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Θ = The Washington Codex (to be distinguished from Θ', which denotes Theodotion)

A = the MS Alexandrinus (to be distinguished from A')
A' = Aquila
€' = Quinta

Aq. = Aquila
Arm. = The Armenian Version
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Accents
Transliterations, false forms, and variant readings cited after the lemma are deliberately left unaccented.
Since this book is, unhappily, being published posthumously some ten years after the death of its author, it is necessary that I, as its editor, should give some account of its history and indicate clearly what my relationship to it has been. Let it be said at once that in all matters of substance it is entirely the work of Dr Walters. For the facts assembled, for the views expressed and for the supporting arguments both credit and responsibility are altogether his.

The work began as a thesis which was presented in 1945 to the University of Cambridge, England, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It was entitled 'The Text of the Septuagint. Its Corruptions and their Emendation. Part One: 1. Grammatical Corruptions. II. Semitisms, by Rev. Peter Katz (Fitzwilliam House)'. In the years that followed the author spent a great deal of time collecting further material, reworking the thesis and preparing it for publication. He hoped, moreover, that when it was published, he could proceed to write a Part Two dealing with emendations. Unfortunately he did not live to see the publication of Part One, and when he died Part Two had not reached the stage of first draft. This is a great pity; but when one considers the difficult and trying circumstances under which Dr Walters had to work both before and after his flight from Hitler's Germany, the amazing thing is that he accomplished so much. The detailed knowledge and painstaking labour involved in a work of this kind are immense. Only the most devoted concentration, supported by the understanding encouragement of his wife (now also unfortunately deceased) and family, could have enabled him to produce such a monumental work of scholarship in such difficult conditions.

In 1962, then, I was entrusted by Mrs Walters with the task of preparing for publication the original thesis, together with all the additions and corrections that had been added since 1945. What I received was two typescript copies of the thesis, both of which had innumerable corrections, re-phrasings, and additions, entered on the reverse side of each page of typescript, mostly, but not always, with some indication as to where they should be entered in the text. The text itself had also been corrected and added to, sometimes more than once. In addition there was a large sheaf of papers containing additions to the main text, additional footnotes, additional excursuses, and additional footnotes
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to the excursuses. And finally there were numerous small slips of paper tucked into the thesis here and there, carrying additional information.

To prepare this varied array of material for publication was a formidable task which I could not have accomplished without the help of others. The Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, who are to be applauded for their willingness to undertake the publication of a work of this nature and magnitude, promised to publish it if I could produce a fair copy to the satisfaction of Professor G. D. Kilpatrick of Oxford and (the late) Professor D. Winton Thomas of Cambridge. The Syndics asked that the presentation of the material be made as short and concise as possible. Professor Kilpatrick, who was already acquainted with the contents of the thesis, immediately announced that he would be satisfied with the thesis if it were prepared, much as it stood, without any shortening. Professor Winton Thomas eventually read through my final typescript, and not only expressed his general satisfaction but also made a number of helpful comments and corrections.

My method of procedure was as follows. I first xerographed the whole of the thesis (the expense of which process was borne by the Queen's University, Belfast, as was also the expense of typing all 620 pages of the final typescript). I then worked through the xerograph, adding in the appropriate places all the additional material prepared by Dr Walters. In my student days I had at his request read through parts of the thesis, and made suggestions for the improvement of the English or for better ways of presenting the arguments. Dr Walters had himself gone through these suggestions, adopting some and adapting or rejecting others, often with additional corrections of his own, and sometimes leaving two or three alternative suggestions without indicating which one he would have finally chosen. In view of this I felt at liberty to continue this work of touching up the English and streamlining the presentation of the arguments where necessary. But in no instance have I made any substantive change either in the evidence presented by Dr Walters, or in the deductions made by him from that evidence. In fact I have, if anything, erred on the side of leaving the English and the presentation of the arguments as I found them.

To help shorten the book and also to make it easier for people to find the information they are looking for in the minimum of time, I have also, where appropriate (as for instance in ch. 2) re-arranged the material to stand as lists, the items in which are given as far as possible in alphabetical order. Conjunctions and other connecting phrases, more appropriate to narrative style, have been removed.

xviii
The only part of the thesis which I have drastically shortened is the Introduction. In 1945 when it was written, the state of Septuagint studies in Great Britain was somewhat different from what it is now. Then the theory of Septuagintal origins associated with the name of the late Professor Paul Kahle was in the ascendency, and the methods of the Göttingen school of Lagarde and Rahlfs, which Dr Walters followed, were under some suspicion. Moreover, Dr Walters felt strongly about certain defects, as he saw them, in the Cambridge edition of the Greek Old Testament by Brooke and McLean. Therefore, in a thesis presented to Cambridge University, by means of which he hoped to establish himself in academic circles in England, he understandably felt obliged to justify his own approach and to explain the inadequacies of other theories and methods, tactfully and at great length. But now Kahle’s theory is no longer widely held, while Barthélemy’s theories, published (in his book *Les Devanciers d’Aquila*, Leiden, 1963) in the year after Dr Walters’ death, have given us a new perspective on the textual history of the Septuagint. Much of what Dr Walters wrote in his Introduction in 1945 is therefore unnecessary, or irrelevant, or obsolete; and I have cut it out. What was of permanent value, however, I have re­tained, either leaving it in the Introduction, or fitting it in to appro­priate places in the main text.

After the final typescript was prepared, I checked all the references, except for an odd ten or so which were to works inaccessible to me. It cannot but be that in a work involving so many hundreds of references some errors will still remain. For this I must crave the reader’s mercy. The reader should also keep in mind that chapter and verse numbering differ not only as between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint but also as between the different editions of the Septuagint. Alternative verse numberings have therefore frequently been given to cover most of the editions of the Septuagint which readers are likely to be using; and special directions for use have been given at the head of the indexes, where appropriate. But I cannot hope that all obscurities and lapses have been removed, and I shall be grateful if readers will communicate to me any they may find.

Now it is evident that the value of this vast mass of detailed information depends to a large extent on the ready accessibility of the details through efficient indexes. These have been compiled partly by Miss Margot Johnson and partly by Mrs Margaret Davies. To them both I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness for their performance of this difficult and exacting task.
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I must also acknowledge the editorial assistance given by the officers of the Cambridge University Press who have taken great pains with the detailed presentation of the material and whose printers have reproduced some difficult material with very great accuracy and expertise.

The typing of the manuscript was done with great patience and skill by a number of secretaries in the Typing Centre in the Queen’s University of Belfast. Among them Miss Pauline Lisney and Miss Pat Watton deserve special and honourable mention.

Colleagues and friends, notably Dr E. M. Smallwood, Mr D. F. Payne and Mr Hugh Williamson, have nobly and unselfishly given up time to check the proofs. To them and all who have in any way helped I offer my sincere thanks.

The work of editing has been onerous; but it has been pleasant to have an opportunity of discharging my debt to one who introduced me to the Septuagint and taught me so much about it, and of showing how much I have appreciated the personal friendship shown me by his wife and family. The dedication at the beginning of the book was, of course, written by Dr Walters himself.

D. W. GOODING

The Queen's University
Belfast
August 1971
INTRODUCTION

Among the remnants of the classical literatures, Greek or Roman, the Septuagint is the one comprehensive body of Greek writings that has not yet been thoroughly emended. To the Byzantine scholars it was a book belonging to the Church rather than to the vast heritage of literature to which they were accustomed to dedicating their scholarly and critical endeavours. Much of its wording was definitively fixed by liturgical usage and the settled musical habits of Church recitation. This tended to keep the Greek Bible out of the current of literary and scholarly endeavours and to isolate it from all other literature.

The Western humanists felt the same. Their fancy led them along other paths. They wished to revive the vanished glories of the old empire on Italian soil, and Vergil was nearer to their hearts than Homer. They were romantics and suffered from an anti-clerical, if not anti-Christian, bias—and the Bible belonged to the Church. To them the Greek Bible was a barbarous piece of writing which did not yield any contribution to their classical ideals. It stood in the way like a stumbling-block between the bygone golden age and its revival upon which they concentrated. In particular the Greek Old Testament was a translation, and showed all too many traces of its barbaric original. Nothing in it responded to their cry ad fontes. Their fontes flowed from the Capitol, perhaps also from the Acropolis, but not from Zion or Alexandria.

They were content, therefore, to render the ‘classical’ literature readable, advancing from cavalier treatment to scholarly achievements. This kind of humanism was not confined to Italy. It moved through the lands of Western civilization and persisted into the nineteenth century. As a result the Greek Old Testament up to our days shared the lot of the Hebrew OT and the NT; it was reproduced in virtually the same form of textus receptus, or almost a masorah.

Even the NT took a very long time to evolve from this stage. There was no printed edition of the NT in the fifteenth century at all, and Erasmus’ influential editio princeps of 1516 was of a kind which he himself characterized as ‘praeципitatum verius quam editum’. Only two centuries later did NT textual criticism begin in earnest with Bentley (1720) and Bengel (1734); and from them it was still a long way to Lachmann,
Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort. Now that both the textual
evidence and the grammatical features of the text are being studiously
followed up, it will be easily realized what enormous strides must be
made in the investigation of the LXX in order to catch up.

Yet there is urgent need of a critical and scholarly text of the LXX.
Admittedly the text of our majuscules is heterogeneous as a whole and,
in addition, full of contaminations from the various stages of its trans­
mision. However, for this very reason a text must be prepared; it is
vital for the OT and NT scholar, for whom the LXX is an indispensable
instrument, and who cannot be expected in his own capacity to have
the requisite equipment for emending the LXX text. If this had been
done earlier, the *apparatus criticus* throughout Kittel’s *Biblia Hebraica*,
wherever it refers to the translations of the MT, and even sometimes
where it proposes to emend the Hebrew text, would differ considerably
from its present form. The task, then, ought not to be postponed, for
everything requisite is now available.

There is first the textual evidence. Three times in three centuries
monumental editions have been produced in this country. The first,
from 1707 onwards, that of J. E. Grabe, even endeavoured to give a
critical text, based on codex Alexandrinus; the second, that of Holmes
and Parsons, a century later, reprinted the Sixtine edition, with a vast
substructure of variants from MSS, translations, and early quotations.
As regards the text and its comprehensive annotation this edition may
be compared with Mill’s *NT* of 1707. But there is nothing in this edition
to compare with Mill’s *Prolegomena* which, as E. Nestle rightly remarked
in 1907, were his only lasting achievement. Yet it was indispensable
until, from 1906 onwards, it was superseded by the Cambridge edition
of Brooke and McLean, to which Swete’s text was a prelude. Here B, or
the next best majuscle, is taken as a text, and an admirable array of
variants is collected which, though not aiming at exhaustive complete­
ness, affords everything that is needed for the study of the conditions
and textual history of the text. Yet, as Ludwig Köhler once said (*Neue
Zürcher Zeitung*, 14 April 1935, Nr. 656, in a review of Rahlfs’ edition),
this edition ‘gives all the material and is indispensable for the master
mariner of LXX research; for the cabin boy, however, and also for the
seaman, it is but a roaring sea of variants in which he perishes’.

To cross this sea safely we need a compass and a pilot to teach us how
to use it. To set another metaphor against Köhler’s, the vast crowd of
witnesses waits, as it were, to fall into line. Their contradictory evidence
has to be disentangled. This was understood in Göttingen: Wellhausen
(Text, 1871, pp. 223 f.) and Lagarde (Lib.VT 1, xvi) both insisted that family groups of MSS had to be constituted, so that from their variants the final LXX text might be constructed. And from 1908 onwards the Göttingen Septuaginta-Unternehmen formed another centre of collation, research and editing. After the first War, friendly contact was established between Cambridge and Göttingen, and each of the four parts of BM’s second volume acknowledges its debt to Rahlfs’ staff for their assistance in collation. Compared with the Cambridge editions, the Göttingen texts designedly go a step further. This is true of Rahlfs’ concise Stuttgart text (which was his private enterprise) and of the great edition which is to appear in sixteen volumes and is sponsored by the Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. They intend to give a critical text, and as far as possible their apparatus does not quote individual MSS, but the definite groups into which they fall. This great enterprise was preceded and accompanied by careful monographs, most of them by Rahlfs himself, in which difficult problems were brought nearer to a solution (Rahlfs, S-St 3 parts; Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, 5 vols). The spectacular step forward which was taken by these editions can best be characterized by saying that the evidence, after being classified, is no longer ‘a roaring sea of variants’, and, by ceasing to be anonymous, has at the same time become appraisable.

The text which has perhaps already gained most from Rahlfs’ minor edition with its discernment of the various recensions (even if he is too restrained in emending it) is that of the Minor Prophets, the Hebrew and Greek of which rank among the most difficult.

For our task it is most fortunate that the Cambridge and Göttingen editions cover different parts of the LXX, and Rahlfs’ Stuttgart text its whole range. So there is no part of the LXX left where we do not have firm ground beneath us. Thus a fresh comparison of the Greek with the Hebrew and a determined effort to emend the Greek is now much easier and should not be postponed; for a determined effort to work back, by applying the rules of textual criticism and the resources of sober emendation, to the form of text which is behind our varied evidence now holds out great promise of success.

We also have a second reason for hoping to remove a great many mistakes from the LXX text. The LXX is the most comprehensive body of Hellenistic writings that has come down to us, and since inscriptions and papyri in overwhelming quantities have acquainted us with the peculiar speech of this period, we are now also, from a grammatical point of view, in a position to remove from the LXX an abundance of
spellings and formations which cannot go back to the original translators, as they obviously belong to later periods of transmission. Part One of the present work is devoted to this task.

Since the emergence of reliable textual evidence and grammatical standards has created an entirely new situation, we are now at last able to avail ourselves in a new way of earlier achievements. These I propose to outline.

None of the three renowned ancient editions of the Septuagint, the Complutensian, the Aldine, and the Sixtine, is a strictly documentary reproduction of a single codex; they all result from some primitive criticism. Yet, roughly speaking, the first is closest to Lucian, as far as cod. 108 represents this recension, that is from the last twelve verses of the Octateuch onwards (Rahlfs, Ruth p. 77); the second, with the same reservation as to the changing character of the main MSS used, represents the Origenian and later recensions under Origen's influence; the third, which on the whole corrects the Aldine from Vat. B, is therefore closer to the genuine form of text, and even adds what were then most valuable scholia. The fact that these editions are based either on later recensions or on improvised corrections certainly diminishes their documentary value; but to a certain degree it removed a great many corruptions which, however, inevitably re-entered our texts in later times, when the latter were confined to the strict reproduction of majuscules. E. Nestle, who was so well acquainted with earlier attempts at emending the LXX, never tired of warning against considering our modern texts as 'the LXX', and in doing so he had in mind the corruptions which were thus allowed a fresh period of comparatively undisturbed sway.¹

After Agellius, who was connected with the great Roman edition,² there is an impressive array of critici sacri, most of them Reformed. One still gets an idea of what they achieved from the careful, though incomplete, codification in (Biel-)Schleusner's Novus Thesaurus (5 vols, Leipzig, 1820). After him the necessary combination of classical and theological studies and interests was no longer found; very few fresh emendations saw the light, and hardly anyone except Lagarde and Nestle took account of earlier achievements. One of the reasons for this neglect was the fact that these emendations were locked up in monographs and had not found their way into editions of the LXX apart from those of Grabe and Bos.

We cannot, of course, make indiscriminate use of these old observations, if only for the reason that our standards are no longer the
same. For example, if we examine that brilliant exponent of sacred criticism, J. E. Grabe, we find that his point of view is still that predominant in Origen and Jerome. All three, and many with them, when faced with a discrepancy between the MT and the LXX, merely aim at restoring what Jerome called the *Hebraea veritas*. It hardly occurs to them that the true reading may have been preserved in the LXX, from which it must be introduced into the MT. Grabe was certainly very often able to show that in fact the LXX did not represent a tradition independent of the MT, and by emending the LXX he fruitfully performed one of the tasks imposed upon the LXX student. Yet the other task which is of equal importance – to indicate the real differences between the MT and the LXX, and then to decide in favour of the MT or the LXX, or a third reading behind them both – was not visualized then with the same clearness.

Of those who saw the necessity of this new task, Bishop Lowth is an early and brilliant forerunner. Yet the great name with which this achievement is connected belongs to the nineteenth century – that of J. Wellhausen. In his early *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (1871), which we shall have to quote more than once, he created a new method by ‘consistently and boldly turning to account the only tradition which can yield variants in the OT, the LXX. In Samuel and Kings one family of MSS differs from the masoretic text; by re-translating these readings into the Hebrew he gathered one striking emendation after another’ (Ed. Schwartz in his commemorative speech, *NGG*, Geschäftsliche Mitteilungen, 1918, p. 53, now *Kleine Schriften* 1, 338) – and, we may add, in the same passages demonstrated beyond doubt that here the Lucianic MSS alone preserved a Greek text which represented a better Hebrew; and thus, not only was he instrumental in restoring the Hebrew, but at the same time he showed that the remainder of the Greek evidence, including B and other well-reputed MSS, depended upon a Hebrew that had been corrupted at a later stage, our present masoretic text, and so itself in turn contaminated the original LXX. As this method was fruitfully exploited by S. R. Driver, F. C. Burkitt and C. F. Burney, there is no need to enlarge on it here.

Before passing from the instruments of our work which are a legacy of the past to those with which we have grown up, and which therefore must be recorded in the present tense, a word should be said about Lagarde. His example has been a powerful incentive to many, including the present writer. Foremost among those whom he influenced was Alfred Rahlfs. Lagarde ‘cast his mantle upon him’ and ‘he took up also
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the mantle of Elijah'. One hardly needs to read Rahlfs' centenary study on Lagarde (Göttingen, 1928); it is sufficient to balance the master's work against the pupil's to see that in Lagarde's studies, along with much toilsome preparatory work for which we are thankful, there was a strange sequence of changing, one-sided statements and vague programmes, often pushed too far in generalization and overstatement. It is most illuminating to see how Rahlfs freed himself from the fascinating prospect of the three fixed types of Bible text as mentioned in Jerome's prologus galeatus. It had led Lagarde's work down a blind alley and has misled many others up to the present time. Yet Rahlfs, who had gradually given up the fixed idea of tracing Hesychius' edition, soberly says that we must deal with facts and cease to pursue preconceived ideas; and afterwards he found that in his early days Lagarde's conception had been much sounder and much more like his own. By entering fully into Lagarde's work, Rahlfs set us free from the deadlock which had prevented Lagarde himself from getting results equal to his genius and industry. For Lagarde was a late product of Romanticism, and his impulses need sometimes to be translated into terms of reality. Nevertheless, the last lines of his poem about himself and his influence remain perfectly true:

Wär er nicht er gewesen,
So stünden wir nicht hier.

(Had he not been what he was,
we should not stand where we do.)

During the decades in which Lagarde strove to lay the foundations of a critical edition of the LXX the practical needs of the day were met by the seven successive editions of Tischendorf which, though based on the Sixtine, to an increasing degree tried to satisfy the demand for manuscript evidence. Its posthumous editions (1880, 1887) were greatly improved by Nestle's Suplementum which gave careful fresh collations of B and S with the Sixtine. Yet as this was merely a makeshift to keep a stereotyped text alive, the real need was an edition based on the earliest evidence and on nothing else. Swete's text, therefore, published from 1887 onwards, was a tremendous step forward. Apart from the great help which it gave to study, as it stands, it was intended to pave the way for the larger Cambridge edition, by Brooke and McLean, of which approximately half has by now been accomplished.

The texts of these two editions are roughly identical and we may, therefore, try to characterize their common features. In so far as an
edition is meant to express the result of an editor's grappling with corruptions and errors of various kinds which have distorted the original work during its transmission, neither of the Cambridge texts could profess to be an edition in the strict sense of the word, as the editors knew perfectly well. Their intention was to take only the first step by providing in a scholarly manner the raw material from which a critical text might eventually be constructed. In particular, anything that would at all bias the main intention, to present nothing more than the oldest evidence, was avoided. As to strict faithfulness, their presentation of the evidence is beyond praise. Any mistakes that appear are due rather to too strict an adherence to their sources. The grammatical aspect of this will be considered later. From the documentary point of view I would make three minor comments.

(1) The first is that in their citations of the majuscules, especially B, the Cambridge editors are less discriminating than is compatible with strict critical principles. To any critical editor B ought to mean a fourth-century MS, but to Swete and his successors it means codex Vaticanus, including its entire history which is expressed by correctors and corrections covering almost a thousand years. Inasmuch as these are decidedly later than the original scribe, it would be methodologically better to regard them as the result of a fresh recension which happened to be written between the lines of B, but might equally well have been written down as an independent MS. For example, S\textsuperscript{ca} represents a most thorough and consistent effort by a seventh-century diorthotes to superimpose a wholly Lucianic form of text upon an originally quite different text. The same has been observed in B, when in the Psalms ten passages were transformed from the old form of text to the Lucianic, two by B\textsuperscript{a}, two by B\textsuperscript{c}, the remaining six by B\textsuperscript{b}; and the correctors \textsuperscript{b} and \textsuperscript{c}, at least, are very late. I take this example from Rahlfs, S-St II, 57, who acutely remarks that from the copying of such corrected MSS there were likely to arise texts of varying degrees of mixture depending on whether the copyist kept mainly to the original or to the corrected reading. As soon as 'B' is considered as standing not only for its fourth-century scribe, but, at the same time, for all its correctors who, moreover, cannot be exactly dated, the result is no longer a fourth-century text, but a series of readings ranging between four and possibly many more centuries. This is an unfortunate dilution of our most valuable piece of evidence. To the critic, any corrections of B are important not so much because they are found in the codex called B, but because they form part of a different recension. This recension may be, and often is, found in a
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different group of MSS, from which the nature and origin of the correction in B can easily be determined. For, when considering a variant, the important thing is not so much to ask where it is found, but what it stands for. This levelling of B and its correctors is obvious in the Cambridge editions, whenever their text breaks away from B*, often for very good reasons, and instead follows one of its correctors, though according to the principle underlying these editions the next oldest MS ought to have been followed – and there is no lack of available MSS older than some of the correctors of B. (On this topic see also Miscellaneous Note 6, p. 275).

(2) Another point was discussed at length in a review of vol. II, part iv of BM's edition (ThLZ, 1937, pp. 341 ff.). There I attempted to show the awkward consequences which result from their decision to keep strictly to the reading of B. The expedient, useful in itself, of sometimes breaking away from this principle – if only in order to shorten the annotation in passages where B stands out alone, because it suffers from an individual corruption – brings about grave inconsistencies; when one has once taken this road there is no reasonable halting-place, and the halt actually made is far from defensible. I demonstrated this by going through all passages in 1 Esdras in which BM had indicated a departure from B by daggers, with the result that in the very same verses many more passages could have claimed a similar treatment. I was even able to give an example of a rash conjecture introduced into the text, a conjecture which, against the correct reading of all other evidence, was made out of a corruption in B (ThLZ, p. 343). (In 1 Esdras 8: 67; here γὰρ is correct and found everywhere except in B and its satellite h which have the easy corruption τὰς; from this †τῶνος† is uselessly conjectured.) To be fair, these strictures ought to have been directed against Swete, for though BM more often break away from B than Swete did, the examples in 1 Esdras to which I took exception were derived from Swete's text.

However, the two points mentioned, namely the undue weight attributed to the late correctors of the chief majuscules and the inconsistency in keeping to the chief majuscule, mostly B, even when it is obvious that a mistaken and corrupt B does not deserve any more deference than a missing B, are only superficial flaws and cannot detract from the fundamental soundness with which the evidence is presented. They may be inconvenient to those using the edition, though, once noticed, they are no serious hindrance. Yet I am afraid it is different with a third point.
(3) If we set out to use the Vet. Lat. translation as given in the apparatus, we are bound to stumble repeatedly. When consulting the original publications, e.g. U. Robert’s Lyons *Heptateuch*, we find there hundreds of the most certain emendations, and there are a good many others still left for us to make. Sometimes corruptions accumulate within a few verses. So in Judg. 16:13 f. we must restore *et texueris* and *et texuit* for *et exueris* and *et exiuit* and in v. 13 *cubitum* for *obitum*, after *cubiti 14* (= τηχυν in 13 in the *L* doublet). Certainly even here there is nothing to hinder a student who is able to emend a Latin text. Nor will he blindly rely upon Robert’s emendations. So when in Lev. 5:4 Robert (p. cii) puts *iuraverit* for *superaverunt*, he will have to restore *separaverit* = διαστείλη, cf. 16:26 *separates est* = διεσταλμένον; Judg. 1:19 *partitus* = διεστελαττο.

Yet I would emphasize that this part of the work ought to have been done and digested beforehand, because what we expect to find at the first glance is the Greek text underlying the Latin evidence. Even when drawing upon a brilliantly emended text like Burkitt’s Tyconius, the publication of which is bound to have been an event to BM, they deliberately prefer to record the traditional corruptions, not even mentioning the obvious emendations in Burkitt’s text although they alone would give meaning to their quotation. So in 2 Sam. 7:14 BM record ‘άφαίς<sup>a</sup> actibus Tyc-codd’, whereas Burkitt’s text displays *tactibus*, and his apparatus, ‘tactibus scripsi; actibus RV: άφαίς LXX’. On Lev. 25:28 BM record *possidentiae La.* for τφ κτησαμένω αυτά. Had they considered Robert’s emendation *possidenti ea*, they would not have included La.* among witnesses omitting αυτά. If this is a shortcoming, it is certainly not inadvertence, yet it compels the student either to consult BM’s sources or to emend all over again. The hint given by ‘-edd’ or ‘-codd’ that the student may find something better in the other, is not enough, and it is not even given in the passages in which Robert suggests his emendations only in the Introduction (pp. lxxix–cxxi) of his first volume or in the notes of the second.

From this there arises the much more awkward suspicion that the same may happen when Oriental versions are quoted. They are all quoted in Latin; but that would be of real avail only if these translations represented an emended text. In fact they do so no more than the Vet. Lat. evidence which is easier for the ordinary classical student to check. But now, whenever we find a strange translation from the Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopic, or Syriac, we are at a loss; for we cannot reasonably be expected to be at home in these languages to a degree that would
enable us to emend it off-hand, and that from its Latin rendering. This means that in passages where an Oriental translation may be most urgently needed, either to help towards the restoration of the original Greek when all other evidence fails us, or to give an idea which of two or more different readings has the support of the translations, we are left without the help which we would expect to find in this otherwise well-assorted store-house; unfortunately it is most unlikely to be supplemented in the direction suggested.

The Cambridge editions are rightly characterized as codifications of the available evidence, the text printed in full being nothing but a repetition of the relatively best-accredited MS which, if any, therefore deserves to be used as a standard text for the collations; and these collations, in their turn, represent the real and lasting contribution of these editions to the study of the LXX. With these editions a first and important period came to an end; and it can be said that the way in which they fulfil their task, the objective presentation of the available evidence, is praiseworthy. Studies like Dr Swete’s Introduction and the suggestive work done by H. St J. Thackeray, including his Grammar, once more represent real progress.

When we pass on from them to the Göttingen editions, we are in a different atmosphere. We have moved from a limited task performed to a high degree of perfection to another task for which there is neither end nor limit: that of an ever-increasing approximation to the supposed archetype to which the evidence points. This is the transition from any kind of textus receptus to a form of text which will result from the application of the methods proved true by many scholarly editions of classical texts.

The idea behind the Göttingen editions is from a comprehensive use of collated MSS, translations, and patristic quotations to single out the various types of text (recensions) and to work back to the oldest type of text obtainable. In so doing a certain eclecticism cannot be avoided, but it is justified by the observation that, as in many other authors, there are continual cross-relations to be traced in our evidence. The different types of MSS have influenced one another, so that the best reading may be found in a MS or group of MSS where we would not expect it. In themselves the different recensions are palpably individual. The reason why we must at times abandon even the best MS is that at different points later influences have come in, so that in different passages different MSS have retained the original text. The standards of judgement to be applied here are beyond doubt and generally recognized.
It is rather about their application in particular instances that divergence of opinion may arise.

As only a very small proportion of the larger Göttingen edition has yet been published, we are here chiefly concerned with Rahlfs' Stuttgart text. This is an intermediary between a critical edition, based upon the research done by the Göttingen Septuaginta-Unternehmen, and a 'German Swete'. 'The pocket edition confines itself, in the main, to the three most important MSS, B, S, and A, and refers only incidentally and where it seems needful to other material' (Editor's English Preface, p. xx). For practical reasons the range of evidence utilized varies considerably.

In Genesis the third-century Papyrus 911, which was still unknown to BM in 1906, is rightly drawn on where it exists$^6$ (Rahlfs for his part could not yet know ChB 961, 962); and so is the fifth-century Washington W (BM Θ) in Deuteronomy and Joshua. Of the later recensions $O$ is quoted only sporadically in the Pentateuch, mostly in passages where a critical sign, asterisk or obelus, was helpful to characterize the variant readings of our majuscules, and $L$ is first mentioned in a note to Josh. 15:21, and here the way in which it is introduced in the middle of a book, 'αρα Β] αραδ $L$' (= 44.54.75.106.134), seems to indicate a subsequent extension of the original scheme in an edition the preparation and printing of which took years.$^8$ From Judges onwards $OL$ appear frequently in the apparatus, but only where they contribute to the constitution of the text.$^7$ In the Psalms, where $O$ is found only in Latin texts (apart from scanty papyrus fragments, among them 2005, a Taylor–Schechter fragment in Cambridge University Library) and $L$ is behind the bulk of the MSS, the sign $O$ is avoided and $L$ is only sparingly used. In Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Sol. the introductory remarks simply say '$O = Sy$'. In Job the passages introduced from Theodotion are marked by asterisks. In the later Wisdom books these signs disappear. In the Prophets $Q$ plays its due part, in the Minor Prophets the other Washington $W$ is rightly drawn upon. Through the whole of the Prophets the recensions $LC$ ($C$ stands for the text of the catenae MSS) are quoted, and from a note at the beginning of Jeremiah it appears that in the preceding Prophets, $B$, which is hexaplaric, stands for $O$. In Ezekiel a note informs us that apart from $B$, which, however, shows some influence as well, the whole evidence is influenced by Origen who supplied much from Theodotion. Here the recensions $C$ and occasionally $L$ are quoted. The very ancient Ezekiel papyrus (200$^p$, ChB–Scheide) has since confirmed my view, published in 1936, that it would have been useful to include Tyconius; for he frequently
confirms B and thus indicates that the B text is not so isolated as might appear from Rahlfs, who sometimes rejects it, obviously only for this reason. In Daniel an effort is made to exclude the parts of the Chigian text marked with an asterisk. This text has come down to us only in its hexaplaric form. Here ChB 967 has confirmed the soundness of these hexaplaric signs.

This brief survey will indicate that our actual knowledge of the LXX evidence has been greatly enlarged by this unpretentious edition, whatever inconsistencies of presentation may have been forced upon it by different influences, one of these being the unavoidable regard for the larger Göttingen edition which has only a kind of personal connection with the Stuttgart text. Rahlfs' main progress consists in the careful sifting and evaluating of the classified evidence, and this is obviously great. There are also good emendations, old and new. Yet it is unmistakable that here initial successes only have been achieved. Much as Rahlfs has done for the restoration of mutilated proper names, much more can be done, as was shown long ago in the precedent set by Bewer for Ezra. And the wealth of old emendations has not been by any means utilized to the full. Even with regard to controversial problems which Rahlfs himself dealt with in a masterly way, such as the contribution of old genuine readings which could be traced in a complex text such as Lucian's, subsequent work has taught me that there are still passages left which have escaped notice. For in a number of instances they were not observed either by Rahlfs, who felt rather inclined to limit the range of Lucian's usefulness, or by those taking the opposite view, viz., A. Klostermann, Burkitt, Burney. (An example of this is given in Miscellaneous Note 2, p. 268.)

These detached remarks are meant to supplement my fuller characterization of Rahlfs' edition in *ThLZ*, 1936, pp. 265-87. The last pages of this review form the nucleus of the reasoned enumeration of the offences committed by our editions against grammatical rules which I give much more fully in Part One of the present work. The reason why my remarks start chiefly with Rahlfs is that he alone is enabled by his principles to move unfettered by any mistaken evidence and tradition, and endeavours to make the best possible use of this liberty.

The emendation of the LXX is, quite apart from the comprehensiveness and traditional neglect of its text, a vast undertaking. It involves crossing the traditional boundaries of our academic faculties, boundaries which, though obviously inevitable in practice, have more than once stood in the way of tasks which required some acquaintance with more
than one traditional branch of study. The period of all-round scholars has gone beyond recall and with it that of achievements like those of S. Bochart and H. Grotius. Yet in our period of specialization there is still room for the deliberate combination of classical and biblical studies without which one cannot deal appropriately with the OT in Greek. There is still room for a specialist, who, while perhaps knowing more about Hellenistic Greek than is necessary for an OT expositor, and more about the special conditions of the Bible than is required for the ordinary classical student, is certainly bound to be inferior to both in their respective fields. For this very reason I must state plainly that, whenever my task causes me to deal out strictures in one or the other direction, this is not due to any feeling of superiority. On the contrary there is much resignation behind the seeming superiority of a specialist. His is the predicament of anyone who has to apply a branch of study to a concrete practical task. He has to combine methods which between them are necessarily heterogeneous, as can be seen in the work of a geographer or a political economist. All of them are fortunate if they happen to see their goal early enough to arrange their studies accordingly, and to neglect what is unnecessary for its attainment.

It stills remains briefly to indicate the nature and purpose of the present work. With its two parts, on grammatical corruptions and on Semitisms, it is only a first instalment of a comprehensive study which attempts to discuss and as far as possible to settle the entire range of problems that are involved in the task of working back to the best text of the LXX obtainable. When I faced the alternative of either giving a succinct survey of the entire field in this work, or of working out the first chapters fully and finally, I decided that it was preferable to finish each chapter in a way that would once and for all set me free for subsequent tasks. This will be understood if one takes into account the vast amount of notes upon which each chapter is built. Yet, on the other hand, this was bound to result in the disadvantage that it is much more difficult to give here and now any idea of the actual extent of my approach to the LXX; and I feel that the expedient which I have chosen — of attaching notes and excursuses on other questions which arose from such passages as I had to deal with from the grammatical point of view — can only be tolerated as an expedient.

The idea behind the arrangement of the chapters was to approach the text from the outside, that is, to start with those corruptions which do not affect the meaning of the text.
EDITOR'S NOTE

At this point Dr Walters indicated that in a second volume which he intended to write he would deal with a series of questions more closely connected with textual criticism, and would proceed to the more intricate problems of the recensions of the LXX. In his review of Rahlfs' edition (ThLZ, 1936) he published more than 900 emendations, both old and new, in addition to grammatical corrections. As a result of his subsequent work he claimed 'this number has since been more than doubled'. (He discussed a few in English in 1942 in his contribution to a congratulatory volume dedicated by some German pastors to the Bishop of Chichester.)

His belief was that 'even if we allow for the many obscure translations which are due to the incompetence of the translators, there are many other passages at the root of which there is no lack of understanding, no guess-work, no confusion of Hebrew roots, but simply a hitherto unnoticed corruption. The more carefully we go into the former classes of mistranslations, the more clearly are we able to single out the quite different class of often utterly startling corruptions.'

The final goal of his labours he described as follows: 'The end in view has always been the text itself, presented for the first time in an emended form which is meant to have profited by all these preceding grammatical and textual considerations, together with a selected apparatus which is to include precise information about the authors of the emendations received into the text.'

About the possibility of a LXX Lexicon he had this to say: 'For want of an up to date LXX Lexicon we gratefully draw on LS and attempt to requite its services with lexical remarks which in themselves suggest that it may no longer be premature to prepare a LXX Lexicon.'

Dr Walters was not spared to complete this herculean task which he had set himself. But some of the necessary preparatory work is to be found in the excursuses in this present book and in his numerous other publications, for which see the Bibliography, pp. 350-1.
PART ONE
GRAMMATICAL CORRUPTIONS
1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The LXX is the largest body of writing in non-literary unaffected κοινή Greek of the pre-Christian period. As such it was for long in an isolated position which made comparison, judgement, and emendation difficult. But now we are in possession of a vast amount of inscriptions, extending throughout the whole range from the archaic dialects down to the Byzantine period, and, moreover, of innumerable papyrus documents which cover the centuries in which the LXX came into being, and equally the Imperial centuries, during which repeated copying affected its transmission. Thus we have abundant material for comparison, and such comparison is greatly facilitated by the intensive study which has been devoted to these ancient documents.

This could not have been achieved without the growth to maturity of nineteenth-century comparative philology. From it there resulted the Greek Grammars of G. Meyer (1880, 1897) and K. Brugmann (1885, 1913) by A. Thumb, now superseded by E. Schwyzer’s two volumes (1939 and 1950). Compared with them R. Kühner’s Grammar, rewritten by F. Blass and B. Gerth (1890–1904), retains its value mainly as a rich and indispensable collection of material, whereas the philological judgement of Blass, who was responsible for Phonetics, Accidence, and Word-Formation, was already obsolete when his volumes were published.

In 1885 K. Meisterhans first classified the grammatical evidence of the Attic inscriptions on stone and vases. For the vases P. Kretschmer’s Die griechischen Vaseninschriften, 1894, came to be a classic, so that Schwyzer, in the final edition of Meisterhans, 1900, was able to confine himself to the inscriptions. In 1898, under his original name, Schweizer, he had produced that brilliant model of a grammatical monograph on a locally limited circle of Hellenistic inscriptions (Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften) which gave rise to many similar publications. In the same decade W. Schmid had studied the Atticistic writers and shown how to exploit their evidence both for what these artificial writers wished to avoid and what they considered its Attic substitute. His friend, E. Mayser, as early as 1898 and 1900 published two Gymnasial-programme on Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, which have since developed into six stout indispensable volumes, partly
already in an improved second edition. They were made possible and extensively furthered and encouraged by the young branch of papyrology, a creation of U. Wilcken. W. Crönert's *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*, 1903, based on innumerable observations from papyri and MSS, drew up the strict lines of discrimination between the divergent modes of spelling of the four subsequent periods which have all left traces in our MSS—Ptolemaic, Imperial, Early and Late Byzantine. Two outstanding philologists, J. Wackernagel and W. Schulze, made their contributions mainly in periodicals or academy publications; fortunately their *Kleine Schriften* were published separately, Schulze's in 1934, Wackernagel's in 1953. Here once more, NT scholars led the way in turning to account the fresh insights gained by this development. From 1894 onwards P. W. Schmiedel produced the new Winer, combining in a most conspicuous way Hort's loving care for NT *minutiae* with an admirably thorough apprehension of the new grammatical standards. In so doing he already constantly referred to the LXX. A. Deissmann, beginning in 1895, mainly emphasized the lexical point of view and, what is more, from a thorough knowledge of life as depicted in the papyri, was able to throw fresh light on many expressions. He was followed by Th. Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus* (Diss. Basel, 1905) and, above all, by Moulton—Milligan's great achievement. Among our indispensable tools there are the NT *Grammars* of Blass (1896), revised by A. Debrunner (1954), and Moulton—Howard (1906–29).

It was only natural that Grammars of LXX Greek came later. They were eagerly awaited, and in the same few years they were being prepared in different quarters. First there were selections, Swete's useful survey 'The Greek of the Septuagint' (*Introd.*, 1900, ii, iv, 289–314) and Conybeare–Stock's 'Grammar of Septuagint Greek' (*Selections*, 1905, pp. 25–100). Of the three scholars who had aimed at a more ambitious, complete, grammar, R. Helbing came first (*Grammatik der Septuaginta Laut- und Wortlehre*, 1907), but proved unequal to this special task, so that the only lasting fruit of his labour is to be seen in an unusually rich review by J. Wackernagel (*ThLZ*, 1908, pp. 635 ff.). Helbing's later book, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta*, 1928, is less ambitious yet most useful (cf. Debrunner's review, *IF* 48, 1930, 99–101). The second was R. Meister, a pupil of P. Kretschmer in Vienna, who, however, after the publication of Helbing's grammar, confined himself to publishing substantial studies in periodicals, mostly *Wiener Studien*, and subsequently relinquished this field of studies. The
third was H. St J. Thackeray, who, being closely connected with both Cambridge editions, was by far the best equipped of the three and produced what has become the standard work. No praise is too high for its careful precision. It deserves being brought up to date and reprinted, and this is what the frequent references to it in the present book have in view.

Yet these frequent references to Thackeray's Grammar will show that something more is needed than mere adjustments in minor points; a difference of approach is necessary. The reason for this is made clear as soon as we reflect upon the general task of a grammar. A grammatical monograph on a single author or body of writings sets out by means of analysis and classification to describe the special features of its language, and one of its results is the detection of inconsistencies which, if they prove corruptions, must consequently be emended. For this task two things are of great consequence: first, the type of text on which the grammarian bases his observations, and secondly his ideas about the improved text which his observations are intended to produce. Both are bound to be closely connected, and so it was with Thackeray. To him the Cambridge texts of the LXX were the unquestioned basis from which to start, and even where he had to question a certain reading, the answer which he found was much in line with the general presentation of these editions.

There is, however, more than one possible method of presentation to be taken into account; I would suggest that there are three. There is first the presentation of a text in the traditional spelling which involves frequent deviations from the MS evidence; secondly the reproduction of a certain standard MS; and thirdly the deliberate attempt to prefer such spellings as can be expected for the translator's period and conditions, even at the cost of disregarding the MS evidence. The first way is the traditional, chosen by the great old editions, the Complutensian, the Aldine and the Sixtine with all its repetitions down to Tischendorf (cf. above, p. 6). The second way, the documentary, was preferred by the Cambridge editions (with some qualifying exceptions to which we shall have to refer later on). The third was followed by the Göttingen editions, yet to a limited extent; and much of the following chapter on grammatical corruptions is meant to extend these limits. At this stage it is necessary to point out that none of these three ways of presentation can avoid a certain, though varying, degree of standardization. In the first, the standards are taken haphazardly from the customary spelling, which represents a very superficial modification of
what is in our MSS. In the second, the variety of spelling which is found in Vaticanus B is followed as a matter of principle. In itself this would certainly exclude any standardization, but as the editors treat on almost equal footing the readings of B and its correctors, and as they allow for certain grammatical considerations, there is some limited measure of standardization also in their text. The third way, that of considering as corrupt whatever cannot be justified from the standards of language contemporary with the author, is the way which, in accordance with all modern editions of Greek texts, has been taken by Rahlfs and the present writer.

As will be seen from these preliminary remarks, there is a fundamental difference between Thackeray's general approach and ours. He goes the second way, we go the third. This difference, however, is not a matter of individual preferences. It is rather the difference between two generations, such as is most easily seen in Hort and J. H. Moulton.

When, in 1882, Dr Hort at last completed his Introduction, it was soon apparent that, as far as the grammatical aspect was concerned, the 'many long years' (§424) which he had spent on casting and recasting his classic presentation had but turned his work into the late fruit of a past age. The whole of his Introduction takes the form of a codification. Codification, however, though it makes the main section on Textual Criticism so memorable, is unsuitable for dealing with the grammatical facts. One would expect that his life-long tendency towards natural science would have led him to avoid a priori methods. However, in the decades from 1853 onwards, the year when he turned to preparing his edition, there was little in contemporary philology to appeal to a scientific mind. So Hort's treatment of grammatical, mainly orthographical, matters was bound to develop in close analogy to his treatment of the problems of textual criticism. To him this meant that spellings form part of the evidence exactly in the same way as do material variants, and that the criteria which he had obtained as to the latter applied equally to the former, so much so that he attributed to the several MSS almost as much reliability in orthographical matters as he did with better reason in matters of textual criticism. 1 Nothing could be more characteristic of this than his reference to §303 in §403, in the very same paragraph in which he was concerned to recall 'the necessity of making allowance for purely itacistic error in considering the properly orthographical testimony of MSS'. §399, to which he especially refers here, certainly does not leave much of an authoritative position to the MSS in matters of itacism; it is unmistakable, neverthe-
less, that it was precisely BS which yielded the subconscious model – if there was anything subconscious in a legislator like Hort – for the formal presentation of his text. That is what was to be expected. Hort’s sense of style, his idea of what was correct and preferable in every alternative, was acquired from a close acquaintance with his ‘neutral’ text. It did not occur to him that most of its formal aspects tallied with his standards just because these were taken from his model. So far his decisions are in the nature of a vicious circle. We today who live outside this magic circle, which kept a generation spellbound, are able to see through Hort’s illusion. In fact we know that the traits which were congenial to Hort’s mind, the abstention from extremes, or at least well-tempered moderation in admitting them, are the unmistakable mark of recension. This observation is far from finally depriving a class of MSS of its value. Indeed, all the good scholarly texts that have come down to us go back to a recension which involved a curtailing of current wild texts, such as we now know in abundance, e.g. from papyrus texts of Homer or Plato. Yet here the crucial problem is to what extent we are allowed to assume that the sound critical standards, which are behind our trustworthy recensions, included even matters of spelling. As long as we are unable to arrive at some satisfactory decision, we ought to refrain from taking advice from the results of textual criticism for deciding in an analogous way matters of spelling, which were obviously a matter of minor concern to the ancient authors and scribes themselves.

Hort’s way is in practice an uneasy compromise between his knowledge of Attic spelling and the evidence of the MSS that, for other reasons, have a just claim on his favour; and this uneasiness, which certainly does him credit, is seen from the fact that he has recourse to a kind of assertion which, at least to twentieth-century ears, must inevitably ring false, as it betrays a *metabasis eis allo genos*. ‘Tabulation renders it morally certain that Ἰστήκειν is nowhere a mere itacism’ (*App.* p. 162b). Here, if anywhere, we have ‘the mistake of assuming the identity of the morally acceptable with the historically true’ (C. J. Cadoux, *The Historic Mission of Jesus* p. 3), a striking attempt to support an untenable position in an illegitimate way, which discloses a nineteenth-century mentality and an almost Ritschlian outlook. The answer appropriate to our century was given by J. H. Moulton (Moulton–Howard, *Gr.* p. 77): ‘It is perfectly futile to follow our best uncials in printing abnormal forms like ἵδον for εἶδον and Ἰστήκειν for εἶστήκειν... The MS evidence is not adequate proof that such forms
really existed.' At last the primary evidence provided by the inscriptions and papyri and vindicated by comparative philology had put an end to the period of slavery to our MSS.

Now this discussion of Hort's approach is not an irrelevant digression from our original purpose, which was to characterize Thackeray's grammatical studies. Thackeray's Grammar, after all, was only a part of Thackeray's work. Among other things he also collaborated in the two Cambridge editions of the LXX (his name appears on the title page of BM's vol. ii) and his Grammar must therefore be regarded as complementary to the presentation of those editions. We must, then, include in our picture of his work the grammatical aspect of the Cambridge editions.

These it is fair to call younger sisters of Westcott and Hort's NT. They are the Cinderellas of the family. The editors avowedly owe to Hort what they consider to be the most valuable and decisive impulses. As to Swete's edition, Hort had the last word in the ultimate moulding of a scheme which originally went back to Scrivener, and beyond this Swete felt 'largely indebted for counsel in matters of detail' (Introd. p. 189). The Larger Septuagint was entirely based on, and guided by, a scheme drawn up by Hort in November 1891, a scheme to which the editors, apart from some modifications 'of the nature of enlargement', felt bound throughout the whole of their laborious work.

The main difference between Westcott and Hort's NT and the Cambridge LXX editions does not impair their family likeness in one important respect. It is true that the former gave a recension of their own, the latter only a reproduction of the leading MS with an apparatus of collations. Yet in both, the grammatical, i.e., the orthographical, presentation reflects that of the textual problems. Here Swete and BM closely follow Hort, and they share with him two other aspects, his exceptional deference to these good MSS including their very late correctors, and his pre-grammatical, rather haphazard, way of modifying them whenever he feels unable to follow them throughout. The editors of the LXX have adopted Hort's aversion to 'absolute uniformity' which, according to Hort, 'belongs only to artificial times' (Introd. p. 308). Moreover, while Hort's unjustified trust in the genuineness of the spelling of our MSS necessarily led him to regard alternative spellings as of almost equal trustworthiness, and to ignore the only legitimate question, what was right and what was not, his valuation of the orthographical variants was at least based upon a serious, even if partly mistaken, study of the evidence. But the special task allotted to the
Cambridge editors of the LXX, and devised by Hort, expressly excluded any approach to textual criticism, including the valuation of grammatical variants. They were only allowed to apply in a sweeping fashion Hort’s orthographical principles, and these not only were a doubtful asset in themselves, but being formulated for a post-Christian corpus, the NT, could not without modification be applied to a collection of Ptolemaic writings like the LXX. So, apart from the frequency of itacistic spellings, inconsistencies abound, e.g. 2 Sam. 18: 10 έώρακας A; 18: 11 έώρακος B; 1 Kings 20: 29 έώρακος A; 21: 13 έώρακος B. In Swete these notes are to be found in the apparatus. In BM they are in the first apparatus, which is devoted to mistakes of the leading majuscules only, and this means that the main apparatus does not indicate what other MSS share the rejected readings. Fairly frequently we find inconsistencies of this kind on one and the same page. Or at times BM extract from our evidence more than it can possibly yield. So in 1 Sam. 2: 9 ισχύι is rendered έν ισχύι. Swete warily notes ‘ενισχύει fort. BA’; for the scriptio continua does not admit a clear decision whether this is merely an itacistic spelling or a mistaken verbal form inferred from it. BM, however, abandoning this due precaution, annotate ‘εν ισχύι’ ενισχύει B’ in their first apparatus and ‘εν ισχύι’ ενισχύει BAb‘imwxz*’ in their second apparatus, thus indicating that they consider the variant to be a verbal form. Most of these variant spellings are recorded in Thackeray’s careful appendices to Swete’s three volumes and in BM’s first apparatus. Yet the decision as to which reading was to be in the text and which to be relegated to the appendix, was by no means based on grammatical considerations. When seen from the grammatical point of view, the distribution ought to have been made very differently. In many passages it is not even easy to recognize the standards which guided them to choose readings now from B*, now from its correctors. Certainly they were not grammatical reasons; probably the intention was to shorten the annotation. Thus these minor apparatuses are not only incomplete, but often misleading from the point of view of grammatical correctness (for further details see ThLZ, 1937, p. 344).

It even happens that formations with which the editors were not familiar were removed from the text and relegated to the limbo of rejected and corrupt spellings, in spite of their very strong attestation, with the result that these formations failed to attract the attention of our grammarians. Thus απωντεσον in Ps. 7: 5, though read by B*vidS*A, that is the whole evidence apart from L, the majority group
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in the Psalms, was sacrificed by Swete to the ‘correct’ ἀποπέσοιμι of B²b, Sc₂a (which is Lucianic), R, though it is obvious that -οιν is the genuine reading, as it is in the old text and would never have been put in place of -οιμι. It is a recent and rare formation, elsewhere preserved only in two fourth-century dramatic fragments from Euripides and Kratinos, a formation, ‘deren Lebensdauer somit vielleicht kein Vierteljahrhundert erreicht hat’ (Wackernagel, Verm. Bei. p. 45 with n. 2; cf. Schwyrzer, Gr. Gr. p. 660). Our passage, which modifies this statement to some extent, must not be suppressed for obscure reasons and thus withheld from our grammars and lexica. Similarly, to quote an example which will be discussed at length later on (p. 125), all editors, including Rahlfs this time, prefer ἑρωγοδύται, a corruption solely due to late and mistaken popular etymology, to the correct ἑρωγοδύται of B, 2 Chron. 12: 3.

In these circumstances the astonishing thing about Thackeray’s Grammar is that it keeps comparatively free from these traditional mistakes which the Cambridge editions make from time to time. Though he makes full use of Mayser’s Grammar and even studies the papyri independently, yet he sometimes seems to be bound by some mysterious tradition or, perhaps, by an inclination to admit alternative explanations in instances that obviously do not leave room for such alternatives. Though he disposes of Hort’s ἵστηκειν, yet on the same page (201) he actually presents alternative explanations for ἵσιν: ‘Epic for ἵσιν = ἵσιν’, where in fact ἵσιν is an unaugmented form; suggests an analogy ἵσιν: ἵππειν = ἵππειν (though he dutifully appends, ‘The Ptolemaic papyri have ἵσιν throughout, Mayser 332 note 2’), which may be why he spells ἵσιν instead of ἵσιν, for the latter would suggest the mistaken itacism. Here even Hort, guided by his evidence, had been more restrained. Elsewhere Thackeray is able for the time being to take seriously the itacistic participle ἵσις (p. 278 n. 2) and, as an alternative, in ANOPAC, 1 Sam. 8: 22 A, to see ‘a relic of the Epic ANEPAC’ (p. 150).

As against such occasional shortcomings we have Thackeray’s very modest words in his Preface (p. x), that he could ‘claim no special equipment for his task other than a persistent interest in the subject’, that his ‘special associations with the Grammar of Blass’, which he had translated, were one of his approaches to the subject, and that the chapter on ‘Word-formation’ had to be postponed. He was a loving connoisseur of the whole range of Jewish Hellenists, and if he could have enjoyed the full collaboration of a student of Indo-European
philology, his contribution would certainly have become still more valuable. Blass, however, could not render him this indispensable service. For though Blass had a most intimate acquaintance with the Attic orators, as a grammarian he was wholly in the pre-philological tradition. Thus he was able in his NT Grammar to treat at length the subject of word-formation without an inkling that the same problems of word-formation, applied to the whole extent of what they are now realized to involve, would have exercised a revolutionary influence on the part dealing with phonetics. So it will not suffice merely to append to Thackeray’s Grammar a chapter on word-formation, as he intended to do himself, for a good deal of his chapter on orthography and phonetics must be re-written on this new basis. Much of my first section on the grammatical corruptions serves this purpose.

My task has been greatly simplified by the publication of Rahlfs’ Stuttgart text. Before this appeared, it would have been necessary to write almost a complete treatise on orthography and phonetics, since the mistakes which are found in B, and consequently in the Cambridge editions, cover all aspects of phonetics. Yet Rahlfs, in principle at least, intended to give the correct spellings which had resulted from the fresh insights of the last generation. It is true that he is still some distance from achieving this ambitious aim, but on the whole the progress marked by his edition is enormous. I shall have to begin where he ended.

It still remains briefly to indicate the principles upon which the following suggestions for the emendation of grammatical corruptions in the LXX are based. They are clearly distinct from those by which Hort and his followers were guided. Their idea that the peculiarities of spelling in the Greek Bible with its wide range of variety represented the original sufficiently faithfully to be trusted, was a mere assumption and represented a return to views which, as one would have thought, had been definitely made obsolete by R. Bentley and K. Lachmann. Some readings, for instance, obviously bear the mark of Byzantine or Imperial origin. These can be recognized without any difficulty and must be removed. Roughly speaking, Crönert’s collections enable us to excise the traces of later scribal corruptions, and Mayser’s give us an idea of the spellings and formations which a Ptolemaic author is likely to have used.

But we must go a step further. The preservation of many orthographical inconsistencies in faithful allegiance to B and its correctors, apart from having precarious consequences (cf. pp. 7 f.), is at variance
with the principles according to which all texts other than of the Bible are edited. In all other editions a certain standardization has taken place. This does not necessarily imply that in every instance the author or his secretaries actually used a standardized orthography. Such normalization of spelling is of completely recent date in all cultures and languages. It is a mere matter of convention whether we should be strictly consistent in our way of spelling or not. We all know from the papyri, that, apart from official chancelleries, no strict normalization obtained. But a very simple reflection makes it clear that the same liberty which the authors took was thereafter taken by every individual copyist, so that the final result is bound to be very remote from the author's hand. This being so, the only sensible policy for an editor is standardization. In fact this is already unavoidable for the reason that we are bound to exclude spellings of a later date than the author's. It would be inconsistent to leave the remaining spellings untouched.

There is also a further difference to be observed. Spelling is always a compromise between custom and tradition on the one hand, and a subconscious reproduction of the *Lautbild* on the other. The latter factor is individual to the highest degree; yet our evidence is anonymous to the same degree. We are bound by this anonymity, as we have no means of piercing it. So real faithfulness compels us to standardize the orthographical presentation of our texts, and in doing so we simply restore what was before the author's mind, even if it may have undergone some modification on the way from his mind to his hand.

A further point is more important. Standardization is less a restoration of a supposed original stage than an indispensable means of interpretation. As soon as we pass from *scriptio continua* to distinguishing the several words, we cannot avoid choosing between diverse interpretations, and it is by no means certain that in every instance only one interpretation is possible. There are other modern additions which are nothing but interpretations, such as punctuation, accentuation, the use of capitals, hyphens, inverted commas, etc. By making use of them, an editor wishes to secure the understanding which he believes correct and to exclude all other interpretations. It is a fact that the Greeks could do without many of these expedients, though most of them go back to the ancient grammarians, whose task it was to secure an appropriate understanding of their texts. It is no less a fact that modern readers cannot do without these helps to understanding, and consequently modern editors have to supply them. To put it pointedly, a modern
editor who keeps strictly to the spelling of his MSS fails to convey to his readers the impression which ancient readers got from the MSS themselves. To enable his modern readers to read the text in the same way as ancient readers, he must avail himself of different and more developed ways of presentation.

It is important to make this point here, because much of what will be discussed later in this grammatical section could otherwise be considered as moving in a sphere of unreality. When discussing whether a noun ought to be spelt with the ending -ία or -εία, I merely wish to make sure that our spelling should correctly express the derivation of the word in question: a spelling -εία connects it with an adjective in -ής, -είδ with a noun in -εύς or a verb in -εύω, -ία with an adjective in -ός or a verb in -έω. Our task is to decide not what the author actually wrote— for when he wrote, itacistic or other influences, e.g. from analogy, may have already misled him— but what is the normal spelling which best expresses what was in the author’s mind, if not necessarily in his pen.

Für einen Herausgeber des NT ist natürlich das einzig mögliche Verfahren das, ohne alle Rücksicht auf die Handschriften konsequent die attische Schreibung durchzuführen‘ (Bl.-Debrunner8 p. 14). If this is true for the NT, it is still truer for the LXX. And it is the principle which is applied in the editions of Polybius and Diodorus, Epictetus and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. It was not progress when Nestle’s NT in the later editions attempted to introduce some features of Imperial spelling; yet, where it did so, it did at least keep consistently to these spellings.

Again, one of our most effective aids to correct understanding is accentuation. Actually none of our authors used it, and if our aim were to restore what our authors wrote, we should not use it either. But what they wrote without accents was accented in their speech, and therefore we are quite right not only to use accentuation, but also to take pains to see that our accentuation secures a right understanding of the text. Another thing is equally certain: the rules regarding accentuation vary in our tradition. In some instances we are told about differences of teaching among the ancient authorities, in others the differences may be due to the way in which their teaching has been handed down to us. There is no instance where it is important for us to follow primarily an individual tradition. Without entering into these discussions we merely wish to secure a correct understanding and to exclude a wrong one, and to achieve this we make use of a certain method of accentuation with which tradition most fortunately presents us.
The following grammatical section aims at completeness for the LXX, and to some extent offers observations on authors outside the LXX. The arrangement follows the order of our Grammars, proceeding from vowels and consonants to the more intricate problems of spelling and accentuation, accidence and word-formation. Repetitions have been avoided as far as possible; cross-references take their place.
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The following grammatical section aims at completeness for the LXX, and to some extent offers observations on authors outside the LXX. The arrangement follows the order of our Grammars, proceeding from vowels and consonants to the more intricate problems of spelling and accentuation, accidence and word-formation. Repetitions have been avoided as far as possible; cross-references take their place.
2. VOWELS

1. Itacistic confusions of ei ~ i

1.1. Verbal stems: correct spelling -ei-

δανείζω. Denominative from τὸ δάνειον, a derivative of τὸ δάνος, the stem form of which is δανει-. δανειον therefore goes back to *δανεισιον, and this shows that spellings with -i- instead of -ei- are itacistic distortions. While the other editions still keep throughout to the traditional spellings with -i-, Rahlfs retains them only occasionally: in Prov. 19: 14 (17); 20: 4 (read δανεις-) and 29: 13; 2 Kings 4: 1 (read δανειοτ-).

An additional difficulty, however, is presented by the future δανιώ. This formation is rare: in the active voice it occurs six times in Deuteronomy, once in Proverbs, once in Sirach; in the middle it occurs twice in Deuteronomy; Philo also uses it twice.\(^1\) It should be spelt with -1-.

As Wackernagel (ThLZ, 1908, p. 637) acutely points out, this future proves that the transition of ei to i belongs to the translators and not to the scribes. But in my review of Rahlfs’ edition (ThLZ, 1936, pp. 281 ff.), I preferred A. Debrunner’s explanation (in a personal letter): he suggests that originally there may have existed side by side two verbs which were confused later on: (1) δανιζω from τὸ δάνος and (2) δανείζω from τὸ δάνειον. In his Wortbildungslehre §258 he assembles completely analogous examples from Homer onwards, and he adds to them in IF 40, 1922, p. 107. If he is right, the very scanty evidence for δανιζω, a metrically certain δανισως found twice in late lyric poets (LS), would get strong support from the LXX. As τὸ δάνος is found in Sir. 29: 4, we even seem to be at liberty to admit the formations with -ι- in Sirach, but I prefer not to avail myself of this seeming liberty.

A third possibility, however, is suggested by the unique future formation of μηνιω: μηνιω Jer. 3: 12, μηνιεσ Lev. 19: 18, μηνια Ps. 102 (103): 9. Neither Helbing nor Thackeray records it; Wackernagel briefly mentions it as besonders merkwürdig (ThLZ, 1908, col. 640). Its striking aspect is that it follows the pattern set by the verbs in -lzω. Is this the result of confusion? Or a first instance of a dental formation, such as is later found in μηνιςω = μηνιω An. Ox. ii, 440, and in the gen. μηνιδος of Ael., Them., Julian., and AP? This transition is certainly remarkable, because the i of the aorist ἔμηνισα does not fit into the
system of the verbs in -ιζω any more than μηνι-μα and μηνι-θμός do. There is, on the other hand, slight evidence for an i in the present stem, μηνίεν II. 2 769, and μηνιεται Aesch., Eum. 101. It may be due to metrical necessity. However, if we remember vacillations elsewhere, e.g. lείω, lείσα from lεισω sweat, where in epic the present is lειω, but in Attic lειω, following the aorist, we begin to wonder whether in some corner there existed a present μηνίω, moulded after έμήνϊσα. If this rather precarious assumption could be accepted, μηνιό and δανιό, notwithstanding the difference in their presents, would have in common the shortening of a length found in the present stem. We might then even argue that δανιό belongs to δανιζω, and rule out δανιζω from the LXX. At any rate this would be preferable to deciding for μηνιζω and δανιζω.

Schwyzer, p. 785, adduces two more examples, but neither of them stands the test: 'jungatt. κατακλιεί (: -κλείω), Koine κονιουμαι'. The former is in fragment 287 of Eupolis Com. (V*), εί μη τις ούτην κατακλιεί; and the best explanation is still H. van Herwerden's (Collectanea critica, epicritica, exegetica, sive Addenda ad Theodori Kockii opus comicorum Atticorum fragmenta, Lugduni-Batavorum, 1903, p. 29) that here, as in fragm. 294 from the same comedy, we have a barbarian speaking. For κονιουμαι the evidence is still slighter. In Philo, vit. Mos. ii, 252, AFHP, the best group of MSS, read βλέπω μέλλουσαν κονιεϊσθαι (κινεισθαι G is a mere corruption), but Cohn (iv, 259, l. 15) prefers κονιεϊσθαι with the other MSS. The other passages with κονιεσθαι (present and, mostly, aorist) afford no parallels and from Leisegang's Index, which s.v. μέλειν gives a selection only, we may assume that Philo always used an inf. pres. after μέλειν. (Cf. also Meecham, The Letter of Aristeas pp. 118, 124. He refers to Moulton, Prol. pp. 114, 204 n. 2, and gives statistics for the LXX and the NT.) Therefore Cohn is certainly right in rejecting κονιεσθαι as a corruption; and μηνιό alone is left as a parallel in part for the explanation of δανιό.

ερεικτός. From ερείκω to bruise, pound. It appears as -ικτ- in Lev. 2: 14 and as ελικτ-, as from ελίσσω, in Lev. 6: 21 (14). In the second passage BM give the variant ερικτά from 9 (11) minuscules, but the correct spelling ερεικτά, which Bos and Schleusner (n, 518, 524) quote from 'interpres apud Origenem', is not recorded nor is Origen quoted, presumably because the orthographical problem was not perceived.

λειχω. To lick. Preserves -ει- in all tenses (Schwyzer, p. 754). Yet in 1 Kings 18: 38 even Rahlfs puts -ιξ- following the general usage of the
former editions. To the passages recorded in HR (five for λειξ- and six for έκλειξ-) we may add two occurrences in the B-text of Judg. 7: 5. Here for a repeated λάψη, which may derive from the less secondary A-text, the majority of the minuscules forming the B-family in Judges read λείξη (1° fikmersuztx; 2° fioqrsuztx). λείξη is perhaps the true reading of the B-text, which in Judges is not always found in Vat. B itself (see Pretzl, *Biblica* 7, 1926, p. 378).

μείγνυμι. Except for the un-Attic tense-formations derived from the radical form μιγ-, έμιγν-, μιγήσομαι, and from adjectival compounds in -μιγνής (cf. συγνής ~ ζευγ-, ἀστιβής ~ στειβ-), the Attic dialect, partly as a result of a secondary equalization, everywhere used the radical form μειγ-.

The testimony of the Ptol. papyri, however defective, confirms this (see Glaser pp. 67 ff.; Mayser 1 p. 91; Crönert, *MGH* pp. 29, 308; and the excellent survey in LS s.v.). We must, therefore, restore -ει- everywhere in the LXX, except in the formations mentioned above and also in ἐπιμείξ, Wisd. of Sol. 14: 25, and in the derivatives of the old present, μιγγω. Rahlf is inconsistent here: from the books of Maccabees onwards, that is from the last part of his first volume, he changes his earlier practice. In the former part he puts uniformly -ι-, in the latter equally uniformly -ει-, apparently without ever considering the rule explained above. In Dan. 9' 11: 6, for example, he has συμμειγήσονται and in Dan. LXX 9' 2: 43 συμμειγειται; and these are not misprints, as 2 Macc. 12: 13 τομμειγέσιν shows. In these surroundings the correct παμμιγη, 2 Macc. 3: 21, is strangely inconsistent. In all, Rahlf leaves us to restore ὑπομιείκ- in five and συμμεικτ- in fourteen passages, including Ps. Sol. 17: 15.

tείσ-. In the LXX we find only the aorist/future stem τείσ- (ἀποτείσ- 34 times, ἀντοποτείσει 1 Sam. 24: 20 and ἐκτείσει Job 2: 4); the present tense τίνω give satisfaction, repay does not occur. Here Rahlf is correct in restoring the -ει- in -τείσ- (cf. Ruth, p. 159 n. 1), which had been lost throughout the whole of Greek literature and was only recovered from inscriptions. But he fails to draw the consequences for the present form, which discloses an interesting history. An old middle present tense τείνυμαι ukisci had in Pindar and the Attic writers given way to a middle form of τίνω. A reverse process took place in the post-Attic period, the first example being Gen. 31: 39 (see also Ps. 68 (69): 5; Sir. 20: 12). The MSS here give forms of ἀποτείνυω, but this late active present in -ύω, which replaced forms in λυμι, must be spelled -εινυ- or
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-ειννυ- as ἀποτειννυέτω P. Avrom. 1 A 26 (Ia). This was seen by W. Schulze, Quaest. ep. pp. 108 f. and Schwyzier p. 697, and was developed by Wackernagel, Gesta 7, 1915-16, pp. 237 ff. and Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer, Göttingen, 1916, pp. 77 ff. Similarly, corrupt spellings like ἀποκτίννυμι (in Plato and later authors) and ἀποκτιννύω (Xen.) begin to disappear from the latest editions.

χρειοφειλέτης. Job. 31: 37, Prov. 29: 13. The spelling χρειοφιλέτης is plainly itacistic, since the second half of the compound comes from ὀφείλω (cf. Bl.-Debr. 352, Anhang).

1.2. Verbal stems: correct spelling -ι-

λιπο-. In 4 Macc. 6: 26 all our editions have the correct spelling λιποθυμείν, but in 4 Macc. 9: 23 they all have the incorrect λεπτοτακτήσητε, although, according to Swete's appendix, SA have λιπο-, which is correct. The vast majority of compounds with a verbal stem as the first component are formed from the aorist stem, though there are many mis-spellings in later MSS (cf. LS sub λειπανδρίσ and Schwyzier p. 442). Present stems were also used in compounds of this kind; yet the only word for which λιπο- is certain is λεπτογνώμων. At any rate in 4 Maccabees we ought to avoid the inconsistency of our editions. In Philo, Wendland restores λιποτακτ. throughout. He shows that there are traces of the correct spelling in MSS (Rh. Mus. 52, 1897, p. 468). Cf. λιποτάκτην Jos., BJ v, 124.

1.3. Noun stems: correct spelling -ει-

νείκος, contention. For discussion of this word see sub νίκος victory, below, p. 34.


Ποσειδώνιον. Should be so spelt in 2 Macc. 14: 19 and not -σιδ-. It is spelt correctly in ms. Va.

σειρήνες (σειρήνιοι 4 Macc. 15: 21). This seems to be the correct spelling, though the discussion is still open: see Kretschmer, WSt 22, 179; Meister, WSt 29, 237; Wackernagel, IF 25, 1909, p. 326; Syntax
π. 1928, p. 316. Originally the word was σιρήν, but in Attic (before ρ) -ι- became -ει-. σειρήν is no more of an Atticism than Attic μάγιρος for the widely attested earlier μάγιρος; in both instances we must acquiesce in the late Attic spelling with -ει-.

τρεισκαίδεκα. Through thoughtlessness the spelling τρισκαίδεκα, τρισκαίδεκατος is still widely adhered to, though the whole series of the second decade, τεσσαρεσ-, τεντε-, έκκαίδεκα etc., would forbid it. τεσσαροσκαίδεκατος, 2 Chron. 30: 15, is not the reading of B*A as Thackeray (p. 189) says with Swete; according to BM it is only in B? and this question mark as to the corrector's hand makes this spelling valueless. Our editions put τρεις και δέκα when the numeral is connected with a nom. or acc. but τρισκαίδεκα in the oblique cases, and always τρισκαίδεκατος; but this solution is modern in its conception, for it fails to remember the scriptio continua and also the tendency of numerals to become inflexible. As τριο- is not thrice here, but a mere itacism, we ought always to spell τρεις-, as LS rightly emphasizes, and consequently write the cardinal and the ordinal uniformly in a single word (Wackernagel, Kl. Schr. p. 240).

In Ezek. 41: 6, where we must neglect the controversial interpretation of the MT, τρεις, the reading of Q (Swete), was rightly restored by Rahlfs. τριάκοντα και τρεις δίς represents a Hebrew instead of the MT's τρισσώς (Cornill p. 455). Where the LXX read τρισσώς, 1 Kings 7: 4, 5 (MT), it rendered it τρισσώς 1 Kings 7: 41, 42.

For the converse mistake, τρείς for τρίς, see below, sub τρίς, p. 36.

χρειοφειλέτης see above, p. 32.

1.4. Noun stems: correct spelling -ι-

γιώρας. This word is a translation of ἐπι, a stranger who stays in another country as a client of an individual or a community (G.-Buhl16). The spelling γειώρας is an obvious itacism, since the word is a simple adaptation of the Aramaic γη (Syr. 937). In Isa. 14: 1 Swete and Rahlfs, who is followed by Ziegler, spell γιώρας as does B (BABSAQГ have -ει-); but in Exod. 12: 19 Rahlfs puts -ει-, although, as far as can be inferred from Swete and BM, -ει- is found in A alone. This is but one more example of this inconsistency between the former and latter parts of his edition.
In the brief article in LS, ‘γειώρας, sojourner, Is. 14:1; Philo 1.417. 2. proselyte, Hesychius’, the retained itacism is not my only objection. Sojourner is a very rare connotation of η (LXX Job 31:32 uses ξένος for η), and it is not, therefore, particularly suitable to be put as the equivalent of γιώρας. πάροικος and προσήλυτος are the words which the later (Greek) translators substitute for γιώρας (Thackeray, p. 34), for η means not so much a man who stays only temporarily, as one who, though a stranger, is expected to fulfil the conditions for being a member of the Jewish community. The η is as clearly distinguished from the "foreigner as he is from the ηίτις = αυτόχθων. Proselyte, in a wider sense (cf. proselyte of the gate) would be a much better English equivalent, especially when taken etymologically and from the angle of the Jewish community: the one who, coming from elsewhere, more or less decidedly takes his stand with them.

In Lev. 19:34 Msv preserve γειωρας as an alternative rendering of προσήλυτοι, without indicating the source of the translation. Field notes, but BM do not confirm it, that M reads γεωραι (sic) here. If this reading does in fact occur here, it would be interesting as being in line with the note on Isa. 14:1 found in B^1, ο την γην φυλάσσων (actually Isa. 14:1 as quoted by Justin, Dial. 123 contains ο γηόρας; but in Justin the poor evidence represents a very late and inferior archetype). Moreover there is a gloss in Suidas, γεώρες· γεωφύλακες (recorded in LS with a reference to γειώρας). Schleusner p. 8 f., who mentions still others, comments, 'quasi esset άττό της γης et ουρος, custos' (cf. θυρωρός). This etymology, and yet another which connects the word with γεωργός, whether popular or learned, may suggest the spelling with -ει- which, though itacistic, was taken by these late interpreters to be a diphthongic ει = ευ = ε; at any rate, this etymology is secondary.

κροκόδιλος. Lev. 11:29. See Mayser 1, 93 n. 7; R. Meister p. 18; Huber, Lev. p. 12.

νικός, φιλονικ-; νείκος, φιλονεικ-. Here the alternative spelling involves the decision whether these formations are to be derived from νικ- victory or νεικ- quarrel. νικός for νικη was moulded in early Hellenism after the pattern of κράτος.9 Later on when -ει and -ι- coincided, νικός came to be a complete homonym of νείκος, contention. (For the discussion see Wackernagel, Hell. pp. 26 f.; Hom. U. pp. 81 f.; E. Fraenkel, Glotta 4, 41; Bl.-Debr., §51, 1.) Moreover the sense of the two words came to be closely akin: φιλονικός, the only legitimate and genuine spelling,
claimed already by Cobet, *Novae Leciones* pp. 691 ff. (O. Glaser pp. 69 ff.), means lüblicher Wetteifer (M. Fraenkel, *Alte tümer von Pergamon* viii, 147); whereas Glaser shows that his only example with -ει- discloses by its sense that the thought there was of νείκος contention (p. 72). Therefore we must group our passages according to their meaning, in order to decide their proper spelling. In doing so we shall have once more to face the necessity of departing from the simple programme of restoring the Attic spelling, as was the case with δανιώ.

To begin with, νείκος victory is quite certain in the seven passages in which, in accordance with the Aramaic meaning of the root, נָנס יְ for ever is translated by εἰς νείκος. In 2 Sam. 2: 26 Rahlfs rightly has νείκος; elsewhere he wrongly puts νείκος seven times (including the superscription of Ps. Sol. 8). We may compare the doxology in 1 Chron. 29: 11 where the splendour is unambiguously rendered victory: ‘Thine is... η νίκη.’ Likewise victory is the intended meaning in the Apocrypha, 1 Esdras 3: 9; 2 Macc. 10: 38; 4 Macc. 17: 12.

νείκος contention, on the contrary, is found in Prov. 10: 12; 22: 10; 29: 22 (Wackernagel, *Hell.* p. 27 n. 1), as well as in Hos. 10: 11; Ezek. 3: 8 bis. Context decides the meaning and therefore the spelling. In Prov. 10: 12 νείκος and φιλονεικοῦντας appear in a parallelism based on the meaning strife (MT different). In Ezek. 3: 7, 8 and in a hexaplaric addition to v. 9 φιλονεικοὶ and νείκος represent Hebrew stiff of forehead and forehead: the translator renders הָנַס, instead of נָנס, forehead, = μέτωττον (so A', C', Θ'). In Hos. 10: 11 διστατέω νείκος represents שָׁמוּר יָנָן which likes to thresh; possibly the translator understood the Hebrew to mean ‘hostile attitude to enemies’, cf. Mic. 4: 13; Hab. 3: 12.

On the other hand, in the compounds in the Apocrypha, the spelling -ι- must be restored in 2 Macc. 4: 4; 4 Macc. 1: 26; 8: 26.

This vacillation between the homonyms νίκος-νείκος led to misinterpretations in the later stages of transmission, as can best be seen from the translations. I give just two examples, one from the NT and the other from the Three.

(1) In 1 Cor. 15: 54 f., where the meaning victory is beyond doubt, Lachmann–Buttmann’s apparatus quotes not only a repeated νείκος of B, but also a thrice repeated contentio from Cyprian and Hilarius. In Hos. 13: 14, which 1 Cor. 15: 55 resembles, the LXX translation of δίκη is δίκη. When Nyberg, *Hosea* pp. 104 f., suggests that it may be corrupt for νίκη = νίκη, there are two objections. (a) νικ- is rare in the LXX proper (cf. p. 331 n. 34), and the nouns νικη, νικος render נָנס.
exclusively. ἐξολοθρεία is never rendered by νίκη. (b) νίκος in 1 Corinthians, the starting point of Nyberg’s suggestion, may have come from the first part of the testimony-like concatenation of biblical passages which is quoted here (cf. A’ Θ’ Isa. 25: 8). However, Nyberg rightly emphasizes that, with or without his conjecture, the LXX text of Hos. 13: 14 is decidedly secondary in comparison with that of the MT, which he prefers.

(2) Commenting on Isa. 63: 6, Jerome puts contentionem for τὸ ν(ε)ϊκο$ of the Three. C. C. Torrey, The Second Isaiah, 1928, p. 200, rightly explains ὑδάτινος ις 63: 3 and 6 as a ‘use of a word in different meanings’, i.e. a pun. According to him it means ‘juice’ in v. 3, but ‘glory’ in v. 6. He failed to record that the Three also translated the two passages alike. Whereas the LXX puts αίμα in both passages, in v. 3 C’ has τὸ τρόπτασιον and Θ’ τὸ τρόπτασιον (A’s version has not survived; a different tradition records for Θ’ C’ τὸ κατανικήματι (Field), but the attribution to Θ’ C’ is not borne out by Ziegler), while in v. 6 all the Three say τὸ νίκος.

σάπφιρος 13 occurrences, Exodus–Ezekiel. Not σάπφειρος, since the word reflects the Hebrew שְׂפִי with an i. Even if the ultimate source of both words be other than Semitic, there are no traces anywhere of an ei-diphthong. See W.–Schmiedel §5, 13a; Bl.–Debr. §38.

