ς. O' vacat.

19. O' vacat. Having accidentally given ἔλπις (see note on ἔλπις, v. 18), they did not repeat it. The rest is a gloss.

ς. ὁνέρβ. τών νιῶν 'Ιωνανάβη; Midrashic.

ς. πάσας τᾶς ημέρας τῆς γῆς; Midrashic.

xxvi. [xliii.] 1. ἔγενεθι λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς μέ. The rest of the chapter is in the 3rd p. The Greek
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. Ἰερουσαλήμ (but AQ* as M.T.); rightly.
   Ὀ' adds βασιλέως Ἰουδα.
6. Ἡμεῖς ἄλλη. Ὀ' vacat.

ἐν τῷ καρτίῳ (ἈQ 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 ‘‘τὸν’’ 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 ἀνάγκη is no objection to this view, as its antecedent has been virtually mentioned in the previous clause (ὅπως). Gi. (ad loc. and p. xxxi) says that the claim of the words ‘‘τὸν’’ 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. (ἀνάγκη) is rendered by Ὀ’. Since however O’’s rendering there is ἀνάγκη αὐτῶι, to them (the hearers), it is plain that his argument falls to the ground.

9. τῷ ὄγδῳ, 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 ש and ש. "[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.

20. אֲכֹל הָעַשֶׁם...בִּירָשָׁלֵם. נֵא (A pref. δ) οἶκος 'יוֹדָה. The Heb. is altered to accord with the end of v. 6.

12. Σέλεμίου ( inodekiov). Apparently the error arose under the influence of the Σ. of v. 14.

21. Καὶ Ἰωβάνναι (AQ* Ναθάν). In v. 25 we find Ἰωβάνναι (A Ναθάν). (In xxvi. [xxxiii.] 22 O' omits the name.) Accordingly in the present case Ἰωβ. 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. ὅ τε. O' vacat.
14. ἐπὶ μεταφρασά τοὺς Βαροῦχ ὑπὸ Νηρίου; a gloss.
   O' vacuum (A τοῦ 'Ιουδεί; Q τοῦ 'Ιουδείν); apparently an accidental omission.

15. Ἔριν. Πάλιν (Ἀρ). The M.T. reading is more natural and graphic. Targ. however is not, as Gi. says, in its favour (?).

16. συνεβολεύσαντό; loosely.

17. ᾿Ο vacat.

18. τοὺς. ἀντίγραφον (Q γελλόν) μοι Ἰερεμίας (Q om. Ἰε.).
   O' vacuum. They may easily have been ignorant of the meaning of this ἄπ. λέγ. 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 Ῥι, but at the same time consider (not so Gi.) that the word is a gloss. See Wo., pp. 47 f.

20. Ἐλεισά (AQ -σαμά), and so in v. 21.

22. Ὁ vacat.
kai ἐσχάρα πυρὸς (ὄμοi ἔχω); doubtless rightly. The ἔχω is in itself suspicious. O' vacat.

23. ἀπετεμένη (A ἀπετεμέν) αὐτᾶς (N A 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. ἐξέστησαν; but AQ and others have ἐξέχειτ, and so SH. These point to the original ἐξέστησαν, which appears in MSS. 41, 87, and is adopted in Compl.

25. Ἐλναθάν (A Naθαν). See on v. 12.

πρὸς τὸ (N³A Q ins. μὴ) κατακαύσαι. The misunderstanding which induced the omission of the negative (for such omissions see on xviii. 18) probably was caused by the δ. 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 ἠκουσέν αὐτῶν; so MSS. 86, 88). See last note.

26. οὕτωι Κρίθην ὡς ἰδιοβείλα. O' vacat.
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καὶ κατεκρύβησαν (Q* adds ἐν Κυρίου); softening the expression, in order to avoid anthropomorphism. Comp. xxxi. [xxxviii.]

20.

31. ἐπὶ αὐτῶν, but ΝΑQ* αὐτοῖς (perhaps read as 'ἐπί ο·λι·ς).

γῆν Ἰουδα (Ν* τὴν Ἰδουμαίαν, Νεα τ. Ἰουδαλαν; Q τ. γ. 'Ἰουδα); an early error.

32. καὶ ἕλαβεν Βαρούχ χαρτιον ἐτερον. The M.T. (against Gi.) has probably arisen from the influence of the command in v. 28.

xxxvii. [xliv.] 1. Μιλ. O' vacat. Here the absence of the article is in itself suspicious.

ἐπισταντες πρὸς ἀνθρώποι. Ἰωακείμ (but AQ pref. Ἰεχωνίου υἱοῦ); an accidental omission.

4. τῆς πόλεως (reading ἡνύσ). MSS. 23, 62, 88, 233 have τοῦ δχλου, and so SH.

5. δεῦρον ἐκλεοσμένοι. O' vacat.

ἐπὶ (but ΝεαAQ ἀπὸ); an obvious error.

7. ἐπεί (perhaps τῆς ταπείς τοίς); Hence O’s reading, as given in the next note.

πρὸς σέ. O’ were thus led (see last note) to read as ἔλθεν (αλλακε), and ignore ἐλθέν, as though an error in their Heb. text.
CRITICAL NOTES.

9. μη υπολάβητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς υμῶν; confusing Hiph. of אָנָּה with Kal of אָנָּה (although they recognised the former in iv. 10); so in xliv. 16 [xxix. 17] אָנָּה, ἐνεχείρησεν.

12. τοῦ ἀγοράσας ἐκείθεν (N. a. marx. adds ἀρτοῦ; 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 ἀλλά, a verb which they thus render in 2 Chr. i. 16 (comp. Neh. x. 32 [2 Esd. xx. 31]). Aq. Theod. have μερισθήναι, and Symm. μερίσασθαι; thus taking it (rightly) to refer to an inheritance.

13. ἄνθρωπος παρ' φ' κατέλυεν (Aq κατέλυσεν); reading the root ἄφ' by transposition, inasmuch as καταλύων corresponds to ἁφράθη in Is. xxxviii. 12.

15. ὅν εἰς καί. O' vacat.

16. καὶ ὅν εἰς (N. a. ὅτι) ἠλθεν (ἐλθέθη); obviously rightly. For a converse case see on viii. 3.

17. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτῶν; a free rendering.

O' vacat.
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ο λόγος (but ΝΑQ om. ὅ); inaccurately, the Heb. being indefinite.
19. ο' vacat.
20. ο' vacat.

καὶ τί ἀποστρέφεις με; ο' vacat;
apparently an accidental omission, helped by the occurrence of ἦμι already in the enumeration.
2. ο' vacat; as often, e.g. xxi. 9, xxvii. 8 [xxxiv. 6], xxxii. [xxxix.] 24, xlii. [lix.] 17, xliiv. [li.] 13.
3. οτε οὖτος (ὅ, οὖν); probably rightly.
4. οὔτα. χρησιμολογεῖ, but ΒαβΝΑQ have χρησμ. See on viii. 2.
5. οὐκ ἦδυνατο ο βασιλέως πρὸς αὐτούς; reading ἦδυνατο, and thus making the clause a remark of the narrator. The tense of οὐκ 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 ἤδυνατο
6. ο' vacat.

λακκοῦ (but ΝΑQ τῶν λ). The anomalous insertion of the article in the Heb. perhaps arose from the ἦμι of xxxvii. 16.
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καὶ ἐξάλασαν αὐτὸν (Q sub "πάντες" with ast. adds ἐν σχούλωις) εἰς τὸν λαόκον. The last words of both texts are probably glosses.

καὶ ἦν (Q* om. ἦν); reading ἦν, afterwards supplanting by the gloss.

7. ο' vacat.

8. ζῷον ἤματι. πρὸς αὐτὸν. Each is probably a gloss.

9. ο' vacat.

10. ἐπονηρεύσω ἐποίησας τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν τοῦτον; altered thus in order to express more literally and fully the actual facts.

11. ο' vacat.

12. ἦσιν... θύσιν. ταῦτα θές (Q θές ταῦτα); M.T. (but not so Gi. p. xxxi) constructing its gloss by the help of v. 11.

14. εἰς οἴκιαν ἁσελεισθὰ (ἡ ἁσαλητή, Ἄ σαλαθητή, Q* ἁσιλεισθή). 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. O' vacat.

O' vacat. 2° O' vacat.

20. τὸν (A om. τὸν) 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 (κατάκαυθήσεται). So Targ. Pesh., suitig the parallelism. The is of course by no means a conclusive objection.

25. τι εὐλαβείσαι σοι ὅβασιλεύς; (Q τι εὐλαβεῖσαι πρὸς τὸν βασ. ;). 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. Kal 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 Ierusalem.

xxxix. [xlvi.] 1. ἔστω δὲ ἡ διψήφια τηλείωσις τῆς Βασιλείας. τῷ (Ἀ pref. ἐν) μηνὶ (ΑQ ἐν τῷ ἐτεί) τῷ ἐνάτῳ τοῦ Σεδεκία (so B; BαόΑQ -λοῦ) βασιλέως Ἰουδα (ΑQ add ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ δεκάτῳ). Βό 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 καί to the Ναβου., while in ΝΑΩ the καί 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. כב (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 αὐτῶν. It sounds obscure, but must mean Jer.'s house. It is probably a gloss, embodying some tradition.

16. Ο' vacat.

xl. [xlvii.] 1. Ο' vacat.
3. Ο' vacat.
4. Ο' vacat.

4. (NAQ ὃκε) καὶ (A om. κ.) θήσω.

4. 5. διασμένω... έθαβεν. εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀπότρεψῃ (NA ins. καὶ) ἀνάστρεψῃ (A εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀπόστρεψῃ καὶ ἀπότρεψῃ). We may take this to represent an original διασμένω... έθαβεν becoming διασμένω... έθαβεν (comp. Zech. xi. 12), and the negative amplified by way of harmonizing with the earlier part of the v. έλθῃ is rendered by ἀπότρηση.

xxxvii. [xliv.] 9. The remainder of v. 4 in M.T. was suggested by Gen. xiii. 9, while the words έλθῃ δὲ λαός are a picturesque gloss.

5. παυτρὶ. έν γῇ ("쾌"); to be preferred.

τοῦ λαὸς έν γῇ Ἰουδα. εἰς ἀπαντά τὰ ἀγαθὰ έν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου, but Νὸ τοῦ λ. εἰς πάντα τὰ ἀγ. έν γῇ (Ν' om. γῇ); Ο' τοῦ λ. εἰς π. τ. ἀγ. έν. Ο' vacat (Ο ἐστιατορίαν καὶ).
7. καὶ ηὐναίκας αὐτῶν. They seem to have been suggested by lii.

16. 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 בּוֹנִי is represented in Targ. by a singular. So also many mss. in Kenn. and de Rossi.

9. ματρώος. ἀπὸ προσωποῦ (אA ins. τῶν) παλδών; reading ματρώος, which is found in 2 K. xxv.

24. It is remarkable that there O' seem to have read ματρώος, rendering παραδόν.

10. O' adds εὐαντίον υμῶν (Q om.).

12. μάρ. O' vacat.

13. O' adds καὶ ἐλαίου (from v. 10).

15. μὴ (ΑQ add ποτε) παρατάξει σου ψυχήν; freely.

xli. [xlviii.] 1. οἰκὶ οἰκῆ. O' vacat; probably a gloss. For οἰκὸς see on xxxix. 13.

2. μετὰ αὐτῶν. O' vacat.

3. μετὰ αὐτῶν. O' vacat.

5. καὶ (Q om. κ.) ἀπὸ Σαλήμ (A Σαλώμ).
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is mentioned as בֹּרֶה in M.T. of Gen. xxxiii. 18, but perhaps ש 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 סהל here, and A's variant strengthens this view.

6. אַרְבַּא דְוַי נַבֶּה. (A καὶ) αὐτὸν εὐφρεύοντο καὶ εκλαίον (הָלֵל וַיְבִלְבֶּה). 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. דֶּתֶר...אֶנֶּגֶט. O' vacat.

8. בָּשׁ. εἴμι (ἐσμέν); but Q om.

9. חָלָּא כַּלְפֵּרוּן קַלוֹנֶשָׁה. πάντας. Gi. (p. xxxi) denies that M.T. is a gloss.

The Heb. is scarcely intelligible, while the Greek is probably right.

10. דְּתָלְפָּאַב כְּאָמַרֵת רַפְּאָא. O' vacat.

אָלָבָאַת קַלוֹנֶשָׁה. 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. ἄνατος. τὸ στρατόπεδον αὐτῶν; reading

13. ἄνατος. O' vacat.

14. ἄνατος... ἀνατομον. O' vacat.

πρὸς Ἰωάννης. ἄνατος ἰματήν καὶ ἔκτετρα. O' vacat.

15. ἄνατος. O' vacat.

16. ἄνατος... ἀνατομον. O' vacat.

17. ἄνατος. ἐν Γαβριη-ρωχαμά. ἐν Γαβριη-ρωχαμά (ἐν ἑπ. ras. B'), ἐν γῇ Βαρωχαμά, Α ἐν γῇ Βαρωχαμά, Οἐ ἐν γῇ Βαρωχαμά. All these, M.T. included, are doubtless corruptions of the original. Gi. conjectures the first word to have been Ἰωάννης. So Aq., and Josephus, whose words (Ant. x. 9. 5) are "εἰς τελα τόπων, μάνδραν λεγό-μενον."

xlii. [xliv.] 1. ἄνατος... ἀνατομον. καὶ Ἁζαρίας

vids Μασαίου (Ἀνναίου, Οσαίου, Α Μασαίου). Ἁζαρ., as in xliii. [l. 2, where M.T.

it itself has ἱστορεῖν., 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 xli. [xlvii.] 8. Maaos. is as in xliii. 2, where M.T. is as here.

2. ἐνυρν. O' vacat.

9. Ἰάληθ...ἔχον. O' vacat.

10. ἐὰν καθίσαντες καθίσατε (reading θαύμα).

12. ρωμ. καὶ ἐλεύθο; so ἤμισσυ, καὶ ἐπισφέρεσσο. Apparently the Heb. words were read as infin. abs., and so considered as carrying on the person of מְלֹאכָה.

14. לְאָם לְא. 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 לְאָם.

15. שֶׁאָרוּךְ יְהוֹדָה. O' vacat.

17. οἱ ἀνθρώποι (Q οἱ ἄνδρες). O' adds καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀλλογενεῖς, as though reading οἱ ἀλλογενεῖς. This was perhaps suggested to them (so Gi.) by דְּרָי of xliii. 2, although it is scarcely probable, as the Greek for that word (see note) survives for us only in Q.

O' vacat. See on xxxii. 24, xxxviii. 2.
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οὐσίμενος; so for 'ש ו' in xliv. [li.] 14, οὐσίμενος.

18. τηθήν. O' vacat.

eis āβατου (Mt Αβγυτου) και (ĸ om. και) ἐποχειροῦ; thus omitting ἅτα. και ὑπ. may well be a gloss.

19. ἰδρέτερ Κύριος. Probably the Heb. has early lost an opening ἰδρέτερ Κύριος through an error of eye. For the formula see x. 1, xliv. 1, xlvi. 13, l. 1. 'O', feeling the abruptness, supplied the relative. Vulg. has Verbum Domini.

20. ἐπονηρέωσας; reading ἐπονηρέωσας. O' vacat; through confusion of eye.

21. ἀστικαὶ τῆς ἐπανάδειξις O' vacat. Gi.'s view that O' purposely omitted ἰδρέτερ Κύριος is unlikely, as thereby they would have wantonly made their rendering harsher.

22. ἔρθει τῆς προσφοράς O' vacat.

23. ἤστηκε Ωσαλοῦν. O' vacat. See v. 17.

xliii. [l.] 2. Ἀκαρχαίος úvós Μαασάιον (B Maasaiou, K Mašéou, K Mašéou, A Μασσαίου, Q Ωσαλοῦ). See on xlii. 1.
We can recover the art. in M.T., if (with Gi.) we emend to ἡμέρας, 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 ἡμέρας, would not be a very serious difficulty with them, we gather from such passages as vii. 10 (see note there) and xlix. 8 [xxix. 9].

6. papērētēr. O' vacat.

10. πρὸς ήμᾶς; reading ἡμέρας. M.T. however is on the whole the more probable, when we compare the language of xlii. [xlix.] 20.

5. μελέτησαμε... σε. O' vacat.

4. θεώρησε. O' vacat (A Ἰουδα). See on xli. 16.

καὶ τὰ λοιπά (A καὶ τὰ ψηφία κ. τ. λ.; O τὰ ψηφ. λ.). So in xli. [xlviii.] 16.

9. εἰν (H εἰς) προθύροις, εἰν πύλῃ. O' have omitted τὸν (which occurs here only), perhaps as being unknown to them. We may however adopt Gi.'s suggestion that they read τὸν, with Aq. Symm. Theod., who
have ἐν (τῷ) κρυφῷ 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 κατάκρυφον. ἰκλη is a subst. which occurs elsewhere only in Nah. iii. 14 (πλήνθου) and 2 S. xii. 31 (τὸ πληθέου). MS. 88 with ast. (so Q πλήνθου ἐν τῷ π.) has ἐν πληθίῳ in the present passage. Probably (so Gi.) it is a corruption of ἰκλη, and stood immediately before ἰκλη. After the word had thus been corrupted to a subst., ἰκλη was inserted for the sake of the sense, and O', finding this form of text, omitted ἰκλη and took ἰκλη as though it were ἰκλη misplaced.

10. ὅραν. O' vacat. See on xxv. 9.

