PROF. WORKMAN ON THE VARIATIONS
BETWEEN THE HEBREW AND GREEK TEXT OF JEREMIAH.*

BY PROF. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

The utter neglect with which the textual criticism of the Old Testament has been treated since the seventeenth century until a very recent time makes every sign of interest in this subject welcome. In this sense I greeted joyfully the book of Prof. Workman entitled "The Text of Jeremiah," published the present year (1889) by T. and T. Clark of Edinburgh. Prof. Workman deserves praise for attacking a neglected problem, and for the industry which he has devoted to its discussion. Genuine textual criticism is, however, a work of some difficulty. It would not be strange should there be some failures. Certainly every new contribution to the science needs itself to be carefully criticised before its results are accepted as established.

The greater part of Prof. Workman's volume is taken up with an argument. Into that argument I do not propose now to enter. My present business is with the last chapter, which probably cost more labor than all the rest of the work, and which the author evidently hoped to make the most useful part of the work. It is entitled "The Conspectus of the Variations," and presents in parallel columns variations between the Hebrew text current among us and the Greek translation known as the Septuagint, retranslated into Hebrew. The purpose of this Conspectus is to give the reader a correct idea of the amount of variation between the two texts, and to enable him to correct the current text.

The first criticism that suggests itself is, that the end might have been better accomplished by a critical edition. The present arrangement necessitates constant reference to the Hebrew, and frequently also to the Greek. A continuous text, with the variations relegated to the margin, would avoid these embarrassments. As it is, the

* Read in December 1889.

I shall use these abbreviations: δ, the Masoretic text; Ω, the Greek translation (LXX); A, the Alexandrian MS; B, the Vaticanus; S, the Sinaiticus; Ti, Tischendorf's edition of the LXX, containing the text of the Editio Romana.
scholar will find it easier to make his own collation than to make use of the Conspectus.

It is, however, often the case that the treatment of a subject which is methodically not the best, is yet a real contribution to science. The form in which the question is put may not be the best, yet the answer may be helpful. Supposing, now, that Prof. Workman's Conspectus may be of use, what are the criteria by which it should be judged? Evidently the work of textual criticism requires, above all things, accuracy. The alleged apparatus must be reliable, or it is of no real use. To judge such a work as the one before us, we must apply rigidly a high standard of accuracy. The application of such a standard shows the following results:

1. Workman has used the two texts nearest at hand—Hahn's Hebrew Bible and Tischendorf's Vetus Testamentum Graece. In at least one instance, the former is inaccurate—vi. 14, ἵνα τί πάρῃ, where the best texts omit τί. The variant of the Greek which he gives here does not exist.

2. His work is incomplete. He has not given all the variations, even of Ti. The following should be added:

i. 2 ἡμείς : τοῦ θεοῦ.
   i. 16 ἔγραψαν : μετὰ κρίσεως.
   ii. 7 ἀγαθόν : τοῦ φαγεῖν ὡμᾶς = ἀνεβάζω.
   ii. 12 The main verbs are taken as indicatives by έ.".
   ii. 15 ἔγραψαν : om.?
   ii. 23 ἔργα : καὶ ὁπίσω.
   ii. 24 ὡθήσατο ἵνα : ἄρα κατ᾽ ἄριθμον = ἔφεσθε ἵνα.
   ii. 32 W. notes that ἄρα and ἀλλάζω change places, but not that the latter should be ἠλλάζω.
   iii. 25 ἀλλάζω ἡ ἡμέρα : ἐναντὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.
   iii. 25 ἔργα : ἐς.
   iv. 4 ἔργα : καὶ περιτέμενος = ἐργάζομαι ; caused by imitation of the same verb in the earlier part of the verse.
   iv. 7 ἐργάζομαι : ἐξολοθρεύων.

2 It gives me pleasure to say that in making this examination my own collation of the two texts has frequently been supplemented and corrected by that of Prof. Workman.