σιρομάστης. The correct spelling is found in Judg. 5: 8 A-text, where, in fact, it forms part of an extensive corruption; but elsewhere the incorrect -ει- appears five times.

σκοτόδινος. The hap. leg. γλώσσα of uncertain meaning, cramp or giddiness (Driver² p. 232) is rendered σκότος δεινὸν in 2 Sam. 1: 9, for which Schleusner (v, 62) records a brilliant emendation of Trendelenburg’s14 σκοτόδινος (= σκοτοδίνιος) dizziness, vertigo, found in medical writers Hippocrates and Aretaeus (IIp). This is exactly what we require. In our context it is of some interest that LS notes without comment that both δεῖνος (cf. δίνη) and δεινὸ$ are found covering all the meanings of the word, of which the primary sense is whirling, rotation.15

τρίς. τρεῖς in 1 Kings 2: 35 is but an itacistic spelling of our editions; it must be τρίς (τρίσ τρις), cf. below, p. 315. For the converse mistake, τρίς instead of τρεῖς, see above, p. 33.
1.5. Terminations: masculines in -ιας

Most of our examples concern certain terminations of nouns and adjectives in which -ι- or -ε- respectively are contained. In some instances alternative formations were used at an early date, while more confusion arose from the progressive coincidence of both sounds. The result in all MSS is a large number of demonstrably wrong spellings.

As masc. in -ιας is occasionally found alongside of fem. abstr. in -α, B. Delbrück (Syntaktische Forschungen iv, 11) and J.-Schmidt (Pluralkirung der idg. Nomina pp. 19 ff.) derived the former from the latter. Their main example for demonstrating this rule was νεανίας as from a supposed *νεανία youth, a development which would be paralleled by Engl. youth and Slav. juna. If, however, νεανίας is a compound, as has been argued by many authors, this explanation is no longer possible. The latest etymology suggested is that by Schwyzer, Mélanges Boisacq ii, 231 ff., according to which νεανίας = *νερο-ανιας young breather, and therefore an abstract *νεανία could never have existed (briefly Gr. Gr. p. 426 n. 3). In fact, the word-group started from νεανίας.16

In the LXX one example calls for consideration, ζωγραφιας, a masc. concrete, one taken alive and ζωγραφια, a fem. abstr., taking alive are both derived from the compound ζω(α)γρεω take alive; the spelling with -ι- is alone legitimate. The Cambridge editions still write -ει-, and so does Rahlfs at Num. 21: 35; Deut. 2: 34. But in 2 Macc. 12: 35 he rightly, though inconsistently, puts the correct form (for other inconsistencies see p. 31 and p. 33). In the Pentateuch passages -ι- is read by AF, in Maccabees by V.

1.6. Terminations: feminines in -ελα

Fem. nouns derived from verbs in -ευω are formed in -ελα. Itacism has here caused endless confusion, especially between pairs of words like στρατεία campaign and στρατια army (see below). Moreover, with some words side by side with the forms in -εια there exists a formation in -ελα, derived from the same root. Since in the course of transmission these neuters in -ελα may have contributed to the obliteration of the formations in -εια, they will be included in this section.

ἀγιστεία. Deissmann, in Kautzsch’s Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des AT ii, 161, has duly vindicated the received reading ἀγιστεῖαιν
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ritual service in 4 Macc. 7:9. The corrupt συγιαστιαν of our majuscules, that holds the field in Swete and Rahlfs, would be unique.

[ἀκηδεία] False form for ἀκήδεια or ἀκηδία; see below, sub κηδεία, p. 40.

ἀρεσκεία, αὐταρεσκία, ἀνθρωπαρεσκία.

ἀρεσκεία is still practically everywhere, including LS⁹, accented proparoxytone. Yet both it and ἔρθεία were long ago rightly claimed as derivatives from verbs in -έωμαι¹⁷ by Winer (1856, p. 48, ‘and not from ἀρέσκω’) and Alexander Buttmann (Gramm. des nt. Sprachgebrauchs, 1859, p. 11) who note that both Lachmann–Buttmann and Tischendorf put ἀρέσκεια in Col. 1:10. In the NT this warning has been followed up almost universally (Hort, App. p. 153b putting -ια in both cases as beyond doubt); yet even the scholarly edition of the Characters of Theophrastus, prepared by Philologische Gesellschaft zu Leipzig, 1897, when expounding the fifth character, ἈΠΕΚΕΙΑ, fails to give the appropriate form of the word, although in the many ancient definitions which are cited it appears side by side with κολακεία, a word moulded on exactly the same lines. Therefore it is owing to a universal, and not to any special biblical, tradition that no edition exists of the OT in Greek which rightly reads ἀρεσκεία in Prov. 29:48 Sw. = 31:30 Ra.

It would, however, be a mistake to spell and accent accordingly words that look like, and are usually considered, compounds of ἀρεσκεία. In point of fact αὐτάρεσκος, -έω suggest αὐταρεσκία C Eccles. 6:9, and ἀνθρωπαρεσκός suggests ἀνθρωπαρεσκία in Justin, Apol. i, 2, 5. There exist no formations in -έω or -έυς which alone would justify an -εία in these nouns that are modelled on the compound adjectives or verbs aforementioned.

ἀσωτεία. (See Mayser i2 3, 9.) Consider side by side the following passages:

2 Macc. 6:4

τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἑρων
ἀσωτίας καὶ κόμων
ἐπεπληρώτω
ῥαθμούντων μεθ᾽ ἐταιρῶν.

Pap. Greco-Eg. vol. i

Pap. Fiorentini (ed. G. Vitelli, 1906), nr. 99

μεθ᾽ ἐταίρων ἀσωτευόμενος
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and the case for ἀσωτεία (as derived from ἀσωτέυομαι) will be seen to be strong, in spite of ἀσώτως Luke 15: 13. This may hold good also for Prov. 28: 7.

ἐπαρχεία. That this is the legitimate form is proved by the inscriptions (Glaser p. 74; Schweizer, Perg. p. 55; Bl.-Dbr. p. 23). In the LXX we find it only in variant readings, spelled with -ι-, which must be read -είαν in Judith 3: 6 A and -είων in Esther 4: 11 O, in a hexaplaric addition. Hort’s mistaken accentuation ἐπάρχεια was corrected by Schmiedel p. 5 n. 30. Moulton II, 157 and Index, spells ἐπαρχία, but on p. 315 Howard writes -(ε)α. In LS there are separate headings for ἐπαρχεία, -α, which is certainly unjustified, as had been amply demonstrated by Schweizer, Perg. pp. 54f. Our editions are correct, however, in spelling συναρχία Esther 3 B (XIII): 4 Swete = 3, 13 d Rahlfs.

ἐξοδεία, ἐξόδιον; μεθοδεία, μεθόδιον; συνοδεία, συνοδία.

ἐξοδεία exodus, expedition (2 Sam. 3: 22 = תְמִי) must be spelled with -ει- (Glaser p. 75), as from ἐξοδεύω. Mayser i 3, 9, and LS assume the existence, side by side, of -εια, procession, and -εια, business-journey. But although such differentiation doubtless exists elsewhere, even where there is no verb in -εύω (cf. ναυτεία naval affairs, ναυτία, seasickness, nausea, disgust; from the latter the verb ναυτιάν with the termination characteristic for terms of suffering), I rather doubt whether it should be introduced here, as the only early evidence for ἐξοδίη is Herodotus 6, 56, and in Ionic the suffix -η is often found in place of an -εια of the other dialects.18

ἐξόδιον, final day of a festival,19 on the other hand, is rightly spelled so. Likewise we read elsewhere μεθοδεία and μεθόδιον side by side. Analogy seems to require συνοδεία (read by B*S in 2 Esdras 17: 64), and the fact that συνοδία is presupposed by the metre in Menander’s Monostichos 24 is not necessarily any evidence to the contrary, especially as the usage found in 2 Esdras 17: 5 bis, 64 is peculiar: it renders γεν. family, lineage (γενεαλογικός = genealogical table), and here a fresh derivation from συνοδέυω would be quite acceptable. Yet it may be wiser to leave the question open.

ντι άνοδίας = τρπ itV, C Job 12: 24; Ps. 106 (107): 40, on the other hand, is derived from κοινος. The same applies to κοινοια 1 Esdras–Sirach (κοινος, -ω).
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έπιγαμβρεία. The spelling -ίαν in Josephus, *B.J* 1, 181 (Niese) is mistaken.

έριθεία. This word is found in OT Greek only in C' Ezek. 23:11. It was long accented wrongly as proparoxytone.

έφηβεία. The note in LS: 'έφηβία, η = έφηβεία 1, Artem. 1, 54 codd. II = έφηβεία 3, LXX 2 Macc. 4:9', is a codification of itacisms.

λατρεία. Correctly so written by Rahlfs.

κατοπτεία. LS rightly restores the spelling κατοπτεία in Jos., *AJ* xvm, 370 (so codd. AE) and *Corp. Herm.* pi, 3 (cf. κατοπτεύω, -έσις, -στήριος). The meaning close observation is the same in both passages. There is no need to interpret Herm. ' = κάτοψις' sight (LS).

κηδεία. Funeral. Cf. ἁκηδεία carelessness, ἁκηδία grief, weariness. In 2 Macc. 4:49; 5:10 Rahlfs has the form κηδεία funeral, as from κηδεύω, but in Ps. 118(119):28; Sir. 29:5; Isa. 61:3 he puts ἁκηδία grief, weariness. In this he is quite correct, for ἁκηδία, which is itself the starting point for the verb ἁκηδιάν (Psalms, Sirach, Baruch, Daniel (LXX), six occurrences), is derived, not from ἁκηδής (which would give ἁκηδεία) but from ἁκηδέω. ἁκηδής nowhere means weary. The connotation λύπη is late. Ap. Rhod. 2, 219 uses ἁκηδείη in the Homeric sense of incuria, but 3, 298 in the Hellenistic sense of weariness, as does the LXX (Wackernagel, *Hom. U.* p. 184). Therefore we may be allowed to use different forms for the two meanings. According to LS, however, evidence for ἁκηδέω, grow weary, is as late as Quintus Smyrnæus 10, 16.

κυριεία. It is still worth while pondering Schweizer's comment (*Perg.* pp. 58 f.). It may be noted that the right spelling is found only thrice in A: Dan. Θ' 4:19 (22); 6:26 (27); 11:5. Moreover the fact that κυρία, fem. to κύριος, is always spelled correctly without variants shows that the two words had not yet become homonyms at the time of the translation.

λογεία, as from λογεύω. (Apart from inscriptions and papyri, λογεύω is found in Polybius 31, 31, 1.) λογεία was reclaimed for 1 Cor. 16:1 f. by Deissmann (*BS* pp. 139 ff. - Hort does not mention the word), who on fairly plausible grounds suggests λογείαν for the first εὐλογείαν in
2 Cor. 9: 5 and (NBSt pp. 46 f.) for 2 Macc. 12: 43 (κατ' άνδρο λογείαν instead of κατ' άνδρολογείον A Sw.; cf. conlatamque viritim pecuniam Vet. Lat. cod. Peyronii). Except for the itacism, V q 58 (as to V Swete’s apparatus is wrong) are right (Kappler, De memoria alterius libri Maccabaeorum, Diss. phil., Gött., 1929, p. 58, who does not correct the itacism). Rahlfs, however, keeps κατ' άνδρολογείαν, the reading found in Lucian, the Aldine, the Complutensian and the Sixtine.

Here, a formation in -ιον, derived from the same root, comes in. ἰπ (so pointed in BH), the oracular breast-plate of the High Priest, is represented by λογείαν in all the old editions and in Rahlfs. The Cambridge editions spell -ιον; they show that in the leading majuscules the spelling -ει- is restricted to A in Exod. 35: 27. Here -ει- is obviously wrong; for it could only mean speaking-place, stage in the theatre (cf. LS), derived from λογεύς speaker, and nobody would suggest that by this the translator wished to describe the breast-plate as the ‘place’ from which the divine oracle of Urim and Thummim was ‘speaking’. λόγιον, on the contrary, yields all that is required, its original meaning (from Herodotus and Thucydides onwards) being oracle, especially one preserved from antiquity (LS). In the same sense it is also used as an adjective (‘Απόλλωνος δώμα λόγιον Berl. Sitzb. 1911, p. 632 (Cyprus)). So we are at liberty to interpret it as either a noun or an adjective. In the latter case περιστήθιον (Exod. 28: 4) could be understood.²⁰,²¹

μεθοδεία. See above, sub ἐξοδεία.

νεανιεία. νεανεία, Philo, vit. Mos. i, 301, must, of course, be spelled νεανεία as it is in post. Cain 170 and spec. leg. iii, 41. It ranges with spellings like κυρεία, de Jos. 71, ταμείον, det. pot. 68; immut. 42; spec. leg. i, 78, ὑγίεια (sic) passim, interchanging with ὑγεία, τείν (not in Leisegang), which cannot be tolerated in our texts. It is impossible with LS, which still reads νεανείαν in spite of Wendland ii, 37, 30, to maintain the different spelling as expressing a difference in meaning. Behind this mistaken differentiation there is the supposed *νεανια which has been discarded above (p. 37). νεανιεία forms a group with νεανιεύομαι, νεανίευμα; cf. the discussion in note 17, p. 282.

ολκετεία. In Job 1: 3 ἱπεύμα household of slaves was literally rendered by Symmachus who put ολκετεία. Field’s -α is itacistic, as is the spelling in Epict., Ench. 33, 7 (LS). This is borne out by inscriptions and the verb ολκετεύω.
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όλεθρεῖα. I should prefer ὀλέθρεῖα to ὀλέθρια in the LXX. There are only two ancient formations, ὀλέθρος, ὀλέθριος (cf. the hap. leg. ὀλέθροφος in 4 Macc. 8: 19) without any verb ὀλέθρ-. In the LXX, however, we frequently have ὀλέθρεύω, ἐξολέθρευω; we find ἐξολέθρευμα I Sam. 15: 21, -σις four times, and in addition Josh. 17: 13 (GN etc.), all these formations being almost without exception confined to biblical speech. So it may be sound to bring the noun into closer relation to -εύω by spelling it -εία (Esther 8: 12 Rahlfs = E(16)21 Swete; 3 Macc. 4: 2; 5: 5).

όρφανεῖα. *γυν childlessness is in Isa. 47: 9 translated ἀτεκνία. This is the normal translation of the root *γυν, cf. Ps. 34 (35): 12. But in the previous verse, Isa. 47: 8, we find the bold and apt translation ὀρφανεῖαν (for the same word *γυν). Rahlfs is right in spelling -εία, because the abstract noun cannot be derived from ὀρφανός, but only from the verb ὀρφανεύω (Mayser 13 3, 9).

προσεδρεία. 3 Macc. 4: 15 (with Rahlfs), compare προσεδρεύειν 1 Macc. 11: 40 and the lexicographer Zonaras (I*I): προσεδρεῖα ἡ ἐπίμονος καὶ διηνέκης ἰσχολία-δίφθογγον (quoted by Schleusner v, 476).

στρατεία. An instructive example of the confusion caused by itacism in the tradition and among the grammarians is afforded by the treatment of στρατεία in 2 Cor. 10: 4. Here the meaning campaign clearly requires -εία; any doubt is removed by the preceding στρατενόμεθα in v. 3. Nevertheless -εία- is the reading of only a minority (including 346 and B). Lachmann, whose ambition is merely to restore a fourth-century text, prints the right form without wasting words on it, but Hort (App. p. 153b) notes 'στρατεία (not to be confounded with στρατιά, compare Krüger on Thuc. 1 3 4)' and calls it a 'doubtful case'. He is followed by Schmiedel, §5 n. 31, and even Deissmann, NBSt p. 9, who gives post-Christian examples for the same mis-spelling in the Fayyum papyri. All three of them acquiesce in leaving this itacism as it stands.

But then it is inconsistent to refer to Krüger, for the passage in Thucydides, which he quotes, is one of the rare instances where στρατιά has the connotation expedition, as it already had in an Attic inscription of 424* (M.-Schw. p. 55 n. 474). To be consistent they would have to write στρατιά oxytone. Moulton 11, 78 gives an
appropriate précis, disfigured only by the misprint στρατία at the decisive point. Bl.-Debr. §23, W. Bauer and Nestle, the latter under the auspices of Schmiedel, at last put an end to the traditional subservience to the MSS. As regards the LXX, Helbing and Thackeray say nothing. If one analyses the article 'στρατιά (-εία)' in HR, the result is that there is only one occurrence of -εία: 4 Macc. 9: 23 (24) στρατεύσαν στρατεύσασθε (cf. 1 Tim. 1: 18), στρατεύσαν, 2 Macc. 13: 14, being a peculiar reading of φαθάνον of the others, which is rightly found in Rahlfs' text. [But Swete gives A's reading as στρατιά, and Rahlfs στρατιαν unaccented. Ed.] A may have been copied from a MS in which στρατοπεδείαν was given as a contraction στρατείαν (cf. below, pp. 135-8). Everywhere else we must read στρατιά, except Num. 10: 28 where στρατιά is a corruption (not observed in BH3) for ἀπαρθίαι representing ἄφθος as in v. 12 and Exod. 40: 36 (same corruption Judith 3: 10 in cod. S).

συνέδρεια. We should certainly read συνέδρεια Judith 6: 1, 17; 11: 9 (as we should in Polybius 18, 54 (37), 2 and Aristeas 303), along with συνέδριον.

συνοδεία. See above, sub ἕξοδεία.

φυγαδεία. φυγαδείαι plur., sedition (Aram. חפנ) must be read with the great majority of our MSS in 2 Esdras 4: 15, 19 (φυγαδείαι δουλων: ἀποστάσεις καὶ φυγαδείαι). The variant φυγαδεία, neutr. plur., which in v. 15 is found only in BA and the LXX doublet of Lucian, and in v. 19 in Bchm (Lucian proper reading ἀγώνες in both passages) does not make sense here. Its termination in -εῖον secures it the meaning place of refuge, and so it is rightly found in the traditional text of Num. 35: 15. Here Rahlfs, with B, Swete and BM, puts a meaningless φυγαδείον in Numbers and refers to it when in the Esdras passages just mentioned he puts its plural. In Esdras, however, φυγαδείαι is supported by a hexaplaric addition which goes back to Symmachus. This is shown by the Syr. hex. of Ezek. 17: 20 (21) which reads (τὴν ἀδικίαν αὐτοῦ...) καὶ τάκας φυγαδείας αὐτοῦ. Although φυγαδεία here represents חפנ (from חנה to flee) and is given as חפנ (from חנה to flee) by Syr. hex., it must be translated by sedition, as the translator connects the words with the preceding passage. LS is therefore mistaken in recording 'body of fugitives, LXX Ez. 17: 21 cod. Alex.'
1.7. Terminations: feminines in ἵα

From stems in -εσ- with adjectives in -ής feminine nouns are formed in ἵα (e.g. ἀκριβής, ἀκρίβεια stem ἀκρίβεσ-). There are exceptions to this rule, but hardly any that could not be easily explained. Thus, for example, when considering the alternative formations ὄφελεια and ὄφελικ, which are both metrically certain, we may remember that the simple form *ὀφελῆς does not exist, only the compound ὀνόφελῆς, and that the verb ὄφελέω would lead to ὄφελικ. So we shall have to explain any seeming irregularities.

ἄεικεια, ἀκεια. ἄεικης (Attic; later contracted to ἄκης) can only form a noun ἄκεικα, ἀκεια. For the facts, which had already been seen by G. Meyer (Bezz. Beitr. 1, 88, cf. K.-Blass 1 1, 215), I quote Georg Kaibel:

Von ἄεικης, ἄκης ist das richtig gebildete Nomen ἄκεικα. Daß Dichter­gebrauch wie εὐσεβΐα so ἄεικα hätte bilden können, ist an sich wahr, da aber überall, wo ἄεικα, ἄκεια überliefert ist, das 1 lang sein muß oder sein kann, so geht daraus hervor, daß die Nebenform nicht gebildet worden ist. Hermann (zu OK 752) hat gegen Elmsley und Porson mit Unrecht polemisiert (Sophokles Elektra, Leipzig, 1896, p. 150, on verse 486).

Crönert, MGH p. 31 n. 2, in addition quotes examples of choliambi with the word at the end of a line, one from Herodas (IIIa) and several from Babrius (IIp) where the metre requires ζζζζ throughout. These facts are far from being presented clearly in LS. We still read ἄκεια in Burnet's Oxford Plato and elsewhere. Here the helpful analogy to ἐπίκης, ἐπίκεια may have been obscured by the contraction of ἄει- to αι-. Equally Rahlfs, though spelling ἐπίκεια correctly throughout, displays ἄκεια instead of ἄκεια in all three passages 2 Macc. 7: 42; 3 Macc. 4: 14; 6: 26.26 (Yet he is right in spelling παθοκράτεια 4 Macc. 13: 5 with Vα (cf. ἐγκράτεια and ἐπικράτεια) and, contrariwise, ἔργολαβία Sir. 29: 19, for there is no adjective in -ῆς, but only ἔργολάβος and the verb ἔργολαβέω.27,28 Here it is obvious that late copyists were misled by εὐλάβεια, which is correctly derived from εὐλαβῆς.)

From Homer onwards the verb was always ἄεικειαν. In fact, derivations from adjectival stems in -εσ- without exception follow this secondary type of formation after the pattern of the much more numerous adjectives in -ος (Debrunner, Wb. §258, and IF 40, 1922, p. 108). This ἄκειαν gave rise to the spelling ἄκεια in spite of the length
of the second syllable, and Homeric ἀεικά as Ionic ἀεική acted in the same direction. Moreover, the noun and verb both formed part of a stock phrase (πᾶσαν ἀείκαν αὐτός ἀκισάμενος Ἰο, ΑΙ η, 52, cf. Polyb. 24, 9, 13). Since in LXX (2-4 Macc.) ἀείκα, ἀκισμός, ἀκίζεσθαι do not make a combined appearance comparable with the stock phrase mentioned, I still keep to the correct non-Ionic spelling ἀείκα. As an instructive parallel I mention another group starting from an adjective in -ής with a privativum, ἀφανής, ἀφάνεια, ἀφανίζω. Here the form ἀφανία is mentioned by Apoll. Dysc., Synt. 341, 8 (LS).

ἀκήδεια. See above, sub κηδεία, p. 40.

ἐκτένεια. Rahlfs, who in most instances applies the general rule, nevertheless puts ἐκτένεια in 2 Macc. 14: 38 and 3 Macc. 6: 41, whereas earlier in the same volume he had given the correct form in ἐπεια in Judith 4: 9 bis. In so doing he faithfully follows Swete who, in turn, follows his leading MS. A formation in -ῆ would go back either to an adjective in -ος or a verb in -έω which is not found in this late word-family.

[ἐπάρχεια]. False form for ἐπαρχεία, q.v., p. 39.

[ἐργολάβεια]. False form for ἐργολαβία (see sub ἀείκεια, p. 44), there being no adjective in -ής, but only ἐργολάβος and the verb ἐργολαβέω.

εὐλάβεια. Correct form, since derived from εὐλαβής.

[κακοπάθεια]. False form for κακοπαθία, Mal. 1: 13; 2 Macc. 2: 26 f.; 4 Macc. 9: 8 (Glaser pp. 5, 73 f.; Schweizer, Perg. p. 54; Crönert, MGH p. 32; Mayser 23, 3, 35). Glaser rightly urged the introduction of this form instead of -εια into Polybius according to contemporary monumental evidence, and it is remarkable that two inscriptions from II A, quoted by Deissmann, NBS T p. 91, display side by side, the one ἐκτενεῖα καὶ κακοπαθέα, the other ἐπιμελεῖα καὶ κακοπαθή. The reason is obvious – the noun is derived from κακοπαθέω, which is amply found from Thucydides onwards, whereas there is very little attestation for κακοπάθης. We may compare κακοπραγία Wisd. of Sol. 5: 23 (24), derived from κακοπραγέω, whereas a κακοπραγής is found only in Hesychius. In LS there are separate headings for κακοπάθεια and κακοπαθία, which is certainly unjustified; see Schweizer, Perg. pp. 54 f.
**GRAMMATICAL CORRUPTIONS**

παθοκράτεια. Correct form (4 Macc. 13: 5 with V*); cf. ἕγκράτεια and ἐπικράτεια.

προσφιλεία. Field was obviously right in suggesting (in his note 2) the spelling with -ει- instead of the traditional ἄσμα ττροσφιλίας (ητ^' Ttφ) A' Ps. 44 (45): 1. Unfortunately his traditionalist mentality here, as often, prevented him from drawing the consequences for his text, and therefore LS still exhibits 'προσφιλεία, ἧ = προσφιλέω Aq. Ps. 44 (45): 1'. Yet it shows at the same time that προσφιλής is very common, and προσφιλέω almost non-existent. Therefore -ια ought to be mentioned, if at all, as only an itacism.

1.8. Terminations: neuters in -ιον and -ειον

Owing to various conflicting tendencies the facts are here rather complicated and by no means easy to disentangle. The original suffix, of course, was -ιον, -ειον being a subdivision of it originating from, but by no means confined to, stems in -εσ (-εσινον) or -εφ (-εφυνον). But this much can be said: primarily, and for a remarkable part of the development of the Greek language, -ιον was not by any means a suffix with a diminutive meaning. It meant after the manner of, and could also be an enlarged form of the substantive itself. So it could be used to help in avoiding unusually short words, like θήρ, by forming θηρίον as even later, when the diminutive meaning prevailed, neuters were increasingly substituted for nouns of unusual formation (ἄρην for ἄρην the nom. of which is found in inscriptions only, κοράσιον for κόρη). Different classes can be distinguished according to meaning: names of (1) places, (2) temples, (3) festivals (plur.), (4) prizes, fees, rewards (Chantraine p. 57). They all, but particularly the first three, are also subdivisions characteristic of nouns in -ειον. A special class of nouns in -ειον is represented by words denoting premises where a craftsman (mostly in -εύς) carries on his business or sells his goods (i.e. a factory or shop). As this formation has been extended to cover derivations from words other than in -εύς, -εφω, it is about the only class which is throughout formed in -ειον to the exclusion of mere -ιον or other endings.

In a detailed book on word-formation this chapter would be one of the most interesting. It would reveal some overlapping and apparent inconsistencies and at the same time show that the system is not rich enough to avoid some ambiguity: πορθεμείον, for example, can mean ferry-boat, landing-place, ferryman's fee.
The Attic inscriptions of the pre-Hellenistic period distinguish carefully between formations in -είον and -ιον from the same stem, and it would be rash to suppose that the itacistic alteration of pronunciation made them homonyms. Strictly speaking there are no homonyms at all, for a word never appears in a detached way, but always in a sentence and a connection which, together with the accentuation of the phrase, conveys the proper sense of the sentence to those listening.

After thus briefly fixing our standards we proceed to discuss the mistaken forms in our editions.

1.8.1. Nouns in -ιον

ἀποδόχιον. As Wackernagel (ThLZ, 1908, pp. 36 f.) has seen, the unanimous evidence given by good papyri of IIIa proves the spelling -είον wrong in ἁποδόχιον storehouse Sir. 1:17, cistern 50:3 (in 39:17 the free translation of the Hebrew, ἀποδόχια υδάτων, which has in mind Ps. 32:7 τεθεὶς ἐν θησαυροῖς ἄβυσσος, links the two meanings of the Greek word) and in ὑποδόχιον in Aristeas 89, 91 and Strabo (Mayser i 23, 45 f.). Against LS I would accordingly spell ὑδροδόχιον reservoir (Mayser i 23, 50, not in the LXX) as well as ὕδραγώγιον aqueduct, as is correctly transmitted for A' 2 Sam. 8:1. With another example I rather hesitate to give a clear decision; μελανόδοχεῖον inkstand, recorded for A' Ezek. 9:2, is a hap. leg. for what is elsewhere called μελανοδόχον (Mayser i 23, 171) or -δόχον (Pollux 10, 60, cf. Crönert, MGH p. 301). Here, according to Field, Jerome, who alone records Aquila's translation, spells -είον. It can be seen from the evidence available that in these words this spelling prevailed in documents written in the period A.D., its source being obvious - πανδοκεῖον inn, which, however, is correctly formed from πανδοκεύς inn-keeper. But there is some late metrical evidence for a simple (μέλανος) δοχεῖον ink-horn, and a very late δοχεύς recipient (of oracles or inspiration). On the other hand, δοχεῖον (sic) is recorded for C' Lev. 8:8, where the LXX has λόγιον for ΨΨ, and here everybody would be inclined to spell δοχεῖον.

ὀπτάνιον. Etymology, semasiology, and analogy may more than once have led to scribal mistakes. So at first sight it is against reason that ὀπτάνιον place for roasting, kitchen should be spelled with -ιον in spite of ὀπτανεύς, and μαγειρεῖον place for cooking, kitchen with -είον while the name of the craftsman was μάγειρος, for in both instances we would expect just the reverse. Yet ὀπτάνιον, which we find only in Quinta
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Hos. 7: 4, is metrically certain (Lobeck, Phryn. pp. 276 f.), and μαγειρέων, on the other hand, is confirmed by the spelling μαγιρέων in an inscription from Delos (LS s.v.). It is safest to suppose that the erroneous teaching ‘ἄτταινον διὰ διφθόγγου’ (Etymol. Magn.) is influenced by the analogy of formations like μαγειρέων. Etymol. Magn. itself compares βαλανεῖον bathing-room which, however, looks more remote.

προστιον, suburb, is metrically certain. It is against the evidence of the majuscules (-ει- in Βab only) that Rahlfs puts -ει- in Num. 35: 2, 7 from misleading etymological considerations. Here the information given by Chantraine p. 61 and even by Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 470, was still mistaken. The right inference from the metrical evidence was drawn by Chantraine, BSL 36, Comptes Rendus p. 39, and LS s.v. The mistaken spelling προστίον is found also in the marginal scholion of min. 243 on Δεβλαθα 2 Kings 25: 20 (Field 1, 699) and again in A' Jer. 38 (31): 40 and C' Josh. 21: 2, 15.

ύδραγώγιον. See above, sub ἀποδόχιον p. 47.

ύδροδοχίον. See above, sub ἀποδόχιον p. 47.

χαλκίον is read by all editions in 1 Sam. 2: 14 and by the Cambridge editions in 1 Esdras 1: 11 (12); here Rahlfs (1: 13) reads -ειον, as did Bos in 1709, and as all do in 2 Chron. 35: 13 and Job 41: 22 (23). For copper vessel -ειον alone is possible (M.-Schw. p. 55 n. 466; Schweizer, Perg. p. 203; Mayser i 2 3, 15). A. Meineke, Vindiciarum Strabonianarum Liber, Berlin, 1852, p. 91, has seen that the spelling in -ειον is required metri causa without exception (Schweizer, loc. cit.). From Mayser numbers of words in -ιον for vessels can be collected, but the misspelling in -ειον may have arisen with some scribes in papyri of the third century B.C. onwards, who took as their model words for vessels like ἁγγείον, ὀλκείον (this wrongly -ειον in Judith 15: 11 (14) in the Cambridge editions, with ‘ολκεία AS’ in BM's first apparatus of mis-spellings, whereas Swete simply records it as a variant).

1.8.2. Names of festivals in -ια (neuter plural)

πρωτοκλήσια. This hap. leg., occurring in 2 Macc. 4: 21, has at last been satisfactorily explained by LS = ἀνακλητήρια, festival on a king's proclamation. Whereas Swete gives the correct spelling without any
comment, Rahlfs, with the earlier editions, e.g. Bos, Tischendorf, puts 
-κλίσια, attributing the spelling with -η- to A alone, as Bos also had done.
It is this spelling which, yielding no sense, but, perhaps, caused by the 
NT ή πρωτοκλίσια, led to strange proposals by H. Grotius and others.
We may compare τα πρωτογενέσια, celebration of a first birthday, in a 
papyrus from II p. Further classical examples are Ελευσίνια, Ολύμπια 
and Hellenistic γενέσια, ἕγκαινια, δζυμα (Schwyzer π, 43).

σαββατα does not belong to this group (cf. pp. 159 ff.).

1.8.3. Nouns in -είον

τα δριστεία. See sub τα πρεσβεία, p. 52.

τα δευτερεία. See sub τα πρεσβεία, p. 52.

δοκιμεῖον. The word δοκιμεῖον has long puzzled NT expositors. In one 
of his remarkable essays Deissmann (NBSΤ pp. 86 ff.) made it clear that 
neither in Jas. 1: 3 nor in 1 Pet. 1: 7 does δοκιμεῖον = test, means of 
testing make good sense. (See Additional Note below.) In Ps. 11: 7, 
moreover, he shows that the Greek passage runs much more easily if we 
understand the adjective δοκιμεῖον as an attribute to ἀργύριον real, pure, 
approved silver; yet the Hebrew original (12: 7) ₀₪ is difficult 
and causes some hesitation. The Greek translation of the whole passage 
follows the Hebrew word for word. Now one of the astonishing dis­
coveries of Flashar's ‘Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter’ 
(ZAW 32, 1912) is that whenever this translator turns to anything like 
a word-for-word reproduction of the original, the reason is either that 
he does not understand it enough even to guess at its meaning, or that 
the original is easily understood, but he wishes to deviate from it for 
religious considerations. Here ₀₪ is difficult. Some commentators 
change it into ₀₪. The LXX simply renders τῇ γῇ. ₀₪ is still more 
obscure; we have to guess its meaning from the Targumic interpretation 
melting-furnace or from its meaning in modern Hebrew, obviously. If we 
neglect ₀, for the sake of which Schleusner rather oddly suggested the 
insertion of ἐς or κατά (π, 184), δοκιμεῖον = means of testing would be 
much closer to the original. Then the words δοκιμεῖον τῇ γῇ would 
represent one of those passages which Flashar rightly recognizes as so 
many declarations of bankruptcy on the part of this meticulous trans­
lator. From this it seems to follow that we have to put δοκιμεῖον as a
noun, refraining from drawing more of a meaning from it than the translator was able to put into it. Moreover, if the adjective, in its turn, had to be spelled with -ει- as well, as LS suggests, the spelling would be the same whether we put the noun or the adjective (cf. below, p. 57).

Additional Note
Bl.-Debr. §263, 1 and Grundmann (TWNT II, 262) follow Deissmann. W. Bauer, on the other hand, retains means of test in James, accepting proved for Peter only. Still in both passages the wording is identical. So we should have to assume that the two authors understood their common source – either a written document or a cherished stock phrase – in a different way. This assumption is most unlikely; at any rate, early readers can hardly be supposed to have taken δοκιμείον to be means of testing, referring to πειρασμός v. 2.

In the same article Deissmann dealt with Prov. 27: 21 also. I can follow him in so far as he postulates the noun δοκιμείον for Prov. 27: 21.

[Deissmann spells -ιον or -ιον, as did his contemporaries. But -ειον is attested by an Attic inscription, M.-Sch. p. 51 n. 394. His translation Prüfungsmittel für Silber und Gold ist die Glut is mistaken. It overlooks the fact that the Hebrew has two brief parallel stichs without verbs which are retained in the otherwise free translation of this difficult passage: a means of testing for silver, and for gold, a proving by fire (Prov. 27: 24).]

κυλικείον, sideboard, cup-stand, is certain in 1 Macc. 15: 32 and probable in Esther 1: 7, as can be proved from Aristeas §319 f. (see Excursus III on pp. 211 ff.), so that no κυλίκιον, cup, is left in the LXX.

λαμπαδείον. This must be claimed as the correct spelling in the LXX, in which the word nowhere means small torch. In Exod. 38: 16 (37: 19) it renders γυαν, cup or calyx of a flower, here used metaphorically of the bowl for the lamps on the candelabra. The same thing is called πυτικος in Zech. 4: 2 f., where also it is translated λαμπαδείον (κρατήρ in Exod. 25: 30 (31) ff.). This bowl was filled with water as a protection against pieces of wicks from the lamps, which, when falling down, were extinguished in the water (Horst, explaining Zech. 4: 2 f.). Therefore we ought not to translate oil-vessel any more than in Eccles. 12: 6 where the LXX, keeping to the metaphor, translates άνθέμιον.85
Incidentally ἀνθέμιον (Fb M mg befgisvz La. Philo and even x at the second occurrence) was long ago restored by Grabe for the mistaken ἄνθέμιον in Exod. 38: 16 (37: 19) bis. οἱ μαμπαζίας 1 Kings 7: 35 (49) stands for πὴν sing. blossom, correctly representing the bowls for the lamps on the candlestick. Correctly and purposely: for in v. 12 (26) of the same chapter the translator renders ἐφ πῃ by βλαστός κρίνου.

μαγειρεῖον. See sub ὅπτανιον, p. 47.

μέλανθεῖον, black cummin. This spelling should be adopted in Isa. 28: 27 bis. The entire MS tradition certainly gives -ιον everywhere, but it is refuted by the unanimous testimony of Ptolemaic papyri (‘stehende Form der Papyri’, Maysr r² 3, 15), including a gen. -έου, and by the fact that the penult. is long in Nicander’s Theriaka 43. The etymology points in the same direction, since the word is derived from ἄνθος (adj. μελάνθης) by a haplology μελάνθειον (-ανθειο-yov). LS, while giving all the evidence, still keeps to the mistaken heading μελάνθιον. Its next article, ‘Ἀνθεῖον, τό, in Orphic phraseology, spring, Orph. Fr. 33’, gives rise to similar doubts.

μέλανοδοχεῖον. Doubtful form; see sub ἀποδόχιον, p. 47.

δόλκειον. See sub χαλκίον, p. 48.

πολυανδρεῖον, common burial-place, must be spelled with -ει-, as M.-Schw. 3 p. 52 proved from CIA II 471, 22 (found a second time in line 69 there), cf. also IG 2, 1035.33 (86a). All our Greek editions, however, give -ιον as a proparoxytone, even when the correct spelling is found in the best MSS, as in Josephus, BJ v, 19, where Niese’s apparatus has πολυάνδρειον (sic), as does the editor of IG 2². 39

πορείον. Found twice in the LXX, yet never, I think, in the emended text. In Esther 8: 14 it belongs to an addition due to Origen; in Gen. 45: 17 it is in our texts, but here the evidence of ChB 962 (IIIp) is in favour of the rarer word φορεῖον which is also in minn. 19 75 135, and to which also φορτία in the secondary Lucianic tradition, called l’ by Rahlfs, Gen., seems to refer. Here φορεῖον means beast of burden (plur.); in 2 Macc. 3: 27 litter. Both words must be spelled with -ει-, as in Gen. 45: 17, where DF rightly spell πορεία. 40
We take next a distinct group denoting rank, distinction, privilege, or prerogative. Some expressions are used in the sing. -ειον, but the plural in -εια is more frequent. They appear along with verbs in -ευειν. There are τα πρεσβεία right of the eldest, his share of the inheritance, together with η πρεσβεία, seniority, right of the elder; τα πρωτεία first prize, place, δευτερεία, τριτεία (cf. p. 57); τα άριστεία meed of valour, prize of victory, trophy.

A further example is Hellenistic and in most of its formations not earlier than the LXX, or even confined to it. There are two distinctive lines: (1) activai πρωτότοκος from Homer onward, with passival πρωτόγονος, passival πρωτότοκος not earlier than the LXX, replacing πρωτόγονος, the verb πρωτοτοκεϊν bear one's first-born, only in LXX, 1 Sam. 6: 7, 10; Jer. 4: 31.

(2) τα πρωτοτοκεία right of primogeniture, the first-born's birthright (= τα πρεσβεία) Gen. 25: 31-4; 27: 36; Deut. 21: 17; 1 Chron. 5: 1; Heb. 12: 16; Philo, alleg. ii, 47, iii, 190; sacr. 120; sobr. 25 (in sacr. following πρεσβεία (119) as a stylistic variation), everywhere with the itacistic mistake -τόκια in the editions, though not in all MSS. In its place Aquila uses η πρωτοτοκεία, which is peculiar to him. He may have preferred it as a closer reproduction of the Hebrew fem. sing. נֹקֶבֶת, and may well have fashioned it after η πρεσβεία. It is ascribed to him in Gen. 25: 34 and may be his alone in Deut. 21: 17, where Syr. mentions the Three, in Gen. 43: 33, where Fb has it sine nomine and j (= 57) in the text itself and in 1 Chron. 5: 1 πρωτοτοκεία -τοκιαν Nbg.

The spelling πρωτοτοκεία, though needing no justification, is put beyond doubt by the occurrence of the verb πρωτοτοκεύειν in two passages. Both passages render a Hebrew idiom in a rather un-Greek way, though, of course, the choice of -ευειν along with -ειον is in itself quite normal. In Deut. 21: 16 the Piel יְבֵשׁ, treat some one as though he were the first-born, a declarative rather than a causative, is rendered πρωτοτοκεύειν. No Greek without access to the Hebrew could ever have understood the true meaning intended. Neither πρωτεύειν nor άριστεύειν nor πρεσβεύειν was ever used to express a causative. The over-elaborated wording of Lev. 27: 26, יִלֶשֶׁת רְשָׁפֶה, the first-born which is born as such to the Lord, is duly simplified by the LXX, πρωτότοκον δ εάν γάνηται...τῷ κυρίῳ, but C' O insert a second πρωτότοκον before γάνηται. Aquila goes further: πλήν πρωτότοκον πρωτοτοκεύθεσται. In this he seems to miss the meaning of the Hebrew, a rare thing with
him. πρωτοτοκηθήσεται would have been more appropriate, but this verb is not in his vocabulary, so far as we know. We have seen that it, too, is confined to two Septuagintal passages.

πρεσβείον/πρεσβυτερ(ε)ιον. In Susanna 50 (Θ'-text) there is an interesting textual variant – πρεσβείον B88410 πρεσβυτερ(ε)ιον rel. (Bas.) – the discussion of which has become involved in the recent controversy about 1 Tim. 4: 14. In the Timothy passage D. Daube, ΖΝΘ 48, 1957, pp. 119-26 understands μετά επιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου (gen. finalis) as investiture with the office of a church elder, and J. Jeremias, in an addition to this article (pp. 127 f.) adduces as a parallel the phrase from Susanna 50 (Θ'-text) σὺ δέδωκεν ο θεός τὸ πρεσβυτέριον. G. Bornkamm, TWNT vi, 666 n. 92, commenting on the Timothy passage, objects that elsewhere in the Pastorals πρεσβυτέριον stands for the body of elders. For Susanna, on the other hand, he accepts dignity of an elder as the meaning required by the context, though he mentions the reading of B88410, πρεσβείον. The editions of Susanna read πρεσβείον and not πρεσβυτέριον, and they are right, as can be amply proved by three strands of evidence.

First, context. The elders merely ask Daniel to take his seat among them and to instruct them, όναγγειλον ήμΐν, for to him God has given the privilege of age (πρεσβείον), however young he may be. In so doing they do not co-opt him to the office of elder (πρεσβυτέριον). Officialdom, realizing its inability, invites the charismatic for this one occasion only.

Next, grammar. As we have seen, distinction is expressed by the suffix -είον; and the actual spelling in Susanna is πρεσβυτερείον. The form πρεσβυτερείον, of course, is impossible; though in a similar passage, Gen. 43: 33, which describes the seating of Joseph’s brethren at his table, ὁ πρωτότοκος κατὰ τὰ πρεσβεία αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ νεώτερος κατὰ τὴν νεότητα αὐτοῦ, the form πρεσβυτερεία (instead of πρεσβεία) occurs again in the early Pap. 962 (ΙΠρ). Now a noun in -είον would be as impossible in a derivation from a comparative as would a verb in -εύω. (We have πρεσβεύω, but, of course, no *πρεσβυτερεύω. We have ἐλαττῶ and biblical ἐλασσόνω, but a κρεισσονεύω to be better is of dubious authority, as it is found only in a quotation from the lost pseudo-Herodianic Επιμερισμοί 69 (LS); the ancient lexica have κρεισσόω.) We must, therefore, regard πρεσβυτερείον as a mistake for πρεσβείον. Similarly in Susanna the existence side by side of πρεσβυτεροί and πρεσβυται is best explained with Ziegler (xvi 2, 65) as due to
the habit of contractive spelling. Additional proof comes from Susanna 24, where min. 88 reads πρεσβυτοι which is πρεσβύτεροι.

Thirdly, there is the date of the text. Here in Susanna 50B, supported by two Lucianics, is a pre-Theodotionic, Jewish text, whereas the bulk of the MSS is Christian, and their variant so much later than the NT that it cannot be invoked as a 'pre-Christian' precedent in support of Timothy. It is neither 'non-Christian' ('außerchristlich', Jeremias) nor 'pre-Christian' ('in vorchristlicher Literatur', G. Bornkamm), but a graphical corruption, perhaps anticipating Jeremias' misinterpretation of the Timothy passage. [This article πρεσβεϊον/πρεσβυτερ(ε)ιον appears in two variant forms in Walters' MS. I have given as fair a précis of both as I could. For a much fuller and more cogent account of the matter see Walters' own article, 'πρεσβυτεριον in 1 Tim. 4: 14 and Susanna 50', ZNW 51, 1959, pp. 27–30 - Ed.]

σκαφείον. This is the correct spelling in C' 1 Sam. 13: 20 (-ειον z, -ίον m).

σφαγείον. There are no occurrences of σφαγείον in the LXX, but many of σφάγιον.

τα τριτεία. See sub τα πρεσβεία, p. 52.

φορείον. See sub πορείον, p. 51.

φυγαδείον. See sub φυγαδεϊαι, p. 43.

1.8.4. Temple-names

Here we cannot simply restore the Attic forms, as a development can be observed. For temple-names (and, in plural, for names of festivals as well) originally the suffix -ιον was used: Debrunner, Wb. p. 289, gives four examples, 'Απόλλων-Απολλώνιον, Νύμφη-Νυμφαϊον, Ἀρτεμις-Ἀρτεμίσιον, θησεύς-θησεϊον. But this simple scheme is sometimes already relinquished in the classical period, -ειον or -ιον expanding at one another's expense. Μουσεϊον as seat of the muses (place-name) is correct, as temple it is an extension of the original scheme. But, in line with θησείον, 'Ηράκλειον, we read 'Ἀνάκειον temple of the 'Ανάκεια or Dioscuri, along with -ιον (M.-Schw. p. 53 n. 437) (so that 'Ἀνάκεια for their festival must not be corrected in Lysias), and Ἁλώντεια (M.-Schw. p. 50
n. 364) (missing in LS) in Attic inscriptions, in spite of Pindar's -ια. We read Πανδρόσειον from Πᾶνδρος (M.-Schw. p. 52 n. 409) and, on the other hand, Προμήθεια (M.-Schw. p. 55 n. 457) which, however, does not necessitate a change of the forms in -εια in Lysias and Xenophon any more than the discarding of one of the alternatives Κρόνειον-Κρόνιον from Κρόνος (the accentuation in Mayser i⁵ 3, 15 and LS must be corrected).

If we turn to the Ptolemaic papyri, another type has emerged and become dominant, for almost all the temple-names enumerated in Mayser 1, 92 end in -ιείον. Where the god’s name ends in -ι, this is correct ('Ασκληπιείον), as it is in the case of most of the Egyptian names quoted there; but we also read 'Αμμωνειόν from 'Αμμων (Amon) and, a Greek example again, 'Ηφαιστείον, where the -ι- has no justification. On the other hand we should expect -είον in Βούβαστείον, the goddess being called Βούβαστις, -ιος in Herodotus (Bastet of Βούβαστις or Βούβαστος). The reason, however, is obvious, -είον and -είον being merely graphically different ways of expressing an identical termination, the i-vowels of which had coalesced into one monophthong at a very early date.

How distinctly the longer termination has come to be looked on as the proper and ruling one is seen from 'Απολλώνειον (II⁵) which, perhaps, was also in the mind of Diodorus, 14, 16, where we read -ωνείον (LS; cf. also 'Απολλώνεια Πύθια Ephesus (ΠΙ*)).

Another temple-name which is recorded by Mayser is of immediate consequence for the LXX: 'Αστάρτείον from 158 and 'Ασταρτείον from 158 which latter, however, he suspects of being rather doubtful, as it is read only by Angelo Mai; also, two formations, which both date from the same year 158, 'Ασταρτιδείον and 'Ασταρτιδήνον (-ηνόν)⁴⁸ (all missing in LS). This insertion of a -δ- element is not unique; thus a Spartan inscription exhibits 'Ασκληπιίεια (the accent taken from LS) for the usual 'Ασκληπιεία.

The temple of Astarte is once mentioned in the OT, τιτίας νησιου ('rectius τιτιας BH⁵) and here, 1 Sam. 31: 10, Ασταρτιον, as given by A and the Aldine, is certainly wrong. What are we to put in its place?

The name of the goddess did not originally end in -i; this would point to 'Ασταρτείον. But, considering the Egyptian and Arabic parallels, recorded in G.-Buhl¹⁶ p. 627, which both end in -i, and, connecting with this the preference shown in Mayser’s list for forms in -είον, including evidence for our word in Egypt where our text was translated, I would suggest 'Ασταρτείον. In a similar formation the
termination in -ι is amply testified (Baudissin, RE 3, 171 ff.), so we should read Ἀτεργατείον in 2 Macc. 12: 26.

As in 1 Cor. 8: 10, we must spell εἴδωλείον in 1 Esdras 2: 9 (10) = 2: 7 Rahlfs (ἐν τῷ εἴσοδῷ εἴδωλείῳ = 2 Esdras 1: 7 ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ σῶτοῦ), Dan. LXX 1: 2 (ἐν τῷ εἴδωλείῳ σῶτοῦ = 2 Esdras 1: 7 ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ σῶτοῦ), Bel LXX 10 (εἰς τὸ εἴδωλείον = Θ' εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Βηλ), 1 Macc. 1: 47 (εἴδωλεία SV), 10: 83 (εἰς βῆθι Δαγων τὸ εἴδωλείον σῶτοῦ = 84 τὸ ἱερὸν Δαγων). In 1 Sam. 31: 10, which was dealt with above, the margin of cod. b (108) gives εἴδωλείον, spelled thus, as do some minuscules in Dan. LXX 1: 2 and Bel LXX 10. Likewise we must spell ἐκ τοῦ Βηλείου in Bel LXX 22, where Θ' in a different translation says τὸ ἱερὸν σῶτοῦ at the end of the verse.

If we may sum up, from the point of view of the different strata of the LXX translation, 1 Sam., 1 Esdras, Daniel (and Bel) LXX all alike represent a more primitive type of translation, employing terms of contemporary Greek, when forming temple-names; whereas 2 Esdras and Theodotion – which I do not otherwise identify – slavishly follow the Hebrew which itself has no temple-names. I think σαββατείον, house in which the Sabbath service was held, perhaps a synagogue (LS), Decr. ap. Jos., AJ xvi, 164, is in line with our first stratum.

In 2 Macc. we observe a variation of expression, using both kinds mentioned above: 1: 13 ἐν τῷ τῆς Ναναίας ἱερῷ, τῶν περὶ τήν Ναναίαν ἱερεῶν and v. 15 τῶν ἱερεῶν τοῦ Ναναίου. Here Grimm was obviously right in spelling Ναναίου for the temple of Ναναία.

1.9. Terminations: adjectives

There is no sharp dividing line between nouns and adjectives, and both in the names of festivals and temples a neuter noun is understood (ἱερά pl. for names of festivals, and ἱερόν for temple-names).

1.9.1. Adjectives in -ιός

πελιός. In Prov. 23: 29 Rahlfs puts πελεῖοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ noting ἐν τοῖς ἱερεῖοι. Swete gives πελεῖοι following S* (‘πελεῖοι B* vid. A’). πελιός is correct, other formations being πελιδνός and the specifically Attic πελίνυς. The word means livid, and Chantraine observes that adjectives denoting colours form a group ending in -ιός (p. 123). It is true, there is a connection between the names for pigeons and the colour grey in many Indo-European languages (W. Schulze,
1.9.2. Adjectives in -ειος

In 1 Esdras 1: 29 we read τὸ ἄρμα τὸ δευτέριον. Yet δευτεριος is nothing but an itacism for δευτερεῖος of second quality, formed like πρωτεῖος, which in the OT literature is found in Symmachus only. Along with πρωτειων, δευτερειων, etc., we have this formation, together with a plur neut. first, etc., prize. So the whole article δευτεριος in LS consists of mis-spellings for -ειος. Even A' Deut. 28: 57 τὸ δευτερεῖον afterbirth = πτηψ (hap. leg.) cannot be analysed when spelled with -1.47

δοκιμεῖος. Belongs to the same class as καθαρεῖος and μεγαλεῖος below, q.v.; Chantraine’s instructive comment is worth quoting:

Dans quelques dérivés d'adjectifs le dérivé en -ειος semble constituer un doublet expressif de l'adjectif dont il est tiré: καθαρεῖος pur, élégant (Aristote, Ménandre) et καθαρεῖος (Xénophon) à côté de καθαρός peuvent être mis en rapport avec καθαρεύω; mais μεγαλεῖος magnifique (Xénophon) ne peut être rapproché que de μεγάλη etc.; la valeur expressive du mot est restée en moderne: μεγαλεῖος épatant (p. 53).

δοκιμεῖος (correctly spelled in LS but without any comment such as Chantraine gives) expresses a higher degree of excellency than δόκιμος. I prefer Chantraine’s explanation to the one which Howard attempts, Moulton n, 336. For Ps. 11: 7 I refer to pp. 49 f. above.

ἐφέτειον. ἐφετειον (wrongly so spelled), Deut. 15: 18, mistakes πᾶσιν doubling as from πᾶσιν year. This spelling, quoted by Thackeray (p. 125) among his examples of irrational aspiration, is adopted by all our editions. It is, in fact, found in the majority of our majuscules, BAFMN, and in 15 of the minuscules used in BM. Only two hexaplaric MSS, ax, have ἐπετειον, which is the usual form, avoiding both the irrational, yet not unusual, aspiration and the itacistic -ι-.
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never form an adjective in -ιος; the correct spelling is ἐφέτειον. ἐφετείου must also be restored in Sir. 37: 11 (Hebrew ΝΨ), where it is distorted in different ways, αφετείου B, εφετείου S*, the others reading ἐπετ(ε)ίου (Smend p. 331). These two examples should be added to the two, from an inscription and a papyrus, in LS.

καθαρείος. (See also sub δοκιμείος, above.) Metrically certain (Menander, Phasma Fragm. 2; cf. also Crönert, MGH p. 34). In the LXX we find only καθαριότης in which -ει- must be restored in Exod. 24: 10, in 2 Sam. 22 ( = Ps. 17 (18)) : 21, 25 (in 2 Sam. B twice has -ει- without impressing the editors), and in Sir. 43: 1. In Wisd. of Sol. 7: 24 καθαριστής of S is corrupt and rightly neglected for the common reading καθαρότητα, which refers back to καθαρόν in v. 23. Likewise we ought to read ἐκαθαρεῖοδησάν Lam. 4: 7.

μεγαλείος (See also sub δοκιμείος above,) μεγαλείος is always spelled correctly with -ει- in our editions, including Swete’s, though in Ps. 70 (71): 19 B* has -ι-. In our texts the word appears mainly as a substantive τα μεγαλεία the mighty works of God. In Sirach there are some examples of a singular τὸ μεγαλείον majesty, sublimity, but in 17: 8 Smend is right in putting the plural as in v. 9 (10) with 157 La. Syr. Strictly as an adjective it is used only in 2 Macc. τὸ μεγαλείον κράτος of God (3: 34; 7: 17). μεγαλειότης is also spelled correctly throughout, -ι- being found only in A 1 Esdras 1: 4; 4: 40.

2. Other itacistic spellings

2.1. Interchange of αι and ε

Though there are sporadic examples, mostly in papyri, of a pre-Christian transition of αι into a monophthongal open ε-sound, we have to reckon with it as a frequent feature only from the beginning of the second century A.D. onward. So in the LXX this confusion is due to Christian copyists. They were completely at a loss, especially when faced with transliterated Hebrew proper names. These last-named corruptions in fact require a chapter on their own. Here I propose to deal with nominal stems, nominal suffixes, and verb-endings.
2.1.1. Nominal stems

γέαι. The spelling of the plural forms of γη in the LXX has been put in order by Wackernagel (ThLZ, 1908, pp. 36, 38, 638) who observed that γω- is nothing but a graphical distortion of γε-, and that γέαι is a formation belonging to a stratum of LXX Greek earlier than that of the Ptolemaic papyri as a whole. In 2 Kings 18: 35; 19: 11 he restores the formations in γε-, for which there is good evidence in 18: 35—apart from the occurrence of γεών in the same verse—and overwhelming evidence in 19: 11 where only B*U read γοῖς. Neither Helbing nor Thackeray in their LXX grammars saw the point, but in 1926 LS adopted Wackernagel’s view. Wackernagel is also right in briefly discarding the contradictory evidence of the fifth-century Strassburg parchment leaflet Δ in Gen. 26: 3, 4, for it is as secondary here as it is in the whole of the five fragmentary verses which it contains. See Excursus IV, p. 213.

ἐλαίον—ἐλεος. These two words were confused in both directions (Thackeray p. 78; Rahlfs, Psalmi, annotation to Ps. 88 (89): 21). This happened even in cases where the dissimilar endings might have been expected to prevent confusion, and the confusion sometimes involved further textual changes (Rahlfs, S-ΣΤΙ, 200 ff.). There is, therefore, much to be said for Flashar’s conjecture ἐλαίον καὶ βοήθειαν for ἑλεος καὶ ἀλήθειαν Ps. 83: 12. He shows from parallels in Psalms that this translator avoided divine predications like ἥπι πασί. Dogmatical embarrassment caused his substitution of ἰψι for ἰψί (so already Agellius) because he took ἰψί = sun, and now needed a verb (ἐγατι). As support for his suggested reading βοήθειαν, Flashar gives five examples of βοηθός = ἰκρι rock from the Psalms, and one where βοηθεία stands for the same πρός, which in all is paraphrased by six different words in Psalms. ἀλήθειαν, he states, looks like a secondary change. After ἐλαίον had become ἑλεος, the frequent parallels with ἑλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια exercised their influence (ΖAW 32, 1912, pp. 242–4). Flashar bases his suggestion on the fact that ὑ ἑλεος is everywhere secondary in the Psalms (compare the note to Ps. 5: 8 in Rahlfs’ Psalmi).

ἐταῖρος—ἐτερος. When θ became an e-sound and the quantity of vowels fell into neglect, these words became homonyms and were frequently confused. As their meanings do not overlap and we have the Hebrew to check its translation, most instances are easily settled. Careful
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Tabulation however does disclose more puzzling aspects than would be expected at first sight (see Excursus V, p. 214).

2.1.2. Nominal suffixes

**Κιτεΐς.** In his review of Mayser i, Wackernagel emends the spelling of the name of the Cypriotes (ThLZ, 1908, p. 36). The nominative Κιτεΐς Isa. 23: 12 calls for the restitution of the gen. -έων in Isa. 23: 1 and Num. 24: 24, where the spelling -αίων, far from indicating the existence of a formation in -αϊοι, is a mere itacism. In 1 Macc. 8: 5 Rahlfs has Κιτέων with S; but his note referring to Num. 24: 24; Isa. 23: 1, where he spells -αίων, simply indicates without comment the change in his approach to some matters of itacism which we have often observed.

**σημέα, ensign and φορβεά, halter** can be dealt with together, in spite of their difference in accentuation. They are formed in -εια, the -ι- of which would be dropped after having become a half-consonant γ. So we can accept both the formations in -εια (ειδι) and -εα (εδα), but there is no room for a formation in -αια, which is nothing but an itacistic distortion of -εα. I prefer this explanation to the one offered by Mayser i, 107; i 3, 11, and, following him, Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 470 n. 6.

As to σημέα (cf. also E. Schwartz, Einleitung zu Eusebs Kirchengeschichte, Die griech. christl. Schriftsteller, Eusebius, II 3, cxxii) the Cambridge editions in Num. 2: 2 give σημέας (σημειον B*, σημειον B* F, σημειον B* A'), Rahlfs σημειον, in Isa. 30: 17 Swete, Rahlfs, and Ziegler σημειον (Bos σηματιον!). Here the evidence (σημειον B* (-μαιων B*) SA' Swete) is unanimous in offering the correct spelling. By refusing it, our editors disclose their traditional allegiance to the correctors of B, the sway of which is unbroken even where it is officially denounced. Of course, we must put -εα in both instances; -εια would also be correct, yet it is not supported equally strongly by the combined evidence. Here Swete follows Hort’s method, following B* in the first passage with the slightest possible correction, and in the second against all the available majuscule evidence giving undeserved preference to the reading of B* ab, as though it were the legitimate outcome of our primary evidence.

**φορβεά, in** the only passage, Job 40: 20 (25), has the correct form in Swete and Rahlfs, and Swete’s note ‘φορβεαν BSAC’ may be a
protest against the traditional spelling φορβαίαν (Sixtine, Grabe, HR). Thackeray (p. 82) and Mayser (i 2, 3, 11) also put the wrong accent.\(^{53}\)

2.1.3. Verb-endings

There is no need to list the very frequent instances of interchange of -τε and -ται, -ε (imp. pres. act.) and -αι (imp. aor. med.) or -σθε and -σθαι, for in most of them no editor is likely to be misled. But there are exceptions, handed on from one editor to the next, none taking a warning from the Hebrew, whose verdict would have settled the dispute. I mention a few instances.

**Exod. 12: 4.** All our editions (including that of Grabe, who was the only editor before Rahlfs normally to consider the Hebrew carefully and to emend the Greek, where the difference between them was bound to be due to corruption in the Greek) read συναριθμήσεται instead of -τε, which is in min. 76 only (p. 105 below).

**Lev. 18: 4.** τα προστάγματά μου φυλάξεσθαι πορεύεσθαι εν αυτοίς. In contexts like this where imperatives in -σθε occur side by side with infinitives in -σθαι, there was an increased danger of itacistic misspellings arising from inadvertence or mistaken interpretation, once the Hebrew was out of sight. On this passage and its reflection in the evidence of Philo, *congr. 86*, see my book, *Philo’s Bible* p. 38.

**Lev. 23: 30.** See note 55.

**Deut. 5: 33; 6: 2.** In these two passages, to which Z. Frankel drew attention (*Vorstud.* p. 70, n.s.), as also in Deut. 7: 24 (see below), vacillation between the singular and the plural of the second person is a possible source of disturbance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut. 5: 33</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מִּצְבַּחְיָה</td>
<td>κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν ὀδὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָנֵּה הֶנְחֹת</td>
<td>ἣν ἑνετειλάτο σοι κύριος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָלָחְכֶּם</td>
<td>ὁ θεὸς σοῦ (^{b})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) σοι has three different positions and is omitted in bckw.

b) σοῦ ἡμῶν (for ὑμῶν = MT) 963 b Arm.

\(^{61}\)
Deut. 7: 24; 12: 3. Grabe and Bos give the correct reading, which is missed by the modern editions. In both passages it is a question of divine injunctions given to the people of Israel, telling them how to deal with the tribes overthrown in their campaign of conquest. As frequently in Deuteronomy, singular and plural forms of the second person vary in the MT and the LXX, and not always in an identical way. In 7: 24 the singular is in the MT, and the plural in the LXX, in 12:3 both texts have the plural. So both passages present an identical aspect in the Greek. In 7: 24 the context is, he shall deliver their kings into thine hands, and thou (self, as rightly interpreted by Steuernagel) shalt destroy their name from under heaven. In Ch. 12 there is a long list of God's statutes and judgements to be observed during the conquest, the first being Ye shall utterly destroy (_uartynb) all the places (v. 2) and the sixth ye shall destroy ( uartynb) the names of them out of that place. 12: 2 reads ἄπολείπασιν ἀπολέιτε πάντως τοὺς τόπους without variants, but in the identical passages 7: 24; 12: 3 the majority of witnesses, including all majuscules and Eth. La. (peribit) in 7: 24, but excluding 963 AG La. (+pe(r)des or pe(r)de(ti)s) in 12: 3, read ἀπολείται τὸ δνομα αὐτῶν.

A further source of disturbance is the influence of 6: 1 ἐνετείλατο κυρίῳ τὸ δε...διδαξει υἱός ποιεῖν οὕτως (= MT). Accordingly in 5: 33 we must restore πορεύεσθαι (= MT) and, besides, κατατάσσωσι.

In Deut. 6: 2 a mistaken φυλάσσεσθαι is found in 963 and the majority of our evidence, including BAF, but not in the translations Arm. Bo. Sah. La., which have observare. Here we must restore φυλάσσεσθαι = ἐστὶν with MN as do Grabe (against A, but without any indication of this fact), Tdf and Rahlfs.

Deut. 7: 24; 12: 3. Grabe and Bos give the correct reading, which is missed by the modern editions. In both passages it is a question of divine injunctions given to the people of Israel, telling them how to deal with the tribes overthrown in their campaign of conquest. As frequently in Deuteronomy, singular and plural forms of the second person vary in the MT and the LXX, and not always in an identical way. In 7: 24 the singular is in the MT, and the plural in the LXX, in 12: 3 both texts have the plural. So both passages present an identical aspect in the Greek. In 7: 24 the context is, he shall deliver their kings into thine hands, and thou (self, as rightly interpreted by Steuernagel) shall destroy (פָּרֶשֶׂה) their name from under heaven. In Ch. 12 there is a long list of God's statutes and judgements to be observed during the conquest, the first being Ye shall utterly destroy (נָשָׁם רָעָה) all the places (v. 2) and the sixth ye shall destroy (נָשָׁם) the names of them out of that place. 12: 2 reads ἀπολείπασιν ἀπολέιτε πάντως τοὺς τόπους without variants, but in the identical passages 7: 24; 12: 3 the majority of witnesses, including all majuscules and Eth. La. (peribit) in 7: 24, but excluding 963 AG La. (+pe(r)des or pe(r)de(ti)s) in 12: 3, read ἀπολείται τὸ δνομα αὐτῶν.
The reason for this corruption is obvious. There was a temptation to make the neuter τὸ δόμα the subject of the clause.65


Esther 4: 8; 8: 5. See p. 289 n. 55.

Ps. 126 (127): 2. The confusion of -σθε and -σθαι move in a different sphere of syntax. Sometimes it is not easy to tell whether they represent real variants or accidental mis-spellings, especially where the Greek is a mistranslation. So in Ps. 126 (127): 2, the LXX fails to connect ἔφρασεν and μή, and moreover by haplography reads the following ἀνάπλασις as ἄν. The resulting translation (καὶ μᾶτην ὑμῖν ἔστιν τοῦ ἐφρασεν, ἔγειρεσθαί μετὰ το καθήσαται, οἱ ἐσθοντες) is most unsatisfactory, and therefore it is not easy to decide between ἔγειρεσθαί and ἔγειρεσθε, especially as the witnesses for these variants come from each of the several recensions. Even if this were partly due to itacistic spelling, which may have arisen independently in the different groups of MSS, we would still have to ask which spelling was the original. ἔγειρεσθε is the majority spelling, as it is found in members of all three of the ancient groups of MSS, namely in Bo. (lower Egyptian group), Sa. (upper Egyptian group), La. = La. T La. G Vulg. (Western); ἔγειρεσθαί (= ἔφρασε) in two only, namely in S (lower Eg.), Ga (Western); the testimony of the Lucianic κοινή text is divided as well, only a minority, including A, reading -σθαί. There is a gap in B (10527–13728); therefore Swete followed A, as did Grabe and Rahlfś, whereas the Sixtine and its followers have -σθε. Was ἔγειρεσθε meant to represent θησκεῖ for οὴσκεῖ, or was it introduced later, because it seemed to offer the imperative required by the following οἱ ἐσθοντες? Either was possible, once the original translator failed to grasp the preceding participles in the Hebrew and thus gave an isolated οἱ ἐσθοντες.

Mic. 1: 16. ξύρησαι καὶ καίρας, make thee bald and poll thee. Nobody will be deceived by καίρε which is read by A. So in Jer. 7: 29 Nestle–Dahse and Rahlfś are right in writing καίραι τὴν κεφαλὴν σου against the καίρε of BS* (compare Job 1: 20 ἐκεῖρατο τὴν κομήν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ), as Nestle–Dahse and before them Ludwig Köhler (ΞΑΨ 29, 1909, p. 13: ‘B hat einen ganz simplen Schreibfehler überliefert’) are in preferring the middle form ἀπόπλυναι to the active -νε of BS* in 4: 14 (compare 2: 22 where Nestle–Dahse and Rahlfś rightly put ἐσν

63
GRAMMATICAL CORRUPTIONS

апоплύη ἐν νίτρω against the active ἡς of B*S* 41 106). For the LXX correctly uses the active voice only when the object of the action is not identical with its subject (Ezek. 16: 9 ἔλουσα...καὶ ἀπέπλυνα... ἔχρισα...).

Moreover, there is a passage in which the application of this well-known grammatical rule confirms the shrewd detection of a doublet by Wellhausen, although it goes against his cancellation of its second half, 2 Sam. 19: 24 (25). The doublet for he had not dressed his feet is καὶ οὐκ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ὄνυχίσατο, the latter half being made more complete and so more conformable to the first half by the addition of τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ in Lucian and of (nec unguis dempsit) de pedibus suis in the margin of cod. Leg., which on the whole is Lucianic (Vercellone ii, 409*). Wellhausen and Nowack take the second alternative to be the LXX proper; but Driver silently refrains from following them. The matter can be decided from the syntactical point of view. Our passage belongs to the later portions of Samuel–Kings, the ‘literal or unintelligent versions’ (Thackeray pp. 10, 13). Contrary to the proper LXX usage shown above, throughout the verse all reflexive activities are given the active voice, ὄνυχισατο being the only exception (οὐδὲ ὄνυχισατο, however, is under -r- according to Field, ‘Codd. Reg., 243’); but a glance at BM’s apparatus shows that ἐθεράπευσεν and ἐποίησεν were transformed to the middle voice by certain classes of MSS, their originators taking offence at this barbarism. So here ἐθεράπευσεν is genuine and ὄνυχισατο secondary. In contrast with such abuse, the passages from Micah and Jeremiah show merely scribal, itacistic, errors and are no more a confusion of voices than is σύνπεσαι for σύνπεσε in a second-century papyrus where, as Mayser points out (12 2, 138, 144), the context does not admit a middle form.

2.2. η > ι

ἀττάκης. In an enumeration of the different kinds of locusts (Lev. 11: 22) we find τὸν αττάκην with some variants. F1 Mms minn. La.rw read τὸν ἀττακον just as αττακος Aristeas §145 and αττακοι Philo, alleg. ii, 105 m (72), while changing over the word with τὴν ἀκρίδα reads τὸν ἀττακιν, and M has the anonymous hexaplaric quotation ἀττακίδα which, possibly wrongly, is attached to ὀφιμάχην.

ἄττακος as quoted by LS is found nowhere. Since it is quoted as a variant reading (‘Al.’) of Lev. 11: 22 it must refer to αττακίδα Mms (‘Ἀλλος’ Field) and therefore read ἄττακος, a formation missing in LS.
As in the instances enumerated earlier αττάκις may derive from an accusative αττακιν, and this in its turn may be an itacistic mistake for acc. αττάκην. But the existence of αττακιδα precludes a clear decision, for there remains the accent: αττακιν cannot be oxytone, while αττακιδα forms part of the inflexion of an oxytone word in -is. Uncertainty about the accent marks all the formations mentioned. There is unanimity about αττάκης only. άττακος is printed as an oxytone in Aristeas and Philo (alleg. ii, 105, cod. M άττακος, A άττακος), yet as a proparoxytone in LS. As to the formations in -is there is a slight possibility of getting rid of αττακιδα. Since this marginal note is misplaced within a context which includes ακρίδα, and ακρίδα is changed over with αττακιν (sic) in min. m, the ending -ίδα may have come in from the vicinity.

Moreover αττακοι is most certainly corrupt in Aristeas. His §145 is obviously not based on Lev. 11: 22. (1) The Bible enumerates four species of locusts; Aristeas’ περιστέρα τρυγάνε* ‘άττακοι’ πέρδικες, ἄττακος καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὄσσα τοιαύτα gives a list of those birds which it was permitted to eat, and continues to speak more fully about those forbidden. The Bible nowhere enumerates the birds permitted, but only mentions them in general, and this not in Lev. 11, but only in Deut. 14: 11, 20 of all clean birds (v. 20 fowls) ye shall (v. 20 may) eat. (2) The particulars feeding on wheat and pulse suit birds rather than locusts. (3) αττακοι are in the right place in Leviticus, but not among the birds of Aristeas. (4) Wendland has αττακοι in his text, but Hühner in his translation. But this is a translation of ἄτταγαι moorfowls, francolins, the reading found in Eusebius’ Praep. Ev. It is mentioned as an alternative in Thackeray’s and Meecham’s translations. (5) ατταγαί must be received into the text, which thus ceases to be an allusion to Lev. 11: 22. Here also there remains a difficulty in accentuation as can be seen from Lobeck’s very full note in Phryn. pp. 117 f.

Are the Atticists right in confining bird names in -ας and their circumflex (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. 1, 461) to Attic? Do they merely contest Hellenistic ἄτταγην, or do they imply a different accent of ἄτταγας in the later period? Can we rely on the accents, especially for plural forms, as found in MSS of later writers, either oxytone or paroxytone? LS and our grammars give no guidance here.

θημωνιά, heap. Conveys the same meaning as θημών. It is collective like ιονιά violarium and κρινωνιά (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. 1, 469) and derives from τὶ-θη-μι. It must therefore be spelled with an η. We find it so, but
wrongly accented as a paroxytone, in the old editions, e.g. Bos and Grabe. As the proper spelling is found in the majuscules in C Sir. 39: 17 (22) and V* 1 Macc. 11: 4 only, it has automatically disappeared from our modern editions (cf. p. 4). Consequently even Rahlfs overlooked Grabe’s correct spelling. This oversight may be excused on account of the rarity of the word: apart from Eustathius (XII p) and Hesychius, it is found in only seven passages of the LXX and two of hexaplaric translations. In the Song of Moses, Exod. 15: 8, Fb? gives an anonymous marginal alternative for ἡρπῃ LXX διεστη, viz. θημωνιάσθη from θημωνιάζειν which is missing in LS.

ρητίνη, the balsamic resin of the mastix or terebinth, Lat. resina. In our MSS it sometimes changes its first -η- into an itacistic -i-. Rahlfs’ restoration of ρη- in his 1926 edition of Genesis has been confirmed by papyrus evidence: ChB 962 (III p) supports D in 43: 11 and 961 (IV p) supports D11 in 37: 25 (Rahlfs, Genesis, Proll. p. 38), where Swete had to put ρη-. In the three remaining passages, Jer. 8: 22; 26 (46): 11; Ezek. 27: 17, B provided Swete with the correct spelling.

2.3. ι > γ
ἀναπιδύει. Prov. 18: 4 ἀναπηδύει = ήξι, gushing forth, has rightly been corrected into ἀναπιδύει by Schleusner 1, 245 (accepted by Tdf, Proll. §17, cf. also Lagarde, Anm. p. 58, Thack. p. 85). There is no *πηδύω in Greek, only πηδάω, but πηδύω is closer to ηξι. LS sub πηδύω, πηδυλίς, records similar itacistic distortions from Hesychius.

'Αταργάτης. There are examples of seeming metaplasma which in fact originate from mere itacism, as the confusion of feminines in -η or -ι. As shown above, the form 'Αταργάτη issued from a mistaken accusative 'Αταργάτην = -ιν.

κάλπης. In 4 Macc. 3: 12 Rahlfs, following S, puts the nonsensical κάλπην, trot, instead of the required κάλπην, pitcher, found in A and, accordingly, in Swete (as to κάλπη, compare καλπάζειν to trot A’ Isa. 8: 6). The confusion occurring in this word is not confined to the LXX (LS p. 870).
οισθα > ἦσθα, Num. 10: 31; Deut. 9: 2. In this instance mis-spelling results in the correct form of a different verb. Since, however, these confusions are due to some similarity of sound at a later stage of transmission, the change is phonetic by nature. For ηηπερ, Deut. 9: 2 FMN, followed by the majority of minn., read the normal οισθα, whereas Bxa have οισθας which, according to v, was the reading of O, Origen’s LXX column, and h1 οισθας which v ascribes to C'. AΘ and some minn. read ησθα which, as from εύναι, would make no sense here whatever. But as a corruption it is not unique, for it is at the root of the strange distortion of the whole context of Num. 10: 31. Here, as was shown earlier,60 the application of sound principles of emendation brings the Greek into complete harmony with the Hebrew:

The corruption began with the change of οισθα into ησθα.61 This led to further substitutions: for ησθα could not govern an object, and consequently the equivalent of ησθα μεθ’ ημῶν was dropped, and μεθ’ ημῶν from the following verse was introduced in its place. There is no need to think that the word expelled bore any graphical resemblance to the imported word. Therefore, in restoring the original word, we are not bound by the normal rules of palaeography, and may safely assume that παρεμβολή or a verbal form of the stem formed part of the original text.62 Thus we need not consider σταθμόν ημῶν (Rudolph, ZAW, NF 11, 1934, p. 118) or σταθμούς ημῶν as I did in 1942.63 προς δψεις is based on a brilliant aperçu by Wutz, p. 19 with n. 2, who suggested the less likely πρὸς δψιν, without dealing with the passage as a whole. πρὸς δψεις organs of sight64 (LS s.v. Πίς) is an excellent rendering of the idiomatic προςίθη. For πρὸς = ἤ I refer to Johannessohn II, 266, 269; for a possible intermediate corruption προσβύτης to Mayser i, 97 and e.g. the corruption which Cohn, Philo vi, v, mentions from cod. M, probus 74, where instead of προσβευταί M reads προσέταξε; or to the corruption mentioned by Cohn on p. liv of the same volume, in Flaccum 97 προσβείαν] πρὸς βίαν MA; for this is obviously no variant at all, but just προσβείαν with two changes, (1) προσ- instead of πρεσ-, which may be due to popular etymology, and (2) an itacistic -1-
for -ει-. The whole passage serves to emphasize the need for examining the Greek and putting it in order drastically, if necessary, before postulating a variant from the MT in the underlying Hebrew; and there are many other passages requiring similar treatment.66

2.5. **υ > αι**

**σφυρωτήρ > σφαιρωτήρ.** In a posthumous essay (IF 31, 1912/13, pp. 492 ff.) Felix Solmsen brilliantly vindicated the traditional spelling σφυρωτήρος for κυψός *thong of a sandal*, Gen. 14: 23. He pointed out that σφαιρωτήρος as our editions read, in spite of αμφίσφαιρα, *buttoned boots*, Hdt. 7, 59, could not be explained as giving the meaning which the context required. ‘For what would be the meaning of the suffix -τήρ, given this explanation? And σφαιρα is not κύκλος.’ While σφαιρωτήρ was unimpeachable as a translation of κυψός, Exod. 25: 31 ff., it could not at the same time cover κυψός. Solmsen further exposed the impossible explanations found in some Fathers and Scholiasts, yet called attention to one in Johannes Chrysostomus, which gives the clue, τινές δέ φασι τήν κλήσιν λαβείν από τού σφύρα τηρείν. For this σφυρωτήρ, he says, derives from σφυροῦν, *tie round the ankle* (σφυροῦν). σφυροῦν compares with γουνοῦσθαι, *embrace the knees*, and στομοῦν, *tie up, stop up the mouth*, mostly Ionic formations, which may have been passed on to early Hellenism, but soon lost so that σφυρωτήρ was supplanted by the unsuitable σφαιρωτήρ. Solmsen further points to the Homeric ἐπισφύρια and to περισφύριον, περισφυρίς, περισφυρον.