καὶ θησεῖ; rightly, as the following shews. M.T. arose from the influence of

κατάκρυψας (ἢ -ῦ). M.T. is probably 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. λεγ. 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. kai kaúsei. See on ἐν τῇ φαλαίνῃ in v. 10.

kai φθειρεῖ (A φθερ.); and so ἐν τῇ φαλαίνῃ, φθειρίζει (A φθερ.). a decidedly unsuccessful guess, although Cor. (p. 73) confidently defends it. O' vacat; a gloss, to distinguish any suitable application of a word which must in its ordinary sense have been familiar. For Aq. and Symm. (? καὶ ἐξερευνήσει τοὺς βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου) see Field's full note.

13. Πῶς ἦν τὸν πόλεμος τοὺς ἐν Ὡμέρου (AQ* ἐν Ἐνώμων); a double rendering.

καὶ τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν. kai tás oikías autōn.
The form in M.T. arose through v. 12.


2. O' vacat.

ἀπὸ ἐνοίκων (AQ* ἐνοίκοιν-τῶν); as though reading ἐν οἴκοιν-τῶν.

3. ὡς. O' vacat. The occurrence of the word in this connexion (contrast v. 8) and its construction (ἐν τῇ φαλαίνῃ) are in themselves suspicious.

4. O' vacat.

5. ἐν πολεμίσι. Considering the number of cases, in which O's rendering suggests the loss s.
of a letter from the present Heb. text, we may
decide to consider that they here read בָּשָׁר, rather than that πύλας is an error for πόλεσιν. 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 בָּשָׁר is rendered by εν πόλε-
σιν (without a variant in H. and P.) in v. 17.

8. לָשׁוּת הָבָרִית לִכְנָם. ἐνα ἐκκοινήστε; reading
doubtless לָשׁוּת הָבָרִית לִכְנָם. The prep. in M.T. comes
from v. 7.

9. τῶν ἀρχόντων ὑμῶν. Read (with Gi.) Σφίττ, comparing the language of vv. 17, 21,
viii. 1.

O' vacat.

καὶ τῶν κακῶν τῶν γυναικῶν
ὑμῶν; but, as Gi. points out, this may be a gloss
by way of correcting ἀρχόντων above, and thus the
words may not have a rightful place in either text.

10. καὶ ὁ οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο; freely.

O' vacat.

O' vacat.

O' vacat.

O' vacat.

11. ἡ ἔρατον. O' vacat.
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11, 12. ἡ πάντας τοὺς καταλογούμενος.

12. οὐάν. O' vacat.

Yet ἰσχυρ. O' vacat. Most of this is a gloss suggested by xlii. [xlix.] 17.

11. O' vacat.

13. οὐάν. O' vacat (ΑQ καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ).

See on xlii. 17.

14. οὐαςμένος. See on xlii.

17. O' vacat (ΑQ θεοῖς ἐτέρωσ).

15. O' vacat.

17. τῇ βασιλίσσῃ τοῦ θυματοῦ. See on vii. 18.

18. O' vacat.

19. 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. יִרָכָה, Job x. 8). Vulg. ad colendum eam, Aq. εν κακωσει (or εἰς κάκωσιν), Symm. τῷ γλυπτῷ αὐτῆς.

20. τοῖς δυνάτοις. See on xli. 16.

21. τοῦ θυματοῦ; as though reading ἡ κακή. The M.T. is ἀπ. λεγ. and suspicious.

17—2
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ἐθυμασαμεν; but B 따른 ἐθυμασαν,
ἐθυμασατε, A ἐθυμασατο.
O' vacat; but they may have found
referring to κτῆτρα. See above.
22. νῦν; ηδύνατο; reading Μαοι στηβ.
O' vacat.
23. καί.
O' vacat.
24. εἰς...Μάρσι. O' vacat.
25. μήεις (A adds ai) γυναῖκες, as
though reading ἢμαμ ρήσεις. This is better, on
account of the gender of the following ἱδρυμα.
It is not absolutely necessary that the three masc.
affixes which follow should be altered. Comp.
Exod. i. 16 (חָזֵב), ii. 17 (חָזֵב and חָזֵב);
so Cant. vi. 9 bis; Ruth i. 8, 9, 11, 13, 22.
26. ἠτανορίκες. O' vacat.
27. ἐδών (B 따른 έως άν) εκλήτω-
σειν (A λειτ.).
28. μόριζαν ειρήνοις. O' vacat.
O' vacat. The earlier form was
doubtless ἢ μ άμ.
29. ἀσκεσι...αυλικες. O' vacat; by an error
of eye.
30. ὧν. O' vacat.

xlvi. 3 [li. 33]. ἅμεν ἕπι πονον τοῦ (Q μου). We should rather read (so SH.) κόπον ἕπι πόνον μου with Compl.

4 [li. 34]. οὐλὴ...θείαν. O' vacat.

xlvi. 1 [xxv. 14]. ἄνευ ρίφας Ἰακώβ ἀπατεβάζει τοὺς μαθηταίς ἡ ἐπιφανεία τῶν ἐπιφανειών. A ἐπιφανεία συν. 'Iepe-

μπλας ἐπὶ τὰ (A* om. τὰ) ἐδύνη. See on xxv. 13 [14].

3 [xxvi]. δολά. So v. 9, and in 1 K. x. 17, xiv. 26, 27, and elsewhere.

5 [xxvi]. ἀναβατ. O' vacat; thus saving us from the difficulty, or according to Schwally (l.c. p. 191, note), the impossibility of taking ἄφες as equivalent to ἐπί.

ὥστε. ἐπί elsewhere is a place of refuge (Ps. cxlii. 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]. ἐπιμαί. ὀδωρ (A* om.); perhaps by confusion of eye with the ἐπι μαί of the next v.

8 [xxvi]. σύναρ. ὀδύνα τοῦ Αὐτοῦ; perhaps meant as Midrashic (comp. the figure as used in Is. viii. 7), and not as translating a variant on the ἐπιμαί of v. 7.
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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], καί μανήσοντας, and li. [xxviii.] 7, ἑσαλεύθησαν.

20 οὐμαθή. O' vacat; but see next note.

10 [xxvi.]. ἔργα (Q om. ᾨ) μᾶχαιρα Κυρίου (Q om. K.).

11 [xxvi.]. For other examples of the confusion of Κ and Ψ see on xx. 17.

12 [xxvi.]. φωνὴν σου (ἡλιὸν); most probably rightly, as better suiting the parallelism. For other examples of the loss of Ι see on iv. 1.

262
17. 39 O' had no difficulty in rendering ἑυκλόθεν αὐτοῦ by κυκλόθεν αὐτοῦ and τοῖς κύκλῳ αὐτῆς. Their reading here was probably from דַּבֵּךְ. 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. [xxxii.] 26.

15 [xxvi.]. ἐφυγεν ἀπὸ σοῦ (ἈQ om. ἀπὸ σοῦ) ὁ Ἀπίς; reading ἡ ἥδη. As Cheyne (ad loc.) remarks, "The authority of the Egyptian-Jewish version in a prophecy relative to Egypt is not slight." ἡ ἥδη, which in M.T. is found elsewhere only Prov. xxviii. 3, is Aramaic, and in the Targ. of Prov. x. 3 represents יִרְדָּנ. Considering then that this last root occurs in the parallel clause here, the reading יִרְדָּנ is a very natural error.

῾ομοίος ὁ ἐκλεκτός σου οὐκ ἐμείνεν; a duplicate rendering of an original ἡ προβάτινα. 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 שנה (see preceding note) and יָכָל in close connexion in v. 21.

16 [xxvi.]. kal (Q' om. kal) τὸ πλῆθος σου ἡ σέβησθεν; reading, according to Gi., יָכָל. But יָכָל is elsewhere rendered by σύμμικτος (xxv. 20, 24 [xxxii. 6, 10], l. [xxvii.] 37). It is thus more likely that they recognised the root רָבָּה (Schwally, l.c. p. 193 proposes רָבָּה), reading the next word בּוֹלך.

17 [xxvi.]. καλέσατε τὸ ὄνομα νυμ. This gives a much better sense. So Pesh. סובא, and Vulg. nomen.

אָשֵׁר. פָּרָע נְכָלָו.

Σαὼν, 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.

סַאָו יִשְׁבֵּי מְזָהָר. Σαὼν 'Eσβεί (AQ 'Eσβί) Ἔμωτή. Gi. suggests that for מְזָהָר they read וְהָיָה or והָיָהוּ.

18 [xxvi.]. ἐνθάλῃ ἵνα άπασάνα. Κύριος ὁ θεὸς (Q om. ὁ θ.).

ὡς τὸ 'Ιταβύριον. So in Hos. v. 1, and in Jos. Bell. Jud. iv. 1. 8, Ant. v. 1. 22, xiii. 15. 4.
19 [xxvi.]. καὶ κληθῶσαι Οὐαί; a paraphrase of the text, either as it stands, or with the letters Ψ and Χ transposed. See on ii. 15, ix. 9 [10].
20 [xxvi.]. ἵππωπασμα; Vulg. stimulator. The Heb. is קָמֹא. ηλθεν εν αυτὴν (הָלָה); doubtless rightly. So Pesh. (מָלַכְתָא) and Vulg. (veniet ei).
22 [xxvi.]. ὁς δεῖως συριζοντος (A*ενδεικνύοντος; evidently an early error for συριζοντος (so Spohn). For σύρω used of serpents comp. Deut. xxxii. 24; Mic. vii. 17.
23 [xxvi.]. εἰκασθῇ. So Spohn suggests ετασθῇ.
25 [xxvi.]. ηλθεν. See on xv. 11.
26 [xxvi.]. τὸν (Q om. τ.) υἱὸν αυτῆς; reading הָלָה (ולוח). For confusion of ל and מ see on xx. 17. The מ itself however (see Nah. iii. 8) is probably an accretion, suggested by the מ of the previous word.
26° פִּלְפֵלָהוֹ...וְלָשָׁנָהוֹ. O' vacat, owing to a confusion of eye, through the recurrence of פִּלְפֵלָהוֹ.
26 [xxvi.]. O' vacat. The expression פִּלְפֵלָהוֹ 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 xlvi. [xxxii.] 47, xlix. [xxx.] 6. In xlix. 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.]. καὶ ὑπνώσει (N* om.). Comp. xlvi. [xxxii.] 11, ἀνεπαύσατο.

28 [xxvi.]. ὡς. O' add ἡ ἀπτόητος καὶ τρυφέρα παρεδόθη; a gloss erroneously introduced from xxvii. [1.] 2, which in O' immediately follows. xlvi. [xxix.]. O' vacat.

בּסֵרָה...אַרְתִּיעָה. 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 (Kαδυτας) 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. \( \text{ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὄρμης αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ὀπλῶν (καὶ) τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.} \) Thus O' read or understood a \( π \) before \( Β \), and did not see the reference of \( Β \) to steeds. See on viii. 16.

4. \( \text{O' vacat; a gloss on the following words.} \)

\( \text{τοὺς (A τὰς) καταλαίποντος τῶν νήσων.} \) This suggests that O' closed the v. with (\( \text{Ν} = \) \( \text{Να} \)), and that \( \text{ομά} \) 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. (\( \text{καταλοίπονθα} \) Pesh. Vulg.

5. \( \text{ἀπερίφη; reading Ρ for Ῥ.} \) Comp. viii. 14. Vulg., taking M.T. as though from \( ρόπος \) or \( ρόπα \), has \( \text{conticuit.} \)

\( \text{Ἐνακεῖμ; probably rightly, M.T. being harsh.} \) Aq. (\( τῶν κοιλαδῶν \)) read \( \text{πρὸς} \). Similarly in 1 Chr. xii. 15 we should correct M.T. to \( \text{ὕπτωκος} \). Comp. the statement in Josh. xi. 22. Krochmel (quoted by Cheyne \( \text{ad loc.} \)) proposes \( \text{πρὸς.} \)

6. \( \text{O' vacat, also connecting the last three words of v. 5 with Λ ἦς ἦς, to which the reflexive sense of Λ ἦς is unsuited.} \)
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7. ησυχάσει (τάσκει), but A -σεις. M.T.'s error was caused by the preceding καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς παραβάλασσιν. For concrete in place of abstract see on xxiv. 5.

reading for the first word ἔπειτα καταλοίπους, ἐπεγερθεῖς, and in the second seeing the root ἵτυρ, to be hot, excited, which appears as a substantival form in xv. 8; (Hos. xi. 9).

xlvii. [xxxii.] 1. οὕτω. O' vacat.

The testimony of Aq. Theod. is not clear. Symm. has τὸ κραταῖομα (? καὶ ἡττὴθη). That 'M should be joined with fem. verbs renders M.T. also suspicious. Gi. proposes some such emendation as is.

2. ἵατρεία (Q ἀγαυρίαμα) Μωάβ (A ἐν M.). They read ἡθύτη, although this word is rendered by ὀφελία (ὀφελεῖα) xxx. [xxvii.] 13, xlvi. [xxvi.] 11.

O' pref. ἀγαυρίαμα (Q om.); a gloss corrective of the preceding ἵατρεία.

ἐκόψωμεν (Q δεῦτε καὶ ἐκκόψω-μεν) αὐτὴν.
CRITICAL NOTES.

καὶ παῦσων παῦσεται. So Vulg. ergo silens conticesces, but Symm. (probably) ἔτι, Μαδμηνά, σωπῆση.

3. ἐκκραγότων. For concrete in place of abstract see on xxiv. 5.

4. ὁσφαίρισε ἐν τῷ (ἢ φρώνι μ') φρύαρεὶ μ'. ἀναγραφητε eis Zoýora; very possibly rightly. Aq. (and probably) Symm. support M.T. as to 'ח. “Zoar and Horonaim are mentioned together, not only in v. 34, but also in Is. xv. 5.” Cheyne (ad loc.). See next note. The 'ח is suggested by xl. 20, l. 45.

5. ἡσελέθ γαρ Ἕλλην (ἠθήνα ἡ) ἡλλην (◙) ἐκκλησ. ἀλλ' ἐν κλάυθμον; thus reading the first word ἡλλην, taking the 'ח as a proper name, and including the next word in the clause (against M.T.). The v. is almost identical with Is. xv. 5, which supports the 'ח.

κλαίων. The 'ח looks like ditto-graphy, and O' considered it as such. Is. xv. 5 has simply 'ח, which probably is the original reading here also.

ἐν δόφος; loosely.

O' vacat. The word is absent from Is. xv. 5 (see last note).

6. οὐσίαν ἃνοικ ἄγιας; reading rightly ὃσια.
7. ἐν ὀχυρώμασιν σου (βασιλεία; see v. 41). So Vulg. in munitionibus tuis. 'בַּנְכָּנִים was easily corrupted into 'בַּנְכָּנ, while the first word is an insertion referring to the idol Chemosh mentioned later in the v. So Cor. (pp. 55 f.). Compare for 'בַּנְכָּנ in this sense, 'בַּנְכָּנִים, Deut. iv. 28 and elsewhere.

8. οὐ μὴ (AQ pref. καὶ πόλις); apparently an accidental omission.

9. σημεῖα (A -είον); reading or understanding דֹּל (comp. iv. 6) or better (so Gi.) דֹּל (xxx. 21), a waymark. Aq. ἄνθος, Symm. βλάστημα.

 revenues. ἀφῆ ἀφθησεται (AQ ἀναφθ.). as though from a root equivalent to לִכְךָ = לִכְךָ, to kindle. Aq. ἄνθος ἐκελεύσεται, Symm. (better) ἐξόδο ἐξέλ. and so Targ. This makes לִכְךָ = לִכְךָ, and such a root would suit well enough דֹּל (see last note). The neighbourhood however of לִכְךָ here suggests that we should emend (so Schwally, l.c. p. 197) in accordance with iv. 7, to לָכְךָ

πόθεν ἐνοικός αὐτή (ΑQ αὐτῆς; A ἀπὸ ἐνοικοῦντων αὐτάς); an unusual rendering. See iv. 7, 29, ix. 10 etc.

10. O' vacat.

καὶ πεποίθως. Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 27, ἡσυχάσει.

ἐπὶ τῇ δοξῇ αὐτῷ; apparently connecting the subst. with ἦ. In its two other occurrences they either ignore it, rendering very loosely (Is. xxv. 6) or translate φυλάγματα (Zeph. i. 12).

12. καὶ τὰ κέφαλα (a corruption of κεφάλαια) αὐτῶν; reading ἰνακρ. The pl. aff. of M.T. is unaccountable. Aq. has αὐτῶν, but Symm. αὐτῶι.

13. ἐλπίδος αὐτῶν, πεποίθωτες ἐπ’ αὐτῶις. Ἄρτι appears as Ἔρτ. in ii. 37 [36]. Here we have a double rendering.

15. πάλιν αὐτῶι. The word following ἰνι seems to have been early dubious. Accordingly O’ omitted it, while M.T. read ἱλα in spite of the lack of grammatical concord. Either ἰν 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 ἱλά early became defective, and was supplied conjecturally by M.T. Vulg. is
ascenderunt. To read the first word of the v. is tempting, and has the further advantage that it saves us from making מַלְאָכֶה of both genders. It does not however account for the difficulty which causes, as discussed above.

15. O' vacat.

16. ἡμέρα. Gi. conjectures a misreading of the consecutive letters מַלְאָכֶה, and nothing better than this seems forthcoming.

17. κινήσατε. So xviii. 16, but in xv. 5 διήλθεν is the verb used.

18. εν ἡγασίᾳ. One text or the other seems corrupt. Gi. conjectures מַלְאָכֶה, comparing Is. xlvii. 1. This does not however help us with ὑγ. Another hypothesis is that O' read בִּעַד יְבִנֵה (see Job viii. 11, xl. 21), or that their original word was ἡγασίᾳ. SH. however agrees with their present reading.

Δαβίδ (א דבּוֹי, אדבּוֹי, AQ pref. θυγάτηρ) ἐκτριβέται (א) -βητάς; Q om.). is perhaps a duplication of the ending of מַלְאָכֶה, which in O' ends its clause. Hence Δ. was thought to lack a verb, and ἐκτρ. was supplied.
CRITICAL NOTES.
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19. καὶ σωζόμενον; Q κ. ἀνασ. (καὶ σωζόμενον).

