

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> I shall use these abbreviations:  $\mathfrak{M}$ , the Masoretic text;  $\mathfrak{G}$ , the Greek translation (LXX); A, the Alexandrian  $\text{ms}$ ; B, the Vaticanus; S, the Sinaiticus; T, 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.<sup>2</sup> 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 Græce*. In at least one instance, the former is inaccurate — vi. 14, שָׁבַר בַּח עָזְרִי, where the best texts omit בַּח. 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:<sup>3</sup>

- i. 2 יחיה : τοῦ Θεοῦ.
- i. 16 כִּשְׁפָרִי : μετὰ κρίσεως.
- ii. 7 לֹאכַל : τοῦ φαγεῖν ὑμᾶς = לֹאכַלְכֶם.
- ii. 12 The main verbs are taken as indicatives by (5).<sup>4</sup>
- ii. 15 וַיִּשְׁחַתֵּי : om. א.
- ii. 28 אַחֲרָי : καὶ ὀπίσω.
- ii. 28 כִּי כִשְׁפָרִי : ὅτι κατ' ἀριθμὸν = כִּי כִשְׁפָרִי.
- ii. 32 W. notes that כָּלָה and בָּרִילָה change places, but not that the latter should be יִבְרִילָה.
- iii. 25 לִיחִיָּה אֱלֹהֵינִי : ἐναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.
- iii. 25 יִבְרִי : ἕως.
- iv. 4 וַחֲסִידָי : καὶ περιτέμεσθε = יַחֲזִלֵי; caused by imitation of the same verb in the earlier part of the verse.
- iv. 7 יִשְׁחַתֵּי : ἐξολοθρεύων.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> I give the reading of δ first, then that of 5, with a colon between.

<sup>4</sup> 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 הַצִּינָה : καθαρθήσονται. It is not always easy to make out whether (B) had clearly in mind the distinction between צִינָה and יִצָּח; but as καθαρεύω is twice in Jeremiah used for צִינָה, and nowhere (unless here) used for יִצָּח, it is on the whole probable that their copy had in this place הַצִּינָה.

v. 12 וְלֹא : 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 ABS by Nestle, published as a supplement to Tischendorf's text.<sup>5</sup> Its use wherever that edition is quoted for critical purposes is essential to accuracy. One who publishes a collation of (B) with (A) might fairly be expected to do more than this. But, to apply only the more moderate requirement, we must find Workman's *Conspectus* lacking. The following errors in his collation have this origin:

i. 2 אֲשֶׁר : W. כִּאֲשֶׁר, based on ὡς Ti.; but ABS have ὅς, agreeing therefore with (A).

iii. 16 The clause λέγει κύριος is in the current Greek inserted in a different place from that in which (A) has it. ABS agree with the latter.

iv. 4 חֲמִיר : A agrees with (A); but BS have ὁ θυμός αὐτοῦ (חֲמִיר).

iv. 5 וְאֲמַרְתִּי : εἶπατε. B only can be cited for the variation.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *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.

<sup>6</sup> The importance of B has been recognized above. It is nevertheless well to know when it stands alone.

- iv. 7 צרף : καὶ αἱ πόλεις Ti, on the basis of which W. gives וְחַצְרִים. A B S agree in καὶ πόλεις.
- iv. 12 משפטי : κρίματά μου Ti. W. משפטי; but μου is omitted by A B S, which therefore agree with ה.
- iv. 19 מצי מצי : B S have the word but once.
- iv. 26 περί (W. באא) is not found in B S.
- v. 8 יצולו : ἐχρεμέτιζεν B S : ἐχρεμέτιζον A Ti.
- v. 11 λέγει κύριος of B has no equivalent in ה. 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. 13 כה ינשא להם is omitted by Ti. It is found in B S.
- v. 19 The article (τη second time) on which W. bases בארץ is not found in A B S.
- v. 20 οὐκω of Ti is not found in A B S, which are therefore in harmony with ה.
- vi. 2 A B S agree in reading τὸ ὕψος σου instead of τὸ ὕψος of Ti.
- vi. 10 אונם : A S read τὰ ὄνα ὑμῶν.
- vi. 11 ובליחים : A B S, and apparently all the mss of Holmes and Parsons, read καὶ οὐ συνετέλεσα αὐτούς.
- vi. 13 וכי כחך. B and S agree in reading ἕως (without καί).
- vi. 22 יצור : 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 אהח : ὁ ὤν, which Workman re-translates into אהח or חה אהח. The word is one that gives the translators some trouble. In Judges it is rendered, or transferred, א א, in Ezekiel οἱμοι, in 2 Kings ὦ. In Jeremiah it occurs four times; three times we find in the Greek ὁ ὤν as here, once ὦ (though in this passage also one ms has ὁ ὤν). It is very doubtful, therefore, whether (B) had any different text from our own.