3 I give the reading of ά first, then that of ὰ, with a colon between.

4 This is of course a matter of interpretation rather than of text, as the translators had no vowel points. As, however, on Prof. Workman's own theory these variations should be included, I have given them here.
iv. 7 ἐπιτήδειον: καθαρεύθηκεν. It is not always easy to make out whether (has clearly in mind the distinction between ἄνευ and ἐπιτήδειον: καθαρεύθηκεν; but as καθαρεύσα is twice in Jeremiah used for ἄνευ, and nowhere (unless here) used for ἐπιτήδειον: καθαρεύθηκεν, it is on the whole probable that their copy had in this place ἐπιτήδειον: καθαρεύθηκεν.

v. 12 ἀβιθανόν: οὐχ.

3. The fact that Workman has not consulted for his Greek readings anything but the current text as represented by Tischendorf, has caused him to give as variants a number of readings which go back only to the editors of the Sixtine edition. It is the purpose of such a comparison as he has made to get back to the original Septuagint. In order to this, the most ancient manuscripts are the most important. Among the ancient manuscripts a high place must be given to B, as probably representing more nearly than any other single manuscript the original Septuagint. The *Editio Romana* professes to give the text of B. Notoriously, however, the editors allowed themselves considerable freedom. It is necessary that we should have the testimony of B, and it is very desirable that we should have the testimony of the other uncial codices, whose agreement gives at least a strong probability in favor of their reading. We possess now a collation of A B S by Nestle, published as a supplement to Tischendorf's text. Its use wherever that edition is quoted for critical purposes is essential to accuracy. One who publishes a collation of (with ἧς might fairly be expected to do more than this. But, to apply only the more moderate requirement, we must find Workman's *Conспектus* lacking. The following errors in his collation have this origin:

i. 2 ἔρευον: W, ἐρευόνω, based on ὅς Ti.; but A B S have ὅς, agreeing therefore with ἧς.

iii. 16 The clause λέγει κέρων is in the current Greek inserted in a different place from that in which ἧς has it. A B S agree with the latter.

iv. 4 ἐπιτήδειον: A agrees with ἧς; but B S have ὅ θυμός αὐτοῦ (ἐπιτήδειον).

iv. 5 ἐπιτήδειον: εἰσπαρε. B only can be cited for the variation. 6

---

6 *Veteris Testamenti Graeci codices Vaticanus et Sinaiticus cum textu recepto collati ab Eberardo Nestle*. The first edition was published in 1880. I have used the second, published 1887.

6 The importance of B has been recognized above. It is nevertheless well to know when it stands alone.
iv. 7 ἐκαί αἱ πόλεις Ti, on the basis of which W. gives Καὶ αἱ πόλεις. A B S agree in Καὶ πόλεις.

iv. 12 τοιούτῳ μου Ti. W. τοιούτῳ; but μου is omitted by A B S, which therefore agree with ἤ.

iv. 19 ὡς ὃς ἂν : B S have the word but once.

iv. 26 τοῖς (W. οἷς) is not found in B S.

v. 8 ἔμεινεν : ἔμεινεν B S : ἔμεινεν A Ti.

v. 11 λέγει κύριος of B has no equivalent in ἤ. It is lacking, however, in A S and a number of other mss of Holmes and Parsons. The phrase is of so easy insertion that its presence even in B can hardly weigh very heavily.

v. 18 οὐδεὶς ἑαυτῷ ἔχει is omitted by Ti. It is found in B S.

v. 19 The article (τῷ second time) on which W. bases τῷ is not found in A B S.

v. 20 ὅπως of Ti is not found in A B S, which are therefore in harmony with ἤ.

vi. 2 Ἀ νῦν : A B S agree in reading τῷ θυσίας σου instead of τῷ θυσίας of Ti.

vi. 10 ἔΨεως : A S read τῷ ὑπότρις ὑπών.

vi. 11 Φθορήτορα : A B S, and apparently all the mss of Holmes and Parsons, read καὶ οὐ περιώλουσα αἰτήσει.

vi. 13 ἐκ τῆς πλατείας. B and S agree in reading ἐς (without καὶ).

vi. 22 ἐπικρίνει : Workman gives the plural, after Ti. A B S, however, have the verb in the singular.