In all this he is perfectly correct. His one small error is in referring to the evidence. Before making his point he emphasizes that ‘the best of all MSS, Vaticanus B, has σφυρωτήρος’. In this he mistakes the Sixtine edition for Vat. B, which is missing for most of Genesis. σφυρ. is the reading of the Sixtine, and the Sixtine took it from the Aldine. Neither HP nor BM give any evidence for this reading from MSS. So we are left with the alternative that Aldus Manutius either found it in the not yet collated minn. 68 or 122, which are presumed to be his sources (Rahlfs, Ruth p. 116 n. 1), or may even have conjectured it for reasons much like those of Solmsen on the basis of the additional explanation by Joh. Chrysostomus which was quoted above. Whether it represents the original text or is an emendation, the reading is sound. On the other hand σφαιρ. may be due to the obsolescence of σφυρωτήρ rather than to scribal or phonetical confusion. Nevertheless it has to be placed in this section, because a grammarian’s task includes warn-
ing in matters which strictly speaking are beyond the limits set to a grammar.

3. Long i-diphthongs

3.1. Mistaken omission of ι

In a number of passages Rahlfs rightly restores diphthongs dropped in the earlier editions, so ἄποθνήσκω, μυνήσκω; in others the diphthongs still wait to be restored.66 There are examples of a neglected –ι in (3.1.1) stems, (3.1.2) nominal suffixes, and (3.1.3) case-endings.

3.1.1. Stems

ἔπαίδων. In Deut. 18: 11 all our texts read ἐπαείδων ἐπαιδήν. Here the use of the old, ‘Ionic and poet.’, form ἐπαιδή for ἐπωδή is remarkable; but it is beyond doubt, being found also in Isa. 47: 9, 12 and in Exod. 8: 7 (3) in AMmgqu, and the very old Papyrus Baden 56 instead of φαρμάκιαις, which is in the great majority of our MSS. So LS ought to have taken notice of it, as it notes the frequent and uncontested use of ἐπαιδός in the LXX. Still more remarkable is the verb. The fact that I mention it under the heading of long i-diphthongs indicates the solution which I offer. ἐπαείδων, found only in B*Mg, is a spelling meant to ensure the pronunciation of the long i-diphthong by spelling its second component i by ei, a device to be observed more than once elsewhere.67 It was Crönert who found this solution (MGH p. 47 n. 2, ἘΠΑΕΙΔΙΩΝ = ἐπαείδων'). He points to the preservation of αίδ-elsewhere in B. He could have added that the corruption of A in Jer. 8: 17 is also clear evidence (ἐπιλησαι for ἐπαείσαι, the η being an itacism for ι: Λη ~ Αί), ἀειν is attested by Mayser i2 2, 167 (236a). It is clear that the spelling ἐπαείδων has some connection with the following ἐπαιδήν; but this remains true if we refer it to later scribes.

πρωρεύς, officer in command at the bow, πρῷρα, of a ship. The word ought so to be spelt in Jonah 1: 6; Ezek. 27: 29.

3.1.2. Nominal suffixes

As ἡδον draws its i from –ιον, two nouns draw it from the compound suffix –ιδ-ιον: καθιον and καλιδιον; cf. ἦδιον, ἦδάριον, and even ἦδαριδιον in which the suffix –ιδ- appears twice.
GRAMMATICAL CORRUPTIONS

κώδιον. A derivative from κώος, κώς, fleece. It is found in Judith 12: 15 and 2 Esdras 13: 15. LS also records a noun κωδάς, -άτος, dealer in sheepskins from an Oxyrh. Pap. (III). When spelled correctly it ought to read κώδας, because the word seems to be based on a formation like κώδιον or κώδαριον. I do not see where it could have got its -δ- from, if not from -ιδ-.

καλόδιον, dim. of κάλως, meaning small cord, is found four times in Judg. 15: 13 f.; 16: 11 f. in both the A and B texts. It is possible that the diminutive meaning was no longer felt. For κώδιον LS does not even give a translation as a diminutive. Perhaps the two words are of those formations in -ιον, -ιδιον, which were introduced, or later on used, as mere substitutes for the original word, where an unusual formation or declension led to disuse of the original. LS gives early evidence, some from inscriptions, for -ωι-. καλόδιον, e.g., was restored by Pokel in Thuc. 4, 26, 8. Since both words are not very common, one would expect LS to cite their occurrence in the LXX.

αλαγώς = λαγώς 'epic', also in prose, has no subscr.; LS does not mention v.l. Ps. 103: 18; A' Lev. 11: 5; Deut. 14: 7; Θ' Ps. 103: 18.

αρωδιός/αρωδιός. As an appendix to 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 I mention αρωδίος, heron, Lev. 11: 19; Deut. 14: 16 (15). The spelling with initial α is supported by BA a9 (509) Vet. Lat., a fairly strong piece of evidence, which Rahlfs ought not to have rejected in favour of the more common ἐρωδιός (there is also a form ἐρωδιός). According to Herodian and the evidence of codd. of Homer, the second syllable should be spelled -ω-, yet the etymology does not favour this spelling (cf. Solmsen and Boisacq in Huber, Lev. p. 10). Therefore Solmsen gives no decision. LS prefers the spelling with -ω-.

3.1.3. Case-endings

πέρα. In 2 Esdras there is a translation of πέρα παρά (17) which differs from the prevailing one (ἐν τῷ) πέραν, found frequently in Xenophon, namely (ol) ἐν πέρα τοῦ ποταμοῦ, 6: 6; 7: 21, 25. πέρα, as an adverb, can be understood as an instrumental in -α or a dative in -α (Bl.-Debr. §26). The spelling in -α is not recorded in LS, although ΠΕΡΑ' τού μετρίου (Crönert, MGH p. 41) seems to be evidence for it. In 2 Esdras we must read ἐν πέρα = ἐπάρα, πέρα being a noun just as ἐπάρα. There is a
noun ἂ πέρα = ἄ περαία (seil. γῆ, χώρα) for which evidence is given by LS from Aeschylus only (Suppl. 262 ἐκ πέρας Ναυπάκτιας; Ag. 190 Χαλκίδος πέραν ἔχον) and an inscription from Argos (V8) πέρανδε 'to a foreign city'. Our closest parallels are passages in Hellenistic writers where compounds of πέρα are used, as ἂ πέρα itself is used in Aeschylus, as an adjective with its noun added or understood. So, for example, the Bucolic Moschus (II) Ἄσιδα τ' ἀντιπέρην τε (seil. παραλίαν;) 'Asia and the opposite coast', or Polyb. 1, 17, 4 ἔξ ἀντιπέρας χώρας (according to the best codex, Vat. A, the inferior tradition reading ἀντιπέρα); perhaps also κατ' ἀντιπέραν, Xen., An. 4, 8, 3; Luc., JTr 42 and, closest of all, κατ' ἀντιπέραν, c. gen. Polyb. 9, 41, 11.73

I think I was right (ThLZ, 1936, p. 280) in restoring ἐν τῷ πέραν στόματος βοθύνου = ἡ περαία Ριβέριν Χρ. Jer. 31 (48): 28. The unanimous ἐν πέτρας of our tradition repeats what occurred earlier in the same verse; Giesebrecht was therefore rash in basing his conjecture on it (without mentioning the LXX), while in one of Cornill's alternatives only this much is wrong that, in suggesting ἐν περασι (after Spohr), he confused τό πέρας and πέραν. I refer to the parallels Jer. 22: 20; 32: 8 (25: 22); 52: 8 and especially 48 (41): 10, because here the article after ἐν τῷ πέραν is omitted in imitation of the Hebrew in which beyond (MT 48: 28 Ῥυθήρην, MT 41: 10 Ῥήπθη) is followed by a construct state without article. πέραν is also read by C', and ἐν μέρεσιν A' has a parallel in LXX Exod. 32: 15.

3.2. Mistaken insertion of ἄ

Here also most of the traditional mis-spellings have vanished under the influence of the evidence of the inscriptions and the new grammatical teaching. So, if we now rightly spell τιμᾶν and no longer τιμᾶν, we are following the documentary evidence and at the same time drawing on our knowledge that behind the spelling έι there is a real diphthong ει and, beside it, an ε- sound that was never a diphthong; and this latter ει was fused with α to form τιμᾶν (= τιμᾶν).

ἀρωδιός. For this doubtful spelling see above, p. 70.

πραῶς, πράος, 2 Macc. 15: 12. Rahlfs' spelling is correct here, for πραῶ- never had an ἁ subser. in our evidence and πράος was only due to the mistaken analogy of βᾶν (Debrunner, IF 40, 1922, pp. 13 ff.).
Wackernagel (Hell. p. 26) has given the most satisfactory explanation of the facts. He points out that the Ptol. papyri frequently display ράθυμος, but never ραθυμη-, and the literary papyri only ραθυμη- (Crönert, MGH p. 51), and he asks whether the spelling ραθυμη- which, he says, has to be recognized as the good orthography of the Imperial period, really goes back to an earlier period or is due rather to some late pedantry which introduced it by analogy with ραθυμη-, ράθυμη-, ραθυμη-, ραθυμη-. So Wackernagel combines the monophthongic ρα- with the Attic adverb ρα. In the fifth century or earlier, he says, (ρα) ράθυμος, ραθυμη- may have been moulded on the analogy of (ευ) εύθυμος, εύθυμην. In this way he avoids the difficulties raised by Mayser’s explanation of the early examples of ραθυμη-. The latter had seen in them a transformation of δι to δ, unparalleled in the third century. But soon after the publication of his first volume the third-century Tebtunis Papyri were found to contain many examples.

So we must spell ραθυμη- in Gen. 42: 1; Judith 1: 16; Sir. 35: 11 (32: 15); 2 Macc. 6: 4 and ραθυμια in 3 Macc. 4: 8. Some slight additional evidence may be found in the fact that the proper name Βίλα which in 2 Esdras appears as Ραουμ or, mostly in Α, 'Ρεουμ, in 1 Esdras is found as 'Ράθυμος, one of the traditional scribal distortions of names (Θ-Θ) with which we shall have to deal elsewhere. 'Ράουμος, which Rahlfs rightly restores, would probably have been less easily changed into 'Ραθυμος, if the scribes had been accustomed to spell the adjective ραθυμος with the iota adscriptum.

4. The o-vowels
4.1. Interchange of o and ω
4.1.1. o > ω
The examples discussed here are of very diverse character, though they have this much in common that they do not admit of a phonetic explanation.

βρόμος. The traditional differentiation between βρόμος (A) any loud noise, and βρῶμος (B) stink, noisome smell, is still maintained in LS, which to the latter adds a warning ‘βρόμος is freq. f. 1.’ There is only one example in the LXX, Exod. 7: 18, where to the LXX reading έποξέσωι Fb adds a marginal note βρωμησει. But, as has been convincingly demonstrated by Dawkins, Class. Review 53, 33 and Hatzidakis, Glotta 22, 1934, pp. 130 f., 132 f. (cf. Bl.-Debr. 8, §126 Anhang), there is only
one word, which has a gradually developed further connotation: βρόμος, noise > crepitus ventris > stink (ἡ βρόμα in modern Greek). Therefore βρόμος, stink, Job 6: 7; Wisd. of Sol. 11: 18; Joel 2: 20; (A' Ezek. 23: 20?) and βρωμόδης C Job 41: 26 are correct, and βρωμήσει Exod. 7: 18 Fb marg. mistaken. βρόμα Letter of Jer. 11 (ἀπὸ ιοῦ καὶ βρωμάτων), however we may interpret it (W. Bauer, art. ‘βρωσίς’, 2), belongs to βιβρώσκω.

dόρακα. Hellenistic Greek, we know, abandoned the apparently irrational differentiation which existed between the imperfect and perfect of ὅραν. Now Thackeray (§16, 6) and all our editions76 still cling to William Veitch’s extremely useful, though philologically uninformed, compilation Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective (18651). So they fail to realize that in the augmented imperfect ἐώρων, -εω- is due to the well-known Attic quantitative metathesis (ἥρων ~ ἥρων ~ ἐόρων), whereas the reduplicated perfect ἐφόρακα was bound to become ἐόρακα; so that ἐόρακα, far from being ‘the old Attic form’, is merely a secondary adaptation to the augmented imperfect.77 I should not have mentioned these well-known facts, if there were not good reason for reversing Thackeray’s statement that ἐόρακα was ‘universal in the Pentateuch’ (p. 204). The fresh evidence from the recently discovered ChB papyri points to the opposite conclusion. ChB 963, which may go back as far as the second century A.D., has ἐόρακα in Deut. 3: 21, 28; 4: 3; 29: 2, whereas ἐώρακα is found only in 4: 9. So it may have been rash of Sir F. Kenyon to supplement [ἐωράκαμεν] 1: 28 and [ἐόράκασιν] 29: 3 (immediately after the preserved ἐοράκατε 29: 2). In this he was following his practice of filling gaps from Swete’s text; but its correctness ought first to have been checked and proved. For the sake of fairness I must add that ChB 965 (first half of IIIp) has ἐόρακα in Isa. 57: 18 and likewise the third-century ChB 962 ἐόρακα in Gen. 41: 15 and ἐο[ in Gen. 46: 30, whereas the evidence of the later Genesis pap. ChB 961 (IVp) is divided: Gen. 26: 28 ἐωρ[ and 41: 15, unlike 962, ἐόρακα. This much may be stated: this fresh evidence, much earlier than that represented by our other MSS, does much to bring the spelling of the Pentateuch into conformity with ‘the majority of the books’ in which ἐόρακα is strongly supported’.

εὐοδία. By a confusion of similar words εὐοδία was written instead of εὐοδία. Here Rahlfs gives the right text in the three Sirach passages mentioned by Thack. p. 91, of which 38: 13 had already been emended
by Schleusner π, 583; but not in 1 Esdras 1: 11 (12) Sw. = 1: 13 Ra., where first Schleusner, loc. cit., and later S. A. Cook (in Charles’ Apocrypha), had corrected the mistake. For this passage must be related to 2 Chron. 35: 13 which it translates. Of course, even the corruption made some sense; so Guthe in Kautzsch’s Apokryphen translates unter Wohlgerüchten.

κατοδυνώμενος. We find the adj. κατώδυνος 1 Sam. 1: 10; 22: 2; 30: 6; 2 Kings 4: 27 f., and C’ Isa. 29: 2, A’ C’ Θ’ Isa. 54: 6. Moreover, we read the part. pres. (τῶν καταστένασόντων κατ’) τῶν κατωδυνωμένων = οἰκίσας κατώδυνας Ezek. 9: 4 and κατωδυνωμένην Tobit S-text 8: 20, where there is no question of changing into a perf. κατωδύνημ-. Both words are confined to the LXX, yet elsewhere we have other compounds of ὀδύνη which Wackernagel, Dehnungsg. p. 48, enumerates in chronological order. The impf. κατωδύνων Exod. 1: 14 is inconclusive, but the simple formations ὀδύνη, ὀδυνηρός, ὀδυνάν in the LXX have nothing comparable, and this for good reasons: what we find here takes place in compounds only. Wackernagel, Dehnungsg. p. 53, shows that this lengthening in the suture of a compound dates back as far as the pre-Homeric period, because it contravenes the later rule of elision without lengthening, which can already be observed in Homer, and further that the earlier usage did not cease suddenly, but underwent a further extension, as in compounds with the privative ἄν-, like ἄνωνητος for ἄνονητος (for the LXX see Thack. pp. 90 f.), which ought therefore to be recorded in LS. Wackernagel’s explanation is still held (Schwyzer pp. 397 f.). It fully explains κατωδυνός, since everywhere in his comprehensive tabulation an adjective is the first formation fashioned in this manner. Things only become more difficult with further formations derived from the adjectives. Nouns like ἄνωδυνία are doubtless legitimate, just as, from a different root, συνωμοσία, συνωμόται Gen. 14: 13. But a verb in -αν is not covered by analogy; so a κατωδυνάω as from κατωδυνός is unimaginable and the repeated κατωδυνώμενος is merely scribal. Therefore, in accordance with our practice of restoring a classical spelling where there are no special reasons for the opposite, we must decide for κατοδυνώμενος as representing the hand of the translators.

So this instance, which is not in Thackeray, must be kept apart from examples of misplaced augment (Thack. § 16, 9), which arose in other verbal formations and nominal derivations by false analogy with indicatives. Consider, e.g., Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. pp. 656, 397: ἀνηλόσωσιν,
4.1.2. ω > o

άθωουν. The diphthong -ο- of ἀθωοῦν, to hold guiltless, changes into -o- almost throughout where a second ω follows (Thack. §6, 29). There exists a certain parallel in an Attic inscription, IG² 136214 θάσσει shortly after 300* (M.-Schw. p. 66 n. 583), but, as the evidence for θώζω, θω(ι)άω, θωά, θω(ι)ή indicates, we cannot be sure whether the writer had in mind ω or ωι, and LS may be right in suggesting that the o is due to copying from a pre-Euclidean original, written in the old orthography which had no ω. άθωοῦν, however, as a denominative from άθφος, had an i-diphthong, and I feel sure that the uniform spelling άθοω-, ranging from Judges to Jeremiah, including ήθόωμαι B* in the late text of Judg. 15: 3, does not go back to the translators, and has therefore been rightly corrected in our editions.

πρωινός. Thackeray credits the translators with the differentiated spellings πρῶιμος and πρωινός, the former of which he derives from πρό. In point of fact πρωινός, too, is sometimes spelled with -o-, Gen. 49: 27 F*; Lev. 9: 17 A. Since it is obviously secondary here, the spelling πρῶιμος must not be admitted into our texts, either in the LXX or the NT, Ja. 5: 7, in spite of the unanimous practice of our editions, down to Ziegler and Nestle22. Though W. Bauer still maintains Thackeray's view, the change of πρῶι- into προϊ- is due to an unwarranted association with πρό (Crönert, MGH p. 288 n. 4) which is nothing but the outcome of a popular etymology to which Thackeray falls a prey. The reason why I do not follow Blass, whom Thackeray quotes, and Bl.-Debr. §35, 1 who, comparing Attic πλῶιμος and the later πλῷμος, explain the two formations from the use of different forms of the stem, is twofold: (1) it is more likely that the erroneous analogy of πρό arose
at the stage of transmission, and (2) the fact that -o- intruded upon πρώιμος too, weakens the case for πρόϊμος as a legitimate alternative to πρώιμος (Blass, Debr.), and even more as the original formation (Thack., Bauer).

βωποπώλης, dealer in petty wares, huckster, 2 Esdras 13: 31 f. It is spelled ροβ- in BS*h and ροπ- in the rest of the MSS. Rahlfs in his note rightly refers to Thackeray §7, 16 who, however, does not mention this instance of putting β for π here, nor of o for ω anywhere. None of our texts, in fact, restores the correct form ρωπ-. LS quotes an inscription from Cos spelling ροπο-. Here also I should attribute the spelling of our MSS to later corruption.87

έν σκώλοις. In Job ⌊x· 40: 19 (24) Grabe takes exception to ἕνσκολευόμενος (for ὑψνός), which is suspect for this reason among many, that -εύεσθαι, the formation indicating a wilful action, does not make sense here. Moreover, the verb would be a hapax legomenon, the nearest existing verb being σκολιόομαι, to be bent, crooked. Grabe's own suggestion, ἕνσκωλ(ι)ευ-, certainly reflects σκωλο-, but that is its only merit (σκωλόομαι, Pass., to be offended, is one of Aquila's coinages). Moreover, Theodotion, who in the remainder of the verse follows the Hebrew closely and without misunderstanding, must not be supposed to put a participle for υψον. So we should read ἐν σκώλοις (cf. A'C' Θ' Prov. 18: 7) without being unduly concerned about the origin of the corruption; it may be due to dictation.

4.2. Interchange of o and e

ρεμβ ρομβ-. The mistaken change of ε into o, though noticed and rejected by Meister II, p. 26 n. 62, and Thackeray, §6, 27 (1), is still found in all editions, as it is read by B (with the sole support of G). In Num. 32: 13 B and our editions have κατερέμβευσεν, but κατερέμβευσεν in the others is now confirmed by ChB 963 (about 200p), and 'the meaning, led astray, points to the spelling with -ε-' (Meister). Moreover, the simple ρεμβεύω, apart from Isa. 23: 16, is found three times in the later translations. The Quinta, Hos. 8: 6 ρεμβεύων, takes the difficult meaning as from בָּשָׁם or בָּשָׁא, and gives it the same intransitive meaning as does Aquila in the two parallel passages Jer. 38 (31): 22 and 30 (49): 4, namely ἡ ρεμβεύσα (ἡ βασιλευσα, O thou backsliding daughter cf. AV), and C', in Song of Sol. 1: 7, ρεμβομένη.88 The word-group is
fairly well represented, mainly in later parts of the LXX and in the later translations: ἐβῳμαι, Prov. 7: 12, once in A' and four times in C'; ἄφῳμενος Prov. 13: 20 in cod. A, believed to be the genuine reading by Lagarde, then two hapax legomena – ἡ ἐβῳάς, Sir. 26: 8, in an addition in min. 248, perhaps representing the second Greek translation or revision, and ἐβῳσμῶς, Wisd. of Sol. 4: 12, derived from a verb ἐβωμίω which, however, has not been preserved in existing Greek literature. So we must not assume a development βῳμαι – βωμός – ῥομβεύω, certainly not in the mind of the translator of Num. 32: 13; if, in the course of transmission to BG – i.e. the text used by Origen for his Hexapla – something like τρεφω – τροφός – τροφεύω was considered, a type which is not frequent, it was decidedly secondary. Indeed it may be nothing more than graphical error (€ ~ O), as in the two instances of ἐβῳώδης quoted by LS from Plutarch and Galen.89

5. Metathesis of ι and υ

The words with which I have to deal under this heading, being absent from the NT, have failed to attract the attention of the OT grammars of Helbing and Thackeray.

ἐρυσίβη. For ἐρυσίβη, rust, mildew, A reads ἐρισύβη in four of the six instances. With this it stands alone in our tradition, as far as we can see, and I find this metathesis recorded only by Lobeck, Path. el. 1, 523, ἐρισύβη ap. Hesych. s. σκωλοβάτης; so it is rightly kept out of our editions, and lexica.90

Ιλύς/ύλις. mud. The Lucianic MSS put ιλύς Ps. 39: 3 and ιλύν Ps. 68: 3, thus restoring the Attic forms, and Rahlfs follows them against the early evidence which reads ύλεως and ύλιν. The latter is spelt ύλην, just as in a papyrus from 153a, which is mis-interpreted by Mayser (1, 34).91 ύλις, mud, is found also in Pap. Lille 3, 19 (IIIa), gen. ύλιν and, from an earlier period and more respected corner, in an Attic inscription (IVa), IG 2a, 2498, 9, ύλιν, and it has been suggested that this form was a stone-dresser’s mistake for ιλύν, which is found in the similar passage IG 1a, 94, 20, 23 (Va). Such errors are bound to have a cause, which in this instance is the early transformation of υ from u to ι. It is only from this increasing similarity between the two sounds ι and i that a metathesis (observable also in other words than ours)92 can be understood.
The first thorough discussion of the metaplasm resulting from the metathesis of ι and υ was given by Lobeck, *Path. el. i*, 523. Quoting *Etymol. Magn.* 180, 10 ἀφυλίσαι παρὰ τὴν ἴλην καὶ κατὰ μετάθεσιν ἴλη, he continues:


He also gives a plausible explanation: 'Ab ἴλεως derivandum erat ἴλυςω, sed quia nullum est verbum in -0300 a nominibus in -ν/ς ductum, ypsilon primam occupavit syllabam.' He goes on to give a few further examples of verbs in -ίω instead of (cf. Debrunner, *Wb.* §234).

It is obvious that the vulgar formation, established beyond any doubt by the gen. ὑλεως, must be introduced into our text, and also Amos 6: 6 διὑλισμένον ὀίνον is correct, meaning *strained, clarified wine*. It will have been seen that I did not accent the nom. and acc. of ἴλη. Perhaps this was over-cautious. The ι of the first syllable of ἴλεως is certainly long, yet as to the υ of the second, metrical evidence is ambiguous, ἴλη, too, has a long first syllable; it is possible that it influenced the metaplastic formation, in which the pattern of πόλις requires a short second syllable; so it may not be too rash to put a circumflex, if only we assume that the metaplastic formation took a long first syllable as do both ἴλεως and ἴλη.

στυππείον, στυππέον/στιππύον; στύππινος, στυππείνος/στιππύινος, (στιπποινος).

The noun, meaning *tow, oaken*, was originally spelt στυππείον as in Hdt. 8, 52 and in Attic authors and inscriptions (M.-Schw. p. 52 n. 422; sometimes στυππείον, p. 43 n. 274). The adjective is spelt στυππινος in Attic inscriptions of the fourth century (p. 97 n. 855) and in an anonymous comic fragment; the earlier στυππείνος (from *στυππείνος*) occurs only once (in a third-century papyrus). This transformation of the adjective took place in the pre-Hellenistic period and we shall see that it underlies the phenomena which we observe in the Ptolemaic period from the third century onwards.

The fresh feature in the Hellenistic examples is a large variety of forms, many of them with a metathesis of υ and ι both in the noun and
the adjective. Compared with this complexity the evidence in the LXX is very plain. The noun is στυπτύον everywhere, the variants being completely negligible. The Attic form στυππείου, read in Isa. 1: 31 by Q – 106 (Ziegler p. 103) is as late and secondary as the corrections mentioned by Ziegler p. 44.

The adjective is found as στυππύνος in Lev. 13: 47, 59 only, with two or three minuscules restoring the sequence υ-ι (ει), but at the same time giving the noun, which makes no sense here.

I should say a word about the isolated reading found in B* at both places, στυππύνον for στυππύνος. There is further evidence for this formation in Pap. Lond. 3, 928 (III P). Formations in -όινος are extremely rare, and are not even mentioned by Chantraine and Debrunner. Schwyzler, Gr. Gr. p. 491, gives two examples, καρόινος, λακόινος. But there is another example nearer at hand. Aquila, following his etymological principle of translation, renders δυσνυς 'strong, powerful' by δυστέινος (cf. δυσνυς, δυστυνική); but, whereas in Gen. 18: 18; Ps. 34 (35): 18, our MSS make him say δυστέινος they give δυστοίνος in Exod. 1: 9; Deut. 7: 1; 9: 1.

All this is far from encouraging us to adopt the reading of Β* στυπ-ττόνος. The confirmatory evidence from elsewhere is late, and, moreover, the form could be an itacism -όνος for -ύνος, perhaps a metathesis of στύππυνος. There are more examples of itacistic οί for υ in Β* (not in Thackeray §6, 41), as καροίς instead of κάρυς Num. 17: 8 (23), against all other evidence.

Here, then, I do not propose to introduce any change, and in this I feel supported by the testimony of Phrynichus (Lobeck pp. 261 f.) for whom στυππέινος is so obsolete that he warns against it and recommends '_ZONE τού ἡ τρισυλλάβως στύππυνον, ὡς οἱ ἄρχοι'. Our στυππύνος is simply the earlier στυππύνος brought closer to the later στυππύνον by metathesis. As στυππύνος it occurs once in a Ptolemaic papyrus.

6. Syncope (aphaeresis) and hyphaeresis

Under this heading I propose the rejection of two spellings of our editions.

(1) νεοσσός in Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and, perhaps, Isaiah. While the Attic form νεοττός in 4 Macc. 14: 15 and νεοσσός in Job and Proverbs are incontestable, νοσσός appears to be the genuine form
in Lev. 5: 7, 11; 12: 8; 14: 22, 30; 15: 14, 29; Num. 6: 10; Deut. 22: 6; 32: 11, as it is attested throughout by B with never less than two and often with many adherents, among them ChB 963 (200p) in Num. 6: 10, the only time in the Pentateuch where ChB has preserved the word. Rahlfs is therefore mistaken in putting νεοσσός in all these passages. In Isaiah the evidence is more equivocal: in 16: 2 νοσσός is found in ‘B 147-93’ (Ziegler) only, and in 60: 8 νοσσοῖς is the reading of SQ*O (including B) L, so that νεοσσοῖς is confined to A and, as it seems, C (the Catena group). Swete is in no dilemma here, since B, which is hexaplaric in Isaiah, reads νοσσό- in both passages. Yet Rahlfs and Ziegler are certainly mistaken in spelling νεοσσό- throughout. In 60: 8, at least, the basis for doing so is too slender.

Since ‘the derivatives all take the κοινή form νοσσιά, νοσσίον, νοσσεύειν, νοσσοποιεῖν’ (Thack. p. 98), we may state a twofold development: in some books the use of different formations for the several classes of words (νεοσσός-νοσσιά), which may have been the rule in Attic (νεοττός-νοττιά) and, somewhat different, in Hdt. (νεοσσεμένος-νεοσσός, νεοσση), as it is still in Herodas (IIIa, νεοσσοί 7, 48-νοσσην 7, 72); but in the Pentateuch (and Isaiah?) analogy has done its levelling work with the result of uniformity (νοσσός-νοσσιά), just as Menander (IVa) once displays νοττός and even Aeschylus, Fragm. 113 νοσσόν (compare W. Schulze, Kl. Schr. p. 690, and Schweizer, Perg. p. 102, who sees an Ionism in the νοσσ. forms).

(2) ἀλίατον Swete, ἀλιαίτων Rahlfs.

Of these two forms of the word for sea-eagle, which occurs in Lev. 11: 13, Deut. 14: 12, the one chosen by Swete and BM is that for which the evidence is provided by only 9 min. in Leviticus, and N with 16 min. in Deuteronomy, of which afiorxyaj are common to both passages—meagre evidence, indeed. The one chosen by Rahlfs is supported by GMejsz (cmbw) in Leviticus and begjw in Deuteronomy (Ra.: ‘pau’). On the other hand, the overwhelming majority reads ἀλίατον in both passages, and this form must be considered the real tradition, and this all the more, because ἀετόν occurs in the same verses without any variants. In neither word can the diphthong -αυ- be expected in prose. So our explanation of ἀλίατος must start from ἀλιάτες.

Here we have an example of hyphaeresis, the expulsion of one vowel out of a group of three (Meister Π, p. 34; Schweyzer, Gr. Gr. pp. 252 f.), such as in γόον for γόεον Hom. II. vi 500 or μυθέα for
μυθέεω, the termination -ιο instead of -ιεω, gen. plur. -ιον instead of -ιεων. This is one of the ways in which a troublesome hiatus in speech is eased, even if it is not wholly avoided. When Meister, the first hitherto to consider this word more fully (and with him Huber, Lev. pp. 2, 14), alternatively thinks of a 'late contraction of αιε into ε or an expulsion of ε alongside of αι', he seems to start from the assumption that the shortening of the word was only possible after αι had become a monophthongic ε. Therefore he says, 'in any case ἄλιετος goes back to ἄλιαιετος, not to ἄλισετος'. In this he is mistaken. For (1) the form with -αι- cannot be expected in later prose, and (2) hyphaeresis is not confined to identical or homogeneous vowels. Perhaps our editors refrained from accepting άλίετον into their texts, because the expulsion of a syllable, which was under the accent, seemed to them to be proof of a later distortion by copyists far removed from the translators; but the parallels adduced from Homer, from later Ionic and other dialects (see Schwyzer) make it clear that such an expulsion, followed by a migration of the accent, was well within the scope of Greek and far from barbarous. Here the Cambridge editions were for once not supported in their choice by any corrector of B.
3. CONSONANTS

1. Single and double consonants

1.1. False simplification

κιννάμωμον = κίναμ. Does not seem to have a variant -ν- in the LXX any more than in the Ptol. papyri where Mayser quotes κινσμόμων from Dionys. Periegeta (ΙΠ) 945 only.

χρόμμων, onions. Our editions have the correct spelling, κρόμμων, with BHM and minn. in Num. 11:5, as do the Ptol. papyri (Mayser 1, 218 ff.) and as is required by the metre in Aristophanes; AFN and minuscules, giving -μ- as do Homer passages (metri causa) and post-Christian papyri, are clearly secondary.

κροσσοί, tassels, fringe. With this word and the adj. κροσσωτός there is strong evidence for -σ- in almost all majuscules in Exod. 28:24 (29) and nearly as many in v. 22, whereas in 36:22 (39:15) only B with six minn. reads -σ-. The same applies to the adj. in 28:14, while in Ps. 44 (45):14 at least S*RT have -σ-. The spelling κρωσσ-, which is given by HR as an alternative for the noun, appears in Bos’ edition only (= the Sixtine), but never in Grabe. We may remember that Hdt. 2, 125 has the variants -ωσσ- SV, -ωσ- R, for a different word κρόσσαι, steps. Following B, Swete and BM give the mistaken forms in -σ-.

ποδοχάχη, ή, stocks, Job 13:27 άλλος. The mistaken spelling, -κακη (Field), is due to false etymology (LS).

προστάς, προσσχης, προσοχές etc. Thackeray (§9, 1) discusses the occasional coalescence of two words, which had in early Attic inscriptions already resulted in the omission of one of the two sigmas or nus at the suture point of the two words. He continues ‘The LXX remains practically free from this blending of words, the only well-supported example being πρόστόμα, 2 Esdras 12:13 BSA’. In point of fact there are many more. For the prophets I refer to Ziegler’s useful classification of grammatical variants Orthographika. In Isaiah he does not go beyond what is found in Thackeray. Here I mention 28:17 εισταθμός B*S*A
and 1: 31 ωςπινθερες SA. From the Minor Prophets he adduces Jonah 2: 6 εισχισμας S*A minn.; Nahum 1: 10 ωσμιλας WS*VAQ* minn., 3: 12 ειστομα S*AQ*. Cf. his edition of Jeremiah, p. 121; Ezekiel, p. 76; Daniel, p. 74. We may add εξαντι (ἐξαντι) Ezek. 7: 5; Arm. comestionem (= φαγήν) for ες σκάφην, Daniel, Bel and Dragon Θ' 33, where some minn. read εισκαφην.

Had Thackeray here applied his own teaching (§9, 4) that identical aspects are shown in the suture of compounds, he could have pointed to a consistent mis-spelling. In Num. 16: 15 the traditional editions, Bos, Tischendorf and even Grabe, have μη προσχης. Our modern editions certainly correct the accent, putting προσχης, but they fail to restore the double σ for προσ-σχεν. It was Lagarde alone who both in his Lucian and the posthumous Psalterii Graeci Quinquagena prima gave the double σ to all unaugmented aorist forms of ττροσέχειν (no form of the future exists in the LXX), just as, e.g., Immanuel Bekker had done in Thucyd. 4, 11, 3 a hundred years ago. In addition to προσχης Num. 16: 15 and 1 Sam. 16: 7 L there are 17 instances of πρόσοχες in the Psalms alone, and three more besides – Dan. LXX 9: 18; Dan. Θ' 9: 19; 3 Macc. 2: 2. In 1 Sam. 16: 7 Lagarde in his edition of the Lucianic recension (Lib. VT) had already put the emended form προσ(σ)χης (cf. p. xi with a reference to Field).

In Wisd. of Sol. 13: 1; 14: 30, Rahlfs may be right in preferring the pres., προσέχοντες (with AS) to προ(σ)χόντες (Β), though in 14: 30 an equally irrational καταφρονήσαντες in the parallel clause, 30c, argues for the aorist.

Wendland (Philologus 57, 1898, p. 116) suggests προ(σ)στός in Theophr., Char. 11, 8.

### 1.2. Doubling of single consonant

οϊμμοι. The spelling οϊμμοι has neither been unobserved nor is it confined to the LXX, contrary to Thackeray's assumption (§7, 41). Wilhelm Schulze (KZ 33, 1895, p. 397) gave examples from Attic inscriptions and even formulated the rule: 'After diphthongs and long vowels we sometimes find the following consonants doubled in an un-organic way, as an indication that in such cases the pronunciation is inclined to distribute the consonant between both syllables.' After referring to G. Meyer, Griech. Grammatik §289, pp. 280 f., for Χαφρονέα, Ισχυρρός, νοῦλλον he went on to say: 'Here the spelling οϊμμοι also belongs', which occurs in two inscriptions on tombstones. In his review
of Kretschmer's *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften* (Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, 1896, pp. 228-56) he added some more examples, one of which, being Byzantine (Χψ), would in itself not mean very much, as it may have been influenced by the biblical usage (now *Kl. Schr*. pp. 278 and 712 n. 3). More is now found in Schwzyzer, *Gr. Gr.* pp. 103, 238. He gives an example of ὀμμοὶ from Menander (H6 Jensen) and of many other words from Attic and other dialects, and dates the habit of changing open syllables into closed ones (by 'doubling' the consonant) as early as the fifth century. In detail, he says, there could be several causes; 'für ὀμμοὶ liegt es nahe, expressive Gemination anzunehmen' (p. 238). There is certainly something distinctive in the prevailing use of this form in the LXX; it may be one of the peculiar features due to its isolation as a book of the Church. Thus far Thackeray was correct in his perception, but neither he nor LS should have overlooked the Attic precedents.

**Grammaratical Corruptions**

πλήμυρα/πλήμμυρα etc. πλήμυρα Job 40: 18 (23), πλημμυρεῖν C' Eccles. 1: 7, and 'Ο Κύρος Jer. 12: 5 (this is not in HR) would appear to be covered by W. Schulze's rule; yet it may be better to assume either a false etymology (πλήν + μύρομαι) or merely a mistaken analogy from πλημμελής, both in the mind of later copyists, and to restore the single -μ-, and all the more as this spelling is found in inscriptions, papyri and good MSS (LS s.v.). The word is not a compound. A suffix -ʊra would be almost without parallels, and even the fact that πλήμη πλημύρις πλήμυρα has its exact analogy in another series of formations of a closely related meaning, ἀληθῆς ἀλμυρίς ἀλμυρός adj., gives no clue. So it may be safer in πλήμυρα to see a retrograde formation from πλημύρειν, such as εὐθύνα from εὔθυνειν, ἀίσχυνη which replaced an earlier αἰσχος from αἰσχύνειν (Deb., *Wb.* §224). In contrast to Luke 6: 48 (-μ- DW al) the correct spelling is in none of the OT passages, as far as we can see; but we should not hesitate to restore it even in the NT, though Moulton (π, 101) would consider it 'due to correction by literary hands in some ancestor'; for in the light of the evidence mentioned above this correction does not look like classicizing, let alone atticizing. Cohn, *Philo* 1, xliii, would have done better not to enumerate 'πλήμυρα προ πλήμμυρα' as 'geminatio consonarum interdum neglecta' in Pap., for it is the correct spelling which has been rarely preserved.
1.3. False forms of the type ἔξεκκλησιάζειν

First of all attention must be directed to Lobeck's rich note in his Phrynichus p. 155. When looking up HR we find seven instances of ἐκλησίαζειν, but twenty-one of ἐξεκκλησιαζειν. This is a strange formation, indeed, for it contains the same preposition ἐκ- twice over. Closer examination of the instances, however, shows that they are all augmented forms of the ind. aor. The fact that they have the augment in the place proper for true compounds, although the verb is a mere denominative derived from ἐκλησία, however incorrect, is not without parallels. What is stranger, they have the -ἐκ- doubled, and hence derives the impression that it was put twice over. In point of fact this doubling is merely scribal (Thack. p. 207), and at the root of the -ἐκ- there is the more familiar noun ἐκκλησία. Thus we must cancel the second ἐκ in all those aorist formations, as has been done in other classical texts from Thucyd. onward. The only formation that is found in a mood without augment is Aristotle, Oec. 1348a ἐξεκκλησιάζος ptc. (with Io. G. Schneider's comment, Leipzig, 1815, p. 44). It merely represents an isolated instance of more advanced corruption. The copyist may have inadvertently thought of an augmented indicative. Strangely enough LS has an article 'ἔξεκκλησιάζω = ἐκκλησίαζω Arist. Oec. 1348 11', and in the article on ἐκκλησίαζω lists the augmented aorist forms as vv. ll. instead of ff. ll., without mention, however, of instances from the LXX. 3

Other instances of this type of mistake are:

ἔνεγγυαν. The mistaken ἔξεκκλησιαζειν has a close and equally frequent parallel ἐνεγγυαν in the augmented forms of ἐγγυάν (Crönert, MGH p. x). Here also the -γγ- is due to the influence of the noun ἐγγύη. It is not in our current LXX texts, and it could be ignored here but for a reference in HR and for the fact that the traditional editions, including Bos and even Grabe’s posthumous text, repeat it from the Sixtine in Prov. 6: 3 ἐνεγγυήσω. In Jos., AJ xvi, 227 codd. MW read κατενεγγυήσαν, Ε κατηγγύ-, but Niese rightly puts κατενεγγυήσεν.

ἔνεγκρατευομεθα. Offered in Justin, Apol. 1, 29, 1 by our poor evidence, this false formation reflects the -γχ- of ἐγκράτεια.

ἔνεμπορευομαι. One more example of the inferior and sorely unchecked information about the LXX in LS is its entry: ‘ἔνεμπορευομαι, trade with one in, σοι ἐν ψυχάς LXX Ezek. 27: 13’. Actually the Hebrew
has the participle ηροονται, the Greek ενεπορεύοντο. A" (= A - 26-544), a group with many peculiar readings (Ziegler, xvi 1, 30), alone read εμπορεύονται i.e. the present, which is the usual rendering of a Hebrew participle. But, as it stands, it looks like a conflation of έμπορεύονται and ενε[μ]πορευοντο. When comparing v. 21 (πισπιβας) we find εμπορεύονται as the majority reading and ενεπορευοντο in 967 A' - 106' and others. All this taken together gives the impression that the ενεμπορεύονται of A" was originally ενεπορευοντο, in which the -μ- had come in as a reminder of έμπορια, έμπορεύοσθαι. Nothing entitles us to trace this form back to the translator. It is a corruption on which no lexicon should base an article, any more than on the mere itacism εμπορειον for έμπόριον Arist., Oec. 1348 b 21, which latter Susemihl restored, though he left untouched εξεκκλησιασας.

None of the corruptions listed above represents spoken Greek. None is even likely to be intentional with the copyists. In all of them the spelling of the noun caused the intrusion.

2. Irrational nasal before consonants

άδρυνω/άνδρύνω. άδρυνω, to ripen, mature (always in pass.), which LS quotes only in connection with fruit, embryos, nestlings, is in the LXX always used of men (except in 2 Sam. 12: 3 of the poor man's only lamb and Ps. 143 (144): 12 our sons as plants grown up in their youth); to show off, swagger, 1 Macc. 8: 14 and similarly in Dan. 3' 8: 11 in a doublet in the Lucianic tradition (cf. Field). In our secondary evidence (but not, of course, in our editions) the infiltration of -v- resulted in an unwarranted *άνδρύνω in most of the passages — Exod. 2: 10; Judg. 11: 2, 13: 24; Ruth 1: 13; 2 Sam. 12: 3; 2 King 4: 18 — or else it resulted in other words which in themselves would be possible, but which in fact are clearly distortions of the less known άδρυνω = ἱππ. So we have άνδρω Exod. 2: 10 and Judg. 11: 2 in l, άνδριζω Ruth 1: 13 in y; the itacism ιδρυνθη 2 Kings 4: 18 in b' along with ιδρυνθη in qt and ιδρυνθη in x; whereas in Ps. 143 (144): 12 a considerable part of our evidence reads ιδρυμένα as from ιδρύω, here always without v. So in Job 34: 19 for άνδρος (ῥυσ) some MSS read άνδρον (AV), others άνδρός (cf. Field, Auctarium). We see therefore how precarious it is to say with LS: 'άνδρυνω = άνδρόω, Ps.-Callisth. 1: 13 (Pass.)'. This corruption of άδρυνω did not deserve an article and, moreover, even Müller's edition of Callisthenes (Paris, 1846), from which LS quotes, has the correct άνδρωθείς without any variant.
λευκαθίζω/λευκανθίζω. λευκαθίζω (cf. Wackernagel’s probable conjecture in Hes., Sout. 146 λευκαθεόντων) = Gothic liuha (= λευκαθα), German leuchten, is the only correct form, although Hude’s Oxford Herodotus 8, 27 still reads -ανθ- against the best MSS, as does the Babrius Papyrus against the metre, and the MSS of many Greek authors. In Lev. 13: 38 f. all our majuscules are correct and with them the editions. The minuscule evidence, however, shows that Origen and Lucian, among others, put the wrong form. In Song of Sol. 8: 5 B and Swete are correct, but Rahlfs, following SA, puts -ανθ-. One of the reasons why the secondary η-infiltration has become more habitual in this word than in others is the existence of words like λευκάνθεμον (cf. χρυσάνθεμον), λευκανθεμίς, white flower, and above all, λευκανθής, white-blossoming. λευκανθίζω, though formed on purely phonetic grounds, seemed to recommend itself as a derivation from such words. According to the evidence, Hesychius, in a gloss taken from Lev. 13, supports the inferior tradition -ανθ-; but Wackernagel, without mentioning the passage in Leviticus, concludes from the alphabetic sequence in Hesychius that he may have spelled λευκαθ- (Glotta 14, 46).

The infiltration of nasals before explosives found its first adequate treatment in W. Schulze’s essay ‘Samstag’ (KJ 33, 1895, now Kl. Schr., pp. 281–96). Among the surprises brought by the early ChB papyri is the fact that they display forms of λημψ- etc. without the inserted -μ-. I cannot now go into the problems which here call for an answer. The insertion of nasals was widespread. Schwizer, Gr. Gr. p. 123, gives examples of ‘inorganic nasalization’ from Asia Minor, and in the LXX there are occasions in which one may doubt whether they are due to Hebrew or Greek influences. *λευκανθίζω and *άνθρυνω have this in common that popular etymology may be at their root; but the combination with άνθος and άνδρ(ός) could not have taken place, if the -ν- had not been inserted for purely phonetic, i.e. subconscious, reasons. One may also remember the modern Greek spelling -ντ- and -μττ- which safeguards the pronunciation d and b, after δ and β had become spirants. But λευκανθ- with its aspirate certainly would not favour this explanation.
3. Insertion of explosive consonants between two other consonants

Εσδρας, Εσδραχ, Ισδρι, Ισδραηλ, Ιστραηλ, Μεσδραιμ, Μεστραϊμ, Μισθραιος, Σαμψων

Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* p. 277, from the LXX mentions Σαμψων, Ισδραηλ (-στρα-), Εσδρας, and a few more examples are given by Thackeray §7, 27. Compare also W. Schulze, *Kl. Schr.* pp. 275 n. 8, 710 n. 2. Moreover, *Istrahel, Isdrahel* which, along with *Israel* and *Sdrahol*, is fully supported by evidence from the Latin Bible in Rönsch pp. 459 f., seems to appear in the LXX only once, Εσδραηλιται, 4 Macc. 18: 1 in S (S always displays Ισδρ- in Acts: v. Soden pp. 1375 f.), but, according to W. Schulze, *Kl. Schr.* p. 383, it was a genuinely Greek vernacular form, removed from our MSS not later than in the fourth century. We should even mention Ιςδρι *τοι†*, 1 Chron. 25: 11, and Μεστραϊμ for Μεσραιμ ἰραζ Τμ Gen. 10: 6, and, less strongly attested, 10: 13. In 1 Chron. 1: 8 even our texts give Μεστραϊμ BLiy Arm.; Μεσδραιμ c2; the latter certainly is secondary (but compare Ιςδρι above, and Μισθραιος, which W. Schulze restores in Appian. *Mithr.* 10), for the last two examples have -στρ- for ῥα as distinct from -σδρ- for ῥα. Thackeray’s instance of δ (2 Kings 19: 37) has disappeared from Rahlfs’ text7 which reads Νεσεραχ instead of Εσθραχ Α (Θ ~ €), in spite of B’s Εσδραχ (τηνι 2 Kings 19: 37, cf. p. 320 n. 2).

Τελαμψουρ. This instance is of a slightly different nature, for here the same rule is applied to two contiguous words, disclosing what is called sandhi ‘i.e. changes in initial and final sounds of words when used in a word-group or sentence’ (Moulton–Howard ii, 541b, Index of Subjects).

1 Sam. 27: 8 the words τηνι ἐντειχισμένην τετειχισμένων are represented by ἀπὸ ἀνηκόντων ἐπὶ Γελαμψουρ τετειχισμένων. S. R. Driver, partly after A. Klostermann, most lucidly shows that there is ‘a doublet twice over (ἀπὸ ἀνηκόντων [apparently = μελλόν] ἐπὶ Γελαμψουρ [= ἐπὶ Γελαμψουρ [again + ἐπὶ] τετειχισμένων [clearly a second representative of ῥα *wall*])’. His restoration, after Thenius and Wellhausen, of σφι(γ)η in the Hebrew is sound, and the interchange of Τ ~ Γ being one of the most common, the whole LXX evidence favours this emendation. It is also clear that the two alternative translations, going back as they do to our corrupt Hebrew, have no significance. They are secondary even in the LXX, and must disappear from the emended text; for they are marked by ✻ in mtext (mtext displays mistaken asterisks) as the reading of
O' = Origen's LXX column. The alternative reading ἀπὸ Τελαμψουρ is likely once to have been marked by Origen by an obelus, of which no trace is left.

Above, I left η without accent. In our present context it must be taken as η introducing a doublet (so Klostermann and Nestle), in the emended text it is η representing τύραννο. But with this the text is still not mended. The parallels, in this book 15: 7, indicate that Τύραννος was originally rendered by ξως; this we must now insert, thus dissolving the compound Τελαμψουρ into Τελαμ τύραννο.

Thus the sandhi form Τελαμψουρ owes its origin to a mutilation of the original text in the course of the contamination described and consequently it does not belong to the original LXX. After ξως was dropped, copyists who no longer understood the place names took Τελαμ τύραννο as one word, so that their Τελαμψουρ with its infixed π (μπσ > μψ), is a complete parallel to Σαμψων.

4. On the pronunciation of ζ

4.1. ζ = σδ

Ionic-Attic ζ represents four different etymological values (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 330), one of which is σδ. So in δςος (Aeol. δςος) German Ast; ιζω Lat. sido, from *si-sd- according to Umbrian andersistu = 'intersidito'; Boeot. θεοζωτος Att. θεοζωτίδης = θεοοδ-; 'Αθήνας (cf. Μέγαρας) from *Αθάνας-δε.

4.2. σδ = ζ

The published text of Deut. 31: 13 in the ChB papyrus 963 reads [[Δ]]ως. Here Δ makes no sense. Unfortunately the plates of this volume are still unpublished, but we can hardly doubt that we must read [[Σ]]ως, both spellings (Δ and Ζ) representing an identical pronunciation, namely sonant σδ.

4.3. δ > ζ under the influence of an immediately preceding σ

Νέμεσις Ζικεα.° Ad. Wilhelm° brilliantly explained this as Νέμεσις σδικεα.

πύλης ζύό. This, the reading of A at Ezek. 40: 39, stands obviously for πύλησσοδύο.
4.4. ζ as a mis-spelling of δ

συμποδιον, τοπαδιον. It even looks as though copyists in various quarters had been made aware of the fact that in some instances 3 was a mis-spelling of δ. In this way Rahlfs explains Coptic spellings such as συμποδιον, τοπαδιον = συμπόσιον, τοπάζιον. Likewise in Ezek. 28: 13 the Scheide Pap. reads τοπαδιον and Tyconius cod. V topadii (Burkitt p. 78, l. 4).

ζιου/διου. Our last example is the transliteration of η. In the Hebrew the word occurs twice, at the beginning and at the end of the record about the building of Solomon's Temple. The original LXX transposes the verses 37 f. of 1 Kings 6 to the beginning of the chapter, after v. 1, as the second half of an insertion, the first half of which represents MT 5: 31, 32a. In the Hexapla they were brought back to their place after v. 34 (36), the place given to them by the Hebrew author, whose text of v. 1 suffered similar, but minor, influences from vv. 37 f. A still later recension, of which MNhy are the chief witnesses, places vv. 37 f. before, not after, v. 1. In the original LXX the word itself has suffered from mechanical corruption, as was seen by Montgomery. Three witnesses only have kept clear of it: 31ου ο; Xiiu La.; δειου n. The hexaplaric insertion has a unanimous θιου, which is read in the MN insertion too, with the exception of διου h. Thus in two of the three text forms a single minuscule indulges in the hyper-Graecism διου – apparently independently.

4.5. ζ = zd

"Αζωτος for τιψη in Hdt. has been observed by the grammarians before as evidence for the pronunciation of ζ in Greek as zd; Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 153, gives Αζεδωθ as the LXX form. Yet this is only partly correct; for, apart from Joshua, the LXX uses "Αζωτος throughout and 'Αζωτιοι for its people, as 'Αζωτιστι for their speech (2 Esdras 23: 24). There is an isolated 'Αζωτιο even in Josh. 13: 3, yet everywhere else in this book something peculiar has happened, namely a confusion with τιψη (cstr. τιψη) pl. of τψη (cstr. τψη) (the only occurrence of the sing. found in the Hebrew, Num. 21: 15, is not represented in the LXX), slope, steep descent. This is transliterated in Josh. (10: 40; 12: 3, 8; 13: 20) as in Deut. (3: 17; 4: 49) throughout, always in the form Αζηδωθ. In Josh. 10: 40 it is even given the article η as a fem. sing.
This indicates that the translator thought of a city-name (*scil. πόλις*), cf. the neuter plurals in -α with preceding η, collected by Thack. §11, 10.

This same Ἀσηδώθ is read for the city ἔβαλλα according to Bdghpr Co. Eth. La. in Josh. 15: 46, whereas in 11: 22 the most ancient evidence, including slight corruptions in B and Θ, leads to Ἀσεδώδ as the reading of BGΘ cfjosvz (Gcov -ωθ). In both passages Origen’s spelling obviously was Ἀσδώδ, and in 11: 22 FN, rel. Co. have Ἀσηδώθ, the reading of 15: 46 and, at the same time, the one uncontested in the passages rendering ὑππόλη ‘slopes’. As the B tradition of Joshua as a whole suffers from the careless transmission, at an earlier stage, of good and pre-hexaplaric material, and similar oversights are found in other passages, as in the unique Csiov for ἔρων instead of ἐρων 13: 21, we may safely state that Ἀσηδωθ is the general spelling in Joshua, the ending -θ once more pointing to the confusion mentioned.15
4. DEVICES FOR A CORRECT UNDERSTANDING AND PRONUNCIATION

1. Diaeresis

As there is a very clear and instructive paragraph on this topic in Moulton’s Grammar (ii, 50), I can briefly state that we use the sign of diaeresis (1) in order to avoid diphthongal pronunciation and (2) also elsewhere to mark the beginning of a new syllable. In many instances our usual method of accentuation precludes all confusion, and this applies also to Semitic proper names and place-names. I propose, however, to exclude names from this section, for their treatment would claim a disproportionate space, particularly since Rahlfs’ edition, which does away with accents and puts -ι- instead of the traditional -ει- when expressing ι, creates a series of fresh difficulties. They require a special chapter.

1.1. Avoidance of diphthongal pronunciation

A sign of diaeresis is required to ensure the correct pronunciation in words like δοσκος, which is always given without the puncta diaereseos (τρήμα) in the Cambridge editions. Here, too, Rahlfs shows his change of attitude; he follows the Cambridge practice in Exod. 28: 33 bis, 34; 36: 31 ff., but inserts the diaeresis in 2 Chron. 3: 16; 4: 13; Sir. 45: 9. If we were to confine the use of diaeresis to the strict avoidance of a mistaken diphthongal pronunciation, we could omit it in the cases with short terminations, because here the acute accent would indicate in itself that there is no question of a diphthong, which otherwise would here require a circumflex. Yet I should not suggest such a practice, as it is not actually found anywhere, nor is it suggested by the lavish usage throughout later antiquity.

So Rahlfs is certainly right¹ in spelling προη Job 7: 19, προέμαι Prov. 8: 4, προIoεμνον 2 Macc. 15: 12, εβραιστι Sir. prol. 22, Ιουδαϊκης 2 Macc. 13: 21, and Ιουδαισμος, Ιουδαιστι throughout. That he does not take the line tentatively suggested above is shown by his spelling εβραισι 4 Macc. 12: 7; 16: 15. In the latter passage Swete is inconsistent for once and puts a diaeresis. But I would go further than Rahlfs and give a diaeresis to Ιουδαιζον.
CORRECT UNDERSTANDING AND PRONUNCIATION

Esther 8: 17 where Rahlfs has none, apparently because the accent on the -α- precludes any misunderstanding. ἀδιόν Wisd. of Sol. 7: 26, shared with Swete, should be corrected after ἀδιότητος 2: 23 and ἀδιόν 4 Macc. 10: 15.

Rahlfs is likewise right in spelling προϋπήρχε Job 42: 17b, προϋποτεταγμένων 3 Macc. 1: 2, and προϋφεστώτος Wisd. of Sol. 19: 7, to secure the pronunciation prohu-. Here Swete adds to the failure of his presentation by even dividing προϋ-ποτεταγμένων which cannot but suggest a mistaken pronunciation.

μισούβρι, as Swete reads 3 Macc. 6: 9, is mistaken from two points of view. First it ought to display the diaeresis of its source (μισούβρει A), and secondly it ought to be proparoxytone. Moreover, its open, etymological, formation in -α- before the second component which starts with a vowel is extremely unlikely in 3 Maccabees with its stylistic aspirations. There are remarkably few examples of such open compounds at all, and A, where it stands alone, is rather unreliable in orthographical matters; so we may safely follow Rahlfs who, with the other MSS, including V, reads μίσυβρι. 2

None of our editions conforms to the common practice, shared by HR and LS; they all fail to spell βοί Exod. 23: 4. πρωί, πρωίθεν, πρωία, πρωινός, πρό'ίμος with a diaeresis. 3

1.2. Emphasis on beginning of fresh syllable

The diaeresis on ἰ (and ὰ) – which at an early period had already become simply a dot on the i, even in ἤτι (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 149) – was very useful in helping the later Greeks to understand and pronounce; and it should be introduced into our biblical texts to the extent of marking the division between the syllables. So we ought to read διϊκνείσθω Exod. 26: 28, διϊπταντος Wisd. of Sol. 5: 11, 4 διϊστήσιν Prov. 17: 9, διϊστώσιν Isa. 59: 2, περιϊπτάμενα 4 Macc. 14: 17, 6 περιϊσταμένου 2 Macc. 14: 9.

2. Accentuation

2.1. Traditional inadvertence

λύχνοι. An isolated instance of mistaken accentuation – λύχνοι for λύχνοι 2 Chron. 13: 11 – was observed in Swete by P. H. Hedley in his review of BH3 Gen. Ps. Is. (JTS 32, 1931, p. 305) and in a note in JTS
2.2. Neglected grammatical prescriptions

2.2.1. Place of accent

Other common mistakes are more serious, as they disclose a neglect of ancient prescriptions.

ἀδελφὲ. It is generally recognized that the vocative ᾧελφὲ was proparoxytone, since elsewhere the accent is drawn back as far as possible in the vocative. This is attested by Trypho Grammaticus (I) and is still alive in modern Greek. Our editors have been very slow to introduce the correct accent into their texts, as is shown by the list of mistaken accentuations given by A. Kaegi, Griech. Schulgrammatik p. ix n. 26. Even now we read ἀδελφὲ in Soph., Electra ed. Kaibel (quoted above, p. 44) 1346, 1484, and in Murray's Oxford Euripides, Iph. Aul. 471, 1241, Orest. 1037, in contrast with ᾧελφὲ Medea 1272. There is no doubt therefore that we should introduce ᾧελφὲ in the more than twenty LXX passages ranging from 2 Sam. 1: 26 to 4 Macc. 13: 11, 18, and the same applies to the NT (Acts 9: 17; 21: 20) and the Gospel of Peter 2: 5. For some unknown reason Rahlfs sometimes retains the incorrect form, so in 2 Sam. 20: 9; 1 Kings 9: 13; 13: 30; 4 Macc. 13: 11, 18; Jer. 22: 18.

ἀμητος. See below, sub τρυγητὸς.

δεσμὴ, bundle Exod. 12: 22. Given by Rahlfs as oxytone in accordance with the prescription of Herodian and with our NT texts, MT 13: 30. The same accentuation is in Schwyzter, Gr. Gr. p. 493, whereas Thackeray, p. 154, and LS mention only δεσμὴ. For δοχμὴ LS gives both alternatives, but quotes στάθμη as a paroxytone only. Lobeck who, Par. p. 396, tries to lay down a definite rule, gives plenty of material, but no satisfactory result. The only thing which he proves is that in the majority of MSS δεσμὴ is a paroxytone, and this cannot compete with the distinct prescription of Herodian.

ταμιεΐον. Another mistaken accentuation is confined to Rahlfs' later period. While he displays the correct ταμιεΐον in Ruth p. 151, and Gen. 43: 30 in his edition of 1926, for an unknown reason the Psalms of 1931
Correct Understanding and Pronunciation

Turn to a proparoxytone -ίειον, which is impossible. In the Stuttgart text the casus recti are correct only in Gen. 43: 30 and Judg. 15: 1 B text as against 23 instances of mistaken proparoxytone forms from Exod. 8: 3 (7: 28) to Ps. Sol. 14: 8.

tρύβλιον, cup, bowl. Expressly stated to be proparoxytone (quotations from grammarians in W.-Schmiedel §6, 7 b and LS); it may not be a diminutive at all. It occurs 18 times in a case ending in a short vowel, in all of which Bos, Swete, and HR accent the second syllable, as Rahlfs does except in 1 Kings 7: 36 (50), where for once he gives the correct accent.\(^\text{11}\)

τρυγητός, αμητος. Herodian teaches that, whenever the time (or act) of harvesting is meant, the words are proparoxytone, and oxytone, as participles, only when they stand for the fruit harvested or to be harvested. On the whole, this differentiation has been borne in mind by our editors, most carefully by Rahlfs and Ziegler; but even after my remarks in ThLZ, 1936, p. 283, which in general were followed up by Ziegler, there remain some passages in which the matter has not yet been definitely settled. For details see Excursus VII, p. 226.

φάρμακος/φαρμακός. φάρμακος, poisoner, sorcerer, magician, as a proparoxytone is taught by Herod., Gramm. 1, 150 in contrast to φαρμακός, scapegoat. The latter is classical, being used from Hipponax onwards and repeatedly by Aristophanes; the former is confined to the LXX, Revelation (21: 8, 22: 15) and Hermas, vis. iii, 9, 7 bis. Therefore W. Bauer, Wörterbuch ζ· JV7", confuses the issue by his information 'das Wort als Hauptwort seit Aristophanes'. In point of fact the biblical word is a fresh formation and ranges among those which mark a difference of meaning by divergent accentuation. It looks as though it was considered sub-standard by polished writers and Atticizing revisers.\(^\text{12}\) Where it is used, we must restore the correct accent, so twelve times in the LXX. Moreover φάρμακος, δ, ἥ, unlike φαρμακός, is of common gender. This is seen from Mal. 3: 5. Although the MT has masculine participles, ψεκασμένος, the LXX reads ἐπι τὸς φαρμακός καὶ ἐπι τῶς μοιχαλίδας, feminines which are not in the vein of the prophet’s context. Besides, participles do not any more than adjectives share in the liberty of using the ending ὅνω for feminines. In Exod. 22: 18 (17), however, where ἰσχυρός is taken to be a collective and rendered φαρμακος, it would not seem safe to assume that the Greek has changed the gender.\(^\text{13}\)
GRAMMATICAL CORRUPTIONS

Syr. Targ., which have the masculine, are no witness to the contrary, for they, or even the Hebrew on which they are based, may be influenced by Deut. 18: 10 ναῦσσε.

2.2.2. Differentiation of ώ and ὁ

There is another example of a traditional grammarians' rule the substance of which, although the authorities are to some extent contradictory even here, we should strictly apply as a welcome and simple means of interpretation. The 'interjection' ὁ, according to them, displays a twofold accent: a circumflex as a mode of address or invocation, but an acute as an exclamation, expressing surprise, joy, or pain. For the details see Excursus VIII, in which all instances of ὁ in the LXX and the NT are checked and classified. Where I spell ὁ, I am interpreting the sentence as an exclamation; where I put ὅ, I wish to indicate that here we have an address or invocation.

2.2.3. Neglected quality of vowels

The neglect of vowel-quantity in word-stems, where metre, etymology, and sometimes the witness of ancient grammarians put the quantity beyond doubt, has led to mistaken accents in our editions.

θλίψις, etc. We must accent θλίψις 22 times, Gen. 42: 21-4; Macc. 14: 9, and θλίψαι Lev. 26: 26; Sir. 46: 5, 16, with HR and Rahlfs; συντρίψαι Gen. 19: 9; Ps. Sol. 17: 24 Ra. = 26 Sw., ἐκτρίψαι Ps. Sol. 17: 23 Ra. = 26 Sw. with Rahlfs (the others are inconsistent - so also HR and Swete have συντρίβον 1 Kings 19: 11, συνεκτρίψαι Wisd. of Sol. 11: 19, ἐκτρίψαι 12: 9); ἐκτρίψαι Jer. 9: 21 (20); 1 Macc. 3: 35; 12: 53; 13: 1, 6, 20; 14: 31; 2 Macc. 9: 15, συντρίψαι Lam. 1: 15; Ezek. 30: 18; 34: 27 with HR and Rahlfs, as the simple τρίψον Isa. 38: 21.

ΙχΘΟς, (ὁφρΟς), ὁσφυς. An express teaching of Herodian regarding the nom. and acc. sing. of ΙχΘΟς (ὁφρΟς) and ὁσφυς which preserves the etymologically certain length of the υ (Moulton π, 141 f.; Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. pp. 463 f.), is not followed by any edition of the LXX or the NT. Yet, as Herodian does not postulate the circumflex for Attic alone, but for common Greek, he ought to be heeded, and Debrunner's remark that it is doubtful how much of the difference between acute and circumflex was still observed in the post-Christian Koine (Bl.-Debr. §13), is not
meant for, and does not apply to, the Ptolemaic period in which the LXX was written. Moreover, it is an unfortunate objection; for, as was said in our introductory remarks, our spelling, far from aiming at a phonetic reproduction of the translator’s actual speech, means a standardizing, and these standards, apart from comparatively few well-known exceptions, have been identical from ancient Greek almost to the καθαρεύουσα of today. Considering the definiteness with which Herodian presents the case, I feel sure that this is not one of the instances in which the Ptol. period introduced modifications of earlier Greek, and that ū was in the mind of the translators.

κεκραξαῖ, etc. In Isa. 65: 24 we must accent κεκραξαῖ, against all editions, including Ziegler’s, for not only do κεκραξομαῖ, ἐκκραξαῖ with κεκραγμός, κέκραγμα all derive from κέκραγα, but, moreover, Herod., Gr. 2, 14, expressly asserts that the α of the imp. aor. κραξοῦν is long by nature.

κὴρὐξ, κηρὐξαι. Thackeray does not mention κὴρὐξ (Gen. 41: 43; Sir. 20: 15; Dan. LXX Θ’ 3: 4, στριτοκηρὐξ 1 Kings 22: 36) nor κηρὐξαι (2 Chron. 36: 22; Isa. 61: 1; 1 Macc. 5: 49), the α of which is short by force of the following ξ, according to Herodian (K.-Blass 12, 458, B.-Debr. §13). Here Rahlfs and Ziegler alone have the correct forms.

κύπτω, etc. Since there is no evidence for a long υ in κύπτω (Bl.-Debr. §13, pointing to Luke 13: 11; 1 Pet. 1: 12), our editions are correct in reading κύψον Isa. 51: 23 and κύπτον Baruch 2: 18. Therefore Cohn was mistaken when in 1, lxxxxiii, he proposed to accent άνακυψαί alleg. π, 34. Likewise in the text ὑπερκύψαι, det. pot. 100, praem. 30, requires -υ-, just as we find correct ὑπερκύψαν (ptc. aor. ntr.) spec. leg. π, 166.

μεῖγμα/μίγμα. In Sir. 38: 7 (8) I prefer Rahlfs’ μεῖγμα to the μίγμα of the other editors. Both are possible, but since in earlier Greek a generalization by Systemzwang in favour of the stem-form μεῖγ- had already taken place (cf. p. 31), probability speaks for μεῖγμα, in spite of the general preference elsewhere in Hellenistic Greek for stem-forms with shortened vowel in nouns in -μα.

πίπτω, βιττω. Φιττω and πίπτω also have ἰ, the latter following the example of the former, its ‘causative’ as Schwyzer rightly calls it
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(Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 648). So we must accent βίψον Exod. 4: 3; 7: 9; 2 Kings 9: 25 (Swete βίψαι with BO'), 26 with Rahlfs, ὀπορρίψαι Sir. 6: 21 (22) with HR and Rahlfs (Swete -ρ-), and even the inferior reading of A 1 Macc. 3: 35 cannot stand as a paroxytone, as in Swete (ἐκρίψαι). In Job 14: 18 Rahlfs alone correctly reads πίπτον.

πνίγος, βίγος, ψύχος. Occasionally it is rather difficult to decide upon a vowel quantity. Regarding πνίγος, which is not found in the LXX, Phrynichus (Lobeck p. 107) attacks those βραχύνοντες τὸ ἰ; for βίγος and other nouns other grammarians attest a vernacular form with a short vowel. Yet, as Debrunner (Bl.–Debr.) §13 admits ψύχος to the NT, it may be safe with our editions to accent βίγος καὶ ψύχος Dan. LXX 3: 67 and ψύχος Gen. 8: 22; Job 37: 9; Zech. 14: 6; Dan. LXX Θ’ 3: 67, 69.

(χιδρον), plur. τὰ χιδρα, unripe wheaten-groats. This word has a long i. This is proved by metre (Huber, Lev. p. 6), and therefore our editions which accent χιδρα are mistaken. An indication of the correct pronunciation is perhaps found in the sporadic spelling with -ει-, Lev. 2: 14 in n and 23: 14 in g. A glossary quoted by Schleusner v, 523, differentiates χιδρα διὰ τοῦ ἰ and χειδρα διὰ διφθόγγου; but it attributes the same meaning to both and is, moreover, unsupported by any other grammarian.¹⁵

χρίσμα, χρίσις, χρίσαι, χρίσον. (Contrast μείγμα above.) In spite of Thack. p. 221, we must accent, with Rahlfs, χρίσμα Exod. 30: 25 bis; 40: 15; Sir. 38: 30; Dan. LXX Θ’ 9: 26, and χρίσις Lev. 7: 35 (25) (for χρίσμα see Bl.–Debr. §13, for χρίσις Huber, Lev. p. 6 with the literature given there, and the exceptionally instructive articles in LS). And certainly the aorist-stem of the verb displays i, as also the present-stem (W. Schulze, Quaest. ep. p. 356). HR and Rahlfs are therefore correct in accenting χρίσαι Num. 7: 88; Judg. 9: 8; 1 Sam. 15: 1; 1 Kings 5: 1 (15); Ezek. 43: 3 (here, for once, Swete agrees with them) and Dan. Θ’ 9: 24 and χρίσον 1 Sam. 16: 12. In Tobit 6: 8, B and S text, Swete himself is correct and spells ἐγχρίσαι.

2.2.4. Incorrect accents in verbal formations: traditional slips

Just as we find mistaken accentuations, which have passed from one edition to the next, in the formations mentioned above, so also in verbal
formations. Thus in 4 Macc. 8: 9 the subj. aor. διάθησθε, with this accent everywhere, ought to be διαθήσθε. Likewise πρόη Prov. 5: 9; 24: 67 (30: 32) is mistaken for προη. In 1 Esdras 4: 50 Swete and BM, following B*hjv, give ἀφιοῦσιν, correct as from ἀφίω, which is found earlier in the book (4: 7 ἐπεν ἀφεῖναι, ἀφιοῦσιν). Nevertheless, they are mistaken; for here, in 4: 50, the preceding ἵνα (as in Prov. 5: 9) requires a subjunctive, which is in fact supplied by AN rell La. Rahlfis, however, who has it, accents ἀφιώσι as from ἀφιημι. But since the translator uses ἀφεῖν, we must spell ἀφίωσι (cf. W.-Schmiedel, p. 123).

A similar traditional mistake occurs in all our texts for Prov. 8: 9, where the dat. part. pres. is accented συνιοῦσι. As there is συνιοῦν in 21: 11 and συνίει in 21: 12, 29, we are bound to put συνιέσι (remembering that the alternative could only be συνιεῖσι). In 2 Chron. 26: 5 Rahlfis was the first to accent συνιεῖσιν. συνιέσιν is the Lucianic variant; συνιόντος of the former editions was a mistake that died hard.

2.2.5. Incorrect accents in verbal formation: imperatives

ἐιπον. The form with which we have to deal here has long offered a real problem and has been much discussed. It is the imp. sing., belonging to the α-aorist ἐιπα, and I am going to offer a solution which, if accepted, would put an end to this discussion. It has, in fact, been adopted in Ziegler's editions, after having been proposed in ThLZ, 1936, p. 284 and accepted by Wackernagel–Debrunner, Philologus 95, 1943, pp. 179–81.

The grammarian Choiroboskos (on Theodos., ed. Hilgard ii, 245, 15) on the authority of Johannes Charax expressly states that, as far as biblical texts are concerned, the imperative aor. ἐιπον must be accented in what he calls the Syracusan way, as an oxytone, an accentuation which would be contrary to the entire profane tradition (cf. H. L. Ahrens, De Graecae Linguae Dialectis ii, 304 n. 7; Alex. Buttmann, Gramm. des nt. Sprachgebrauchs p. 50; W.-Schmiedel §6,7d; Bl.–Debrunner §81, 1; Schwyzser, Gr. Gr. p. 745). Yet it is obvious that this is a mere sophistication dating from a time very remote from the facts with which it attempts to deal, namely the time when accents began to be put in our MSS. So it is a secondary attempt at marking a difference between this imperative *ἐιπόν and ἐιπον, the first. sing. and third plur. of the indicative. Choiroboskos’ concluding words: οἶνον λάβε λάβον... ἐλαν ἐμε δευτόνως, δὴλον δτι καὶ ἐπὼν κτλ., look like a mere reasoning by analogy; none of the links in this chain should be taken at face value.
His idea is that the secondary imperatives, belonging to asigmatic α-aorists, followed the accentuation of the ε-imperatives formed from the original aorists in -ov-. Yet his argument does nothing to suggest that he was any better informed than we are about the peculiar features of non-Attic accentuation, and ‘Syracusan’ may only refer to some late pastoral poetry. We may, therefore, safely dispose of his teaching as not representing any genuine tradition. This involves an alteration of very many passages in the LXX, ranging from Gen. 12: 13 to Dan. Θ’ 4: 15 (18), among them as many as 44 occurrences in Ezekiel, to mention only one book, and alteration, as well, of the three instances in the NT, Mark 13: 4; Luke 22: 67; Acts 28: 26.

τε, λάβε. In five verbs the primitive oxytone imp. aor. sing. in -ε was preserved in Attic, as was the middle imp. aor. in formations like λαβοῦ throughout the whole history. Two of these, λαβε, λέε, were lost in the later development and are therefore expressly stated to be exclusively Attic. Thus there is no room for them in our texts, and our editions, including even Rahlfs’ earlier editions of Genesis, 1926, and Psalmi, 1931, rightly accent λάβε, λέε. It follows that we must correct a great many passages in Rahlfs’ Stuttgart text of 1935, which reads the Attic forms throughout.

κατάσχες. All our editions have preserved another traditional, mistakenly and wrongly accented imperative which, although maintained by some ancient pseudo-tradition, was expelled from our classical texts during the nineteenth century. Instead of κάτασχες πειράτω, 2 Sam. 2: 21, we must read κατάσχες παράτω, healing, at the same time, the haplography, which, though found in B only, has been taken over into our editions. The haplography is twofold: (Ε[Θ]Ε). Its unusual παράτω is convicted as secondary by the fact that Β, with all the others, displays πειρατω only six words later on (Thack. p. 190). To support κατάσχες we have τείχες in Job 18: 2, just as in third-century papyri (Mayser 2, 138 ff.) we find τείχες, σύνες. In Euripides, where the metre demands the same emendation, Elmsley, Brunck, Lobeck (Path. el. II, 208 ff.), and Nauck were right against Porson and G. Hermann. Although κατάσχες is found as v.l. in Philostratus and is read even in Pap. Mag. Lond. 97, 404 (LS) – without any indication of the accentuation in mind, of course – in our passage haplography offers the easiest explanation of the corruption. κατα-, πάρασχε, which encroach upon our rules for the accentuation of verbal compounds, cannot be explained.
as fashioned by analogy with κάτεχε, πάρεξε; and it is much more likely that the confusion of compounds of ἕξω and ἱσχω was at the root of the mistaken forms. So Götting rightly put ἐπι-ισχε as from ἐπι-ίσχω in Hes., Scut. 446, where the majority of MSS read ἐπι-σχε(ς) as from ἐπι-σχεῖν (K.-Blass 1, 2, 434; Wackernagel, NGG 1906, p. 175; Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 800; nothing in Thackeray).

2.2.6. Enclitic personal pronouns

Our list of incorrect accents is by no means complete, but I shall content myself with this last observation. It is inconsistent to write προς με, but προς σε and προς ἡμας, υμας. Certainly there is an ἐμέ besides με, but this does not mean that we should read each σε as equivalent to ἐμέ in the first person. As to the plural pronouns there is not only an express tradition (Apoll. Dysc., Synt. 130, 23) pointing at enclitic forms ἡμων, ἡμων, ἡμας and υμας, but, as can be proved, these forms were still alive in the later Imperial period; for Babrius (III P), who in his choliambi always has an accented syllable under the verse ictus of the penult., could not be read without breaking his rule, if we were not allowed to read there the enclitic forms (9, 9; 47, 11, υμας). For the whole see Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. pp. 601 ff.; LS sub ἐγώ and σύ. I do not propose to introduce the enclitic plurals, as this would be too unusual, but at least an equal treatment of the first and second sing., i.e. to introduce enclitic forms of the second person in all passages, in which the pronoun is used without emphasis, as equivalent to the enclitic με etc. in the first person. Take Gen. 31: 52, where προς σε and προς με correspond to one another. Here only Grabe accented correctly, whereas we read an inconsistent προς σε and προς με in Bos and Rahlfs, and even προς σε and προς με (!) in Tdf?, Sw., BM.