i. 10 היום חוה : σήμερον. It is unnecessary to suppose that the translators had no חוה before them.

i. 19 ואם יהוה : εἴπε κύριος. W. proposes to restore אמר יהוה,

on the theory that **נאם יחיה** is always translated *λέγει κύριος*. In ii. 3 he proposes also to read **אמר יחיה** on the ground of *φησὶ κύριος*. As both of the Greek phrases really render **נאם יחיה** 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 κύριος*. 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 (9) 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 **אמר יחיה**.

ii. 3 **אליהם** : *ἐπ' αὐτούς*. W. **עליהם**. The apparent interchange of **אל** and **על** 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 singulars of **לך**. Hebrew, however, uses collective nouns so frequently (as here *κατοικία*) 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 **בארץ ציבחה ושיחיה** : *ἐν γῆ ἀπίρψ και ἀβάτω*, on the ground of which W. substitutes **ישחיה** for **ישחיה**. Some doubt is thrown upon this by A's *ἀβάτω και ἀπίρψ*, especially as we find *ἄβατος* used elsewhere for **צרכה**. In case of an uncommon word like **שיחיה** 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 **שיחיה**.

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

ii. 31 **ררני** : *ὄν κυριευσόμεθα*, which W. supposes to represent **הלא ררני**. But *κυριεώ* twice represents **ררה**, so that, if anything, we should read **הלא רריני**. One cannot help thinking that *ὄν κυριευσόμεθα* is an accurate rendering of **ררני**. Schleusner gives the phrase, and defines it *non dominium in nos patiemur*, which surely defines **ררני**.

ii. 36 **לשניה**. I do not understand why we should suppose (9) (*δενερωσαι*) to have read **לשניה**.

iii. 1 The *éav* of (5) may well represent כַּי of 5: "*certe Syris et Chald. כַּי valet éav.*" (Schleusner). W. changes to אַם.

iii. 3 מַצַּח : *ὄψις*. W. proposes מַצִּי. (5) does not testify to a variant; *ὄψις* is nowhere used (if we may trust Trommius) for מַצִּי and is a good translation of מַצַּח.

[It should be noted that in the two preceding instances Workman allows 5 to remain as a possibility, writing אַם (כַּי) and מַצִּי (מַצַּח). 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 (5) read the same which we have.]

iii. 8 מַשְׁבָּח : *κατοικία*. As the translation of the word is uniform, it is clear that the translator did not have מַשְׁבָּח in his text (as W. assumes), but pronounced מַשְׁבָּח, as if from מַשְׁבָּח.

iii. 11 צִרְקָה נִשְׁטָה : *ἐδικαίωσε τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ*. It is possible that this points to מַשְׁבָּח, as W. suggests. As, however, a considerable group of mss has *αὐτῆς* this is by no means certain. As *Ἰσραήλ* is the subject the change in the Greek from original *αὐτῆς* would not be unnatural. Even if *αὐτοῦ* were original, it would not indicate a variant in the proper sense; מַשְׁבָּח surely was not strange to the Hebrew of the editors.

iii. 14 צִיּוֹן : *εἰς Σιών*. The translation is as near as we ourselves could make it. אֶל-צִיּוֹן is uncalled for.