4. To this must be added, that the Conspectus contains a number of alleged readings of the Greek translators which are probably not variants at all. The restoration of the original is, of course, a matter of considerable delicacy. But this is a reason for at least giving the Greek along with the proposed rendering. The following examples will probably make this clear:

i. 6 δὸ γυν., which Workman re-translates into γυναῖκα or γυνῆ γυν. The word is one that gives the translators some trouble. In Judges it is rendered, or transferred, Α ἡ, in Ezekiel οἱ γυναῖκες, in 2 Kings ἣ. In Jeremiah it occurs four times; three times we find in the Greek δ ἡ γυνὲκε as here, once δ (though in this passage also one ms has δ ὅπως). It is very doubtful, therefore, whether δ had any different text from our own.

i. 10 τοῖς οὐγκρατής : στήματος. It is unnecessary to suppose that the translators had no οὐγκρατής before them.

i. 19 τοῖς αἷσι : εἴπε κύριος. W. proposes to restore τοῖς αἷσι,
on the theory that מְאֹכָל is always translated λέγει γύρως. In ii. 3 he proposes also to read מְאֹכָל on the ground of פָּגָה γύρως. As both of the Greek phrases really render מְאֹכָל correctly, it is doubtful whether we can change the Hebrew on their account. It is worth noticing also that in i. 19 twelve MSS (including A), and in ii. 3 fourteen MSS, actually read λέγει γύρως. It is not impossible that this is the original, changed by the copyist for the sake of variety. On the other hand, in a phrase of such frequent insertion the variety of reading in (6) may indicate interpolation in conformity to the Hebrew, in which case the phrase in both these instances would be of doubtful authenticity. Certainly it would be unfortunate for one seeking light on the text to suppose that the facts indicate without ambiguity the reading מְאֹכָל.

ii. 3 מָלֵא יָם: ἐὰν αὐτοῦς. W. מָלֵא יָם. The apparent interchange of מָלֵא and מְאֹכָל is so common in Jeremiah, that it is difficult to base an argument upon the translation.

ii. 6 The current Greek has plural verbs for the singulare of מִתָה. Hebrew, however, uses collective nouns so frequently (as here כַּלָיָם) that any argument based on mere change of number in the translation is very precarious. On this ground a number of Workman's variants should at least be marked by an interrogation.

ii. 6 מִתָה: מְאֹכָל רֶכֶב וַחֹקֶר, on the ground of which W. substitutes תֵּבָע לְבָן רֶכֶב for מְאֹכָל. Some doubt is thrown upon this by A's מְאֹכָל וַחֹקֶר, especially as we find מְאֹכָל used elsewhere for מְאֹכָל. In case of an uncommon word like מְאֹכָל the translators may have given a conjectural interpretation, guided by the evident requirements of the context. In the other place where it occurs in Jeremiah they have identified it with מְאֹכָל.

ii. 24 מְאֹכָל רֵדִי: ἐπεισαγοράζεται. W. renders מְאֹכָל רֵדִי, which however, is hardly an equivalent. "Libere transtulerunt; nam haurire ventum quod in textu legitur est anxie spiritum ducere." (Schleusner).

ii. 31 מְאֹכָל: oū κυριευόμεθα, which W. supposes to represent מְאֹכָל. But κυριεύω twice represents מְאֹכָל, so that, if anything, we should read מְאֹכָל מְאֹל. One cannot help thinking that oū κυριευόμεθα is an accurate rendering of מְאֹל. Schleusner gives the phrase, and defines it non dominium in nos patiemur, which surely defines מְאֹל.

ii. 36 מְאֹל. I do not understand why we should suppose oū (κυριευόμεθα) to have read מְאֹל.
iii. 1 The ἐγίνοντος (§) may well represent τὸ of τὴν: "certe Syris et Chald. τὴν valet čin." (Schleusner). W. changes to ἐγίνονται.

iii. 3 τοῦτο: ἓρξα. W. proposes τὸ. (§) does not testify to a variant; ἓρξα is nowhere used (if we may trust Trommian) for τοῦτο and is a good translation of τοῦτο.