2.2.7. Supposed solecism

Rahlfs, who leaves proper names unaccented not only where they are merely transliterated, but also where they are fully Graecized and even inflected, but not found in non-biblical sources, extends this procedure to formations which he considers solecistic. But he could have taken from LS that δ ἄκαν and acc. τον ἄκαν, both 2 Kings 14: 9, are unimpeachable, though uncommon, Greek formations. The absence of accents in Rahlfs, and the accentuation ἄκαν, ἄκαν, which is peculiar to the Cambridge editions, are equally strange.
5. ACCIDENTE AND CONNECTED SYNTACTICAL MATTER

1. Nouns in -ις

There was always some fluctuation of inflexion in feminine nouns in -ις such as κλείν ~ κλείδα, χάριν ~ χάριτα (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 464). In our context four nouns call for special consideration.

βάϊς, palm-leaf, from Copt. bai. Here the only two examples from an intact pre-Christian book are found in 1 Maccabees. The first is in 13: 37, where the correct reading, the acc. βάιν, is in AV and a few others. The traditional editions and even Rahlfs, following S and the majority of MSS, have τήν βαινήν άπεστείλατε. This dittography was tentatively indicated by Schleusner 1, 536, and simultaneously removed in ThLZ 6, 1936, p. 284, and in Kappler's edition. This interpretation is more suitable than the old one suggested by Salmasius ad Achill. Tat., Erot. 4, 13 and Sturz, De Dial. Maced. et Alex. 1808, p. 89, according to which βαίνη meant ράβδος βαίνη, virga palmea, an assumption which is not supported by convincing parallels. The second example occurs in 13: 51, where we must read βαϊων against S* (Kappler). As we find βάιν in Horapollon (IVp) and acc. plur. βα(ε)ις in Porphyry, Abst. 4, 7 (as a quotation from Chaeremon Trag. IV*), it is difficult to understand why Mayser, 1, 2, 31 f., expressly states that instead of *βαϊς, *βαδος, which, he says, was to be expected, the Egyptians, assuming a word βαϊς, formed an acc. βάιν. Seeing that bai was a vocalic stem, what might we suppose to have been the origin of the dental in the other cases? What we do in fact find is precisely what 'was to be expected', a barytone word with a vocalic inflexion throughout. 2

βαίς is missing from Thackeray's enumeration §10, 18 (p. 150), and the gen. βαϊων, βαινων, mentioned above indicate that he is mistaken in asserting that 'Egyptian (Ionic) words in -ις are declined like πόλις'. Although these Egyptian words are i-stems, they are not declined in the (non-Attic, i.e. Aeolic, Doric, and) Ionic way, which retains this -ι- through all the cases. For acc. plur. ειβις B* Isa. 34: 11 is itacistic in both syllables for ἵβις, as is acc. plur. βαςις Porph., Abst. 4, 7 for βαςις. The only example that actually follows Thackeray's rule has nothing to
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do with this paragraph. Yet Thackeray’s examples θερμάστρεις, ἐπαρύστρεις are to the point, and there is one more requiring comment (see στίβις below).

ἐπαρύστρεις, vessels for pouring oil (into a lamp).

θερμάστρεις, kettles for boiling water.

These two examples are genuinely Greek; they occur within the narrow limit of nine verses and are of the same type. Our remarks concern their inflexion which can be seen from the acc. plur. In 1936 I merely said: ‘Für griechische Wörter verweise ich auf θερμάστρεις III Reg. 7: 26 (40), 31 (45), neben dem ἐπαρύστρεις 35 (49) in B beachtlich erscheint.’ Today I am happy to prove what I then suggested. θερμάστρεις is paralleled by three occurrences in fourth-century Attic inscriptions of an acc. sing., displaying a form without the second ρ, which had vanished from progressive Ferndissimilation, θερματίν instead of θερμαστίν (M.-Schw. p. 130, θερμαστίν; now Schwyzer (Gr. Gr. p. 464) more appropriately omits the accent). These formations are remnants of the former i-inflexion, the forms in -ίδος, -ίτος being secondary (Schwyzer, p. 464, § 1).

ἐπαρύστρεις is confined to B alone (here Swete’s and Thackeray’s ἐπαρύστρις is still better than BM’s ἐπαρυστρικός in contrast to the usual ἐπαρυστρίδας of all the others. Yet there are two important exceptions, La. reading ἐπαρυστρίδας tres aureas, and the hexaplaric text (Ax, while Syr. is missing) τῶς ἐπαρυστρίδας χρυσῶς τρεῖς. This bears out that ἐπαρυστρεις was in the original text, but at an early date, so that the formation was mistaken in as far as τρεῖς was thought to be three and the termination -ίδος consequently supplied. This secondary ἐπαρυστρίδας τρεῖς χρυσῶς was literally translated by the source of the margin of cod. Legionensis (La.*), and it was still in the text on which Origen drew. He, in an endeavour to improve upon the arrangement of words, produced τῶς ἐπαρυστρίδας χρυσῶς τρεῖς. Moreover, one may say with some likelihood that Lucian, when closing the sentence with χρυσά τὰ πάντα, seems to try to make sense of the expanded reading by means of a generalization, either as it underlies the Latin or rather in the Origenian form.

If, after this experience, we look back once more to θερμάστρεις, we find a close analogy. For τῶς θερμάστρεις in v. 31 (45) BM record ‘caldaria tria Arm. Eth.’ and the same for Eth. in v. 26 (40). And in this verse even La.* renders τοὺς λάβητος καὶ τῶς θερμάστρεις καὶ τῶς φιάλας by ollas tres et caldarias et phialas. Here it is obvious that
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tres has changed its place—for it is bound originally to have stood after caldarias.

So it is evident that in all three passages of this chapter there was a period when the termination -τρεῖς was mistaken for a numeral, though Origen was deceived over ἐπαρύστρεῖς only. Moreover it has been proved almost beyond doubt that θερμάστρεῖς and ἐπαρύστρεῖς are genuine. In both words we have to accent the penult., for a Greek using or reading a fem. acc. plur. in -εῖς in all probability related it to a supposedly wholly barytone paradigm like πόλις.8

στίβεῖς, powdered antimony, kohl. Our editions give it in the form στίβη, Jer. 4: 30, following BS (στιμη Α, στειμι Q). But this is an itacism, the context requiring a dat. instrument., so that we must write ἕν ἔγχριση στίβει (παραδ.) τοὺς ὀρθαλμοὺς σου. The same Παράδειγμα occurs in Isa. 54: 11 where A' Θ' have ἕν στίμει, C' στίμει, according to Eusebius and Procopius (cf. Ziegler's second apparatus), spelled στίβει in cod. 86.7

2. Verbs

2.1. Corrupt future middle formations with passive meaning

The LXX no longer knows any future middle formations with passive meaning; to avoid them the authors do not refrain from using very long formations, like λιθοβοληθήσομαι, ἔξολεθρευθήσομαι (Helbing, Gr. p. 98); the same has been observed in the Ptol. papyri (Mayser 11, 122 f.). In Pap. Tebt. 1 61 (b) : 314 f. we have a middle form ἀποκαταστήσονται, most likely with passive meaning; yet since a few lines later (321) we read ἀποκαταστάθησονται in an identical context, it may be safest to emend the former instance to agree with the second. An analogous emendation was proposed by Wackernagel (ThLZ, 1908, pp. 640 f.) when he pointed to an apparent exception from the rule, Gen. 16: 10 πληθύνων πληθυνῦ τὸ στέρμα σου καὶ οὐκ ἄριθμησεται ἀπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους. 'Hier ist -σεται sicher passivisch. Aber gegenüber den Hunderten von Gegenbeispielen kann diese eine Stelle nichts beweisen. Die Form ist durch Haplographie aus ἄριθμησεται entstanden; vgl. Gen. 13: 16 (ἐξ)ἀριθμηθήσεται (ἀριθμηθήσεται in cod. 76) und II Chr. 5: 6 ἀριθμηθήσονται.' Consequently Rahlfs, who purposely does not mention merely scribal mistakes, puts the aor. pass. in his text without mentioning the middle aor. read by Aglmt only.

There are, however, two more passages left for discussion which Thiersch, p. 92, had already mentioned as rare exceptions. As to the
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first, Gen. 17: 17, 'γεννήσεται nasceetur’, our majuscules, including 911 (IIIP), no longer support the -νν- formation as from γεννάω, reading γενήσεται, from γίγνομαι come to life, be born, which is a standing usage from Homer onwards. If not merely scribal, the only variation worth mention is M’s γεγενήσεται which would be a unique fut. III.8

Thiersch’s second example, ‘συναριθμήσεται numerabitur’, Exod. 12: 4, has not been dealt with since. The middle is read by BA b’cdkt Cyr. only, the others putting the pass. Yet we must read συναριθμήσετε, as does cod. 76, έκαστος... συναριθμήσετε, in accordance with the Hebrew and the AV every man... shall make your count (the Vulgate and Luther omit the verb).9

2.2. Future of χαίρω and its compounds

Here things have been put right by Wackernagel (ThLZ 1908, p. 640). In the simple verb the LXX, as the later translators, the Book of Enoch and the NT, use χαρήσομαι, a Hellenistic formation fashioned after ἔχαρησα. Therefore the only exceptions, χαροονται Zech. 4: 10 (BS*W) and χαρεϊται Zech. 10: 7 (BS*AQ), the latter along with χαρήσεται in the same verse, must be corrected. In the compounds, however, there exists only ‘die spezifisch jüdische Neubildung’—χαροομαι. 3 Macc. 1: 8, Wackernagel adds, is not evidence to the contrary; for this author does not write LXX Greek. συγχαρησομένους, as read by the traditional text against χαρησομένους of A (χαρισομένους V, Rahlfs, is an unfortunate compromise) is required by the sense congratulate, and this formation is quite usual in Polybius, the inscriptions and elsewhere. Other parallels, including some from Diodorus, who, he says, is neglected by Hellenistic research, are added by Ad. Wilhelm (Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Wien, 1937, pp. 28 f.). Wackernagel’s explanation is obvious—the polysyllabic compounds were more easily influenced by the ordinary verbs in -αίρω (καθαίρω and others) than the disyllabic χαίρω.10

2.3. Impossible aorists in -σασθαι, formed on the analogy of futures in -σεσθαι

In the same context of his review of Helbing (ThLZ, 1908, col. 636) Wackernagel sets right Helbing’s statement ‘für έτυξον einmal έτυξα II Ma. 15: 7’ (p. 91), pointing out that the passage in question has the middle: πεποιθώς μετά... ἔλπιδος... τεύξασθαι (τεύξεσθαι q-120 62–93
58) and that in sentences expressing hope we should expect the future. On the other hand, W. Kappler, *De memoria alterius libri Maccabaeorum*, Diss. phil. Gött., 1929, pp. 29 f., decides ‘τεύξασθαι, utpote magis insuetum, correctum est’ (he means rectum – correct). Neither author pointed to the parallels found in Maccabees. In 3 Macc. 2: 33 Rahlfs reads εὐθλιπῶς...τεύξασθαι (A pau.) -ξεσθαι rel.), and in the same 2 Macc. 9: 22 ἡχεόν...θυπίδα ἀκρεύξεσθαι (ξεσθαι V 12019–9355 106 771). Taken together, these instances allow for a certain decision. Nobody disputes the fact that Hellenistic Greek confused future and aorist infinitives (mostly in stock formulae, different from ours, Mayser pi 1, 219 f.; 2 2, 163 f.). In the NT the future infinitive after verbs like ἐπίλειψαι is confined to the literary style of Acts and Hebrews, but even these books elsewhere use the aorist infinitive, either uncontested or as a variant. For the future infinitive after ἔλεξείν B stands alone in Acts 26: 7 (Bl.–Debr. §350). In 2 Macc. 7: 11 the aorist is almost unanimous ταύτα πάλιν ἐπιτίγω κομίσασθαι [ξεσθαι A, and undisputed in Job 24: 23 μὴ ἐπιτίξωτον ἥγιασθηναι -αναι A. In the former the alternative is the present. The present is unopposed in the mistranslation of Gen. 4: 26 (Enos) ἥλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι. If thus the aorist infinitive has almost universally taken the place of the future, there is no need with Thackeray pp. 76, 287 to compare misformed futures such as Mayser cites from papyri, ἐσασθαι, παρέξασθαι. They are without parallels in the LXX and particularly unwarranted in books with the literary aspirations of 2 and 3 Maccabees. This, however, is not the decisive point. For τυγχάνειν we know of no middle aorist formed on the lines of act. ἔτυχον. For τεύξασθαι K.–Blass 1 2, 556 quotes Themistius (IVp) as corrupt. Similarly for ψέψαι K.–Blass 1 2, 561 notes θέψα = Χψεφαν from Hesych., ‘wohl nur spät, ἅκρεύξας or. Sib. 6, 6’, But LS has δια-θέψασθαι Decr. Ath. in Hp., Ep. 25. It is for this reason that we decide for the future in all three passages, though it is strongly attested only in 3 Macc. 2: 33 (τεύξασθαι) and 2 Macc. 9: 22 (ἐκρευξεσθαι). The opposing forms in -ασθαι are due to later scribal changes, cf. 2 Macc. 9: 17 επελευσασθαι A 347, as quoted in R. Hanhart’s Göttingen edition of 2 Macc., 1959, p. 25 n. 11.

2.4. Competing aorist formations

To return once more to χαίρω, there is strong evidence for an aor. ἐπέχαρα. ἐπέχαρας is unanimously attested in Ezek. 25: 6 and given by all our editions; in addition it is even found in Scheide Ezek. 25: 3 for
the ἐπεχάρητε of all the others. It is therefore a question of a merely traditional slip, observed by W.-Schmiedel p. 109, that all our editions spell ἐπιχαρέντες in Baruch 4:31, although B*A are certainly right in spelling ἄντες, for which there is a parallel from Π⁺ in Mayser 1² 2, 133.

A similar mistake occurs in Sir. 13:22. σφαλέντος v. 22 α and σφιλάν v. 22 ε are no more consistent than ἐπιχαρέντες and ἐπέχαρας. So we ought to read σφιλάντος. From Smend's commentary we learn that with this not all difficulties have disappeared.

As to the new second aorist ἀνέθδλον Thack. p. 235 is right in considering it legitimate, and Bl.-Debr. § 75, wrong in proposing to read -λλ- instead of -λ-, thus restoring present formations.

If our texts are right there is another intransitive aorist in -ον 4 Macc. 4:23, δόγμα ἔθετο ὑπός, εἰ τινες αὐτῶν φάνοιεν τῷ πατρίῳ πολιτευόμενοι νόμῳ, θάνοιεν. This would make sense: *if it were manifest that some behaved according to the traditional law, they would be killed.* And it may be out of respect for the rhetorical assonance that no editor seriously considered the reading of Α ΦΑΝΙ6 = φανείεν. I do not propose to adopt it either, as does Thack. p. 288 n. 1. But there is a third possibility. If we keep in mind the high stylistic aspirations of our author, however remote he may be from the decided Atticism of later writers, we could feel induced by a very slight alteration to find here the specifically Attic mode of expression φανθηναι for to be denounced.

Writing φανθηναι, we would sacrifice the assonance, but give to the text an interesting nuance, which would be by no means out of its reach. Then φάνοιεν, if not merely a scribal mistake, would be a later adaptation to θάνοιεν.

2.5. Assimilation of verbal formations as to voice and tense

An assimilation of verbal formations from the vicinity, including a change of voice and tense, is unmistakable in 1 Kings 8:57 γένοιτο κύριος...μεθ' ἡμών..., μη έγκαταλίττοιτο ήμες μηδε άποστρέψοιτο ήμες. Here the middle formation έγκαταλίττοιτο is entirely unique; and, as the context here excludes a future optative, the resulting sigmatic aorist with an asigmatic termination in -οι is hardly less irregular. So Lucian corrected both forms, putting ἐγκαταλίπτω and άποστρέψαι. In the second verb he is decidedly wrong as to the voice, άποστρέφεσθαι, to forsake, abandon, being good Attic and Hellenistic Greek (Schleusner 1, 403; Helbing, Kasussyntax p. 35; W. Bauer* col. 199; Bl.-Debr. § 149). Representing the same ὄψι we read σφιλάντος με
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Jer. 15: 6, and the same aor. pass. occurs in the NT, Matt. 5: 42; 2 Tim. 1: 15; though the middle aor. is found in 3 Macc. 3: 23 as in Hos. 8: 3; Zech. 10: 6 (Thack. p. 286). Of the alternatives ἀποστρέφω and -ψάω, only the latter is possible, as our verse forms part of a prayer of blessing. In Hebrew blessings and wishes are expressed by the jussive, the shorter imperfect form; this, however, is in most instances indistinguishable, but fortunately the first verb in the sentence is an obvious jussive, γένοιτο, and so Fr. Böttcher §964 (n, 182) is right in interpreting as jussive the two following verbs also, which are rendered by the two Greek verbs in question; as will be seen later, the LXX renders them by opt. aor. Consequently A and 10 minn., which read ἀποστρέψαιτο, are correct (ἀποστρέψετω gu and -ψάτω i represent another recension which I am unable to identify off-hand).

As to the first verb, Lucian is obviously right in putting the active form ἐγκαταλίπτω. As a matter of fact, we cannot decide with certainty whether in doing so Lucian preserved the correct tradition or merely restored the correct form. In the latter case his evidence would not necessarily stand for the original Greek wording; yet if there has been an adaptation of ἐγκαταλίπτω to the surrounding middle forms γένοιτο and ἀποστρέψαιτο, it is far more likely to have taken place in the course of transmission, early enough to influence the entire evidence, except Lucian.\(^{18}\)

There are, however, examples of mistaken voices which cannot be explained by influences from the vicinity. Some of them have the verb in question twice, and here no reason can be seen why the faulty form should have come in side by side with the correct one.

τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας, Wisd. of Sol. 19: 14 (13). This active cannot possibly mean those unknown; long ago Grotius and Grabe put τοὺς ἀγνώτας.

ἀπέχυννε, 1 Kings 22: 35. ἀπεχύννετο τὸ αἷμα ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς = προσθήκη ἔφη is required. Only B reads το twice. The Hebrew is intransitive, cf. κέχυται Job 38: 38. Rahlfs' ἀπέχυννε τὸ αἷμα may rest on the assumption that the LXX took ἔφη as a transitive, but would not this require τοῦ? Yet what we find here is not a confusion of voices, but mere haplography. In this chapter the Greek article occurs where the Hebrew has a construct state. We therefore cannot acquiesce in the reading of the Cambridge editions, ἀπεχύννετο αἷμα. Moreover, as the Greek puts ἐκ, the article becomes still more indispensable. Even the doublet later in the verse, τὸ αἷμα τῆς τροπῆς, has the article.
**ACCIDENCE AND CONNECTED SYNTACTICAL MATTER**

**βουλεύω.** The active is frequent in poetry, rare in Attic, and foreign to the LXX except for Isa. 23: 8. Here we read βουλεύσεων = γρ, but in the following verse βουλεύσατο = γρ. The meaning of both is identical in the Greek, as it is in the Hebrew, and therefore we must adopt βουλεύσατο although it is in S Syr. RG minn. only.

**ελέγξαι, 1 Chron. 12: 17 (18).** Of the variant readings,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ελέγξοι</th>
<th>ελέγξει</th>
<th>ελέγξας</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>AN rell.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ελέγξαι alone is correct. Here there is no middle form in the vicinity; only the tense vowel suffered attraction.

**ἐξεκτράσασθε.** This impossible middle is read by Rahlfs in Deut. 6: 16 in spite of ἐκτράσεις earlier in the same verse. In this he follows B*AFM minn., strong evidence, indeed, which has since been reinforced by Papyrus 963. The earlier editions, including Swete and BM, all had ἐξεκτράσατε, a received text for which Rahlfs, owing to the restriction imposed on his annotation, quotes Bc only. In the Hebrew וַיְרֶשֶׁם, no shade of difference in meaning can be detected. The explanation has nothing to do with grammar. To put the passage right we must call to mind the continual fluctuation between the second sing. and the second plur. found in Deuteronomy. It occurs both in the MT and the LXX. But in many instances the resulting text of the LXX differs from that of the MT. If we accept Rahlfs' reading, the two texts would offer the following sequences of numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>verse</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sing.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plur. plur.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>sing. plur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plur. sing.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>sing. sing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In point of fact the LXX, supported by the Samaritan, keeps the sing. of v. 15 longer than the MT. Therefore not only -ασασθε is mistaken, but also the active -ασαι of the remainder looks like a tertiary compromise. So we are left with ἐξεκτράσασας = MT which is read by Ny Eth. La., and this is no doubt the correct reading. The early corruption -ασθε is easily explained as the result of two-sided dittography -ας[ΘΕ]έν - for which I may refer to the analogous haplographies φυγ(ιε)ιεα (p. 112) and κατασχε (C) C (E)αυτω (p. 100).
**GRAMMATICAL CORRUPTIONS**

εὑροῖτο, 1 Sam. 24: 20, read by Bjyab₂ for κοινωνία, is corrupt, since none of the connotations which are expressed by the middle applies. Read εὑροῖ with Ν rel. Chr. (c εὐρη Α εὐροῦν). In the same verse, αὐτῷ must be replaced by σοί, though it is only in the Ethiopian and Lucifer, of which the former certainly reflects a correct Greek and the latter most likely. Finally, there should be a question mark after ἀγαθῇ.

2.6. Optative aorist

The 3rd sing. opt. aor. in -σαι and the 3rd sing. fut. act. in -σει tend to be confused in our tradition, and therefore some grammatical discrimination is required, lest we introduce some rash corrections.

There are instances where the context and parallel passages permit a certain emendation, so in Lev. 5: 16 the opt. aor. ἀποτείσαι B*Awyz, which Huber, *Lev.* p. 3, does not understand and would take to be an inf. aor. -τείσαι, is shown to be mistaken for the fut. ἀποτείσει by the following προσθήσει καὶ δῶσει and the analogous wording of 5: 24.

There are, on the other hand, instances where, quite apart from other considerations, to which we shall have to return, some of the Greek forms are too different to be easily interchanged. So, as I tried to show, *ThLZ,* 1938, p. 34, in a review of *BH* 3, part 13, Megilloth, Th. H. Robinson was not justified in even tentatively suggesting in ποιήσαι Ruth 1: 17 a corruption of an original ποιήσει (his note β), as he himself does not suggest changing the following προσθήσει into προσθήσει (his note γ). He ought to have remembered that the same form of oath, τάδε ποιήσαι καὶ τάδε προσθήσει (κύριος) occurs elsewhere in 1 Sam. 3: 17; 14: 44; 20: 13; 25: 22; 2 Sam. 3: 9, 35; 19: 13 (14); 1 Kings 2: 23; 19: 2; 21 (20): 10; 2 Kings 6: 31.

So, although the optative mood underwent a continuous process of elimination in the post-classical period – interrupted only by an artificial revival during the Atticizing reaction of the Imperial period – a process which led to its complete disappearance in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular* p. 115), and although many of the specifically Attic niceties as regards the use of the optative no longer exist for our authors, there is an extension of classical usage peculiar to the LXX. After earlier, less adequate, attempts to circumscribe and define it (*ThLZ,* 1936, p. 341; 1938, p. 34) I am now able to delineate its setting, proper usage and Hebrew root, for it is a distinctly syntactical Hebraism. For all particulars I refer to Excursus IX, p. 237.
3. Mechanical corruptions

This is the proper place to point out that some verbal forms of the LXX play a regular part in our Greek grammars only because of their corruptions, and that, when they have been emended, they have to disappear from them.

3.1. No prohibitive subj. pres. after μή

The Greeks do not use the subj. pres. with μή in a prohibitive sense (K.—Gerth p. 210); the few examples rather hesitatingly quoted by Gerth have now been emended in our editions. Even Mays, p. 147 n. 1, gives very few examples and so likewise shows that they require an easy emendation. The only instances left are two of μή έξη in one and the same second-century papyrus. The reason is obvious: there is no aorist of έξεϊναι, whereas γενέσθαι is the aorist for the simple είναι. After reporting (n. 1) that in μή ἄγωνις, Oxy. iv 744, 4 (I), Wilamowitz suggests a scribal error for μή άγωνιας, Mays goes on to say, 'Bisher war das älteste derartige Beispiel Tobias 3: 3 μή με έκδικης'. Yet this is not the reading of any MS. Β alone reads μή έκδικης, the others μή με έκδικήσης, only b omits με and dp put με after the verb in a rather un-Greek way. Now according to Nestle and many others, the Β text of Tobit is only a shortened recast of the S text, and the S text here agrees with the others against Β alone. So here the evidence itself provides the same correction which in Oxy. is due to Wilamowitz.

Mays could have quoted Obad. 12 as well, where a similar corruption was equally corrected by Rahlfs, who restored μή μεγαλορρημονής after μή έπίδης καί μή έπιχαρής (Swete, BW 142—μονής).

3.2. No ἔνι for ἔστιν

There has been much discussion, chiefly among NT expositors, regarding the interpretation of ἔνι in Sir. 37: 2 οὐχὶ λύπη ἔνι ἔως θανάτου (Bl.—Debr. §98). Relying on information provided by R. Smend, Wackernagel discussed it in NCG, 1906, p. 179 n. 1. There are two alternatives — the older meaning is be in the midst and be possible, this latter still found in Polybius and 4 Macc. 4: 22 in both instances = ἔνεστιν. Later, 'in a more recent or more vulgar form of Hellenistic speech' and in modern Greek, where it is spelled είναι, it is a mere equivalent of ἔστιν, and no longer of ἔνεστιν. Smend, and Wackernagel...
with him, believe that since the discovery of the Hebrew original the first-hand reading of the uncial, now including ChB 964 (IVp) "in" is definitely shown to be superior to the less attested reading "μένει". In this they are doubtless right. Yet they further say that the Hebrew puts the meaning is beyond doubt, so that the translation "inest" of the Latin Bible was simply mistaken. In this they are wrong, because neither the Hebrew nor the Greek, when emended, means "is".  

20 The Hebrew in Smend's text runs thus (the pointing is mine, as Smend gives an unpointed text): נִלְגָּא יִשְׁבָּה "is it not a grief verging on death? Before turning to the Greek we consider the parallel passages in Sirach. One is in the same chapter, 37: 30, יִשְׁבָּה עַל הַיָּדוֹ and the greedy man is near to dysentery. The other is 51: 6 תַּנְנָי and verging on (the kingdom of) death was my soul. There are two more parallels, where the Hebrew is missing. In 23: 12 the Greek, in an emended form, reads, and Smend translates, There is something else that comes near to death. Here the Greek, εστίν λέξις ἀντιπαραβεβλημένη θανάτω, differs from the usual rendering, as it does in 31: 13 (Ra. 34: 12) επόθανάτου έκκυνησώσα where Smend, p. 308, suggests "νη for the Hebrew, observing that the Syriac translation is the same as in 51: 6 (Δάφαν). In 37: 30 and 51: 6 the translator renders "νη Hiph. by γγίαν (37: 30 καὶ η ἀπλήστια γγίαν ευς χολέρας; 51: 6 γγίσεν επόθανάτου η ψυχή μου), as the Psalmist had done in two completely analogous passages, 87 (88): 3 (4) καὶ η ἀσύμμετρα γγίονει ἀπό το χολέρας έκκυνησάν (106 (107): 17 (18) καὶ η γγίσαν επόθανα πτών πωλήν όμον θανάτου. From these parallels it is obvious that instead of "νη we must read γγίσαν, the corruption being a result of mere haplography (ἐΓΓΓΕΙΕΩ, combined with a confusion of ΓΓ ~ Ν) .

23 This emendation accepted, Sir. 37: 2, as the only example in the LXX for the later usage of "νη = εστίν and the earliest example anywhere, vanishes, so that the Greek OT offers no parallels to the NT usage, for which Pernot (MSL 9, 178 ff., quoted by Wackernagel) gives the striking parallel of French il y a, in the modern use of which the local meaning represented by y is eliminated in the same way.

4. Post-Ptolemaic formations, which have to be emended

Before passing on to remarks on word-formation proper I here propose to emend some passages which bear unmistakable traces of a post-Ptolemaic modernization.
ζύτος/ζυθος. The first is concerned with a change of consonant in the word for beer, namely ζύτος in the Ptol. papyri, but ζυθος in those of the Imperial period (Mayser 1, 36, 179). In the only LXX passage, Isa. 19: 10, our editions put ζυθον, but in 1936 (ThLZ, p. 283) I saw that the corruption ζυγον in S* points to the restoration of the proper form. Here, as often, a corruption (Τ > Γ) made modernizers overlook a formation which elsewhere was bound to be modernized. Ziegler, who in 1939 consequently admitted ζυγον into his text, was able to give further evidence for ζυγον from 198c and 534, two minuscules which, though equally belonging to the Alexandrinian group of MSS, are codices mixti and elsewhere have no specially marked kinship with S.

κατάγαια, μεσόγειος, ύπόγαιος. Sometimes the dividing line between Ptolemaic and other speech cuts across the LXX. Consider the formations derived from γῆ, Ionic and Hellenistic -γαιος, Attic -γειος. So rightly κατάγαια, Gen. 6: 16, following which we should read τὴν υπόγαιον, Jer. 45 (38): 11 with AQ* (S -ε- is rather equivocal), whereas it may be safe to accept the Attic form attested in 2 Macc. 8: 35 τῆς μεσογείου. In another instance 2 Maccabees betrays its vacillation between vernacular and more cultivated speech. When writing τὴν αυλαίαν θύραν, 14: 41, it follows the prescriptions of the Atticists (Harpocration ed. Dindorf, p. 66, referring to Menander, and Moeris ed. Piersonus, p. 65, αυλ(ε)ία θύρα Άττικώς, πυλών Έλληνικώς), though its spelling, as far as we can trust it, in -αι- is unique, for we have to keep distinct αυλαία = curtain.

μηνιάσης, Sir. 10: 6 (μηνίσης SA). This is a typically Hellenistic form, as is the hapax legomenon μηνίαμα Sir. 40: 5 (4). The same μηνιάσης must be restored in Sir. 28: 7 against the entire evidence, which reads μηνίσης. The outstanding parallel witness for μηνίαν is Apoll. Rhod. (III 1) 2: 24. Our emendation in Sir. 28: 7 is all the more corroborated by the fact that in mistranslating the difficult verse, 10: 6, the translator was guided by 28: 7 (cf. Smend). With later copyists the influence of Lev. 19: 18 may have led to the change of μηνιάςης into μηνίσης.

νουμηνία/νεομηνία. Only in the Imperial period and not earlier do we find the form νεομηνία, for then it had become a pedantic fashion to indicate more perspicuously the component parts of a compound. Here our editions still represent the haphazard mixture of ancient and modern
found in our MSS, in B worse than in A. In most instances they happen to be correct, yet Rahlfs still has six mistaken open forms νεωμήνις, *viz.* Num. 28: 11, where A with many others, including ChB 963, is right against B; 1 Sam. 20: 5; 2 Kings 4: 23; 1 Chron. 23: 31; Ezek. 23: 34, where Scheide with the bulk of MSS is correct against B and a few followers, and Ps. 80 (81): 4 (Mayser 1, 153; Wackernagel, *ThLZ*, 1908, p. 37; Thackeray p. 98). Moulton π, 91 (though not on p. 279) may be right in excluding the open form also from the NT, as νουμήνις is still read in the Epistle to Diognetus 4: 1.

σκοτομαίνη/σκοτομήνη. There is no reason to substitute σκοτομήνη for the reading of B*A in Ps. 10: 2 σκοτόσινη (spelled here -ενη), derived from σκοτόμαινα, for which see Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 499, Hesychius s.v., and Meister π p. 21.

[In his MS Dr Walters has here two paragraphs summarizing Deissmann’s observations on two words. They are marked in the margin with the note ‘del. 136 f.; careful with footnote’. This I interpret to mean that he wished to delete Deissmann’s observations (presumably because they were not his own work) but to retain the lengthy comments in his own footnotes. I give, therefore, the references to Deissmann and the footnotes in full. Ed.]

γραμματεύς. 27 See Deissmann, *BSt* pp. 106 ff.

χατεχαστος. 28 See Deissmann, *BSt* pp. 135–7.
6. WORD-FORMATION

1. Nouns

γένημα: γέννημα. 'Γένημα (unrecorded in LS ed. 8) is a new κοινή formation from γίνομαι = produce of the earth, fruit, and is carefully distinguished from γέννημα, offspring (from γεννάω).' Thackeray's statement, p. 118, based on Deissmann and Mayser, is correct. But we cannot follow him in excepting 1 Macc. 1: 38; 3: 45, where the bulk of the evidence would suggest γένημα as 'applied to Jerusalem's offspring'.

LS has now an article on γένημα, but it leaves much to be desired. Polybian passages such as 1, 71, των εκ τῆς χώρας γενημάτων must still be looked up under γένημα, although the best evidence has the correct -ν-, as is rightly stated by W. Bauer p. 280.

ι Mace, 1: 38 and 3: 45, on the other hand, form part of dirges about desolate Jerusalem and its 'offspring', children. Both Rahlfs and Kappler, nevertheless, retain the γενήματα of their sources, the former with a reference to Thackeray, the latter on the authority of Phrynichus (Lobeck p. 286) who warns against the use of γενήματα for καρποί. But here in Phrynichus, as Bl.-Debr. § 111 states, we must read γενήματα. Thus the Atticist's warning is not directed against an extended use of γένημα, but against the new Hellenistic word γένημα.

πρωτογενημα(τα) which renders τοινίου or τοισι, thus fruits of the field or of trees, is always correct with -v in Rahlfs. In Cohn and Wendland's Philo the spelling with -vv- is carried through, although it is everywhere mistaken for the compound and in most instances for the simple noun where vegetable produce is meant. We even find the correct spelling recorded as corrupt in the annotation, so in det. pot. 114 or de decal. 160. In 1 Chron. 4: 8 all editions still have γεννήσεις for γενήσεις, as found in vv. 2, 21, 38 of the same chapter, and besides in Exod. 6: 24 f. and Num. 1: 18, with no variants, except for the Lucianic δημοι. BM now record γενήσεις from f (= 489), doubtless the correct reading. This connotation is not in LS.

As to the underlying verbs, γενέσθαι shares in the rendering of דָּהִ, most frequently in Genesis. This is in accordance with classical usage and
involves no toning down. The primary meaning of γίγνεσθαι is come into being and to be born (of persons), to be produced (of things). There is some dilution in the meaning take place, come to pass (of events) and still more in become (with predicates) and whenever the past tenses are used to supply the defective verb είναι. The reduplicated γι-γν-εσθαι and γενναν, its causal (LS), derive from the same root. Rahlfs (Genesis p. 39) observed that was born is frequently rendered by ἦγεντε, sometimes in passages close to others which have ἦγεν(ν)ηθησαν, and accordingly chose the Hellenistic pass. aor. ἦγενθησαν, adding in proof passages such as Exod. 19: 16; Num. 4: 48, where the evidence has -νν- in spite of the obvious meaning became, was. He decided in the same way all through the LXX, although there are not many examples of γενέσθαι be born outside Genesis. In general he was right. But there are a few passages which might be usefully discussed and possibly emended. There are three instances in Gen. 21. In the awkward accumulation of v. 3 του γενομένου (τῶν) ἐκείνῳ ἐκείνῃ γενέσθαι, the passive is expressed by γενέσθαι, the active, as in v. 7, by τεκεῖν. In vv. 5 and 9 ἦγεντε correctly renders a passive (5), but incorrectly ἦγεν(ν)ηθησαν (9) which in v. 3 is ἐτεκεῖν. Is the reason for this that the subject is Hagar, that is to say, does the Greek disclose a bias against Hagar such as later on came to full growth in Philo’s exposition of the story? In Lev. 25: 44 f. the Greek has a twice repeated γένωνται, first for γένησαν, secondly for γένωνται which they begat; but here the passive is shared by the Samaritan (γένωνται) and Targ. (Baentsch). Accordingly this passage does not serve to explain any tendencies of the translators. Another point in Rahlfs’ argument is Gen. 17: 17 γενήσεται = γεννήσεται (followed by τέξεται = τεκεῖν). Here γενήσεται as read by some minn. is certainly wrong; for we must not expect any middle futures with passive meaning (αριθμησεται, Gen. 16: 10 Aglmt, is a haplography (Wackernagel, ThLZ 33, 1908, coll. 640 f.)). Thus we must read γενήσεται, without a following υίος, in accordance with Rahlfs who still had it in his 1926 text. It may have come in from v. 19. Our earliest evidence, Philo, constantly, alleg. III, 85, 217, mut. 176, Pap. 911, Bo. La., omit it and are not discredited by the fact that Ocq and other late minn. leave it out in accordance with the MT. It may have come in to relieve the context.

Although it was shown earlier that γίγνεσθαι fully expresses be born, there are passages in which γεννασθαι would seem preferable. In Job we certainly read an isolated ἦγεντε for ἦγεν(ν)ηθησαν 1: 2, yet in 5: 7 γεννασθαι = γεννησαν. The passages 3: 3 and 15: 7 are so similarly shaped that we should not with Rahlfs read ἦγενθησαν in the former, but
έγενήθης in the latter. I would suggest έγεννήθης (Γενν.,) considering the parallel έπάγης (Παγ.,).

In the Psalms, where we find no middle aor. γενέσθαι, the thrice-repeated γενέσθαι requires έγεννήθησαν 86 (87) : 4, έγεννήθη v. 5, γεγεννημένων v. 6. In Ps. 89 (90) : 2, too, the most graphic parallelism was born ἦν and was brought forth by labour ἦν would postulate γεννηθήναι, if only we could be sure that πλασθήναι in the parallel stichus does not indicate a toning down of the original.

In Isa. 9: 6 (5) έγεννήθη and έγενήθη (Α' έγένετο, C' έσται) ήν would postulate γεννηθήναι, if only we could be sure that πλασθήναι in the parallel stichus does not indicate a toning down of the original.

In Isa. 9: 6 (5) έγεννήθη and έγενήθη (Α' έγένετο, C' έσται) ήν are both right. Since there is no example of γενέσθαι for ἦν in Isaiah, one understands Ziegler who, Einl. p. 105, states that in 2: 6 the context requires έγεννηθή. But his text nevertheless reads έγενήθη.

2. Verbs

Here I propose to restore some verbs which, by force of itacism or other reasons, have been changed into verbs of another class. The confusion of verbs in -έω, -άω and -ίσω, more precisely of forms in -ησ- and -ισ-, is a very common corruption.

άκροβυστέω: άκροβυστίζω. άκροβυστέω to be uncircumcised, doubted by LS, must be replaced by άκροβυστίζω treat as, and leave, uncircumcised, A' C' Θ' Lev. 19: 23. Fig. άκροβυστίζειτε την άκροβυστίαν αὐτῶν (refers to πάν ξύλον βρώσιμον). The meaning is refrain from gathering the fruits during the first three years = φρένιον νήπιον. The emendation is Field's after his Lips. (see Field pp. 79 and 199) which reads -είτε as do Mv in BM. -είτε is found only in second-rate tradition (cf. Field). Here the later translators render the Hebrew in their meticulous way, whereas the LXX (περικαθαρίζειτε την άκαθαρσίαν αὐτοῦ), Vulgate and Targum give the very opposite meaning.4

άνομέω: άνομίζω. In 1 Kings 8: 32 our editions read

...τὴν τῇ κήρυκα τῆς ἱδρυματίας ένομηθήναι άνομον, δούναι...
...καὶ τοῦ δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον, δούναι...

Here both verbs in the Hebrew are declarative, but in the Greek only the second. As a parallel to δικαιῶσαι we expect a declarative άνομήσαι, which in fact is the reading of θ and other later recensions. It looks as though this causative άνομήσαι had been purposely altered in our otherwise best tradition, here BA and the more reliable part of the
Lucianic MSS, ocēς (Rahlfs, S-St iii, Ch. 2, especially §14), to avoid any ambiguity.

But what is important in our context, is a second attempt to replace άνομηθήναι so that the causative meaning may stand out unmistakably. In cod. i (56) we read άνομισθηναι. According to Rahlfs (§5) i is a 'LXX codex with many L readings in the text', readings which, just as the doublets and mixed readings, are secondary in i (p. 42). There is a second, undoubtedly Lucianic, witness for this reading, namely the Syriac palimpsest codex Z(uqinensis), for it is obvious, that instead of [άνομη]σθηναι (Tissérant, BM) we have to restore [άνομι]σθηναι. *άνοµιζω, to outlaw, is otherwise unknown, but we can still see why it was fashioned. Besides, a causative άνοµεν, unknown in secular Greek apart from the p.p.p., is found in Ezek. 22: 11 ήνοµοοσαν (||έµαι-νεν) = τὴν αὐξάνει and in Dan. θ' 11: 32 άνοµεντες διαθήκη ν = θεός τὰ χείρι, which could be explained as an internal (modal) object. Cf. Helbing, Kasussyntax p. 12, where there is more evidence than in LS.

άσθενέω. πολλοὺς ήσθενήσατε ἐν νόμῳ, Mal. 2: 8, may stand, although the causative meaning is unique (MT ἄσθενον Hiph. make to stumble). Here Schleusner's various suggestions fail to convince; his -ώσατε is a hapax legomenon in Xen., Cyr. 1, 5, 3, his alternative -ίσατε is found nowhere. The only other possibility is that πολλοὺς, which has an uncertain position, is a secondary addition. In this case the LXX would have understood ἐστίς as Qal, which is hardly plausible, and πολλοὺς would represent a later approximation to the Hebrew which left the Greek verb untouched.

eὐλογέω. The Berlin Papyrus P. 11763 (VII/VIII P), a hymn composed of psalm verses (Otto Stegmüller, Berliner Septuagintafragmente, 1939, Nr. 16, pp. 41 ff.) quotes Ps. 127 (128): 4 with εὐλογηθήσατε (verso 1. 17). The editor considers derivation from εὐλογίζω, quoting εὐλογι-σθή from an inscription on a grave, Preisigke, Sammelbuch 1, 298, and referring besides to Tobit 4: 12 ηυλογισθησαν A, ευλογηθησαν B. But this is one of Swete's imperfections of collation; for BM have ηυλογηθη-σαν A in their first apparatus only, the only variant being ηυ- for ευ-. Even Stegmueller prefers to think of a form of εὐλογέω, the unanimous reading of all MSS. He is certainly right, yet he should not adduce ασθενήσα (verso 1. 22) nor Thackeray's §18, 2, which deals exclusively with the insertion of σ immediately before the endings.
εὐπόρεω: εὐπορίζω. A conjecture by Grabe has been superseded by fresh evidence. Wisd. of Sol. 10: 10 εὐπόρησεν αὐτὸν ἐν μόχθοις, he made him thrive in his toils, is obviously causative. Grabe therefore proposed εὐπορίσεως. Helbing, Kasussyntax p. 79, however, quotes εὐπορέω τοῦτον from an ancient schoolbook. So the causative meaning is established and ought to be endorsed by our lexica. Moreover, εὐπορίζω is recorded only from a dubious reading in Galen. A causative εὐπορέω could easily arise from the secondary deponent εὐποροῦμαι = intr. εὐπορέω cf. Debr., Wb §§192 f., and parallels from the NT and later Greek in general in Bl.-Debr. §§148, 3; 307; 316, 1.

κοιμάσθαι: κοιμίζειν. Rahlfs was correct in introducing ἐκοίμισεν with S and L into his text of Gen. 24: 11, whereas it was listed as an itacism in BM's first apparatus. For in the LXX there exists only κοιμάσθαι on the one hand, and κοιμίζειν for the causative (ΒΒΒ Hiph., pass. Hoph., and other equivalents) on the other. The array of examples for the latter in the LXX indicates that the impression conveyed by the selection of examples in LS – that the verb belongs to poetry and higher prose only – is mistaken. Of all these passages only one has some stronger evidence for ἐκοίμισεν, which, nevertheless, is an itacism (1 Kings 17: 19).

The scrupulous translator of 2 Kings renders the Hophal: ἐκείνος ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην αὐτοῦ (4: 32), laid upon his bed, as AV alone renders, while most moderns follow the less exact iacebat of Vulg. and lag of Luther. And yet this nuance is as necessary here as it is in the parallel story about Elijah, ἐκοίμησεν, 1 Kings 17: 19. In Ezek. 32, where the Greek misses the point, κοιμηθήσεται 32, AV again brings it out faithfully be thou laid 19, he shall be laid 32, although Vulg. has dormi, dormivit, and Luther lege dich, soll liegen.

κυκλάω. ἐκύκλευσαν, 2 Kings 3: 25, is attested by B exclusively. As all MSS read ἐκύκλωσαν in v. 9 of the same chapter and κυκλάω is the only form of the verb found elsewhere in the LXX, -ευ- in B is mistaken here and must not be considered the genuine text.

οἶκεῖν, οἰκίζειν, κατοικίζειν, συνοικίζειν.

Confusion between forms in -ησ- and -ισ- is common, but has mostly been put right in our editions. No one, for instance, would follow A, which spells κατάφησεν instead of -ισεν in 1 Sam. 12: 8, and κατοικήσατε
instead of -ισαι in 1 Macc. 3: 36. Moreover Schleusner v, 210 f. and Field had already corrected συνωκησας of C' Gen. 3: 12 and κατοικησω of C' Hos. 2: 18 (20) into forms with -ισ-. But we still read κατοικίσαι for ἐνέκουσαι, usque ad habitandum (situm), Num. 21: 15, and κατοικεῖ for ἐνέκει, dwells, Ps. 28 (29): 10, i.e. a causative instead of an intransitive. For Numbers, Schleusner iii, 291 already read κατοικήσαι which, against BAMNgivy Syr., is found in F* h* rel. and inhabitare La., and there is the still more literal translation κατοικίαν in dh*pt, the Lucianic sub-group, confirmed by habitaciones Bo. In Psalms the easy emendation κατοικεῖ = ἐνέκει suffices, while for the present tense there is a parallel in Ps. 9: 8 μένει (πάντα fort 1 μενει’ BH2), for here, owing to the following ἥτοιμασεν, we must not read μενεῖ.

Still there remain a number of passages in 1 Esdras which I have discussed at length in a review of BM n, part iv (ThLZ, 1937, pp. 342 ff.). In all of them there is the question of introducing (συγκέντρωσας, τριεκαίσαι) alien wives into the national Jewish community, and the verb used, with the exception of 9: 12 (συνωκησας), 17, 18 (ἐταναιοκησάσθαι), is συνοικίσαι, which is good Greek, though not Attic: Hdt., Pap. – cf. συνοικίσα, -σαν, marriage, συνοικισμός, wedlock – Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch. 

συλλοχάω: συλλοχίζω. In 1 Macc. 4: 28 συνελόχησαν ἄνδρων ἔπιλεκτῶν ἐξήκοντα χιλιάδας, where the context requires the sense he raised (gathered) 60,000 picked men, L. Goetzeler, Quaest. in App. et Polyb., Würzburg, 1890, p. 40, saw that we must write συνελόχησαν, according to parallels from Appian and Plutarch (cf. also LS p. 1673b). The point is that, while λόχος means both ambush and a body of troops, the simple λοχάω is found only in contexts implying the first meaning, whereas λοχίζω has both meanings. The evidence for συλλοχίζαι is confined to our passage and an equally doubtful one in Plut., Galba 15. Both must therefore be changed into -ισ-. Among the grammarians quoted by Schleusner v, 152, only Suidas has the correct spelling, and the corruption in S συνευδόκησαν obviously goes back to the mistaken spelling.

τρισσεύω: τρισσόω. In 1 Kings 18: 34 an inconsistency within the space of a single verse must be corrected one way or the other. καὶ ἔπευξεν Δευτερώσατε· καὶ ἔτρισσεν. καὶ ἔστρισσεν stands for ἔστρισσεν, ἔστρισεν, ἔστρισέ, do it for the second (third) time, a Hebrew idiom which cannot be transplanted.
without violence into any non-Semitic language. Here the translators—or perhaps already the vernacular speech around and behind them—were bound to create a novel mode of expression for a novel requirement, and although the verbs are used intransitively in our passage, the causative formations in -όω, which were among those most alive up to the latest periods, were very apposite.\textsuperscript{12} As to δευτ-, the formation in -εύω had formerly been used for other purposes; as shown on pp. 57 ff. πρωτεύω,\textsuperscript{13} δευτερέω was the verbal expression alongside of πρωτεός, δευτερεός, \textit{first, second of rank};\textsuperscript{14} so they chose δευτέρω as in a number of other occurrences of προφήτης. For three the examples are rarer in both languages. Apart from our passage ἀκρυλοτάτος Piel is used in Deut. 19: 3, divide in three, τριμερεῖς, and 1 Sam. 20: 19, 20, where the context requires do on the third day, v. 19 τρισσεύσεις καὶ ἔπισκεττής,\textsuperscript{15} you will be missed on the third day, v. 20 καὶ ἔγω τρισσεύσω ταῖς σχολίσαι ἀκοντίζω, and I on the third day will shoot with arrows.\textsuperscript{16}

In 1 Kings 18: 34 the inconsistency has been removed in different ways, Lucian putting τρισσεύσατε for -ώσατε and thus adapting the former to the second form—and, on the other hand, AN with a number of minuscules reading ἐτρίσσωσαν in the last place. This latter is what the context requires. Then -ευ- would have come in from 1 Sam. 20: 19 f. at a later stage, but only in part of the evidence.

3. Compounds

There are nouns and proper names, in which a distortion, due to late and mistaken etymological considerations, has gained a hold of most of our evidence and the whole of our published texts. The most conspicuous example in classical texts is Κλυταιμήστρα 'whose name has nothing to do with the "suitors"' (μνηστήρες, W. Schulze, \textit{Kl. Schr.} pp. 697 f.; Schwyzzer, \textit{Gr. Gr.} p. 448). For the correct spelling of this name there is a mass of evidence: vases, the Vet. Lat., the testimony of the famous cod. \textit{Laurentianus} of Aeschylus and Sophocles, and the much earlier occurrence in the Herculean scroll of Philodem., \textit{Rhet.}, first noted by W. Schulze, \textit{Kl. Schr.} pp. 697 f.; yet editors were slow to accept it.

ἄνδρογύνων. In the Greek Proverbs, 18: 8 and 19: 15 are but different renderings of the Hebrew 19: 15 (so that the Greek counterpart of the Hebrew 18: 8, which is repeated in 26: 22 and found there in the Greek as well, is lost). Much as the two verses differ in vocabulary,
they have in common ανδρογύνων(α)ος, which is not a bad translation of παθή, lassitude, as it replaces a quality by its bearer. We should therefore expect the same formation in both. Rahlfs, however, whilst rightly reading ανδρογύνων in 18: 8, against ανδρογυναίων of S** alone, prefers ανδρογυναίον in 19: 15, thought it is, here also, a minority reading of BS**. In themselves both formations are possible, cf. μίσο-, φιλογυναίος, -γυνής, -γυναῖ. But the real point is one of textual criticism: BS** here deserve no more to be followed than S*. Thus we must read ανδρόγυνον in 19: 15 too.

έλεπολις, battering-engine, a compound with a verbal stem in -ε as its first component. In Homer such compounds only have a present stem, thematic aorist stems being found only in post-Homeric poetry. These compounds represent a type inherited from Indo-European; their imperative interpretation, however, is secondary, and instances which must be interpreted as imperative are recent (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. pp. 441 f., 444 f.). A subsequent development, though found already in Homer, shows the familiar composition vowel -o- in formations containing a thematic aorist, such as ἀμαρτοφητής Il. xvi 824, or φυγοπτόλεμος Od. xiv 213 (Schwyzer, p. 442). But there is nowhere a formation containing both in a combination -ε-, such as *έλεσπολις would be, which Rahlfs twice accepts into his text, 1 Macc. 13: 43 with SLa.*, 44 with SV La.*, ‘A pau’ omitting the word, and the majority reading the correct έλέπολις. A compound ελεο- could only be connected with τὸ έλος, marsh-meadow (*έλεσο-). Against these facts Rahlfs apparently puts the venerable Vet. Lat. which he does not quote frequently elsewhere. However the Latin only shows that the corruption took place very early.

έξοπλασία: έξοπλισία. O. Glaser proved that έξοττλασία is the only form of the word in the inscriptions and the MSS of Polybius. Though the verb is έξοπλάζω, -σία may have become customary and even prevalent in comparison with -σία from the proximity and influence of forms in -σία from verbs in -άζω (cf. W. Schulze, Kl. Schr. p. 367, from whom LS’s report on έξοπλασία in Diodorus can be modified). In 2 Macc. 5: 25 Swete has a correct form έξοπλισίαν; Rahlfs, however, prints an impossible -σίαν, which, according to his apparatus, is the majority reading. If it is, it agrees in an itacism18 or a confusion of Η and Α (cf. έξοπηνίσιας sic, v. 1 in Diodor. 16, 3, 1). So we have to choose between -σία and -σία, the former of which is better attested. The
isolated ὀπλευ from ὀπλέω Hom., Od. vi 73 is not sufficient to support Rahlfs.

ἐπιεικῶς. Rahlfs is equally unfortunate in giving as his emendation ἐπιεικέως, 1 Sam. 12: 22 with BM -σιως (om. L), 2 Kings 6: 3 with -σιως in B and part of the Lucanian evidence. -εως is the Ionic form which cannot be expected in our texts except as a mistake (cf. δλοσχερός, ἐπιμελῶς and others). So Rahlfs himself, with that change of mind observed before, acquiesces in ἐπιεικός, 2 Macc. 9: 27, where the evidence is unanimous.

καταπάλτης. O. Glaser (p. 69) shows from the inscriptions and a corruption in the MSS of Polybius, which he combined in an instructive way, that the only correct form for catapult was καταπάλτης from πάλλω, sway, and not -πέλτης as is 'frequently written in literary texts' (LS9 p. 904"). This distortion may be due to later confusion with πέλτη, small shield. The word occurs five times in 4 Macc. 8: 13; 9: 26; 11: 9, 26; 18: 20, and in Niese’s Josephus B J v, 14, never with the correct form.19

Περσαῖπολις. Among the itacisms that have to be corrected owing either to fresh documentary evidence or recent linguistic research is the name of Persepolis. Wackernagel, Glotta 14, 36 ff., whose results have been endorsed by Schwyzer pp. 196, 438 n. 2, and LS, begins by quoting Th. Noldeke’s view (Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte, Leipzig, 1887, p. 140) that Περσαῖπολις means Town of the Persians, and that Clitarchus, the historian of Alexander the Great, whose work to some extent can be reconstructed from later historians, in a peculiar way replaced ‘the correct *Περσαῖπολις’ by the old poetical compound περσαῖπ(τ)ολις. Wackernagel first states that destroyer of cities would be so strange a name for a city that, however stilted Clitarchus may have been as a writer, it was unlikely that historians and geographers and even the official usage should have followed his example. He then shows that *Περσαῖπολις is a grammatically impossible formation. From Lobeck, Path. El. 1, 549 ff., he quotes the law formulated by C1. Salmasius, Exercit. Plin. 834 (p. 586* in the Utrecht edition of 1688): ‘in huiusmodi locorum denominationibus, quae ex duobus substantivis componuntur, integra duo nomina Graeci semper retinent’, and demonstrates that this rule is true throughout the whole of older Greek, and especially with πόλις. Formations like the modern Constantinople, Adrianople
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must not mislead our judgement, though *ethnica* like Ἡλισσολίτης (Hdt.) would lead to them. Σκυθόπολις in Josephus for the Σκυθῶν πόλις of the LXX – 2 Macc. 12: 29 Σκυθῶν πολίς, 12: 30 Σκυθόπολις – is one of the earliest examples. Further, we find the spelling Περσαιπολις unanimously in Aelian, *NA* 1, 59 and as a frequent and sometimes prevalent reading in Strabo. So the form with -ε- is a mere itacism. To explain Περσαιπολις Wackernagel, following Nöldeke, reminds us that the city was also simply called Πέρσαι. Passages in Berossus and Arrian allow no other interpretation of Πέρσαι. There are sufficient examples of towns bearing the names of the tribes which founded them. Πέρσαι πόλις grew together as did Νέα πόλις so acc. Περσαιπολις is as acceptable as Νεάπολις.

2 Maccabees, which Wackernagel does not mention, is not much, if at all, later than Strabo, our first preserved coherent text which has the name Persepolis. So we must read εἰς τὴν λεγομένην Περσαιπολιν in 9: 2, where the isolated spelling Περσαιπολιν of V perhaps preserves part of this pre-itacistic form. Further Wackernagel shows that both in Arrian and Plutarch there are passages where the interpretation of Πέρσαι is difficult now, because the authors contaminated different sources and failed to realize that on occasions Πέρσαι meant the city. So even in 4 Macc. 18: 5, ἄπαρας ἀπὸ τῶν ἱεροσολύμων ἄπαρας ἐπὶ Πέρσαις it is not impossible to understand against Persepolis, especially as ἀπὸ τῶν ἱεροσολύμων precedes. There is a parallel in Plutarch, *Alex.* 37 ἡττό καθηγεμών Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῆς ἐπὶ Πέρσαις πορείας, where Wackernagel would rather think that ἐπὶ points to the people and country. Yet there is sufficient evidence for ἐπὶ before place-names in LS and Mayser to allow for the alternative interpretation.

3.1. Compounds with πῦρ, πῦρος

The compounds with πῦρ, πῦρος deserve comment. There were three types in Greek. Most frequently the first component appears as πῦρ-, in some examples as πυρι-, which is here an instrumental dative, and as -o- tended to become the general vowel used in compounds we also find πυρο-, although this always involves some ambiguity by confusion with πῦρο- from πῦρος, *wheat*. This -o- appears also before terminations, as in πῦρεῖς (Schwyzer pp. 438, 440, 446 f.).

The first type is represented in the LXX by πυρπολεῖν 4 Macc. 7: 4, πυρπνόος Wisd. of Sol. 11: 18, πυρφόρος Job 41: 20 (21); the second by πυρκαυστὸς Isaiah four times, where it regularly represents a form
of ἐν with an added τῆς, and πυριφλεγής Wisd. of Sol. 18: 3 and 3 Macc. 3: 29 (here Schleusner’s conjecture περι- is not necessary); the third by πυροβόλα (καὶ λιθοβόλα) 1 Macc. 6: 51, πυροφόρος Obad. 18, πυρόπνουν Rahlfs 3 Macc. 6: 34. It is mainly the third type that requires some comment.

Both Schleusner iv, 536, and LS fail to see that πυροβόλον, far from being a βέλος tipped with fire, is an engine — ἐστησεν ἐκεῖ βελοστάσεις καὶ μηχανας καὶ πυροβόλα καὶ λιθοβόλα καὶ σκορπίδια εἰς τὸ βάλλεσθαι βέλη καὶ σφενδόνας — a fire-thrower, as λιθοβόλον is a stone-thrower. The word is not frequent, and it deserves mention that along with it there is a πυροβολέω sow wheat in a London pap. from Ιp. There exists, however, no other form of the word, apart from the one with the first component πυρο-.

As to πυροφόρος, Obad. 18, it is very instructive that in the case of Jerome, who was neither a Purist (Is. Hilberg, WSt 34, 1912, p. 261) nor an Atticizer, his feeling for Greek revolted against this formation which Rahlfs receives into his text with BS* WLP C, against πυρφόρος of AQS Lp. To him it would mean frumentarius or, as Schleusner (iv, 536) puts it, is qui brachiis vel tergo frumentum gerit, in spite of the fact that inscriptions from various parts of Greece and various dialects actually display πυροφόρος as bearer of sacrificial fire, which is elsewhere πυρφόρος. As things stand, we cannot condemn πυροφόρος with the confidence shown by Schleusner, who relies on Jerome, and of late by Rudolph, ΖΑW, 1931, p. 225, and this all the less, because there is no reason for bringing the rather barbaric translation of the Minor Prophets into line with the translator of Job. πυρόπνουν, on the other hand, which Rahlfs reads with AV*, is not supported by any parallel, and therefore here we decide for πυρίπνουν of the others.

Τρωγοδύται. The Ethiopian Τρωγοδύται are surprisingly slow in getting rid of their added -λ- which makes them cave-dwellers (τρωγλοδύται) instead of a tribe the name of which has been preposterously forced into a far-fetched and mistaken etymology. In Hdt. 4, 183 Hude in his Oxford text three times within four lines confines -γο- to the apparatus, though it is supported by the best evidence (AB, here even in C), and prefers -γλο- with the vulgar text.21 The same occurs in the LXX and Josephus, 2 Chron. 12: 3 and AJ II, 259. In 2 Chronicles Swete and Rahlfs have the correct form in their apparatus as the reading of B, whereas BM record it among the scribal mistakes of B in their first apparatus.22 In AJ Niese puts Τρωγλοδύταις with the unanimous
Greek evidence, though the Latin rightly preserves *trogoditarum*. Observe that the corruption is more recent than the date of the Latin translation, as it is secondary in Herodotus and 2 Chronicles. After Puchstein, *Epigrammata Graeca in Aegypto reperta*, Diss. Strassburg, 1880, W. Schulze, *Orthographica*, Progr. Marburg, 1894, p. xxiv, had collected the evidence for *Trogodytai* (cf. also his *Kl. Schr.* p. 413), and now we have an impressive array of evidence for *Trogodytai* and its derivations in LS from Greek and Latin authors and the papyri, together with some useful comments.

### 3.2. Accentuation of compounds

A word must be said about the accents in these formations. We have the general rule that formations, in which the second, verbal component conveys an active meaning, are paroxytone, while those with passive meaning are proparoxytone. The grammarians record very few express exceptions to this general rule, and we should apply the rule in all instances apart from those special exceptions. So, compared with the traditional texts and HR it was a progress in Swete and Rahlfs to accent πυροβόλος 1 Macc. 6: 51. On the other hand, all our editions are superior to Schleusner and LS in accenting πυρπνόων Wisd. of Sol. 11: 18, and 3 Macc. 6: 34 τὴν πυρπνοῦν (instead of πυρπνοῦν) τόλμαν. 24

πρωτότοκος, 4 Macc. 15: 18 Rahlfs, is a mere misprint.

**γλωσσοκόμον.** In this word, which stands for יִהְיָה, *ark*, the active meaning is so unmistakable that a paroxytone accent must be postulated (W.-Schmiedel §16, 5, p. 140; Bl.-Debr. §119 tending rather to the same). The word is late in the LXX. In 2 Sam. 6: 11 it forms part of a variant belonging to the Origenian text, where the LXX reads κιβωτός as in the whole context. In 2 Chron. 24: 8, 10, 11 bis γλωσσοκόμον is used for יִהְיָה where it does not mean the Ark of the Covenant, but a collection box, whereas the parallel passage in 2 Kings 12 uses κιβωτός indiscriminately. This tendency is continued in the later translators. So e.g. A' Gen. 50: 26 says γλωσσοκόμον for יִהְיָה which here means *coffin, mummy-chest*. His tendency to etymological translation would lead us to expect him to use the same Greek word for different meanings of the same Hebrew word; but here it is interesting that γλωσσοκόμον seems to have been used in this sense also in secular Greek (cf. LS).
7. IDIOM AND LEXICON

1. Peculiarities of the system of tense formations

In this section I would insist on the need for a very intimate knowledge of the peculiarities of Greek, before one sets out to publish observations about it. I begin with two statements contained in Herrmann-Baumgärtel, Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta, 1923. On p. 28 Baumgärtel, when attempting to prove that Isaiah was the work of two different translators, gives as his twenty-first example, ' Penis Ni. α: προστιθέναι 14: 1, β: προσκείθεται 56: 3, 6'. Πες Ni. join somebody is rendered by προστεθήσεται 14: 1, and the προσκείμενος of 56: 3, 6 is nothing but the normal p.p.p. of προστίθημι. This example cannot therefore prove anything for a difference between two translators. Or, speaking about the different translators to be traced in the Pentateuch, he gives a tabulation of the renderings of μα (p. 57, no. 15, and p. 76, no. 13), and one of his points is that there is a δενσκειν and an ἀποθνήσκειν side by side. If we look up the passages, we find what we expected to find, namely that the simple verb is found only in the perfect which is the common usage: the perfect is 'perfectival' in itself, whereas the other tenses require a preposition to this effect.1

It is important to make sure what tenses are actually formed from each verb. However obvious, this demand was neglected up to the nineteenth century. So, e.g., from Dionysius Thrax to the grammars of the nineteenth century, including Ph. Buttmann’s, the general paradigm for the normal verb was τύπτω, from which all tenses were formed in an entirely unreal way, although anyone could know that the paradigm ran τύπτω, πατάξω, ἐπάταξα (παίσω, ἐπαίσοι), τύπτομαι, πληγή-σομαι, ἐπλήγην, πέπληγμαι (cf. Rutherford, The New Phrynichus pp. 257 ff.), as even the LXX shows: τύπτων ἐπάταξα τὴν Ἰδουμαίαν, 2 Kings 14: 10 (cf. Wackernagel, ThLZ, 1908, p. 640) and the passage quoted by Thackeray p. 287 n. 1, ἐπεὶ πατάξαι, τύπτουσιν 1 Esdras 4: 8.

The LXX also follows the general line in restricting ἐπισταθεῖν, to know, to the present stem. So we find its subj. pres. after three subj. aor. in Isa. 41: 20, ἰνα ἰδοὺς καὶ γνῶσι καὶ ἔννοηθῶς καὶ ἐπιστᾶντας, for the obvious reason that there was no aorist within reach of the translator, whose feeling for Greek was a match for any indigenous Greek’s, though he was very imperfect as a translator. As a matter of fact, Veitch
and LS record only two examples of an aor. ήτπστήθην, from Hdt. 3, 15 and Plat., Leg. 687a.

In emending corrupt passages we have to keep this in mind. In 2 Esdras 18: 13 (Neh. 8: 13) וַיִּלֶשֶׁבֶת is rendered εἰποτῆσαι πρὸς πάντας τοὺς λόγοις. Schleusner 11, 587, after giving a strange literal translation, continues ‘mallem tamen hic legere vocem ab εἰποτήμη derivatam’. The solution is εἰποτάσσοι, as is suggested by the reading of Lucian συνέναι and by Isa. 41: 20 as well. εἰποτήμην is excluded for the reasons given above.2

2. Transitive and intransitive use of verbs

It is of equal importance to notice whether a verb is capable of being used as a transitive or not. So εν- and κατισχύω are used transitively in the LXX, though very rarely elsewhere (Helbing, Kasussyntax pp. 76 f.), but the simple verb nowhere.3 Compare the mistaken translation Isa. 35: 3 Ισχύσατε, χείρες άνειμέναι LXX (C Ισχύσατε, χείρες) with A' ενισχύσατε χείρας παρειμένας; Ισχύσατε χείρας in a small minuscule group is an impossible compromise. Therefore Grabe was right in emending Wisd. of Sol. 16: 20 ἀρτον... ἡδονήν Ισχύοντα by putting Ισχύντα after Vet. Lat. habentem. A similar emendation is required in Sir. 43: 15 εν μεγαλείω αὐτοῦ Ισχυσεν νεφέλαι, where the context requires Ισχύσαν νεφέλαις (cf. A ισχύς εν νεφέλαις). In this chapter the translator changes the construction of the original throughout (verses 5, 14, 15b, 16).4 Sir. 43: 17, which seems to break the rule (δώνεις γῆν), is corrupt as well, and here the emendation is found in Α οἰδίνησεν γῆ.

In Tobit 10: 2 the B text μήπωτε κατήσχυται is obviously corrupt, but not healed by κατίσχονταi (Drusius in Schleusner iii, 289). The emendation is suggested by the S text which reads κατερώθη (La. detentus): it is κατέσχυνταi. detinere is the regular translation of κατέχειν in the Latin Bible. As De Bruyne has seen (Rahlfs, Ruth p. 128 n. 2), the Vet. Lat. has detinemini in Ruth 1: 13. This observation duly exposes A. Sperber’s adventurous guess in MGWJ 31, 1937, p. 59: decinemini – desinemini – reflecting senex! – retranslated έκγηράσετε.

3. Confusion of similar words

Different words of a similar spelling were frequently confused, especially when the variant made sense though not the intended one.
Here it is sometimes difficult to decide whether we have a scribal mistake, which must be corrected, or loose thinking on the part of an author, which must not be touched. I have in mind instances when forms of ἀλοῦω, to thresh, are influenced in form by ἀλως, ἀλων, threshing-floor, two stems which, in spite of their English equivalents, are not identical. Certainly in Jer. 5: 17 the reading of Q ἀλωήσωσιν for ἀλοήσουσιν of BSA is secondary, and no one will feel tempted to adopt it. Yet W. Crönert (Passow's Wörterbuch, völlig neu bearbeitet p. 308) attests this formation from Eust. 560, 43. He also draws attention to two late occurrences of ἀλω[ε]ισμός, along with ἀλόησις, and ἀλωνευόμενος, threshing, in App., Mac. 13 (p. 323). So we shall refrain from touching C Jer. 28 (51) : 33 καιρὸς ἀλωὴς as rendering tempore calcationis ejus, and this all the more, as Crönert (p. 321) records a gloss ἀλωὴ, tritura.5

ἀπαγωγή/ἐπαγωγή. Here the confusion is one-sided in the LXX, the intruder being ἐπαγωγή; and the discrimination is easy, because each word is used only in one meaning, and the Hebrew original leaves no doubt what to read in any passage.

Throughout, ἐπαγωγή means leading away into captivity, as in the third-century example quoted by Mayser i 2 3, 20 and in Polybius, captivity, prison. In the eight Sirach passages ἐπαγωγή renders different Hebrew words meaning distress, misery, and is therefore correct. The same applies to Θ' Prov. 27: 10, ἐν ημέρᾳ ἐπαγωγῆς.

As to ἐπαγωγή in Sirach there is a variant only in 38: 19, B with a few minn. and Lat. reading ἐπαγωγή; but, as Smend shows, the LXX translates here πῆξ, plague, visitation as in 3: 28 and 40: 9, cf. 10: 13 = τῆμ.6

There are four passages for which we must claim ἐπαγωγή. The one least contested is 1 Esdras 8: 24 ἐπαγωγή = Ezra 7: 26 ἀπαγωγή, LXX εἰς δεσμά, rightly accepted by Rahlfs against εἰς παράδοσιν of BN(h) only (cf. νῆσι Dan. Θ' 4: 12 (15), 20 (23) δεσμῶν). Here only k reads ἐπαγωγή, which does not count.

In Isaiah ἐπαγωγή, which is preferred by Rahlfs and Ziegler in 10: 4, and by all editors in 14: 17, would make sense in itself. Yet only ἐπαγωγῆς tallies with the Hebrew רַסֶּה, prisoner; cf. 10: 4 ol λ' ὑπὸ δεσμον; 14: 17 ol λ' τοὺς δεσμοὺς; 24: 22 LXX δεσμωτήριον, C δεσμίου; 42: 7 LXX δεδεμένους.7

So we must write εἰς ἐπαγωγὴν 10: 4 with BQLC, τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ 14: 17 with VQCmsL and others (abductos Tyconius). Here Montfaucon had already proposed ἐπ. Rahlfs and Ziegler may have preferred the
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mistaken reading because it is more strongly attested and more remote from the Hebrew: but this latter applies to all corruptions.

The last example is Deut. 32: 36. Here the Hebrew displays an example of its 'polar' mode of expression, *בָּהָרוֹ חֹמְצִית* which in the LXX is interpreted in many different ways. Since in the context of Deut. 32: 36 παρειμένους can only mean *released*, we must understand the preceding word as *detained*, and this is bound to have been expressed by *ἐν ἀπαγωγῇ* as found in a few minn., the Armenian and, apart from *Lugdunensis*, in the collection of Vet. Lat. MSS quoted by Robert. There is further evidence for *ἀπαγωγή* in Schleusner ii, 422.

*ἀπαλλάξῃ/ἀπολέσῃ*. Here no obvious reason, graphical, semasiological, or otherwise, can be seen for the confusion of two verbs. Yet if once detected in one passage, it may help us to emend other passages. For example, if we find *ἐν φυλακῇ προσκυνήσεως* lest he burst forth against them rendered, in a way which softens down the harsh expression, *μήποτε ἀπαλλάξῃ ἀπ' αὐτῶν, lest he part from them, fall out with them* (so Helbing, *Kasussyntax* p. 178) in Exod. 19: 22, we realize without any hesitation that what we find in verse 24 as a translation of the same Hebrew expression, *μήποτε ἀπολέσῃ ἀπ' αὐτῶν*, is a mere corruption of the former. Having this in mind, we shall easily restore Isa. 10: 7 in the opposite direction, reading *ἀπολέσαι σὺν αὐτῶν* for *λέσαι σὺν αὐτῷ* instead of *ἀπαλλάξει* which is in all MSS — and which had rightly been changed to *ἀπαλλάξει* by Biel (Schleusner i, 325) — comparing εξοραί Symmachus, *ut conterat Vulg.*

*ἐπειράθην/ἐπειράσθην*. Although Thackeray pp. 220, 281, and Helbing, *Kasussyntax* p. 143 n. 1, had warned against the confusion of *ἐπειράθην*, from *πειράομαι*, make proof of, have experience of, with *ἐπειράσθην*, from *πειράζω*, be tried, proved, our editions, including Rahlfs, still read *πειρασθεῖσα* 4 Macc. 15: 16 with A against the correct *πειραθεῖσα* of SV, whereas they are correct in Sir. 31 (34): 10 against S. Here the Latin, in a triplet, twice has the mistaken *tentatus est = ἐπειράσθη* (vv. 9, 11) and once *est expertus = ἐπειράσθη* (v. 10).

*ἰδεῖν/ἰδέναι*. See Excursus I, p. 197.

*κοπάζω/κοπιάω*. There is some confusion between *κοπάζω*, leave off, cease, come to rest and *κοπιάω*, be tired, grow weary; work hard. In two passages the corruption is almost universal:
(1) In Ps. 48 (49): 10 (9) Grabe, after Lucas Brugensis, and Rahlfs read ἐκόπασεν, which alone is in harmony with ἔφυγε, ceased, whereas our entire evidence reads ἐκοπίασεν. (Α’ επαύσατο, C’ παυσάμενος, yet Θ’ ἐκοπίασεν = LXX.)

(2) In 2 Sam. 13: 39 the Hebrew, when rightly emended, reads ἐφυή, yearned after, which cannot be expressed by the ἐκόπασεν of our editions. Therefore Schleusner iii, 358 suggested ἐκοπίασεν which, according to BM, is actually found in u. Against all our editions we must read ἐκοπίασεν."

An additional confusion lingers in our lexica. For κοπάζω almost everywhere we find the meaning grow weary which belongs to κοπιάω. Still LS records, ‘grow weary, τοῦ πολέμου Lxx Ἰο. 14. 15; τοῦ θυμοῦ ib. Es. 2. 1’. When going into the matter we find that ἐφυή, come to rest, is rendered by καὶ ἢ γῆ κατέπαυσεν πολεμουμένη Josh. 11: 23 and καὶ ἢ γῆ ἐκόπασεν τοῦ πολέμου 14: 15. In Esther the verb is ὑπῆρ, to sink – ‘the king’s wrath abated’. The Greek changes the construction, saying ἐκόπασεν οὐ βασιλεύς τοῦ θυμοῦ 2: 1 (ὁ β. ἢ τ. θ. 7: 10) desisted from. Here the authority upon which LS depends simply produces mis-translations, rendering ἐκόπασεν as though it were ἐκοπίασεν. Whereas this confusion exclusively rests with the anonymous expositor, the converse seems to exist in a papyrus (LS s.v. κοπιάω III).

κτησ-/κτισ-. See Excursus VI, p. 219.

στυγνάζω/στενάζω. The confusion between στυγνάζω and στενάζω is one-sided, the latter coming in as a bad guess for the former which ceased to be understood when there was no longer any contact with the Hebrew. ἄναμαι, to be struck dumb, petrified with horror, is rendered in different ways: ἐκυμάζονται ἐπὶ οὕτῃ Lev. 26: 32, ἐκοτίναι 1 Kings 9: 8; 2 Chron. 7: 21, with ἐπὶ Isa. 52: 14; Jer. 2: 12; 18: 16; 29: 18 (49: 17, Ra. 30: 11) (> BSA), σκυθρωπάσει Jer. 19: 8; 27 (50): 13. In Ezekiel there are two passages with an undisputed στυγνάζω: ἐστυγνάσαν ἐπὶ σὲ 27: 35, στυγνάσουσιν ἐπὶ σὲ 32: 10. In 28: 19 Rahlfs, referring to the two former passages, rightly rejected the στενάξουσι of B. There remains 26: 16, where not only the entire Greek evidence reads στενάξουσιν ἐπὶ σὲ, but even Tyconius translates ingemensent (with Const. and Wirc.), while he put contristati sunt 27: 35, contristabantur 28: 19. I therefore suggested στυγνάσουσιν (ThLZ, 1936, p. 280), and this, like other emendations, has now been proved true, since it is the reading of Scheide Pap. I have since found a further
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instance: in Job 18:20 (LXX) ἔστεναξαν must be ἔστυγνασαν. (In Job 17:8 ἔστη is translated θαύμα ἔδεχεν, which renders ἔφυγε ἐκεῖ in 18:20b.)

tορευτός/τορνευτός. τορευτός, worked in relief, chased, and τορνευτός, worked with a chisel, turned on a lathe, are found with the same objects, but only the context—and in the LXX the Hebrew—can tell which is correct in a passage. In the LXX we find only τορευτός. It is correct as a rendering of πῦξα (G.-Buhl’s classification), solidum opus, in Exod. 25:17 (18), 30 (31), 35 (36) and also in Jer. 10:5 LXX C, where it is due to a confusion with πῦξα II, field of cucumbers (cf. Isa. 1:8). None of the occurrences of πῦξα involves turned work. Isa. 3:24 (πῦξα) is quite a distinct word, although A’ renders ἐνουλώσεως, curling, a new hapax legomenon found in min. 710 ed. Lütkenmann-Rahlfs.