iii. 17 שִׁרְיָה : *ἐνθυμημάτων*. W. supposes מַשְׁבָּח, and cites vii. 24, where we find מַשְׁבָּח בְּשִׁרְיָה : *τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν*. If, however, we suppose *ἐνθύμημα* (*ἐνθυμήματα*) to be a possible translation of שִׁרְיָה (שִׁרְיָה), then מַשְׁבָּח 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 שִׁרְיָה occurs eight times in Jeremiah. In two (besides vii. 28) it is lacking in (5). Once it is translated *πλάνη* (W. חַיִּית), and three times *ἀρεστόν* (*ἀρεστά*, W. רַחֲמֵי). According to Prof. Workman, therefore, the text before (5) 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 מִיִּצְיֹחַ 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 לֹא־נִשְׂרִי יְהוָה : τοῖς ἀνδράσιν Ἰουδα. W. gives לא־נִשְׂרִי יְהוָה; but it is evident that אִישׁ 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 שָׂאֵי נֶס : ἀναλαμβάνετε φεύγετε. As the translators seem not to have understood נֶס, but everywhere connect it with נִים, it is likely they made the best they could out of the present text, and the hypothesis that they read הַנֶּסֶאִי וַיִּוָּסֵר is uncalled for.

iv. 16 נֶצְרִים : συστροφαί, for which W. gives us the choice of צָרִים and צִרִים. As Schleusner and Gesenius agree in asserting that נֶצְרִי has sometimes the meaning of צָר, it is not improbable that the Greek translator had the same idea.

iv. 19 תּוֹמַת לִי לְבַר : μαίμασσει ἡ ψυχὴ μου, σπαράσσεται ἡ καρδιά μου. We have here probably a case of conflation in (5), two translations of the same phrase having been put side by side. This is not uncommon in our copies of (5) — 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 בָּאוּ בְּצַבִּים is represented by εἰσέδυσαν εἰς τὰ σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰ ἄλσῃ ἐκρύβησαν, — "*ubi quilibet videt duas coaluisse versiones.*" (Schleusner).

iv. 21 אֲשַׁמְעָה : ἀκούων. W. שִׁמְעָה. One group of mss has ἀκούω and another ἀκούσομαι and a third ἀκούσω. It is clear that the corruption in (5) is easier to account for than in (5).

iv. 23 יַהֲרֹה אֵינָנָה : καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐθέν = יַהֲרֹה, according to W. But οὐθέν is elsewhere used for יַהֲרֹה, and all that we can conclude is that (5) did not have יַהֲרֹה, which would be easily inserted from the familiar Gen. i. 2.

iv. 24 חֲזַקְלְקְלִי : παρασσομένων. Workman gives us the choice of מַתְחַלְחָלִים and מַתְחַלְחָלִי. In Eccles. x. 10 we find חֲזַקְלִי rendered ἐτάραξε.

iv. 26 (5) adds ἠφανίσθησαν at the end of the verse, which W. translates אֲבָרִי, with כְּלִי in parenthesis. If any preference is indicated as between these two, it should be in favor of כְּלִי, which might have been obscured into the כִּי of the next verse, omitted by (5). Beyond this rather slender ground, there is no reason for choosing

either of these from the dozen or more verbs that are rendered *ἀφανίζω*. Another possibility remains: *ἠφανίσθησαν* may be an attempt to translate more correctly the preceding *הצו*.<sup>7</sup>

iv. 29 *קשת* : *ἐντεταμένον τόξον* (one MS has *ἐκτεταμένον*). W. proposes *קשת ררובה*; but as we find in Hos. vii. 16 *ὡς τόξον ἐντεταμένον* for *קשת רמיה*, it seems quite certain that the translator connected *קשת* with *ἐντείνω*, and did not have a different text.

iv. 31 *צרה* : *τοῦ στεναγμοῦ σου*. W. supposes *צצקצק*, which, however, does not seem elsewhere to be paralleled. It is sufficient to read *צד*.

v. 10 W. proposes to substitute *כל* for *ב*, on the ground of *ἐπί*. In the breadth of meaning in which *ב* may be used there seems no necessity for this.

v. 14 The variants given to *הנני*, *הנני*, and *לאש* seem to be based only on slight liberty in translation. *יבן רברכם* certainly is well rendered by *ἀνθ' ὧν ἀλαλήσατε*.

v. 17 The nouns which W. would change to the plural (*חם*, *צאן*, *בקר*) are collectives.

v. 22 *אשר שמחי* : *τὸν τάξαντα*. It is difficult to see how (5) could have rendered better.

v. 31 *לאחריתה* : *εἰς τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα*. I do not see how W. can suppose (5) to read *לאחרייה*.

vi. 3 *אחיריו* : *τῇ χεφὶ αὐτοῦ*, on the ground of which W. gives *בידו*. No change is called for.