20. συνετρίβη. Λαβὴ being masc. elsewhere in the v., we must read Ἡ, and consider that the ἦ crept in through the following one.

21. καὶ (NAQ pres. εἰπὲ) Ῥέφας

24. O' vacat.

25. καὶ τὸ ἐπίχειρον αὐτοῦ. See on xxvii. 5.

26. εἰς 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. εἰς γελοιασμὸν; reading, probably rightly, γελοιασμόν.

28. εὐρέθη (but Q θησαυ); reading (with 'ט) מִלְתָּא בֶּרִית.

O' vacat; possibly, owing to their s.
not understanding the sense; but rather, the words were suggested by the רבעי of xxxi. 20.

But M.T. is very possibly right in the sense of *shaking the head in mockery*. Comp. the Hiph. in xviii. 16.

28. κατέλιπτων; -λειπ. Ν. A (צוב). and so for the imperatives that follow.

πέτραις στόματι βοθύνου. πέτ. is perhaps a corruption of πέρασιν.

29. μέγα. ῥηπισεον (א).

30. και ψωθη (א). (A τα) ἐργὰ αὐτοῦ; reading ἡμερων.

οὐχὶ τὸ ἰκανὸν αὐτῷ (תא אὐτοῦ) οὐχ οὕτως ἐποίησεν; In Is. xvi. 6, which is substantially identical with this v. as far as לָנָא 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 לָנָא בַּזַּר, 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 οὕτως τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ αὐτοῦ, and Symm. οὕτως ὁ βραχίων αὐτοῦ.

31. ἁλίλιν, ἀγάπη. ὀλολύζετε, βοήσατε; perhaps to avoid expressions which might savour of anthropomorphism. See however on x. 19.

32. ἀφελοῦν. O' vacat. The word hardly looks like a gloss. Gi. (p. xxxi) seems right in thinking that O' deliberately omitted it.

ἐπ' ἁνδρας κειράδας (A κιδάρας) αὐχμοῦ. ἠσιν, as in Is. xvi. 7, may very well have been the original here also. The αὐχ. seems a duplicate rendering of ἡ, which is already represented in the transliteration κειρ. here and in v. 36. Vulg. muri fictilis; Aq. Symm. τοίχον ὀστρακίνου. It is possible however that κειρ. may be a rendering of πρήθι, bald-headed, shaven.

O' vacat. If we hesitate to change to ἢνει, 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 ἑρει.

32. ὡς κλαυθμὸν (καλύτερον); thus pointing us to the reading ἤμελεν found in the parallel passage, Is. xvi. 9. For confusion of ב and ב see on xx. 17.
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πόλεις (Bασιλεις) Ἰακχρ. The Ἰακχρ is clearly an accidental repetition, but it may be earlier than O'. In that case they read Ιακχρ (with 'I. in apposition); otherwise

οὐκ ἔλεθας; as in v. 8. In v. 3 it is (and more accurately) the rendering of Ἰακχρ. Is. l.c. has Ἰακχρ, of which Ιακχρ may be a corruption.

33. Ἰακχρ. O' vacat; taking 'Ι for a proper name (see on ii. 7), and so omitting it as geographically distant from the subject of the prophecy.

προὶ οὐκ ἐπάτησαν (Ἀπατήσας, Α ἐπατηθήσασαν), οὔτε δείπτης οὐκ ἐποίησαν αἴτε. Gi. suggests that προὶ has arisen from a gloss ἴππης, introduced here through the influence of the parallel, Is. xvi. 10 (ἐπατῆσας), and taken as = ἴππης, with the help of the subsequent corruption of αἴτε to δείπτης. It seems however much easier to suppose that 'Ιακχρ (which Gi. makes O' to omit) was read by them Ἰακχρ. This done, they became hopelessly confused as to the remainder of the v. In M.T. we should probably amend (from Is. l.c.) Ἰακχρ to

The last word in O' is a corrupted transliteration.

34. Ἰακχρ. ai πόλεις (Ἀπολει) αὐτῶν (Ἰακχρ).
CRITICAL NOTES.

36. ἐν τῷ ἔδρα (ἕν κείμαι, Ἀ κείμα-

ρεις). See on v. 31.

37. ἐνὶ τῶν τῶν. O' add ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ.

38. ἐν τῇ ἐν τῇ ἐν τῇ ἐν τῇ (ἢ ταῖς

πλατείαις αὐτῆς. But MSS. 22, 33, 36, and others
(without ast.), and so SH., add διὰ κοπεῖτος. The
latter word, if not also the former, seems therefore
to have been early omitted by accident.

39. ἔνα τόπῳ. O' vacat; but it has φησὶν Κύριος
earlier (after συνετριψα). This difference of
position in the two texts illustrates the character
of the insertion, as a frequent gloss.

39. ἐν τῇ ἐν τῇ ἐν τῇ ἐν τῇ (ἢ ταῖς

κατ᾽ ἀλλαξεῖν; The

least change possible is (on account of the masculi-
lines that follow) to read ἔνα, understanding Moab
as the subject. So Gi. Possibly ἔνα is a gloss.
There remains κατη. Cappellus (Notae Crit.
ad loc., quoted by J. F. Schleusner) suggests that it is a corruption of κατά τὴν; Spohn ad loc. that O' had 'Aγάθ (see v. 1), ὀλόλυξον. Thus ἴλιον would be retained as part of the original text. In v. 1 however 'A. represents θάνατον, not 'τὰ Ἰ."  

40. Ἰάκωβ. O' vacat; a gloss, supplied by xlix. 22 [xxix. 23], as is the latter part of v. 41.  

41. Ἰσραήλ...μακάβ. O' vacat. See last note.  

43. παρ᾽ ἐν θόρυβῳ θηρίων καὶ βόθυνος, transposing the order of the words. In the parallel passage, Is. xxiv. 17, the arrangement of the three subssts. is as M.T. there and here, thus giving the order required for v. 44.  

44. ταῦτα (ἡ ἐκκλησία). 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. τὸ δὲ κ᾽ ἐκ τοῦ, as Gi. points out, is a formula otherwise unknown, and apparently suggested to the glossator by v. 21.  

xlix. [xxx.] 1. Μελχῶλ (Q Μολχῶλ, and so SH.). It is evidently the proper name, and not "their king;" and so in v. 3.  

2. O' vacat. The passage, Am. i. 14, which resembles this, does not contain the words.
XLIX. 4] CRITICAL NOTES.

*eis ἀβατον καὶ eis (Ἀ om. eis) ἀπώλειαν. We must apparently take ἀβ as a very free translation of ἔβε, for O' understood it accurately enough in xxx. [xxxvii.] 18, ἔπὶ τὸ ὑψος αὐτής.

καὶ βωμοὶ (ἈQ pref. oǐ) αὐτῆς; reading ἡ ἅρχην αὐτοῦ; either reading ἡ ἅρχην αὐτοῦ, or rendering freely, but giving up thereby any attempt at preserving the paronomasia.

3. ὑ. O' vacat (Q Γαι). Symm. ἡ ἱσχύς (ὑ); so MSS. 22, 36 (adding Γαι), and others, supported by two MSS. of Kenn. K. H. Graf would amend to ὑ.

ὦρὰς ἱστασθήναι δὲν ἐγὼ. O' vacat (Q hab.); MSS. 22, 36, and others have καὶ διαδράμετε διὰ τῶν τριγχῶν (θριγχῶν). But after σάκκους ΝQ have καὶ ἐπιλημπτεύσασθαι (A κ. ἐπιλημπτεύσασθαι), a verb which renders Hithp. of ὑψος in 1 Sam. xxii. 15. Aq. for ἐν θηρίῳ has ἐν φραγμοῖς.

μελχ. See on v. 1.

4. ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις Ἔνακείμ (Ἀ om. Ἔν.). O' thus doubly represents the first word, omitting the others. These latter look also like a somewhat corrupted dittography of the previous letters. MS. 88 (and so SH.) ἐν τ. π. Ζηβ
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πεδίως σου, 22, 36, and others ᾿Εν. διέφρευσε τὰ πεδία σου, Symm. εὖ ταῖς κοιλάσι διέφρευσεν ἡ κοιλάς σου.

(Q τῆς) ἰταμίας. See on xxxi. 22.

is rendered by ἰτ. in xlix. 16 [xxix. 17].

κατασχάνθη. Ο’ add ἡ λέγουσα for smoothness.

5. οὔκ ἡμᾶς Λαῦδι. οὔκ (ᾍΑQ pref. καὶ) ἔστιν (ᾍΑQ ἔσται) ὁ συνάγων; thus omitting ἸΛαῦδι, 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]. Ο’ do not recognise the interrogation. The ἢ may be conjectured to have arisen from the last letter of ἥρω ἡμᾶς immediately preceding, for, as O’ shew us, ἔβαλα, which now separates the two words, is an insertion in M.T.

ἐκ συνάγων. O’ read the word as we do, but made it the Kal ptcp. (not elsewhere found) of ἡμᾶς. Otherwise we must suppose them to have read ἐκ συναγών or ἐκ συναγεῖον.

7, 8 [xxix. 8, 9]. Ο’ do not recognise the interrogation. The ἢ may be conjectured to have arisen from the last letter of ἥρω ἡμᾶς immediately preceding, for, as O’ shew us, ἔβαλα, which now separates the two words, is an insertion in M.T.

ἐκ συνάγων. O’ read the word as we do, but made it the Kal ptcp. (not elsewhere found) of ἡμᾶς. Otherwise we must suppose them to have read ἐκ συναγών or ἐκ συναγεῖον.

Νομρέας ἡμῶν: ὡς ἔφες. οὐκ ἔστι τοῦ πόσον αὐτῶν, but ηπ. τὸ πρὸς (ᾍ τόπος) αὐτῶν. Schwally, l. c. p. 201, considers ἦπ. (a corruption of ἥπ.) ὁ τ. αὐ. to represent a variant of ῾Ηπ. ἥν ὄνειρ ὄν, viz. Νομρέας ἡμῶν: ὡς ἔφες. οὐκ ἔστι τοῦ πόσον αὐτῶν, but ηπ. τὸ πρὸς (ᾍ τόπος) αὐτῶν. Schwally, l. c. p. 201, considers ἦπ. (a corruption of ἥπ.) ὁ τ. αὐ. to represent a variant of ῾Ηπ. ἥν ὄνειρ ὄν, viz.
(Gi. prefers יְתוֹם), while according to him יְתוֹם 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 יְתוֹם any word of similar appearance which shall at all answer to רֹם. O's rendering suggests יֵתֹם. But surely O' read יְתוֹם, and saw in it the root יִתֶּן, which is rendered by the same verb in iv. 10. For their willingness to assume the disappearance of the נ, see on vii. 10, xliii. 2.

9 [xxix. 10]. הָרָנָה כְּפַר.客户提供 אֵצֶחֹ יִתֶּן יִתֶּן יִתֶּן (נָאָ -pss) aυτῶν (יִתֶּן -רָנָה -לָיָה). In the passage, Obad. 5, from which this is probably drawn (נָאָ -רָנָה -לָיָה -בַּקֶּר יִתֶּן), O' were more successful (οὐκ ān ἐκλέγαν τὰ ἐκατά ἄντων ;). That passage seems to have influenced the Vulg. here, “rapuissent quod sufficeret sibi.” Comp. in Obad. “Nonne furati essent suffici-entia sibi ?”

10 [xxix. 11]. יֲבָשָׁה. κατέσυρα (A κατη-ραύνησα). As יֲבָשָׁה is the word in Obad. 6, we may (with Gi.) conjecture here יֲבָשָׁה, as better suiting the idea of a hiding-place. O' however seem to have read as we do, inasmuch as they
represent וַיָּשָׁה (not, as Kircher, by ἀνασύρειν Is. xlvii. 2, but) by περισύρειν Gen. xxx. 38, while A's variant points in the same direction. (See Joel i. 7.)

κρυβήναι; taking it as Niph. infin. abs. (ְךָבָּחַק).

ἀποντὸ δὲ κεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ (א סου; AQ καὶ) γελτονός μου (AQ αὐτοῦ); reading (with other obvious changes) καὶ νῆ σιν, and pointing to the overthrow as caused by a neighbour, Israel; so too Obad. 18—21.

10, 11 [xxix. 11, 12]. ἴδω τὸ καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἑπολύπτεσθαι. M.T. is clearly right both in the stopping and in taking ἴδω as an imperative.

11 [xxix. 12]. ινα ζήσηται καὶ ἐγώ ζήσομαι (Q om. κ. ε. ξ.); a duplicate rendering.


O' vacat, but AQ δι τι πίων πιέσαι, and so (but with πίων) MSS. 22, 33, and others; 36, 48, and others (and so SH.) δι τι πίνουσα πιγ.


ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς. Probably ζῆ ὅτι had fallen out of O's Heb. text (ἐν μ. αὐ. being only a gloss). Hence they took Ἰάκωβ 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 Βοοδρ ἐν μέσῳ μέρους αὐτῆς. Ἡ is also supported by Aq. Symm. Theod.

16 [xxix. 17]. ἡ παιγνία σου; perhaps connecting the word with μλακῶν, the idol mentioned in 1 K. xv. 13; 2 Chr. xv. 16. Ἡ, according to Gi., is a corruption of a gloss, ἡπιλετήνα.

α' τί. ἐνεχειρησεν. See on xxxvii. 9.

κατέλυσεν. ἦν is similarly rendered xxv. 24 [xxxii. 10].

μαθὼν ἑπταν ἑπτηλοῦ; including doubtless a gloss.

17 [xxix. 18]. συριεῖ(Q ἐκ-
στήσεται καὶ συρ. ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν πληγὴν αὐτῆς). The clause τὴν...ν ἔσται 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 1. [xxvii.] 44—46.

19 [xxix. 20]. οὐκ εἰκ. μέσον (ὡς om. μ.). In xii. 5 ἐν φρονάγματι, while in 1. [xxvii.] 44 ἀπό alone, expresses the word.

ὁμόν. εἰς (A τῶν) τόπου. See on ix. 9 [10].

ἐκδιώκει αὐτούς; as though reading, with M.T. (Ἡ) in 1. [xxvii.] 44, ἀντέντω.

καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους; a free render-
ing. So in l. [xxvii.] 44 we have καὶ πάντα νεανίσκον.

ἐπιστῆσατε (A -σεται); perhaps an error arising from the sound of the following ἀντιστήσεται. In l. [xxvii.] 44 O' have ἑπιστῆσω.

ἀντιστήσεται μοι; and so in l. [xxvii.] 44. So in Job ix. 19 is ἀντιστήσεται; Dan. xi. 2 τοιαύτην (probably we should read τοιαύτης), ἀνθεστήκασιν (Theod. ἀναστήσονται).

Apparently in each case they connect with the root ἴσα, appearing, e.g. Ps. xx. 9 (ἴσιον)
20 [xxix. 21]. συνψηθῶσιν (συνῳσιν; AQ συνψηφισθῶσιν); as though reading ἴσαφα. In the parallel passage (l. [xxvii.] 45) M.T. is as here, and O' have again a passive (διαϕαρῇ).

κατάλυσις αὐτῶν. See on 19 [xxix. 20].

In l. [xxvii.] 45 the rendering is νομῆ.

21 [xxix. 22]. καὶ ζαλαλάζω ἐν σοῦ θαλάσσας οὐκ ἠκούσθη, but AQ καὶ (Q om. καὶ) κρ. σοῦ ἐν ψυχῇ ἡν. MS. 88 καὶ καὶ σοῦ ἐν θ. ἐρυθρὰ ἐξηκούσθη ή. φωνῇ αὐτῆς; so (but om. ἡ and with σοῦ for αὐτῆς) 22, 36, and others. Σοῦ 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]. O' vacat.  
οψεται; reading ῥ for ὰ.  
οχυρώματα αὐτῆς. See on v. 13 [xxix. 14].

23 [xxx. 12]. O' vacat; perhaps from perplexity as to the meaning. Schwally, l. c. p. 202, suggests that ἅμια may have been a gloss on ἐμνήσατο. Cor. (p. 57, where see his discussion of other conjectures) considers that the primitive reading in this part of the v. was ἀρμὸν ἥμερας ἔθυμαθησαν (Ἀκ. ἑπτ.). This seems an early error for ἐθυμαθησαν (ὠείας); for elsewhere in this Book ἅμια is rendered by φοβεῖσθαι (xvii. 8), λόγον ἔχειν (xxxviii. [xlv.] 19, xlii. [xlvi.] 16).

24 [xxx. 13]. O' vacat.  
Aq. Theod. represent the clause from ἥμια onwards. SH. also omits ἅμια. This portion therefore is probably a gloss. The remainder is needed for the parallelism.

25 [xxx. 14]. ουρ ἡθολατ (ἡθολατ ἤ) κρῖναι. πόλων ἐμὴν; καμήν ἡγίστησαν. O' had either a different or a defective text.

26 [xxx. 15]. ἰησοῦνται; reading ἵησονται, as is shewn by l. [xxvii.] 30, where ἰησοῦνται represents ἥμια. See on viii. 14 for other instances.
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27 \[xxx. 16\]. ἀμφιδά. See on vi. 5.

28 [xxx. 6]. ἄπλησθο ἠφώρο. (A Q τῆς) βασιλείας τῆς αυλῆς (ἲπλῆς τῆς?).

καὶ πλήσατε; but Q rightly πλήξατε.

30 [xxx. 8]. τῷ 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) βάλανοι οὐ (Q οὐδὲ) μοχλοί; a double rendering.

32 [xxx. 10]. eis ἀπώλειαν. σε receives diverse renderings; in xxi. 9 σκῦλα, in xxxviii. [xlv.] 2, xxxix. [xlvi.] 18 εὐθεμα.