In the remaining three instances we must read τορνευτός. Two of them are in Song of Sol. 5:14; 7:3; 5:14 ἰπτήρ γῆς, golden cylinders (AV golden rings), τορνευταὶ χρυσαί; cf. Esther 1:6 ἐπὶ κύδοις χρυσοῖς where Schleusner iii, 404 rightly emends to κύδοις, referring to ἔπτηρ cf. sub rotis La. (mo); 7:3, ἰπτήρ γῆς, a round goblet, (AV 7:2) κρατήρ τορνευτός, Vulg. crater tornatilis. The third is 1 Kings 10:22 ἱθών τορευτῶν καὶ πελεκητῶν is obscure’ (Burney, Kings p. 149 n. 2). Twelve minn. here read τορνευτῶν, and Syr. lapidum elaboratorium et tornatorum looks like a translation of λίθων πελεκητῶν (τορευτῶν καὶ τορνευτῶν) of τορνευτῶν. So Martin Rehm (Alttest. Abh. xii, 3, 1937, p. 127) is certainly right in postulating τορνευτῶν. After F. Wutz, Systematische Wege von der Septuaginta zum hebräischen Urtext i, 1937, p. 779, he also gives a reconstruction of the Hebrew underlying the Greek, which does not look convincing. Lucian’s reading ἀπελεκήτων indicates that he found and kept τορνευτῶν.

Addendum

[In his thesis Dr Walters indicated in his Introduction that he had deliberately omitted from the grammatical part of the thesis his observations on the distortion of proper names and on abbreviations and contractions. His intention was to deal with these topics fully in a later, separate section; but he was never able to carry it out. In the Introduction, however, he gave a few examples of his findings, and these
I append here in the place where he himself indicated that they strictly belonged. Ed.]

1. Distortion of proper names

There are more habitual distortions of names which cannot be attributed to the translators than is generally recognized. Thus it is only going half-way to change Ἰβοσθε to Ἰσβοσθε, for we must restore Ἰσβοσθε, and likewise Ἔῳβοσθε, since Ἔῳβοσθος in Josephus merely indicates the early date of the corruption. In other names itacistic αι for ε is detected from a comparison with the Hebrew, and consequently our editions require emendation. So ἰπηθ is bound to be Ἐπηθ, Ἰῆθ Δεσαν. Even the spelling Θεμαθ for Πηθ could be advocated, as ε is the old equivalent also for Ε (cuneif. Τῆς, Τῆς), but in instances like this last close collaboration with Semitists is indispensable, whereas instances like the former are easily emended. (Note. If we sometimes find spellings like Ἶμαθ, especially in Chron., Jer., Ezek., this η has not replaced an itacistic αι, but is a later spelling for what had been ε in an earlier period of transmission. There is plenty of evidence, partly from preserved earlier spellings, partly from corruptions which escaped later correction, to indicate that, mainly in Chronicles and 2 Esdras, a more recent mode of spelling η and ι has replaced the original one which displayed ε and ο. Here Lucian sides with the older fashion. Even the initial Η of Ἱσαίας invites reflections, which include the inconsistencies in the spelling of this name in the Vulgate and the AV and confirm the repeated observation that the spelling of identical names is sometimes subject to differentiation, as far as different bearers are concerned. A first step to the explanation of the otherwise inexplicable NT spelling Ἐλισαβετ can be shown to be a corruption in the LXX, and so disposed of (cf. Lagarde, Ue. p. 69 note).)

For the distortion of proper names as a result of euphonic changes within compound words and at the meeting point of two contiguous words see ThLz, 1936, p. 272.

2. Misunderstood abbreviations and contractions

Since we now touch on palaeographical questions, this might seem the proper place in which to classify many corruptions according to the confusion and interchange of similar letters, yet I refrain from doing so here. In bygone times when there was an only slightly justified, though
quite common, belief in the infallibility of the methods of merely formal textual criticism, such classifications were in vogue. The idea was to give an indispensable help to, and a never-failing means of, unshakeable emendations. Nowadays we no longer believe in this infallible method, in the wake of which there followed a mass of needless conjectures which did not come up to the rank of emendations. For it is simply not true that in general an emendation starts from the tentative changing of interchangeable letters in the way of a chemical experimentalist. Only two things are necessary when a text is corrupt. One must have a clear idea about what the author is supposed to have said; and one must be sufficiently familiar with the language to know how the text required by the context was bound to run. The first requirement is more easily met when we are dealing with a translation, however mistaken it is; and efficient help towards the second is provided, when our text is extensive, by parallel phrases and passages. The LXX, of course, is very extensive, though it is not homogeneous throughout. Lists of interchangeable letters and habitual corruptions are most instructive in dealing with corrupted proper names, especially with those transliterated and translated from a foreign language which has no special affinity with the translator's language. Here lists like those in the introduction to Bewer's book on the text of Ezra (cf. p. 12 above) are most useful. There are more recent lists in Wutz's book on the transliterations of the LXX; yet just here it is quite palpable that, apart from the explanation of corruptions in single MSS, their usefulness for emendations of a running text can in no way be compared with their value for emending corrupted proper names. Moreover, if one would discover where the opposite procedure leads to, one needs only to go through Wutz's suggestions in his Transkriptionen to find amazing examples of sheer impossibilities which, nevertheless, are graphically flawless. I give one example: Hab. 3: 5

B (Swete)  
A (Rahlfs)

πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ πορεύεται λόγος  
καὶ ἐξελύσεται εἰς πεδία  
kατὰ πόδας αὐτοῦ

One sees at once that B is closer to the MT, and this is not necessarily in its favour. Thackeray (Schweich Lectures, 1920, pp. 51 ff.) therefore decides in favour of the other text which is more remote from the MT, and, by a lofty flight of imagination, pictures 'the Λόγος shod in the sandals of Perseus!' (the exclamation-mark is Thackeray's). Wutz, on
the other hand (p. 472), knows that the MT's ηάη means *pestilence*, and though ες πεδία is only one among several variants, he finds behind it the requisite word for *bubonic plague*, *έμπελία* To him it does not matter that there is only an adjective έμπέλιος *livid*, used once only – and perhaps coined – by the artificial Alexandrian poet Nicander (II*), *Ther.* 782; he forthwith forms a noun. In itself this noun would not be impossible, but Wutz neglects two facts: (1) ηάη is accounted for here by λόγος = ἐς, as elsewhere, and (2) ηάη everywhere in the LXX and the Three is interpreted as *flames or winged birds*. It is from the latter that the emendation should undoubtedly start. The natural equivalent which is supported by parallels and meets all requirements is πετεινά. Now one of the frequently observable processes of corruption, especially in proper names, is the transposition of letters and even of syllables, for proper names had no meaning for the copyists. This same process has led from πετεινά > πε"δια > ες πεδία. Thus, except for his palaeographical bias, Wutz was right in keeping to B, and Thackeray's mythology could not but lead him astray.

Wutz's methods in his Hebrew emendations are sometimes of the same kind. Thus in 2 Sam. 3: 39, where an emendation to be sound must start from the translations, he starts from the Hebrew, putting χύμα droppin g in tenderness (cf. Deut. 28: 56) for the MT's ηάη Χύμα. This conjecture is certainly brilliant, but beside the mark, since the starting-point is mistaken (Wege p. 773). For another example of wrong method in attempting emendation, see Miscellaneous Note 5, p. 274.

But to return to the question of the interchange (as distinct from the transposition) of letters. The only instance which I find convincing is an exchange ν ~ θ in Chronicles. This is rare elsewhere and seems to reflect variations in the Hebrew of Chronicles. I here confine myself, therefore, to corruptions arising from the use of contractions.

In Greek there were different ways of shortening a word in writing. Of these the best known and most frequent way was *abbreviation* (or *suspension*) which omitted some of the last letters of a word. As the endings and with them the grammatical characterization of a word were thus lost, with the result that the whole sentence may have become ambiguous, a second way was used, *contraction* (G. F. Hill, *JHS* 18, 1898, p. 304, *'syncopated abbreviation'), which retained as much of the word-stem as was considered indispensable and sufficient to avoid misunderstanding, and also the entire ending, cutting out what was between them. Sometimes this was done in a varying and inconsistent way and sometimes simultaneously in more than one place in the word.
The problem of contractions was sharply posed by Ludwig Traube's posthumous *Nomina Sacra* (1907), a wonderful and inspiring book which, however, gravely underrated, and as far as possible explained away, the extensive use of contractions in Greek documents and MSS which cannot be supposed in any way to be influenced by the habits of biblical MSS and through them by the Hebrew custom of contracting the *nomina sacra* (Traube’s chief thesis). (With ancient Hebrew custom compare the early Victorian Her *M.jesty*, a pronounced Judaism, which reflects the masoretic "(so BH3), as it is still found in the orthodox Jewish spelling G.ttt, G.d.) Contractions, it is true, are rare in book hands, and orthodox teaching, almost everywhere, denies their existence. Yet Swedish scholars especially have collected overwhelming evidence from ostraka (G. Rudberg, *Eranos* x, 1910, pp. 71-100) and inscriptions (E. Nachmanson, *ibid.* pp. 101-41). They have also gathered from classical MSS a vast number of corruptions which can best be explained on the assumption that either a word was understood to be a contraction and accordingly expanded into its supposed full spelling, when it was in fact quite a different word; or a contraction was understood to be a word written in full, only slightly corrupt, and therefore replaced by a different word, which was shorter than the original one when written in full. An example of both alternatives was given from Hippocrates Περὶ Φυσῶν by Alex. Nelson, *Die hippokratische Schrift Περὶ Φυσῶν*, Diss. phil. Uppsala, 1909, p. 67: in the first instance the correct text νούσων had a variant νούθεσιων, that is NOYCON understood as NOYΘΝ (= νούθεσιων), in the second the variant φυσιν for the correct φρόνισιν originated from reading ΦΡΟΝ as ΦΥΟΝ.

How can this observation and explanation be reconciled with the fact that contractions, though not altogether absent in LXX MSS, are nevertheless rare in uncial MSS? The answer is the same as in the case of inscriptions on stone: the engraver had the contraction in his cursive first draft and failed to write it out in full as was the intention for his copy on stone; and his customer did not object (Nachmanson pp. 105 f.). In exactly the same way, the scribes of our majuscules or of their prototypes either drew on cursive or occasionally fell back on the habits of cursive writing, just as scribes continually vacillated between numbers written out fully in numerals and numbers written in the shorter way in numeral letters. Thus for example, we are often unable to decide whether a certain translator originally put δώδεκα or δεκάδυο, because he may have used numerical letters, the transformation of which into words may have changed more than once in the course of transmission.
Occasionally a corruption still indicates today the way in which a scribe pronounced an abbreviated numeral; thus in ChB Num. 29:12 the mistaken τ in τημέρα derives from πεντεκαιδεκάτη. It is instructive to compare the whole section Num. 29:12–17 in ChB with the evidence given by BM from which, for example, it cannot be seen what MSS in 29:13 actually spell ιδ, apart from B (and ChB). From what they do say, δεκατέσσαρος, the form chosen by Rahlfs, is only in AF corru, and δεκατέσσαρες, in F#. As their only further information attributes the unusual setting δέκα καὶ τέσσαρες to q and τέσσαρες καὶ δέκα to Gx (= O) and dgnpt (= L), we are left to assume that τέσσαρες καὶ δέκα, as in 29:17, was the reading meant here also e silentio by BM. Bos, who with the Sixtine reads δεκατέσσαρος, notes that the Aldine read δεκατέσσαρες.

Although I did not collect examples of contractions systematically in the early stages of my work, nevertheless their number is large. Lam. 2:21 ἐπορεύθησαν for the necessary ἐπεσον, which Origen reintroduced from Symmachus, can only be explained as a spelling in full of a supposed contraction ΕΠΟΚΑΝ (ThLz, 1938, p. 34) – which would also support the view that the original form was ἐπεσον in the Greek. The doublets in Sirach which I quoted from Smend (ThLz, 1936, p. 270) arose in the same way, and so did the corruption έξήρανεν for έξήρεν 10:17. From the rich material I quote a few more examples: Ps. 144:13 βασιλεία BS for βασιλεία; 2017, Ps. 135:19, βασιλέα for βασιλεία; Ps. 100:3 S* παρα βασιλείας instead of παραβάσεις; Judg. A text 5:6 βασιλείας where Grabe rightly restored βάσεις (Wutz has here an abortive βαδίσεις), all of which find parallels from inscriptions. The shining skin of Moses’ face in Exodus and Leviticus is rendered indiscriminately by χρώματος and χρωτός (always gen.), where only the latter is correct. In nom. and acc. this confusion would not have been possible. χρώματος sometimes prevails markedly, and we can observe a sporadic attempt at its rectification. Lastly, two examples from the difficult text of the Minor Prophets: Zeph. 2:9 ἀλων ‘salt’ is represented by ἀλωνος, only Jerome with the Three giving the correct rendering ἀλων which, of course, was taken to be ἀλωνος and consequently written in full as ἀλωνος. The reverse process has occurred in Zeph. 1:9. Here the Hebrew speaks about those who in the pagan manner jump over the threshold, תִּשְׁגַּל נַחַל לְהַלְּך. The Greek, displaying a nonsensical ἐπὶ τά πρόστυλα, is still unemended. Yet it is easy, I think, to see that ἐμφανώς sprang from a misunderstood contraction of ἐφαλλόμενος (ΕΦΑΛΛΟΥΣ: ΛΛ ~ N) cf. Sir. 36:31 (26) ἐφαλλομένος, Song of Sol. 2:8 πηδῶν, with διαλόμενος in the
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parallel clause, Isa. 35: 6 ἀλείται, 2 Sam. 22: 30 (= Ps. 17 (18): 30) ὑπερβήσομαι.

I am not sufficiently familiar with the corresponding features in the NT. Yet I feel sure that ἀναστάς δέ Acts 5: 17 is but a similar misinterpretation of an original ἀναστάς δε which has been brilliantly vindicated by F. Blass.
PART TWO
SEMITISMS
Even after Thackeray's rich and instructive survey, 'The Semitic Element in LXX Greek' (Grammar §4), much remains to be done. In one field part of it has been done by M. Johannessohn, Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in der LXX (1, 1910; II, 1925), and R. Helbing, Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den LXX, 1928, each of whom deals with one of the many subjects that fall under the general heading. I cannot here enter upon an exhaustive treatment of the whole subject, but confine myself to giving some examples characteristic of three of its main aspects. Helbing in his introduction gives a useful classification of the different kinds of Hebraisms, syntactical, lexical, phraseological, and stylistic. Here I confine myself to the first two, as far as they give rise to emendation of our editions.

1. Syntactical Hebraisms
Johannessohn, II 334, briefly remarks that 'some verbs, meaning be well pleased with a person, choose him, are constructed in a slavish imitation of the Hebrew with έν: (a) βούλεσθαι, Rg. I 18: 25; II 24: 3, (b) θέλειν I 18: 22; II, 15: 26, both = ב רצון, take pleasure in; (c) έκλέξασθαι I 16: 9 f. = ב רצון choose (yet v. 8 with the accusative, though here also ב in the Hebrew)'. Helbing touches on this usage only slightly.

(1) As to βούλεσθαι έν ~ ב רצון the above statement is exhaustive. I have only to add that 2 Chron. 25: 16, έβούλετο ἐπὶ σοὶ τοῦ κατα-φθείραί σε, as our editions read, does not belong to this group; for here where the Hebrew has ה şiִלְיה רצון, God has determined to destroy thee, the correct Greek reading is found in Lucian only, ἐβουλεύσατο κε. Also in 2 Chron. 29: 11 κEZ is omitted by B m. See Excursus X, pp. 242 f.

(2) As regards θέλειν έν = ב רצון three more passages can be added to the two quoted by Johannessohn: 1 Kings 10: 9, 1 Chron. 28: 4, in a chapter which contains a peculiar accumulation of all the expressions dealt with in this section, and 2 Chron. 9: 8, where έν after ηθέλησεν was dropped by haplography in BANgh only and must be restored. This passage is the parallel to 1 Chron. 10: 9, but here the same omission of έν occurred in y only and thus did not influence our editions.
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(3) εὔκλεσθαι εν ~ έν έτοιμ is more frequent. There are, however, instances in which εν may have been dropped during the course of later transmission. So immediately before 1 Sam. 16: 9 f., in v. 8, the MT reads "ρατίμυ εν τούτω εξελέξατο κς. v alone has εν τούτω = MT, and there is much in favour of this being the original translation. If so, all MSS but one would have been under an influence which in 16: 9 was confined to four minuscules, fmsw, reading τούτων.2

The extremely literal character of the translation of Kings and Chronicles may be seen from two observations. (1) The Hebrew does not always keep to the construction of έν with έτοιμ. In these instances the Greek follows the Hebrew in constructing εὔκλεσθαι with acc. So in 1 Kings 8: 48 and 11: 13. (2) Once, in 2 Chron. 7: 16, the MT reads

τεν τυπίκειν την τολμαντῃ την ένθης, having only one object to the two verbs and constructing it, as is natural, to fit the second verb. This is meticulously followed by the Greek εξελεξάμην καί έγίακα τον οίκον τούτον. So also in a relative clause, δεν...οιτόν as in MT, 1 Kings 11: 34, contrasting with ής...έν αύτην, 1 Kings 8: 44, δεν...έν αύτη, 2 Chron. 6: 34, in both instances exactly like the MT.

It remains to enumerate the examples: 1 Sam. 16: (8) 9, 10; 1 Kings 8: 16 bis, 44; 1 Chron. 28: 4 f.; 2 Chron. 6: 5 bis (= 1 Kings 8: 44) (in the second instance of 6: 5 bemc have τον Α instead of εν); 6: 34; 7: 12; 2 Esdras 19: 7.

(4) αίρετίζειν εν ~ έν έτοιμ has not yet been recorded. It is found in 1 Chron. 28: 4, 6, 10; 29: 1; 2 Chron. 29: 11; 1 Macc. 2: 19 (9: 30 with acc.). Of these passages two need some explanation: in 1 Chron. 28: 10 the Hebrew reads ήπ έτοιμ, yet the bulk of the Greek evidence ήρέτικεν σε. Lucian reads σοι instead of σε and his reading makes sense only after the haplography is corrected: ήρέτικεν (εν) σοι. It looks therefore as though ήρέτικεν σε was a secondary adaptation of the ungrammatical ήρέτικεν σοι. Therefore I propose to include this passage in the number of those reading αίρετίζειν εν, relying on the observation that the LXX follows the MT closely in putting εν for σ. The other passage mentioned, 1 Chron. 29: 1, is more interesting. Here our Greek text conflates the original and the corrupted Hebrew. The Hebrew now reads έτοιμ εν μου εϊς, δεν ήρέτικεν εν οιτόπο κύριος, by emending έτοιμ to έπέτειμ.5 The latter alternative is
preferable, and therefore after this emendation our passage is no longer among those which omit the relative particle. In the Greek δν...έν αύτω exactly represents τα τα, as in the passages mentioned earlier in this paragraph. Thus it is obvious that εϊς was added after the corruption of the Hebrew had taken place. Its addition brought about the conflation mentioned above. Here strict interpretation rather than the slender evidence justifies our emendation; for Arm. and Bo. are translations which may have taken exception to the word which prevents the sentence from running smoothly, and d (107) is perhaps too isolated a witness to carry weight. [d Arm. Bo. omit εϊς. Ed.]

2. Lexical Hebraisms

2.1. Greek words extend their range of meaning in an un-Greek way after the Hebrew word which they render

This is only what was to be expected, as it is found everywhere where a culture has become bilingual. Here is an example from our own times. Because the English like combines among others the meaning similar, equal and be fond of, Americans of German extraction are inclined to say ich gleich das, when they wish to express I like that. They ought to say das habe ich gern, das gefällt mir. The characteristic thing to be noticed here is not the formation of a homonym (a feature with which we shall have to deal in our next section), viz. the adoption of a word for a meaning different from, and without connection with, the usual one, but, on the contrary, an extension of a word’s range after the pattern of another language.

Thiersch expresses it well in his study quoted earlier, ‘Vocabulo Graeco tantus conceditur ambitus, quantus est Hebraico, quocum in sua nativa congruit’ (p. 118). In a most instructive contribution J. Wackernagel, Lateinisch-Griechisches, 3. parabola (IF 31, 1913, Festschrift für Berthold Delbrück pp. 262 ff. = Kl. Schr. pp. 1239 ff.) shows at length among many other examples that the biblical παραβολή assumes all the five connotations of the Hebrew בַּעַלְפָּה.

Only one of the five is classical. The Latin Bible did the same and passed on this usage to all Romance languages. He further shows that εὐλογεῖν and benedicere, when meaning endow with gifts of fortune, can only be understood if we go back to the Hebrew. For בָּעַלְפָּה combined the meaning speak well of somebody, praise him, which it shares with the Greek and Latin verbs, with the other, which is foreign to them. He also
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points to the English *Gentile = paganus* with its modified sense, the ancestry of which can be traced back to *gentilis = εθνικός = ἰδιος*.

The example which I propose to discuss here is not dealt with by Helbing, and its presentation in LS is to some extent erroneous and at least incomplete.

σπεύδω and its compounds and derivatives, mostly being the equivalent for *הָב* Piel and Niphal, combine, as they do, the sense of haste with the Hebraizing one of trouble, fright, dismay. So σπεύδω = *הָב* Niphal means be frightened, Exod. 15: 15, as the parallel clause ἐλαβεν αὐτούς τρόμος shows clearly, 1 Sam. 28: 20 (cf. p. 318 n. 10), 21; Judg. 20: 41 (A and B texts); Dan. LXX 5: 6; Sir. 2: 2. The same passive meaning of *הָב* Niphal is elsewhere rendered by σπουδάζειν, Job 4: 5; 21: 6; 23: 15 (14). Here also we have a further example in which the parallel clause guarantees the meaning of σπουδάζειν: Isa. 21: 3, ἡ αὐτήν ἐσπούδασεν ἡ ἡττάναι τοῦ *I am upset so that I cannot hear, alarmed so that I cannot see*, ἡκηδίασα (cod. 93, ἡδίκησα the others) το μὴ ἁκούσαι, ἐσπούδασα το μὴ βλέπειν (τοῦ instead of τὸ is obviously required; it is read by *O' L" C* in the first example, by *O' L"* in the second) [Ziegler's notation. – Ed.]

σπεύδειν does not occur as a rendering of the transitive to frighten. For this the translator of Job uses σπουδάζειν again, in 22: 10 for the Piel, in 23: 16 for the Hiphil of *הָב* (ἔσπούδασέν με, immediately after the intransitive ἐσπούδακα 23: 15). Elsewhere compound verbs are preferred for transitive use (compare p. 128 above, about intrans. ἵσχυω and a transitive use of ἔν-, κατισχύω) and this usage is confined to late translations and to the Three, in the LXX proper to 2 Chronicles and Daniel LXX.

In 2 Chron. 32: 18 κατασπεύσαει has been corrupted to κατασπάσαι, and the corruption extends over the whole of our Greek evidence; *L* adds αὐτούς = MT, and Arm. even μuros, to make sense of the verb. It was Wutz, Transkriptionen p. 31, who restored κατασπεύσαει in line with the fact that *הָב* is rendered by κατασπέσαι in 26: 20; 35: 21. His free and good conjecture is now corroborated by fresh evidence. The Alcala Vet. Lat., as discovered and edited by R. Weber,* renders ἔσποινα λυπέα τοιούτων by *ad terrendos et ad turbandos eos*, whereas the Vulgate omits the second verb. The new text not only confirms the Lucianic reading φοβήσαι αὐτούς against the corrupt βοηθήσαι αὐτοῖς but κατασπέσαι too, and the latter moreover with the correct interpretation *to terrify.*
In 2 Chron. 26: 20, κατάστημασαν αὐτὸν (בָּשָׂר), καὶ γὰρ ἀντίς ἐπιστημονών (נְסָיָה) ἐκεῖθεν, the compound and the simple verb are used side by side, and it is tempting to infer a difference of meaning. In fact Buhl interprets ὑπὸν Hiph. as thrust out hastily, Kittel as take away with fright. Certainly the prevailing meaning is that of haste, with but some colouring of fright or flutter. The latter, however, is much slighter than in 2 Sam. 4: 4; 2 Kings 7: 15; 1 Sam. 23: 26, which are renderings of יִנֵּס (p. 318 n. 11). In 2 Chron. 32: 18, on the other hand, the parallel σπεύδωσιν guarantees the meaning frighten for σπεύδω καταστημάσαι.

In the third passage mentioned, 35: 21, it is hard to understand how Buhl could have ranged it among the instances of הֵבָב Pi. meaning frighten. Here in the urge to haste the idea of precipitancy is at best concomitant, and certainly in no way predominant.

In Daniel LXX the translation, καταστημάσω, occurs 4: 16 (19); 5: 6, in the latter passage immediately before an intransitive ἐπιστημονέων. The other examples belong to the Three: καταστημάζει Dan. Θ': 4: 16 (19), an active καταστημάζει, unique in this meaning, A' Ps. 2: 5 καταστημάζει (LXX ταράζει), καταστημάζει Job 23: 15a, in a doublet from Θ', but also claimed for A', and in addition A' 2 Sam. 4: 1; Ps. 6: 11; 29 (30): 8.

As to the noun there are again passages in which the context, sometimes a parallelism, removes every doubt about the meaning fright for הֵבָב: so Jer. 15: 8 (τρόμον καὶ) σπονδῆν (A' σπονδᾶς = הֵבָב). Again, Ps. 77 (78): 33, ἐν ματαιότητι ἡ μετὰ σπονδῆς (הֵבָב, in trouble AV, A' κατάστημασεν). We may compare Isa. 65: 23 εἰς κατάραν (A' Θ' εἰς σπονδῆν).

This σπονδῆ is further found in Zeph. 1: 18 and Dan. Θ' 9: 27, in a doublet not identical with Dan. LXX, and Θ' 11: 44 where it may represent Theodotion’s own translation, augmented by an intrusion from the LXX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Θ'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and rumours καὶ ἄκοη</td>
<td>καὶ ταράζει αὐτῶν καὶ σπονδᾶς ταράζουσιν αὐτῶν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Zeph. 1: 18 we read σπονδῆν in the LXX and καταστημάσμον in A'.

It remains to complete the picture by reviewing the passages in which a word of the σπευδ- group renders a Hebrew original other than הֵבָב. This enumeration gives additional evidence for our view that when
using σπεύδ-, the translators in fact wished to render לָהֹב in its meaning to frighten.

There is first לָהֹב Niphal, be deterred, be overwhelmed by a sudden terror, in which there is certainly a suggestion of haste in sudden, although it is only accessory to the chief idea of facing a terror. It is rendered by ἐταράχθη Esther 7: 6, by θορυβήθην, Dan. LXX 8: 17, and θεωρηθηθην, Dan. Θ' 8: 17. In 1 Chron. 21: 30 the Hebrew construes it with יָרָע and so the Greek puts κατάσπευσεν ἀπό προσώπου. The meaning, terror, is still more obvious in the noun. ἡ ταραχή Jer. 14: 19 and σπουδή 8: 15. Compare also σπαναὶ, objects of terror = φοβερισμοί Ps. 87 (88): 17 (16) (in Job 6: 4 the translation is so free that any inference would be hazardous).

The other instances are slightly less conclusive, as they throw more light on the Three and their interpretation of the MT and the LXX than on the LXX itself. So πάχα, angustiae, which in Isa. 8: 22; 30: 6 is rendered στενοχωρία by the LXX and the Three, is interpreted as κατάσπευσις, terror, in Prov. 1: 27 by Θ' (LXX πολιορκία). For πάχα, terror, which is ἐπώλειος in LXX Ezek. Θ' has σπουδασμός, Ezek. 27: 36; for the same in Job, where the old LXX translation uses δῆμοι, Θ' displays ταραχᾶ, 24: 17 (ταραχῶς is the competitor of σπεύδω in rendering ἐπί both in the LXX and the Three). In Dan. 10: 7, where the MT reads καινὴν, in the hiding-place, the LXX says κατά σπουδήν, which Θ' appropriately interprets ἐν φόβῳ. In Dan. Θ' 9: 27 a doublet not found in B translates τὴν κατά σπουδήν till the extermination and decision = the decided extermination by ἔως συντελείας καὶ σπουδῆς. Here the translator may have confused τὸν 1 decide with the rare τὸν π hasten (hap. leg. 2 Sam. 5: 24); but it is almost equally possible that, as in the previous examples, he took his pattern from πάχα, which in Isa. 65: 23 and Ps. 77 (78): 33 means sudden destruction (cf. p. 145). In any case neither Dan. Θ' 9: 26; Θ' 11: 36, nor Isa. Θ' 10: 23; Θ' 28: 22 support Behrmann's view (Comm. p. xxxvi) that this doublet is the genuine translation of Theodotion.

We have still to mention Jer. 38 (31): 20 ἐσπέυσα ἐπ' αὐτῷ for ἡ τρικάλεν, my bowels are passionately excited towards him, where Symmachus renders ἐταράχθη and after him Jerome conturbata sunt viscera mea super eum and AV my bowels are troubled for him. The marginal note 'Hebr. sound' follows Aquila's interpretation ἤχειν, which is not unique, for the first translator of Jeremiah (1–28) actually uses ἤχειν for ἱλα, roar,8 the second translator βομβείν.9 Here we must leave open the decision whether in ἱλα ~ σπεύδω the notion of haste or of passionate turning
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towards the object prevailed in the translator's mind. He may have combined both of them here as elsewhere.

The last word rendered by σπεύδω that comes into consideration is ιπ8. Its range of meaning is rather akin to that of τρομάω; yet whereas in τρομάω the meaning of frighten, trouble prevails so decidedly in earlier Hebrew that Kautzsch considered the meaning hasten an Aramaism, with the other way round: the Piel throughout means hasten or do something quickly, and it is only in the Niphal that psychological implications come in which, generally tending towards the meaning of hasten Niphal, have left room for some divergence of interpretation by the translators and expositors.

So in Job 5: 136, where our expositors translate τιτίνδα by is too rash or goes ahead too precipitately, the LXX and C' agree in expressing the idea of frustration and confusion (LXX βουλήν ἐκστησεν, C' βουλή τοροχ-θήσεται).

In Isa. 35: 4, where the LXX rightly renders έλαστε, the faint-hearted, by οἱ διαγνώμενοι τῇ διανοίᾳ (in a context which is a mistranslation), Α' τοῖς τοχυνοῖς καρδίας, and Θ' τοῖς τοχυκαρδίους display what can only be called misplaced etymological renderings. On the other hand their rendering of the play upon the root ιπ8 in Isa. 32: 4 τάχυνοντων ~ ταχύνει is more in line with the exegetical tradition (Symmachus alone goes his own way by putting ἄνόητοι in both passages), and suggests an emendation of the LXX: its οὐθένοντων is not covered by διαγνώμενοι of 35: 4, and obviously should be σπευδόντων with the meaning which is well expressed in Duhm's translation die Schnellfertigen, just as the LXX renders ιπ8 by ταχύ μαθήσονται. This σπευδόντων is in line as well with the translation of ιπ8, Isa. 16: 5, σπευδόνων (elsewhere δεσπσ Ps. 44 (45): 2; Prov. 22: 29, εὐφυής 1 Esdras 8: 3; ταχύς 2 Esdras 7: 6), and κατέσπευσαν for ἴπ8 Sir. 50: 17.

Earlier we mentioned that Kautzsch saw an Aramaism in the meaning hasten of הֵבָה. In fact the Aramaic of Daniel has both meanings side by side: הֵבָה Pail means frighten, Hithpaal be frightened, Hithpeel to hurry, cf. הָרַע hurry Ezra 4: 23, and the same wide range of meanings in Jewish Aramaic which is beyond my competence. There are, at least in Syriac, more signs of a confusion or rather close combination of the two meanings hasten and be troubled (I borrow from the Syriac only what apparently cannot be supplied by the earlier Aramaic language.) As will be seen in our next section, and as is already well known, our translators were often guided more or less unconsciously by their native
Aramaic, and here this provided them with a close relationship of the meanings to hurry and be troubled. The result of this is what we have found in this paragraph. Perhaps we may state that here a sense-distinction which is quite clearly drawn in our minds did not exist equally distinctly in the minds of the early Semites.

We may do well to stop at this point. Otherwise it would be tempting to go on and reflect upon the oriental outlook which sees dignified slowness as inseparable from the good life. Its prevalence to this very day makes us realize why hurry and trouble were for their ancestors two closely connected aspects of something incompatible with that good life.

From what has been stated, the following modifications are suggested for LS σπουδάζω: the meaning disturb, trouble any one ought to be supplemented by the intransitive one be upset, alarmed, terrified Job 4: 5; 21: 6; 23: 15 (14); Isa. 21: 3; σπουδασμός Ezek. 27: 36 is not zeal, but fright.13 σπουδή, fright, is entirely missing from LS, for the heading ‘π, zeal, pains, trouble, effort’ does not cover the meanings found in the LXX, as the examples given clearly indicate. Jer. 15: 8 (τρόμον καὶ σπουδή) would be a good example, and so would Zeph. 1: 18 σπουδήν τοιήσει and Ps. 77 (78): 33 μετὰ σπουδῆς. Under κατασπεύδω 1 2. agitate, dismay, the emended 2 Chron. 32: 18 should be added. 11 1. intr. make haste, hasten would be better represented by 2 Chron. 35: 21 δ θεός ἐπι ομο σπεύδης, Prov. 1: 27 for ἀσθενεία is certainly not haste, but something like fright, terror. As to κατασπούδαζε- LS records a dep. pass. and a later active, be serious; it records the pass. κατασπούδαζομαι, be troubled, which in fact is confined to the more recent translators, for instead of ‘Jb. 23. 15’ it ought to quote v. 15a which is an addition from Θ’ (and A’ cf. p. 145). But it omits Aquila’s transitive active κατασπουδάσει Ps. 2: 5 (MT ἀλάξας; LXX ταράξει).

2.2. Greek words assume un-Greek meanings from a confusion of Hebrew homonyms

Solecisms similar to that observed in σπεύδειν, which in itself could never mean confuse in Greek proper, can also result from a slightly different reason. Whereas here the co-existence in a Greek word of
incompatible meanings reflects a usage found in its Hebrew equivalent, in other instances the un-Greek range of meaning derives from a confusion by the translator of two homonymous or similar Hebrew roots. In the former instance the solecism results from a meticulous imitation of the Hebrew, an etymological way of rendering, a thinking in terms of Hebrew even when another language is used, as can be best observed in Aquila — and, in our own days, in the expressionistic German OT translation of Rosenzweig-Buber. In the latter instance it is a sheer mistake, arising from a deficient knowledge of Hebrew or, at an earlier stage, from a secondary confusion of originally separate roots of similar sound by the Hebrew-speaking community themselves.

LS pays more attention than any earlier general lexicon to this kind of mistranslation, indicating the Hebrew roots the confusion of which led to peculiar meanings of Greek words. It is therefore expedient to give some examples of words where it fails to resort to Hebrew homonymy. My examples are ἀγχιστεύειν, -είς and παρατικραίνειν.

ἀγχιστεύειν, *to be the next or near* represents ἰα and from here expressions like ἵνα do a kinsman's office to a woman, marry her (so LS; better perhaps redeem (ransom) a childless widow) or ἀγχιστεύων τὸ σύμα Numbers, Joshua, ἀγχιστεύων τοῦ σύματος Deuteronomy, ἀγχιστεύς τοῦ σύματος, 2 Sam. 14: 11, avenger of blood, do not stretch the word beyond all limit. The expression take possession as a legitimate heir, Num. 36: 8 bis), is more difficult, as it represents not ἰα, but σύμα (Num. 27: 11 κληρονομήσει, Lev. 25: 46 ἐσούνται ὑμῖν κατόχιμοι = ἰάς ἴνα ἴνα). ἀγχιστεία for ἰα, duty of redeeming, in Ruth 4: 6 ff. to be understood as an internal object to ἀγχιστεύειν, is quite legitimate. Yet there remain some passages, about which LS records: 'ἀγχιστεύω 3. Pass., to be excluded by descent, ἐπὶ τῆς λεγεῖται 2 Es. 2. 62, Ne. 7. 64' and 'ἀγχιστεία 3. exclusion by descent Lxx Ne. 13. 29'. In giving these meanings, it fails to realize that in these three passages the translator, who is one and the same, since 2 Esdras comprises also Nehemiah as chapters 11–23, confuses two Hebrew homonyms and renders ἰα and the hapax legomenon ἰα as though they were the ἰα and ἰα, about which we have just spoken. The Pual of ἰα means be proclaimed defiled and therefore tabu, disqualified, the noun ἰα, plur. constr., defilements.19 So we have an obvious mistranslation, and LS is mistaken in its attempt to telescope the meanings of the two homonymous roots. Defilement, pollution and be disqualified, with a note about the homonymy, is required, and by descent ought to be dropped. The mistake in LS
goes back to Biel, yet was avoided in Schleusner's new edition as early as 1820.

παραπικραίνειν. This compound is confined to biblical literature, including Philo, and so is the simple verb in the meaning embitter and the active ἐκπικραίνειν. A transitive παραπικραίνειν represents έκινε irritate in some passages of Jeremiah, who also has the simple verb. In Deut. 32: 16 ἐκπικραίνειν takes its place, παρα- (from 31: 27) being read by B alone. To our astonishment we find that these Greek verbs only very rarely render רע which would be their proper equivalent. So we read an uncontested transitive πικραίνει in Job 27: 2 only, and παραπικραίνειν with the Three exclusively. In other passages the same verbs are rendered by παροργίζειν or similar verbs.

Yet there is still another usage which was observed by Mozley in a note on Ps. 5: 11 (The Psalter of the Church, 1905) and dealt with in detail by Flashar (ZAW, 1912, pp. 185 ff.) and Helbing (Kasussyntax pp. 101 ff.). Flashar, who confines himself to the LXX Psalter, bases his argument on Mozley's suggestion (p. xiii) that the Pentateuch, Hebrew and Greek, probably was ‘our translator’s textbook in learning Hebrew, and served him to a great extent in place of a dictionary’. As to παραπικραίνειν Flashar sees the model passage in Deut. 31: 27, where מִים, rebelling, is rendered παραπικραίνοντες as though from רע, be bitter, instead of הָרֹע Hiphil, to rebel. The same occasional confusion is made by the same translator when rendering הָרֹע by ἔρεθιστής Deut. 21: 18, by ἔρεθισμόν Deut. 31: 27. He points out that this occasional slip in the translation of Deuteronomy resulted in ten examples of a stereotype παραπικραίνειν = הָרֹע in the Psalms, to which he adds the two examples of מִים, rebels, rendered παραπικραίνοντες. παραπικραίνειν for הָרֹע, however, is found sporadically in other parts of the LXX or behind its mistranslations (Hos. 10: 5, cf. Schleusner and Nyberg). In addition, Ezek. 2: 3 twice renders רע to rebel in the same way, τοὺς παραπικραίνοντας με, οἵτινες παραπικραίνοντας με. Ezra 5: 12 ἡ παραπράξεις τοῦ ναοῦ (2 Esdras 5: 12 παροργίσασιν οἱ πατέρες ήμῶν τον θεόν) reads οἱ πατέρες ήμῶν παραπικραίναντες ήμορτον εἰς τὸν κύριον in 1 Esdras 6: 14. And a passage in the translated 1 Macc. 3: 7, in the psalm-like eulogy of Judas Maccabaeus at the beginning of his career, discloses the same feature, ἐπικραίνειν βασιλεῖς πολλοὺς καὶ εὑραμένει τον λακωθ; for here we must translate he rebelled or rose against many kings, a meaning which may be traced back to a הָרֹע of the lost original, and which is expressed in
correct Greek ἀντίστη πρὸς τὸν θεόν Hos. 14: 1. So it is a mistaken literalism ('septuagintism') to translate with Kautzsch, 'er erbitterte viele Könige'.

To return to the Psalms, in addition to their stereotyped rendering of πρέξη by παραπικραίνειν, there are two more occasional renderings of the same character. (1) ἰπρής, deceit, which elsewhere in Psalms is rendered by δόλος or its derivations throughout, appears as πικρία in 9: 28 (10: 7 MT), as though the θ at the beginning of the word formed part of the root, which it does not, since ἰπρής derives from ἰπρι Πiel to deceive. (2) The other instance is of far greater consequence, since through the medium of the NT, it distinctly colours our liturgy. Once more the translator of Psalms interprets a noun with an initial θ as though this was the first radical. ἰπρής quarrel, dispute (μάχη Gen. 13: 8, ἀντιλογία Num. 27: 14) is also the name of a rock spring in the desert. Here the late translator of Ezekiel transliterates Μαριμ(β)ωθ 47: 19; 48: 28; Exod. 17: 7 says Λοιδόρης, Num. 20: 24 Λοιδόρια, whereas Num. 20: 13; Deut. 32: 51; 33: 8, and even Ps. 80: 8; 105: 32 display Ἀντιλογία. Against this background Ps. 94 (95): 8, quoted in Heb. 3: 8, 15, stands out with its Παραπικρασμός as from ἰπρής. It is obvious that in the Ps. passage we must spell place-names, ἐν τῷ Παραπικρασμῷ and τῷ Πειρασμῷ = ἰπρής. In Hebrews I leave the decision to those more competent to explain the author's mind. It might require inverted commas in our vernacular texts. In Psalms, Luther alone translates zu Meriba, zu Massa, as do the modern expositors; for the Hebrew clearly refers to the event which took place at the locality described by the two place-names, the situation of διαν., σήμερον, being paralleled to the one of bygone times. The Vulgate and the AV, however, follow the LXX (and Hebrews), and in Hebrews all translators give the translated place-names - Vulg. Ps. in irritatione, Heb. in exacerbatione, in v. 15 inserting illa - and the expositors form no exception.

H. Windisch's exposition (Handbuch zum NT iv 3, 32) 'παραπικρασμός, in der Bibel nur in diesem Zitat, ist Erbitterung, die in Gott hervorgenen wurde', is completely mistaken. Against it, it is sufficient to quote Deut. 33: 8, Λοιδόρης ἐπὶ Ὠδότος Ἀντιλογίας which in the language of Ps. 94 (95): 8 would read παραπικρασμόν ἐπὶ Ὠδότος Παραπικρασμοῦ, following the paronomasia in the Hebrew ἰπρής ἰπρής ἰπρής. For the meaning of the noun here depends upon that of the verb, which is certainly not erbitten, as even Flashar says (p. 186 n. 1); it is used absolutely, and embitter is a transitive. Following Flashar we must go back to the LXX, more especially to Deut. 31: 27, the Greek
Psalmist’s model, and what he took from it. In so doing we find that there is only a very weak foundation for asserting a prevalently transitive use of נָשַׁב. It is constructed with יַע in Deut. 31: 27, rarely with א as in Ps. 5: 11, and more often with the accusative, but there are still more examples of the absolute use; so even the accusative may be something half-way between a modal accusative and one designating an object. Thus Deut. 31: 27 נָשַׁב is translated τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, which is decidedly modal. Therefore the problem is not to ask with Flashar and Helbing in what passages an accusative may justify the translation embitter, provoke, but, following a line traced by Flashar elsewhere, how clear a meaning we may expect at all. For, as Flashar has amply shown, the characteristic feature of these borrowed equivalents for difficult Hebrew words is that they betray a lack of understanding, the translator being satisfied with having filled the gap in a way that left all responsibility to his authoritative source, the Pentateuch. In this connection Flashar lays great stress on his observation that, when a Hebrew text was easily understood, the translator tended to mould it afresh after his own mind; but, when it was difficult, he followed it word for word, without insisting too much that it make sense, and left the responsibility to the original. In virtue of these observations I would plead for an interpretation in line with the Hebrew which is always to rebel, be subversive. The fact that in Ps. 5: 11 יִנַּע יִנַע is rendered by παρατικραίνειν σε, also by an accusative, does not mean much to the contrary. Considering נָשַׁב ~ Παρατικρασμός, Ps. 94 (95): 8, we cannot even be sure whether the translator, at this first occurrence of the phrase, did not have in mind instead נִבּי part. Hiph., cf. 1 Sam. 2: 10; Hos. 4: 4 and its defence here by Nyberg (Hosea, 6, pp. 27 f.). The frequent use in Ezekiel of οἶκος παρατικραίνων = נִיבּי, house of rebellion, tends towards the same end, as does our earlier observation that transitive παρατικραίνειν for נָשַׁב is rare and, as a rendering of נָשַׁב, hexaplaric only. So the transitive meaning was not established firmly enough to be a model for the usage which arose from confusion or homonymy in the Hebrew.

Interpreting our LXX passages in the light of their origin from the Hebrew is one thing, and following up its influence on later translations another. Through the medium of the Vulgate our vernacular translations put provoke, Luther in five, AV in six, of the 12 instances in Psalms, but the LXX and Vulg. in nine of the twelve instances; yet our expositors, who translate from the Hebrew, give intransitive translations only.
So the translation, even in Hebrews, ought to be rebellion and to rebel, and the reason for the strange use in the LXX of -τπκρ- is not so much, as Mozley, Flashar, and Helbing say, a confusion of the other roots with ῥεφ – which is too rare – but a mistaken association with, and connotation of, ῥεφ.

The relevant articles concerned in Bauer’s Wörterbuch attempt to develop the meanings the other way round. In doing so, it is striking that the first meaning for παραπικρασμός, ‘Erbitterung’, is evidenced from three hexaplaric occurrences only, one from each of the Three, in spite of the fact that they wrote generations later than the author of Hebrews.

Here it may be advisable to pause and reflect upon the nature of these mistranslations which are caused by a confusion of two Hebrew roots. They present a problem which from the point of view of the Greek lexicon is wholly different from that presented by the mere extension of meaning after the pattern of a single Hebrew root. In the latter aspect, which was dealt with under (1), it can be taken for granted that the translator wished to convey to the Greek word the meaning of its Hebrew equivalent, as he did understand his Hebrew text and was mistaken only in so far as he forced the Greek equivalent into the range of meaning to which he was accustomed from the Hebrew. In doing so, he may have been guided by some earlier tradition among his bilingual compatriots, and to some extent this tradition may even have been legitimate wherever it was possible to imagine a semasiological bond linking the different meanings in Hebrew, and consequently to apply it to the Greek equivalent as well. Here, in the (1) instances the Greek lexicon should record and explain the novel, Hebraistic, meaning. But what of the (2) instances? Here we can be fairly sure that the translator did not understand his text, and this betrays a lack of exegetical tradition; for otherwise he would have recognized the specific meaning of the root concerned, however rare or obsolete it might have become by his time. So his translation stands for, and renders, a root which was not in the mind of the original author, yet, apart from the nonsense which results, there is nothing remarkable in the relation between original and translation. If the lexicon is intended at all to record such blunders, it can do so only by way of indicating the strange background of this mistranslation, without ascribing the meaning of the Hebrew to the Greek word, which in fact reflects its homonym. LS often appropriately explains a mistranslation on these lines; but there are other articles where it fails to do so.
Our two examples give rise to further discriminations. Homonym roots such as הָלָּח and ה do not in the least cover any common semasiological ground; only complete ignorance or utter negligence can confuse them. So a lexicon must not try to build bridges between two points which are not situated on the same plane. But, perhaps, it may be different with other examples. In Hebrew there are slightly different roots which, nevertheless, are semasiologically identical. There are other similar roots bearing similar, though not identical, meanings. Some may be due to some secondary differentiation of what was once identical; in others we may observe some semasiological assimilation at a later stage. This assimilation may have taken place at a stage later than that covered by Hebrew literature and may even have been an idiomatic peculiarity of our bilingual translators. They may have acquired it either from life or from a combination of earlier translations which they used as their model and pattern. If so, what originally was homonymy in Hebrew only would have been turned into some Greek homonymy. With some reservation I am inclined to suggest that something of the latter kind may have occurred in the assimilation to the meaning of רֶפֶנ which the LXX discloses in the roots אֶפֶנ, הָרָפֶנ, וָרָפֶנ, and occasionally, as we have seen, also in some other words in which the initial is not even a radical. Here we observe an intermediary stage, half-way between a solecism from a misunderstood Hebrew homonymy and a less serious blunder in line with the extension in Greek of the range of meaning of a word after the Hebrew pattern, and this would involve a different attitude on the part of the lexicographer. But before he can set to work with any confidence, many puzzles have to be solved. As an example I refer to what is said elsewhere on the confusion of the verbs לָשׁוּת and בָּלָשׁ (Excursus XV, pp. 262 ff.). Collaboration with Semitic scholars is required here.
9. HELLENIZED SEMITIC WORDS

Apart from that section of the vocabulary of the LXX which discloses fresh meanings derived from the Hebrew original there are other words which are wholly new coinage. Thackeray gives three lists of them, first transliterations proper, which are treated in their Greek form as in­declinables, the Hellenized Semitic words, and finally Greek words of similar sound to the Hebrew. These lists were very helpful when they were published in 1909. Moreover they are an opus supererogatorium as prefixed to a treatise which deals only with orthography and accidence, and it is in the nature of things that a successor of his, to whose lot it will fall to continue his Grammar by adding the missing chapter on word formation, is likely to approach the matter from a slightly different angle.

1. Transliterations

After the discussion caused by the theory of F. Wutz (Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus, 1925–33) that most of the translations were made from a Hebrew text written in Greek characters, which left its traces in the translation, more will have to be said about the transliterations than was necessary in 1909, even though Wutz has failed to convince. Here I do not go any further than stating that there are in our texts transliterations which hitherto have escaped notice. I mention one of them, because it is instructive as regards the Hebrew and the Greek texts.

In 1 Chron. 25: 9 ff. the casting of lots among the twenty-four classes of temple-singers is reported by an enumeration of the twenty-four heads of families. As befits a charter, this enumeration proceeds monoto­nously without any variations. In the Vulgate everything runs smoothly, and the same applies to Luther and the AV, which here obviously draw on Jerome. The Hebrew and Greek, on the other hand, share a cor­ruption in 25: 9. Instead of the second to Gedaliah they read Ἑνιά, both putting the second after Gedaliah.

(1) What is the meaning of Ηνία, as Rahlfs, or ‘Henia, as the others spell it? Far from being a proper name, comparable with Ἡλέια, Ἡλέιος, Ἡνιώκαπ, Ἡνιώκαπ, it is a transliteration of εψ, and thus a doublet. To understand its origin, we have only to consider the context: ΟΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΣ <C>
SEMITISMS

ΗΝΙ[A]ΔΕΛΦΟΙ, where ⟨⟩ means a haplography, [] a dittography. The late origin of this doublet is betrayed by η = ζ. Once it is removed, the MT and LXX are identical. I wonder whether the traditional aspirate is due to ἣνια, reи. Where nonsense has once started, anything is possible.

(2) BH3’s suggestion ‘trsp c Vulg. λινις ηνια’ is based on the Vulgate, as though nothing could be gathered from the LXX. In point of fact we have a pre-Jerome Latin text which clearly reflects a LXX text in agreement with the original uncorrupted Hebrew. It is the Latin Lucca Chronicle (Lagarde, S-St II, 5–28), quoted by BM as Anon1. Together with g (158) it fills a gap in the Hebrew earlier in the same verse (cf. BH3), as can be seen from BM; yet the more important contribution which it alone makes has hitherto escaped the notice of Hebrew and Septuagint students.

(3) As Lagarde indicates (p. 44), we have here, in the two MSS of Lucca and Turin, ‘a dated and geographically locatable “Itala” text’, of African origin, from the second half of the fifth century (the copies preserved, of course, are much more recent). It is worth while to give the different forms of the text in parallel columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Anon1</th>
<th>Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ εξῆλθεν</td>
<td>excidit</td>
<td>egressaque est</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ κλήρος ὁ πρῶτος</td>
<td>sors prima</td>
<td>sors prima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑιὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>filiorum eius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἄδελφοιν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>et fratum eius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ Ἀσαφ</td>
<td>ipsius Asaf [sic]</td>
<td>Ioseph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ Ἡσσιφ</td>
<td>illi Ioseph,</td>
<td>qui erat de Asaph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ἀδελφοί αὐτοῦ]</td>
<td>et filii eius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ὑιοὶ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>et fratres eius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The redundant words in the beginning, which LXX and Anon1 have in common, can only be understood from the latter, and that only after putting right the punctuation, as has been done above. We have to
Ipsius Asaph, Illi Ioseph. Ipsius and illi are like articles, they are there to indicate that Asaph is a genitive and Ioseph a dative. There is much thought behind this interpretation of the Hebrew, from which the expositors agree that must be excised, as being either a gloss or a diatography of . There is some connection between Anon and the ordinary Greek which would point to a reading , such as is also at the root of Jerome's alteration, and his transposition too. Yet the preceding words make no sense here, and we must state that, from the doublet preserved in Anon, the LXX chose the wrong alternative, namely the first, whereas the second, with a minor transposition, was preserved by g (158) only. Yet the most important contribution of Anon is the words Secundus Godolias (not in BM) which elsewhere are found in the Vulgate only. But the Vulgate has secunda which is more correctly related to sors, whereas Anon preserves not only the nominative of the LXX, which is good, but even the gender of δεύτερος, failing to observe that it makes sense only when referring to κλήρος. In these two aspects Anon reflects a Greek text such as was reconstructed in the diagram. This Greek text has the two words in the proper order and thus restores what is lost in v. 9 only in the Hebrew and in the current Greek alike. But in the whole of the list, from number two, Godolias, onward to number twenty-four, v. 31, it gives the proper names as nominatives and therefore must have related the ordinals to them, dropping the correct translation of v. 9a ο κλήρος ο πρώτος...το Λοσσαφ. This mistake easily escapes notice in the Greek, because κλήρος is masc., in contrast to Latin sors, and also because the proper names are uninflected transliterations. But once we compare the enumeration of the 24 priestly classes in ch. 24, vv. 7-18, the difference emerges clearly; for here the proper names are all preceded by το as in 25: 9a. Thus the translation is correct in ch. 24, whereas the proper meaning is missed in ch. 25 for the classes 2-24 of the temple-singers. In both chapters Anon follows its Greek Vorlage. In ch. 24 the only exception is that in Anon the ordinals precede the proper names in contrast to both the MT and the LXX: prima sors Iarim, secunda Bidae... In ch. 25, as was stated earlier, Anon restores the required word order of the MT and the LXX by having secundus before Godolias. In neither does it express the dative by illi or ipsi, in contrast to 25: 9a. This different aspect of chapters 24 and 25 has something comparable in the Hebrew. Whereas in 24 everything runs as smoothly in the MT as in the LXX, there are in 25 many parallels to the η missing before Iarim (though not to the transpositions). η must be inserted also in vv. 10,
SEMITISMS

12–18, 20 f., and in vv. 20–31 the ordinals are preceded by ָinstead of the article; among these instances there are two in which ַis missing before the proper name, viz. vv. 20 f.

So the note in BH3 ought to be 'trsp. c LXX, Vet Lat, Vulg'.

As to Thackeray’s list of Hellenized words I would suggest the elimination of three groups and the selection of three others for special treatment.

2. Groups to be eliminated

2.1. Corrupted transliterations which assumed the semblance of a Hellenized word only by force of their corruption.

There are three words ending in -ων which are nothing but transliterations, and not Hellenized words: Κεδρων, σαββατων, σιρωνων or σιωνων.

Κεδρων. The detailed evidence provided by BM and Rahlfs allows us to draw the line more distinctly than could Thackeray (pp. 38 and 169 n. 5), and this has a special interest in view of John 18: 1. As a transliteration of Ἰππος, Κεδρων is a normal formation. Its ε is not shaped by any influence from Ἰ κέδρος. Examples of ε for Hebrew i abound.2 Having in mind the variants of John 18: 1, τῶν κέδρων BCL, τοῦ κέδρου SD it. var, τοῦ Κέδρων A it. var syr.3 (among which it was left to Emanuel Hirsch (Studien zum vierten Evangelium, Tübingen, 1936) from his partiality for the consent of SD to decide in favour of τοῦ κέδρου), we briefly review the LXX passages. Leaving aside the ‘other Κέδρων, a town in the region of Jamnia’, to which Hort drew attention (II Appendix p. 90), we find that Κέδρων, which is always preceded by χειμάρρους,5 has no article whatever. Such variants as exist are negligible: (1) τῶν (as though it were κέδρων) 1 Kings 2: 37 Nb-α, 242; 2 Kings 23: 6, in the first occurrence, v Cyr.; 2 Kings 23: 12 i. (2) An article resuming the case of χειμάρρους and thus co-ordinating Κεδρων, as in John 18: 1 πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τοῦ Κέδρων, a usage almost unknown in Attic speech (Thuc. 7, 80–2) and foreign to the LXX proper, found at 2 Chron. 15: 16 in abdmp–zea (byea are Lucianic). In two passages, where κέδρος occurs instead of Κεδρων, we observe an isolated mechanical adaptation of κέδρος without an article to the case of χειμάρρους, 2 Kings 23: 4 (L) κέδρου (= 19, not in 108); 2 Kings 23: 6, second occurrence, κέδρω x.
Against this background there stand out the two passages mentioned by Hort and Moulton-Howard (π, 149), 2 Sam. 15: 23, 1 Kings 15: 13 as parallels supporting τῶν κέδρων John 18: 1 which they both prefer. Moulton goes so far as to say, ‘the hellenised form starts in LXX’; yet I think I can show that this holds good only of some late and secondary developments during the course of transmission which may be contemporary with, or even deriving from, τῶν κέδρων and τοῦ κέδρου of John, but certainly do not form part of ‘the LXX’. In 2 Sam. 15: 23 the expression occurs twice, but the first εν τῷ χειμάρρῳ τῶν κέδρων is missing in OL, and the entire clause, of which it forms the closing part, in MNagjnuvyb₂. As can be seen from Wellhausen and Driver, this clause is a late doublet of the last clause of the verse, in which again καὶ δὲ βασιλεύς 2° is a doublet rightly omitted by OLV. In the intermediary clause, which is genuine, we read τὸν χειμάρρον τῷ Κέδρῳ, with 0 alone displaying εν τῷ χειμάρρῳ τῶν κέδρων and L εν τῷ χειμάρρῳ τῷ Κέδρῳ. In 1 Kings 15: 13 Syr. L omit τῶν before Κέδρον. Rahlfis, who does not otherwise emend 2 Sam. 15: 23 nor 1 Kings 15: 13, where at least εἶδωλον τῷ Ἀλσεί instead of σύνοδον εν τῷ Ἀλσεί is certain (ThLZ, 1936, p. 286, after Wutz, Transkr. p. 24), in neither passage admits the article before Κέδρον. In this he is right. In the former passage the very divergence of OL (τῶν κέδρων O, τοῦ Κέδρου L) exposes the secondary nature of their respective additions, which do not yield LXX Greek; in the latter O is deserted by its chief witness Syr. and by L too.

If I am right, the article before Κέδρον originated from late copyists who had in mind John 18: 1. It appears in part of the LXX evidence in three alternative forms, the gen. sing. τοῦ κέδρου being represented most slightly of all, as was to be expected (κέδρου after χειμάρρου without the article, in a singular Lucianic MS (b’) 2 Kings 23: 4). So we must exclude the article before Κέδρον everywhere in the LXX, just as we exclude all other interpolations from the New Testament.

σαββατων. χειμαρρις νας is rendered σάββατα σαββατων Lev. 16: 31; 23: 32. In the former passage Schlesusner (i, 242 f.) opposes the accentuation σαββατων and suggests the transliteration σαββατων, quae mihi ipsa vox hebraica graecis literis expressa esse videtur. He is right, though he does not fully maintain his suggestion in v, 2. As his suggestion appears to have been overlooked, something more is required to set it in its proper frame, and thus to contribute to the understanding of the complex phrases of which it forms part.
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(1) σάββατων is confined to the two passages mentioned, the prevailing rendering being ἀνάπαυσις, which in Lev. 16: 31 σάββατα σάββατων ἀνάπαυσις ἐσται σάββατα ὑμῖν, is found together with the former. 4

(2) In θνηστεία ηγή the former word is in the construct state, yet in this the LXX does not follow the MT. Moreover the LXX translates Exod. 16: 23, where the MT inverts the sequence of the words, as though it had read θνηστεία ηγή; and, in any case, the meaning of MT Exod. 16: 23 is exactly the same as in the passages with the sequence θνηστεία ηγή, though the other translations and the expositors follow the MT. The sequence of such synonymous words represents a kind of hendiadys, which intensifies the meaning common to both. As such this expressive mode of speech is closely related to the one which takes the place of a superlative by means of ‘bringing to prominence a feature among the members of its own category’ (König, Syntax § 309b) in ‘supporting a substantive by the plural of the same word’ (G. Kautzsch § 1331). 8 Now a tabulation of the examples given by König and Kautzsch, both for the repetition of the same word and the juxtaposition of synonyms, shows that the older parts of the LXX tend to avoid the construct case relation. They certainly say τοῦ ἄγιου τῶν ἄγιων Exod. 26: 33 (cf. ἄγιον τοῦ ἄγιου 29: 37, τὰ ἄγια τῶν ἄγιων Lev. 21: 22), θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων Deut. 10: 17 (as Ps. 135 (136): 2 f.), and, ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Deut. 10: 14 (also 1 Kings 8: 27); but in the older parts of the translation they would say τοῖς οἰκέτης Gen. 9: 25, even avoiding the repetition of the same word τοῖς οἰκέτης (which Aquila renders literally δούλος δούλων and likewise Jerome servus servorum). 7 Similarly they put ὁ αρχων ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν Num. 3: 32 (AFMN and many minn., that is, some later recensions other than B0£,, inserting ὁ before ἐπὶ) for ἀρχων ἄρχων. Likewise Isa. 34: 10 οἰκία ἡμῶν is rendered εἰς χρόνον πολὺν, whereas the Three closely follow the Hebrew: Α' Θ' εἰς νῖκος νικῶν, C' εἰς ἐκχάττα ἐκχάττων. The same co-ordination is found in σκότως γνόφως τῆς ἡλίας ἐφέσσις Exod. 10: 22 (cf. Deut. 4: 11; 5: 22 (19)).

With this juxtaposition of synonymous substantives Kautzsch groups θνηστεία ηγή, where the co-existence of two words derived from the same root results in expressing a superlative. So σάββατα σάββατων is an asyndetic juxtaposition of two nominatives, as is σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις Exod. 16: 23; 31: 15; 35: 2; Lev. (16: 31); 23: 3; 25: 4. Accordingly La. says requies sancta, omitting σάββατα, Exod. 31: 15 and quies sancta sabbata, requies 35: 2, following B; and, in the light of his genitives elsewhere, it is worth recording that Jerome in the Vulgate has co-
ordinated nominatives in the same passages: sabbatum est, requies sancta, Exod. 31:15, erit vobis sanctus, sabbatum et requies, 35:2.8 The Greek uses a genitive in Lev. 25:5 only, Ἐπιστος ἄναπαύσεως for ἡμέρα ἡμών; for no other translation would make sense. But in the Vulgate genitives prevail: Exod. 16:23, requies sabbati for ἡμέρα ἡμών and, rather strangely, an analogous sabbati requies for ἡμέρα ἡμών, Lev. 23:3,9 while the majority of passages read sabbatum requietionis, Lev. 16:31; 23:32; 25:4, and, of course, annus requietionis, Lev. 25:5.

Twice, in Lev. 23:24, 39, ἡμέρα appears alone. Here the LXX renders ἄναπαύσεις,10 yet the margin of some codices preserves some anonymous hexaplaric readings, 23:24 σαββατων Mv (as Fb in a doublet in the text of Exod. 31:15), σαββατον sz; 23:39 σαββατον svz. This is interesting for its consequences. There can hardly be any doubt that Jerome, who was influenced by the same late Jewish tradition as the Three and drew so freely on them, took from this tradition his translation of ἡμέρα, sabbatum, Lev. 23:24, 39, which is still preserved in Luther and the AV. Still more, even in Lev. 25:5, where the old translations have Ἐπιστος ἄναπαύσεως, annus requietionis, year of rest (AV) there are some remnants from the Three, σαββατα s, σαββατων vz, and this is preserved by Luther’s translation, Sabbatjahr. This is still alive in German, as is sabbatical year in English. I feel sure that at the root of this quid pro quo there is the confusion of σαββατον and σαββατων: both originally represented ἡμέρα, and as o is the more primitive transliteration of i, we must not assume that σαββατον was written to mean ἡμέρα, το σαββατον.

But expressions like ξώσα φοιμάτων, δούλος δούλων tempted later抄ists and readers to the interpretation, σάββατα σαββατων,11 and this happened so early as to result in the translation of Lugd., Lev. 16:31, sabbata sabbatorum erit haec requietio erit vobis ea, for σάββατα σαββατων ἀνάπαυσις ἐσται σάββατο σαββατων, which was recognized as a doublet by Schlesssner (cf. above, p. 159). As to Schlesssner’s decision, it is difficult to speak definitely. He must have had in mind Lev. 23:32, the only passage elsewhere with σαββατον. But considering the later tendency to add the transliteration of ἡμέρα, σαββατων (Fb Exod. 31:15), σαββατων ov Lev. 23:24, 39, as was shown in the preceding paragraph, it is safer to judge that a hexaplaric correction, which elsewhere resulted in a doublet, took the place of the original ἀνάπαυσις in Lev. 23:32, and must consequently be cancelled in Lev. 16:31.12
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σαρωνυμ, σιρωννυμ. In Judg. 8: 26 two of the five groups of MSS of this book render δυνατη crescents by σιρωννυμ or σιωννυμ, the members of both groups being exceptionally divided in their witness. The other three groups, including the markedly secondary Β text, read μηνισκων, as does Aquila. The context requires a gen. plur., and so all our editions accent σιρωννυμ; so does even Rahlfs, thus indicating that here he did not find a transliteration, but a Hellenized word. On the contrary I am convinced that the false resemblance to a gen. plur. was attained only in the course of transmission, at the beginning of which there was a transliteration. In fact x has σαρωνυμ.\(^{13}\)

2.2. Formations that are unique and of doubtful or transitory nature and in line with what we observe elsewhere. Most of such instances may be traced back to 2.1.

τα βακχονρια (Thack. p. 34). ἐν τοῖς βακχουριοις, 2 Esdras 23: 31, for συνεξεχελιστει is unique, yet very well attested, as only Lucian here reads πρωτογενημοσιν, as do all in 20: 36 (35). As it stands, it favours those who believe Theodotion to be the translator. This was Torrey’s assumption, which was based mainly on the frequent transliterations. But it can hardly be adopted for Chronicles, Esdras, Nehemiah (cf. Rahlfs, S-St III, 85 n. 2), for they often represent a corrupt Hebrew consonantal text, a fact which Torrey in vain attempts to explain away. If the text read βακχουρια (this nominative seems to be the correct one), everybody would be inclined by an easy graphical correction to restore βακχουριοι; but the dative too admits an unobjectionable emendation (βακχουριοι ~ ειμ).

The existence side by side in the same translation of πρωτογενηματα 20: 36, and βακχουρια- 23: 31, is not unparalleled. As an example I briefly mention the translations of Aram. ḥאע pl., to which we shall have to come back in a later section. In Dan. 3: 94 (27) LXX and Θ both have σαράβαρα, in 3: 21 they divide, LXX reading υποδήματα, Θ σαραβάροις. Yet this parallel is less striking in so far as τα σαράβαρα was used in Greek beforehand, even if we have only the fragment from Antiphanes left, whereas βακχουρια, at its best, was due to the momentary predicament on the part of a bad translator (he mistranslates ἄγχιστεια for ἔγχιστεια for ἔγχιστεια (above, p. 149) only two verses earlier).
2.3. Borrowed words of old standing, and therefore familiar to Greek speech and literature, though less frequent there than in the LXX, which was influenced by the Hebrew original. This is the only group of real importance.

Whereas under (2.1) and (2.2) only a few examples were ruled out, many of Thackeray’s examples of declinable Hellenized Semitic words will have to go as soon as we make a distinction between such Semitic words as had been received into the Greek vocabulary at an earlier epoch, and others which owe their existence in the LXX to the Hebrew words of which they are the equivalents in the translation. It is obvious that only such a distinction, involving as it does a sharp reduction in number, will allow an unequivocal picture of LXX speech in comparison with contemporary speech uninfluenced by a Semitic source.

Among those to be ruled out are ἀρραβῶν, βίκος (HR wrongly βικός), βύσσος, θήρις, κασία, κιννάμωμον, κύμινον, λίβανος, νάβλα, νάρδος, σάκκος, σαμβύκη, σάπφιρος, συκάμινος, χιτών. There are differences, of course; some of the words appear as early as in Homer, others are post-classical, or found only in inscriptions or papyri, but not in literary texts; but these differences are of no consequence, for these words were all ready at hand for our translators and had not to wait to be created by them. There remain, however, among the words already borrowed by the Greeks some of special interest. They will be dealt with in the next section.

3. Groups for special treatment
3.1. Words received into Greek more than once

Even if a word is found both in common Greek and in the LXX, the latter may have adopted it spontaneously in a second creation, as it were. Where this cannot be proved it must be dismissed as a mere speculation. But elsewhere differences in form indicate that a fresh borrowing has taken place, and frequently its outstanding feature is a closer approximation to the sounds of the original. In the West this second borrowing created words which were closer to the Latin or French original, some of them for clerical needs, others for those of the scholarly and more highly educated part of the society. I give some English examples, chosen by analogy from the German ones found in Hermann Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* p. 372, and it will be seen that there is an unmistakable differentiation of meaning between the
old and the new word: order—ordain (ordnen—ordinieren), preach—
predicate (predigen—prädizieren), prove—probe (prüfen—probieren, erproben).
If we try to apply this to the examples which I am going to adduce
from the LXX, we shall find that there is almost no suggestion of a new
meaning; what is new, apart from the difference in form, is the hint at
the background provided by the original text, which becomes felt by
the slightly different use that is made of the sounds of the original word.

3.1.1. Clear examples

νιτρον. Thack. p. 35 rightly describes λιτρον as the older and νιτρον as
the more recent form of the word borrowed from ρη ( = Egypt. ntrj;
Natron). There is also some truth in his statement that νιτρον 'must have
been the original form'. Yet this does not mean that the undoubtedly
later νιτρον should have preserved the original pronunciation of the
Greek word. Following a tendency which the Greeks may have inherited
from their Indo-European ancestors (K. Brugmann, Kurze vergleichende
Grammatik der indog. Sprachen §§ 174*, 3343; Schwyzer, Gr. Gr.
pp. 258 f.) they dissimilated v into λ (λίκνον, cf. λικμάω, from *νίκνον; Hom.
ἀνεμώλιος for -ωνιος; νυκτάλωψ from -νωψ) or vice versa (cf. the
reduplications γαγγαλίζω, τανταλίζω for γαλ-, ταλ-). The majority of
the examples quoted contain a ρ (λάρναξ for *ναρναξ, CorropvïAos for
-vivos). So we may safely say that when "ipj was first Graecized, it
came to be λιτρον, and there is no reason for assuming that a νιτρον, of
which there are no traces left whatever, should have existed along
with it. At a later date and independent of the LXX, νιτρον was
introduced, perhaps not so much as a correction of λιτρον, but owing to
a fresh contact with the world from which it had been borrowed. Such
contact is not difficult to imagine in the Hellenistic world. The difference
between the two forms is not one of dialect but of time, for Hdt. and
the best MSS of Hippocrates have λιτρον in common with the Attic
writers. So in the LXX certainly νιτρον has to be judged exactly as
σικλος (see below): the change in pronunciation and spelling witnesses
to a fresh contact with the original, amounting to a second and indepen-
dent borrowing.

σικλος. In Xen., An. 1, 5, 6 we have an early, more careless repro-
duction, σιγλος, of ρη. The LXX and Josephus, however, say σικλος
(κ being the regular equivalent of ρ). το σικλον (Ps.-Galen. περι μέτρων
και σταθμών, 19, p. 763), το μικρον σικλον (p. 764), το σικλον (p. 773)
look like secular witness to the form with -κ-. But more probably they all are corruptions of τό Σικελικόν, just as Polyb. 34, 8, 7 σύγλος, where LS suggests the same. In Soph., fragm. 1094 σίκλος καὶ τὸ ἐνώτιον, καὶ σταθμὸς βαρβαρικὸς (Photius, lex. p. 511, 15) the -κ- may be due to subsequent alteration. LS would interpret it as ear-ring. It would thus range with ‘ἡ σίγλα P. Masp. 340°, Hsch.; aeol. acc. to Pollux 5.97’ and σιγλοφόρος, -ον, wearing ear-rings, Com. Adesp. 792’ (LS). We need not therefore assume any overlapping between an early σίγλος and a later σίκλος as distinct borrowings from ἦπε.

3.1.2. Less certain examples

ἀκροβυστία. In some way or other ἀκροβυστία for the earlier ἀκροποσθία would be a secondary borrowing, if in fact Ass. buṣtu (cf. נְשָׁב) were at the root of the Greek word. Yet early derivations of πόσθη, like πόσθω, make this rather unlikely. In the Jewish authors this may be an example of popular etymology which, in introducing the association of buṣtu, נְשָׁב, modified to some extent the form of the old word.

ὁ μανδύας, woollen cloak. Renders ἃπρ, ἄτρ. Aeschylus has a gen. μανδύης, and ἡ μανδύα, -η is found elsewhere. J. Laurentius Lydus (VI p) agrees with the LXX, using μανδύης, just as he also agrees in using ὁ μανιάκης (see below).

ὁ μανιάκης, necklace, torque. It is possible that a different termination and, consequently, inflexion, could witness to more than one act of borrowing at different times or places. ὁ μανιάκης (a middle-Iranic word through Aramaic mediation) has the same inflexion in Dan. LXX Θ', 1 Esdras as in Polyb. and later writers, only a pap. VIp displaying ἡ μανιάκη. In addition, however, there exists τοὺς μανιάκους in a variant to Judg. 8: 21 ejz Arm. (torques Eth. La. Syr.) for the prevailing reading τοὺς μηνίσκους, and this is not a scribal mistake, as the termination -ους might suggest, but a real variant, which for crescents substitutes necklaces from verse 26.

Παλλακούς. For σιπα the LXX uses ἡ παλλακῆ; only once, Job 19: 17, we read ἡ παλλακῆς; yet both are ancient Greek forms. In Ezek. 23: 20, however, where σιπα pl. is used for males in the meaning, minion, paramour, the LXX has Χαλδαίους which, apart from lacking literalness, is proved wrong by the context, because the author has in mind the
Egyptians. Here J. A. Bewer, in his review of the Scheide Ezekiel, offers a brilliant conjecture, τταλλακούς (JBL LVII, 1938, p. 422), which would be exactly in conformity with the Hebrew. If he is right, this would be the first occurrence of the word in an author, for otherwise it is found only with the lexicographers Hesychius and Photius, and they, of course, are most unlikely to have drawn on our passage. Bewer's emendation, apart from being entirely to the point, is graphically sound; the decision here depends on our readiness to introduce an extremely rare word in an equally rare context.

3.2. Words borrowed from Aramaic and not from Hebrew
The second class of words which ought to be singled out for some special consideration are those which can be shown to have been taken over from the Aramaic. As to words incorporated into earlier secular Greek speech an a priori decision is awkward. Anciently there were two entrance-doors of equal importance: Phoenician, the Western Semitic language of the trading people which gave the Greeks γράμματα Φοινικῆ, and so much besides, and Aramaic, the East-Semitic lingua franca of Western Asia.

It would be rash forthwith to consider e.g. σίγλος, λίτρον as necessarily borrowed from Aramaic; for though the normal Hebrew form of nomina segolata is qitël, there is a fundamental qitl which is preserved in many forms and connections. As to σίγλος, an Aramaic origin is not excluded by the more recent Aramaic formations having n as their first radical, for the old Aramaic form, which alone could be behind the old Greek borrowed form, was, like the Hebrew, ṭtī. Even a termination of the Greek word in -α is not an infallible indication of a borrowing from the Aramaic.

3.2.1. The names of the Greek letters and the question of their origin
As to the Greek names of the letters of the alphabet, it used to be considered an established fact that they were borrowed from the Aramaic. It was Albert Schultens, Instit. Ling. Hebr. (Leiden, 1737, p. 9), who in the closing -α first found the Aramaic emphatic state. Weighty authorities like Lagarde (Ges. Abh. p. 255) and Wellhausen (Bleek† pp. 629 ff.) backed this view by fresh arguments. P. Schröder (Phoen. Spr. pp. 30 f.) took the opposite view, namely that the γράμματα
Φοινικήϊα were borrowed from the Phoenicians; but the weak point in
his argument was that the closing -α was adopted in analogy to γράμμα.
Yet there is a better and fully satisfactory explanation, which was first
suggested in a book that has since been forgotten (E. A. Schmidt,
Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Gramm. des Gr. u. Lat., Halle, 1859, p. 77) and authori-
tatively propounded by Th. Nöldeke (Beitr. z. sem. Sprachw. 1, Strassb.,
1904, pp. 134 f.): ‘Die Griechen vermieden, dem Charakter ihrer
Sprache gemäß, den Auslaut auf eine Muta durch Anhängung von α’
(p. 134); ‘der Auslaut α bei einigen wenigen Buchstaben ist ein rein
griech. Zusatz, um die Form eben aussprechbar zu machen’ (p. 135).
Of late, this explanation has had the weighty approval of the great
Egyptologist K. Sethe, Der Ursprung des Alphabets (NGG 1916, Geschäftl.
Mitt.), p. 90 n. 1.

E. Schwyzer (KZ 58, 1930/1, pp. 170 ff. and, briefly, Gr. Gr. pp. 140 f.,
409) was the first to rescue this view from its isolation and so to make it
fully plausible. He began by pointing to the interjection σίττα (= st/,
hush!) which is known from Theocritus onwards and which, as he
shows, is found in all periods of Greek since, including modern Greek,
and in a good many other languages as well, as often happens with
sounds that are natural expressions and reactions. There are other
observations to support this view. ηλς (‘alf), heifer, and ηςςς, door, are
Hebrew words (ηςςς is used only in the plural = cattle) which are not
It is no longer necessary to explain ζήτα from the analogy of βήτα etc.,
which has always been awkward, as there already existed in Semitic a
formation zajit alongside the Hebrew zajin (Sethe, ZDGM, 80 (NF 5),
43 f.; Lindblom, Symbol. philol. Daniellson, 1932, pp. 157 f.) with this,
another weak point of the ‘Phoenician’ view has been fortunately
eliminated. In view of the other fact that a mediation between σίγμα
and samekh is difficult, an old explanation of σίγμα as from σίγω, to hiss,
(make the sound st! σίττα!) has been readopted. A further strong argument
is the indeclinability of the names. (Democritus’ isolated δέλτατος,
θῆτατος are but one among many characteristics of his self-willed
style.)