[It should be noted that in the two preceding instances Workman allows § to remain as a possibility, writing (ὑπὲρ) εἰς and (ὑπὸ) τοῦ. My criticism is, that the probabilities are so strong against there being any variation that none should have been assumed. This form of writing the words seems to allow only the possibility that (§) read the same which we have.]

iii. 8 ἐδείκτηκεν: κατασκεύα. As the translation of the word is uniform, it is clear that the translator did not have ἐδείκτηκε in his text (as W. assumes), but pronounced ἐκπύρω, as if from ἐκπυρώ.

iii. 11 τοῦτο: οὐκ ἔχει. ἔδεικτηκεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν. It is possible that this points to τοῦτο πρᾶξ, as W. suggests. As, however, a considerable group of MSS has αὐτῶν this is by no means certain. As Ἰσραήλ is the subject the change in the Greek from original αὐτῶν would not be unnatural. Even if αὐτῶν were original, it would not indicate a variant in the proper sense; τοῦτο surely was not strange to the Hebrew of the editors.

iii. 14 γραφαί: εἰς Σιών. The translation is as near as we ourselves could make it. γραφαί is uncalled for.

iii. 17 οὐκ ἔχειν: ἐνθυμημάτων. W. supposes ἔχειν, and cites vii. 24, where we find ἐνθυμηματος: τοῖς ἐνθυμημάσεως. If, however, we suppose ἐνθυμηματα (ἐνθυμημάτα) to be a possible translation of ἐνθυμηματος (ἐνθυμήματα), then ἔχειν of the second passage is the interpolated word. This, moreover, is rendered probable by the fact that the more familiar word is the one which is naturally inserted to explain the less familiar word. The word ἔχειν occurs eight times in Jeremiah. In two (besides vii. 28) it is lacking in (§). Once it is translated πλάνη (W. ἔχειν), and three times ἀπεστάλον (ἀπεστάλα, W. ἔχεισ). According to Prof. Workman, therefore, the text before (§) did not contain the word at all, but always had some other word in its place. This is exceedingly suspicious. It is more likely that not being quite settled as to the exact equivalent of the word, but taking it in the general sense of "imagination" (as indeed recent authorities have given it), they colored their translation differently in the different places where the word occurs. That they were in line with ancient tradition in
their general understanding of the word is indicated by the (probable) insertion of ἡσαρέος as its synonym and explanation in vii. 24. In no one of the six cases referred to, therefore, are we justified in supposing a real variation of text.

iv. 3 τότε ἀνδράστην Ἰουδα. W. gives ἦς ἵνα γίνῃ; but it is evident that ἦς is used collectively, and the translation must change the number, as we ourselves should do in rendering into English. Compare what has already been said under ii. 6 above.

iv. 6 ἵνα Εἰρήνη. As the translators seem not to have understood ἡσαρέος, but everywhere connect it with ἦς, it is likely they made the best they could out of the present text, and the hypothesis that they read ὥστε ἣνάσο synonymity is uncalled for.

iv. 16 οὕρ καίτις: συντροφαῖ, for which W. gives us the choice of οὗρ καίτις and ὥστε. As Schleusner and Gesenius agree in asserting that ὥστε has sometimes the meaning of ἦς, it is not improbable that the Greek translator had the same idea.