κακραμένους ( שיש א רגוי הקארמגונע) πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν. The same Heb. in ix. 26 is rendered περικεφαλήνου τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον αυτῶν. This of itself corrects the κεκραμ. הָּאָמ in both places was connected by O' with חָמ.
CRITICAL NOTES.

33 [xxx. 11]. ἡ ἀδελφή. See on v. 28. 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]. ἱστορία. Συνεπρέβη (ᾗ ἈΟ ζυγοῦσθαι); to avoid anthropomorphism. See on xxxi. 20.

36 [xxv. 16]. ἔθνος. The ἂν arose by dittography, ἡ ἰδία preceding.

37 [xxv. 17]. ἀρων. O' vacat; kακὰ (ἢ hab.) having fallen out before κατὰ.

1. [xxvii.] 1. ἄλαλήθ...ἐνβίω. O' vacat.

2. διὰphereται ἵπτες. O' vacat; owing to the recurrence of ἢσος.

3. ὠλτέω. O' add ἡ ἀπτόντος, ἡ τρυφερά.

4. παρέδωθα; possibly a corrupt form of παρελυθή. Comp. v. 36 ζωῆς, καὶ παραλυθησονται.

5. ἔκλεσθαι. O' vacat.

3. ἄφες τὸν καρ. O' vacat. The words are suggested by ix. 9.

5. ἔλθησαν καὶ καταφεύγονται. Probably neither text is right. Read, with Cor. (p. 76) τὸν ἔλθησαν. So Pesh. (1ολ) ὁ. He compares li. 10, xxxv. 11.
7. ἀνώμεν αὐτοῦ (reading ἀνώμεν). Comp. Is. ii. 9.


8. ὀσπερ δράκοντες; apparently a corruption of τράγοι, inasmuch as the word ἠθή is shewn to be not unfamiliar to O', by their rendering ἐριφος in li. [xxviii.] 40.

9. ὑπηλυχ. O' vacat.

10. ὑπηλυχ. O' vacat.

11. נְאָנָה (thus and not נְאָנָה. See Baer and Del. Adnot. Crit.). ὀς βοίδια ἐν βότανῃ (אַיֵּים). So Pesh. (אַיֵּים) and Vulg. Yet this wrecks the Heb. grammar, which demands the ptc. (trampling). Targ. (אַיֵּים רְבָּכָה) is right. Correct Gi.'s note accordingly, and see, for the use of רְבָּכָה in connexion with threshing, Levi, Neuheb. u. Ch. Wörterb. s. v.

12. φόρει Ἰολάμβας. O' vacat (A ἐνετράπτη ἡ τεκοῦσα ἡμᾶς; Q with ast. ἐν. ἡ τ. ἡμᾶς). 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
CRITICAL NOTES.

κατορύγη. Comp. Symm. in Ps. lxx. [lxxi.] 24. See Field on both passages.

μὴν η ἐπ' (Q eis) ἀγαθά. Gi. suggests Mic. i. 12 as the source of O', which, as compared with M.T. here, appears incapable of explanation.

O' vacat.

14. O' vacat.

15. kai κατακρατήσατε (AQ ἐπ') αὐτὴν. O's choice of verb is strange. Κατακρατ. has been suggested (comp. v. 31). It is otherwise unknown in O', although Liddell and Scott give it without reservation as occurring there. Elsewhere in this Book κατακρατείν renders the Hiph. of פָּדָה (v. 43, viii. 5), or קַל of שָׁמָּה (xl. [xlvii.] 10).

16. μαχαίρας Ἠλληνικῆς. See on v. 10.

on xxv. 38.

17. τὰ ὀστὰ αὐτοῦ (חֵטֵם).

18. ἀλακσάρ γεβάλ. ἐπὶ τὸν Βαβυλῶνας; but Bab marg. ΑQ insert βασιλέα.

19. O' vacat.

21. (20) ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, λέγει Κύριος. (21) Πικρῶς ἐπὶ βῆθι ἐπ' αὐτὴν. O', not understanding מָלַק, divided the sentences wrongly (finding also רֹאָה in their text). Although they read the last two words as S.
we do, Gi. proposes to substitute הֵרָע for כִּי, as in Is. xxi. 2, so as to supply a subject for the imperative.

καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπ’ αὐτὴν (Q ἐν αὐτῇ; A om. the whole; A om. ἐπ’). 'ἔσχα' may have been read, and taken to represent ἔσχα.

ἐκδίκησον; failing to recognise the proper name, which occurs also in Ezek. xxiii. 23, and there is treated as such by O’.

μάχαιρα (ὄρα) καὶ ἀφάνιον. 'ἡ' 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. ἄναρ. O’ vacat.

24. ἐπιβήσονται; but BαβνQ ἐπιβήσονται. The verb does not occur elsewhere in this Book. The corresponding substantive is correctly translated in v. 26.

26. ὠς (Q om. ὠς) Βαβυλῶν; doubtless a corruption of ὡς B., perhaps induced by the sound of γυνῆ dwelling on the ear.

26. ὅτι ἐκλύθασιν οἱ καιροὶ αὐτῆς. O’ seem to have read as we do, or possibly
31. \textit{Kairos} is their rendering also in Gen. vi. 13; Lam. iv. 18 [19] \textit{(bis)}; Dan. viii. 17 (and ? ix. 26); 2 Chr. xxi. 19.

Vulg. has \textit{ut exeat qui conculcent eam}, as though the word were connected with \textit{υλ}.

\textit{ἐραυνήσατε} (B\textsuperscript{b}ν Q \textit{ἐρευν.}; A pref. \textit{kai}) \textit{αὑτὴν ὡς σπῆλαυν} (N om. \textit{ὡς σπῆλ.}).

O' probably read \textit{σελ} as we do. In Is. lvii. 14 they translate \textit{καθαρίσατε}. '\textit{Υ} they seem to have read as \textit{μουρα} or \textit{μουρί}.

27. \textit{ἀνακηρύσατε}. See on v. 21.

\textit{αὐτὴς πάντας τοὺς καρποὺς} (Q \textit{π. τ. κ. αὐ.)}; reading \textit{ηρί.}.

28. \textit{ἐκπέμπεται}. O' \textit{vacat.}

29. \textit{θεῶν ὁγιῶν} ('\textit{άλ θ}.). See on li. 5.


O' \textit{vacat.}

31. \textit{ἐκδίδησεως} (NA pref. \textit{τῆς}) \textit{sou} (Q\textsuperscript{e} om. \textit{sou}); reading \textit{θακρακ}.)


34. \textit{πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιδίκους αὐτοῦ} (\textit{καθαρίζειν}).
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For the Heb. root see on iv. 20, and for ἐξαίρεσιν in an active sense, xviii. 7, where it renders the root הראש.

36. ἡρῴς ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνάλογων ὑπολογίων. Ὕστερον 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.” Μέτρου is used but once elsewhere (Is. xliv. 25) of persons (comp. too O's difficulty in xlviii. [xxxii.] 30), while ἀνάλογων also is somewhat rare.

37. ἀλλὰ. O' pref. μᾶρχαραν ἐπὶ τοὺς μαχητὰς αὐτῶν; an accidental repetition from the similar words of v. 36.

38. ἡρῴς. Ὅστερον vacat. ἡρῴς 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.

καὶ κατασχυνθησόνται (ὡς), which is supported by Ps. xcvi. 7. See next note.

καὶ ἐν ταῖς νήσους οὗ (ἢ σου; AQ om.) κατακαυχωντο. Gi. points out that Ps. xcvi. 7 serves to correct both these words. ἄλλοι οἱ ταπεινοὶ εἰς τόδε τιμώρασιν here. O' read ἄλλοι, thus testifying to
an early corruption. Kenn. has as variants אָבָא מִסְיִּים, וּבָאָלִים, מִסְיִּים. Symm. supports M.T. (iσχυροῖ), and Vulg. portenta. Aq. has εἰς δῶλα, Targ. אָבָא, by which, as Gi. points out, אל is without exception rendered in the prophets.

39. ἰνδάλματα. In Is. xiii. 21 we find ἡρία, xxxiv. 14 δαιμόνια.

ἐν ταῖς νῆσοις; taking the wrong sense. Is. xiii. 22, xxxiv. 14 have ὄνοκένταυροι.

θυγατέρες σειρήνων. So in Mic. i. 8.

eἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. See on iii. 5.

O vacat.

41—43. This passage strongly resembles vi. 22—24.

42. ἰπάσονται παρεσκευασμένοι (B* παρασκ.; Ν παρεσκ. ἰππ.). Comp. the rendering in vi. 23.

ἀνέπερ πῦρ. See on vi. 23.

44—46. See also notes on xlix. 19—21.

44. O vacat (AQ τόπον).

li. [xxviii.] 1. Χαλδαῖος; 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. ἀνεμὼν καίσωνα.

2. ἀνεμὼν καίσωνα.

2. ὑβριστάς, καὶ καθυβρίσουσιν
(A ὑβρισόσ; Q ὑβρίσωσιν) αὐτήν; reading ὃ for ἔ. M.T. however is so far right (comp. xlix. 36), but we should read θῦρ, in order that both verbs may be from the same root.

3. οὐσί περὶ Βαβυλῶνα (reading ὡς).

3. οὐσί περὶ Βαβυλῶνα (reading ὡς).

3. τεινέτω (Ἀκά μαρ. pref. ἐπ' αὐτήν; Q pref. ἐπ' αὐτή) ὁ τεινών. It seems tempting to read ὅλη, and so ἔλη later. We then omit 2ο ὄν in accordance with ὃ (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 (Ἀλαὶ θύρας = θῦρας ὢ), even when we connect with θῦρα of v. 2, but yet it has the advantage over the reading of the negative (with 2ο θῦρ 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.
CRITICAL NOTES.

... reading apparently ... Wo. also suggests ... Comp. xlvi. [xxvi.] 4. θώρακας. Cor. (p. 77) says that O’s rendering of this and the preceding word points to a reading 'ὑπόθελε υπερ γραφής, whence he conjectures as the original, 'ὑπόθελε γραφής (the enemy) (the enemy) ... 5. πρὸς τὸν ἁγίον Ἰσραήλ; as though the adjective (in defiance of grammar) were applied attributively to Israel. In l. [xxvii.] 29 the context (אֱלֹהִי) 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. οὐ. O’ vacat.

8. ῥητίνην. See on viii. 21.

9. ἅφατε. 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 ἱλίμ in Is. lxii. 1; Ps. xvii. 1.
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11. ἡ ἑρμηνεία τὰς φαρέτρας. So in Ezek. xxvii. 11. In 2 S. viii. 7 we find χλωτοῖς (bracelets), in 2 K. xi. 10 οἱ τρισωσολ (the triple things), in Cant. iv. 4 βόλιδες (missiles), in 2 Chr. xxxiii. 9 τὰ δρακ. Thus the word was for the most part a puzzle to the translators. The probable meaning is none of these, but shields.

βασιλέως (ἑω-ων, ἑω-ως). 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. ἐν ὁμειού; and so in v. 27. See on the other hand the rendering in iv. 6, 21.

φαρέτρας (ἑω-τραν, ἑω-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.).

δρακ. See on xliii. 10.

13. ἐντρεῖς (Ἀ ἐπὶ) τὰ σπλάγχνα σου; (Ἁ ἐμοί). Aq. ἀληθεῖα πλεονεξίας σου. Symm. renders Ἰ by πῆχυς. Vulg. pedalis precisionis tuae. The expression in M.T. is however a strange one. Gi. proposes ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς. ἡ ἡμέρα occurs
in Niph. Job vi. 17, xxiii. 17, in the sense to be extinguished.

14. κατὰ τοῦ βραχίωνος αὐτοῦ; apparently an accidental substitution of an equally familiar formula.

διότι Πληρώσω σε; thus supporting the simple ἔι against ἔι, which latter it is difficult to take in the sense of surely. Gi. suggests ἔι.

οἱ καταβαινόντες (Ῥωίδα or Ῥωίδα). But possibly κ. is a corruption of καταπατοῦντες. In Is. xvi. 9 Ῥωίδα is rendered by καταπατήσω.

15—19. This passage is almost identical with x. 12—16, where see notes.

17. ἐματαιώθη; but AQ (as in x. 14) ἐμαράνθη.

20. ἐκ σοῦ (Q ἐν σοὶ, and so MSS. 22, 23, 26, and others, and SH., this last with the other reading in marg.) βασιλεῖς. If the first ἔ were by accident taken into the previous word, this with the confusion of ἔ and ἔ (for this see xx. 17) would combine to produce ἐκ, and would go a good way towards explaining βασ. The same mistranslation of ἐκ however recurs in v. 27 in Bṣ.

22. οὐ vacat. The
translators also make the preceding and following clauses to change places.

23. καὶ τὸ γεωργίου αὐτοῦ. Elsewhere in O' γ. is not used in this sense. In Gen. xxvi. 14 it renders ἡ Ἐβραί, in Prov. xxiv. 30 [45], xxxi. 16 [xxix. 34] ἄν, while ἄν appears elsewhere as δύο (βοᾶς, 1 S. xi. 7), κόχλαξιν (1 S. xiv. 14), ζεύγη (βοῶν, Is. v. 10).

25. ἑδράφαρμένον; probably taking the word as a subst. (?) ἀσπάσται of Ezek. ix. 1).

ἐπὶ (but ΝΑQ ἀπὸ) τῶν πετρῶν.

27. βασιλείας ἀρατῇ; but AQ βασιλείας Ἀραπῆθ (Q -ρῆ). MS. 88 βασιλείας Ἀραπῆθ, and so SH. (with -ρᾶθ). Ἀρατῇ is doubtless a corruption.

ὃς ἐμοῦ; a similar mistake to that of Ps. xlv. [xlv.] 9, where ἐς, stringed instruments, appears as ἐς ἐν.

βελοστάσεως. The word is used to render ἐς, a battering-ram, in Ezek. iv. 2, and ἐς, a watch-tower, in Ezek. xvii. 17, xxi. 27 [22]. In Nah. iii. 17 (its only other occurrence) ἄσπρα appears as ὁ συμμυκτὸς σου. O' was thus unacquainted with the word.

ὥς ἀκρίδων πλῆθος. οὖς occurs
here only, and the verbal root is found but twice (Ps. cxix. [cxviii.] 120, καθήλωσον; Job iv. 15, ἑφριξαν). Hence O's failure to interpret rightly. See Field's note for discussion of the word.

28. αναβιβάςατε; 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.

τὸν βασιλέα.

τὸν Μὴδων καὶ πᾶσας τὴς γῆς. It is clear that O cannot have had these words, when rendering ἀλ 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 (Ἀ καὶ πᾶσας τῆς γῆς ἐξουσίας αὐτοῦ); clearly a gloss. The masc. pron. has no antecedent. Wo.'s comments on this v. (pp. 83 f., 143) are by no means convincing.

30. ἐθραύσθη; loosely. The verb occurs but three times in M.T. O were more successful in Is. xli. 17 (Καλ), ἐξηράνθη, but see Is. xix. 5, πιονται.

ἐνεπυρίσθη; reading ἡττα. The Hoph. does not, it is true, occur elsewhere, but on account of the parallelism is probably right here.
31, 32. χειραποθεώρησα (32) ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν διαβάσεων αὐτοῦ.

32. καὶ τὰ συντέματα (Bref Q -στημ-) αὐτῶν (AQ αὐτοῦ). It is strange that O' should have rendered the word rightly (ὥς), 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.

33. οἶκοι (Q -κος) βασιλεὺς Βαβυλώνιος; reading ἐνι. Bas. seems a gloss, suggested by such passages as xxxiii. [xl.] 4, (xliii. [l.] 12, 13).

34. ιουλίνα (π) λεμπίνα (κ) ἑνεκαρίας μ' β' ἢ ζινίνα (κ) κατέφαγεν μ' ἐμερίστατο μ', κατέλαβεν μ' σκότος λεπτὸν, Ναβουχοδ. β. B. The verb ἢμ occurs here only in this Book. Elsewhere O' renders it mostly by ἐκταράσσω or ἐξίστημι. Gi. (p. xxii) proposes ἥμημ. The variety in position of 'μ' 'μ' 'ζ' μ' 'ζ' suggests that the words are a gloss in both texts. σκότος λεπτὸν seems a corruption for σκεῦος κενῶν. MSS. 22, 36, and others
give both these as a conflate rendering, κατέλαβε με ὡς σκότος λ....κατέστησε με ὡς σκέδος κ. SH. also gives κατέλαβεν (before ἐμερ.), apparently as a corruption of κατέφαγεν.

34. 35. (35) ἐξεσάν με οἱ μόχθοι (ἠ καθαρά) μου καὶ αἱ ταλαιπωρίαι μου; reading ἡμῖν ἀνέβας. Gi.'s conjecture (p. xxi) ἀναβας (for ἀναβας) is barred by O''s usage elsewhere. See on iv. 13, 20.

37. Ι. O' vacat. The remaining words at any rate were in all probability absent from their Heb. text. For ἦλθα see on ix. 10 [I].

38. ἐξηγερθησαν. MS. 88 (supported by SH.) adds οἱ παιδες αὐτῶν (νύνια). So 22, 36, and others, οἱ νεανίσκοι αὐτῶν. The root μη in this sense is not found elsewhere in M.T., and hence may have been omitted by O'' as unintelligible. ἦ is rightly rendered in ii. 15 (ὡρύντο) and loosely in xxv. 30 [xxxii. 16] (χρηματικὸς δις). In Hos. xi. 10; Am. iii. 4, 8 it is translated ἐρεύζεται. It is thus possible that the present Greek text may be corrupted from ἐρεύζουται. So Aq. Theod. render here in the second clause.