The same vowel ‘of the opening of the mouth’, as in the interjections
and the names of the letters in -α, Schwyzer finds in Archilochos’
τῆνελλα, the reproduction of the sound arising when the chord of the
kithara is touched. Among the examples with other vowels than -α are
σίττε, which is found alongside of σίττα, and θρέττε, Aristoph., Equ. 17.
On pp. 184 ff. he gives good reason for seeing an analogous procedure
in other Greek words, in which the addition of an α was a phonetical protection against the loss of an otherwise final, and thus endangered, consonant, which was of paramount importance for a word and therefore was retained. He also (p. 182 n. 1) gives some striking parallels from the Romance languages, quoting Meyer-Lübke, Roman. Grundr. 2 i, 674 §58, 3: 'Da das Florentinische kein Wort mit einem Konsonanten enden kann, so lässt es konsonantisch schließenden Fremdwörtern ein e nachklingen: Davide, vgl. §83; ebenso allen Oxytona: andré, virtüe, piüe, was in heutiger Schrift nicht mehr anerkannt wird, wohl aber in älterer nicht selten zum Ausdruck kam.' Schwyzer continues: ‘Daher auch die ital. Buchstabennamen effe elle emme enne erre esse und die span. ele elle eme usw.’ (Roman. Grundr. 2 i, 638, 883). I should not have gone into these details, if I could not add a further argument in favour of the Phoenician derivation of αλφα etc. It was natural that the Aramaic emphatic state should seem to offer an easy and plausible explanation of the Greek forms. But reflection upon its essential nature exposes a basic weakness in this line of argument. The proper function of the emphatic state was to indicate an individual bearer of the noun (Marti, Gramm. d. bibl.-aram. Sprache 2 §70b), and so long as it retained this function, it would have been against its very nature to designate letters of the alphabet. Later, in the post-Christian period, it ceased to express a determination and became the normal form of the noun (Brockelmann, Syr. Gramm. 2 §200). But this borrowing took place in the very early period, when the character of the emphatic state is bound to have been most distinct. Now the names of the letters do not point to individual letters written on stone or paper any more than the mathematician’s triangle, which is a symbol, points to any actual triangles, which are but its illustrations. For here we do not think either of an actual writing or of the mathematical figures in an exercise-book. To confuse the aspects of generic idea and actual object (universalia and res) is a sign of loose thinking, and this is at the root of the theory which attempts to trace the names of the letters to a supposed Aramaic emphatic state.

On the whole, however, it is well worth while paying attention to the grammatical form and gender in which the borrowed words appear in Greek, and sometimes it is here that the answer is to be found to the question from which Semitic language a special word was borrowed. So, to give an example, it is plausible that Aram. ננ, rather than Hebr. גנ, גנ (all masc.), was the parent of ἑ νόβαλα (Soph., Fragm. 849) and
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ό νάβλας, gen. -α. Without entering here upon the questions arising from the sounds, terminations, gender, and inflexion, which we find with the Semitic words accepted into secular Greek,\(^\text{17}\) we turn at once to the Semitic words which are confined to the LXX and the literature influenced by it. Here Aramaic plays a very decisive part. For the position of the translators was this: their language was Greek, and the Hebrew from which they had to translate was to them virtually a dead language. The learned rabbinical tradition, which later on was to make itself felt so emphatically in the restoration period for which the school of Aqiba is characteristic, and which is reflected in the Three and Jerome as well, either did not yet exist or was very remote from them. In this point, however, there are remarkable differences among the various translators. Nevertheless, one feature is common to almost all of them. The one Semitic language that, if any, was fairly familiar to them, was Aramaic, and it was from Aramaic that they had to make their guesses and to fill the gaps of their knowledge of the Hebrew. Many mistranslations are nothing but Aramaisms, as the translation gives to the Hebrew word the meaning of its root in Aramaic. The influence from the Aramaic which concerns us here is one of form, which makes itself felt in two ways: in transplanting Hebrew words into the Greek translation they chose Aramaic forms, some crudely transliterated without any adaptation such as inflexion, and others to a certain degree accommodated to Greek habits, yet in such a way that one still can recognize from the kind of inflexion adopted the Aramaic form which suggested the chosen inflexion and gender.

3.3.2. Crude transplants from Aramaic

μάννα, πασχα, σικερα. Examples of crudely transplanted Aramaic words are σικέρα (אֶשֶׁר) for רֶקֶץ and πασχα for ὑπήρξε (here we cannot vocalize the Eg.-Aram. נַעַם, yet Jew.-Aram. was נַעַם and Syr. יְנָוָם). The few exceptions but indicate how firmly this indeclinability was kept.\(^\text{18,19}\) There exists no inflected form at all of πασχα in our MSS. There is a gen. σικέρας in a single minuscule only, t in Num. 28: 7, but σικεραν, Judg. 13: 7 in the Complutensian, belongs to its home-made Greek of which there are many examples. A different adaptation is confined to two passages of Isaiah: in 5: 11 '26 72 ג301', in 5: 22 '26 736 C301' (Ziegler’s notation) read τα σικέρα instead of το σικέρα, thus taking the indeclinable σικέρα to be a neut. plur. and adapting the article to it. It is interesting to see that the Latin Bible discloses a
divergent tendency. Its trend away from indeclinability will be
discussed in Excursus XII.

τὰσχα and σικερα point to an old and primitive stratum of the LXX,
when the translators in an unreflecting and spontaneous way incor-
porated into their translation what may well have been modes of
expression used in the vernacular Greek of the Egyptian Jews²⁰ (here
I do not press 'Egyptian'). On the other hand, φασεκ and μέθυσμα,
μέθη (for which I refer to the excursus just mentioned), reveal a later
stage which avoided such patent Aramaisms, perhaps from a reflection
upon the sacred nature of the Bible text. This avoidance makes itself
felt in two opposite directions: either real, unidiomatic Greek (μέθυσμα,
μέθη) or strict transliteration (φασεκ, phase Vulg., φεσε A' Deut. 16: 1, in
which the varying vowels may interest the historian of Hebrew pro-
nunciation). Here Jerome (cf. Excursus XII), where he does not in the
main pass on earlier translations, follows the more recent trend, as the
Three had already done. This observation comes in as a help in singling
out those parts of the Vulgate which are but a slightly modified Vet.
Lat., where there are no surviving MSS of the Vet. Lat. proper or
quotations therefrom.²¹

I append a few remarks on μαννα, merely in order to give some
information additional to that given by W.-Schmiedel p. 92 n. 2, the
very rich content of which ought to be kept in mind throughout. For
μαν the LXX has μαν in Exod. 16: 31, 33, 35, yet everywhere else μαννα,
which has rightly been related to Aram. μαν. With this μαννα a different
one, which stands for μαν twelve times, must not be confused in our
editions as it is in our MSS. Rahlfs was the first to restore the correct
μαννα everywhere (e.g. compare his notes to Jer. 17: 26, Ezek. 46: 5,
Dan. Θ' 2: 46); the second α- here represents the guttural Π, for in that
older stratum of the LXX α and ε stand for the harder Hebrew
gutturals. At first sight μαν in Exodus as a close reproduction of the
Hebrew word may appear strange, as it seems not to fit into our view
that spontaneous Aramaisms are the more primitive, subsequent
conformation to the Hebrew the later feature. Yet here the reason for
this seeming exception is obvious. In using μαν the translators had in
mind the etymological explanation of 'manna' in Exod. 16: 15, where
the children of Israel asked one another μαν (Τί τούτιν τούτο; ); and
the word to which this question alludes follows only sixteen verses later.
It is in these passages that the LXX understandably enough uses μαν.

Lugd., which is missing in Exod. 16, has the nom. manna, Num.
11: 6–9, Josh. 5: 12 bis, yet the acc., mannam, Deut. 8: 3, 16; the Vulgate
extends the use of the Hebrew *man* from Exod. to Num. 11: 6 f., 9, yet elsewhere uses *manna*; Deut. 8: 3, *cibum manna quod*, 16, *cibabit te manna*, 2 Esdras 9: 20 (= 2 Esdras 19: 20), *manna tuum non prohibuisti*, Ps. 77: 24, *pluit illis manna*, all accusatives, if in Deut. 8: 16 the construction of the Greek τού ψωμίσαντόξ σε τὸ μάννα is imitated here as it is in Lugd. qui te adescavit mannam. In Josh. 5: 12 there is a nom. *decepetu manna*. This indeclinable neuter is still in Tertullian and other ecclesiastical writers; St Hilary uses *manna*, -ae, f., as did Plin., [*nat. hist.* (Schmiedel)] and Sulpic. Sev. (Georges). The Greek examples in Josephus and the Sibyllines (Schmiedel) indicate that this was the common tendency, to which Lugd. also adheres, and further, that in the Vulgate Jerome once more turned the wheel backwards. As to *pascha*, Tertullian inflects it as a feminine, which is inconsistent with his uninflected use of *manna*.

The analogy of *pascha* and *sicera* and others with which we are about to deal is sufficient to explain the transition to a fem. inflexion of *μάννα*. Yet W. Bauer (*Wb, s.v.*) may be right in pointing to Greek ἡ μάννα (*frankincense*) powder or granules, or gum. This homonym, however, is not required for explaining the formation *μάννα*, but merely for the later inflected fem., which, of course, is outside Bauer's scope. Besides, the meanings of the old Greek ἡ μάννα and the word borrowed from *μάννα* are so closely related that I prefer to deal with this word here and not together with other homonyms from the Hebrew or Aramaic. Moreover, the final stage is not reached until *μάννα* becomes a fem., and this did not happen in the LXX any more than in the NT.

### 3.3.3. Debatable borrowings

δέλτος, *κινύρα*, νάβλα, νάβλας, νάβλον, *σαββατα*. Some borrowed words were inflected from the moment of borrowing. A more complete treatment of them would have to point out in detail the differences of gender that occur between the Hebrew word and its Greek counterpart. The reasons for these differences are not always the same; thus I feel sure that ἡ *κινύρα*, which represents masc. *κιθάρα*, was fashioned after the pattern of ἡ *κιθάρα*, just as *lanterna* from λαμπτήρ after that of *lucerna*.

In most of the Aramaic words the termination -ā or (in Aram. fem.) -ṭā (which phonetically was a spirant, thus -ṛā) was capable of more than one interpretation and imitation in Greek. It could lead to fem. in -ā, as in the old ἡ *νάβλα* (cf. p. 168), or to masc. in -ας, gen. -ā, as in ὁ *νάβλας*. It could also be taken as a neutr. plur. in -α, and from this in
due time a sing. in -ov could arise, as in the occasional τὸ νάβλον (cf. pp. 173 and 328 n. 24). But, on the whole, instances which once seemed to find their obvious explanation in this way, must in fact be explained otherwise. So E. Schwyzer (KZ 62, 1934/5, pp. 1 ff.) has convinced me that τὰ σάββατα, far from owing its termination in -α to an Aramaic emphatic state, must be explained in conformity with his explanation of ὀλφα etc. (above, pp. 167 f.).

There remains the difficulty that ἡ ought to be θ and not τ; Dalman (cf. Moulton II, 153) had explained this spelling as resulting from the influence of the Greek ending -τον; in fact, -θο- is very rare as a suffix in Greek; and the majority of the examples that are found are certainly of non-Greek origin (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 510). And what is still more important, among these examples there are no neuters in -θον of the second declension. Schwyzer attempts to overcome this apparent difficulty by the assumption that σάββατα may have been borrowed at an earlier date when a less exact reproduction of the Semitic spirant was still possible, as it was in βῆτα, ταῦ and other examples.

Perhaps we can corroborate Schwyzer's argumentation by considering the Hebrew forms themselves. Just as the τ in βάτος for ἰα could find some support from the fact that the Hebrew plural was רט with -tt- (cf. Lagarde's derivation of the word from דב), W. Lotz (quaest. de hist. Sabbati, 1883, and RE 37, 289) had derived נפש from sabbatt = sabbatat, comparing formations like ור nutrit, 1 Kings 1: 15 = me-šaratt = נְפָּשׁ, part. fem. of נפש Piel, ministering (G.-Kautzsch §80d), or Gen. 16: 11, Judg. 13: 5, 7 נְפָּשׁ for נפָּשׁ. If he were right, the Hebrew would have already displayed a tenuis here and not a spirant. Besides I confess that I do not know whether there is any early evidence for an Aramaic emphatic נפש, which is generally referred to by those who plead for a derivation of σάββατα from Aramaic.

The derivation from נפש of ἡ δέλτος (Eustathius, Benfey, Wurzellexikon II, Berlin, 1842, p. 199, A. Müller, BB 1, 287 f., H. Lewy p. 171) has never found much favour with Indo-European scholars; yet if it were true, the fem. gender of the Greek word would answer to its origin, while ὁ χιτῶν does not when compared with νήμα the fem. το- of which, together with the gender, has also been dropped. It is different in Latin which, for the formation of (c) tunica and bār(i)ca (from ἡ βάρις, -idos), continued the old Indo-European expedient of the termination in -ica for accomplishing a 'motion', i.e. fashioning a feminine (W. Schulze,
Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen', AGGW, NF v 5, 418 f.), and thus kept alive the gender of the words of origin.

Within the frame of the LXX something more has to be stated about the Greek derivations from יְבִא. Apart from ה יָבְלָא, which is the LXX formation, there is a variety of formations. As Thack. p. 35 indicates, only a few books use יָבְלָא at all. It occurs in 1 Sam. 10: 5 (where Rahlfs rightly neglects the isolated יָבָלָא of B, which, far from being a closer approximation to יְבִי, is merely a corruption, יָבָלָא(לֹא)), in 2 Sam. 6: 5, in 1 Kings 10: 12, eleven times in Chronicles, and in 1 Macc. 13: 51. Aquila and Symmachus too use יָבְלָא, as they agree with the LXX in strictly discriminating between this יְבִי and the other one which means wine-jar, rendering the former יָבְלָא, the latter יָבֶל. The more recent translators on their part show some difference in form. Symm., Ps. 91 (92) : 4, διὰ δεκαχόρδου καὶ ναυλας, Ps. 150: 3 διὰ ναυλας καὶ λύρας with α purum is pretty modern evidence for Thack. §10.3, 4; nevertheless, Aquila is reported to have written εν ναυλῳ. So we cannot decide whether Aquila, Amos 5: 24, pronounced יָבָלָון σου (so Field) or יָבָלָון σου. The spelling ναυ-, of course, is merely graphical. When it arose, both β and v had become an identical v-sound. Then also יָבָלון, fare, was pronounced ναβλוֹν σου (so Field) or νδβλוֹν σου. The spelling ναυ-, of course, is merely graphical.

When it arose, both β and v had become an identical v-sound. Then also יָבָלון, fare, was pronounced ναβλוֹν σου (so Field) or νδβλוֹν σου. The spelling ναυ-, of course, is merely graphical. For יָבָלון, fare, there exists also a masc. י νאֲלוֹס, and in itself Aquila’s εν ναυλῳ, Ps. 150: 3, does not disclose its gender. To sum up, apart from ה יָבְלָא the later translators occasionally display יָבְלָא and, as far as the evidence can be trusted, they use יָבְלָא with α purum and impurum side by side. Probability speaks for Aram. נִגיָה being the parent of these formations rather than Hebrew יְבִי.

3.2.4. Definite borrowings

γυώρας, παταχρα, -ον. There are other words for which we do not need carefully to balance the pros and cons regarding derivation from the Aramaic, for the Aramaic form is so different from the Hebrew that it cannot be mistaken.

One example has been discussed above (p. 33), γυώρας = נִגיָה for Hebrew י. The Pentateuch and Isaiah, where the word is found, belong to the older translations; and a reading in Philo (Thack. p. 34) and marginal notes to Lev. 19: 34 indicate, as we have seen, that the original text read γυώρας in passages where we now read πάροικος or...
In my last example the LXX introduces an Aramaic word totally different from the Hebrew, and this of necessity, for this Aramaic word is not found in Hebrew. In Isa. 8:21 cod. 93, a minuscule belonging to the sub-group μυ of the Lucianic recension, alone reads παταχρα for ῥησ, whereas other MSS have πατρια. In Isa. 37:38, where the MT again reads ῥησ, the evidence is divided: παταραξον B*, πατραχον 93 538, πατριαρχην (and not πατριαρχου as is in Swete and Thackeray) Q*, πατραρχον rell. (SABcL, according to Rahlfs and Ziegler). In 8:21 Symmachus agrees with the LXX displaying the doublet πατραρχα εδολα, just as in Exod. 12:11 we found him translating ποβ, when it appeared for the first time, by φασεχ ύπερμάχησ (p. 249). In our passage his double rendering is firmly established by the united witness of Q and Syr. hex. Here Rahlfs was the first to follow 93 in reading παταχρα in Isa. 8:21 and in emending τον παταχρον in Isa. 37:38. In both passages he was followed by Ziegler. Although they are doubtless right in Isa. 8:21, their reading in 37:38 is hardly final. From what was discussed above, we should expect a neuter, and το παταραξον would be an easy correction (Rahlfs, S-St iii, 114). But it is unlikely that our translator, however often he may have failed to render correctly the syntactical context of the Hebrew original, misunderstood πατριαρχα, which is correctly translated in the parallel 2 Kings 19:37 by the LXX and in Isaiah by the Three as well, ἐν οἰκῳ Ν. θεοῦ αὐτοῦ. It is more reasonable to suppose another example of the frequent confusion Ὕ ~ Ν (cf. Bewer p. 2) and to read τον παταραξον. As to ἱδωλ, idol (of Persian origin, according to Brockelmann, Syr. Gr.2 p. 182*b), Theodoretus in his commentary on Isaiah explains both passages. For 8:21 his comment is found in Field, for 37:38 it first came to light in Möhle's edition, 1933, p. 150 and is reproduced in the Einleitung to Ziegler's Isaias, p. 81.

As a translation it betrays the unsophisticated spontaneous nature of the old type, which, from the Pentateuch onwards, does not in the least refrain from manipulating the original when apologetical reasons seem to call for some retouching. As it stands, ἵδωλ says nothing about an idol, and Duhm3 p. 64, whilst referring to 'the moving tale', 2 Kings 6:26 ff., expressly states, 'daß es sich um einen Götzten handele, ist eine willkürliche Annahme'. He does not refer to the fact that the translator did everything to suggest this 'assumption'; for his version, τον ἄρχοντα καὶ τὰ παταχρα, to all intents and purposes denies the
titles of honour to what it thinks to be an unworthy king and his idol. The same can be seen in 37: 38, and this is conclusive evidence that chs 36–9 have the same translator as chs 1–30, the translation of which is obviously much more primitive and ingenuous than that of the parallel chapters of 2 Kings 19 f.

It is equally characteristic that with the same end in view later translators had to think out other devices. For in Isa. 8: 21 the same discrimination is behind the plural θεοίς οὐ τοῦ of A' Θ'. 'Der Plural θεοίς erklärt sich hier aus der Deutung von Σαβάας auf falsche Götter' (Lü.-Ra. p. 73 n. 341). In Isa. 37: 38, however, this expedient does not work; for there it is the question of only one god, and our easy differentiation between God and god does not exist for those writing Greek. Yet even here the fact that he had a name sufficiently indicated what kind of a god it was. (See Excursus XIII.)

As we see, the translator of Isaiah moves with complete freedom and detachment, taking from his idiomatic Greek a word which here was borrowed from Aramaic, as there it had been borrowed earlier from Persian. Later copyists did their best to Graecize it. From this there emerges πάτρια in 8: 21, at a rather early date, as the unanimity of our evidence may suggest. The varying evidence of 37: 38 still allows us an insight into the gradual attempts to Graecize what was no longer understood; but here also in πατριάρχην of Q* a result was reached which is Greek and at the same time not completely meaningless. Both passages show how bold the original translator had been, and how little later centuries were able and willing to follow him.

3.3. Borrowed words which took the form of already existing Greek words of different meaning (homonyms)

3.3.1. Introductory

Homonyms are words of different meaning, but of the same sounds and pronunciation and also, except in English, of the same spelling. They may have arisen within one and the same language through phonetic changes which gave one word an identical pronunciation with another that originally was pronounced in quite a different way. As a language develops, such internal homonymy, as it were, may be transitory. So for example an expert in Old and Middle High German can tell exactly the period during which two words were homonyms in strictly defined parts of that country. Yet there is also an external homonymy, resulting from the clash of two or more languages in the habits of speech of one and
the same country. For this English is the classic example in our days. For what we are going to find in LXX Greek it would be easy to find parallels in English. A common feature is that we can distinguish between the words that attract others and mould them to their pattern, and the words that are attracted. In this process of attraction and assimilation many influences are at work, among them popular etymology.

As an example I take gauntlet, which means two absolutely different things, (1) various kinds of gloves, and (2) in run the gauntlet, a kind of punishment originally taken from the habits of the landsknechts. The first is derived from the French gantelet (as it was also sometimes spelt in English), which has the same range of meaning. Its ultimate root is Swedish vante = glove. The second is likewise of Swedish origin (gata = street, lopp = course). Here I feel sure that an adaptation has taken place: (a) the relationship between gata and gate was not felt, since gate has almost lost the meaning street, way in English; so a nasal was inserted and by this means the word was made familiar, but only in sound, and not in meaning. (β) lopp, to which leap would be closest, could not be made intelligible; so in its unaccented position it was turned into -let, the diminutive which had already been taken over from French in many words as, e.g., in gauntlet (1). The transformation and assimilation of endings is the most common feature everywhere. Possibly homonymy would vanish when the idea of challenge came in, so that gauntlet (2) was understood as being a special application in a common phrase of gauntlet (1), as common phrases are often used without any reflection upon their origin, as a kind of small change. The thing which interests us here, however, is not so much what may later on happen to these homonyms, but their beginning, the way in which they came to be introduced into a certain language.

3.3.2. Three special aspects to be excepted

Coming to the homonyms which we can observe in the LXX, we must, because of its relationship both to Greek and to the Hebrew original and also because of the speech habits of the translators, who knew Aramaic better than other Semitic languages, carefully keep apart a small number of groups which have nothing to do with homonymy proper. As an example of the first group I take σαράβαρα, of the second ἄφεσις, and of the third θεραπείαν.
(1) σαράβαρα was briefly mentioned above (p. 162). Perhaps I can best start by reproducing the article on it in LS. ‘σαράβαρα, τά, loose trousers worn by Scythians, Antiph. 201; also = Aramaic sarbālin, Lxx, Thd. Da. 3.27 (cf. 21). (Prob. Persian shalvār or shulvār (braccae).)’ From this we may learn that there was no genuinely Greek word σ., but that in an identical form it was twice borrowed from abroad, each time to denote or render something foreign, the first time as early as IV* by the comic poet Antiphanes, of whom only fragments are preserved, the second time by Daniel LXX and Θ’. Though the Greek forms are identical, the meanings are not. Nor can we safely say whether the word was alive all the time between its two widely separate occurrences. It may have been a momentary creation in Antiphanes, for the dramatic poets, both tragic and comic, liked to introduce barbarian articles under their foreign names to give a picturesque impression. And whether we have here a real homonym, depends on the meaning of the word, for according to definition homonymy means the coexistence of two words of the same spelling but different meanings. Now there is no agreement about the meaning of βֹרֶכֶת pl. in Daniel. Here the LXX, the old translation, certainly understood sandals, for in 3: 21 it translates υποδήματα, whereas in 3: 94 (27) both translators and in 3:21©' (and A') have σαράβαρα. The lexica (G.-Buhl 16 pp. 917 f., and Marti p. 82* Glossar) record three different interpretations of בֹרֶכֶת, each supported by parallels from Eastern languages, which between themselves are so similar in their sounds that it could be imagined that some of them had already become homonyms in the ancient Middle East. I gather from Behrmann’s Commentary on Daniel (p. 23) that these interpretations are all of them very old; they are upheld and discussed by Theodoretus and Jewish authors (Aben Ezra, Tanchum, Barhebraeus). This is not the place, nor am I competent, to discuss what our modern philologists and expositors say when proposing their solutions. It is sufficient to repeat that if there is a difference of meaning between Antiphanes and Daniel, it may go back to homonymy in the circuit of languages from which בֹרֶכֶת was derived, so that we may rather consider this instance analogous to what was said above (pp. 143 ff.) about Greek mistranslations due to confusion of Hebrew roots, either by the translators or earlier in Hebrew itself (cf. also Excursus XV about the confusion of ולש and של). If, on the other hand, we assume that the first σαράβαρα caused another borrowed word to take its shape, although it derived from a different word in an Eastern language, we shall have to receive it into the number of Greek homonyms; but this is exactly what we cannot prove.
Deissmann, in one of the most attractive essays of his BST (1, 96 f.), has observed that in Lev. 25: 10–15 ἑβρῖον, jubilee, year of emancipation kept every fifty years, is translated in different ways in the LXX: by σημασία, signal-year, which he considers as a wholly literal rendering that does not obliterate what is peculiar in the original, since ἑβρῖον among other things also means the ram’s horn by which this festival year is proclaimed (Exod. 19: 13 without μή), by ἀφεσις, or by a combination of these terms with or without ἐτος or ἐνιαυτός. ἀφεσις, he points out, is meant to help non-Hebrew readers to understand the technical expression, signal-year. This ἀφεσις was first introduced in verse 10 διαβοήσετε ἀφεσιν ἐττΐ τῆς γῆς, where it properly renders ῥόδη (grant of) liberty, release. From this, he continues, it must be understood that in the later sections of ch. 25 and in ch. 27 jubilee is rendered by ἐτος or ἐνιαυτός τῆς ἀφεσεως, which, he says, is an explanatory paraphrase rather than a transliteration. In this he follows Cremer’s NT Lexicon, the forerunner of Kittel’s. Even if Deissmann is not correct in some minutiae, his main points are sound, including his reference to contemporary parallels in papyri and on the Rosetta Stone with ἀφεσις as release from taxes.

The important thing for our present context is that from the accumulated renderings in Lev. 25: 10–13 there originated a fixed habit of making ἀφεσις the equivalent of ἑβρῖον. There are ten instances in Lev. 25: 28–54 and five in Lev. 27: 17–24. ἀφεσις, which in Lev. 25: 10 a correctly renders ῥόδη, as it does in Isa. 61: 1; Jer. 41 (34) : 8, 15, 17 bis; and Ezek. 46: 17 (here τοῦ ἐτος τῆς ἀφεσεως), has been drawn into the complex rendering of ἑβρῖον in 25: 10 b, 11, 12, 13, and the effect of this on the mind of the translator was such as to induce him to use it further on like an ideogram for the meaning for which he had earlier required a whole aggregate of words, although any one of them might in itself have been more appropriate than ἀφεσις. It would be no more irrational, were σημασία to stand for ῥόδη. This development originates from a psychological process in the translator’s mind, and is therefore completely individual and fortuitous. It is all the more remarkable that ἀφεσις ~ ἑβρῖον is found also in Num. 36: 4, the only occurrence of ἀφεσις in this book. This is clear proof that this verse was translated under the influence and after the pattern of, and later than, Lev. 25 and 27. Next we shall find another example of a word in a meaning that can only be explained from a development which had taken place in another book, which therefore is bound to have been translated earlier.

Commenting upon Jer. 19: 6, Jerome (Field ii, 622 n. 14) wonders,
'Miror autem quid sibi voluerint LXX, pro THORPHETH διάπτωσις, hoc est, ruinam, ponere, et pro valle πολυανδρεῖον, quod significat virorum multituddinem', and proceeds to an attempted explanation;²⁷ Theodoretus has a similar comment upon Jer. 2: 23 (Field II, 577 n. 44). Jerome may well wonder at this strange translation which is found three times in Jer.: 2: 23; 19: 2, 6.²⁸ We cannot explain this translation from Jeremiah, but we can from Ezekiel. Here three times, 39: 11 b, 15, 16, we read τὸ Γαί τὸ πολυανδρεῖον τοῦ Γωγ, as a correct and literal translation²⁹ of τῆς ἀνάπαυσις τῶν. With these passages already in mind, the translator of Ezekiel in 39: 11 a rendered αὐτὸν ἰησοῦν by τὸ πολυανδρεῖον τῶν ἐπελθόντων. In translating thus, he proceeded on exactly the same lines as the translator of Lev. 25. I can perhaps best illustrate this by a diagram:

![Diagram]

To this translator the single components of the compound expression τὸ Γαί τὸ πολυανδρεῖον had melted into one, with the result that he was able to supplant the first by the second, putting πολυανδρεῖον, when he wished to translate γαί. Here again we observe a psychological process, and in Ezekiel this development takes place before our eyes. And Ezek. 39: 11 a came to be the literary model for Jeremiah LXX; for what can be easily explained in Ezekiel, could not be in Jeremiah otherwise than by seeing in it an adoption of a model fashioned previously in Ezekiel.³⁰

Thus we have found some strange equivalents of a decidedly literary nature, equivalents which, far from illustrating the proper meaning of the Greek word in itself, rather illustrate what was in the mind of the translators. So the problem is not exactly lexical. As to Leviticus-Numbers on the one hand and Ezekiel-Jeremiah (in this unexpected order) on the other, the truth of Thackeray's statement about 'en bloc translation' has been confirmed.

On p. 324 n. 10 I have pointed to the slight possibility that a third example of what we have just observed might be seen in Lev. 25: 8, where the LXX has ἀνάπαυσις for ἁμέν, supposing that the translator in a similar way singled out ἀνάπαυσις from σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις = ἀνάπαυσις ἁμέν for ἁμέν instead of for ἁμέν. But I cannot wish to weaken the
force of the preceding two examples by attributing the same weight to
a parallel which admits of a different explanation. In itself the assump-
tion that the LXX took \( \text{r\text{h}atf} \) to be \( \text{flnstt/} \)
is not impossible, but \( \text{jinatt*} \) has no plural, and the context in the MT and the LXX requires a plural.

(3) \( \text{θεραπείαν} \). Among the ‘instances due to later scribes extracting a
meaning out of what were originally transliterations’ (Thack. pp. 36 f.),
\( \text{θεραπειαν} \), 1 Sam. 15: 23, was given special attention, because it is the
reading of B and consequently of Swete. As even Rahlfs is not quite
successful in restoring this passage nor quite correct in presenting the
evidence, I may perhaps try to state the facts as they appear to me (see
diagram).

From this diagram, which purposely neglects the less important
details, there emerge three forms of the Greek text. One is that roughly
common to BO; it shares with the others the complete failure to
understand the last Hebrew word (for which the Vulgate much better
says \( \text{nolle acquiescere} \)), and also the separation of \( \text{τη} \) from the first half
of the stichus. The lack of meaning thus created Origen attempts to
correct by the gen. \( \text{ἀμαρτίας} \). As Rahlfs’ \text{app. crit.} indicates, he considers
the passage one of those in which Lucian alone offers a text which is
free from the later corruptions found in the others. It was Wellhausen
who first drew attention to such passages on the ground that in them
Lucian was bound to be the true LXX, because his Greek text pointed
back to a Hebrew better than our present one on which the other
recensions depended, either wholly or by contamination. But in this
passage there is nothing of the kind; all go back not only to the same
Hebrew, but even to the same misunderstanding of it as is shown by
their \( \text{έττάγουσιν} \). Moreover, Rahlfs is certainly right in adopting
Lucian’s acc. \( \text{διόνυσιν καὶ πόνους} \), but he is mistaken in citing Lucian as
his source for \( \text{θεραφίν} \), even if he does so only as against \( \text{θεραπειαν} \) of B.
This is my main objection: Lucian does not read \( \text{θεραφίν} \) at the very
place where Rahlfs puts it with some later recensions which are under
hexaplaric influence, including O itself. That the Lucianic text contains
a doublet is most easily seen from a comparison with the Vet. Lat.,
which is the most primitive of all. Here I neglect the different results of
its wrestling with \( \text{οἰώνισμα} \) and the addition of \( \text{tibi} \) and \( \text{ad te} \), the latter
being attempts at making sense of \( \text{έττάγουσιν} \). Yet its second part proves
that the last words in Lucian represent the older and genuine half of the
doublet,\(^{31}\) and that the old text, if ever it reflected \( \text{εἰσφέρω} \), included it in
\( \text{πόνους} \) and thus did not read \( \text{θεραφίν} \) at all. Therefore we get the oldest

\(^{31}\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὅτι</td>
<td>ὅτι</td>
<td>ὅτι</td>
<td>ὅτι</td>
<td>ὅτι</td>
<td>quoniam</td>
<td>ὅτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμαρτία</td>
<td>ἀμαρτία</td>
<td>ἀμαρτία</td>
<td>ὁλόνισμα</td>
<td>ἀμαρτία</td>
<td>peccatum</td>
<td>ἀμαρτία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰώνισμα</td>
<td>οἷώνισμα</td>
<td>οἷώνισμα</td>
<td>ἀμαρτία</td>
<td>οἰώνισμα</td>
<td>abominatio (L. Lucifer)</td>
<td>οἰώνισμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐστίν, ἐστίν, ἐστίν, ἐστίν Παρα-πτικρασμός</td>
<td>ἐστίν, ἐστίν, ἐστίν, ἐστίν</td>
<td>est (+ tibi Leg.)</td>
<td>ἐστίν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐστίν, ἐστίν, ἐστίν, ἐστίν Παρα-πτικρασμός</td>
<td>ἐστίν, ἐστίν, ἐστίν, ἐστίν</td>
<td>est (+ tibi Leg.)</td>
<td>ἐστίν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδικα (h-ας) καὶ θεραφιν</td>
<td>ἄδικα (h-ας) καὶ θεραφινb</td>
<td>ἀδικία (h-ας) καὶ θεραφινb</td>
<td>dolores</td>
<td>ἄδικα (h-ας) καὶ θεραφινb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ πόνος</td>
<td>καὶ πόνος</td>
<td>καὶ πόνος</td>
<td>et gemitus</td>
<td>καὶ πόνος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ πόνος</td>
<td>καὶ πόνος</td>
<td>καὶ πόνος</td>
<td>ad te</td>
<td>καὶ πόνος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεραπείαν</td>
<td>θεραφιν</td>
<td>θεραφιν</td>
<td>adducentur (Leg. Lucif. Spec.) (adduxisti Lucif. 1)</td>
<td>θεραφιν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεραφιμ</td>
<td>θεραφιμ</td>
<td>θεραφιμ</td>
<td>adducentur (Leg. Lucif. Spec.) (adduxisti Lucif. 1)</td>
<td>θεραφιμ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπάγουσιν.</td>
<td>ἐπάγουσιν.</td>
<td>ἐπάγουσιν.</td>
<td>ἐπάγουσιν.</td>
<td>ἐπάγουσιν.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Transposition.  b Doublet.  c = ὀνείδισμα (abominatio elsewhere = βδέλυγμα).
and best text obtainable by cancelling θεραφιν from Rahlfs' text. Lucian's insertion is hexaplaric, for in Theodotion's text the three words πορατικρασμὸς διόκα θεραφιν followed one on other as they do in Lucian, only that Lucian inserts a καί before θεραφιν. So here Rahlfs' text is secondary, an Ur-Lucian with an interpolated θεραφιν, and Swete's tertiary, Origenian plus the late Graecizing θεροπτείαν, which is in Bvy only. Therefore, when seen against the background of its context, θεροπτείαν, far from being a homonym, fashioned on the basis of ἡραν, is still more foreign to the LXX than θεραφιν, and, at its best, merely ranges with our examples in a.x, above, pp. 158 ff.

In his many reflections upon the appropriate and correct nature of translations found in the LXX, Jerome, who likes to pose as an expert linguist, often touches lightly the problem of homonymy, without, of course, ever getting any real grasp of it. In reading such passages we never really know whether we have to do with anything more than passing thoughts. So, when speaking about the variants θῆραν ~ χήραν in Ps. 131 (132): 15, he knows that et hebraea volumina et ipsi Septuaginta Θῆραν habent, though he prefers to keep to the traditional reading χήραν (Anecd. Mareds. iii 1, 90: 10, Rahlfs, S-St ii, 121); yet he cannot simply acquiesce in θῆραν, but tries to explain it in a passage (Quaest. in Gen. 45: 21) which has often been quoted from H. Hodius onward (Schleusner iii, 68): θῆραν venationem magis potest sonare quam fruges, tametsi moris sit Aegyptiorum θῆραν etiam 'far' vocare, quod nunc corrupte 'atheram' nominant. For the context of this chapter Jerome indicates that (ά)θηρα, gruel, porridge, in Egypt was a homonym of θηρα, chase, which, as we have seen, he personally did not favour in the Psalm passage. He is mistaken, of course, for θηρα in its further meaning, prey, game, is a good translation of τῆς (compare Job LXX 38: 41 βορᾶν, 2 Esdras 23: 15, in a Lucianic addition, ἐπιστιτισμόν).

3.3.3. Homonyms proper

If we had to classify the homonyms according to their formation, an example of secondary coincidence would be τό νίκος (above, pp. 34 f.). When the word was moulded in early Hellenism, ι and η had not yet become fully homophonous, but for the later parts of the LXX where we find νίκος (and νίκη) as Aramaizing translations of Πν, homonymy with τό νείκος can be assumed.

I propose, however, a different classification, dealing first with a group where borrowing was easiest, and then with another one where
it is rarest in all languages, and finally discussing several words which offer a special interest.

3.3.4. Homonyms proper: measures and coins

Names of measures and coins are everywhere most easily borrowed. They move in a special sphere so that there is no danger of confusion.

No Englishman, when using the names of foreign monetary units like *mark* or *franc*, feels in the least reminded of their homonyms, *mark* = *target*, or the tribal or personal name *Frank* (which, as the orthography indicates, is but an earlier borrowing of the same word), and *frank* = *candid*. Exactly the same happened to early Western Greek under Italic influence. Here as early as in the fifth-century Sicilian comedians, Epicharmus and Sophron, there is a νόμος = *nummus*, thus a homonym of νόμος, *usage, custom and melody, strain*. And this borrowed word is even found elsewhere. In modern Greek, where the vowel quantities are equalized, a further homonym comes in, νώμος, *shoulder*, pronounced νόμος, which arose from the acc. τὸν ὅμον.

δ βάτος = ἦς is also a complete homonym of δ βάτος, *rubus, bramble*, as this is masc. in the LXX. There is a third word in Greek, δ βάτος, *skate*.56

δ κόρος = ἦς in the LXX is homonymous with δ κόρος, *satiety*, Esther E 3 (8: 12c Ra.), and there are two more homonyms outside the LXX, δ κόρος, *boy, lad* and δ κόρος, *besom*, in Hesychius. In a written text, apart from the pronunciation there would be still two more homonyms, κορός, *dark, black*, and κορός, *pure*. Eupolemos, as quoted by Alex. Polyhistor, the NT, and Josephus share in δ κόρος = ἦς, which they took from the LXX.

λίτρον/λίτρον. In another word of measurement full homonymy was never reached. Earlier we mentioned λίτρον from ὑπ with short i; it was not until Πρ that an occasional λίτρον for λίτρα = Latin *libra*, with a long i, λίτρον, was used, Pap. Fay. 331 (LS). But by this time the former λίτρον had long given way to νίτρον. LS ought to accent λίτρον = λίτρα as a properispomenon.
3.3.5. Homonyms proper: verbs

The class of words where borrowing is least frequent is that of the verbs. A noun is more like small change; it fits into every syntactical context without qualifying it. A verb, on the other hand, is of more far-reaching consequence. It is much more closely connected with the conception and fashioning of the whole idea in the mind of the writer, and impresses its meaning in a much more thorough way upon his whole sentence. So it contributes in a much higher degree to the peculiar colour of speech than any noun could do. From the start we have, therefore, to expect that homonymous verbs are much rarer than homonymous nouns; and in scrutinizing any examples that may have been recorded, we are bound to apply a much stricter standard. Some influence from Semitic languages may be expected; this follows from what we have been discussing about the extension of the range of meaning in Greek verbs according to the Hebrew pattern (above, pp. 143 ff.). But much that has been suggested by earlier scholars is rather doubtful, especially when it includes consonants which belonged to the Greek terminations.

So ‘ἵρκυς ~ ἐξέβραξεν’ in Wellhausen’s stimulating list (Text pp. 10 f., note) cannot even be verified either from more recent or traditional editions, and I cannot here deal with similar suggestions as given in Cornill’s otherwise so valuable critical edition of Ezekiel (1886).

Thackeray’s example συκοφαντέον (ἥτις, -τία) Ps., Prov., Job Θ’, Eccles. = ἔσσει is neat, yet the convergence of the Hebrew and Greek meanings explains the renderings to such a degree as to exclude this example from our section dealing with homonyms. This much can be said, that with the later translators (Job Θ’, Eccles., and many hexaplaric quotations in Field) συκοφαντ. = ἔσσει is one case among many where the Greek word was chosen because it sounded similar. In the older examples we may merely have good and free translations without anything of the refinement of the later technique, e.g. Lev. 19: 11 οὐ συκοφαντήσει = ἔσσει. In Gen. 43: 18 R. Kittel’s retranslation ‘συκοφαντήσασαι = λύτράν’ ( BH3) does not carry conviction; it looks as though it were thought out so as to be as close as possible to his retranslation of Targ. Syr., ὀμηνήλι, which is preferred by Procksch after Kittel. The experts do not yet agree as to the interpretation of the MT’s λύτράν. As Joseph’s brethren do not know what may happen to them in the house of the man whom they believe to be a high-ranking Egyptian authority, συκοφαντήσας would be the proper expression for anything that they apprehend from him. This example dissuades us
from seeing anything in Lev. 19: 11 in line with the later parallel συκοφαντ. ~ πᾶσως. I rather think that our NT grammars acted wisely in neglecting this example when discussing possible semitisms.

The remaining two verbs in Thackeray’s list, p. 38, do not stand the test either, as soon as one thinks of finding in them more than a casual similarity of sound – and that, it is only fair to say, goes beyond Thackeray’s purpose. κωλύειν and ἀποκωλύειν everywhere render verbs with the meaning retain, stop, hinder, ἀπόκομψις, ἀποκομμάτιον, ἀποκομμάτιον. In 1 Kings 1: 6 ἀποκομμάτιον αὐτὸν renders ἄτρωπον, as does κωλύσῃ, Job 12: 15, though the MT has ἄτρωπον, reproached him. The only thing that is remarkable about ἀποκωλύειν is the fact that in 1 Sam. 25: 7, 15 the LXX translates ἀπέκώλυσεν, insult, as though it had read the verb ἄτρωπον which, as Wellhausen remarks, has nothing corresponding to the Hiphil and Hophal formations used here in the MT. Thus all that can be recorded boils down to some further examples of the confusion of Hebrew roots both of which, however, here make tolerable sense; but, of course, no editor would be tempted to make any alteration in the Hebrew text.

Ελαχεν = ἄτρωπον, 1 Sam. 14: 47, does not form part of the original LXX, as was seen by Wellhausen and Field, and is easily recognizable from Rahlfs’ text and annotation:

κατακληροῦται ἐργον
κατακληρ. (+ το L') ἐργον B [L(4)] + του βασιλευειν L';
ἐλαχεν το βασιλευειν O'; pr. ἐλαχεν το βασιλευειν B'.

Thackeray above all should have avoided taking ἐλαχεν το βασιλευειν, which is in B and accordingly in the text of the Cambridge editions, as belonging to the genuine text; for he was the first to explain the use of the historic present by the earlier translators of the books of Samuel and Kings (for his final statement see his brilliant Schweich Lectures, pp. 20 ff. and Appendix 1). One is really surprised that he should not have been startled by the context of B and Swete, for καὶ Καουλ κατακληροῦται... followed by καὶ ἐπολεμεῖ is a striking example of Thackeray’s own teaching, the effect of which is seriously impaired by the interpolation after Καουλ: ἐλαχεν...

There is, however, a better example of homonymy in a verb, ἡπτάοσαί. Neither the verb nor its derivatives are frequent in the LXX, yet one thing stands out clearly. The great majority of the occurrences belong to Isaiah, and here six out of twelve have as their Hebrew equivalent מָשׁ Qal, Niphal, be frightened; moreover, some other
instances where the Hebrew is different are likely to confirm the interpretation which we are going to give. Elsewhere this particular rendering is confined to the later translators. Some few other passages disclose other usages of ἐπτάοθαι such as are paralleled in secular Greek. The homonymy which we believe we are able to state is given by the existence side by side of the more common usages of ἐπτάοθαι on the one hand, and the peculiar one rendering ηʔη on the other. For the details see Excursus XIV, p. 256.

3.3.6. Homonyms proper: selected nouns

It still remains to deal with some homonymous nouns which offer a special interest.

βάρις. When discussing σαρόβορα (pp. 177 ff.), we found that it was not originally Greek in any of its meanings, and the possibility was mentioned that in its early and later occurrences it derived from different foreign words, possibly even languages, and, if so, disclosed the co-existence, or subsequent existence, of two homonyms. What we were unable to prove there, for lack of evidence, is certain with βάρις (cf. p. 304 n. 3, where the remaining differences of inflexion are mentioned). Hesychius records the different meanings, as though they belonged to the same word, βάρις: πλοῖον, ἡ τεῖχος, ἡ στοά, ἡ πύργος, cf. also Etymol. Magn. 188, 31. Evidently there is no reason why we should accent the two homonyms in a different way, as do H. Lewy, Fremdwörter p. 96, HR, and Thackeray (p. 34, yet not p. 150), when spelling βάρις = ΠΤ3. Actually the decisive cases do not occur. Yet both the Hebrew n"ya, from which it is immediately derived, and the fact of homonymy point to the accentuation βάρις, which is beyond doubt in the homonym denoting Egyptian flat-bottomed boat. βάρις, large house, tower, is rare outside the OT and Josephus, yet there are some examples in LS from authors – Ephorus (IVs) and Posidippus (III*) in later citations with slightly different meanings – and an inscription (IIp). Though there are not so many compounds as of βάρις, boat, yet πυργόβορις, Ps. 121: 7, shows that the word was fairly well received into Greek.

γῆ. Κῆ, Κῆ, valley, low ground (see also the discussion of γεσωνα, p. 247), is sometimes rendered by γῆ.43 What we want to know is, whether this is merely a scribal adaptation of what originally was a transliteration to
a similar Greek word, or whether it actually goes back to the translators, who thus would have given a ‘translation’ by means of a homonym to Greek γῆ, earth, land.

The decision is easy in passages where there is evidence for both γη and γῆ; for here the latter cannot be anything but a transformation of the former. So we must read ἐν Γαί Βεν €ννομ, 2 Chron. 28: 3 with Bc only, 33: 6 with B only. The same applies to 1 Chron. 4: 14, where the evidence offers some additional interest. Here, as in 2 Esdras 21: 35, we have the place name, ἱερὸν καὶ Ιμπήσω (ol γη, Ιμπήσω, τας φάραγγας), sanguine tuo et satiabo τό ὀητό τοῦ αἵματος σου; πασαν τήν γῆν colles τα πεδία. Now Pap. Scheide supports A and the catenae-group and Scheide is much earlier than both. So the balance has decisively changed, and one is bound to state that the Β text is mutilated. The change in the order of words, as compared with the MT, though not frequent in Ezekiel LXX (Cornill pp. 97 f.), indicates the authenticity of the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Const. (Weingart)</th>
<th>Tyconius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐπελήσω (οἱ Γ· +·ς τὰς φάραγγας)</td>
<td>sanguine tuo</td>
<td>et satiabo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματός σου</td>
<td>saturabo</td>
<td>sanguine tuo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πασαν τὴν γῆν</td>
<td>colles</td>
<td>colles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

πασαν τὴν γῆν] om B om τὴν A; οἱ Γ· +·ς τὰς φάραγγας; τα πεδία L colles Vet. Lat.

In some major points the recensions and translations are at one, as in the rendering of the difficult οἰκεῖον and in the transposition of τοῖς and ποιμὴν. To Rahlfs πασαν τὴν γῆν was a negligible minority reading (AC), and moreover his critical apparatus merely records that L reads τὰ πεδία. Now Pap. Scheide supports A and the catenae-group and Scheide is much earlier than both. So the balance has decisively changed, and one is bound to state that the B text is mutilated. The change in the order of words, as compared with the MT, though not frequent in Ezekiel LXX (Cornill pp. 97 f.), indicates the authenticity of the text.
of Scheide AC, all the more as it is found also in Lucian, whose τὰ πεδία may suggest that the Vet. Lat. colles, though attested by two independent witnesses, was once valles (if it is not an adaptation to the preceding montes). The more important point is that this fuller reading is obviously not hexaplaric, as Q records τὰς φάραγγας for the Three, displaying it under Æ, and this twice, at the place corresponding to the Hebrew and again instead of πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. So τὰς φάραγγας is an Origenian insertion, and we may safely imagine that in the Hexapla πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, if retained at all, was marked by an obelus. Its omission in B is, therefore, one of the indications, which are not too rare in Ezekiel, that here B’s text is influenced by the LXX column of Origen.

After thus vindicating πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, we are prepared to profit by the lesson which it has to teach us. As we saw earlier (p. 59 and n. 49), plural formations of γῆ are rare in the LXX as elsewhere; they therefore invited itacistic corruption which Wackernagel was the first to correct in his review of Helbing’s grammar (ThLZ, 1908, p. 638). Thackeray observed (§10, 6, p. 143) a tendency to avoid this rare and difficult plural by using the singular with an adjective, Gen. 41: 54, ἐν πᾶσῃ τῇ γῇ, Jer. 35: 8 ἐπὶ γῆς πολλῆς, or even without it Dan. Θ' 11: 42, always for πᾶσας. Now in Ezek. 32: 5 the same expedient is used in rendering πᾶσας, and this is conclusive evidence that this translator put γῆ for γῆ, as Cornill suggested (‘welches übrigens = καί sein könnte cf. 39: 11’, p. 383). This presents us with an incontestable example of a homonym.46

There remain some passages in the Minor Prophets with what we can learn from them. τὰ θηρία, Zeph. 2: 14, is an old crux. J. Hempel, OLZ, 1926, pp. 263 f., after dismissing some attempts to interpret the passage by deriving it from other roots elsewhere unknown in Hebrew, joins those who read (κ) the (the last of these was Sellin), and with regard to the LXX’s τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς he comments that γῆ was ‘aus Unachtsamkeit aus der Transkription in die Übersetzung übernommen’. On the contrary, I feel sure that there never was a transliteration preceding the existing translation; and one must remember that Hempel wrote in the heyday of Wutz’s theory, which imagined a transliterated text in Greek characters as the basis from which the LXX was translated. τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς is found more than once in the LXX, where it stands for different Hebrew expressions, among which is ἡ γῆ, Exod. 23: 29 (cf. also Hos. 4: 3 with the spurious amplification in the LXX, Nyberg, Hosea p. 24). In Josh. 15: 8 we read γῆς Ροφεὶν for διὰ τῆς γῆς along with a twice repeated φάραγγες ἐνομ = δοῦν (ἐν) γῆς; one sees, and that
is why I quote these passages, that there was some latitude in the use of γη as an equivalent for different Hebrew words; but this is no obstacle to taking it as a homonym when it renders ָּ. It is my contention that it ought so to be taken in Zeph. 2: 14; for Marti's explanation, which is repeated by Horst—וע a dittography of the following מ, and מ יג dropped—is at least without support from LXX's תָּם. Actually the LXX may not have found מ in Zeph. 2: 14, but מ, and freely have 'substituted' מ as, soon afterwards, in 3: 6, it rendered וִּּפֶּרֶּפֶּפסּוּ = מַּאַּא (cf. Ps. 93 (94): 2; Job 40: 7 (12)) for the MT's מ, which latter is not contested by our editors and expositors. This difference between the assumption of a different Hebrew text found by the translators and their method of 'substitution', which was a legitimate game of imagination rather than a deliberate departure from the given Hebrew text, is instructively taught by A. Kaminka in his Studies on the Minor Prophets (1928).

Here is the proper place to mention yet another homonym deriving from מ which was recorded by Thackeray (p. 38), 'נָּאָא is suggested by מ, מ in Mic. 1: 6, Zech. 14: 4'. In both passages נָּאָא in its genuinely Greek meaning makes sense, though not that of the original, and we should not fail to record that immediately afterwards, in Zech. 14: 5, we twice read פָּרָאָגָּאָא פָּרָאָא for מַּאַּאָא, which has been emended into מַּאַּאָא. נָּאָא is not found elsewhere in the LXX, and the case for its being a homonym is less strong than that of γη. Nevertheless, it emerges afresh in Enoch 11: 13 (observed by Albrecht Dieterich, Nekyia pp. 218, 221) τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πῦρος which is identical with γεννα (τοῦ) πῦρος in Matthew and 2 Clem. 5: 4 (parallels from outside the Bible, yet not outside its influence, in W. Bauer's p. 304).

δρέπανον. Twice used in 1 Sam. 13: 20 f. In the second instance it stands for מַּאַּא, ox-goad, and most probably this same word must be restored in the Hebrew of v. 20 from which it was expelled by a word from the close context so that this word now appears twice. Most assuredly this translator knew that δρέπανον meant sickle. If ever he had to guess, it was the Hebrew word that set him guessing. And his guess-work continued on the line by which he had just rendered the hap. leg. מַּאַּא by מַּאַּא, scythe. Other translators had a correct δρέπανον for different Hebrew equivalents. The same applies to φακός (see below). δρέπανον can therefore no more be called a homonym than φακός. When Wellhausen (Text p. 10 n.) assumes that the 'LXX' was well acquainted with the true meaning of the Hebrew words, but
knew their Greek equivalents only in the meaning of the Hebrew, he pictures a stage of primitive homonymy, but hardly the situation in which we find our translator.

**Thalassa** = ἦθη (a channel) 1 Kings 18: 32, 35, 38. So Thackeray p. 37, but Rahlfs, 5-51, 185, 285 and 59, thinks that Thackeray was wrong for the reason that he did not consider the reading ἑκάλαξα which was not in Swete, and which Rahlfs considers the true LXX reading.

**ηθη, channel, ditch,** elsewhere οὐδραγωγός Isa. 36: 2 = 2 Kings 18: 17; 2 Kings 20: 20; δύσις, drain, gully, Job 38: 25; plur. εὐστέματα, Ezek. 31: 4, is represented by θάλασσα in the three passages mentioned by Thackeray:

32 ἐποίησαν θάλασσαν χωροῦσαν δύο μετρητάς.
35 τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπλησαν υδάτος.
38 τὸ υδωρ τὸ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ.

In all three passages Lucian reads θααλα or θαλαα, and in 32 he also has the neuter χωροῦν instead of χωροῦσαν; yet in 35 he reads τὴν θασαλα and in 38 τῇ θασαλα. Here we have the Lucianic method of inconsistent correction. He corrects the fem. χωροῦν in 32, yet acquiesces in τὴν 35 and τῇ 38. This gives the impression that in the text upon which he was working he had found θάλασσα and changed it to θααλα which he, to begin with, treated as a neuter. That these alterations are late and of Lucian's own date and do not go back to the text upon which he made his recension, is also seen from the fact that support is missing from the Vet. Lat., which reads καπίνεως (= χωροῦν-τες 0) and foveas (Lucifer foveam) in 32, foveam in 35 and in altare (Lucifer) in 38. This Vercellone (11, 533) derives from the comment of Theodoretus which he translates as follows: 'In orbem fodiens fecit aquae receptaculum (δοχεῖον). Hoc Hebraeus quidem appellavit θασαλα; Iosephus vero δεξαμενήν.' And Vercellone continues, 'Hinc Lucifer Calarit. habet foveam, margo cod. gothic. legion. foveas'. In 38 the non-Lucianic reading is shared by N, which has a transposition of some clauses. In 39 Lucian has a word which is elsewhere marked with an asterisk; so his text looks decidedly secondary in the whole passage.

Textual evidence, therefore, strongly favours the reading θάλασσα. This, however, needs some explanation. A ditch, dug in the terrible waterless years, certainly cannot have been called 'sea', and Thackeray is correct in tracing θάλασσα back to ἦθη; but he fails to account for the difference in form between the Hebrew and the Greek. Here we do
well to remember the fact that in certain strata of the LXX Aramaic forms were used and Graecized to render the corresponding Hebrew word. Therefore long ago I ventured to reconstruct an Aramaic word which has not been preserved elsewhere. Its sound would be something like *tael* or *tael* in *tael*.*a.* When I submitted this attempt at a solution to Professor Rahlfs some years before the First World War, he agreed and modified my suggestion by pointing to the Arabic forms *tal* or *ta*r, with a transposition of the second and third radical. In conformity with this, the Aramaic form was bound to have been *θαλάζα*, and from this the Greek homonym *θάλασσα* was fashioned.

This rendering of *p* by -σσ- is an example of the repeated emergence of certain innate proclivities of Greek. All such examples are valuable for Greek phonetics. In earlier Greek, there is noticeable, in different periods and places and in ways that are not entirely identical in detail, a tendency to use -σσ- or -ττ- to express sounds, particularly foreign ones, which were neither σ(σ) nor τ(τ), but something half-way between them, so that some ears perceived a preponderance of the s-sound, others that of the t-sound. We are unable exactly to define the phonetic value of these sounds. The only thing that we can say with certainty, is that it was neither σ(σ) nor τ(τ). The dual spelling which in various ways attempts to express this peculiar consonant is found in many genuinely Greek formations: thus πράτω was used not only in Attica, but also in Boeotia and the Euboean Eretria; elsewhere the spelling was πράσσω or πρήσσω. Further it appears in place and proper names of a pre-Greek stratum like 'Υμηττός. In Asia Minor there is even a special letter for this sound both in Carian names and genuinely Greek words; the shape of this (Carian—Cretan? Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* p. 149 with n. 3) letter, which has latterly been found as far off as the Cilian Selinus, has given rise to the suggestion that originally the difference between the spellings σσ and ττ in the main was a matter of orthography and not of phonetics. So Wilamowitz, *Gesch.* ii, 3. The Carian letter, T, looked like a broad T and τ(τ) may simply be a more recent substitute for this Τ. In later times this Τ survives only as the cipher γ, earlier τ, σ, and was called by the Byzantine name σαμπί, said to be σάν + πί, but in reality σαν ( = ὁσ ἁν) πί 'like πί'.49

Among the preserved spellings with Τ there is also θαλάς. Thus *θαλάζα* = *θαλάς* opens an interesting perspective, if we are allowed to interpret it as a late resumption of a formerly fairly wide-spread phonetic or orthographic custom. The analogy would be almost complete, if Brugmann–Thumb (pp. 42, 114) were right in assuming...
that σσ — TT was a 'long' or 'geminated spirans'; but Schwyzer, whose Greek Grammar supersedes the preceding editions of Brugmann and Thumb, gives convincing reasons for his view that we cannot define the pronunciation of this σσ and ττ in the period previous to the Koine (pp. 318 f., 149).

μηχανήματα. J. Freudenthal, who combined mastery of rabbinics and classics, records in his monograph on the remnants of Jewish and Samaritan historical writings (Hellenistische Studien 1/2. Alexander Polyhistor, Breslau, 1875, pp. 119 f.) that Eupolemos 'Τίου Ι Κον. 7, 16 (4). 7, 43 (28) mit μηχανήματα übersetzt'. τους μηχανήματα, the ten bases on wheels, each carrying a sacrificial kettle, are among the cult objects manufactured by Hiram of Tyre (1 Kings 7: 27 ff.). In the LXX the word is transliterated μεχωνωθ for the Hebrew singular and plural alike, and, inconsistently enough, is treated as a fem. singular and plural in all instances in 1 Kings (τάς μ. 2 Chron. 4: 14), but as a masculine τών μ. in 2 Kings 25: 13, and a neuter τα μ. in 25: 16; elsewhere it is translated βάσεις Jer. 52: 17, as Lucian reads 2 Kings 25: 13. For Freudenthal this was evidence for the fact that Eupolemos, a Jewish historian who probably lived in the first half of II e, though drawing mostly on the LXX, especially on Chronicles, sometimes consulted the Hebrew original. Yet after going into the matter, I cannot but state that Freudenthal was mistaken, and that therefore this example, welcome as it would have been, must be abandoned. In order to prevent a similar mistake by later writers on the matter, I will now give some evidence for this statement.

On the whole Eupolemos follows the order of the biblical report. There are some modifications and embellishments, and also some omissions which, however, may go back to the fact that we do not have his original work, but extracts made by Alexander Polyhistor, as quoted by Eusebius, Praep. Evang. ix. So, after describing the molten sea (λουτήρα χαλκούν 9, 34, 9) with some non-biblical detail, he appends a short sentence about the altar and continues (9, 34, 11), ποιήσαι δέ καὶ δακτυλίους δύο χαλκούς ἀλυσιδωτοὺς καὶ στῆσαι σύν τούς ἕτει μηχανημάτων ὑπερεχόντων τῷ ύψει τῶν ναὸν πῆχεις κ… After this there is an obvious gap, and earlier there may have been another gap where we now miss his description of the ten bases on wheels for the ten lavers. For what was quoted above undoubtedly refers to 1 Kings 7: 41 (27) f., 'the two pillars, and the two bowls of the chapters that were on the top of the two pillars; and the two net-
works, to cover the two bowls of the chapiters which were upon the top of the pillars' etc.; and μηχανήματα means the contrivance upon which these bowls and networks were based. The fact that he speaks of δύο, and the other fact that the whole thing is said to be higher than the temple-roof, make it certain that here we have a description of the two pillars Jachin and Boaz. Moreover, Freudenthal himself gives a correct interpretation on pp. 114 and 211, so that his equation μηχανήματα ~ οὐσία is a slip. The closest parallel to this usage of μηχανήματα is 1 Macc. 13: 29, in the description of the memorial monument which Simon Maccabaeus erected on the grave of his brother Jonathan.

μνών. J. E. Grabe, at the beginning of ch. IV of his Prolegomena to the first volume of his edition of the LXX, revives and adopts a suggestion of Capellus and Bochart which, though he does not say so, would lead us to assume another Greek homonymy of two borrowed Semitic words. He proposes in Gen. 31: 7 to read δέκα μνών instead of δέκα διμών, and in 31: 41 δέκα μνών for δέκα διμώσι. The Hebrew is מְנַי, and he stresses that elsewhere מְנַי is rendered מְנָא. Grabe purposely here omits the vowel points, and he defends his emendation, 'quanquam in his Jacobi verbis non minas auri argenteive, sed vices decies mutatas significet', and continues 'Librarii autem occasione ultimae in proxime praecedenti numero δέκα literae α, quodque agnorum Jacobo pro mercede datorum mentio in hoc Capite sit facta, διμών & διμώσι exinde fecerunt'. He then defends the translator against Jerome's stricture, 'atqui non LXX, sed Librarii sunt in culpa, si recta sit nostra Emendatio'. In the other passages which Grabe quotes, 1 Kings 10: 17; 2 Esdras 2: 69; 17: 71 f.; Ezek. 45: 12, מְנַי (Ezekiel) and מְנָא are the natural translations of מְנַי plural מְנַי, from which מְנָא had been borrowed so early that the difference between Att. pl. מְנַי and Ion. מְנָא reflected that of γαῖ-γέαι. Yet apart from מְנַי pl. מְנַי, part, portion, which in the LXX is always μέρος, there still is the pl. מְנַי (from מְנַי*) parts, i.e. vices, with which we are concerned here. This is obviously another word, though the consonants are the same. If the LXX really translated מְנָא, they have either confused two different Hebrew words which had the same appearance in their unpointed text, or they chose to render it by a Greek homonymy which to some extent corresponded to the Hebrew one. The former alternative is highly improbable, as the translators of the Pentateuch and especially Genesis were guided and safeguarded by a fairly strong exegetical tradition – it is different with some later books like Isaiah and the
Semitisms

Minor Prophets; the latter must be considered in the light of the evidence.

For ουκ ἔχει, which is the same in Gen. 31: 7, 14, in verse 7 the LXX reads τῶν δέκα ἄμνων, with very few variants: ἄμναδων Cyr.; om. τῶν C; Cyr. cod.; Aquila δέκα ἄριθμοὺς, Symmachus δεκάς ἄριθμοῦ. In v. 41 there are some more variants: the prevailing reading of the LXX is δέκα ἄμνασιν; ἄμνών 911, 129 (pr. τῶν); ἄμνας 961, 53, 56; ἄμναδων dpChr. ( = l); τῶν δέκα ἄμναδων 34mg Armvid. Boh.; Aquila δεκάς ἄριθμοῦ according to Μ, δέκα ἄριθμοῖς according to jc2; Symmachus δεκάς (this and the evidence of 31: 7 seem to indicate that in 41 the reading ascribed to Aquila by M in fact belongs to Symmachus). The difference of cases in both verses is what we should expect, for the translators of the Pentateuch are fond of variation, as was amply demonstrated by Thiersch. Another difference is the article in 7, which in a few MSS is also in 41. If we accept Grabe’s emendation, the article must be excised, for it came in only with the corruption of μνών to ἄμνων. The fluctuation is between ἄμνος and ἄμνας; for ἄμνη, a rare formation (Passow–Crönert, pp. 380 f.) does not occur in the LXX; therefore ἄμνος in 961, 53, 56 is mistaken, as it stands; but with an assumed dittography δεκάς munας it may witness for an original δεκάς μνάς. Observe that the oldest MS, 911 (IIIp) displays ἄμνων as read in verse 7. I think that Grabe is right, and we should read δέκα μνῶν (without article) in verse 7; as to verse 41 we are at liberty to choose between μνας and μνάς, both being correct. By introducing this homonym, the translator wished to express ten times, and I rather wonder whether in so doing he reflected an idiom peculiar to Jewish vernacular Greek.52

σχίζα. Of Wellhausen’s examples of homonyms σχίζα (missing in Thackeray) stands the test better than some; for here it so happens that the Greek word renders one Hebrew equivalent only, and that in a single context and in an isolated reflection in the Apocrypha.

In the story of Jonathan and David parting with heavy hearts, 1 Sam. 20: 20–38, σχίζα, shaft, dart, is ten times rendered by σχίζα, the Greek meaning of which is piece of wood cut off, lath, splinter. The same word is found in another translated book, 1 Macc. 10: 80, where the meaning, dart, is equally unmistakable, ἔξετίναξαν τὰς σχίζας εἰς τὸν λαὸν.53 I think the example in 1 Macc. at least proves that σχίζα = σχίζα had been incorporated in the translators’ vocabulary. It may well have formed part of their community’s idiomatic speech.54
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σχία, dart, is not confined to the LXX. LS cites Anthol. Pal. 6, 282 and an inscription, IG 2², 1629, 996. Here, in an inventory, Traditio Curatorum Navalium Piraei, materials are quoted in a long list, on occasion of their being passed on to successors; we read σχίας εἰς βέλη κατατταλτῶν, which, in my opinion, can only be translated laths, for making darts to be used in catapults. So this example does not hold good.

In the dedicatory epigram Anthol. Pal. 6, 282 the poet enumerates a list of articles used in Greek athletics, beginning with the felt-hat, buckle and scraper and proceeding to the pulled bow and the outworn chlamys, sucking up grease (γλοιοπότιν) καὶ σχίας καὶ σφαίρας ἀείβολον (always thrown). If with some expositors we understand σφαίρα as the disc, this would be an example of metaphorical speech, which would form a basis for seeing the same in σχίας, splinters, for darts. If, however, σφαίρα is the playing ball – the attributive ἀείβολος lends itself to both interpretations – to take σχίας metaphorically would be without parallel in the context. LS does not repeat the interpretation of σφαίρα as a disc, found in earlier lexica; but I do not know whether this omission is intentional. At any event, other words of this epigram are dealt with fairly exactly in LS.

So I must leave it in suspense, whether ἦν merely invited a Greek usage which already existed, or led to the formation of a homonym similar in sound to the Hebrew vocable, a formation which in Anthol. Pal. was reached as a metaphor.

This last question, namely whether and to what extent these homonyms, fashioned after a Semitic word of similar sound, had a Sitz im Leben in the idiomatic Jewish Greek on which the translators possibly would draw, could only be answered more decisively, if there were some example from outside the Greek Bible which would make it obvious that such a thing existed in the living Jewish Greek.

φακός. Among the examples of homonyms to which Wellhausen drew attention, some denote tools and instruments of everyday life, yet when considered one by one they are seen to stand on different levels.

So Thackeray (p. 38) is right in saying that, when φακός renders ἂν, a flask (also ἥνσε a cruse) in 1 Sam. and 2 Kings, ‘this meaning of the Greek word is classical’ (see also H. Lewy, p. 28). It is irrelevant that in Greek this meaning derives from the original meaning lentil, denoting anything shaped like lentils (LS); as everywhere the metaphorical character of a word was easily forgotten, and so it offered an easy translation for
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the Hebrew words of similar sound. So this is not a homonym. (See also δρέπανον and σχισα above.)

χάος. See above sub γῆ, p. 189.

3.3.7. Conclusion: the proportions

Finally there arises the question of the proportions: to what extent do all these variegated tendencies colour and characterize the Greek of the LXX? As to the homonyms with sounds similar to Hebrew words, my enumeration, without aiming at completeness, was confined to those words about which it was hoped that something useful could be said. It reveals that this feature, however striking it may be, keeps within fairly narrow limits.

When looking at the whole of the not infrequent words of similar sound and meaning in both languages one is rather bound to feel that many opportunities were so to speak missed. βωμός for ναώ is confined to six passages in the Prophets; otherwise it is the proper translation of ἱερό; χώρα never renders νῆσον, any more than νῆπι is represented by λέσχη, although λέσχη, besides couch, later on means public building or hall. One must, however, not overlook the special attraction which the root קָשָׂ exercised on σκηνή, σκηνουν, the Indo-European etymology of which does not give the impression of being firmly established.

Compared with this feature, the others, namely confusion of homonymous or similar Hebrew roots on the one hand, and extension of the range of meaning after the Hebrew pattern on the other, to a decidedly higher degree influence the style of the different translators, stressing the varying degree of their independence upon the Hebrew original. To realize this, the reader must keep in mind that he has been given but a very scanty selection of examples which deserve some special consideration. For this there were two reasons: (1) we have the very solid, though not exhaustive studies by Johannessohn and Helbing, and (2) in this section the aim was not so much to provide a chapter that is missing in our LXX grammars, as to deal with such words as seemed to call for emendation in our editions. The first chapter on grammar was meant to be exhaustive, but completeness in the chapter on Semitisms was intended only within the treatment of the selected examples.
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EXCURSUS I

Confusion of ἴδειν and ἴδεναι

'There is constant confusion in the MSS between the forms of ὁδά and ἐδον' (Thack. p. 278), and even after Rahlfs a number of passages await rectification. This confusion is easily detected by consulting the underlying Hebrew. No one confronted with the Hebrew would have made the blunder; for in Hebrew the equivalents of know and see cannot be mistaken for one another, as can the words expressing see and fear. The imperfect φοβήα, feared, was frequently confounded with γνωρία, γνώριμα, γνωρίσκει, saw. Certainly it would be a mistake in method to correct mistaken Greek translations originating from confusion of Hebrew forms which were almost indistinguishable in an unpointed Hebrew text such as (n)הרי; but it is necessary to emend such mistakes as are due not to the translators, who had the Hebrew before them, but exclusively to copyists, who had no recourse to the Hebrew and so were unable to check the text which they were copying. The difference is brought out by the words correct and emend: our task is not to correct mistakes committed by the translators, which, indeed, often would require but a single stroke of the pen, but to emend secondary corruptions and work back from the later stages of transmission to the earliest within reach. Therefore the appropriate procedure here is to start with the Hebrew words and to single out those features of the Greek which cannot be reconciled with their Hebrew equivalent. In this interfering influences from the context must be taken into consideration.

1. To know

I take the most instructive passage first, because its corruption affects the Old and New Testaments alike, and conflicting tendencies can be observed in both. It is Isa. 6: 9 f.:

9a ἀκο inh ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνήτε

9b καὶ βλέπετε καὶ οὐ μὴ εἶδήτε·

9c καὶ βλέπουσας βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ εἶδήτε·

10a ἔπαχύνθη ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου,  ἀμωματον ἂν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἔκαμμυσαν

10b καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν ἔκαμμυσαν

10c καὶ τοῦς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἔκαμμυσαν  ἐκάμμυσαν

10d μὴποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
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The editions have ιδητε in v. 9c, but obviously only ιδητε answers to ἔχειν. The change may be merely itacistic; but more likely it is a definite corruption due to the influence of ιδοσι in v. 10d which, however, renders ἕκατερον. Moreover, the argument of the whole passage points to the same conclusion: the fullest use of hearing (gb) and sight (gc) does not exclude a complete failure of understanding (gb) and perception (gc) on the part of the heart (10f) which has been made MT or grown (LXX 10a) fat, unfeeling, callous. In 10d–f the functions of the eyes, the ears and the heart stand out distinct and are not interchangeable, so that the corrupt ιδητε of gc must not be allowed to dim the same distinction which is at the root of 9bc, where ἀκούσει and ἔχει are synonymous descriptions of the function of the heart. 10a–c express the same evil of obduracy in a changed order: heart–ears–eyes, in contrast with 10d–f eyes–ears–heart, whereas the same scheme is only slightly obscured by the use of synonyms due to parallelismus membrorum: ears and heart (gb), eyes and heart (gc). To sum up, ιδητε, far from being a mere itacism, was caused by a thoughtlessness which confused the issues of gc and 10c, so that ιδητε could be considered an equivalent of βλέποντες βλέψετε. No expositor nor any of our great Bible translations were misled by the corruption of the LXX; it is the more surprising therefore that it has not been emended before.

This corruption is dealt with at length because it appears both in the original Greek and the Versions. There are two complete quotations of Isa. 6: 9 f.: Matt. 13: 14 f. and Acts 28: 26 f. The former is preceded by an allusion: Matt. 13: 13 = Mark 4: 12; Luke 8: 10. All three have the inverted order 9cb which corresponds to that of 10de, seeing before hearing, but differ in minor points. Mark alone has καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν = Isaiah καὶ οὐ μὴ ιδητε (and appends 10g). Matthew omits it, but it can easily be restored in Luke, though his wording βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἄκουσες μὴ συνίωσιν is the shortest of three. By adopting the minority reading ἴδωσιν, DWpc, we get a smoother text in which both seeing and hearing are expressed by a single word.1 βλέπωσιν then is an assimilation to the synoptic parallels. It is understandable that Mark and Luke, which have the allusion only, should present it more completely. Perhaps the equivalent of ἔχειν was dropped in Matthew when the full quotation was appended. John 12: 40, on the other hand,
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must be kept apart, because here the quotation is confined to Isa. 6: 10 with its legitimate μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.

Luther and the AV render εἶδήτε in Matt. 13: 14 and Acts 28: 26 and εἶδώσιν in Mark 4: 12. In Luke 8: 10, of course, they reflect βλέπωσιν. They are equally correct in rendering ἴδωσιν (Isa. 6: 10) in John 12: 40. They were not deceived by the itacistic corruption of Isa. 6: 9 and its quotation in the NT, because they knew the Hebrew original. On the other hand, the Vulgate is inconsistent. Though correctly translating Isa 6: 9 (nolite cognoscere) and Acts (non perspicieties), it has non videbitis in Matthew and non videant in Mark. Also our modern translations and expositions are strangely inconsistent. Some prefer εἴδεναι, but do not face up to the problem itself; and the same may be said of the grammars and lexicons. Indeed, where there are variants (εἴδητε Isa. 6: 9 SV, and here and there in the NT quotations, and, on the other hand, the mistaken εἴδωσιν Isa. 6: 10 Q*) we can never be sure whether they were actually intended to convey a different interpretation. With us today it is different; for our task requires that our spelling reflects the correct interpretation. In this respect Isa. 6: 9 in the LXX and NT is a test case for what has been said on pp. 25 f. Once the issue is faced, the decision is easy. It leads to the restoration of forms of εἴδεναι in Isa. 6: 9; Matt. 13: 14; Acts 28: 26; Mark 4: 12, and in the Western variant of Luke 8: 10, which may well be the original text here as well. In this the decisive point is that, just as in all these passages there appears the exact equivalent of γνωστός, so we have to see to it that γνωστός is not obliterated by an ambiguous spelling of the Greek.

There are several more passages which all have this much in common that, whereas the original meaning is made clear by γνωστός, the itacistic confusion between ἴδειν and εἰδέναι necessarily foists into the context something unwarrantably different. But because the transformation makes some sense, there are occasions where editors have all allowed it to pass unquestioned. Yet in all these passages the true reading has been preserved in part of our evidence and, what is more significant here, in some of the secondary versions.

Exod. 33: 13, γνωστῶς ἴδω σε, that I may know thee (AV), reads γνωστῶς ἴδω σε in our editions; but Fo (εἴδως) praē εἴδος, confirmed by ut noscam Arm. and the conflation et noscam et videam, Eth., is the correct reading, which moreover is supported by Gen. 2: 9 τὸ δύλον τοῦ εἴδεναι γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ = τὸ γνῷ τὸν καλὸν καὶ τὸν θρησκευτὴν, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Later in the same verse γνῶρι, and consider (imp.), is freely rendered by
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καὶ Ἰσαγγελία which Baentsch rightly retranslates ΝΑΡΔΑ. The reason for this alteration of the meaning may be that ὅπερ ΠΚΔΠΙ is unique, and that a barbarism like Mal. 3: 18 διπτερεῖ ἀνά μέσον...καὶ ἀνά μέσον for the equally unique ὅπερ ΠΚΔΠΙ, *know the difference, discern between, was impossible in the Greek Pentateuch. The translator, who is translating freely here, may have been influenced in his choice of expression by the preceding γνωτέως εἶδος. A later copyist, however, would have been open to the same influence, and, for that reason, some might prefer to account for the reading as a corruption of ΙΔΩ into ΓΝΩ. This would be as easy an assumption here as in Isa. 26: 11, which will be dealt with sub ΠΠΠ (see below, p. 202).

Lev. 23: 43. Here too ΊΠΔΠΙ, may know, is missed by the ΊΔΩ of all our editions; again the expected εἶδος is provided by MSS (Ffhsvx) and translations (Arm. Bo. w La.) and further supported by vms γνώσις.

2 Kings 10: 10. For ἐπισκοπήν τικίς εἶδος, our editions read ίδετε αἱβοῦ; but scitote Syr., the conflation scitote et videte La.6 and γνωτε Α′ indicate that we must read ίστε (only occurs elsewhere in 3 Macc. 3: 14) or some other form of εἰδέναι.

Sir. 46: 10. τελειοφορόμενον εἴδως εἴδωσιν. Smend's einsähen is somehow halfway between the Hebrew and the Greek. We must emend to εἴδωσιν.

Job 38: 12 ἔπεμψε, caused to know. This has undergone a change of person in the LXX, owing to a free translation. It was Grabe who rightly corrected έλθειν into οίδειν = ἔπεμψε, referring to the MT and cognovit of the Vet. Lat.4

In the last three instances we have had to restore the correct spelling by reference to the Hebrew without the help of any of the Greek witnesses. There are other occasions where some Greek MSS witness to the true reading but have been suppressed by Swete and others in their preference for the leading uncialis. For example, in 1 Macc. 11: 31 Rahlfs rightly recovered δττώς είδήτε from L against SA, and in so doing vindicated the unanimous reading of the editions before Swete which represents a peculiarity of the Greek speech touched upon by Ph. Buttmann, Ausf. Gr. Sprachlehre Π2, 160.5
CONFESSION OF Ἰδεῖν AND ἐίδεναι

2. To see
2.1. ήδει

Gen. 39: 3. Our editions read Ἰδεῖ δέ; but Joh. Fischer rightly restored ἐίδεν δέ from minn. f(είπεν) il. He could also have referred to Eth. vidit.