iv. 19 τοις τρόποις: μαμάσσεις ἢ ψυχὴ μου, σταράμαται ἡ καρδία μου. We have here probably a case of conflation in (.), two translations of the same phrase having been put side by side. This is not uncommon in our copies of (.), a corrector inserting what he supposes to be a more accurate rendering, and yet not venturing to eject the phrase already in the text. A similar case is iv. 29, where ἡ δικαίωσις is represented by ἀπελθον τοῦ τὰ στίχωμα καί εἰς τὰ Μήνυ ἄκρυβηθη, — "ubi quilibet videt duas coaulesse versiones." (Schleusner).

iv. 21 καὶ τῇ ἐγκατάστασι: ἄκουον. W. ὄναττον. One group of MSS has ἄκουον and another ἄκουσμα, and a third ἄκουσιον. It is clear that the corruption in (.) is easier to account for than in (.)

iv. 23 καὶ δὲν ὁ τύχεν: καὶ δὲν ἔφαγεν ἐντελῶς, according to W. But ὁ τύχεν is elsewhere used for τρίτον, and all that we can conclude is that (.) did not have ἄριστα, which would be easily inserted from the familiar Gen. i. 2.

iv. 24 καὶ τῆς προφορᾶς: ταρασσομένων. Workman gives us the choice of ταρασσομένων and ταρασσόμενοι. In Eccles. x. 10 we find καὶ τῆς προφορᾶς rendered ταράσσεται.

iv. 26 ὥστε adds ἡπανίσθησαν at the end of the verse, which W. translates ἦπείθη, with ὥστε in parenthesis. If any preference is indicated as between these two, it should be in favor of ἦπείθη, which might have been obscured into the ἦπείθη of the next verse, omitted by (.). Beyond this rather slender ground, there is no reason for choosing
either of these from the dozen or more verbs that are rendered ἄφαντα. Another possibility remains: ἤφαντα θηραν may be an attempt to translate more correctly the preceding ἔτσιν.7

iv. 29 καὶ εἰς ἁρματομένον τόξον (one ms has ἐκτεταμένον). W. proposes τοῦ ἁρματομένου; but as we find in IIos. vii. 16 ὡς τόξον ἐκτεταμένον for τοῦ ἁρματομένου, it seems quite certain that the translator connected ἴρμα with ἕτωμα, and did not have a different text.

iv. 31 τοῦ στραγγοῦ σου. W. supposes πρόξενος, which, however, does not seem elsewhere to be paralleled. It is sufficient to read ἵτω.

v. 10 W. proposes to substitute ἵτω for ἰτι. In the breadth of meaning in which ἵτω may be used there seems no necessity for this.

v. 14 The variants given to ὡς ἂν ἤρθε, καὶ ἂν ἤρθε, and ὡς ἂν ἤρθε, and ὡς ἂν ἤρθε, certainly is well rendered by ἄνδρι ὡς ἄνδριτα.

v. 17 The nouns which W. would change to the plural (ἢλ, ἃς, ἰτικ) are collectives.

v. 22 It is difficult to see how (6) could have rendered better.

v. 31 ημεραίον: eis τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα. I do not see how W. can suppose (6) to read ἡμεραίον. No change is called for.

vi. 4 ἥμερα: ἡμέρας found in the current Greek may be a corruption of ἐσπέρας which is found in a number of MSS. ἡμέρας would hardly be written by a Hebrew in preference to ἐσπέρας, whereas the resemblance of ἡμέρα and ἐσπέρα is obvious.

vi. 5 θεμελία αἰτής. As θεμελίων is used by (6) at least eight times for γονής, it cannot here be quoted as favoring ἰτως or ἰτώς, W.

vi. 7 τὸν καὶ μέστη, on the ground of which W. restores τὸν καὶ μέστη. He fails to notice, however, or to make plain that (6) joins the words to the following verse — τὸν καὶ μέστη πατινούθησι. The translators took the Hebrew words as instrumental accusatives, and needing-no prepositions to help them.