39. παραδώσων (ἢ καθαρῶσων); a word not found elsewhere in O''. Gi. suggests that they read ἐκλήσων.
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40. kal (AQ om. kal) kataphiasson (אא -סא) יתורתי (ויר). O' vacat. See on v. i.

41. א"ש. O' vacat.

43. ויה. O' vacat.

44. ייזא. מ"ה לובלת רבע. The shorter reading is probably right. Gi. points out that דכ might, it is true, easily fall out before דכ. Yet inasmuch as (a) it was not Bel but Babylon (v. 34) which had been the devourer, and (b) the parallelism of the clause ככ 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 מ"ה.

44—49. במשה...יסי. O' vacat. The cause of the omission was the similarity between גגו לובלו נחל נח חמה בבל נחל and מ"ה.

50. מ"ה. We can only conjecture that the word was obscurely written, and that under these circumstances the influence of the following word דכ determined the rendering.

52. ויננ. πέσονται. The verb and corresponding subst. have been successfully dealt with by O' in their other occurrences. Here probably
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obscurity of writing was the cause of the mistranslation.

53. ἀληθῶς (Q ὑπωση) τὰ τεῖχη (Ba τὰ ὑψη, N* ὑψη, Nc AQ ὑψος) ἵσχυε (Nc AQ -χύος) αὐτῆς; apparently reading for Ἔκοι by an early error Ἡμῶν. Comp. (i. 18;) xv. 20; Deut. xxviii. 52; Is. ii. 15, xxii. 10 for the connexion of θῶ καὶ Εκοι.

55. ἡχοῦσαι. Ἐκοι may easily be a gloss, introduced under the influence of v. 22, xxxi. 34, where Ἐκοι and Ἐκοί are connected.

56. ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνα. Ἐκοι was probably a gloss upon Ἔκοι, and found by O' already incorporated in the text. They thus omitted the wrong word.

ταλαιπωρία. See on iv. 13.

ἐπτόηται.

τὸ τοῦτον αὐτῶν (κείμενον). We may note that this is the form (א with and א 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.

ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐταποδίδωσιν αὐτοῖς (N* om. αὐτ.) ; reading θεὸς αὐταποδίδωσιν.

57. (57) Κύριος αὐταποδίδωσιν (N*
om. Kvp. ἀντ., ἔν ἱπ. Q* pref. ἀντ. ΔQ add ἀντή ἡν ἀνταπόδοσιν). O"s apparent omission of
by no means implies necessarily that they
had not the present M.T. See on xxiii. 39.

57. ἐπικράτει. 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.

οὐ...οὐ. O' vacat.

οὐ...οὐ. O' vacat.

οὐ...οὐ. O' vacat. The clause is bor-
rowed from v. 39.

58. τείχος; thus agreeing with M.T.
of v. 44.

ἐπιτάυωθη (ἡ ῥήματα).

καὶ ou κοπίασονσι. For the insertion
of a negative see on xviii. 18.

εὐφύς δεικνύμενον ἂνεὸς ἀπαντῶν. λαοὶ εἰς κενῶν,
καὶ ἐθνη ἐν ἄρχη (ὑμᾶς ἔργος). In the similar passage,
Hab. ii. 13, O' were slightly more successful with
the somewhat infrequent ἔτη (λαοὶ ἰκανοὶ...ἐθνη
50) of σήμερον to σήμερον (comp. this root in Niph. in ii.
25, xviii. 12) is a good one. The ἐθνη may easily have
fallen out through the ἔτη preceding, while we shall
moreover gain a parallelism with ἐθνη.
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59. ἐνετείλατο Κύριος Ἰερεμία τῷ προφήτῃ εἰπεὶν τῷ Σαραία; altering in order to agree more nearly with the language of such passages as xxvi. [xxxiii.] 8.

παρὰ Σεδεκίου.

ἀρχεῖν διώρων (Μάνδρα). So Targ. (אֵּת הָיָה). Vulg. princeps prophetiae is obscure. נַבֵּה seems too daring a conjecture.

Doubtless as to the sense of 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. Ὁ vacat; ΝΑΩ add ἐνι.

62. ῾Ηρώειε Κύριε (ΝΩ om. Κ. 2a).

64. τῶν Χαλδαίων (ΝΑΩ τῶν κακῶν, Q κακῶν); an early gloss, substituted for the text.

O vacat. ἦν clearly has to do with ἦν which ends v. 58. As Gi. suggests, ἦν may have originally stood there, and if so, on the removal of those words to their present place, ἦν may either intentionally or by accident (Cheyne, Introd. to chaps. l. li., says the latter) have been transferred with it. The sense will be "To they shall be weary," thus far are etc."

S. 20
lil. 2, 3. O' vacat.
4. τῷ ἐνάτῳ (A ἐβδόμῳ; Q δεκάτῳ).
'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.

τετραπόδωσις (Q adds λίθοις). In 2 K. xxv. 1 Ἡ is translated by περίτειχος.

6. ἐν τῇ (AQ* om. ἐν τῇ) ἐνάτῃ τοῦ μηνός (Q pref. with ast. ἐν μηνί τῷ τεταρτῷ). O’s rendering is accidentally defective, xxxix. 2 supplying the words which are here lacking.

7. ἐξῆλθον; rightly, thus keeping closer to the Greek of Kings (v. 4).

8. αὐτόν.

9. eis Δεσπάθα. η ἡ αὐτόν are absent also from Kings (v. 6).

11. μύλωνος. So in xxxix. [xlvi.]
7 Q inserts (after Baβυλώνα) καὶ δοῦναι αὐτόν eis oïkon τοῦ μύλ.; a trace of tradition.

12. O’ vacat; an insertion perhaps suggested (so Gi.) by 2 K. xxiv. 12.

εστηκὼς κατὰ πρόσωπον; thus
Both however should probably be emended (so Gi.) to $\pi\nu\mu\nu$ as in Kings (v. 8).
For confusion of $\nu$ and $\mu$ see on xx. 17.

13. της πόλεως. M.T. is borrowed from Kings (v. 9).

14. καὶ πᾶν τεῖχος. In Kings the corresponding verse (v. 10) is lacking.

17. μὴ ἔσθην. O' add καὶ ἀπήνεγκαν (Q-F om.). Kings (v. 13) has ἔσθην.

18. καὶ τὴν στέφανην. So also Exod. xxvii. 3, apparently taking the word as equivalent in sense to ἔβη, which they render in the same way in Exod. xxv. 24, 25 [23, 24]. O's ordinary rendering of ἔβη 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 κρεᾶγρας. This word generally renders $\nu\nu\nu\nu$ or $\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$. Once (2 Chr. iv. 11) it represents ἔβη. It may therefore (as an alternative rendering to στέφανην) do the same duty here. In that case τὸ φάτεντα will be unrepre-

sented.
O' 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.

O' 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'.

O' vacat.

19. καὶ τὰ (οὐ τὰς) σαφφῶθ καὶ τὰ (οὐ ΑΩ τὰς) μασμαρῶθ (οὐ τὰς μασμαρῶθ); thus pointing to a considerable corruption of text, and to the omission of Ἄπαντα.

O' vacat. The words καὶ τοὺς υποχυτήρας, which stand in this place, seem to be a second rendering of Ἄπαντα. It is in itself unlikely that θῆνα would occur in both ῃ, and if it did, O' would scarcely render it differently in the two.

καὶ τὰς θυίσκας. 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 (μεταφωνωθ). In the Temple as built by Solomon the ἀλα ("bases") were under the lavers, while the bulls supported the "sea" (1 K. vii. 25, 43). Hence O’s substitution of θαλ. 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. ἀλαρίνα τριάκοντα πέντε πηχών. 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 (י and י).

מַעְבָּד. κύκλῳ (Γ om.); reading בְּבִיב, 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.

וּרְפִּילוֹמ. ὀκτὼ ῥόαι 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. תְּדַהְרָה. ἐν μέρος (B<sup>ab</sup>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. ἀραίστηρια. O' vacat (Ω Ἐραλέμ and Ἐραλέμ).

25. καὶ (AQ ins. εἰκ τῆς πόλεως ἔλαβεν) εὐνοῦχον.

26. ἐκλητή. εἰς Δεβλάθα. So in Kings (v. 20), but there in v. 21 we have 'Pεθ. (A Δεβ.)

27. ἱμηθε. 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. εὐς τῇ τετράδι καὶ εἰκάδι. 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 (ἈΑΩ om. κ. ἐκ. αὐτ.), καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτῶν. As Gi. points out, the first Greek verb seems to represent a corruption of Ἰησοῦ (reading 1 for the Σ), and so far to represent a (probable) gloss.

34. ἄρα ἡ. O' vacat; perhaps considering the word superfluous or an accidental repetition.

οἱ ἡμῖν. O' vacat.
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ON THE OLD LATIN EVIDENCE, WITH NOTES ON THE LUCIANIC RECESSION 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. (⌜حصر⌝) and B (even where such rendering does not necessarily imply a variant); small capitals call attention to an agreement with M.T. (⌜礌⌟) 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 one¹.

¹ In the case of Sang [ ] indicate a lacuna in the ms.
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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 Würzburgensium, Antiquissimae V. T. versionis Latinae fragmenta*, ed. Ernestus Ranke, Vienna, 1871. The fragments are as follows: xii 12—xiii 12; xiv 15—xx 11; xv 13—17; xvi 14—19; xvi 21—xvii 6; xvii 8—10; xviii 16—xx 4; xx 6—xxii 39; xxxv 15—19; xxxvi 2—11; xxxvi 28—xxxvii 11; xxxviii 23—xl 5; xli 1—17.
³ It contains xvii 10³—17 (somewhat mutilated); xlix [xxix] 13³—17. Mr Burkitt has kindly permitted me to use his transcription for these notes.
the Bible is made by Arabic figures, e.g. Ps 2 12 = Ps ii 12 (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 Schepss, in Tycon. to Mr Burkitt's edition.

The references to Philo are those of Dr Ryle's ed., 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 qua 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 weakened.

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*.  
i. 3. *USQUE AD CONSUMMATIONEM Hier*.  
i. 4. *AD ME DICENS* Hier.  
i. 5. *DE VULVA Hier*  
   de lap 10 Vict Pett Apoc 11 5 Hil Ps 119 5 Hier tr hom or i (746) s/i xi (43) (but de v. matris tuae ib i 753) id am 6 13 Ambr exp Luc 1 15 ib 25 in v.) de fide 1 s 4 212 Aug ep 3 137 op imp con iul 6 134 
   Auc qu. ex vet test ap Aug 44 Pros Aqu de voc 2 31 Leo Mag a 30 Mar Merc hypog 6 56 s/2: in utero [Hil trin 6 80] Aug retract 1 66 de div qu 68 6 (comp de pec mer 1 30): in vulva Faust et Marc trin 2 4 Hier 1 66 (Gal 1 15 ep 1 41) Pet Chrys mer 7 4: de v. m. Ambr de benn pat 52 de int lob et D 2 31.  
   *et (prophetam) Auc quaest ex vet test ap Aug 44: om et Hier.  
i. 6. *A A A: AH AH AH Hier: qui es* Hil de trin 6 8 Hier is 3 4: quis es? Ambr Ps 118 3 6, but comp Ps ib 7 34, where we find (without an interrogation) iuvenis (bis) for puer and per for secundum. See also tr hom or i (747, 753). Qui es 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: πρός αὐτὸν λέγω 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 *δω* 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* Hier: *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 i 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.

*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 67: *eradicare suffodere evertere DISPERDERE* Aug Ps 50 8: [ad destructionem et aedificationem] id Ps 88 3: *erad et disp* Hier tr hom or i (747): *e. et suff.* ib: *erad* ib 755 2/2, and *erad et sub- vertere et disp* ib xi (756, 844), erad et suff et disp ib i (758) Ezek i 1 ff Soph i 13, *ut ante eradicaret et suffoderet et perdere* Hier Eccles 3 (408) (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).

*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 succensam ab Aquiline Aug Ps 59 10.*

*EGO VIDEO* Hier*: om id 18 41 25 Ezek 24 1.

1 Luc 0 + 1.

2 Luc 4 + 2 (+ 1).

3 Luc 4 + 6.

4 Luc 4 + 4. 6 Luc 4 + 3.
APPENDIX.


*PANDETUR Eucher ib s/2: APERIENTUR Hier, who adds sive exardescent: exardescent id Is 16 ib Joel ib Soph ib Tit ib: exardescent id Ezek 40 zo, 41 8, 42 1, Os ib: succeditur (in ref to the olla) id Is 14 32 (264): accenditur id Ezek 1 4.

i. 15. *COGNATIONES Hier id *Is 22 (232).1

*OM τῆς γῆς Hier id Is ib.9

i. 16. *et loquar IUDICIA MEA CUM EIS Hier8.


*AD EOS Hier4: om Lucif Cal de non parc 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.

*aereum: aeneum Hier.

*OM firmum Hier: hab Lucif Cal ib.

1 π. τ. βασιλείας τῶν βασιλέων (thus differing from both) Luc 4 2.
2 ἀπὸ β. τ. γῆς (thus agreeing with B) Luc 3 6.
3 καὶ λαλήσω μετὰ κρατῆσα μοῦ πρὸς αὐτοὺς Luc 3 2.
4 Luc 4 6. 5 Luc 4 4.
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*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. t. Hier) et caritatem desponsationis tuae Hier.

*IN DESERTO, IN TERRA QUAE NON SEMINATUR Hier³.

ii. 3. *delinquunt: -quent Hier.
*mala venient: mala inducam Lucif Cal athan 2 t.⁴

ii. 5. *in me patres vestri Lucif Cal de non conv c haer 8 Gildas 47: p. v. in me Hier Gildas 80.

*ET IMAGINEM MORTIS Hier³: et sine fructu Lucif Cal ib.

(for σῶθε) *VIR Hier Lucif Cal ib.
*neque habitabit homo (om ἤκε) Hier: neque commoratus est ibi filius hominis Lucif Cal ib.⁵

ii. 7. *IN TERRAM Carmeli Hier: in Carmelum Lucif Cal ib.
*optima: bona Hier Lucif Cal ib.

*et tenentes legem Gildas ib: et seniores legis meae

¹ Luc 4 + 4. ² Luc 4 + 4. ³ Luc 2 (+ 1) + 1.
⁴ καὶ ἀβάρψ (ἱδαξω), thus differing from both M.T. and B, and supported in so doing by O. L. evidence.
⁵ Luc 4 + 2.
⁶ ωδη ἄθροι. Luc 4 + 4, thus differing from both M.T. and B, and supported in so doing by O. L. evidence.
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Lucif Calib: et cultores legis meae Ps Aug spec ib: et t. legem meamHier: t. l. m. id Zech ii 8,1
ii. 9. *Ait DOMINUS Hier Gildas ib, 2
ii. 10. *transite (_slider) Hier: circuite Fulg Rusp ep 12. 8

*et considerate vehementer et videte Hier: interrogate minis Tert adv iud 13.
ii. 11. *GENS Hier Fulg Rusp ep 12 8: gentes Tert ib.
*populus vero meus mutavit gloriæ suam in idolum Hier, who adds sive de quo ei nihil proderit; as Hier (but om vero and idolo) Joh Cass coll (x) de or 5.

ii. 12. *OBSTUPECITE coeli super hoc et portae eius DESOLAMINI vehementer Hier: expavit coelum super isto Tert adv iud 13: (for יבְּרֹת) multo magis Cypr test 8 59: obstupuit coelum super hoc et horruit valde Hier ep 96 8: o. c. s. h. et exh. terra vehementer Hier Os 6 11: exspectavit (coelum) ...inhorruit multo vehementius Aug con ep parm 2 20: exhorruit coelum super haec vehementer Ps Aug spec 144.


*et foderunt (om et Hier) Hier id Ezek 32 17, 47 1 Hos 1 1, 10 9 Am 4 7 Tert ib Cypr ib (comp et effod id ib 1 3 de cath eccl un 11 ep 70 1) Zen Ver 2 59 Philast de haer 20 Aug ep 2 121 12 Ps Aug spec ib Paul Nol ep 50 12 Vigil Taps de trin ib con varim ib (Cassiod Cant 4 15): et fecerunt Ambr Ps 61 5: et effoderunt Carth Conc A.D. 255 Aug con ep parm 2 20: (ut delinquere) et foderent Opt Mil 4 9.

1 Luc 2 + 5. 2 Luc 4 + 6.
*cisternas: cisternas cisternas Hier (Cassiod ib): lacus (id est cisternas) Hier Ezek 32 17: lacus Tert adv iud 13 Cypr test 1 3 2 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 30 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 8 36 1 575.

*quae continere non valent aquas Hier (Cassiod ib): qui non poterunt aquam continere Tert adv iud 13 Ps Aug spec 36 comp ot oë δυνάστοντας σωσθένυν ὕδωρ Philo ib: qui non poterunt aquam portare Cypr test 1 3; so with potuerunt Vigil Taps 13 Bened pag 324: so with possunt Cypr de cath eccl un 11 ep 70 1 Zen Ver ib Aug con ep parm 2 30 Carth Conc A.D. 255: qui non poterunt aquam continere Cypr test 3 59, but comp poterunt portare id ib 13: qui non habent venam luct 4 30: qui non possent capere quam 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.

ii. 18. *TURBIDAM Joh Cass coll (xxiv) de mortif 24 (J C is quoting the original and discussing its application to "t. atque coenosum"): Sior Hier: geon Ambr Tob 48 Ps 1 3: aquam geon turbidam id ep 51 5: aquam geon id 16 52 4 Ezek 29 3 (comp 31 introd) Os 2 5 Ab 2 15.

*FLUMINIS Hier Joh Cass ib: fluminum Hier 15 50 12.

ii. 19. *arguet te malitia tua et aversio tua increpavit (-pabit Hier) te Hier, who adds sive erudiet te prae-
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varicatio tua : emendabit te abscessio tua Ir c haer 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 AVERSIO tua Joh Cass ib et coll (xxiii)
de velle bon etc 9.