Num. 35: 23. In itself οὐκ ἐίδώς would make sense (= ἀκουσίως), but a glance at the Hebrew νεών without seeing (him), is proof that we must emend οὐκ ἰδών, though there are no variants except the queer per dolum La.

2 Kings 6: 32 μὴ ἐπιθυμησίν see ye? (AV). This appears in Rahlfs' text as οἴδατε with this annotation, ήδειτε B*, εορκατε L¹, ειδετε Sixt. The Sixtine emendation must be accepted, as it was by Grabe, just as we read ίδετε for ήδει later in the same verse.

Job 28: 23 ff. Here we find the sequence: 23 ὁλῶν (ὑν), 24 a ἐφορᾷ (ὑν), 24 b ἐλῶς (ὑν), 26 ἰδὼν (ὑν), 27 ἤ εἴδεν συνήν (ὑν). Here εἴδως for ἴδων is mistaken, as was observed long ago by J. J. Kneucker, Das Buch Baruch (1879, p. 305). Commenting on Baruch 3: 32 ὁ εἴδως τὰ πάντα, in which he rightly sees a quotation from Job, he states, 'Jedenfalls aber ist, hier wie dort, εἴδως (statt ἴδων) ein Fehler. Vgl. dagegen Sir 15: 18: βλέπων τὰ πάντα' (in the Hebrew וּלָךְ). In fact we must put ἰδών in both passages, as we did in Num. 35: 23. Besides, a close analysis shows, what E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek pp. 217 f., proved (in an argument which, except for some minor details, still stands) that ἰδών 26 and ἐλῶν συνήν 27 are duplicate renderings of the same Hebrew and thus both belong to v. 27, the former being the translation of the LXX and the latter that of Θ'. It was therefore rash of Grabe and Rahlfs to replace ἰδών by ήετόν. Certainly the equivalent of ὀφθαλμός is missing; but it lurks under συνήν which ought to be οπτῶς; and ἰδών ἡράθησεν is the LXX alternative of the Theodotic v. 27a.

Sir. 20: 6. εἴδως καίρων is corrupt (ς τὰ φασάρ τι); here Smend emends ἰδών; cf. 48: i1 where S alone corrupts ἰδώντες (ς ταρ) into ἐλδότες.

Isa. 33: 19. Ἰδεῖν ό is rendered οὕδε Ἰδεῖ. The translation is confused, and the second person was lost owing to this confusion; but doubtless we must restore Ἐδεί, cf. C' ὅψει.
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There are examples of passages in which Swete’s recourse to B introduced itacistic corruptions which neither were in the previous editions nor are in Rahlfs’. I only mention Isa. 5: 19, where the Greek context was tempting, ἧν᾽ ἠνέρας Ἰωύ, ἵππα ἔδωμεν, ἵππα γνόμεν (106 O, including B, have ἔδωμεν); and Ezek. 12: 3 ἢτη, B* Swete ἔδοσιν; yet the others rightly ἔδωσιν.

2.2. ἡ λεγόμενον

Job 24: 1. Here there is an addition in 249 Syr.ν. οὐκ ἔδον (ὃν) ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ; here Jerome puts a mistaken nescierunt, which Montfaucon duly retranslated οὐκ οἴδασιν (Field). This is an example of how these mistakes arose.

Job 27: 12. οἴδατε for μὴ ἔδωσιν is corrupt; but we still can see how the corruption arose. To the translator the Hebrew was quite unmistakable. It consists of two sentences, as all the verses do in the immediate context: you have seen; why then...? Originally the Greek ran, ἔδεστε δτι...έτπ-βάλλεσθε; This δ τι, why, instead of the more frequent τί δτι (Lachmann p. xliii; A. Buttmann p. 218; Field, Notes on the Translation of the NT p. 33; Turner, JTS 27, 1926, pp. 58 ff.; W.-Schmiedel §24, 18a) was no longer understood by a reviser who consequently changed the interrogative sentence into a subordinate that-clause; and at the same time οἴδατε seemed to him to make better sense.7 εἰράκατε A* is secondary.

Isa. 26: 11. This passage seems to resist our simple scheme in so far as the same repeated Hebrew is expressed by two different Greek verbs which both mean know:

οὐκ ἔδεισαν, γνόντες δὲ...

For the first we could write εἰδεσαν or εἴδοσαν (Isa. 22: 9, Thack. §17. 5), and behind ΓΝοντες there could hide ΙΔοντες, just as in Exod. 33: 13, which has been dealt with above, the disturbance arising from passages like 5: 19 (see above p. 200).

Isa. 26: 14. Here ἢτη is rendered ὠς ὁ μὴ ἔδωσιν. Several explanations are possible. (1) As it stands the translation can be defended only as a circumlocution. (2) The LXX may have seen a υη behind ἢτη; then εἴδωσιν S* would certainly be wrong, and ἢτη something of a doublet. (3) Comparing Sir. 48: 11 ἢτη (30ην min. 70)
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ζησόμεθα, we might read ζῶσιν, perhaps in the phonetical spelling σῶσιν, as was suggested above, p. 89, for ChB Deut. 31: 13. But a last suggestion receives some support from the context. (4) For ἔστι, all except S* 239 read an active ἄναστήσωσι = ὑποστήσει, Hiphil. The translator may therefore also have interpreted ἔστι as a causative Piel ἔστι, after 57: 15, διδοὺς μακροθυμίαν καὶ διδοὺς ζωὴν. The parallel would suggest δῶσιν. The same interpretation is in Θ' οὐ μὴ ἑωοποιήσωσιν and in C', mortui non vivificabunt, gigantes non suscitabunt. This concurrence points to an exegetical tradition. This again strengthens the case of δῶσιν.

2.3. Conclusion

From the preceding discussion we may draw the conclusion that most of the readings which we had to reject are not real variants, but simply reveal a wide margin of error around the mark of correct spelling. Their difference from ordinary itacisms is that the resultant mis-spelling in this case appears to represent an entirely new word in the Hebrew, yet one which would be fairly intelligible in the context and thus recommend the mis-spelling. From this, even habits of spelling may develop; yet that does not make them legitimate, as they characterize merely a recent stage of transmission. They cannot be traced back to the translators, nor do they form part of what we would call ‘evidence’ in a strict sense. They are merely the dust that covers our evidence and must therefore be swept away. (Cf. above pp. 25 ff.)

A good many of these corruptions are due to the influence of contiguous passages. I give a few examples. The correct readings ἰδοῦ Num. 11: 15 and ὂθιας 11: 16 influenced one another so that many MSS read ἰδῶ in 11: 15 and B*, ἰδῖς in 11: 16. A fluctuation between ἰδῶτες, Job 20: 7, and ἰδῆτες Job 19: 14-19 can be studied from Rahlfs’ instructive notes. Further, I refer to what has been said about Isa. 6: 9, 10 and its quotations in the NT about Deut. 32: 17a, b, and Job 28: 23 ff. Even in Dan. Θ’ 2: 8 the mistaken ἰδῶτη AQ instead of ἰδῆτε B (ἡμῖν LXX ἐφέκτητε) may be a thoughtless scribal adaptation to ἰδῷ (ὡς) earlier in the same verse. Similar reasons, or rather the absence of any, together with the habit of comprehending ἰδεῖν and ἰδέναι under the heading ἘΙΔω (so Schleusner without any strict discrimination) may here and there have lulled the attention of editors. In opposing this attitude I do not think my standards have been too strict.
But still a note of caution should be struck. It should not be overlooked that, in spite of what has been said above, the meanings of *knowing* and *seeing* have some affinity or rather a restricted field of overlapping, in *come to see, experience*. Hence changes under the influence of neighbouring passages are so easy and frequent. But there remains one set of passages that certainly resist any rash attempts at emendation, namely those in which *νοέω* is rendered by *γνωσκειν*. Two of them must not be touched: Gen. 39: 23 *καὶ μὴ γνώσητε...* where the unanimous evidence is now supported by 962 and 961; and Exod. 22: 10 (9) *καὶ γνώσεσθε γνῶ...* οὐκ ἐγνώσκατο, where we have only a recent variant στν, which is spelled ἔνη in anaw Syr., and *videns* in the Three. Others are different: so Exod. 33: 13 *καὶ γνώσεσθε...* where I proposed ἔσω, because *γνώ* could have slipped in from *γνωστώς* ἐδο, just as in 2 Esdras 14: 15 (9) the unique ἔγνωσαν of A for ἔσω replaced ἠκουσάν for the only reason that there follows ἐγνώσαν (= ἔθημα); but certainly this suggestion is as contestable in Exod. 33: 13 as it is in Isa. 26: 11, where ἐγνώσαν γνώντες would admit transformation into ἐδοσαν Ιδόντες, on account of the underlying Hebrew ידעתי ידוע. But there are two passages with real variants which cannot be ruled out forthwith as being secondary adaptations to the MT: Num. 11: 23 *θύμην...* where, apart from Arm.-ed., Eth., Philo, *sacr. Abel* §66, reads a unanimous ὠψει, and after him Ambros., *sacr. Abel* §32, videbis; and Judg. 2: 7 *καὶ ἐγνώσατε...* where La. Or.-Lat. have viderunt. But I would contend that the discussion of these few doubtful instances does nothing to detract from the force of my arguments as a whole.
As far as the LXX is concerned, this word group has not been dealt with satisfactorily in LS. The fact has been overlooked that the bulk of instances does not belong to the LXX proper, but to hexaplaric insertions. To begin with, the entire article ‘διακριβεία, η, minute observation of the law, LXX 3 Κι. 11. 33 (pl.)’, is misleading. In the only passage where this hapax legomenon occurs, 1 Kings 11:33, it forms part of a hexaplaric addition καὶ διακριβεῖας μου καὶ κρίσεις μου = ἡ ἁκριβία τῆς νομοθεσίας. This is found in A Arm. Syr., according to BM. And since these, together with 247 (= χ BM), form the Origenic recension, Rahlf's annotates O-247. The following verse, however, has a similar hexaplaric addition, δς Ιφύλαξεν ἐντολάς μου καὶ ακριβείας μου in O', and a slightly different one in L', representing ἡ κρίσις τῆς διακριβειας. As expressly stated, both hexaplaric additions are taken from Aquila's translation. Now Aquila is so consistent in rendering Hebrew words by the same Greek equivalent everywhere that any exceptions from this rule call for explanation. Since Syr. at least has the same rendering in both verses, the unique διακριβεῖα is attested by A alone. In fact it is the result of a corruption, namely a dittography καὶ ΔΙα-3 and as such a ghost-word. We must read ακριβείας, and both μου and the plural indicate that Aquila correctly understood statutes, as he understood the parallel κρίσεις here and ἐντολάς in v. 34. We must not therefore acquiesce in διακριβειας nor try to find in it a divergent shade of meaning as we will find in his ἁκριβολογίαι Judg. 5:16.

This ακριβεία is characteristic for Aquila, who uses it for ἁκριβεία in Wisd. of Sol. 12:21; Sir. 16:25; 42:4 (cf. 32:3 ἁκριβεία γιαστεί) and Dan. LXX. Θ’ 7:16 (κρίσεις). Similarly ἁκριβοσμός is exclusively hexaplaric. In A' Exod. 13:10; Deut. 6:17 it also represents προφητεία, πρὸς, and once more the word is lacking in C', though found in Θ' Ε' and anonymous quotations. ἁκριβοσμός does not belong to the LXX proper either, as could be inferred from HR. For 1 Kings 11:34; 2 Kings 17:15 are hexaplaric insertions taken from A', and the διακριβεῖα of Prov. 8:29 derives from Θ'. There remains only ἁκριβοσμόι Judg. 5:15 A-text, which, as Rahlf's rightly felt, does not appear to be the genuine
LXX text or even ancient, although it is read by AO, the MN group
and L (glnw), and no better alternative is offered by our evidence.
Further we have ἄκριβαςτας for ‘κυρὴ imposer of ὑπηρεσία statues or en-
actments’ (Burney, Judges p. 122), A’ Judg. 5: 14, A’ Ḍ’ Isa. 33: 22,
A’ Ps. 59 (60): 9 (= 107: 9), where Ḍ’ has ἄκριβοςάμενος. This last
leads us to the verbs, ἄκριβας and ἄκριβος, which in the majority of
passages render the root ψηφ or, the p.p.p., the nouns ἕψις and ἁρµός.
With the exception of Sir. 46: 15 and (δι-) Sir. 51: 19; 2 Macc. 2: 28,
all instances are hexaplaric. Here both the active and middle voices are
used without any noticeable difference of meaning in Greek. Before
turning to the question of meaning I propose to discuss a few problems
in detail.

The translations of Judg. 5: 9, 14, 15, 16 must be considered together.
In v. 9 ἀντίστατος is interpreted as a neuter p.p.p. by the AB texts, ἑττὶ τὰ
dιατεταγμένα, and Ὅ, εἰς τὰ προστάγματα. τοῖς ἄκριβοςαμένοις,
however, which ἑ ‘invitis, quod ad LXX attinet, libris’ (Field) ascribes
to Ὅ ( = Origenian LXX column) Ḍ’Α’, takes the Hebrew as a Poel,
commander, thus giving the appropriate rendering.

In v. 14 the LXX unanimously translates ψηφ by ἔξερευνώτας, thus rendering ψηφ (cf. vv. 15 f.) instead of ψηφ. In this it is mistaken.
As the Hebrew formation which this translation presupposes, G.-Buhl
suggests ψηφτζ (Piel ψηφ). Yet because this is found elsewhere only in
Eccles. 12: 9, and the participle ψηφ without the initial ψ is found in
the vicinity, Judg. 5: 9, it is more likely that they mistranslated ψηφ
instead of ψηφ (μ). That the MT is correct in v. 14, is seen from the
parallel ψηφτζ ψηφτζ. In our Greek tradition the correct translation is
ἄκριβαςτας Ὅ’ and ἐπιτάσσοντες Ὅ’.

In v. 15 ἀντίστατος is generally emended into ἀντίστατος, as read in the otherwise
identical clause in v. 16. The latter is certainly found in ἐξερευνώμενοι of
the B text which Bos changes to ἐξερευνώσαμοι (as Ὅ reads in v. 16). In
our passage Ὅ seems to have read ἰν, if we are right in ascribing
dιολογίσμοι to him. Then Ὅ’s ἄκριβεια renders ἰν, just as does ἄκρι-
βαςμοί in all groups of the A text.

In v. 16 the MT reads ἰν, and so do the A text (= Ὅ’) ἐξερευνώσαμοι
and the B text ἐξερευνώσαμοι. When compared with his ἄκριβεια in v. 15,
Ho’s ἄκριβοςάμας, which could mean investigation, looks like a translation
of ἀντίστατος. But there may be something peculiar behind his choice of this
precise word. Perhaps he wished to hint at ἀντίστατος at the same time. If so,
his device may be something in the nature of what the hermeneutic
tradition of the Hebrew Grammar used to call formae mixtae. These are
spellings, or, more often, only pointings, which, though meaningless as they stand, invite the understanding reader to choose between two alternatives both of which are partly represented in the resultant composite pointing. Whereas modern research has been inclined to dispose of most of these as misunderstood or incorrect spellings (cf. G.-Kautzsch 28, §78d, p. 229, but also §90n.) some expositors like C. C. Torrey (The Second Isaiah) have traced many fresh instances in what would otherwise be listed in our Hebrew grammars as freak spellings. It is tempting on these lines to explain the peculiar spelling יִּשָּׁל with -i- in Judg. 5:15. In spite of Isa. 10:1, which shows the same pointing, one may suspect that at a late period, when it was no longer possible to give emendations in the form of Qere readings, the -i- of יִּשָּׁל was put with the intention of suggesting יִּשָּׁל. At any rate יִּשָּׁל, which must be claimed as the correct reading in accordance with 5:16, found its way into 5 MSS (BH3). Though neither the interpretation which was suggested for A’s ἀκριβολογία in 5:16, nor the other concerning the pointing of יִּשָּׁל in 5:15, is very strong in itself, one may to some extent corroborate the other.

In ἀκριβάζω a peculiar use of voices can be observed. We may best begin with the renderings of ἀκριβή in A’ Θ’. Here ἀκριβάστης is found in A’ Judg. 5:14; Isa. 33:22; Ps. 59 (60):9 (=107:9 definitio) and Θ’ Isa. 33:22, whereas A’ Gen. 49:10; Judg. 5:9, and Θ’ Ps. 59 (60):9 use ἀκριβασμένος. The middle voice is further used in Prov. 8:15 A’ C’ Θ’ ἀκριβάσσονται = ἀκριβή. In the remaining instances the active or a real passive is found. The active in Prov. 8:27 A’ Θ’ ἐν τῷ ἀκριβάζειν γύρον = ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ (sic, BH3), and twice in Isa. 30:8 A’ ἀκρίβασσον αὐτήν = ἀκριβή; 49:16 A’ ἐκρίβωσά σε = ἀκριβή. This distinction has no basis in Greek usage but represents a mechanical attempt at expressing the various voices of the Hebrew verb by an analogous variation of Greek voices which do not lend themselves easily to this manipulation. Thus the middle forms correspond to Poel formations of the Hebrew, whereas the active forms represent the Hebrew Qal. So ἀκριβασμένος Judg. 5:9 Θ’ Α’ means commander, whereas τὰ διατεταγμένα, LXX, and τὰ προστάγματα, C’, render a passive Qal formation by means of a real Greek passive. On this latter line A’ and anonymous quotations, which may be A’ as well, render ἀκριβή and ἀκριβή by τὰ ἡκριβασμένα or -ωμένα. There is one apparent exception from the rule which, however, is no real exception. For Isa. 10:1 Ziegler records from min. 710 and Chrysostom (the latter ‘ολ ηκριβή’) Θ’ οὐάι τοῖς ἀκριβασμένοις ἀκριβείαι (rationes Chr., retranslated from the Armenian)
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δικίας = ἰσχύς ἀρετής ὅραν. From this we can only understand that Θ' took the participle ἀρετής as a Poel formation, without the initial π as in Judg. 5: 9 (for other examples of G.-Kautzsch 28 § 52 s, pp. 150 f.). As far as I can judge, Θ''s interpretation should be considered; for at its root there seems to be the observation that the meaning to decree, enact which is necessary for Isa. 10: 1, would be unique in the Qal, but is the usual one in the Poel.

This use of the Greek voices for the purpose of a close imitation of the quite different voices in the Hebrew has not been observed before, as far as I know. So this rubric is missing in Reider's very careful description of the peculiarities of Aquila's speech. Of course, it must not be confused with the quite regular device of expressing the active or passive meaning of Hebrew voices by Greek actives and passives, with all the consequences which may sometimes outstep normal Greek usage (Reider pp. 40 ff.).

Apart from A' and Θ' (there is no example which can be ascribed to C' with certainty) there is some restricted use of the whole word group in the later parts of the LXX; but in the LXX proper it is almost non-existent. The only indisputable instance is ἀκριβῶς Deut. 19: 18 for ἀκριβῶς carefully, which is elsewhere in Deuteronomy rendered σαφῶς and in 2 Kings 11: 18 ἀγαθῶς (L ἐπιμελῶς). And the meaning is the usual one.

With this, we turn back, after a long parenthesis, to the question with which we began when exception was taken to the way in which LS defines the meaning of the passages which it quotes. Here we must carefully distinguish between common Greek usage and Hebraizing peculiarities. As to the former, LS give a strange interpretation of Sir. 46: 15, 'Pass. to be proud', for which there is no foundation whatever either in Greek or Hebrew usage; for here the Hebrew has ἰδρύω was consulted, and exactly this is one of the meanings of ἀκριβῶς (cf. Matt. 2: 7). In the Hebrew Sirach this meaning is obvious in 46: 20 also, ἰδρύω allowed himself to be consulted, where Sirach's grandson freely, but not incorrectly, renders προεφήτευσεν. Thus LS ought simply to interpret, ἀκριβῶς = ἀκριβῶς consult, Pass. Sir. 46: 15'. The continuation in LS, 'censured by Poll. 5. 152', must not be understood as confirming the meaning be proud; for the intention of Pollux is obvious from the fact that among other expressions he recommends διηκριβωσάμην, ἐπιστωσάμην, ἀκριβολογοῦμαι, and continues τό γαρ ἀκριβάζω ἀπειρόκαλον. Under ἀκριβεῖα the LXX is not mentioned in LS, otherwise the normal and the peculiar hexaplaric usages would be seen.
in their difference. The fact that here a bundle of novel formations is found in the hexaplaric remnants ought to have made every expositor think twice; for it would indicate that something special and idiomatic was behind this peculiarity, which might be supposed to influence the hexaplaric use of already existing members of the word group too (άκριβάξω, -όω, ἀκρίβεια). As the Greek word group is but a slavish rendering of the Hebrew root ppn with all its derivations, we must first make sure about the basic meaning in Hebrew and its different shades, and further justify our assumption, that the hexaplaric translator intended to express every nuance of the original. The fact that he meticulously kept to the same equivalent throughout rather suggests the contrary. To his reader, at any rate, the word may thus become devalued and of little meaning and so frustrate the translator’s intention which was to indicate by the strange translation the original which lay behind it. Thus, with due allowance for the range of connotations represented by ppn, LS ought to have recorded that the hexaplaric translators use άκριβ- for √ppn. Under άκριβάξω it could have stated the difference between act. άκριβάξω = ppn Qal and middle άκριβάζομαι = ppn Poel; and it could have introduced this Hebrew differentiation into the Greek as well. We might expect to be told that άκριβεια, άκριβας, άκριβος, and τὸ ἠκριβασμένον (ωμένον) are synonymous renderings of ηρ, ρή, and that άκριβαστής is the imposer of τηρ, σφην. Such consideration might have prevented LS from rendering άκριβασμοί καρδίας Judg. 5: 15 A-text by searchings of heart, which at best is the translation of the emendation έρπη instead of ρηπη, when everything points to the fact that A rendered ρηπη and not Ͽρηπη. In Gen. 47: 22, where ρη means fixed revenue, Aquila puts the same άκριβασμός, for which LS gives the translation portion, gift, without any further evidence in support of this interpretation. Here portion is half mistaken in so far as it suggests part or share, but gift goes completely astray and can only be understood as being suggested by the LXX which here translates δόμα and δόσις, aptly, but not literally. So if in the former instance the meaning of an emendation was read into the translation of the unemended text, in the latter the free translation of the LXX was used as a means of interpreting Aquila’s etymological, but for that reason slightly unintelligent and unintelligible, rendering. In both instances LS is at variance with the recognized rules of hermeneutics.

But there is a third instance, Judg. 5: 14. As we have seen before, the εξερευνοντες of the LXX refers to the root ἔρπη, whereas A’s άκριβαστοι and C’s επιτάσσοντες rightly keep to the MT’s ἐρπην. Now LS, after
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reporting the correct meaning lawgiver for Isa. 33: 22, continues 'inquirer, A' Jdc. 5. 14'. That again is nothing less than smuggling into Aquila's unequivocal translation the different translation of the LXX, ἐπην instead of ἐπην. It is true that ἀκριβ- seems to combine both connotations, for ἀκριβοῦν and ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι, besides expressing exactness, can include the thought of investigation, and that is why I said earlier that A's ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι 5: 16 was equivocal; but his - and Θ's - ἀκριβαστής = ἐπην is decidedly not. Thus LS is here guilty of two mistakes at the same time: besides interpreting A' on the line of the LXX, though both represent obvious variants of the Hebrew, LS confuses two similar Hebrew roots (taking ἐπην to be ἐπην) and by way of contamination, as it were, forces that meaning of the root, which it considers the right one, upon the other. For another example of the same mistake see p. 149, on ἀγχιστεία 3. and ἀγχιστεία 3.

Aquila's manner of etymological rendering tends to obliterate the special meaning of a Hebrew word in a special passage. The strange translations which he obtains in this way do not qualify for inclusion in our general lexicons because they are nothing but forced interpretations and fail to add to our knowledge of what was real and living Greek. Their place would be in a special Aquila Index. So we should only repeat the mistake of LS, if, for example, we attempted in Isa. 30: 8; 49: 16 to lend a more colourful interpretation to Aquila's purposely colourless translation of ἐπην, merely because all the others give the special shade required by the MT; 30: 8 ἀκριβασθεν οὔτην = ἐπην, where the fem. suffix in the Hebrew stands for a neuter, C' ἐγχάραξον, Θ' διάγραψον; 49: 16 ἡκρίβωσα σε = ἐπην, LXX ἐξωγράφησα, C' ἐχάραξά σε or ἔστηριξά σε, Θ' διέγραψα σε or διεχάραξα σε (our evidence is divided).

A last example, which may indicate the difficulty of interpreting the translation ἀκριβάζειν, is taken from the Lucianic variant in 2 Chron. 4: 18, which, of course, is outside the scope of LS. Here the MT reads ἐπην it was calculated, checked. The translation of the LXX ἐξελπίτεν may be free (Schleusner) or go back to ἐπην. Lucian, however, reads ἡκρίβωσθην. Is this ἐπην or ἐπην? Is it influenced by any of the Three or by MT 2: 7, 16 ἡκρίβωσθην? Is the Lucianic variant ἔλαιον for the έκκαθη of LXX Jer. 26 (46): 23 (= ἐπην) just a scribal corruption or a mutilation of ἀκριβασθηθή; Often decision is impossible; but it is immaterial where the difference is of no consequence.
EXCURSUS III

κυλικείον

Rahlfs is right in spelling κυλικείον 1 Macc. 15: 32, for κυλικείον μετὰ χρυσωμάτων καὶ ἀργυρωμάτων can only mean a side-board, place for κύλικες (Mayser ι 3, 13). If we had the Hebrew original of 1 Maccabees preserved, we would know the Hebrew expression, which we do not now.

When spelling κυλικιον, Esther 1: 7, our editions keep to the tradition and to the MT, which twice mentions ποτήρια, the first of which is rendered ποτήρια, so that one feels inclined in κυλικιον to see its second rendering. Yet in doing so one would overlook the fact that this second clause is not a proper rendering at all. Is the LXX based on a different Hebrew? δizando, which he does not render here, is correctly and closely rendered 3: 8 ἔξολοι παρα, yet πατο move to another place, a construction found in 2: 9 only, is missed again and quite non-committally rendered ἔχρησατο αὐτῇ κολάζω, treatment her well.1 The same existence side by side of adequate and futile translations is found in the rendering of other idiomatic Hebrew phrases in Esther. So the repeated noun: in 1: 8 ης τε των ανθρώπων is mistranslated αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ανθρώπων, yet in 3: 4 ης καθ' ἑκάστην ήμέραν, and, on the contrary, 8: 9 ἀνθρώπων extremely literally κατὰ χώραν καὶ χώραν.

The decisive observation, however, is that the first ποτήρια is rendered by a plural ποτηρίων, so that the singular κυλικιον is most unlikely to denote the same again. Moreover, everything that is said in connection with this κυλικιον is entirely out of touch with the Hebrew; it is a free midrashic fancy picture. Its embellishments can already be seen earlier when καὶ ἄργυρα is added to χρυσά, though this in itself would still keep in conformity with the frequent variations to which Wellhausen in the Introduction to his Text first drew attention. Yet ἀνθρώπων and the addition of a fabulous value, ἀπὸ τολάντων τρισμυρίων, definitely overstep this general limit and make us doubt whether a cup can have been in the translator's mind. προκεῖμενον must not divert us as being necessarily said of a vessel on a table, for it can mean to be placed in front (LS s.v. II 1), and certainly the enormous sum of 30,000 talents clearly prevents us from thinking of a cup, even in a fairy tale. What remains to be asked is whether even in a fairy tale a sideboard could be thought of.
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as made of, or in the nature of (LS), ἀνθραξ, a precious stone of dark-red colour, including the ‘carbuncle, ruby and garnet’ (LS). Could it possibly denote inlaid work?

Moreover, 1 Macc. 15: 32 and two passages in the Letter of Aristeas, to which we shall turn immediately, do prove that in descriptions of this kind, sideboards are a standing feature, especially here where the cups have been mentioned before (compare also the quotations from comedians in Athen. xi, 460 d, xii, 534 e, the pictures in Daremberg-Saglio, Dict. d. ant. i 1, 3 f., and Studniczka’s comment in the Leipzig edition of Theophr., Charact., 1897, pp. 141 f. on κυλι(κ)ούχιον, which I would not with Casaubon, Salmasius and LS at once change to κυνούχιον in Theophr., Char. 18, 4).

At the end of the Letter of Aristeas we are told about the presents given by the king to each of the Jerusalemite translators (§319) and to the High Priest (§320). Among the gifts there figures a κυλικιον. This is the unanimous evidence in Josephus, whereas in Aristeas §319 κυλιδιον prevails, which can only be a corruption of κυλικιον, as read by all in §320. In his edition Wendland adopts a conjecture of Wilamowitz, reading κυλικεϊον both times. If anything, this must mean that Wilamowitz thought of sideboards and not of cups. Wendland, however, in his translation speaks of cups, whereas Meecham puts sideboard in both places. Wilamowitz is proved right by the order in which the gifts are enumerated. In §319 the enumeration proceeds from smaller gifts to furniture, in §320 the order is inverted. In both places κυλικεϊον stands together with all the furnishing for three couches (§319) and ten couches with legs of silver and all the fittings thereof (§320) (the translations are Meecham’s), and in §320 the group of φιάλαι καί τρυβλίως (which, I think, are not Teller, as Wendland translates) καί κρατήρες stands distinctly apart at the end of the list. From this we may safely take it that in both passages κυλικεϊον means a piece of furniture. This meaning and spelling must be put in Josephus, AJ xii, 116 f., as has been done by Wendland in the collection of testimonia annexed to his edition of Aristeas, but not by Niese.

From these parallels, 1 Macc. 15: 32 and Aristeas 319 f., the reading κυλικεϊον becomes highly probable and almost certain, even in Esther 1:7.
EXCURSUS IV

The nature of the text displayed by $\Delta_3$\textsuperscript{1}

In Gen. 26: 3, 4 one of the many traces of deuteronomistic insertion in the Hebrew context is the plural $\text{בְּנֵי-כּוּרֵן}$. The ordinary translation lying behind our entire evidence, except $\Delta_3$, shows great judgement in twice translating it by the usual singular $\pi\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\iota\nu\gamma\eta\nu$, so that here $\Delta_3$ betrays itself as clearly secondary, both by the plural and its form, giving $\pi\sigma\sigma\alpha\varsigma\tau\acute{o}s\gamma\varsigma\varsigma$.

If, surprised by this observation, we further examine the other variants found in $\Delta_3$ we come to realize that $\Delta_3$, not an early witness at all, indulges in a vocabulary as remote from that of the whole of our tradition as, say, the revision of the text of Judges in B. In the fragments of Gen. 25: 19–22 which have survived in $\Delta_3$ besides 26: 3, 4, we twice read the unique τοῦ Μεσοποταμίτου for τοῦ Ούρου in v. 20, and in 26: 3, 4 three times the equally unique $\sigma\pi\sigma\rho\alpha\varsigma$ instead of $\sigma\pi\rho\mu\alpha\varsigma$ for $\gamma\nu\mu\iota$;\textsuperscript{2} for in the LXX $\sigma\pi\sigma\rho\alpha\varsigma$ is never found in the meaning a man's progeny; only in its proper meaning, 2 Kings 19: 29; 1 Macc. 10: 30.

Thus the scanty remnants of five verses yield three very pronounced divergences, and all three appear more than once, disclosing a rigid consistency such as is not found in Judges B. As far as we can judge from these few fragments, they differ mainly by their vocabulary, just as does Judges B; and just as Judges B is therefore not a fresh translation, but a very bold recast, $\Delta_3$ discloses a late modification of our current text. Besides, all the three important early papyri made known after the publication of Genesis in the larger Cambridge edition, viz. 911, 962 (both III\textsuperscript{p}), and 961 (IV\textsuperscript{p}), support our MSS against $\Delta_3$, which, furthermore, has nothing in common with the hexaplaric translators either.
EXCURSUS V

Confusion of ἐτερός and ἐταῖρος

The passages are arranged according to the different Hebrew equivalents.

1. Other, strange, new

There is an obvious mistake still left in the Stuttgart edition of Judg. 11:2 A and B texts: A text δι τι γυναῖκος ἔδω ἐταῖρος εἰ σὺ; B text δι τι ἔδω γυναῖκος ἐταῖρος σὺ. The MT reads ἐταιρίας γυναικός ἔτερας σὺ; and there can be no doubt that the equivalent of γυναικός can only be ἐτερός. ἐτερός is the most frequent equivalent of ΌΠΧ and is also the reading of the great majority of our MSS. It is found in A itself, in abc (= O-κά), gnow ptv (= L-ε), Nhyb (MN group -Μ) and, for the B text, in fijmra (Β group -Βeu). Of the translations only Eth. renders ἐτέρας. Vet. Lat. Lugd. throws light upon this corruption. It reads filius mulieris fornicariae, as it does in 11:1 where all have ἐρικος γυναικὸς πόρνης for ἐτερας γυναικῆς. The ἐτέρας of 11:2 was read in the light of πόρνης of 11:1 and accordingly considered to be an itacism. The Sixtine and B were the model for our editions; only Grabe and BM (1897) in their reproductions of cod. A kept ἐτέρας, which is relegated to the app. crit. by Tischendorf, Swete, and BM (1917). ἐτέρας must certainly be read in the A text, and in the B text as well, because in the latter it is supported by half the evidence and, besides, is almost unanimously attested by the MN group, which frequently draws on the B text. Moreover, although the B text is very late, we are entitled to correct its corruptions, unless they demonstrably repeat mistakes of a Vorlage.

It is in the nature of things that translations are here more revealing. Dan. 4:5 (8) ἰδεῖς finalis (εἰς ὥς Θ’) was misunderstood by the Qere as άλλος another. This would be = ἐτέρος; but our only evidence for it is Jerome’s information ‘ολ γ’ collega’ = ἐταῖρος.

Whereas our editions duly refrain from considering the variants with -αι- in Job 31:10 (Ῥήμα) and Sir. 11:6 (free amplification of the Hebrew), the free translation of Sir. 42:3 κληρονομίας (καὶ 70 k) ἐταίρων is equivocal, and in the course of their interpretation both Ryssel and Smend approximate to the meaning of ἐτέρων others.
CONFUSION OF ἐτέρος AND ἐταίρος

1.2. ἡ

It is natural to proceed from ἐτερος to ὁ strange with its many shades of meaning. For all of them ἀλλότριος is the prevailing equivalent. There is only one passage with ἐτερος, Exod. 30: 9 θυμίαμα ἐτερον frankincense oblation contrary to regulations, whereas Lev. 10: 1; Num. 3: 4; 26: 61 have πῦρ ἀλλότριον just as in the obelized part of the doublet Num. 16: 37 (17: 2) π. α. τοῦτο = ἄλλον, τὰ γυναικεῖα. Even the alienum at the margin of Syr. Exod. 30: 9 may go back to ἀλλότριον. With this ἐτερον we may compare the equally rare ἄλλος Job 19: 27. With this in mind we will not be tempted to touch Sir. 41: 20 (Ra. 22) ἀπὸ δρόσους γυναικός ἐταίρος = γυνὴ ἀλλοτριωτική, for this passage is put beyond doubt by its parallel Sir. 9: 3 γυναικὶ ἐταίρισμένη. Smend, who here straightforwardly translates einem buhlerischen Weibe and 41: 20 Hure, suggests that the LXX may have read ἄντι instead of ἄντι and refers to two further reasons: the first that ἄντι and ἄντι designate the strange woman who, far from home, may most easily fall to illicit intercourse; the other that Syriac ἀλλοτριωτικός is the word for adultery, just as even the male adulterer could be called ἢν and ἄντι (Sir. 23: 22, 23).

1.3. ζην

As to Ezek. 11: 19 καρδίαν ἐτέραν (MT ἄντις) καὶ πνεῦμα καινὸν Cornill and Bewer (BH3) may be right to emend ζην with ‘3 MSS Syr. Targ. Co.’ and the parallels in Ezekiel; but in spite of Eth. Syr. we cannot take for granted that the Greek ἐτέραν necessarily stands for ἄντις; for in Exod. 1: 8 the LXX renders ζην-ανίειν by βασιλεὺς ἐτερος (A’ ἄλλος; C’ δεύτερος; Θ’ καινός). This ἐτερος = ζην, if we are allowed to take this equation for granted, would be good Greek – compare Plato, Phileb. 13a, προσαγορεύεις αὐτὰ...ἐτέρω...ονόματι you call them further by a new name (LS I 4a).

2. Companion, friend

For words such as ἄλλος, ὁ ἐταίρος is the natural translation. Therefore in the A text of Judg. 14: 11 (ὑστερος) both BM in their separate edition of 1897 and Rahlfs rightly decide for ἐταίρος. This is supported by a minority of witnesses, the most important of which are the translations Arm. Eth. L., whereas AMN with most of the others read -ε-. For this secondary change of ἐταίρος into ἐτερος (i.e. for the opposite of what we found in Judg. 11: 2) there are several reasons.
Job 31:9 which has this secondary change was convincingly emended by Grabe. He apparently realized that γυναῖκι ἄνδρος ἐτέρου, 31:9a, as our modern editions still read in spite of Grabe, was nothing else than ἡμιλητής of v. 9a, combined with ἵνα of v. 9b, where it accordingly does not appear in the Greek, but is replaced by συντής. This ἱνα is bound to be ἐταίρου, and then ἄνδρος is secondary; for it could only come in after the corruption ἐτέρου had occurred. Whence this corruption? I am not sure whether Grabe asked this question; yet obviously it came from the following verse, where ἡμιλητής is correctly rendered ἐτέρου. This explanation is plausible in itself; but its plausibility is further enhanced by the observation that there are here still more deviations from the word-order of the MT: e.g. ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθῃ opens 9b in the MT, whereas ἐπὶ θύρας συντής is at the end of the Greek 9b. But for this observation one could have imagined that, as frequently in the Wisdom books, the last words of a stichus were transposed to the end of a neighbouring stichus. Here ἄνδρος ἐτέρου (or rather ἐταίρου without ἄνδρος) would have originally belonged to 9b, and after it had migrated to γυναῖκι, the gap was suitably filled by συντής.

Apart from the influence of the second word, when found in the vicinity or in similar passages, there is a second tendency which complicates the picture in numerous passages, and we have to be careful in disentangling it. The expression ἐτέρος πρός τόν ἐτέρον is found not only in the unfettered literary Greek of 1 Esdras 3 f., the tale of the three pages, but also in the early translations in good κοινή Greek, replacing the un-Greek imagery of the original: Gen. 31:49 ἐτέρος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐτέρου for οὐκ ἔσται; Isa. 13:8 ἐτέρος πρός τὸν ἐτέρον for ἐπὶ τῆς ἱλίου. When the same Greek phrase as in the closely related passages, Isa. 13:8 and 34:16, occurs in 34:14 for ἐπὶ τῆς ἱλίου, we realize that the translator, though well versed in Greek, is at a loss when facing rare words because there is not much of an exegetical tradition behind him (cf. 13:21). So in his embarrassment ἐπὶ τῆς ἱλίου induced him to read ἐπὶ τῆς ἱλίου as though it were ἱλίου. But he does not invariably keep to one pattern; thus in 34:15 he puts ἀλλήλων, where Θ' says ἐτέρα τῆν ἐτέραν in true Septuagint style, just as Isaiah LXX says in 34:16.

The same expression renders ἐπὶ τῆς ἱλίου Exod. 16:15; Num. 14:4 ἐτέρος τῷ ἐτέρῳ. When we find a similar translation of the feminine διόροις διὰ διάστημα in Ezek. Θ' 1:9; LXX 1:23; 3:13 (here ἐκκατέραν πρὸς τὴν ἐκκατέραν) we feel that even this translator, whose Greek cannot compare with that of the Pentateuch or Isaiah, simply had to
CONFUSION OF έτερος AND έταίρος

use this phrase, because here its subject (wings) was neuter and not personal as in the former examples.

Isa. 6: 3 says έτερος πρός τόν έτερον for a repeated Πτ of the Hebrew, just as it says οὕτως...καὶ οὕτως...καὶ έτερος for the three times repeated Πτ 44: 5. Similarly Job 1: 16 ff. Πτ - Ππ, τούτου λαλούντος ἔλθεν έτερος ἀγγελός (in 18 only S: genuine, or an adaptation to the preceding verses?).

In some Wisdom books of a later type we find a different way of rendering: Prov. 27: 17 ἄνηρ...έταίρου for ηπη...ςρ; similarly Eccles. 4: 4 ἄνηρ ἀπὸ τοῦ έταίρου αὐτοῦ for ηπηρ σρ. Here B, and with it our editions, are certainly correct in spelling -αυτοῦ; for after rendering σρ literally, one is bound to do the same with τοῦ. Yet there is a difference between the two passages; namely the addition of αὐτοῦ in the barbaric Aquila-like Greek of Ecclesiastes, which moreover would require the cancelling of τοῦ. The nature of this rendering with αὐτοῦ will be seen from the following observation, which is taken from the hexaplaric translations.

Gen. 31: 49, as we have seen, is one of the passages in which έτερος is correct, because it forms part of the stock phrase which is used here as in the other passages mentioned. Now min. f adds αὐτοῦ, and this can only mean that έταίρου αὐτοῦ was understood as a close reproduction of ΠΠΓΠ. This min. f belongs in Genesis to one of the smaller sub-groups, f(i)r, which J. Dahse (ΖΑΝ 28, 1908, pp. 14 ff.) wrongly considered to be the Lucianic recension – and Procksch with him in his exposition of Genesis (cf. E. Hautsch, ‘Der Lukiantext des Oktateuch’, MSU 1, 4 f. – NGG, Ph.-h. Kl., 1909, pp. 519 f.).

The type of text here displayed by f is seen from comparison with Num. 14: 4. There, for έτέρος we have the Origenian variant έταίρος αὐτοῦ Gck, έταίρος αὐτοῦ x Syr. Origen certainly wrote έταίρος, for έτέρος cannot be determined by a possessive.

Again, the type of text on which Origen drew can be seen from some quotations from the Three: Num. 14: 4 A’ ἄνηρ πρὸς ἁδελφόν αὐτοῦ; C’ ἐκαστος πρὸς (τὸν?) ἁδελφόν ξεαυτοῦ; Θ’ ἄνηρ πρὸς τὸν ἁδελφόν αὐτοῦ. Or Isa. 13: 8 A’ C’ Θ’ ἄνηρ πρὸς τὸν πλησιον αὐτοῦ; 34: 14 A’ C’ πρὸς (C’+τὸν?) έταίρον αὐτοῦ; Θ’ ἐτι τὸν πλησιον αὐτοῦ; 34: 15 A’ γυνὴ έταίρον αὐτής; C’ ἐκαστη τὴν έταίρον αὐτής.

It is this unreasonably close adherence to the peculiarities of the Hebrew which brought about the έταίρον (-φ) αὐτοῦ in the Origenian groups of Gen. 31: 49 and Num. 14: 4 and perhaps in other passages where it did not survive.
EXCURSUSES

The interesting point here is that, apart from Eccles. 4: 4 and A' C' Isa. 34: 14 f., where ἐταίρον, ἐταίρον is kept, the Three differ from Origen. They put πλησίον Isa. 13: 8, Θ' Isa. 34: 14 = ἔγερ, or ἀδελφόν = πῆς A' C' Θ' Num. 14: 4. When, on the other hand, Origen keeps to ἐταίρος, we may imagine that he wished to remain closer to the text of the old Septuagint by simply adding αὐτοῦ. It may not have occurred to him that in so doing he was bound to change over from ἐτερος to ἐταιρος which, but for the accent, had by that time become its homonym. (For further remarks on homonyms, see pp. 175-96.)
EXCURSUS VI

Confusion of κτησ- and κτισ-

This confusion is in some part due to itacism, yet to a greater extent to a difference of interpretation of the Hebrew, in which the verb may have more than one meaning. Since this does not apply to nominal derivations, it is best to take the noun first.

1. The noun

In spite of frequent itacistic confusion the true meaning is very rarely doubtful, even when in the Apocrypha there is no Hebrew original to guide us. For instance, κτίσει Wisd. of Sol. 2: 6, which stands as the parallel of τῶν ὄντων ἀγαθῶν, might possibly be κτήσει = κτήμασιν (as collective, LS II 2) possessions, property, as Risberg tentatively suggested. The following sentences, however, obviously enumerate the gifts of creation = κτίσις (AV the creatures), and this is still more clearly seen when instead of ἡμῶν, v. 9, we read λειμῶν, following the doublet in the Latin and some stray Greek evidence. In Sir. 43: 25 the reading κτίσις κητών has been rightly adopted by Smend and Rahlfs; possibly we could improve on it by putting the plural κτίσεις, which does occur elsewhere, Tobit 8: 5, 15 (B-text), and would be still closer to the original niliai, monsters.

We can speak with more confidence where there is a Hebrew original all through. Some rather controversial passages are found in the Psalms. In Ps. 104 (105): 21 κτήσεως is certainly correct, as is indicated by the parallel οἴκου, and in 103 (104): 24, though only Ga, possessione, and the Three read κτήσεως, Rahlfs rightly adopted it after Grabe (praef. vol. iv). In both instances the Hebrew word is נוי, but in the latter the word appears in many MSS in the plural, which would lead to the unique meaning creature. The only really controversial passage is Ps. 73 (74): 18 where B' Sa. R' enlarge τοῦτος = נוי by adding τῆς κτίσεως σου. Should it be interpreted creation or possession? The former is correct if we understand the beginning of 18 as referring to vv. 12–17, which indeed are a praise of God's creative activity in the universe. But against this there stands the observation that the same verse 18 is concerned with abuse of God and blasphemy against his
name. And that this is the main and overriding subject of the whole Psalm is shown by the fact that v. 10 is almost identical in content and wording with v. 18, and the same idea recurs at the end, v. 22. There are other links which connect v. 18 with the main subject of the Psalm: in v. 2 God is entreated remember thy congregation ἡς ἐκτῆσω ἀπ᾿ ἀρχῆς, and this is taken up most effectively in v. 18 μνήσθητι ταύτης τῆς κτήσεως σου. From this I gather that the addition is genuine, the more so as it is very strongly attested. But it makes sense only if κτήσεως and not κτίσεως is read; for it continues the thought of vv. 2 and 10 and so shows that vv. 12–17 are but a parenthesis. This is confirmed by the interpretation of the psalm as a whole, even if we refrain, as we rightly do, from introducing the enlargement of the LXX into the Hebrew. It is what Wellhausen taught us to consider an explicitum, here an appropriate one in the appropriate place. One could even argue with some likelihood that the addition alone represents the original Greek, whereas ταύτης = ἡς, though omitted by none, came in at a revision stage.

2. The verb

Here two facts must be kept in mind throughout. In the Greek κτάσθαι is a deponent so that confusion with κτίσειν might be expected only in a few tenses, mainly aor. and fut. pass. What goes beyond this limit must be regarded as deliberate re-interpretation rather than corruption. In the Hebrew נָב is used everywhere, including those passages where it is traditionally interpreted to create. Since this meaning cannot be easily reconciled with the basic meaning to acquire (by purchase), as a mere connotation, it has been recently suggested that there are two homonymous roots, נָב 1 to acquire and נָב 2 to create. The suggestion has been accepted in Koehler’s Lexicon.

If we had to deal with the LXX alone, there would be very few difficulties, for its equivalent of נָב is almost everywhere κτάσθαι. Therefore the few passages with κτίσειν are suspect. κτάσθαι is the true interpretation of נָב, as will be seen from the interpretation of a few passages.

In Exod. 15: 16 δ λαός σου δν ἐκτήσω = הָנָב וַיִּשְׁנוּ is identical in meaning with 15: 13 τὸν λαόν σου τούτον δν ἐλυτρώσω = הָנָב וַיִּשְׁנוּ. Similarly in Ps. 73 (74): 2 ἐκτήσω = הָנָב and ἐλυτρώσω = הָנָב follow one another as synonyms in a parallelism. The continuation presents a further similarity with Exod. 15, the object of ἐλυτρώσω being βάρδου κληρονομίας σου = הָנָב וַיִּשְׁנוּ. This whole setting is deutero-
nomistic. God’s relation to his chosen people is expressed in terms of acquisition by ransom and ownership by inheritance. Its first expression is κληρονομία allotted or inherited property Exod. 15: 17, (λαόν) ἕγκληρον Deut. 4: 20, (τὸν λαόν σου καί) τὴν μερίδα σου Deut. 9: 26, (λαός σου καί) κληρός σου Deut. 9: 29. Others are God’s πληροσ portion = μερίς and his lot of possession = σχολίσμα κληρονομίας Deut. 32: 9. He has ransomed Israel and this therefore is his κληρονομία Ps. 73 (74): 2 and his = (λαός) περιούσιος Exod. 19: 5; Deut. 7: 6; 14: 2; 26: 18. It is easy to realize that in this context the idea of creation is neither required nor even suitable. ἐκτήσω is the appropriate rendering, and so is the meaning acquired = made his own, brought under his rule. The same must be said about Ps. 77 (78): 54 (an allusion to Exod. 15: 17) with its mention of Mount Sion ἐκτήσατο ή δεξιά σου. The objection that Sion always belonged to God since he created it is pedantic. It fails to realize that the sacred poet identifies God’s purpose with the victorious campaign of his chosen people. There is a complete parallel in a Ugaritic hymn (1 Aqht. 220) where Gordon should not translate he created the abode; for dyqny ddm simply means acquired (by any means, including making, after Burney’s explanation of the biblical usage, JTS 27, 1925/6, pp. 160 ff.).

We are now prepared to consider three more passages in which ἐπιθεῖ πρώτως heads a sequence of further verbs and is almost universally taken to mean to produce, create, even procreate. The first, Deut. 32: 6b, is the closest parallel to Exod. 15: 16 f. Here too the object of ἐπιθεῖ is σου, and some of the verbs following are the same in both passages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Vulgate</th>
<th>Luther</th>
<th>AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιθεῖ σου</td>
<td>numquid non</td>
<td>Ist er nicht</td>
<td>Is not he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σου πατήρ</td>
<td>ipse est</td>
<td>pater tuus,</td>
<td>dein Vater</td>
<td>thy father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκτήσατό σε</td>
<td>qui possidet te</td>
<td>und dein</td>
<td>that has bought thee?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ εποιησέν σε</td>
<td>et fecit</td>
<td>Ist’s nicht</td>
<td>Has he not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐκτίσεν σε</td>
<td>et creavit te?</td>
<td>er allein,</td>
<td>made thee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐκτίσεν σε</td>
<td>et creavit te?</td>
<td>der dich</td>
<td>gemacht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the LXX and the AV agree in understanding ἐπιθεῖ as acquire. On the other hand Jerome’s possidet follows an interpretation which he expressly advocates elsewhere, and Burney has lucidly explained that
it reflects the dogmatical views of his Jewish advisers who interpreted
ownership, but suppressed the qualification by acquisition. Luther's dein
Herr might look like rendering a participle "ij? ; but it is more likely that
he either follows Jerome, though with an admirable improvement of
diction, or draws independently on Jewish interpretation. 'Onkelos
paraphrases "ij? who begat thee by ΠΝΕ and thou art his, doubtless in
order to obviate the anthropomorphism of the original' (Burney,
p. 163 n. 1). The last verb, ΠΗ Hiphil, is correctly rendered by Luther
and the AV, but ξκίσεν and creavit, its translation in the Vulgate,
would be unique. A glance at the app. crit., however, gives the expla­
nation. και ξκίσεν se is missing from Bb' and is read earlier in the verse,
instead of ξκίσεστο, by g, a Lucianic MS, and Eth. Moreover, a good
number of MSS, including the remainder of the Lucianic, have
ξλασσαν as a third verb = 1^*· It is therefore safe to infer that this
unusual ξκίσεν is but a a misplaced correction of ξκτίσατο, and we
shall come back to this inference later. It means that the original
translation of ξκίσασα was lost at an early date. Exod. 15: 16 uses
ξτομασασα and for our passage ξτομασασα is recorded as A''s rendering.
It is the obvious one.

The common interpretation produced, made, and established thee (S. R.
Driver) should therefore be abandoned. Instead the first verb is
acquired, made his own, became (made himself) Master of, as in our first
series of examples. [Similarly in Gen. 4: 1 ξκτίσαμην άνθρωπον (the
etymological explanation of the name Cain) – though here the subject
is human. In this passage there are no variants. Philo supports the LXX
both in his quotations cher. 40, 124 and his exposition καιν = κτήσις,
which extends through cher. 40–130, especially 124 ff. Wherever in his
treatises he expounds this verse or allegorizes Cain, he returns to this
interpretation. He applies it likewise to Θοβελ (Gen. 4: 22 = σύμπασα
τότε, post. Cain 114) Καιν, as was brought out by Tischendorf's neat
emendation κτησάμενοι instead of στησ-. Josephus, too, pictures Cain
as πονηρότατος (cf. Philo, fug. 64, τό κακίας σύμβολον) και πρός τό
κερδαίνειν μόνον ἀποθέλετον (A ι, 53).] The idea of creation is certainly
implicit, but in the second verb ξποίσασα rather than in the first. The
latter merely preludes the detailed description given by the following
two verbs.

Our two further examples, too, have God as the subject, and here
also ψηφ is the first of a number of verbs. Admittedly the object here is
not God’s ψηφ or ψηφ, but a child, but this difference should not be
exaggerated. This caution is based on the simple fact that here we are
CONFUSION OF ΚΤΗΣ- AND ΚΤΙΣ-

not so much concerned with what is described by the subsequent verbs as with the place within the sentence of the first verb, and its relation to those following. As far as the Hebrew is concerned, both Ps. 138 (139): 13 f. and Prov. 8: 22 f. describe the formation of a child by a sequence of verbs of which כֹּל is the first and (after Prov. 8: 23 has been emended), כִּסֵּס to weave the second. Still more: exactly as in Deut. 32: 6 there follow other verbs that unmistakably denote creation or even procreation, וַיַּעֲשֶׂה I was made, formed [Professor D. Winton Thomas suggests that this is probably וַיִּשְׁמָא I was covered. Ed.] and וַיַּעֲשֶׂה I was wrought out in Ps. 138 (139): 15; וַיַּשְׂרֵא I was born in Prov. 8: 24 f. (cf. Deut. 32: 18). To return to the first verb, the LXX of Ps. 138 (139): 13 has ἐκτήσω τοὺς νεφροὺς μου. In Prov. 8: 22 our editions read κέκτησέν με with the great majority of our evidence. Codd. V 252, however (but not the third-century Antinoopolis Papyrus 8, which elsewhere frequently joins them and has a peculiar text), and the Three read έκτήσατο, and this is likely to reflect the later school, culminating in the Three. In addition, there is an early witness for έκτήσατο: Philo has it in de ebr. 31, both in the quotation and throughout his comment, a fact which excludes the explanation of later tampering. Moreover, Philo’s whole argument ceases to make sense if έκτήσατο but not the third-century Antinoopolis Papyrus 8, which elsewhere frequently joins them and has a peculiar text), and the Three read έκτήσατο, and this is likely to reflect the later school, culminating in the Three. In addition, there is an early witness for έκτήσατο: Philo has it in de ebr. 31, both in the quotation and throughout his comment, a fact which excludes the explanation of later tampering. Moreover, Philo’s whole argument ceases to make sense if έκτήσατο but not έκτήσατο of our evidence is due to a revisor’s complete success. For this secondary replacement of έκτήσατο by έκτήσεν, I refer to the explanation given above of the variants found in Deut. 32: 6. The upshot is that in the three passages which have κτήσες as the first of a sequence of verbs, the LXX understood acquired and translated κτήσθαι. In this the translators were quite right.

Their unanimity provides us with the standards of judgement when, finally, we are faced with the only instance of an uncontested κτίσθαι, Gen. 14: 19, 22 δὲ κτίσεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν = תַּחְתַּם הַשָּׁמָיִם. Here BH has a note in the second apparatus of variants, ‘LXX, Vulg. Targ. Syr. = creator’. But according to the principles underlying the apparatus criticus this note ought to be in the first apparatus containing unapproved readings: the κτίσεν of our evidence is due to a revisor’s complete success.

If thus κτάσθαι and κτήσις are seen to be the original translation of
EXCURSUSES

In our context the more important thing is that variants and marginal readings of our MSS of the Hebrew Sirach more than once replace הָניָּפֶל by אָבוּר or אָבַר. For הָניָּפֶל our scrutiny has shown that there is no reliable instance any more than in Ugaritic or Phoenician. In the Greek the only certain instances suggesting the meaning create for הָניָּפֶל are in Sirach where הָניָּפֶל is represented by קְטִּיהֶה, correctly in 34 (31): 13, but everywhere else incorrectly. Where the Apocrypha have קְטִּיהֶה or קְטִסִּים, אָבוּר or one of the other verbs is the model, and the same applies to the NT. In this context it is worth while calling to mind that Mark 10: 6 אֶלָּדוֹן בַּלַּדַּה קְטִּישָׁהוֹס is reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls (the Damascus Fragments) by יִרְשֶׁה הַמֶּרְגָּמִית as was seen by J. L. Teicher (JJS v, 1954, p. 38). The new conception create was expressed by אָבַר, but even this was not rendered קְטִּיהֶה in the Pentateuch except on one occasion only in Deut. 4: 32. Instances of הָניָּפֶל create are found only during the stage of transmission, viz. the variant of Deut. 32: 6 and the interpolation of Gen. 14: 19, 22; they are the work of Christian revisors and may well reflect NT usage.

The fact that in both verbs the connotation create took such a long time to gain ascendancy is due to concurring factors. On the one hand Greek קְטִּיהֶה firmly retained its original meaning to people, found, even
in the Hellenistic period. On the other, the idea of creation is so abstract that it is bound to have achieved predominance only at a more advanced stage of sophistication. The earliest Hebrew conception of creation sees in it a species of craftsmanship (טש, רצוי); the Deuteronomistic school described it in terms of an economic process (לך, תלע). There is nothing in the LXX proper to indicate that the translators went beyond the stages reached in the Hebrew. The novel conception emerged with אֵרֶב, but even אֵרֶב is not rendered κτίσιν in the Pentateuch, with the exception of Deut. 4: 32. The Greek translators were slow to follow the new achievement of the Hebrew. לְכֵה has hardly any part at all in this development.
I propose to give an enumeration of all passages, arranged according to their meaning and, consequently, accentuation.

τρυγητός/τρυγητός. τρυγητός must be read with Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler Mic. 7: 1, with Swete and Rahlfs Lev. 26: 5, with Rahlfs and Ziegler Amos 4: 7; 9: 13; Isa. 24: 13, with Rahlfs Sir. 24: 27, but τρυγητός with Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler Joel 1: 11, with Swete and Rahlfs Judg. 8: 2, A and Β texts, 1 Sam. 8: 12; 13: 21, with Swete and Ziegler Isa. 32: 10, with Swete Joel 4: 13; Isa. 16: 9.

αμητος/άμητός. In the same way we must read αμητος with our editions Gen. 45: 6; Exod. 34: 21; 2 Kings 19: 29; Prov. 6: 8; 10: 5; 20: 4; 25: 13; 26: 1; Mic. 7: 1; Isa. 9: 2; 18: 4; Jer. 8: 20, but αμητος with our editions Deut. 16: 9; 23: 25; 24: 19; Ruth 2: 21; Prov. 6: 11a; Isa. 17: 5, 11; 23: 3, with Rahlfs 4 Macc. 2: 9, with Swete Jer. 28 (51): 33.

αλόητος/άλοητός. Rahlfs (with Schleusner 1, 188) twice rightly prefers the variant άλοητός threshing-time Lev. 26: 5; Amos 9: 13 to αμητος harvest-time. Although there is no express prescription for this word in the ancient grammarians, analogy would suggest the accentuation άλοητος which I proposed in 1936, after Schleusner 1, 168.

Most of the passages, and above all the uncontested ones, need no comment, the following do.

In Joel 4: 13 the Hebrew reads הָרֶשֶׁה the corn to be reaped (G.-Buhl), thus obviously speaking of the fruit on the field. The LXX renders τρυγητός, as of wine. I can understand Rahlfs’ and Ziegler’s changed accentuation τρυγητός only if they mistook παρέστηκεν for has come, is at hand and so thought that this could only apply to harvest-time; παρέστηκεν, however, is a close translation of ό πρώιμος σπόρος παραστήθη OGI 56.68 (Egypt, III*); so prob. ή γη παρέστηκεν P. Lille 8* (III*)’. The parallel of the fruit waiting on the field to be reaped and the grapes waiting in the press to be trodden is too close to be neglected,
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and I think this correct interpretation is behind the translation of the Vulgate maturavit messis, following which Luther translates die Ernte ist reif and AV the harvest is ripe.

Likewise in Isa. 16: 9 the Hebrew certainly speaks of the act of harvesting which was disturbed, but the Greek, in a very loose translation, or rather guess-work, introduces the idea of καταπατεϊν which is also in Joel 4: 13. It reads έπι τφ θερισμφ και έπι τφ τρυγητφ σου καταπατήσω, και πάντα πεσούνται. As in Joel 4: 13 and its free quotation, Rev. 14: 15 (ξηρανθη έ θερισμός, Vulg. aruit messis, Luther die Ernte ist dürr geworden, AV the harvest is ripe) the standing crop is meant, which cannot be classified apart from the fruit. Therefore we must not follow Rahlfs and Ziegler who accent τρυγήτω.

In the same way in Isa. 32: 10 the translator has noticeably modified the Hebrew original. Here Swete is right, but we must insert δ σπόρος και which is omitted in B. The LXX appears to understand the crop is come to an end, the seed is gone, άναλωθήναι in the other Isaian passage where it is used (66: 17 for ηΐο) also means come to an end, elsewhere to be consumed (cf. Gal. 5: 15 to be completely eaten up); σπόρος, in the parallel, means the seed, as it does in the NT.

In 4 Macc. 2: 9 άμητος means corn-field, as in Deut. 23: 25, and therefore Rahlfs is right in putting the same form in both passages.

In Jer. 28 (51): 33 it is not easy to reach a decision. Rahlfs writes ήξει δ σμητος σωτης. He may have been influenced by the second τφ in the Hebrew which, however, is missing not only in the LXX, where the accentuation σμητος may have been meant to supersede it, but also in Syr. Targ. and consequently cancelled by OT critics. I would prefer to suppose that ήξει (τφ) made him think of an approaching time, as παρέστηκεν had done in Joel 4: 13. Yet the idea that the fruit comes to the waiting threshing-floor is so striking that I see no reason to avoid it in our Greek, which must accordingly be σμητος. (For καιρός άλωης C' Jer. 28 (51): 33 see p. 129.)


EXCURSUS VIII

Ø and ø in the LXX and NT

I. General information

Our grammars do not say much about the problems involved. For this Blass gives the reason: 'Die Interjektionen sind bloße Empfindungslaute und sind daher für die Grammatik bedeutungslos' (K.-Blass I, II, 252). But he at least suggests something of the differentiation mentioned, whereas Gerth in the later volumes devoted to the Syntax, apart from a line in his Index, which refers to Øμοι (II, 1, 388a) does not even mention the spelling Ø. Therefore, for many points of interest, especially those which have not been given a fresh aspect by the comparative linguistics of the last century, we do well to turn back to Philipp Buttmann's outstanding Griechische Sprachlehre (π², Berlin, 1839). On half a page he not only gives the facts, but proceeds to explain them by the simple means of appending his remarks to his paragraph on the prepositions. A disyllabic preposition, so he argues, is generally proclitic with a grave on the last syllable; for it is so closely connected with the oblique case which it governs that it keeps no accent of its own. Apart from this, we have remnants of an earlier stage in what we may properly call 'postpositions'. They can even supersede a verb so that πόρος stands for πόρεστιν, ἐν for ἐνεστιν, as real adverbs. ἰπο, independently of its position, is an adverb meaning remote from. So, says Buttmann, Ø is the independent form, and ø the proclitic. 'One understands therefore that out of Ø (*Øo) came Ø (*øo), precisely as ὑπο came out of ὑπο; and only its nature as an interjection prevented it from becoming entirely unaccented like ως.' And in a footnote he adds, 'I consider this accentuation so sufficiently well substantiated that I must not follow the MSS which have transmitted it in many places, in those where they abandon it' (π², 379). A glance at our usual Greek texts shows how timely his considerations still are today. Now we have a judicious article in LS and a section well supported by evidence in M. Johannesson, 1, 8–11, which, however, do not render the following remarks superfluous.

In classical Greek the addressing and invoking Ø reached its zenith in Attic speech, after very slight beginnings in Homer and Hesiod. However, it had become so obsolete in vernacular Hellenistic that we
ought to explain the special intention of every example in the LXX as also in the NT. Hebrew has nothing comparable, and this ought to be always before our mind when we are concerned with a translation from it. On the other hand, there are plenty of affective exclamation lavishly used in Hebrew. So whenever we find an ώ in a biblical text, our first task is to try to trace it back to the Hebrew original and from that to define its real nature. A clear perception of this is behind Wellhausen's remark referring to Matt. 15: 28 ώ γύναι, expressing astonishment, 'Sonst findet sich ώ in den Evangelien nur als Droh- und Weheruf, aber nicht vor dem einfachen Vokativ' (Ev. Matth. 1 p. 80). In the light of his statement, and on the basis of the observations I propose to make regarding the use of interjections in the LXX, some closing remarks about ώ in NT might prove useful.

2. Statistics

First some statistics. There is no ώ of any kind in 28 books, including most of the historical books, and in the remaining 22 books there are 80 instances, to which 4 Maccabees, a book which is not written in LXX Greek, contributes almost half. In the other books the number is fairly small: 1 in Genesis, Numbers, Tobit B and S text, Job, Wisdom of Solomon, Baruch, 2 Maccabees; 2 in Daniel LXX; 2 in Psalms, Proverbs, Sirach; 4 in 2 Kings, 1 Esdras, Ezekiel; 5 in Jeremiah; and 36 in 4 Maccabees. Not more than 6 instances with certainty display a truly vocative ώ, most of the others are the exclamative ώ. 4 Maccabees, which stands by itself, requires some special consideration.

3. Exclamative particles apart from ώ

Two observations should at once be made here.

(1) The exclamative ώ does not stand alone in rendering Hebrew exclamative particles. So, along with it, we find οὐ rendered by δέομαι, κύριε, in the good Greek of Joshua (7: 7), by mere transcription ο횟ς in Judges, by οὓμου Ezek. 9: 8; 11: 13 (οὕμου, κύριε), equivalent to ώ, κύριε, of 2 Kings 6: 5, 15), or by μηδαμώς, also with following κε, Ezek. 4: 14; 21: 5.

οὐ is rendered by ώ Ps. 114: 4; 115: 7; 117: 25 bis, Jonah 4: 2, more slavishly (including the οὐ-ντ-) by οὐ δή 2 Kings 20: 3, by μη δή 2 Esdras 11: 5, by μηδαμώς Jonah 1: 14, more freely by δέομαι Exod. 32: 31, as Josh. 7: 7 for οὐ and Gen. 19: 18 for οὐντ-, and is wholly
omitted from the good Greek of Gen. 50:17, where Aquila inserts a δη, and Isa. 38:3, where the Three and with them the recensions Ο (ο) C fill out the phrase by ο δη, Κ, exactly as the translation runs in the parallel, 2 Kings 20:3, the late translator of which has many traits in common with the Three. All translations of Ο and, with the exception of Judg. 11:35 where θυγατέρ υου follows, all those of ΟΟΟΟ are followed by the vocative κύριε, a fact to which we shall return.

For ΟΙ and ΟΙ, besides Ο (Aquila has the transliteration ωϊ), we find οιμοι and ουσι (this preponderant in Isaiah where ο τάλας έγώ 6:5 is an isolated classical reminiscence, well fitted to the sublime note of this passage). Ο and ουσι do not indicate any difference of meaning: Hab. 2:6, 19 ουσι δ, Hab. 2:9, 15 ο δ, all of them with a participle following. All three are found in the same verse Jer. 22:18: ουσι επι τον άνδρα τούτον, which, though missing from the MT, may well reflect the true text, "Ω άδελφε (ΑΟΟΟ οιμοι, OL οιμοι, assimilating in different ways), and ΟΙΜΟΙ κύριε (Ο L' Bo).4

For ΟΟΟΟ, expressing real or malicious joy, we find, along with a solitary Ο (Sir. 41:2, following a reproaching ο = ους 41:1), εύγε in Psalms and Ezekiel, and some good free translations.6

(2) Commenting upon ο τέκνον, Gen. 27:20, Johannesson 1, 9, says that in this chapter there are twelve vocatives, all without ο, six of them τέκνον. Similarly the four instances of ο, κύριε, in Ps. 114, 115, 117 are completely isolated among hundreds of simple vocatives κύριε in Psalms.

4. Conclusions

4.1. ο

Our conclusions are clear and far-reaching. Wherever ο represents an exclamative particle of the Hebrew original, it must be taken as an exclamation in Greek and, consequently, accented ο, as has been done tacitly in the foregoing paragraphs. There is nothing in these passages to justify dealing with ο differently from οιμοι (cf. οιμοι = ο μοι) and ουσι; even the occurrence of a vocative like κύριε must not mislead us, as ο here belongs to the whole sentence, and κύριε consequently must be included in commas. This ο introduces either a commandment (imperative or jussive in Hebrew) or an impassioned statement, sometimes in the form of a question. So we must spell ο 2 Kings 3:10; 6:5, 15 (= οιμοι); Num. 24:23; Isa. 6:5; Ezek. 22:3 (conjectured in ΜΤ); 24:6 (= οισ); 2 Kings 20:3 (ο δη, κύριε); Ps. 114:4; 115:7; 117:25
contains a mix of biblical references and commentary on the use of certain Greek words in the Septuagint and New Testament.

**4.2. ὰ**

ἀδερ, on the other hand, preceding a vocative – or a nominative taking its place – and giving it one or the other traditional nuance, is found only in some books which disclose a higher standard of Greek (numbers 1, 4, 5 of Thackeray's classification, Grammar p. 13) and is fairly rare even there. The six certain examples mentioned in (2) on p. 229, are Gen. 27: 20; Job 19: 21; Prov. 6: 6; 8: 4; Wisd. of Sol. 6: 9; 2 Macc. 7: 34, about which Johannessohn 1, 9 f., may be consulted.

**4.3. Doubtful instances**

Two further groups are more equivocal.

(1) One is represented by the speeches of the three pages in 1 Esdras 3 and 4. The inconsistency which they disclose is rather veiled by Johannessohn's statement, 'Ihre Reden beginnen oder schließen entweder mit ἄνδρες (3: 17, 3: 34) oder ὰ ἄνδρες (3: 24, 4: 2, 12, 32)'. The setting is the same everywhere, each speaker beginning with his demonstrandum and ending with his demonstratum, putting it as a question everywhere and prefixing an allocution, e.g. 3: 17 ἄνδρες, πῶς ὁ ὀίνος; As the third speaker really has two subjects, the praise of Ἁλήθεια from 4: 34 onwards being superimposed on the old story praising the sovereign power of ὰ γυναῖκες, we have in fact four speeches. Now three of the four speeches, 1 (3: 17), 3a (4: 14), 3b (4: 34), begin with a mere ἄνδρες, and the first three of them end with ὰ ἄνδρες: 1 (3: 24), 2 (4: 12), 3a (4: 32), whereas 3b very appositely ends differently, in silent praise. The only inconsistency is the beginning of 2 (4: 2) with ὰ ἄνδρες. But since there is a variant at the beginning of
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3ª (4: 14), A reading ὦ ἀνδρεῖς instead of the ἀνδρεῖς of the others, I submit that the beginning of 2 (4: 2) with its unanimous ὦ ἀνδρεῖς may indicate a corruption affecting the whole evidence, though in 4: 14 it is confined to A. If I were right, there would be a difference dividing all the beginnings on the one hand and the endings on the other. Now Johannessohn makes the point that ὦ is intended to rouse the attention of the listeners, and in Wisd. of Sol. 6: 9 the kings, after being addressed by a mere vocative in 6: 1, are called to fresh attention by an ὦ, and that the same applies to Prov. 8: 5 after 8: 4 (1, 10) – and, following him, also to Baruch 3: 24 after 3: 9. So it is obvious that our solution would make good sense in 1 Esdras. If this is so, we should spell ὦ here, as all editions do. But there is still another alternative, on account of which I put these passages among the doubtful ones. As mentioned, all the sentences of the speakers are questions, and questions, like imperatives and impassioned exclamations, are often introduced by an ὦ, which in this instance is prefixed to the sentence as a whole and therefore is ὦ and not ὦ, even if an appositive vocative (or nominative) follows it.

(2) In Daniel LXX we twice read ὦ Δανιήλ, introducing an excited question asked by the king. In 6: 20 (21) there is no exclamative particle in the MT, so we may safely read ὦ here; 5: 16 is a free rendering, so that we cannot draw any conclusions from the original. We may therefore here acquiesce in ὦ equally, always keeping in mind the alternative possibility, which is supported by the fact that we have an impassioned question following.

5. 4 Maccabees

It was said above that 4 Maccabees requires some special treatment. It is not written in the Greek of the translated books, nor quite in any other fixed type. Although one sees the author's models, it must be said that he overdoes rather than follows them: so his high-flown language is something entirely peculiar. This is obviously so in his use of ὦ, which is indeed excessive. And we are not too much astonished at finding in this book all instances of ὦ printed as vocative ὦ in HR, Swete, and Rahlfs. Certainly this is mistaken, as we shall presently see; but one sometimes doubts whether the author, ambitious as he is and anxious to equal the best models, has full command of the finesses of language of which he makes such an excessive use.
There are 22 examples of an unequivocal use of ώ. They include invocations of deceased heroes like Eleazar, the seven brethren, and their mother. Johannesson illustrates this from Epictetus, who uses ώ with proper names only when addressing great men of the past. ώ in addressing those still alive is mainly found when indignation or exasperation is to be expressed. But there is an unsound accumulation of rhetorical addresses of abstract things such as ideas, qualities, natural laws. Yet all these are grammatically sound, whatever one may think of them from the point of view of taste. In a few passages, however, one may doubt to what extent this strained style is factually based upon sufficient mastery of literary Greek and its niceties which the author attempts to force into his service.

So, to give a few examples, we read, side by side, ώ βασιλέων λογισμοί... 14: 2 and, immediately following, ώ ιερος... συμφωνίας 14: 3. Here at least, one can hardly detect any difference of meaning. 14: 3 is certainly an exclamation, yet 14: 2, though supported by other examples in the book, is not an obvious address, however rhetorical, at least if taken together with what follows. One cannot help feeling that the author is overtaxing both the resources of Greek speech and his own capacity.

A similar complex, which is hard to disentangle, exists in the sixteenth chapter, vv. 6 ff., in the lamentation of the hero-mother for herself: 6 is a self-address, as is 10, yet between them we have first (7) ώ μάταιοι... κυοφορίαι etc., which is still more stilted, if taken as an invocation, and would be sounder as an exclamation which could very well allow a nominative; then (8) an address to her deceased sons in an apposition ἐφ' ύμιν, ώ παῖδες; finally (9) the following, which, as it is given in our editions, would form an address similar to v. 8 - ώ τῶν ἐμῶν παῖδων οἱ μὲν ἄγαμοι, οἱ δὲ γήμαντες ἀνόνητοι. Yet it is not quite impossible to put a colon after παῖδων, taking the first four words to be a call of distress and the rest a new sentence, tersely put without copula. I rather doubt whether any genuinely Greek stylist would allow himself so unhomogeneous a series of five ώs.

The sequence presented in 17: 2-4 is slightly better, since the σὺ in 3 removes any ambiguity from ώ μήτηρ in 2 and 4.
5.2. ο

It remains to classify the remaining 14 (10) examples for which I claim the exclamatory ο. There are 3 self-addresses, 16: 6, 10, and especially 8: 17 ο τάλανες ἡμεῖς, which, of course, cannot be accented differently from ο τάλας εγώ, Isa. 6: 5. There are four further exclamations concerning abstract things which are given as genitives, 7: 15; 11: 20; 14: 3 (see above); 18: 20.

In 15: 4 we have an ο introducing a rhetorical question, the answer being given in the sequel. Here it is impossible to imagine any allocution; so we are bound to write ο, τίνα τρόπον ἠθολογήσαμι...; 8

There are two similar examples in the same chapter, and we must not be misled by the fact that here ο is followed by real vocatives. In both instances 15: 1, 13, an exclamation states the existence of wondrous powers whose influence on human beings is shown in the words immediately following. The natural thing here would have been to put genitives after ο, though even nominatives would have been possible. All these constructions, including the vocative, would admit the exclamative ο.

14: 7 f. is hardly less ambiguous, the only difference being that the sevenfold number of brethren is a slightly more concrete quantity (ο πανάγιε συμφώνων ἀδελφῶν ἐβδομάς); but the decisive thing is that what is said about them follows in the third person. Have we not here an exclamation rather than an address or invocation? It is evident that we are left here with the awkward task of a teacher who has not so much to correct, as to interpret, a sentence in his pupil’s imperfect script. In instances like these our solution cannot be more definite than the difficulty has been in the mind of our pupil. Yet the teacher at least is bound to make things clear to himself, and so are we as interpreters. In any case, observations like these are a help towards characterizing an author’s speech and frame of mind.

Including the equivocal instances discussed above I propose to read the exclamative ο in the following passages: 7: 15; 8: 17; 11: 20; 14: 2, 3, 7; 15: 1, 4, 13; 16: 6, 7, 9, 10; 18: 20, fourteen in all, among which 14: 7; 16: 9, and also 15: 1, 13, are open to some doubt.


It remains to draw the consequences for the text of the NT.
There is first an address, expressing astonishment, ὅ γυναι Matt. 15: 28; then addresses with stronger (1 Tim. 6: 20; Acts 13: 10) or weaker (Rom. 2: 1, 3; Jas. 2: 20) effect. In Acts there are examples closer to Attic usage, among them 1: 1 in the carefully composed proem, and 18: 14; 27: 21.

In the remaining instances we should accent ὅ. Two of them introduce affective questions, Luke 24: 25 ὅ ἄνόητοι, οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει...;, and Mark 9: 19, with parallels Matt. 17: 17; Luke 9: 41 (ὅ γενεᾶ ἄπιστος, ἐξετ πῶς...). I wonder whether we should not deal in the same way with Rom. 9: 20, ὅ ἄνθρωπε, μενοῦν ὅσ σὺ τίς εἴ;, where two questions precede and a chain of questions follows throughout to the end of the chapter, interrupted only by the series of OT quotations vv. 24–9. Yet, perhaps, μενοῦν ὅσ rather suggests a decision in the opposite direction, as, in any case, in Rom. 2: 3, with its many questions, the vocative ὅ ἄνθρωπε is safeguarded by 2: 1.