vi. 4 *ערב* : *ἡμέρας* found in the current Greek may be a corruption of *ἑσπέρας* which is found in a number of MSS. *צלליריום* would hardly be written by a Hebrew in preference to *צללירערב*, whereas the resemblance of *ἡμέρα* and *ἑσπέρα* is obvious.

vi. 5 *ארמניה* : *τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς*. As *θεμέλιον* is used by (5) at least eight times for *ארמין*, it cannot here be quoted as favoring *יסוד* or *מוסד*, W.

vi. 7 *חלי ימכה* : *πόνω καὶ μάλιστα*, on the ground of which W. restores *ובמכה*. He fails to notice, however, or to make plain that (5) joins the words to the following verse — *πόνω καὶ μάλιστα παιδουθήσῃ*. The translators took the Hebrew words as instrumental accusatives, and needing no prepositions to help them.

vi. 12 *שרה ינשים יחדו* : *ἀγροὶ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*.

<sup>7</sup> As we find a *שריה* in v. 30 which is evidently out of place (omitted also by (5) I cannot help suspecting that this word has something to do with v. 26.

The only change indicated is the substitution of נשירם for נשירם. The proposed reading, שריריהם ינשיריהם יחד, is at least uncalled for.

vi. 13 כלי בוצע בצע : πάντες συνετέλεσαν ἄνομα, and כלי עשה שקר : πάντες ἐποίησαν ψευδῆ. The collective force of כלי is so plain that the rendering could hardly have been different. W. proposes כלם בצעי and כלם עשית.

vi. 15 יבשלו : ἀπολούνται. 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 מירבתי-אריק : ἀπ' ἐσχάτου 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 חיל כירלרח : ὠδίνες ὡς τικτοῦσης. The same is true of this as of the preceding: the phrase occurs with the same translation elsewhere.

vi. 28 חלבי רביל : πορευόμενοι σκολιῶς. σκολιός 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 רביל here, we are entirely in the dark as to the restoration to be made. W. proposes מנפשיים; but the meaning of (י) is not so remote from that of the (not common) Hebrew word that we need assume a variation.

vi. 28 משחיתים : διεφθαρμένοι. 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 לא יכלו חמים : οὐ δυνήσονται ὕδωρ συνέχαι. W. restores לא יכלו לחביל חמים. Of course (י) read יכלו; but this being so they must supply something to make sense, and we have slender evidence for the insertion of לחביל. It is probable, moreover, that if they had read לא יכלו לחביל, they would have put συνέχαι ὕδωρ, instead of transposing the two words.

ii. 19 ולא פחדתי אליך : καὶ οὐκ εὐδόκησα ἐπὶ σοί. W, following Schleusner, re-translates בך בחיוריך; but בחיורי is nowhere rendered εὐδοκία (if one may trust the concordance), and the ἐπὶ points to a word that can be used with על or אל. Why not read ולא תחדתי עליך?

ii. 25 מייחה : ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ τραχείας. W. gives us the choice between

מִיִּצְיָה and מִיִּקְשׁ, neither of which is much nearer the Greek than is יֵץ. In Isa. xl. 4 ὁδὸς τραχὺία is רַכָּס, which, if any change is to be made, should be brought into view. Probably, however, Schleusner's *liberius exposuerunt* is correct.

ii. 27 לְצַן אֲמָרִים : τῷ ξύλῳ εἶπαν ὅτι πατήρ μου = אֲמָרִים לְצַן אֲבִי, according to W. But does not the Greek distinctly imply לְצַן אֲמָרוֹ כִּי אֲבִי? The corruption of אֲמָרִים into כִּי אֲמָרוֹ would not be strange.

ii. 29 Why should the readers be puzzled with תְּדַבְּבֵי?