(quia) MALUM ET amarum (est) Hier¹: amarum Cypr
id coll (xxiii) 9 comp q. M. et am. 16.

*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.

*Dominus Deus exercituum Hier: D. D. tuus
(loosely) Cypr ib: Dominus Joh Cass ib.

ii. 20. *confr registi...rupisti Hier Gildas 47: contribu-
lasti...dirupisti Cypr ib.

*non servium (om. σοτ) Hier Cypr ib Gildas ib.

*prosternebaris Hier: confundar Cypr ib: diffundar
Hier Os 4 10.

ii. 21. *vineam electam Hier Faustus de grat 1 12 Prim
Adrum Apoc 3 Gildas 47: v. fructiferam Ambr de fde 4 165 Ps
36 9 Hier Is 5 1, 32 9 Ab 3 17 Fulg Rusp ad mon 1 83 : vitem fruct.
Hier tr hom or 13 (866): vineam frugiferam Ruf Aqu bea rub
Hier Ezek 15 1 Mic 4 8 Zach 14 15 Mal 3 7 : vitem fructuosam Ambr
Luc 6 30 Paul Nol ep 10 9: vitem universam fructiferam Ps
Aug spec 112 : v. veram Fac Herm def tr 11 3.

*omne SEMEN verum Hier id Faust ib Gildas ib: om
Ambr de fde 4 165 Prim Adrum ib: totam feracem Ruf
Aqu ib: totam veram Ambr Ps 36 9 Hier Is 5 1, 32 9 Mic 4 8 Ab 3 17
Zach 14 15: universam v. Hier tr hom or xiii (866): vineam veram

¹ προπό οι καλ νομ. Luc 3 1.
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Hier Mat 15 13, 26 29, 27 34: veram Ps Aug spec ib: omnem veram (Hier Ezek 15 2) Hier Mal 3 7: om πᾶν. αὐθήθ. (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 18 5 1, 32 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 amaritudinem vitis alienae Ambr de fide ib Ruf Aqu ib Hier Is 32 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 tr hom or 18 Aug Ps 55 1 Joh 8 80 1 Faustus ib.


*ambulavi: abii Hier Prisc ib.

*vias suas Hier: v. tuas Prisc ib.


ii. 25. *A NUDITATE Hier: ab aspera via Lucif Cal de non conv cum haer 8 Hier ep 132 1: a v. aspera Hier ep 132 1 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 8 59: dicit 1 οδ βεβλώματι 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 1463]: lig. dixerunt, P. m. es tu; et lap., Tu gen. me Hier ep 128 1.

*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 1: v. contra me scapulam recedentem (loosely) Hier Ezek 8 15.

ii. 28. *Surgant et liberent Hier: resurgant et salvam...faciant Hier Is 57 18.

*TE Hier id ib, 1

ii. 29. *quid vultis mecum iudicio contendere Hier id ep 128 so Aug Ps 143 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 143 2 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 col (vi) de nece san 11 Gildas ib: sine causa Cypr ad dem 7 Hier Is 1 5, 9 8 Soph 1: Mal 3 6 Aug con ep parm 8 90 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 τιδε λέγει Kip. Hier Gildas ib.

*tetra serotina Hier Gildas ib: t. in incultum dere-lista Tert marc 4 31.

*recessimus Hier Gildas ib.


1 Luc 4 4.
ii. 37. *nihil habeabis 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 8, 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 2 4.

*OM πρὸς πάντας Hier id ib 3

iii. 4. *ergo saltem AMODO voca me: pater meus, dux virginitatis meae tu es (es tu Hier) Hier: non ut Domi-num 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 Joel 1 8. Comp. οὐχ ὡς οἶκον με ἐκάλεσας, καὶ πατέρα, καὶ άνδρα τῆς παρθενίας σου Philo de cherub 8 14 1 48, where Dr Ryle (p. 298) points out that Philo is laying stress on the reading άνδρα.

iii. 6. *aversatrix Israel Hier: habitatio domus Israel id 1r 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 22 1. See previous note) 2.

1 om eis εἰδ. Luc 3 11. 2 Luc 9 1.
3 εὐθρέπων Luc 3 5, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.
iii. 7. *FECISSET Hier: fornicata est id ep ib Gaud Brix ib: fornicat. est ib de poenit ap ambr 10, but fornicat. est ib 22: fornicati sunt Hier Os 4 10.

*convertere Hier: revertere Gaud Brix ib Hier ep ib Os ib.

*SOROR EIUS Iuda Hier.

iii. 8. *OM εις 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).

iii. 9. *et facilitate fornicationis suae contaminavit terram Hier: et facta est fornicatio eius in nihilum id ib.

*SUM LAPIDE ET LIGNO Hier: lignum et lapidem Cypr ep 63 18: in lignum et lapidem Hier 1s 57 4.

iii. 10. *SOROR EIUS Hier: om id tr hom or (870 et 876 tex).4

*AIT DOMINUS Hier: om id ib.

iii. 11. *IVERSATRIX Hier: om id (870).


*IVERSATRIX Hier: habitatio Hier Zach ib.

*aet: dict Hier id Zach ib Auct qu ex utr test ib.

*avertam Hier, who adds sive firmabo: firmabo Auct qu ex utr test ib.

*om ὑμᾶν Hier: hab Auct qu ex utr test ib.

iii. 15. *SCIENTIA Hier Ferreolus reg ad mon 37: pascentes Cypr test 1 14 3 66 de hab virg 1 ep 4 1 Lucif Cal ath 1 1 22 23 de non parc in D. del 11 ib 22 Aug coe cre sc don 3 8: om Aug ser 46 23 ib 3 1 3 2.

1 *IOU∆A δέλφη αὐτῆς Luc 4 3, thus agreeing with M.T.
2 Luc 4 2, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.
3 Luc 3 (+: 3 (+ 1). 4 Luc 4 2 (+ 1).
5 Luc 3 3. 6 Luc 4 2.
APPENDIX. 327

*ET doctrina Hier Ferreolus ib : cum disciplina Cypr ib
Lucif Cal ib Aug con cresc don ib ser 46 93 ib 313 a.

iii. 16. *NEQUE (NEC Hier) RECORDABUNTUR ILLIUS Hier 1.

iii. 17. *IN TEMPORE ILLO Hier: in illis diebus et in
t. i. Prim Adrum in Apoc 2.

*IN NOMINE DOMINI IN IERUSALEM Hier 2: om in
Ier Prim Adrum ib.


*vocabis, cessabis Hier Joh Cass coll (xii) de prob dei 8.

iii. 20. *amatorum 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 1s 51 9.

*AVERSIONES vestras Hier: contritiones v. id Is ib Ezek ib
Na ib: tribulationem vestram ib de poenit ap ambr 25.

*ECCE NOS VENIMUS AD TE Hier 4.

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 habitatori (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 AUFERTE Hier: (circumcidimini deo) et circumci-
dite Tert adv iud 3: et circumcidimini id marc 1 20 4 v 4: (cir-
cumcidite vos deo vestro) et circumcidite Cypr ib Lact ib: et

1 Luc 4 2 add ev avq 2 Luc 3 ( + 1) + 3.

*omen Luc 4 1, agreeing with M.T.

4 ofbe (with Q; see critical note) Luc 3 4, thus agreeing with
M.T. rather than B.
nolite circumcidere carnem praeputii vestri Hier

\textsuperscript{Eph} 2:12: om Zen Ver\textsuperscript{ib}.

*indignatio mea Hier: \textit{ira mea} Cypr\textsuperscript{ib} Lact\textsuperscript{ib} Zen
Ver\textsuperscript{ib}.

iv. 7. *de cubili suo Hier: de Iordane Hier \textit{Zach} \textit{xx} 3.
*et praedo Hier\textsuperscript{a}.
*terram tuam Hier\textsuperscript{a}.
*civitates tuae Hier\textsuperscript{a}.

iv. 8. *ira furoris Hier\textsuperscript{a}: \textit{ira} Ps Aug spec \textit{a3}.

iv. 10. *heu heu heu Hier. See on i. 6.
*erit vobis Hier\textsuperscript{a}.
*et ecce pervenit Hier\textsuperscript{a}.

iv. 11. *urens Hier, who adds \textit{sive roris}: but see
crit. note.

iv. 12. *ex his Hier\textsuperscript{a}.
*loquar Hier (\textit{ἐκφύλασθε}, \textit{λάλου}: Q has -\textit{λύω})\textsuperscript{a}.

\textit{erunt} Ps Aug spec \textit{a3}\textsuperscript{a10}.

iv. 19. *ventrem meum 2° Hier id Ezek 33 Ambr\textsuperscript{ob}
val 29 fug \textit{spec} 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 \textit{ib}: s. c. m. conturbati sunt Eucher\textsuperscript{ib}.

\textsuperscript{1} τὴν ἀκροβ. τ. καρδίας ὑμῶν (ἡμῶν) Luc 3 + 3, thus agreeing with
M.T., but one Luc ms. (51) has τὴν σαλπροκαρδίαν τ. κ. ὑμ.

\textsuperscript{2} Luc 1 + 1.

\textsuperscript{3} τὴν γῆν σου, Luc 3 + 6, thus agreeing with M.T.

\textsuperscript{4} ins. σου Luc 3 + 5.

\textsuperscript{5} Luc 1 + 5.

\textsuperscript{6} Luc 4 + 6.

\textsuperscript{7} om ibid Luc 0 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T.

\textsuperscript{8} Luc 4 + 4.

\textsuperscript{9} λαλήσω Luc 4 + 6.

\textsuperscript{10} ἑπερατεῖαι Luc 3 (1) + 4.
iv. 20. *TABERNACULA MEA Hier ¹.
iv. 21. *AUDIAM Hier ².
iv. 22. *STULTUS Hier Gildas ¹⁷: duces Hier Mic ⁷⁷.
iv. 29. *omnis civitas (יִלּוֹן זַ双脚) Hier, who adds

size regio.
*universae urbes Hier ³.
iv. 30. *VASTATA Hier ⁴.
*quaerent Hier ⁵.

v. 1. *et considerate et quaerite Hier: om et cons. id
adv pel 2 ad: et quaer....et cognoscite, inverting order, Aug
quaeest in hept 1 40 Eugip exc Aug ⁷⁴.
*virum Hier id ⁶ adv pel ib: hominem Aug ib Eugip ib.
*om ἃ ἃ Hier id ⁷ adv pel ib Aug ib Eugip ib.
*eis: ei Hier ⁸: propter eum id ⁹ adv pel ib: peccatis
eorum Aug ib Eugip ib.
 v. 2. *QUODSI ETIAM Hier: QUAMVIS ENIM id ¹⁰
adv pel ib.
*et hoc falsa iurabunt Hier: fraudulenter (=יִלְלָל)

IURANT, et hoc ipsum in mendacio id ¹¹ adv pel ib.

v. 3. *respiunct fidem Hier Gildas ¹².

v. 4. *dei sui Hier ⁶.

¹ ins μον Luc 3 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T.
² Luc 4 + 5 against the ptcp δροῦω, but two MSS. (23, 90) have
δροῦω instead of the future. Thus on the whole Luc agrees with
M.T.
³ πᾶσα χώρα Luc 4 + 2 (thus agreeing with B against M.T.).
⁴ ᾧ ταλατ. Luc 4 + 3, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.
⁵ Luc 0 + 3.
⁶ ἀνδρα Luc 4 + 5, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.
⁷ αἰτή Luc 4 + 4, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.
⁸ Luc 3 + 2.
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v. 6. *AD VESPERAM Hier Cassiod Ps 101 11: usque ad domos id Na 9 11.1

v. 7. *saturavi Hier 2.

v. 8. *emissarii Hier: om Ir c haer 6 48 3, 8 2 Hier de

perp virg 8 adv Iov 32 37 Exak 8 to Zach 9 5 Ps Aug spec 45 Salv de gub 7 4,

but id ib 4 24 has insaniences (without emiss) and so Hier

ubique.

v. 11. *ait (dicit Hier) DOMINUS Hier 3.


v. 17. καί τοὺς ἱλασάνας ύμῶν 6.

*TU HABES fiduciam (TU fid. HAB. Hier) Hier (ἡμῖν ἡμῖν, ύμεῖς πεποίθατε) 7.


v. 22. *et a facie mea non dolebitis Hier who adds,

sive timebitis Gildas 46: om Ambr hexam 8 2 11 (shewing that

he sometimes quoted from memory): a f. m. n. formida-

bitis Hier 18 5 13.

v. 23. *recesserunt (ἡρ, καὶ ἐξέκλιναν; B* vid Q om

καί) Hier Gildas ib. 9


1 ἐκ τῶν oλείων (MS. 144 has ὦς τ. ολ.) Luc 3 + 1, an example of

a conjectural emendation, supported by Luc mss. and based on O',

without any connexion with the Heb.

3 καὶ ὄρεισθων αὐτοῦ Luc 3 + 2.

4 So Luc 4 + 3 (+ 1), thus agreeing with M.T. and B.

6 Luc 3 + 1 (+ 1), thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

6 Luc 1 (+ 1).

7 σῷ πέντεα Luc 3 + 2, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

6 Luc 3 + 6, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

9 om καὶ Luc 3 + 4.

10 in καὶπό αὐτοῦ (a double rendering of ἱπτ) inserted between

ἄγ. and καὶ πάνω by Luc 4 + 2.

*INSIDIAN'TES QUASI AUCUPES laqueos (лежащих) Hier Gildas ib: et loquentes vana Epp Decret S. Stephano adscr. This rendering appears to represent some such Heb. as חק בְּשֵׁם. If so, it has the interest of preserving an attempt at the emendation of a deeply-seated corruption in M.T.

v. 28. *INCRASSATI 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.): *pluserunt m. s.* Ps Aug spec ib.


vi. 13. *et a PROPHETA usque ad SACERDOTES* (-DORSEM Hier Gil) Hier Gildas 80: *a sacerdote u. a. pseudo-prophetam* Ps Aug spec 46 Faust et Marc ib prec 33.

vi. 14. *et non Hier id adv iov 8 37 Aug Ps 147 14: et ubi Ambr Ps 118 D 14 Hier epi 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 λάλον τοὺς λάγους μου εἰς παραρέν (before κρίσιν 1) Luc 3 2, thus agreeing with M.T. against B.

2 τοὺς λάγους μου εἰς παραρέν (before κρίσιν 1) Luc 3 2, thus supporting a modified form of M.T. against B.
vi. 15. *quia (qui Gil) ABOMINATIONEM FECERUNT Hier Gildas ib: defeecerunt 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 Kuplov Hier id Na s 2 Ambr Ps 118 1 22: Domini Hil Ps 118 3 Hier Is 3 13 Ps Aug spec 5 Cassiod Ps 117 1: dei Hil Ps 117 1. 117 4.
*om kai ἕτερον Hier id Is ib: et quaerite Hil Ps 118 3: et videte Ambr ib Hil Ps 117 1. 117 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 4 21.
*congregatio, quanta ego faciam eis Hier, who adds to congreg., sive qui pastitis greges: et qui pascunt pecora in eis Ir ib: so with pascent Cypr ib.
vi. 20. *affertis (ὥσπερ) Hier Ir c haer 4 17 2.
*consumptum est plumbum Hier: om Joh Cass ib Gildas ib.
*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 8 17 2.


vii. 4. *om dr...ūmās Hier Salv de sub 7 11: quia (quoniam Ir) in toto non prodierunt 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 LOQUENS Hier Gildas ib: ante lucem Cassiod Ps 106 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 k. μ. εὐ.), et non obsistas mihi Hier: et ne postulaveris pro his in prece et oratione (OM k. μ. εὐ.) Tert pud 9: et noli postulare illis misericordiam (OM k. μ. εὐ.) Ambr ib: nec assumas pro eis deprecationem (OM k. μ. εὐ.) et non
obsistas mihi (much closer to M.T. than to O') Hier adv ivo 2 30: et ne postulaveris misereri illius, et non accesseris ad me pro eis Fac ep Herm pr 2 def tr 19 5.

*TE Hier id adv ivo ib Dan 9 ii Ambr ib Fac ep Herm ib: om te Tert ib.


vii. 21. *exercituum, Deus Israel Hier: om Ir c haer 4 17 3 Auct qu ex utr test 103.


vii. 24. *(et non) AUDIERUNT Hier Tert ib: OBAUDIERUNT 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 malitiae suae) Ir ib: in iis quae concupiverunt (corde suo malo) Tert ib.


*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. 27. *omnia...eos Hier Gildas 49: hunc sermonem 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.

vii. 29.  *FURORIS sui Hier*: facientem haec Ir 4 36 2.

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 apvs 12 Joh Cass coll (xiii) de prof dei 3 Prosp Aqu adv coll 2 Bach Mon de rep 27 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 3 114: n. g. cadit non adiicet ut resurgat? Ambr Ps 36 24: nonne qui ceciderit resurget? Pac ep 1 5 par ad poenit 12 n. g. cadit non surget? 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 ib 3 et 7 Fulg Rusp Gildas: malignam Ps Aug spec ib.

*APPREHENDERUNT* Hier Gildas: TENUERUNT Ps Aug spec ib: INDURAVERUNT Joh Cass ib 3 et 7 Fulg Rusp ib.


*NEMO QUOD BONUM EST* (loquitur) Hier Gildas: om Ps Aug spec ib.

*OMNES CONVERSI SUNT* Hier Gildas: defecit quia currebat Ps Aug spec ib.

*IN PROELIO*: AD PROELIUM Hier: in hinnitu suo Ps Aug spec ib: IN PROELIUM Gildas ib.

viii. 7.  *et hirundo ET CICONIA* Hier id 1 3 15 Gildas
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49: et hir. (hyr Cypr) ruris (agri for ruris Ambr) Cypr text 1.3
Ambr hex 6 4 so ep 23 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:

iudicium Ambr hex 6 4 so.


