reference to the satisfaction of the appetite of the wicked mentioned in
the preceding verse. This is in part provided by the emendation of the
first half of verse 10, approved by Houbigant Lagarde and Wellhausen
(see Oxf. Heb. Lex. p. 240), יִּתְנָה מִיָּדָּם. If their suggestion be
correct, it would seem to follow as a matter of course that the second
half of verse 10 was originally לָא מִיָּדָּם. Sense and metre are
then restored, and the whole verse might be translated—
'So he gives them bread in abundance
And water is never scarce for them.'
The corruption in 10 b would appear to have arisen thus. First the י and
ת of לָא מִיָּדָּם were transposed and the word read יִּתְנָה; next, by haplo-
graphy, the י following the very similar letter ת was omitted; then, by
a common scribal error, י was changed into ת.
At this stage the meaning of the line would be the exact opposite of
that required by the context, and the final corruption which turned
לָא מִיָּדָּם into לָא מִיָּדָּם would appear to be a clumsy attempt to get rid of
the negative.

F. S. Marsh.

MACARIUS OF EGYPT.

Mr G. L. Marriott has deserved so well of those who care for the
devotional literature of the early church that it is with some hesitation
that I write to point out a mistake in his communication to J. T. S. of
January last with regard to Macarius of Egypt. He says on p. 178 that
the two British MSS containing his Homilies 'before the fiftieth Homily
... read' words which describe it as ἐπιστολῇ πρώτῃ. I surmise that
Mr Marriott writes from notes which he made when the MSS were
before him, and has misread a '1' (one) as an 'l' (fifty). There is no
such note as he describes in either MS before Homily L, though, as
Mr Marriott says, that Homily at its close describes either itself or the
collection in which it stands as being a letter. The note of which
Mr Marriott speaks is prefixed not to Homily L, but to Homily I, at
least in the Holkham MS. In the Bodleian MS the words are hard to
make out. Mr Marriott had stated the case more accurately in his
The point is that the MS evidence, such as it is, instead of connecting
Homily LI with Homily L alone, as Mr Marriott now says, connects
Homily LI with the whole set of Homilies I–L, as Mr Marriott, rightly
following Thomas Haywood, said before.

A. J. Mason.