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 (b) probably represents the beginning of verse 31 in (a). At least the words missing in (b) in one place and in (a) in the other are near enough alike to make the conjecture plausible that one has given rise to the other; they are respectively יֵלֵא יִרְאֵם (καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθητε) and הִדִּיר אֲרָם. I think (b) original.<sup>8</sup>

iii. 3 מֵאַחַז הַכֶּלֶם : ἀπηραιοχύντησας πρὸς πάντας (there is no appreciable variation in (b); one MS only of Parsons omits πρὸς πάντας). How does Prof. W. arrive at his restoration, מֵאַחַז חֲכַמֵי מִשְׁנֵי־כֶלֶם? Evidently the Greek verb is a good rendering of מֵאַחַז הַכֶּלֶם, and the πρὸς πάντας is כֶּלֶם or מַחְכֵל; which is a good deal nearer חֲכַלֵּם than בְּמִשְׁנֵי־כֶלֶם or בְּמִשְׁנֵי־כֶלֶם.

iii. 8 עַל־כֵּל־אֲדוּת אֲשֶׁר נִאֲשָׁה מִשֶּׁבַח יִשְׂרָאֵל : περί πάντων ὧν κατελήφθη ἐν οἷς ἐμοιχάτο ἡ κατοικία Ἰσραήλ. W. re-translates this עַל כֵּל אֲדוּת אֲשֶׁר נִאֲשָׁה בְּאֲשֶׁר נִאֲשָׁה וּגְיָ; but this is too much. Clearly אֲדוּת is not represented in the Greek, and should be omitted. Whether κατελήφθη (κατελείφθη is found in several MSS) represents נִאֲשָׁה or some other verb is doubtful. Putting the two readings together, we notice that περὶ πάντων ὧν κατελήφθη stands in the place occupied by עַל־כֵּל־אֲדוּת, and are led to suspect that the Greek words represent something not unlike these Hebrew words. My conjecture would be עַל־הַלְכָּרָה. But nothing more than a conjecture can be given, and when given it should be marked by an interrogation point.

iii. 22 W. gives שְׁבִירֵכֶם as the original of τὰ συντρίμματα ὑμῶν (אֵץ)

<sup>8</sup> I may perhaps be pardoned for introducing a conjecture of my own on the unusual phrase יִרְאֵה דְבַר יְהוָה in v. 31. Was it not originally יִרְאֵה דְבַר יְהוָה? The prophet goes on to "justify the ways of God to men," or at least to Israel — תְּמַדְּבַר חֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל.

(מסוכריות). But as מַטְבֵּרוֹת is a word in actual use, it is better to suppose it here, as being nearer the form in אֵל.

In the same verse we find אֶתְנִי אֶתְנִי לָךְ : ἰδοὺ δούλοισι ἡμεῖς ἐσόμεθα σοι. W. renders thus, אֶתְנִי (תְּנִי) לָךְ (תְּנִי). I suspect that the only change needed is that of אֶתְנִי to אֶתְנִי, which is not at all far-fetched. אֶתְנִי אֶתְנִי לָךְ might well be rendered as it is by (5), δούλοισι 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 יִחַזְקֶנּוּ and יִחַזְקֶנּוּ, and v. 10 יִחַזְקֶנּוּ and יִחַזְקֶנּוּ. In each of these cases the resemblance of one of the two verbs to אֵל is so marked that the other is altogether out of the question.

v. 17 יִרְשָׁט : καὶ ἀλόησουσι. (5) regularly substitutes the plural for the singular in this verse, so that one of the proposed readings (יִרְשָׁט) is unnecessary, and the other (יִרְשָׁט) I do not understand. Elsewhere we have ἀλόαω as a translation of רִישׁ, which would point to יִרְשָׁט.

vi. 2 הִנֵּה וְהַמְצַנְנָה דְּמִיתִי בְּחִצְיוֹן : καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται τὸ ὑψός σου θύγατερ Σιών. W. supposes the Hebrew original to be הִנֵּה וְהַמְצַנְנָה דְּמִיתִי בְּחִצְיוֹן. But τὸ ὑψός σου is clearly רִמְחָךְ. Secondly, הִנֵּה must be the γίνεταί at the end of the preceding verse, and can scarcely represent καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται, which therefore is for יַחְמַצְנָנָה. Schleusner conjectures יַחְמַצְנָנָה. We should therefore get יַחְמַצְנָנָה : רִמְחָךְ בְּחִצְיוֹן, and this, or something like it, is what W. should have restored.

vi. 25 לְאֵיב מְגִיר : (ῥομφαία) τῶν ἐχθρῶν παροικεῖ. W. does not seem to recognize that the variation has arisen from the misplacement of the מ simply. παροικεῖ is גֵּר as perfect (or participle), and the change to מְגִיר 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 *Conspetus*, 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.