*mendacium operatus est Hier: in cassum facta est Cypr ib Lact ib: in vanum f. e. Ps Aug spec ib, (adding metatura vestra).

N.B. scribae confusi sunt Cypr ib Ps Aug spec ib differing from M.T. and O’s division.

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): audiemus Ir 6 30 2.

*fremitus Hier (id de ben etc): vocem velocitatis Ir ib,

(adding equorum eis).

*(hinnitium) pugnatorum eis Hier: hinnitus (decursionis) equorum eis 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. *(quae 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 Esack 27 17: asc. sanatio

Esack 47 6: obd. est cic. Gildas ib.

viii. 23 [ix. 1]. *om τον λαον μου τουτουν Hier id ep 30
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et 98 95 Joh Cass coll (ix) de orat 99 Gildas 35 et 49 Siric ep 1 7 : hanc plebem Chrom Aqu Mat Tract 3 3 : populum istum Hier ep 129 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 Cal athan 2 1 : extendit (lingua eius mendacium et non fidem) 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 invaluit Lucif Cal ib: et non f. inv. Ps Aug spec ib.

* quia de male 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 uoluerunt et non obreliquetur usuram super usuram (dolum super dolum) Lucif Cal ib: ut...lab. (as Vulg.) Joh Cass coll (xxii) de velle bon etc 1 5 : laborant (ut inique agant) Gildas 68.

ix. 5 [6]. * dicit Dominus Hier Lucif Cal ib.

S. 22
ix. 6 [7]. *Dominus exercituum Hier: om exerc. Lucif Cal ib.

*QUID (enim aliud faciam)? Hier: (quia) sic faciam Lucif Cal ib.

*OM formias: (a facie filiae sive a fac.) malitia (fil.) Hier: malignitas 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 D3 Hier Lucif Cal ib Ps Aug spec ib.

ix. 9 [10]. *ASSUMAM Hier, who adds sive assumite: accipite Ambr de fide 3 119 Vigil Taps Trin 5 Bened pag 247 c. varim 144: 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 τρός με 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 26 adv iov 2 8 Ioel 2 1 Abd 11 Na 3 13 interp hom or in Cant 2 Bened pag 529 (but in all but Ioel there is a variant vestras): per fenestram (om. pron) Ambr de fug sec 1 3: so -tras id Ps 118 43: fen. vestras Hier Ecke 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 6 17 3 Cypr test 3 10 Hil Ps 193 9 Zen Ver 1 3 9 Aug
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ep 55 6 Ps Aug spec 22 et 75 Hier Zach 10 12 tr hom or iv (79) vii (811) (Leo Mag ep ad demetr 13) Fulg Ferr ep 7 4 Prim Adrum Apoc 2: scire et intelligere Deum, et facere iudicium et iustitiam in medio terrae Lucif Cal athan 1 10: int. et sc. in D. (dominum) gloriari (3/3) et iud. et iust. super terram (2/2) id athan 2 7.


*haec enim placent mihi Hier: in his est voluntas mea Cypr ib Lucif Cal athan 3 9 (3/3) Ps Aug spec ib.

N.B. Hil Ps 51 1 quoting loosely ends with sed qui gloriatur, in Domino glorietur.

ix. 25 [26]. *om carne Hier Lucif Cal ib: hab Hier 15 52 1 Eph 2 15.

x. 2. *vias Hier Cypr test 8 34 Ps Aug spec 44.

*(nolite) discere Hier (see critical note): ambulaveritis Cypr ib: (nolite) incedere id ib 8 59: (nolite) ambulare Ps Aug spec ib.

*(quae timent) gentes Hier: (quia timent) illa in personis suis Cypr test 8 59; (timentes) a conspectu facies eorum Ps Aug spec ib.

x. 3. *praecidit Hier: excisum Cypr ib Ps Aug spec ib.

*manum (sic); manuum 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 confixibia 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 affertur, et aurum Hier: a Tharsis. venit aurum Cypr ib (who adds Moab for *de Opas, Mwdfδ).

*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 2/3: a terra et de sub caelo id con faust 13 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 13 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 13a.

*praeparat orbem in sapientia sua Hier: et correxit in sap. sua or. Ambr ib: erexit orbem in sap. s. Hier tr hom or or v (793): om Ps Aug 54 et 56 et 13a.

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: infatuaus est homo a sci. sua Ambr ib.

x. 20. *tabernaculum MEUM Hier: t. tuum Ps Aug spec 46 et 140.

*vastatum est Hier (al. destitutum est): miserum factum est, periit Ps Aug spec ib.

*funiculi MEI Hier, who adds sive...pelles MEAE: pelles eius Ps Aug spec ib.
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: necque viri
ibit et corriget cogitationem suam Lucif Calathan 29: (non est
in hom. via eius) et a Domino gressus hominis diriguntur
Hier ep 17: necque viri ibit et corriget v. s. Aug Ps 118 18: (non
est in homine via eius) nec viri est ut ambulet et dirigat
gressus suos id de pecc mer 2 7 et 26: necque viri est ut dirigat iter
sum Prosp Aqu de voc 1 8 et 24: necque viri est ut corrigat
viam suam Fulg Rusp ep 17 41.

x. 24. *corripie ME Hier Aug de pecc mer 2 6 Fulg Rusp
ad mon 1 58: doce nos Lucif Cal ib: corripie nos Ambr Ps 118 O
Hier Is 5 25 Ezek 13 9 Zach 1 2 Joh Cass coll (vii) de nece san 11 3:
emenda nos anon tract adv novat.

* in furore tuo Hier id Zach 1 8 Aug ib Joh Cass ib Fulg
Rusp ib: in ira Lucif Cal ib: in furore Ambr ib Hier Is 5 25
Ezek 13 8.

* ad nihilum redigas ME Hier: ne paucos facias nos

x. 25. * provincias Hier, who adds sive gene-
rationes: regna Lucif Cal ib Hier Ezek 9 8 et 13 8.

* et devoraverunt eum: om Hier Lucif Cal ib.

xi. 14. * in tempore 2° Hier Tert de pud 2 Cypr de laps 19
ad fort 4: om Gildas 49.

xi. 15. * multa Hier Gildas 81. See critical note for
Ir c haer 1 17 3.

xi. 16. * fructiferam Hier id Is 17 8 Bened pag 88 Gil-
das ib.

xi. 19. * consilia Hier: cogitatum Tert marc 4 40 Cypr
test 2 15 Jul Firm Mat de err prof rel 97: cogitationem Lact div
inst 4 18: consilium Ambr de fde 4 165 Hier tr hom or viii (814 etc):
cogitationem malam Fulg Rusp ad tras 1 19.

* 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 so 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 ind 10: iniiciamus Ambr Ps 35 1 de fide 6 165 Ruf Aqu in symb apos 29.

*in panem eius* Hier id tr hom or ib Tert marc 8 19 4 40 adv ind 10 Cypr test 2 15 et so Lact ib Jul Firm Mat ib Ambr Ps 35 1 de fide 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 occasionis* Hier: S. EOS in D. interfectionis eorum id Soph 1 7 tr hom or viii (8:8).

xii. 9. *avis discolor* Hier: spelunca hyaenae id Is 65 5 tr hom or viii (8:8).

xii. 13. *hereditatem acceperunt* Hier: cleri eorum Hier ep 51 1, 59 5 Or 5 7 Am 8 4. Comp. cleri eorum non proderant eis id tr hom or vii (8:9 bis).

*propter iram furoris* Hier, who adds (to a fr.) sive a glorificatione vestra: a gloria v. W: a gloriatione v. Hier tr hom or vii (8:10 et quinque): a glorific. v. Ps Sulp Sev ep ad sor 16.

*absconderam illud: defoderam* W.

xiii. 7. *multam. Populum (et pop. Hier) istum 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 (811).
xiii. 20. *oculos VESTROS Hier id Mal 3.
xiv. 9. *VAGUS Hier: dormiens Vigil Taps de Trin 3
Bened pag 923.
xiv. 14. *et SEDUCTIONEM Hier Mar Vict Afer ep
athan etc Gildas 81: et praesumptiones Ps Aug spec 49.
xiv. 15. *IN (OM IN Hier) GLADIO et fame consumentur
Hier Gildas ib: morientur et in fame consummabuntur W.
xiv. 16. *ERUNT Hier Gildas ib: 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 (839).
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 11: propter malignitates eorum W.
xv. 10. *non FOENERAVI, nec FOENERAVIT (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. οὐκ ὡφέλησα,
οὐδὲ ὡφέλησάν με Philo de confus ling 8 12 i 411.
*OMNES Hier: virtus mea defect W; Ambr ib Hier tr
hom or xi (846 etc tert). Comp. η ἱσχύς μου δέδωχεν Philo ib.
xv. 11. *DICT HIER: fiat W.
*SI NON RELIQUIAE TUAE Hier: consummatio illorum W.
xv. 13. *(dabo) GRATIS Hier, adding sive absque pretio
ID TR hom or XI (848), but without GR. IB (849): (dabo) immutationem 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 inimicis tuis: et dabo te in servitutinem t. id TR hom or XI (850): et tradam W.


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 contristant me: (ut quid) iniurantes me W: qui contristant me Cypr EP 73 6 Aug De BapT Con Don 3 so con LIT Pet IB.

*factus est...PERPETUUS Hier, who adds sive...confortantur: convalescent W: praevalent Cypr IB Aug De BapT etc IB con LIT Pet IB.

*DESPERABILIS Hier, who adds sive...fortis: solida est W; Cypr IB Aug De BapT etc IB: valida est ID con LIT Pet IB.

N.B. Obs. at end of v. *facta est mihi quasi mendacium 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.
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xvi. 18. *PRIMUM DULICES Hier id tr hom or xii (86o etc.): DULPLICITER W (but see crit. note).

*IMPLEVERUNT Hier id ib : RELEV. W.

xvi. 19. *vere mendacium Hier: quoniam falsa Hier tr hom or ib (863 bis) : quam f. Aug con faust man 18 7 Ps Aug spec 44.

xvii. 1. *SUPER ALTITUDINEM (al. LATIT. Hier) CORDIS EORUM Hier, who adds 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 8 14 : in p. cordis tu id apol dav alt 6a: super pectus cordis eorum Hier tr hom or ib (864).

xvii. 1—4. om W.

xvii. 5. *ET PONIT CARNEM BRACHII SUUM Hier Eugip vix sev 5 2: et confirmavit c. brachii sui W; Ps Aug spec 107 : et firmat c. b. s. Aug con faust man 18 8 de grat et lib arb 6 (Leo Mag ep ad dem 8) : et firmat c. brachii sui Hier 1a 31 1 : et firmat c. b. s. Prosp Aqu lib con coll 16 16 Eugip exc Aug 283 : et p. spem carnem b. s. Cassiod Ps 30 13, 107 8 : so with c. sp. id ib 88 13 om id Ps 59 11.

xvii. 8. *timebit : erit sollicitum Hier, who adds sive ...timebit ; W ; Aug con faust man ib Fulg Ferr ep 7 4.

xvii. 9. *PRAVVM 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 cognosce illud?) Hier id Am 4 13 : et homo W; Ir c haer 3 18 3 Tert marc 8 7 de car chr 15 Cypr test 2 10 Lact div inst 4 13 inst epit 39 (44) Hil Trin 4 43 Ambr Ps 39 5, 43 80, 61 8, 118 5 3 de inst virg 99 de poenit 1 12 Zen Ver 2 7 3 Hier eccles Bened pag 417 1a 17 11 Ben pag 382 Aug con faust man ib 3/3 de civ Dei ib Vigil Taps con eut 1 13 Eugip exc Aug 50 Commod carna apol 59: homo Ir c haer 3 19 4, 33 11 Tert adv iud 14 (al. et h.) Vigil Taps trin 3 Bened pag 222.

xvii. 11. *PERDIX Hier id tr hom or iv (78o etc) 4/4 : clam-
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avit perdix; Sang; Ambr hex 6 13 ep 1 39: Hier ep 138 4 Aug con faust man 18 13; Philast praef in lib de haer; Eucher lib form spir int 5: [p. qui e. Ambr ep 1 45 14].


Thus Sang Ambr Aug omit 'ן 'ני.


*(venam) AQUARUM VIVENTIUM Hier, who adds *(to venam) sive fontem Salv de sub 6 1: *(fontem vitae Sang Hier tr hom or ib (788, 791) Ps Aug spec ib Vigil Taps de trin 13 Bened pag 395.

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 [labo]ravi subsequens [te] Sang: non l. sequens post te Ambr de virginit 100 ep 2 85 9: non l. sequens te HIER ep 139 7 Esch 13 3: ego autem non l. subsequens te Aug de cons evang 3 16: so, inserting post Hier tr hom or iv (781, 791, 799) ego autem non l. te sequens Joh Cass de cons last 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 virginit 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. 20. *AUDITE Hier Tycon 5 (p 6a).
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. quae stirit) Tycon ib.
xvii. 25. *et principes Hier Tycon ib.
xvii. 26. *et victimam (-mas Hier, who adds sive thymiamata) 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 2/3.
xviii. 2. *audies Hier Hil Ps 3 9 Ambr de int iob et dav 2 20 Vigil Taps con ent 4 2o (VicT Tun de poenit ap ambr 97).
xviii. 4. *e luto manibus suis Hier: in m. eius Hil Ps 3 9 Vigil Taps ib: in m. s. Ambr ib Hier 1s 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 132 3 adv pel 8 6: ut feriam eos (et perdam) Hil ib:
ut tollam eos (et ut perdam eos) Vict Tun ib: (ut) auferam
am (et disperdam) Hier Am 913: (eradicavit) DESTRUXIT
(et perdidit) id Ab 3 9: et auferam (et disp. eos) id Soph 2 15:
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(ut evellam) ET DESTRUAM (et disp.) Joh Cass coll (xvii) de de
defini. 21: (ut evellam) ET DESTR. (et eradicem) Faust R heg
de grat. Dei 110: (ut evellam et dissipem) ET DESTRUAM (et disp.) Gildas 36.

xviii. 8. *QUOD LOCUTUS SUM ADVERSUS (-SUM Hier) EAM Hier: om Hil ib Faust R heg ib Vict Tun ib Hier Am 9 10 (comp. his very loose quot. Soph ii 12 Aug ser 29 6: quod l. s. ut facerem ei Hier adv pel 3 6 ep 132 3 Joh Cass ib Gildas ib.

xviii. 12. *DESPERAVimus Hier, who adds sive con-
fortabimur id ep 132 3: DESPERAMUS Gildas 50.

*cognitiones...nostras Hier id ib Gildas ib.

*pravitatem Hier, who adds, sive quod placuit id ib
Gildas ib.


*aguae erumpentes FRIGIDAe et (om et Gildas) delu-
entes Hier Gildas ib: aqua quae fertur 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 perditionis eorum Hier: ost. eis diem perd. eor.
W.

xviii. 18. *et non attendamus Hier: et audiems W.

justitiae meae W.

xviii. 20. *foderunt foveam Hier: locuti sunt
verbum 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 Eucher  


xx. 3. *cumque illuxisset in crastinum Hier: om 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 3 4 et 3 16 off min 3 102: om Hier tr hom or xi (841).

*(ignis exaestuans) clausus (que) Hier: (i. ardens) flammigerans W: (i. ard.) flammans Ambr Ps 118 3 4 et 3 16: so, with flammigerans id Luc lib vii § 132 off min ib: (i.) flammig. id Ps 38 4, 118 19 ep 1 43 15: (i.) inflammans 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 3 4 et 3 16 off min ib Hier tr hom or ib.

*non sustinens Hier: et non possum ferre W: et f. non pr. 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 cem Hier: adstate et superstemus ei W.

xx. 16. *om in thesp Hier id adv pel 2 27.

xx. 18. *quare (iva ti tvro) Hier id adv pel ib: ut quid ergo W.

xxi. 2. *nabuchodonosor Hier: om W.
xxi. 3. *om bas. 'l. 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 parcant 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 PUIRI W.
xxii. 4. *ipsi et Hier: IPSE et W.
xxii. 5. *AUDIERITIS Hier Gildas 5°: fueritis W.
xxii. 6. *inhabitables 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 ep 1 30 4 Ps Aug spec 118.
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xxii. 15. *confers te Hier: tu exacerbatus es W.
   *cedro Hier: in achem W.

xxii. 15, 16. *iustitiam Tunc cum bene erat ei?
(16) Iudicavit Hier: iust. bonam nescierunt. non indicasti W.

xxii. 17. *tui vero oculi et cor (ad avaritiam) Hier: non sunt oc. tui neque tuum cor bonum W: so, with cor tuum, Ir c haer 4 s 18 3.
   *cursum Hier: homicidium W; Ir ib.

xxii. 18. *ad Joachim (-sim 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

1 W (ך organisé

   *malitia tua (ך organisé) Hier: amatoribus suis W.

xxii. 23. *congenuisti Hier: congemisce in eo W.


xxii. 25. *et in manu 1o Hier: om W.
   *et in manu N. regis Bab. et Hier: om W.


xxii. 27. *ut revertantur illuc Hier: om W.

xxii. 28. *numquid vas fictile atque contritum


   *quare Hier: propter quod W; Ambr Luc ib: quoni-
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xxii. 29. *terra terra (TERRA again Hier) Hier W; Ambr Luc ib ep 1 25 4 Hier Is 56 19 tr hom or Ezek 4: terra Ir ib Ambr de int iob etc ib.

xxii. 30. *HAEC DICT Dominus Hier: om W; Ir ib Ambr Luc ib de int iob etc ib.

*(scribe virum istum) STERILEM Hier: (s. v. i.) reprehabitum hominem W: (s. v. hunc) abdicatum hom. Ir ib: (v. i.) abdicatum Ambr Luc ib de int iob etc ib.