vi. 12 ἄργοι καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αἰτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αἵτι. As we find a ἀργοι in v. 30 which is evidently out of place (omitted also by (6)) I cannot help suspecting that this word has something to do with v. 26.
The only change indicated is the substitution of "nisi" for "etiam". The proposed reading, however, is at least uncalled for.

vi. 13: πάντες συνετελέσαντο άνωμα, and not πάντες έποίησαν ψευδή. The collective force of ἔνα is so plain that the rendering could hardly have been different. W. proposes ἔναν μὲν ἔναν and ἔναν μὲν ἄλλῳ.

vi. 15: ἀπολούται. The Greek word is used for a variety of Hebrew verbs, and is near enough in meaning to cover this one as well.

vi. 22: καὶ λαός ἐστιν δραχάν τῆς γῆς. As the same phrase occurs with exactly the same translation in three other places in Jeremiah, it is improbable that a various reading existed.

vi. 24: τόπος τῆς θητῆς: αἰώνες ὡς τιτανοῦς. The same is true of this as of the preceding: the phrase occurs with the same translation elsewhere.

vi. 28: περερώμενοι σκολίας. σκολίαι is used for a number of Hebrew words, but for no one of them more than once or twice, and if it represents something different from לסק, here, we are entirely in the dark as to the restoration to be made. W. proposes לסק; but the meaning of the is not so remote from that of the (not common) Hebrew word that we need assume a variation.

vi. 28: διωθαρμένοι. The rendering is as correct as we could ourselves give.

5. To these criticisms,—the great majority of which will, I think, command assent at once,—a few cases may be added where Prof. Workman has not considered all the possibilities.

ii. 13: οὗ δύνῃσονται ἀνῳ συνέχεια. W. restores ἀνῷ ἀνῷ. Of course ἀνοιεῖσονται read ἀνοιεῖσον; but this being so they must supply something to make sense, and we have slender evidence for the insertion of δύνῃσον. It is probable, moreover, that if they had read δυνατον ἀνῷ, they would have put συνεχεῖα ἀνῳ, instead of transposing the two words.

ii. 19: καὶ οὖν κοινόκεια ἕνεκ σολ. W., following Schleusner, re-translates κοινόκεια ἕνεκ σολ; but κοινόκεια is nowhere rendered κοινόκεια (if one may trust the concordance), and the ἕνεκ points to a word that can be used with ἀν or ἐκ. Why not read ἰδίω καὶ ἐκ τοιὴς καταρακτος?

ii. 25: ἀπὸ κόσμον τραχείας. W. gives us the choice between
and ῥήματι, neither of which is much nearer the Greek than is ὁ. In Isa. xl. 4 ἐβολέας τραχύα is βαίνει, which, if any change is to be made, should be brought into view. Probably, however, Schleusner's liberius exposuerunt is correct.

ii. 27 : τῷ εἶλος εἴπαν ὅτι παρήρες μου = τῷ ἀπείρῳ ὅτι αὕτη ἄκρι βαίνει, according to W. But does not the Greek distinctly imply ἀκριβεῖ; The corruption of ἀπείρῳ into ἀκριβεῖ would not be strange.

ii. 29 Why should the readers be puzzled with ἀκριβεῖ;?

ii. 30, 31 It is unfortunate that W. quotes separately the end of verse 30 and the beginning of verse 31, thus obscuring the fact that the end of verse 30 in ὁ probably represents the beginning of verse 31 in ὁ. At least the words missing in ὁ in one place and in ὁ in the other are near enough alike to make the conjecture plausible that one has given rise to the other: they are respectively 

καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήητες) and μὴ οὖν. I think (ὁ original. 8

iii. 3 ἀπειρωχύντησα πρὸς πάντας (there is no appreciable variation in ὁ; one ms only of Parsons omits πρὸς πάντας). How does Prof. W. arrive at his restoration, ἀκριβεῖ;? Evidently the Greek verb is a good rendering of εἰπέτενα, and the πρὸς πάντας is ὄντος or ὄντος; which is a good deal nearer to us than ὀντος ἡμῶν.