*IN DIESBUS SUIS NON PROSPERABITUR Hier: om W; Ir ib Ambr Luc ib.

xxiii. 1. *(gregem) pascuae meae Hier Gildas 82: (oves) a pastionibus suis W: oves meas (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. *REGIS 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 8: 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 ADULATORIS (al. ADULTERIS Hier) REPLETA EST TERRA Hier: om W.

*MALEDICTIONIS Hier, who adds sive iuramenti: is-torum W.

*CURSUS eorum Hier W.

S. 23
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*DISSIMILIS* Hier: *non sic* W.

xxiii. 14. *

*manus PESSIMORUM* Hier: *manibus MALIGNIS* W.

xxiii. 16. *

*QUI PROPHETANT VOBIS* Hier: Gildas\(^{ib}\):
om W; Cypr de cath eccl 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 bi.* Gildas) ME Hier Gildas \(^{ib}\): *LOCUTUS EST DOMINUS* Hier, who adds (to *bl. me*) *sivi abiicuint verbum meum: eis qui abigunt v. Domini* W: *eis qui abiicunt 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 cuni in errore cordis sui* W: *et omn. ambulantibus in vol. suis* Cypr de cath eccl un 11.

xxiii. 18. *

*in consilio Domini* Hier Gildas \(^{ib}\): *in substantia* Dom. W (so subs. for *consilio* in v. 22): *Mar Vict Afer* ad\(^{v}\) ar 1 30, 2 3 Ambr de fide 3 123 Ps Aug spec 104 Foegad de fil div 4 Vigil Taps de trin 5 Bened pag 248 con varim 1 44 con pall ar 2 4 Vict Vit de pers 3 2: *in s. mea Mar Vict Afer* ad\(^{v}\) ar 1 59 Vigil Taps con ar sab etc 2 19.

*et vidit ET AUDIVIT (sermonem eius)* Hier Gildas \(^{ib}\): *so with verbum eius* Vict Vit \(^{ib}\): *et v. verbum eius* W Mar Vict Afer ad\(^{v}\) ar 1 30, 2 3: *et v. verbum meum* \(^{ib}\) 1 59: *et audissent v. m.* Vigil Taps con ar sab \(^{ib}\): *et videbit verbum Domini* Foegad \(^{ib}\) Vigil Taps con pall ar \(^{ib}\): *et vidit v. eius Ps Aug spec \(^{ib}\): *et videbit verbum Dei* Vigil Taps con varim \(^{ib}\): *et v. v. eius id* de trin \(^{ib}\).

xxiii. 20. *

*intelligitis (-GETIS Hier Gildas) CON-
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SILIIUM EIIUS Hier Gildas lib: intelligent ea W; Ir c haer 6 36 1: cognoscetis 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. 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 1s 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 linguis W.

*et aiunt: dicit (Dominus) Hier: et dormant somniantes W.

xxiii. 32. *ad prophetas (om qui prophetant) somniantes mendacium Hier: ad prof. qui prophetant somnia falsa W.

*qui narraverunt (al. narrant Hier) ea Hier: et enarrant ea W.

xxiii. 33. *vel prophetæ 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 pervertit (al. pervertisti Hier)...Dei nostri Hier: om W.

xxiii. 37. *haec dices...Dominus 1°: haec dices, adding sive dicitis (al. dicitis)…Dom. Hier: om W.

xxiii. 38. *si autem...dixeritis Hier: om W.


xxiv. 8. *om ˷ Hier (Cypr de pauch comp 11).

xxiv. 9. *afflictionemque Hier: (om Cypr ˷).

*in proverbiun Hier: (in odium Cypr ˷).

*et patribus eorum Hier: (om Cypr ˷).

xxv. 4. *et misit Dominus Hier: misi Cypr test 1.
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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 186 3, but see on vii. 13, 25: cum dicerem vobis Lact ib.

*dedit Dominus Hier: dedi Cypr ib Lact ib.

xxv. 6. *me Hier Cypr ib et ad fort 3 (de aliat 8) Lact ib Iul Firm Mat de err prof rel a8 Zen Ver 115 a.

*et non affligam vos Hier: ad dispersendos vos Cypr ib Lact ib Iul Firm Mat ib: et dispersam 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 Esek 23 58 tr hom or 9 (822): om Hier Is 6 8.

*DE Iullo 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) 51 17 Esek ib tr hom or ib.

xxv. 16. *et bibent Hier id ep ib Is 51 17 Esek ib tr hom or ib: om Tycon ib Ambr ib.

*et turbabuntur (inebriabantur Hier, who adds sive voment) et insanient Hier: et voment et ins. Tycon ib Ambr ib Hier ep ib Is ib Esek ib tr hom or ib.

xxv. 18. *et in maleditionem, 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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xxv. 25. *et cunctis regibus Zabri: Zamri Hier: om Tycon ib.

*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 2/2.

xxv. 38. *(a facie) irae columbae Hier, who adds sive a f. gladii magni: a. f. gl. col. id Soph 1 7.

xxvi. 2. *ad omnes civitates Juda, de quibus veniant Hier: omni Iudae, iis qui v. Ambr de poenit 3 30.

xxvi. 3. *et poeniteat me (mali) Hier, who adds sive quiescam a malo: et poenitebit me Ioh Cass coll (xvii) de defor 25.

xxx. 8. *de collo tuo, et vincula illius Hier: a serice illorum et v. illorum Cypr test 1 13: so, with eorum in both places, Hil Ps 131 1.

*et non dominabuntur eis (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.

xxx. 10, 11. Very loosely quoted Hier adv petr 2 8.

xxxii. 2. *invenit gratiam in deserto populus, qui

remanserat gladio Hier: quasi calidum in deserto, inveni Israel cum occisis gladio id 1 65 8.

xxxii. 8. *inter quos erunt coecus et claudus
Hier: in die festo (adding, *Paschae diem significat*) Tert de bapt 19.

xxxı. 9. *VENIENT Hier, who adds sive egredientur: exierunt Ambr de int iob et dav 3 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 CONSOLABOR EOS Hier: om Ir ib.


*SACERDOTUM Hier, who adds sive filiorum Levi: sac. filiorum Levi Ir ib.

*PINGUEDINE (יִּשְׁפָּנְת) Hier: om Ir ib.

xxxı. 15. *plorans (-rantes Hier) FILIOS SUOS Hier id Mat 2 17 Rened pag 15 Ambr Ps 37 : [R. ploravit f. s. Ambr cp 44 9].

O.L., like Pesh, (see crit. note) omits 'ר ב י ל י 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 : Eucher hom de bland lugd Vict Cap ev harm int 10.

xxxı. 19. *CONVERTISTI ME Hier: captivitatis meae Ambr de poenit 2 36.

*egi poenitentiam Hier: poenit. egi Ambr ib.

*PERCUSSI FEMUR MEUM. CONFUSUS SUM Hier, who adds (after meum) sive ingemui and (after conf. s.) sive ex die confusionis: ingemui super dies confusionis Ambr ib.

*et ERUBUI Hier, who adds et ostendi te: et subjectus sum tibi Ambr ib.
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xxxii. 22. *FEMINA CIRCUMDABIT VIRUM Hier (id de ben lac patr): in qua salute circuistant homines Aug op imp con Iul 3 84: faciam novum in femina, quod omnes mirabimi (very loosely) Rust diac con aceph.

xxxii. 32. *DOMINATUS SUM Hier: neglexi (-cl-) Cypr test (1 11) 8 90 Lact div inst 4 90 Aug Ps 118 33 de civ Dei 17 3 de spir et lit 33 Prosp Aqu de voc om gent 9.


xxxii. 37. *MENSURARI POTUERINT Hier: exaltatum fuerit Cypr test 3 80.


*EXTENTO Hier, who adds sive excelso: excelso Vigil Taps c var 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 demetr 13).

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, praecepta caeli 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 4 36 5.
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xxxv. 16. *quod praeceperat eis: om W.

xxxv. 17. *Dominus exercituum, Deus Israel:

Dom. W.

xxxv. 18. *obedisti: audierunt filii Nadab filii

Rachab W.

*et custodisti omnia mandata eius: om W.

xxxv. 19. *haec dicit Dominus exercituum Deus

Israel 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: carthas istas W.

xxxvi. 9. *et universae multitudo...in Ier.:

et in domo Iuda W.


*super eos W; Ir ib.


xxxvi. 32. *Ieremias autem...scribae: et accept

Baruch chartam aliam W.

xxxvii. 1. *(pro) Iechonia filio Ioiachim: (pro) Ioachim

W.

xxxvii. 4. *(in medio) populi: (per medium) turbam

W.

*qui obsidebant Jerusalem: om W.

xxxvii. 5. *ab: ad W.

xxxvii. 8. *haec dicit Dominus Deus Israel; sic
dicitis 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 ep 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. 'דרן 3) : cum eo W.

*et viros...IsmaHEL: om W.

xli. 5. *et de Selo: 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 revocavit W.

*ET UNIVERSUM POPULUM, QUI REMANERAT 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 (Iohanam) filium Caree:
(reversi sunt) ad Ionan W.

xli. 15. *A FACIE Iohanam: 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 nobis Hier 18 30 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.

*abscendi Hier ib.

*SOLIUM suum Hier ib.


*ET AMICIETUR... AMICIETUR Hier ib.

xliv. 21. *HORUM (recordatus est...?) Salv de sub Dei 45.

xliv. 22. *POTERAT Salv ib.

*EO quod non sit habitator: om Salv ib.
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xlvii. 3. *a strepitu pompae armorum, et bellatorum 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 1 Bened pag 184.

xlviii. 7. *in munitionibus tuis et in thesauris tuis
(a double rendering. See crit. note) Hier Is ib: in mun.
t. id Ezek 25 8.

xlviii. 11. *requievit Eucher lit form spir int 8.


xlviii. 25. *abscessum est cornu Moab, et brachium eius contritum est: quomodo fracta est virga fortis,
baculus gloriosus Hier Is 15 1 Bened pag 184.


xlviii. 27. *in derisum Hier ib.

xlviii. 29. *superbus est valde (oupperov, ἠχὴ) Hier ib.

xlviii. 31. *eiulabo: clamabo Hier Is 16 7 Bened pag 190.

xlviii. 32. *et ad Moab Hier ib.

xlviii. 33. *sustuli: nequaquam calcator uvae solitum celeuma cantabit; mane non calcaverunt, meridie autem non fecerunt (om aïde) Ambr ib.

1 The note in Migne points out that the Roman ed. for meridie etc. has neque vespere sec. cel.
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xlvi. 37. *OM ev π. 7. Hier Is 15 a Bened pag 185: hab
id Ezech 7 18.

xlv. 7. *NUMQUID NON est...? Hier Abd 1.

xlv. 9. *rapuisser QUOD SUFFICERET SIBI Hier Abd 4.

xlv. 10. *DISCOPERUI (κατευπα): DISCOOP. Hier ib.

*celari: celare (al. -ri) Hier ib.

xlv. 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 colis Hier ib: munitionem c. excelsi

Sang.

xlv. 17. *STUPEBIT ET sibilabit super omnes plagas
eius: sibilabit Sang.


xlv. 19. *de superbia Hier Abd 7.

*ad pulchritudinem Hier ib.

*(subito) currere eum faciam Hier ib.

xlv. 22. *ASCENDET ET Hier ib.

*evolabit: volabit Hier ib.

*Bosram Hier ib.

xlv. 24. *ANGUSTIA...PARTURIENTEM Hier Is 17 1

Bened pag 193.

xlv. 27. *moenia Hier ib.

*Benadad: Benadab Hier ib.


*et vastate Hier ib.
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xlix. 31. *non vectes Hier\textsuperscript{ib}.

xlix. 32. *qui sunt ATTONSI in comam Hier\textsuperscript{ib}.

xlix. 33. *ADOR Hier\textsuperscript{ib}.


xlix. 37. *MALUM : om Tycon\textsuperscript{ib}.

I. 17. *EXOSSAVIT EUM : CONFRINGET OSSA ILLIUS Hier\textsuperscript{is} 56 8 : (comedit...) ossa eius Ps Aug\textsuperscript{spec} 114.


*om \textit{Dei} 27 Ambr de el et iesum 56: propter hoc (propter teresa) commota sunt gentes Hier tr hom or 2 (765), but om gentes (765 et 767) [(a quo inebriatae sunt) gentes Ambr Ps 118 741].

II. 8. *resinam Ambr de ios pat 17 Hier tr hom or 2 (768)

Joh Cass coll (vi) de an mob 31 4.

II. 9. *(non) est sanata Hier Ezek 47 6 : (non) est curata id Eccles 7: s. (n.) e. Ambr\textsuperscript{ib}.

II. 11. *REGUM Hier\textsuperscript{is} 21 1.

*MENS eiusmod Hier\textsuperscript{ib}.

*TEMPLE sui Hier\textsuperscript{ib}.

II. 12. *CUSTODIAM Hier\textsuperscript{ib}.

*INSIDIAS Hier\textsuperscript{ib}.


II. 25. *(mons) PESTIFER : m. corrupte Ambr Luc\textsuperscript{lib}

8 8 19 de fide 3 11.

II. 27. *(regibus ARARAT Hier\textsuperscript{is} 21 1: Bened pag 213.

*MENNI Hier\textsuperscript{ib}.

*THAPSAR: TAPSAR Hier\textsuperscript{ib}.
APPENDIX.

*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...E IUS Hier Is ib: so with illius for eius id Dan ib.
li. 33. *Filia Babylonis Hier Dan ib.
li. 37. *In tumulos: in tum. arenarum Hier Is 21 1 Bened pag 212.

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.
ho die in civitatem     Ecce enim...
in columna murream    in columnam ferream
munitam et in columna...
et in murum aereum.
murum aereum, super omne terram, regibus Juda, principibus eius, et sacerdotibus, et populo terrae. Et bellabunt adversum te, et non praevalebunt; quia ego tecum sum, ait Dominus, ut liberem te.

...                      1b xxiv 25.
et pr.                   Ecce enim dedi te
et pr.                   in columnam ferream
et principibus, et sacerdotibus eius, et.
et.

...                      .

...                      .

...                      .

...                      .
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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 coll (vi) de ncc san ii 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.

Vulg.       Cypr ep ad Dem 7.       Leo Mag ber 84 (al 81) .

Percussisti eos et Verberasti eos, Flagellasti eos et non doluerunt; attri- nec doluerunt; fla- non dol.; castigasti visti eos et renuerunt gellasti eos, nec vo- luerunt accipere discip- accipere disciplinam. accip.” disciplinam.

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 planctu—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 text 8 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 xcviii. 11) ‘sapientium’ (but Amiat has hominum) with Tert conc. mar 8 6 and Cypr de hom. patient. 2.

(b) Ib 4 (Ps ix. 23 [x. 3]) ‘et qui iniqua gerit’ (so
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, abstinenst 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 Θ. In xl. 4 however (*veni, Θ*, ᾿Ηξε; see crit. note) we have a case of support from Θ.

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 $\delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega$ (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 (B&RAQ) 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 (de[siderati] xvii. 16) it seems influenced by the Vulg. and in three cases (xvii. 13, xlix. 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 (Kal Teb.) O. L. supports M.T. and RAQ against $\kappa$, 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 (NQ), 9 (AQ),
28 (NAQ); iii. 10 (Q supports '7N); iv. 7 ter (Q), 8 (Q),
10 (AQ), 20 ('7N 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 ('t'), 11,
16, 17; iv. 12 ('N), 30; v. 4 ('N), 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 (1 + 1; AQ); iii. 6 (A* vid), 9 (N),
22 (Q); iv. 10 ('N WAQ), 12 (lai. 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.
ii. 3, 6 (vi. aro. but in this case NAQ agree with Luc.),
8 (but here NAQ have m.o.) = 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 eπi 2ο.
In iv. 29 Luc 4 + 2 agree with B against M.T. in
reading tασα χωρα.
In v. 17 Luc 1 (+ 1) agree with B against M.T. in
reading κ. τοις έλαι. υμών.
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 uncial.

(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 ἄσηλειάς (but so too Q).

xvii. 13. Luc 3 ( + 1 ) + 2 ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς (so א - ą).

xxi. 9. Luc 3( + 1 ) + 2 εἶς ἑφέλεων.

xxxix. [xlvi.] 14. Luc 2 + 0 εἰς Ἰαφίθ.

xl. [xlvii.] 4, 5. Luc 4 + 1 have additions like those of W.

xlviii. [xxxi.] 31. Luc 3 + 1 have ταύχους καϕάδας (-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 Speculum¹
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 furtur S. Augustini,
the second of the two edited by Weihrich, Vienna, 1887, and "gener-
ally considered to contain a degenerate African text" (Burkitt,
Tyconius 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 Rhegiensis 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 Brixiensis 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 Nolanus 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; Reiffersheid 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
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N, 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, 153

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. Chalde.*, 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 f.
"omissions," discussion as to origin of, 3 ff.; light thrown by history on origin of, 7 ff.; non-recensonal oms., 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
Psammetichus I., 8
Ptolemy I. (Lagi), 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
Schleusner, J. F., 43, 52, 68, 70,
90
Schleusner, 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, 280, 285
Smith, Prof. H. P., 16, 57, 61,
63, 64, 69
sound, O's tendency to render
by a word of similar, 263
Spohn, 45, 88, 96, 143, 159, 165,
278

Stade, 98 f., 191
substitutions of words or letters,
19 f.
summary of reasons inducing in-
accuracy 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
Vitrina, 9

Wellhausen, 47, 48, 115, 192,
220
Wisdom, 10

Workman, theory of, 15 f.; criti-
cised 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, 51, 52,
55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 66, 72,
73, 76, 77, 81, 83, 93, 102,
103, 104, 106, 121, 128
Cambridge:
PRINTED BY J. & C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.