iii. 8 πέρι πάντων ὁν καταλήσσως ἐν ὢς ὥμοιόν αὐτῷ κατεκάθισε Ισραήλ. W. re-translates this ἐπὶ βασιλείας τῆς Ἰσραήλ; but this is too much. Clearly ἁράκι is not represented in the Greek, and should be omitted. Whether καταλήσσως (καταληκτῆς is found in several mss) represents ἄκριβεῖ; or some other verb is doubtful. Putting the two readings together, we notice that πέρι πάντων ὁν καταλήσσω stands in the place occupied by ἀκριβεῖ; and are led to suspect that the Greek words represent something not unlike these Hebrew words. My conjecture would be ἀκριβεῖ.; But nothing more than a conjecture can be given, and when given it should be marked by an interrogation point.

iii. 22 W. gives ἀκριβεῖ; as the original of τὰ συνπροματα ὑμῶν (ὁ

8 I may perhaps be pardoned for introducing a conjecture of my own on the unusual phrase τὰ συνπροματα ὑμῶν in v. 31. Was it not originally ἀκριβεῖ; ἡ τριάδα ὑμῶν? The prophet goes on to “justify the ways of God to men,” or at least to Israel — ἀκριβεῖ; ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἡ εἰρήνη.
But as ἔστιν is a word in actual use, it is better to suppose it here, as being nearer the form in ἦ.

In the same verse we find ἵνα ἂν ἂν τὸν θεὸν ἴσομεθα τὸν σου. W. renders thus, τὸν θεόν τὸν ἴσον τὸν σου (τοῦτο). I suspect that the only change needed is that of ἴσομεθα to ἴσος, which is not at all far-fetched. ἴσος might well be rendered as it is by ὁ, δοῦλον being inserted to make the sense clear, perhaps by a later hand, as it is missing in a number of MSS.

I may say here, that if in a number of cases W. has arbitrarily given only one out of a number of verbs that might be represented by the Greek, he has in others given unnecessary alternatives, as v. 7, where we find ἡμῶν and ἡμίφυλος and ἡμεῖς, and v. 10 ἡμῶν and ἡμεῖς. In each of these cases the resemblance of one of the two verbs to τὸ is so marked that the other is altogether out of the question.

v. 17 ἐγράφη: καὶ ἀλοίπουσαν. (σ) regularly substitutes the plural for the singular in this verse, so that one of the proposed readings (ἡμέρας) is unnecessary, and the other (ἡμέρα) I do not understand. Elsewhere we have ἀλοίπως as a translation of ὥν, which would point to ὥν.

vi. 2 ἦν ὁ καθάρστης καὶ ὁ ἱερότυπος. W. supposes the Hebrew original to be καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται τὸ ψῶς σου βίγματε Σω. But τὸ ψῶς σου is clearly ἀφάκον. Secondly, τοῦτο must be the γίνεται at the end of the preceding verse, and can scarcely represent καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται, which therefore is for καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται. Schleusner conjectures ἐβορστόν. We should therefore get ἐβορστόν τοῦτο καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται, and this, or something like it, is what W. should have restored.

vi. 25 ὧν ἔχοντες ἐπακολουθεῖ: (ῥωμφαία) τῶν ἐχθρῶν παροικεῖ. W. does not seem to recognize that the variation has arisen from the misplacement of τὸ simply. Παροικεῖ is ὡς as perfect (or participle), and the change to ὡς is not necessary.

It will have been noticed that all the instances quoted are from the first six chapters of the book; and, in fact, I have confined my examination to these six chapters. The only conclusion to which I can come is, that the Conspectus, besides being faulty in plan, is inaccurate and unreliable. While it may give a fairly adequate idea of the character of the variations between the two texts, it is worse than useless (because misleading) for serious criticism of the text.