If thus Rom. 2: 3 may best be left in suspense, there is no doubt, on the other hand, about Gal. 3: 1, where the whole series of questions is opened by the woeful exclamation ὅ ἄνοητοι Γαλάται, τίς υμῶς ἰδάσκαλον;.

Further, we have the prayerful exclamation in Rom. 11: 33 ὅ βάθος πλοῦτου... continuing with the exclamation ὅς ἀνεξερεύνητα... leading to the questions in the quotation 34 f. and ending in the most solemn statement of 36 with its Amen, the whole being an act of adoration, leaving no room for addressing an abstract quantity βάθος πλοῦτου, a mode of speech which would be more redolent of 4 Maccabees than of St Paul. What a wondrous depth! In this last passage I have the support of Bl.–Debrunner, § 1462.

Having seen how decisive a help to interpretation is given by the Hebrew when considering passages either translated or conceived by Hebrew authors writing in Greek, I turned to Fr. Delitzch's NT in Hebrew, and I found most of my decisions confirmed.
In Matt. 15: 28 he puts a mere ἣ; in 1 Tim. 6: 20; Acts 13: 10; Rom. 2: 1, 3; Jas. 2: 20 he introduces the allocution by ἢ; he leaves Acts 1: 1; 27: 21 without any introductory particle and says ἢ in 18: 14. In Luke 24: 25 and Mark 9: 19 (cf. Matt. 17: 17; Luke 9: 41) his introductory ἢ was most welcome to me. Certainly he begins Rom. 9: 20 with καὶ = μενοῦν γε, but in Gal. 3: 1 he marks the exclamative character of the passage by ἢ. Rom. 11: 33 is most appositely opened by an anticipation of the following ὡς: ἀλήθεια ἡ ἡμῶν.

Apart from Rom. 9: 20, where I had refrained from giving a final decision, the results obtained on the basis of my observations in the OT passages are thus fully confirmed.

Thus both in the Old and New Testaments strict adherence to the traditional discrimination between ὡ and ὡ affords a help to interpretation which we should not neglect.
EXCURSUS IX

Jussive optative aorist a syntactic Hebraism

1. Setting

In the Ptol. papyri the genuine optative in principle clauses, expressing a realizable wish, is the only kind of optative which is still alive. It is used in a few stock phrases. The potential (with δν) and the optative in conditional subordinate clauses are found more rarely, and the optativus obliquus (iterativus) has almost disappeared (Mayser η ι, 289). Wishes and imprecations in the papyri are expressed by either optative, imperative, or ind. fut. (Bl.-Debr. §385). The papyri use the opt. pres. for continued or repeated events wished or imprecated by the speaker, but the opt. aor. for a simplex (point) act (the English expressions after Thumb-Angus, Handbook of the Mod. Greek Vernacular, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 116) (Mayser, ι ι).

2. Usage

We find the same co-existence of optative, imperative and ind. fut. in the LXX, and a tabulation shows that they were used indiscriminately and freely interchanged, all three equally expressing a benediction or curse.1

Sometimes opt. aor. and fut. are used side by side with the clear intention of expressing a different shade of meaning, so Gen. 28: 3, Ο θεός... εύλογήσαι σε καί αυξήσαι σε καί πληθύναι σε, καί έση... bless thee... so that thou mayest be... (AV).

In other instances the Greek is right in rendering a Hebrew imperfect by an optative, as Zech. 3: 2 bis, ἐπιτιμήσαι κύριος ἐν σοί, where the AV correctly puts the Lord rebuke thee (similarly Luther), though some of our commentaries give a less appropriate future. Yet in a similar passage, Mai. 2: 12, the unanimous evidence has a future (see below).

The translation of Job presents some strange examples of a continual interchange of opt. aor. and ind. fut. throughout entire chapters. Only a most artificial interpretation can detect any optative intention in the original, and in most instances even the future is but the usual, very loose translation of the Hebrew imperfect, as in ch. 15: 6 and 28-35. In ch. 18 and 20 the characteristic feature is that the verses belonging
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to the LXX proper are mostly in opt. aor., whereas the interspersed supplements from Θ' are in future. The famous resurrection verse 19: 26 has the opt. aor. ἀναστήσωσι. In ch. 21: 19a LXX reads an opt. aor., 19b Θ' a future, both with God as subject; v. 20 LXX has two opt. aor. with man as subject.

The question of the subject comes in decisively, when we now turn to a chapter which is without parallel in the LXX and elsewhere, Deut. 28. Whereas Lev. 26 and also Deut. 30 express a similar series of promises and curses by future formations only, as we should expect them to do, Deut. 28 discloses a strange mixture. The chapter begins with future forms (vv. 1, 2) and goes on to a subjunctive παραδόει v. 7. From v. 37 onwards there are exclusively future forms, as in Lev. 26. But in the intermediate verses there is an interchange of opt. aor. and ind. fut., and this almost without exception in such a way as to give the opt. aor. to clauses in which God is subject, but ind. fut. to all the others, where men are the subject. The effect is that our translator here renders the predictions about God as though they were benedictions or curses (wishes or imprecations), but the consequences which they have on men, simply as things to come. Regarding the latter the evidence is unanimous; and even as far as predictions concerning God’s actions are involved, only a few remarks are required.

(1) The verses 7–36, which are distinguished by the opt. aor. forms mentioned, cover by far the greater part of the whole, for there is only one statement about God preceding v. 7, namely v. 1, and only nine after v. 36.

(2) There is some indication that the scheme—expressing statements about God by an opt. aor., about men by an ind. fut.—originally covered the whole chapter; for it is extremely unlikely that the rare device of an opt. aor. should be secondary where it appears as a variant. So for δώσει v. 1 min. kext reads δφη, though in the other MSS the opt. aor. first comes in v. 8. As we can still imagine, it was tempting to put δώσει in v. 1, because the sentence runs, καὶ ἔσται...καὶ δώσει σε κ. In v. 7 the chief evidence gives παραδόει; this would be a subjunctive, as in 21: 10 where it follows ἐὰν. Some MSS read παραδώσει, and the evidence is complicated by a σοι added either to -δφη, -δοΐ, -δώσει; but we should read παραδόει with F (-δφη σοι v, παραδόει F*Nimb). Compare δφη v. 24. The only real break in the series of optatives is πληθύνει σε κ. v. 11, though here min. 18 reads -ύσει, just as in v. 60 c has ἐπιστρέψαι instead of the fut. -ψει of all the others.
In two passages the MT has a statement in the second person with the Israelites as subject, but the LXX displays a third person statement about God with a future form which does not fit into the scheme observed.

In the first passage, v. 29, our text requires emendation. Instead of καὶ ἐσοῦς ἑλαστῶν...καὶ οὐκ εὐδόκουσει τὸς δόξος σου (..., ...καὶ ἕτερος τὸν ἵνα μὴ ἵππον ἐσοῦ) we must read εὐδοκοῦσει which is attested by the Munich Vet. Lat. (BM's Η²) non diriges and by Eth. Arm. as well, though, while giving the second person, they seem to use slightly different verbs (non inventes Eth., si non corriges Arm.), provided that this difference is not merely due to corruptions in these Oriental translations which were left untouched in BM's Latin version (cf. above, pp. 9 f.).

The second passage is a little more complicated. For ἢλ ημίν ἔλεη τὸνποτὲ σουν ἐν τοῖς ἤλιοι and the Greek reads οὐκ ἀναπαύσει σε οὐδ' οὐ μή ἣνταται στάσις (v. 65). As in v. 29 we would read a second person, so that ἀναπαύσει would be only an orthographical variation of -σή. But there is an additional κυρίος in Syr.marg. provided with an obelus. If this obelus is genuine, this would mean that Origen found a text which, deviating from the MT, ran, οὐκ ἀναπαύσει σε κυρίος. But even if so, this may be a pre-Origenian corruption, in which a mistaken -σει σε had been completed by a still more mistaken explicitum κυρίος. So, after all, we are at liberty to decide for ἀναπαύση.

Before leaving Deut. 28 we should record that ChB 963, written about 150, agrees with our MSS in preserving the opt. aor. in vv. 13, 20, 28, 35. Unfortunately there is a gap in v. 11, where our MSS have πληθυνεὶ. In v. 29 ChB 963 reads

οὐκ εὐδοκοῦσει[τὸς σου]

the bracketed letters being supplemented, so that we cannot see what really was in the codex; but in v. 65 we find καὶ ἀναπαύσει σε οὐδὲ, the traditional reading which we took to be corrupt, but – interestingly enough – also here without the obelized κυρίος Χ found in Syr.marg. In the gaps there is nothing to preclude the introduction of our opt. aor. forms.

There are some few minn. which give either a subj. aor. or the ind. fut. So it is not astonishing that in v. 8 Pap. Rylands 460, a IVp testimony book, reads the more common ἀποστελεῖ, as here also euβεθείσα La., Co., Eth. do, but not Lugd. which has inmittat = ἀποστεῖλαι.
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3. Root in the Hebrew
When reviewing the Rylands Pap. 458 and 460 (\textit{ThLZ}, 1936, p. 341)
I ended by saying, ‘Bei den Opt. handelt es sich um Segen oder Fluch,
also mag der Wunschmodus – nur in diesen Versen! – das rein futurische
Moment verdrängt haben. Die ganze grammatische Literatur scheint
diese Gebrauchsweise nicht zu kennen; ich habe auch keine lit. Belege
außerhalb LXX.'

Later I found that the strange opt. aor. were renderings of optative
jussives in the Hebrew. After checking the vast list of jussives – many of
them detectable only by unequivocal jussive forms in the same context –
drawn up by Fr. Böttcher (\textit{Ausf. Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache}) §964, π,
182 ff., and their rendering in the LXX, it became evident that the
LXX translators used three translations. To take the examples from
two adjoining verses, Gen. 9: 26 ἐστιν ~ καὶ εστιν, 27 πλατύναι,
καὶ γενήσεται. Between the second and the third jussives the
Hebrew has ἥτις, which is not formally recognizable as a jussive,
though rightly rendered by καὶ κατοικήσατο. I then found that S. R.
Driver, \textit{Deut.} p. 305, characterized the jussives of vv. 8, 21, 36 as I had
characterized the Greek optatives. He also records that the LXX uses
the optative from 7 to 36. It was König in his \textit{Syntax} § 192 a who estab-
lished relation between the Hebrew and Greek forms.

In the Hebrew itself the jussives of Deut. 28 stand out as needing
explanation (‘significant of the eagerness with which the orator watches
and desires the future which he announces’, Driver); yet the Greek
usage based on its Hebrew original is still more peculiar, though not
confined to Deuteronomy.

Here it is a mere Hebraism, and if I may venture a judgement about
the Hebrew usage, I would see in it rather a pious reflection, comparable
to some extent with the later standing insertion ‘praised be his name!’
This would preclude a very early date for this mode of speech. However
primitive or advanced it may be, we are hardly interested in the way
in which König attempts by phonetic reasoning to reduce the number
of the ‘difficult instances of the jussive’ which he found in Driver’s
\textit{A treatise on the use of the tenses in Hebrew}, §171 (König §192 e).

In the Greek this jussive opt. aor. is losing ground and liable to
correction, as Deut. 28 and other examples clearly show. Nevertheless,
its elaborate use in Deut. 28 in its restriction to God as a subject is too
scrupulous to look primitive. As this pericope differs so strikingly not
only from the common usage of the LXX, but even from the proximate
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verses in Deuteronomy itself, it may be due to a translator different from the translator of Deuteronomy; and, as e.g. in Ezek. 36, the question arises whether this is a translation which was originally made in an independent way for use as a lesson in a Jewish service, but which later on found its way into the LXX, ousting, perhaps, the original translation.

It may be adventurous to go one step further. Haftarahs in a prophet, such as have been traced in Jeremiah by Giesebrecht (pp. xxvii, xxxiii) and in Ezekiel by Cornill (Das Buch Ez., 1886, Proll. pp. 101 f.) and Thackeray (e.g. Gr. p. 11) (traced in both instances from the different character of the translation), are nothing to wonder at, because only selected parts of these books were regularly used in the Jewish liturgy. But with regard to the Pentateuch we do not know of any primitive stage when only selected chapters were read as lessons; for there was always a lectio continua. My very restrained and modest question is whether, at least for the Alexandrine synagogue, we are here able to trace a selective use of 'Pentateuch-Haftarahs' in worship. I cannot answer this question, nor can anybody else; yet others may tell me to what extent it is worth asking.
Confusion of θεύομαι and θεύομαι

Throughout the LXX the confusion of θεύομαι and θεύομαι is fairly frequent; all passages using θεύομαι for θυ and θεύομαι for θυ are corrupt. Thus we must read θεύομαι ι Kings 12: 6 with the Cambridge editions and Rahlfs, against Agu only; 2 Chron. 10: 6, 9 with Rahlfs against BA(N) and some minn.; θεύωμενοι 2 Esdras 4: 5 with Rahlfs against B only; and Prov. 12: 20 with Grabe and Lagarde, following Syr.mg and 23, against our modern editions. 2 Chron. 25: 16 which gave rise to this excursus has been emended on p. 141.

As to the reverse, the mistaken θεύομαι for θυ, there are less confusions. So our editions rightly neglect the corrupt reading of A in 1 Macc. 15: 3 and Jer. 49 (42): 22 (cf. Jer. 6: 10). In Isaiah, Rahlfs and Ziegler duly put θεύετο 42: 21 against SAB 393 538 (88) Sa. (a doublet in Bo.). In a note Ziegler seems to suggest that θυλεύσατο came in from 46: 10. Yet 46: 10 f. presents a problem in itself. In the Hebrew θεύομαι and θυλεύομαι form a parallelism (my counsel and all my pleasure, Torrey); in v. 11 there follows θυλεύομαι the man of my counsel. The Greek translator, an ingenuous blunderer, reads πάσα μου ή θεύεται and πάντα δόσα θευσμαι in v. 10 and περὶ διένθευμαι in 11; here evidently taking as to be θυλεύομαι and the noun θυλεύομαι to be a verbal form from θυ or θυ. With a correct translator one would suggest that the first θευσμαι is due to a secondary assimilation to the second in v. 11. If we have correctly assessed the character of the Greek Isaiah, we detect in him a curious habit such as we find in a careful and competent writer like St Paul. More than once St Paul substitutes a less appropriate word for the appropriate one, for the simple reason that he anticipates a word which is soon to follow in his context. Therefore I am not sure how to decide. Yet if we try to emend, we should not put θεύομαι, a perfect formation that never occurs in the LXX, but θεύομαι, for the present would be correct to represent a noun, as it often represents a participle. At any rate, there is a parallel in 53: 10, which presents two examples, both of θεύεται, the first appropriately for the participle θυ, the second in exactly the same misunderstanding of the noun θυ as in 46: 10. This results in a curiously mistaken translation of the famous passage which can be mended only
CONFUSION OF βούλεσθαι AND βουλεύεσθαι

by putting τὴν ψυχὴν of 534 Syr.pal., Tert., Tyc., Hieron. into the text instead of τῆς ψυχῆς. In the remaining passages the LXX renders τὰ ἔτη by θέλημα as do the later translators, mainly Symmachus (53: 10 θέλημα, ἦθέλησεν), whereas Aquila 53: 10 puts βούλημα, ἐβουλήθη. In 46: 11 also Symmachus says ἀνδρα πολλής μου.
In Lev. 23: 3 the LXX has σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις κλητή ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ, Vulg. sabbati requies est, vocabitur sanctus; 23: 24 LXX ἔσται ύμιν ἀνάπαυσις, μνημόσυνον σαλπίγγων, κλητή ἁγία ἔσται ύμιν and Vulg. erit vobis sabbatum memoriale, clangentibus tubis, et vocabitur sanctum. The Hebrew here says שֶׁבָּターּ קָרֶם 'convocation for the purpose of divine service' (without שֶׁבָּターּ Isa. 1: 13, see also 4: 5), for which the LXX has κλητή ἁγία in Exodus, Leviticus throughout and Num. 28: 25, whereas Numbers in the other passages says ἐπίκλητος ἁγία. As elsewhere, LS offers a translation for both which is simply the current interpretation of their Hebrew equivalent: 'κλητὴ scil. ἐκκλησία convocation'; 'ἡ ἐπίκλητος convocation, assembly'. For ἐπίκλητος, the parallels which LS gives, as Hdt. 7, 8 σύλλογον ἐπίκλητον... ἐποιεῖτο held a privy council, do not really support this interpretation. LS may also have thought of ἡ σύγκλητος which in Attic and Hellenistic speech covers a considerable range of meanings, including that of the Roman senate. From the first occurrence of the word in the LXX, however, everything becomes clear. Here the LXX is twice mistaken in assuming νυσιν as subject:

Exod. 12: 16

καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ πρώτη
κληθήσεται ἁγία,
καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἑβδόμη
κλητὴ ἁγία
ἐσται ύμιν.

Here it is certain that in 16b the LXX took νυσιν to be a part. pass. (Pual) of νυσιν which exists in the latter part of Isaiah (five times) and in Ezek. 10: 13. The LXX may somehow have read 16a in conformity with this, for variation of expression is a feature very common to the translators of the Pentateuch. This was long ago observed by Thiersch, and supported by ample evidence. This translation, then, became a fixed habit of which ἐπίκλητος in Numbers is but a more elegant variation. The Vulgate is here somewhat free, yet it seems to share in the LXX's mistranslation, as can at once be inferred from its putting dies as the subject: Dies prima erit sancta atque solemnis, et dies septima eadem
festivitate venerabilis. We have already mentioned its translation *vocabitur* for κλητή (έσται) Lev. 23: 3, 24. This mistake is introduced, as it were, in Lev. 23: 2, where *quas vocabitis sanctas* is an abbreviation of the LXX's ἀς καλέσατε αὐτάς κλητάς ἁγίας. In 23: 4, *Hae sunt ergo feriae Domini sanctae, quas celebrare debetis temporibus suis*, the first part evidently goes back to the corruption in the Greek καὶ αὐτάς ἁγίας καλέσατε (BA') for κλητάς ἁγίας, ἀς καλέσατε. But in the second part *celebrare* for κλητή, καλέσετε *you shall proclaim* (correctly rendered Num. 10: 2 ἀνακαλεῖν τὴν συναγωγήν, convocare multituidinem – Lugd., closer to the LXX, says ad evocandam synagogam) is a mere guess, interesting in so far as it has some connection with the rendering *celeberrimus* for κλητή, which Jerome elsewhere adopts consistently, while he equally consistently uses *venerabilis* for επίκλητος.

In conclusion the two passages in Isaiah, displaying κλητή without ἕν, are instructive. In 1: 13 the LXX does not understand κλητή ἔν, 'the convening of convocations'; so it extricates itself by the vague translation ἡμέραν μεγάλην, with which we may compare 34: 10 εἰς χρόνον τοῦ for ἡμέραν μεγάλην (p. 160), and which sounds like an early foreshadowing of *der lange Tag*, the popular Jewish name for the Day of Atonement. Here the Three give versions of κλητή which are etymological and reminiscent of the earlier LXX usage discussed above, yet far from being literal, Α' κλητήν, Κ' επίκλησιν, Θ' επίκλητον; whereas Jerome has a colourless *festivitates alias*. In 4: 5 the LXX misread the word, and nothing of the Three has survived; yet Jerome, here without any support from the LXX, falls back on its usual translation, for which he has but a few examples, Lev. 23: 2, 3, 24, rendering ἐπικλεῖται et ubi invocatus est.

Returning to LS it remains to say that the context never allows for a supplementary ἐκκλησία. The reason why the form is always a fem. is that it always depends upon fem. nouns, ἡμέρα, ἕορτα, ἀνάπαυσις. Therefore the lexicon should register κλητή and ἡ επίκλητος as mistranslations of κλητή *festival* as though it were a part. pass. of κλῆ, *cry, call, convene.*

The justification of lengthy comments like this lies in the obvious fact that without observation of many detached peculiarities we cannot obtain an adequate picture of the nature of our translations. From my quotations of Jerome, taken together with the here sorely scanty remnants of Vet. Lat. Lugd., the reader will have drawn some conclusions as to the nature of the Vulgate. In the Pentateuch Jerome preserved many of the original differences of translation in the Vet. Lat.
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without consulting the Hebrew throughout and thus giving a fresh and reliable translation. It would be rash to decide from these limited observations whether his revision was restricted by respect for the familiar wording, or whether it merely represents a superficial touch. At all events, inasmuch as he is evidence for the Vet. Lat., his value for the illustration of the LXX is enhanced. But to work this out, even within our limits, attention should be given to Jerome’s Bible quotations apart from the Vulgate.
EXCURSUS XII

Gehenna, sicera, pascha in the Latin Bible

The Complutensian fashioned its σικεραν Judg. 13: 7 after the pattern of the Latin Bible, which carried much further the process of Hellenizing Hebrew words and names. This procedure of the Latin Bible was, no doubt, encouraged by the Greek NT which advanced far beyond the LXX. The outstanding example is γέεννα, -ης, -η, -αν in the synoptic gospels and Jas. 3: 6. Of this the uninflected γεεννα B, γεεννα hq Josh. 18: 16, far from being the prototype, is but a late reflex. It is located in a corrupt context and found only in B with its satellites; and this group of MSS, though still being the earliest form of text in this book, goes back to a very careless archetype and is corrupt in this passage. The omission of γεεννα is some NT grammars is striking. The only serious attempt I have found to explain the form is by Gustaf Dalman in RE 6, 421 (cf. also Moulton 11, 147, 153). He points to (1) the old pronunciation of the short i as e (Gehennom) (cf. p. 158 and p. 320 n. 2), (2) the Aramaizing -am (Gehennam) of the termination -om, and (3) the throwing off of the closing -m ‘as in Μαριά for Μαριάμ’. He does not mention the most important thing, namely the final form in which this threefold process results, an inflected fem. in α impurum. What was natural in a girl’s name, was much less so here.

Here both the Vet. Lat. and the Vulgate NT follow the Greek by inflecting ge(h)enna as a fem. in -a (see the full list in Rösch, Itala und Vulgata pp. 256 f.). Jerome, Josh. 18: 16, different from the Vet. Lat., gives the transliteration and adds an interpretation, Geennom, id est vallem Ennom. I have no example of an intrusion of the inflected NT form into the OT either in Greek or in Latin.

The case of σικερα and πασχα in the Latin Bible is different. Lugd. has the acc. siceram1 Lev. 16: 9; Num. 28: 7 (after emending the corrupt sintera); Deut. 14: 26; 29: 6; Judg. 13: 4, 7, 14 and an abl. vino et sicera Num. 6: 3. In Luke 1: 15 the Vet. Lat. MSS give evidence for both sicera and siceram. Wordsworth and White print sicera with the MSS, where the Sixtine and Clementine editions read siceram. This must make us cautious in judging the readings which I quoted from the current Roman Vulgate. There are no forms other than inflected in the Vet. Lat. and the Vulgate in the MSS of Jas. 3: 6. In the Vulgate OT sicera
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(always acc. siceram) is confined to the passages mentioned in Deuteronomy and Judges and Prov. 31: 6 date siceram for רֶפֶן רֶפֶן, διδότε μέθην. This translation ought to be recorded for the LXX as evidence for a possible σικερα, which, if original, would have been completely replaced by μέθην, the translation of Α' Θ' according to Syr. In the other passages Jerome translates in accordance with his definition in the Ep. ad Nepotian., 'Sicera Ebraeo sermone omnis potio adpellatur quae inebriare potest'. So he puts lengthy paraphrases for the simple της μέθης, σικερα: omne quod inebriare potest Lev. 10: 9; Num. 6: 3 (10), ex qualibet alia potione Num. 6: 3 (20), or, more simply, potio Isa. 24: 9 or ebrietas Isa. 5: 11, 22; 28: 7 ter, 29: 9. This last translation of his is closer to the μέθυσμα of the later translators than to the LXX's σικερα. He is independent of the LXX in the second occurrence in 28: 7, where the LXX has a doublet της μέθης τοϋ σικερα. Here Β stands alone in omitting τοϋ σικερα; but σικερα is obviously the original translation, and της μέθης its hexaplaric substitute. Β is therefore secondary.

As to πασχα, the facts are somewhat more complicated. Where pascha is used, as in Lugd. throughout (Rönsch does not deal with this word, so that I have no information about other Vet. Lat. MSS of the OT), we read a nom. and acc. pascha, yet, along with it, a gen. paschae. The examples are: (1) pascha Lugd. Num. 9: 2, 4, 6, 10, 13, 14; 28: 16; Deut. 16: 1, 2, 5, 6; Vulg. 1 Esdras (= LXX 2 Esdras) 6: 19, 20. (2) paschae Lugd. Exod. 34: 25; Num. 9: 12 and, after emendation, Num. 33: 3 (in this last passage Robert corrects the corrupt castra into pascha, but a gen. is required, and paschae is the standing translation of τοϋ πασχα; as there follows et in the Latin, the emendation involves only the correction of a haplography); Vulg. Ezek. 45: 21. In the NT Vulgate Jerome translates in the same way, nom. and acc. pascha, which he treats as a neuter: hoc pascha manducare Luke 22: 15, ante pascha John 11: 55, post pascha Acts 12: 4, but in die paschae Luke 2: 41, dies paschae John 12: 1 cf. 13: 1, parasceve paschae 19: 14. Whether in pascha John 2: 23; 18: 39 to him was an abl. fem. or the indeclinable form, must be left undecided.

I think that in the passages mentioned Jerome merely retained what he had found in the Vet. Lat. text; for where he shows his own hand, the aspect is quite different. In the LXX there are forty-two examples of πασχα ranging from Exod. 12: 11 to Ezek. 45: 21, but only seventeen occurrences of φασκ, all of them in 2 Chron. 30 and 35 – and there is one more in Jer. 38 (31): 8, but it is a mistranslation, which is not shared by the Vulgate. Jerome, however, gives a high preference to the
latter which he writes as phase. In the passage where ΠΟΒ appears for the first time, he appends an explanation, phase, id est transitus. Symmachus before him had done the same, saying φασε ύπερβασις. This is one of the Jewish interpretations of ΠΟΒ and the verb ΠΟΒ which is reflected also in LXX Exod. 12: 13 σκεπάσω ὑμᾶς, 12: 27 ἐσκέπασεν, and Isa. 31: 5 περιποιήσεται. But materially Jerome follows up another Jewish interpretation which is in LXX Exod. 12: 23 παρελεύσεται κύριος τήν θύραν. His transitus reproduces the ύπερβασις of Aquila in the same passage which is reflected in Isa. 31: 5, ύπερβάνων Γ’, according to Jerome’s report. This found its way into the LXX text as a doublet: περιποιήσεται (+ καὶ ύπερβησεται sū L Ziegler). The same exegetical tradition is behind Jerome’s transibo Exod. 12: 13, transcendet 12: 23, and victima transitus Domini 12: 27. In the last instance Jerome takes the ἕ of μὴν as sign of a gen. subj., which was necessary if ΠΟΒ was to mean the Lord’s passing by. This translation also goes back to one of the Three, most probably again to Aquila. The LXX, of course, is more correct, saying θυσία το πασχα τούτο κυρίω for ΠΟΒ-μην μὴν μεν which, if rendered quite exactly, would result in something like *θυσία του πασχα αὐτή κα.

This explanation of ΠΟΒ is already in Philo and Josephus, though they use different words. Philo has διάβασις in alleg. iii, 94, 154, 165, sacr. 63, migr. 25 bis, heres 255, congr. 106, spec. leg. ii, 147, and διαβασις τήρεια vit. Mos. ii, 224, 226, 228, 233, spec. leg. ii, 41, 145, 147, 150. He uses the form πασχα throughout, etymologizing it as διάβασις ἀπὸ (ἐκ) τῶν παθῶν Αἰγύπτου alleg. iii, 94). Therefore an isolated φασκα, alleg. iii, 94, looks secondary, and this all the more as it is followed by a constant πασχα. Several explanations are possible. It may be a corruption like φασκα (vit. Mos. ii, 224, codd. BEM GHP). Or, as it occurs where the festival is first mentioned, it could be explained from reasons similar to those which are responsible for the secondary text of a lemma. As such it may have been taken from a more recent form of the text of the LXX or even from one of the Three (cf. p. 170).

Josephus has the explanation in AJ π, 313, πασχα..., σημαίνει δ’ ύπερβασια διότι... δ θεός αὐτῶν ύπερβας...
Perhaps I may here inquire into the way in which our translators handled the two passages Exod. 22:8 and 1 Sam. 2:25. In these passages (Exod. 22:9 (8); 1 Sam. 2:25 in the Greek and Latin Bibles) is taken as a real plural and followed by a verb in the plural. This casts light on the priestly jury, acting close to the sanctuary and on behalf, and before the face, of God. In neither passage did the LXX leave any traces of what was peculiar in the original. In 1 Sam. 2:25 it shares in the corruption of the MT, which was corrected by Wellhausen, who from restored the plural; but in both passages it does its best to obliterate what might have been considered a difficulty from the point of advanced monotheism. In Exod. 22:8 we are therefore almost left with the Three, and Jerome who follows their lead. They take the Hebrew as it stands, no doubt, leaving its precarious plurals to those whose set task it was to explain away any difficulties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ et quem damnabunt dии Θ’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ δὲ αὖ tου</td>
<td>διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ et quem damnaverint dии C’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τούτων</td>
<td>utriusque causa perveniet,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὕτη κρίσις</td>
<td>ad deos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐ φατέρων</td>
<td>et si illi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ Οἱ σάμιται</td>
<td>et quem damnant dии A’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ Οἱ ἁγίας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clue to this literal translation of the Three and Jerome is given by a doublet in the text of Vercellone’s (i, 255*) ‘Cas. 1’, which, he says, ‘addit scilicet ad sacerdotes’. This *scilicet* must not induce us to believe that *ad sacerdotes* is a mere gloss; for there are parallels which incontestably indicate, just as do Greek doublets introduced by καὶ or ἢ, that these words represent a different way of translating which has left only a few, but unmistakable, traces. So in the verse immediately preceding, which contains the same διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ in a plural meaning, but without a plural verb which, of course, caused the chief trouble, the Vulgate again displays *ad deos* and the same Cas. 1 ‘addit et ad sacerdotes et ad sapientes’.
(Vercellone). And in Exod. 21: 6 where originally must have designated the Penates, but was apparently interpreted on the same lines as designating the priestly jury, we find the same array of varying renderings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>A' C'</th>
<th>Vulgate</th>
<th>Vercellone’s COD. K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κυρίου</td>
<td>προσάξει αὐτον</td>
<td></td>
<td>offeret eum</td>
<td>dominus eius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυρίου</td>
<td>πρὸς τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td>diis sacerdoti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the LXX’s ἀρχοντὰς κριτηρίων τοῦ θεοῦ and K’s sacerdoti, though diverging in their wording, betray an identical interpretation of τοῦ κυρίου as the priestly jury. This, however, is mistaken, because the κυρίοι are at the door and the doorpost, and only one act of ‘bringing’ is being described, as emerges even from the clumsy translation in AV, his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post. In all these instances the MSS from which Vercellone quotes are MSS of the Vulgate, but the modifications of Jerome’s text which he quotes are contaminations deriving from MSS of the Vet. Lat., and therefore they ought to be recorded in BM, who confine themselves to quotations from marg. cod. Leg., when every addition to our scanty knowledge of the Vet. Lat. should be warmly welcomed.

A similar set of variants is found in Exod. 22: 28 (27), where though to common sense τοῦ κυρίου means God and ἀρχοντὰς the ruler, the LXX puts θεοῦς and ἀρχοντὰς (the sing. ἀρχοντας of AFM, Eth. is secondary, for it is only one among the several adaptations to Acts 23: 5, which here agrees with the MT and the Three). ἀρχοντας, rather than disclosing a variant in the Hebrew, obviously indicates that the LXX took both Hebrew expressions to be closely parallel, the judges and the ruler(s). In 22: 8 f. (7 f.), the LXX has a mere θεοῦ, and in 21: 6 it takes to the periphrastic κριτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, but here it agrees with what in the two other passages is the more recent tradition. In our passage also Targ. Onq. thinks of the priestly judges officiating at the sanctuary (Baentsch). Our evidence offers a complete sample-card of interpretations. Two variants can be left aside; proceres tuos Bo. represents ἀρχοντας and has come in from the second half of the verse, and θεοῦς σου b Arm. is a dittography θεοῦσι[C][COY]ΟΥ. Then we have the singular
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θεόν in dp*t Co. (= l + Sah.), which could indicate that the LXX here repeated the translation of 22: 8 f., so that the plural which we read would be secondary here as it is in the passages compared above. Likewise κριτήν in p, which calls to mind κριτήριον in 21: 6, looks like a gloss in the vein of the traditional interpretation, and the same is certain as to the doublet (diis) et sacerdotibus which is in Vercellone's Cas. 1 (1, 256b), but missing in BM. Finally we read the addition (θεούς) ἀλλοτρίους in km La., which is in conformity with what we shall find in Exod. 22: 20 (19) and Deut. 4: 28.

In Exod. 22: 20 (19), which mentions the third in an enumeration of offences deserving death, μετὰ, the context unmistakably points to gods = idols, as it does in 18: 11, κρίνω, and, of course, in those passages which refer to the pagan worshippers (12: 12 ἰδεῖς καὶ θεοῦς καταρακτηρίας). Nevertheless, we can still trace elaborate attempts at excluding a blasphemous misunderstanding. One of them resulted in a gloss, ἄλλος ἡμᾶς ἡμῖν, which permeated the whole of our evidence except the Samaritan. In the Hebrew its nature is betrayed by its awkward position after the concluding verb (Baentsch). In the Greek it may nevertheless have come in from the margin, as is suggested by the changed order of words in min. 18 (provided that this is not merely an individual adjustment of a clumsy text). The other attempt has the approval of Baentsch and BH3, namely the insertion of ἐτέροις in the Samaritan, and ἐτέροις in A, the Origenian x, the two secondary groups (Rahlfs, Gen., 1926, pp. 31 f.) bw and fir, in Bo., Co. and in the Vet. Lat. Wirceburgensis. Thus Baentsch and BH3 follow Sam. in both its additions and omissions. However, in spite of the Coptic versions, ἐτέροις is very poorly supported, and in fact still more poorly than BM would suggest. For their La. is nothing but Wirc., which, as Billen has shown (pp. 45, 101), 'evidently represents a late alteration', as 'Cyp., Spec. and Aug. omit the word'.

In Deut. 4: 28 the case for ἐτέροις, a Greek addition unanimously attested from 963 onward and found also in Vet. Lat., Lugd. and Verc. F (1, 491), is much stronger; for as it already exists in five Hebrew MSS, it cannot be explained as a dittography of the following ἐπιγοῦς. And yet this addition was not really required, because no misunderstanding was likely. If it has come in from similar passages, this is bound to have happened either very early or repeatedly during the course of transmission.

In 1 Sam. 2: 25 there have survived many more remnants of a similar interpretation, sacerdo(te)s = θεοῦς, than BM's annotation would
suggest. Apart from ‘murmurabunt prosacerdos eo Cyp-cod\'\', which is a corruption of murmurabunt sacerdotes pro eo or -bit sacerdos, they content themselves with quoting Vercellone's Legionensis, Si peccando peecaverit homo in hominem, stabunt pro eo sacerdotes ad Dominum: si autem in Deum peccaverit sacerdos, quis orabit pro eo? This is a free exposition which conveys the meaning behind the corruption of the MT; but in so doing it sacrifices the veiled mode of expression by which the MT avoids mentioning the priests by playing between 'Jahwe' and 'Elohim'. Whereas BM quote this from Vercellone (Π, 187\b), they fail to include his most interesting additional evidence from MSS of the Vulgate which here also derive from contamination with the Vet. Lat. (Verc. Π, 185\a). Apart from references to Sabatier Vercellone quotes from Beda Π, 340: Si peecaverit quis in hominem, rogabit sacerdos pro illo. Here quis affords further evidence for BM's 'τις Or-lat ed\' Chr\'\', sacerdos for sacerdotes of Leg., and rogabit raises the question whether in Leg. stabunt is corrupt for orabunt, as even Leg. later says orabit — for it is unlikely that stabunt should represent ἀριείς 1, and orabit ἀριείς 2. In the second part of the verse Beda's si peecaverit quis (si quis autem peccaverit Concil. Tolet.) is unparalleled in the Greek; yet the preceding rogabit sacerdos pro illo agrees with ὁ Ιερεύς προσεύξεται Chr\'\' and ὁ Ιερεύς Or-lat\' Chr\'\', just as does a further quotation si sacerdos peecavit. From this we see that the interpreting translation ἀριείς ~ (Ιερεύς) ἦσαν was certainly recessive during the course of transmission, but is still much more richly supported by evidence than could be taken from BM. Only the plural sacerdotes in the first part of the verse has disappeared altogether from the Greek evidence.

Here it is not sufficient to point to the existence of isolated and peculiar readings. Behind the de facto there rises the question de iure; we must try to make out which reading marks the most primitive stage so that we are entitled in it to see the LXX reading. Regarding 1 Sam. 2: 25 we may speak with some confidence. For here our present MT and LXX are corrupt, but the minority version, to which witness is mainly, but not exclusively, borne by Latin sources, represents the emended Hebrew such as was suggested by Wellhausen and Driver by material conclusions drawn from strict interpretation without any reference to this supporting evidence. Orabunt (rogabit) pro eo goes back to ἀριείς. Compared with Beda's rogabit sacerdos pro illo, the text of Leg. looks like a contamination, sacerdotes ad Dominum combining two versions of ἀριείς.

In this the characteristic feature was the introduction of sacerdos. We
EXCURSUSES

understand it from the Exodus passages given above; but at the same
time we realize how extremely well it fits in the situation of Eli re­
proaching his trespassing priestly sons. This whole setting gives the
impression of being genuine and fashioned out of an ingenuously good
conscience which, with the best of intentions, wished to overcome the
difficulties of the text, one of which was the plural verb related to

If I am not mistaken, we can even see the relation of the Vet.
Lat. text to the common Greek: as soon as we cancel the repeated
sacerdos from the Latin, the outcome is our present Greek text. And this
cancelling may have taken place as a step of approximation to the
Hebrew. As we have seen before, the first ἴερεὺς is still preserved in a
non-hexaplaric quotation in Origen and also in Chrysostom, who is a
Lucianic witness. Both combined indicate that there was a trend of
tradition which had a text identical with the Vet. Lat., and presumably
this was the original version of LXX.

Exod. 22:8 is different. Here the Hebrew is sound, and the somewhat
free Greek translation makes sense without taking more of a liberty than
can be observed in other passages where there was reason for not being
literal. Compared with it, the slavish translation of the Three and the
Vulgate, dīi with a plural verbal form, betrays its late date. The earlier
period of translation, which is represented by the LXX, greatly
resembles the Targums with which it has in common all sorts of
meticulous considerations of dogma and decorum which led the early
translators to give embarrassed paraphrases rather than literal trans­
lations. This is the pre-Aqiban way; it does not refrain from finding
fault with the sacred text and is prone to manipulate it ad usum Delphini;
in so doing it is scrupulous and naive at the same time. Indeed, the same
is found everywhere, not only in Israel. Wherever there is a sacred text
endowed with legal authority, it calls for advocates who by tricks of all
sorts try to render it harmless, and at the same time are firmly convinced
that with this they strike the true meaning behind an objectionable text.
For would it not be sacrilegious to believe that a sacred text bore a
meaning that was offensive? The post-Aqiban way was quite different.
There was now no longer any desire to touch and modify the text. As it
stood it inspired awe, and the later translators, most notably among
them Aquila, aimed at reproducing it as scrupulously as possible, and
often even more than possible. All its stern and hardly digestible traits
were now reproduced with the utmost exactness. These translations
were to give the closest possible idea of the Hebrew: Aquila’s is Hebrew
clothed in Greek words. For any difficulties one relied upon the expert
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who had a solution for everything in the Hebrew, and in proportion as the translations were close to the original they profited by these solutions.

No longer did the awkward *sons of God* Gen. 6: 2, 4 present any difficulties. The earlier school had removed this stumbling-block by translating *ἀγγέλοι τοῦ θεοῦ*, here as in other passages. It is hard to understand why Rahlfs should have rejected this reading of Aras L Bo. Spec. and Philo, Josephus, Clem. Al. Its origin at a later date is inconceivable, whereas the reading *υἱοί*, which he prefers, is obviously secondary, since it is the reading of the Three (*A' υἱοί τῶν θεῶν [sic], C' οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν δυναστευόντων, Θ' οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*) and of Origen (Syt. *hex* etc.). Here the fact that in 6: 4 *ἀγγέλοι* has been preserved by m (72) and Philo exclusively, must not mislead us. We can only say that most of our evidence has undergone some modernization here, and that such modernizations are hardly ever consistent.

The earlier school, including the Targums, avoided anthropomorphic modes of speech in references to God. So in the LXX God was not allowed to *burst forth against* the children of Israel, Exod. 19: 22, 24, he could only *depart from* them. Nor would they admit that God, when resting on the seventh day after the week of creation, should *be refreshed* (Exod. 31: 17), as was in place only when said of *the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger* (Exod. 23: 12). Here in 19: 22, 24 the Three present three different, but equally adequate, translations of the strong Hebrew expression *ἀναψύξει* and Fb marg. an anonymous fourth (19: 22); in 31: 17 Aquila displays the same *ἀναψύξει* about God which the LXX displays in 23: 12 about men.

To sum up: passages like Exod. 22: 8 and 1 Sam. 2: 25 disclose a modification of *ψυξίωσον* comparable to that observed in Isa. 8: 21; 37: 38; but Isaiah LXX, with its Aramaic παταχρα, -ον, bears witness to earlier Jewish parlance.
EXCURSUS XIV

ήττδσθαι and ήττον in the LXX and the Three

ήττδσθαι renders ἡ η Ἡσ. 8: 9 ter; 20: 5; 30: 31; 31: 4, 9; 51: 7. These renderings are quite consistent in themselves. They impressed themselves so firmly upon the translator’s mind that ήττδσθαι became one of his stop-gap words, as R. R. Ottley styles it so graphically. Ottley was the first to observe that whenever the translator was in doubt about the proper meaning of a word or period, he took refuge in one or more of those words without considering whether they gave the correct sense or any sense at all. So in 13: 15, where the Hebrew has the parallel verbs ðπτ for will be stabbed and ðπτ for will fall by the sword, the Greek says (δς γαρ ἠν ἀλφ) ήττηθήσεται, καὶ...μοχαρρα πεσοῦνται. ἀλφ does not suggest that by ήττ. he meant conquered. If he had anything particular at all in mind, it must have been something like frightened. This we may gather from 31: 9, another guesswork translation, in which ήττηθήσονται = ηρπτ and ἀλώσεται again appear side by side. In 19: 1 ἡ καρδιὰ στόν ἡττηθήσεται represents ἦν ἑνναά μεβ. The Hebrew verb στόν, of course, means melt away and the Three have the correct translation τακη-σεται. But what the LXX with its ήττηθήσεται took στόν to mean, we can only deduce from its usage elsewhere. In 10: 18, for instance, where στόν occurs, Symmachus has a reasonable ὅς τετηγμένος, but the LXX’s ὅς δ φεύγων is simply a wild guess. On the other hand, in 13: 7 στόν is rendered δειλίασει. Again, in 31: 8 στάτου-στάτου is rendered ἡττημα, whereas traditional Jewish interpretation (Targum etc., according to G.-Buhl) connected the word with στάτου melt away, or else, as in the Three, understood it in the sense of φόρος. The LXX in these passages betrays no knowledge of these traditional interpretations, and, therefore, to understand its translations ήττηθήσεται and ήττημα, we must be guided by 13: 7, where στόν is rendered δειλίασει will be afraid; ήττηθήσεται accordingly must mean will be frightened and ήττημα an alarming situation. One might further wonder whether the Targumic interpretation of στόν which connected it with στάτου aimed at a meaning similar to that of the well-known Homeric phrases, e.g. λύθη ψυχή τε μένος τε II. 5 296.

In 33: 1 the Hebrew reads ὅρον rob, act maliciously, which is rendered δειλίασει in Isa. LXX 21: 2; 24: 16 and three times also in 33: 1. Yet
when here ἢττάσθαι appears for the fourth time in 33:1 the LXX says ἢττηθήσονται. In itself it would not be too bold to emend ἰδετηθήσονται; yet here again the translator is very far off the mark, and as an indication of this we have here quite a collection of the stop-gap words which betray his embarrassment: ἀλώσονται, παραδοθήσονται, and finally ἢττηθήσονται. The only thing that can be said is that in ὡς σής ἔτι ἵματιον οὕτως ἢττηθήσονται the verb cannot mean will be defeated; after ἀλώσονται and παραδοθήσονται it must be something like to have a terrible experience.

In Isa. 31:4, 9 the Three follow the LXX in putting ἢττάσθαι and so do C' Θ' throughout 8:9, where A' reads πτησεῖν. A' reads the same in Ezek. 2:6, and so does the late translation of 2 Kings 19:26 (ἐπτησαν, only BL ἐπτάσαν). Equally A' reads καταπτήξει Hab. 2:17, and the Three render πτησαν Prov. 18:7 πτησείς and μὴν ἢττάσθαι Ezek. 32:25 πτησείς οὕτων.

Elsewhere the Three have ἢττάσθαι = μὴν in the following passages: A' C' Jer. 31 (48): 39 ἢττήθη (doublet in Lucian), where the corrupt κατακλαζεῖν of the LXX must be emended into καταδέχεται, as is read in v. 25 for μὴν; Jer. 28 (51): 56; 27 (50): 2; 28 (51): 49, where the LXX's τραυματίαι correctly renders ἢττηθήσονται, and Symmachus' ἢττωμενοι seems to go back to a reading μὴν [sic Walters. Ed.] cf. v. 56 καὶ ἢττήθη, Jer. 31 (48): 1, which is in Rahlfs' text, is under an asterisk, and I think that Field is right in ascribing it to C'. In Ezek. 32:30 where the LXX correctly renders μὴν ἢττήθησαν ἵππων by σὺν τῷ φόβῳ αὐτῶν, C' has ἢττηθέντες, in which he is followed by L. Finally C' has ἢττηθήσονται in Obad. 1:59 for πτηθήσονται of the LXX; and the hexaplaric Milan fragments, which were discovered by Mercati, yield the first evidence, apart from Suidas, of ἢττησις C' Ps. 88 (89): 41 for μὴν (LXX δειλιν), which elsewhere is rendered πτόησιν A' C' Jer. 17:17 (LXX ἀλοπηκρωσιν), δειλιν C' Jer. 31 (48): 39 (LXX ἐγκότημα), τρόμος Isa. 54:14 LXX, συντριβή in Prov. LXX (only 13:3 πτοησει).

Thus Isaiah LXX and the later translators in some passages of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Obadiah use ἢττάσθαι = μὴν be frightened with some few derivations. This usage is obviously due to the Hebrew, and ἢττάσθαι here is a homonym fashioned with regard to the Hebrew word with its similar sounds. Phrases in Hdt. and Thuc., in which ἢττάσθαι is used of frustration and weakening in resolve, offer no real parallel to the biblical usage; for they are merely a passive version of the basic meaning to be less or weaker than. And something of being defeated is
in all these phrases, compare Thuc. 6, 72, 2 τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν οὕχ ἡσσάθαι and 8, 66, 3 ἡσσόντο ταῖς γνώμαις, on the one hand, and 2, 87, 2 τῆς γνώμης τὸ μὲν κατὰ κράτος νικηθέν, on the other.

To survey the remaining meanings of ἠττάσθαι in the LXX, we have ἠττώμενος ἐν συνεσί Sir. 19: 24 lacking intelligence (ἣμα τοῦ; see Smend, Commentary p. 178). Here Βab 68 read ἠσσττωμένος, and I think that we should read ἠπαττόμενος as in 25: 2 (compare also ἀπολείπη σύνεσιν, 3: 13). Further, we have a few passages with the meaning be defeated, only one of which belongs to the LXX proper, or at least the LXX text, 2 Macc. 10: 24. Another passage, 1 Kings 16: 22, has rightly gone out of Rahlfs’ text, as it belongs to a hexaplaric repair (marked with an asterisk) of a gap in the old LXX. Here Swete and BM failed to get to the root of the matter. They insert καὶ ἠττήθη κατ’ against Β, without thus healing the mutilation of the BL text which is due to an omission ὁπίσω 1ο–2ο. From a glance at Rahlfs’ annotation everything becomes clear. Further an alius (‘nescio an Symmachus sit’, is the expert comment of Field) reads ἠττήθη in 1 Sam. 4: 10, where the LXX has πταίει, for πταίει was defeated. As we learn from these rather few examples, ἠττάσθαι was not a frequent rendering of being defeated, thus e.g. the translator of Exod. says τροπή for ἠττήθη 32: 18 (also Α’ C’ Θ’, but the Samaritikon ἠττα) and ἐτρέψατο for act. ἔρημος 17: 13; and Isa. 14: 12, in the difficult Lucifer passage, ὁ ἀποστέλλων (C’ ἀπρόποιτων) for the active ptc.

If we now proceed to the active to defeat, both νικάν and κρατεῖν appear only on the fringe of the LXX proper, yet examples of ἠττάν are not entirely missing. After some Attic precedents, the papyri have a technical law-term ἠττάσθαι to be cast in a suit (LS s.v. I 3; Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias p. 197). In Dan. LXX 6 this usage appears twice, and both instances are additions to the Hebrew so that here we can be still more certain than in Daniel LXX in general that we have not some translation Greek, but the ingenuous expression of the translator’s own Greek. In two closely similar sentences we find the active ἠττᾶν in v. 6, and the passive in v. 9:

6 ἵνα ἠττήσωσι τοῦ Δανιὴλ ἐναντίον τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἐφή εἰς τῶν λάκκων τῶν λευτών.
9 ἵνα ἠττηθῇ διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως [Rahlfs. Ziegler: διπως ἠττηθῇ ἐν ταῖς χερεί τοῦ βασιλέως. Ed.]

Here the active must be translated that they might get him condemned to death, and the passive that he might be condemned to death by the king.
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In the other LXX passage, Isa. 54: 17, the note of obtaining victory in a lawsuit is equally unmistakable, both in the Hebrew and Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יָתַּשְׁתֶּא</td>
<td>καὶ πᾶσα φωνὴ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָתַּשְׁתֶּא</td>
<td>άναστήσεται ἐπὶ σὲ εἶς κρίσιν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָתַּשְׁתֶּא</td>
<td>πάντος αὐτοῦς ἡττήσεις,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָתַּשְׁתֶּא</td>
<td>ὁ δὲ ἐνοχῶι σου ἔσονται.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Torrey, Second Isaiah p. 212, against both Rahlfs and Ziegler.
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If Lagarde (Anm. p. 39) were right, there would be one more example of pass. ἡττάσθαι = ἔσωρ: Prov. 12: 2

Lagarde takes from Holmes–Parsons that 161 marg. reads παρὰ θεῷ for παρὰ κυρίῳ in 2a, and his idea is that παρασιωπηθήσεται is corrupt for παρὰ θεῷ ἡττήσεται. παρὰ θεῷ, he says, was drawn into the second line, and ἠσσῶν along with κρείσσων is good Greek. ἔσῳ II Hiph., he continues, cannot have been in the translator's mind, as it is active and intransitive, whereas παρασιωπηθήσεται is the passive of a transitive. He thinks that the translator read Qal ἔσωρ instead of Hiph. ἔσωρ.

This suggestion is ingenious, though open to certain objections. (1) A causative θηρ Hiph. is in Job 11: 3, which is no longer challenged in BH3 nor in Hölscher's recent commentary (1937; 1952), who vindicates it by pointing to new Hebrew ץֵהְפּ=Piel make deaf; (2) the translator may well have read Hiph. ἔσωρ and simply have transformed the whole clause from active to passive. (3) The basis for Lagarde's conjecture is rather narrow, a feature not rare with him, as he likes to erect towering buildings upon a pin-point. Here his basis is the existence of a marginal variant in a single minuscule, a variant which he, nevertheless, styles 'die alte Übersetzung von ἔσωρ'. Yet, in spite of all, Lagarde's suggestion is clever and deserves consideration. In any case, the translator of Proverbs would agree with Isaiah LXX and Daniel
LXX: all three of them write good Greek, and their mutual evidence corroborates their witness to a usage which was good technical Greek. On the whole in the Koine ἡττάσθαι was not a popular word, but in its non-judicial usages it formed part of the higher literary speech. Moreover, Lagarde's conjecture is equally possible, if we start from a repeated παρά λο, instead of his παρά θεο. It is certainly a true observation of Lagarde's that in Proverbs ἡν is rendered by θεος to an extent then unknown in other books, yet even in Proverbs the renderings by κύριος are in the great majority, even if we decide in favour of θεος whenever it is supported by some evidence, as does Lagarde in Proverbs. Lately, it is true, fresh support for Lagarde's observation has come from an unexpected quarter. One of the novel features of the scanty remnants of Chester Beatty Pap. 966 (Jeremiah, fragments of two consecutive leaves, 200\(^p\)), 38 lines in all, are two certain instances of θεος against a hitherto unanimous κύριος (5: 10, 12) and one probable instance (5: 9, if the restoration of κς at the end of the destroyed line before δ θς, which opens a fresh line, were unjustified). On the other hand, according to Rahlfs, Verz. p. 50, cod. 161 from which Lagarde takes his marginal reading (XIV\(^p\), on paper), contains Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Job, the former three with marginal readings from the Three, Proverbs also with some sporadic scholia, Job with a marginal commentary. So it is unlikely that a marginal reading in 161 should provide us with a variant preserved from a more primitive stage of the LXX than the bulk of our textual evidence.

The active ἡτταν is of still later origin, occurring from Polybius onward. Since it is not frequent, I give the hexaplaric examples as well. They are all taken from Symmachus. The first represents the traditional meaning defeat, Ps. 80 (81): 15 ἡττησα = ὑπέκ [LXX ἔταπείνωσα]; the other two the homonymous rendering of ἡν, which, as far as we can see, is a creation of Isaiah LXX, Job 40: 7 (12) ἡττησον αὐτούς where C' obviously read an imperative of ἡν Hiph. instead of ἡν (LXX παραχρημα); and Hab. 2: 17 ἡττήσει for ἔτη terruit eas (LXX πτοήσει, A' καταπτήξει).

This late expansion of the use of ἡττασθαι and ἡτταν offers a special interest which may justify the space which here has been devoted to it. Wackernagel (Hell. pp. 12 ff.) among other things has shown that to a Hellenistic writer only the Attic form ἡττασθαι or the Ionic ἐσσοῦσθαι was available, as ἐσσοῦσθαι, which LS puts at the head of the article, is due to a ‘künstliche Stilisierung’ which certainly took place with the Attic tragedians and Thucydides, though never in the living speech of
any period. Now one wonders whether the co-existence of the different dialect forms which we observe in the NT, ἴσσωθείτε, 2 Cor. 12: 13, you came off badly, on the one hand, and ἴττημα defeat, Rom. 11: 12 on the other (cf. 2 Pet. 2: 19), may somehow be due to the fact that the former meaning is absent from the LXX, which always uses the Attic form. The non-Attic ἴσσ. is what we would expect when there was no question of a technical term.

As to LS, one notes the mistake of considering ἴσσωθαί as primary, though it displays a mixture of Attic -α- and the non-Attic -σσ- of ἴσσούμαι. One would also wish to see mentioned the homonymy, and both the judicial and non-judicial usage of the active ἴτταν in the LXX and the later translators. LS should likewise record the thrice repeated strange use of ἴττητος by Symmachus Ps. 88 (89): 8 – θεέ ἴττητε = יִכְרָא לֵא from מִכְר Niph. dreaded; v. 14 ἴττητος ἡ χεῖρ σου = יִכְרָא, is strong; v. 18 ἰγλαύσια ἴττητον αὐτῶν εἴ σύ = יִכְרָא וְיַדָּךְ תֵּרָא of their strength; and the fresh vocable ἴττησία = יִכְרָא my strength, Symm. Ps. 30 (31): 5 Mercati; upon this we are unable to comment, because Mercati has not yet published the complete new text which he has discovered, so that here we cannot yet test the relation of Symmachus’ Greek to the Hebrew. [The text was published in 1958. Ed.]
παριδεΐν and ύπεριδεϊν are sometimes used in a way that renders it difficult to make out the meaning which the translators connected with their translations. In some of the passages the Greek verbs represent ἀπαθεῖν ὑπέριθεν act unfaithfully, be perfidious, in others the different voices of ἐνίστη be in hiding, hide. At least in some of the passages we are bound to assume a confusion of both Hebrew roots by the translators.

This is most obvious in a passage which uses another Greek word that can mean nothing but hide, whereas the Hebrew has commit perfidy: Num. 5: 27 ἔληθην μὴ ἁπάντησέν ουδὲν ἔθελεν ἐν εἰδῇ λήθη τον ἀνδρα αὐτής. Exactly the same mistake occurs in Leviticus, where the frame of presentation is the same, yet the matter discussed quite different. Here we read λήθη ἐνεργείαν ἔχειν τον μὴ λάθη αὐτόν λήθη 5: 15 with a phrasing taken from 4: 13; 5: 3 f. where the Hebrew has ἄφαντη Niph. The explanation of this strange mistranslation may be found in what follows immediately in Lev. 5: 15, and sin through ignorance καὶ μάρτυς ἐκκούσαν, and consequently the Greek Num. 5: 27, where there is no such excuse, may depend on Lev. 5: 15 in one way or another.

We are now prepared to deal with παριδεΐν and ύπεριδεϊν. They are strange renderings indeed. There is no lack of literal translations. Thus is correctly rendered by λαθεῖν, ἐλαθεν αὐτόν, λάθη αὐτόν, Lev. 5: 3 f., and, with eyes, λάθη εἰς ὀφθαλμοίν Lev. 4: 13; Num. 5: 13. Or we read ἀπεκρυψε 2 Kings 4: 27; ἀπεκρυψεν τον κρύπτων σε βουλήν Job 42: 3; μὴ κρύψῃ τά ὦτά σου εἰς τήν δέησίν μου Lam. 3: 56. This last passage is the transition to those expressing a connotation of the Hebrew verb, using the accusative one’s eyes: ἀποστρέψοι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μου ἄφι ὑμῶν Isa. 1: 15; ἀποστρέψει τον ὀφθαλμον αὐτοῦ Prov. 28: 27; ἀπὸ τῶν σαββάτων μου παρεκάλυπτον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν Ezek. 22: 26. This to cover one’s eyes so as not to see, either a crime or a case of emergency where help is required (– and denied) led to a translation by παριδείν or ύπεριδεϊν, verbs which easily suggested themselves, as they display a variety of meanings in nuances from a simple overlook, neglect to a more positive despise, disdain, scorn. Of all the passages concerned Lev. 20: 4 is closest to the Hebrew: παριδείν ἢ παρισεῖν, hide their eyes from the man ~
CONFUSION OF ἄφθαλμος AND σύν IN THE LXX

ὑπερόψει ὑπερίδωσιν τοῖς ὅφθαλμοις αὐτῶν. From here it is only a small step to hide oneself from the distressed, refuse help which is expressed by a simple ὑπερεῖν c. acc. personae Deut. 22: 3 f. and τὴν δέησιν μου Ps. 54 (55): 1 (2). Following the Hebrew the same is expressed more fully: ἅπα τῶν οἰκεῖν τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐχ ὑπερόψη Isa. 58: 7 and ἀποστρέφον πρόσωπον καὶ ὑπεροράσαν ψυχάς (Smend following La. Eth. reads ψυχήν εαυτοῦ) Sir. 14: 8.

Whereas we find less emphasis in Ps. 9: 22 (10: 1) ἄφθαλμος (or ἄφθαλμος Targum) hidest thou (seil. thine eyes) ~ ύπεροράσας and in 1 Kings 10: 3; Eccles. 12: 14 παρεοράσας hidden, as in some passages with παρεοράσας in the meaning overlook (Isa. 57: 11; Job 11: 11; Sir. 28: 7; 30: 11; 3 Macc. 1: 27; 3: 9; 4 Macc. 13: 4; 15: 23), υπεροράσας means despise in Nahum 3: 11 and παρεοράσας the same in Sir. 35: 14 (Rahlfs' numbers). υπεροράσας has an even more severe meaning when it renders ὁράσις despise, cast away Lev. 26: 43 f. or even ὁράσις have indignation Zech. 1: 12 (cf. the still stronger expression by the same translator Mal 1: 4, also about God, παρετέτακται drew into battle for the same). So παρεοράσας 2 Macc. 5: 17 does not mean a gracious overlooking (LS) and non-imputation of guilt on the part of God, but, on the contrary, God's turning away and withholding of grace as a (temporary) punishment. Omitting the passages where υπεροράσας renders ὁράσις forsake (Job 6: 4; Ps. 26 (27): 9) there are only two left to notice. (1) When Ps. 77 (78): 59, 62 ὁράσις fly into passion is translated by υπερεῖν (Vulg. sprevit) with God as the subject, we must not range this with the stronger expressions just mentioned, but must see it in a confusion with Hithp. ἁμαρτάνει 1 'be careless', an Aramaism which is also found in Deut. 3: 26 was wroth with me ὑπερείνει καὶ ἔμε, as Sirach uses παρεοράσας for the same. (2) It has been observed by Dillmann, and accepted since, that Num. 22: 30 ὁράσις be accustomed to is wrong and must be corrected from the LXX which, reading ὑπερεῖνα υπερεῖδουσα, for ἄφθαλμος, points to ἄφθαλμος act foolishly. Another observation, prompted by Dillmann's, may be useful. Lev. 26: 37 ἔλθαν δὲ καὶ ὁ ὅδελφος τῶν ὁδελφῶν. Here the LXX did not soften down the strong expression of the Hebrew, but mistook ὁράσις for ὁράσις. This was a mistake, of course, but we can still see how the translation was brought about.

Now, at last, we have arrived at the point where we can understand the rendering of ὅφθαλμος by υπεροράσας, τοροράσας, as though it were ὁράσις.

Lev. 26: 40 ἐκ τῶν ἄφθαλμων by their perfidy which they have committed against me ~ διὶ παρεσθήσαν καὶ ὑπερεῖδον με; Num. 31: 16 ἐκ τῶν ἄφθαλμων by their perfidy which they have committed against me. 263
EXCURSUSES

"אכ (MT has אכ) to commit perfidy against J., του άποστεναι καί ύπεριδεῖν το βήμα (not in MT) κυρίου; and Num. 5: 6 (Lev. 5: 21 (6: 2)) παριδεῖν παριδεῖ, 5: 12 παριδεί ύπεριδούσα, emended in n. 5 p. 301, all for ἠν.

There are two ways of explaining this translation. The first is that ύπερορδν, παρορδν as rendering a great variety of Hebrew verbs, some of them expressing strong contempt and hostility, were taken to be appropriate to render even act perfidiously, be perfidious. Yet this explanation may not be quite sufficient. The second has to come in for support, or rather, replacement: in these instances we must admit a mere confusion with אכ of אכ which here found expression in the choice of ύπερορδν, παρορδν, just as in Lev. 5: 15; Num. 5: 27 λαθεϊν, the proper translation of אכ, was used, so we found, to express σκοτείν, although there is no conceivable relationship of meaning between the two Hebrew verbs.

LS, of course, cannot go into all these details. It is right in recording ύπερορδσ Lev. 20: 4 as taking no notice, yet it should give a similar translation for ύπερόρδσ Num. 22: 30, instead of its contempt, disdain. The proper connotation is that of ύπερορδσ II overlook, not II despise, disdain.

These observations may serve as an example of the semasiological study which necessarily precedes most of our observations and emendations.

To complete the picture I append some remarks on a related verb. παραβλέπω renders ἠν behold, espy Job Θ' 20: 9; Θ' 28: 7, and Song of Sol. 1: 6 the sun hath looked upon me (AV), whereas Luther translates has burnt me. In fact, the verb in Song of Sol. 1: 6 has been rightly connected with σκοτείν singe, blacken with its derivations κλυτείν, κλυτείν mildew of the grain. For the LXX, however, this meaning must not be assumed. Apart from this, Sir. 38: 9 παραβλέπω, as Norbert Peters and Smend have seen, renders רב I Hithp. tarry, be negligent, careless, exactly as does παριδεῖν 7: 10 (cf. p. 263). Moreover in Song of Sol. 1: 6 C' has παρεμβλέπω instead of the LXX's παραβλέπω, and it is obvious that this cannot mean here look askance, as in the few classical passages with which LS classifies it. παρεμβλέπω in C' is but a slight variation of παραβλέπω, and implies no change of meaning whatever.
MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

1. On problems related to the Chester Beatty Papyri

It is unfortunate that Sir Frederic Kenyon's admirable edition of the Chester Beatty Papyri was prepared and partly published before Rahlfs' Stuttgart text was available, for otherwise he would have been able to characterize the fresh texts much more distinctly than was possible on the basis of the Cambridge editions.

Thus in Isaiah certainly 'the papyrus confirms the established view that the text of B in Isaiah is not a good one' (Isaiah, 1937, p. ix). But now we know that in Isaiah B, with N(V), is the main representative of the Origenian recension, which certainly is of the same date as our third-century papyrus, but began to influence our evidence only at a much later date. Therefore our purpose in comparing the Isaiah papyrus with B is no more than we have in mind when comparing the ordinary LXX text with G and 135 in Genesis or G in Numbers and Deuteronomy, namely to see whether the papyrus had any kinship with the text upon which Origen worked out his hexaplaric text. From Rahlfs' and Ziegler's annotations it becomes obvious that Isaiah 965 (ChB) is free from the additions of the later recensions OLC: and this is far more informative than a mere comparison with B which here belongs to O.

Or take the still earlier ChB Papyrus 963 of Numbers, Deuteronomy (after 150°). Sir Frederic rightly states that in Numbers it sides with B and in Deuteronomy with A. We have since learned that Pap. Rylands 458, which is three centuries older (150°), also presents a text of Deuteronomy which is closest to A. From this Sir Frederic (Schweich Lectures 1932, London, 1933, p. 108 and in the edition, 1935, Introduction, p. xii) draws two conclusions. (1) 963, a very old papyrus book, 'was no doubt copied from two (or more) distinct rolls, and these chanced to be of different textual character'. (2) 'Since 963 gives support to the A text in Deut. and the B text in Num., it appears to show that both these types of text existed already in the second century, so that neither can claim preference on the ground of superior antiquity' (Schweich Lectures p. 108).

I am afraid I cannot accept either of these conclusions. In point of fact 963 displays an identical type of old text in Numbers and Deuteronomy. Where it proves free from secondary approaches to the Hebrew,
it helps us to check the text of our later majuscules. If the result is different in Numbers and Deuteronomy, this points to inconsistency on the part of B and A rather than of 963 (for B this was inferred by E. Hatch, Essays p. 281, from the evidence in Sirach, where B 'affords in this respect a corroboration of the opinion that the same MSS have different values for different books'); which is not surprising in view of the fact that B is hexaplaric in Isaiah and part-hexaplaric in Judges, and that A is often, though by no means everywhere, secondary, is sometimes under sporadic or even full hexaplaric influence, and in Genesis is a very poor text indeed. As soon as we stop considering B and A as homogeneous bodies of evidence throughout, we shall be saved from drawing the false inference that their type of text, even where it is demonstrably secondary, as A's text is in Numbers and B's in Deuteronomy, already existed in the second century. All that can rightly be inferred from the internal evidence and from the Chester Beatty text is that the good text type, witnessed to by B in Numbers and A in Deuteronomy, already existed in the second century. Moreover, the text-forms of 963, B and A in Numbers and Deuteronomy are of a complex nature which does not allow for simple formulations. So we cannot replace Sir Frederic's by simpler ones before analysing the texts thoroughly, and an attempt to do this has now been made by D. W. Gooding in his unpublished doctoral thesis, 'The Greek Deuteronomy', Cambridge, 1954 (a summary of the results is given in Recensions of the Septuagint Pentateuch, Tyndale Press, London, 1955).

When O. Procksch, in his review of Rahlfs' edition (Luthertum, 1935, p. 240 and ZAW, NF 13, 1936, p. 87), emphatically states that B and A are the pillars through which the path to the true Septuagint leads, there is no palpable truth behind the metaphor. Moreover to describe B as Egyptian is not to make any relevant distinction, and it is unreal to call A Syrian.

Again much of A. Allgeier's laborious studies on Die Chester Beatty Papyri zum Pentateuch (Paderborn, 1938) and 'Rylands Papyrus 458' (Biblica, 1938, pp. 1–18) is spoilt by his mistaken attempt to regard 'B' and 'A' as individual quantities, which are consistent throughout. More profitable would have been an answer to the question which he neglects, namely, what is the evidence of the papyri when compared with the families or recensions, which are later in date. But perhaps this mistake is more deeply rooted. I confess that I regard with some mistrust the attempts of v. Soden and others to systematize the blunders and other characteristics of MSS like A in the NT, as long as they fail to convince
me that these features all belong to one and the same layer of transmission. Their mistake is comparable with that of an astronomer who looks at the starry sky without taking into consideration the different distances of each individual star from the earth.

2. Further comments on Sir Frederic Kenyon's edition of the Chester Beatty Papyri

Sir Frederic Kenyon has put us all under a very great obligation by publishing so promptly volume after volume. Once more he has shown the unrivalled mastery which was admired as early as in 1891 when he deciphered Aristotle's Πολιτεία Αθηναίων. Then he gave a brilliant start, only to take a very important part in the continued discussion which followed his editio princeps. Owing to the lack of LXX specialists the response to his equally brilliant achievement in the field of the Greek OT has up to now not been equally encouraging. It is different with the NT volumes. Yet very much can be learned and taken from the ChB OT, and in some minor points some additions can already be made after the auspicious beginning which Sir Frederic Kenyon has made (cf. above, p. 265).

(1) He fills the gaps from the Cambridge editions, very often without any notes, though the important thing is just to know with which part of a divided evidence the papyrus is most likely to agree. I give a single example, referring to others discussed later in this section. In Gen. 37: 24 Swete reads ὁ δὲ λάκκος ἐκεῖνος ὄδωρ ὀὐκ εἶχεν with A or, more fully, after Rahlfs, Gen., 1926, A 58 (0) 75 (L) 44/106 (l). This reading of a very decided minority of MSS can be understood from what the others read, ὁ δὲ λάκκος κενός, ὄδωρ ὀὐκ εἶχεν DE 0 (135) Chbgr 55, 59, 134 (that is, apart from Cottonianus and Bodleianus, most of the recensions), a good translation of ὃν καὶ ἐκεῖνος as Z. Frankel, and lately Ottley (Handbook pp. 97 f.), had seen, is but a Greek corruption, perhaps originating from the lack of 'and' in MT and LXX. In instances like this it is, of course, not advisable in a gap of 961, much less the more ancient 962, to follow A with the Cambridge editors who on their part do not pretend to give the genuine text. At least one would expect a note.

Sometimes the Cambridge text is reproduced even where the papyri allowed for, or rather required, a different interpretation. Of this I found an example in Gen. 10: 14. Here again A+, that is A with its satellite 121 (y) only, is opposed to all others, in one of those hundreds
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of singular, or sub-singular, readings of A in Genesis to which Nestle (S-St v) drew attention. For \( \text{αν} \) A+ has \( \chiασμωνιεια \), a mere slip like \( \chiασλωρεια \) in C. In Sir Frederic’s edition of \( \text{C} \) the word runs \( \chiασ\muωνιεια \), with a μ as the first letter after the gap. Yet as far as we can trust the facsimile plate we find ourselves in the equivocal position of arguing against its outstanding editor. For what we can see looks like \( \text{φής} \). The two curved lines are exactly those of a lambda, only the top, where the two curves should meet, is missing, and what is found instead hardly belongs to the letter. It may be a damage, or stain of the paper, or a split stroke of the pen; or perhaps some of the ink has vanished, and what was originally one stroke now appears as two. At any rate, the frequent examples of M look quite different; for they are broader and their upright strokes are decidedly less curved. Therefore only one thing is left – to put \( \chiασ\lambdaωνιεια \) (the common corruption of \( \chiασλωχιεια \)) so as to indicate that the first letter preserved is a partly preserved lambda. If our papyrus really agreed with the slip of A+, it would be so remarkable and unexpected a coincidence that it would call for comment if not exoneration!

(a) Close attention to the problems of recension may sometimes lead to attributing a higher value to some variants found in the papyri. Here also I give only one example (cf. also pp. 265 f. and pp. 273 f.). Among the ‘more noticeable singular readings’ of ChB 966 Sir Frederic mentions Jer. 5: 1 (p. xiii). Indeed, here we are for the first time presented with the genuine LXX translation of this passage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ChB 966</th>
<th>Rahlfs</th>
<th>Lucian OL Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{αν} )</td>
<td>( \text{αν} )</td>
<td>( \text{αν} )</td>
<td>( \text{αν} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \epsilonυρεθη )</td>
<td>( \epsilonυρητε )</td>
<td>( \epsilonυρητε )</td>
<td>invenietis inveniatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \epsilonυδρα )</td>
<td>( \epsilonυδρα )</td>
<td>hominem virum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{ποιων} )</td>
<td>( \text{ποιων} )</td>
<td>( \text{ποιων} )</td>
<td>facientem facientem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(BH): ‘\( \alpha > \Theta \)’
‘\( \text{s-s frt dl c L} \)’

We knew it before approximately, from one of Lucian’s doublet renderings and from the Latin. We see now that \( \text{τις} \) after \( \epsilonυρεθη \) (\( \epsilonυρη\) in Sir Frederic’s Introduction, p. xiii is a slip) is a Lucianic addition, which makes the combined doublets run smoothly. The passive, which is at variance with MT, is confined to 966 and \( L \); and the Latin roughly differs from the common text only by omitting the suspect \( \psi\-\alpha\), whereas 966, with BS* A+, further omits \( \epsilonυδρα = \psi\alpha \). Thus once
more, as so often, we find an old stage of the LXX text in a Lucianic doublet, and we may be sure that it was in the text upon which Lucian worked out his recension, often as here by contaminating it with the current secondary text and embellishing the old half here and there. Without the evidence now afforded by 966 we could just trace the genuine text from L Lat., without, however, knowing exactly how it ran before both of these witnesses manipulated it.

3. On Wutz’s theory
The theory put forward by F. Wutz in the first part of Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta (1925) was most sensational. Wutz attempted to prove that the bulk of translations was not made from a Hebrew text, as we read it, but from a wholesale transliteration of the Hebrew into Greek characters, which would mean the intercalation between the Hebrew and Greek of a third type of text, with quite novel possibilities of corruption. Wutz did not succeed in making his theory plausible. He was industrious and rich in resources, yet his linguistic equipment and critical method were far from sound. A few dispersed remarks in H. S. Nyberg’s Studien zum Hoseabuche (Uppsala, 1935) reveal catastrophic shortcomings on the Semitic side, and his knowledge of Greek is no better (cf. pp. 134–5). Turning to entirely different problems in the second part of his book and subsequent writings, he left unanswered the problem for the sake of which Professor Kahle had asked him to enter upon these studies, namely what could be learned for the history of the pronunciation of the Hebrew language from the variegated transliterations found in the LXX and later texts. Thus his constant references to his Hebrew Grammar according to the transliterations, which was never completed, are just tantalizing. Part of what he promised to give was later achieved by a pupil of Kahle’s, A. Sperber. For the LXX specialist Wutz’s first instalment was suggestive for the reason that – without recording their origin – he revived a great number of earlier LXX emendations. Still Wutz’s contribution had its weaker aspects, and Kahle’s remarkable memorial article still leaves room for a critical survey of Wutz’s ways and means of emending the LXX.
4. An analysis of the textual problems of 2 Samuel 3: 39 to illustrate the contention that behind the seeming variety of text-forms there is but one old and genuine text

If we try to review and sift the different forms of text, we soon find that there are certain standards which are secure and guarantee a safe result. The easiest task is to excise everything that has resulted from Origen’s secondary attempts at adapting the Greek quantitatively and qualitatively to the Hebraea veritas in the post-Aqiban Bible, which he identified with what the inspired authors had actually written. In general it is equally easy to single out the results of Lucian’s recension, the tendencies of which are generally agreed upon by now, however inconsistent Lucian and his school may have been in applying, or not applying, their principles. In this a decisive help is given by an unceasing reflection upon the Hebrew which is behind the different forms of text, influencing the decisions of the recensors. However many MSS or translations may support a demonstrably inferior Hebrew text, they are convicted of being secondary, generally hexaplaric, as soon as part of our evidence witnesses to a better Hebrew which has since vanished. Whenever a branch of our evidence, be it only one MS and perhaps one that generally is not of much value, stands for a Hebrew variant which is obviously superior to the present Hebrew and perhaps also explains its corruption, we stand on firm ground. In such passages there are not two or more texts which with equal right can claim to be the LXX, but only one; for the others which are based on the masoretic text are but intruders dating from a time when the masorah had stabilized its influence and invalidated everything that had preceded it. This standard is of general application and is valid without regard for the reputation in which we may hold the special MS or group of MSS which give the genuine reading. In a full discussion many passages would have to be considered, yet here it may suffice to give a single illustration.

In 2 Sam. 3: 39 in a speech by King David, in which he definitely dissociates himself from the murderers of Abner, the first clause of the Hebrew is obscure and has not yet been convincingly emended (see p. 135). Here our editions read καὶ δει ἐγώ ἔμι σήμερον συγγενής καὶ καθεσταμένος ὑπὸ βασιλέως. συγγενής would make sense only in a clause about Abner, which thus would be in line with the immediately preceding clause. Yet then the third person would be required, so that ἐγώ ἔμι makes the clause meaningless. Already H. P. Smith in his commen-
tary drew attention to Lucian’s reading καὶ δὴ σήμερον συγγενής καὶ καθεσταμένος υπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως πέπτωκεν and from it attempted to restore the MT. He was followed by Nowack, though hesitatingly. Yet nobody has yet drawn the obvious consequences for the Greek text, though they are unavoidable. (1) συγγενής = Ψ instead of Ψ, is unanimously attested, including the translations made from the LXX; therefore it incontestably belongs to the original Greek. (2) The subject of this clause must have been Abner, and not David; so it must have been in the third, and not in the first person. (3) ἐγὼ εἶμι, therefore, is inconsistent with the supposed original Greek. It is an intruder from the MT, but an isolated one, for not only συγγενής, but all the rest, is meaningless when understood as predicated by David of himself. (4) This line of argument stands, even if we do not follow Smith in his restoration of the MT from Lucian. (5) Our usual text, B Eth. 0, in spite of being witnessed by B Eth., is hexaplaric, representing Origen’s patchwork contamination. Apart from it there is the old text without ἐγὼ εἶμι. It has come down to us in two, perhaps three, different forms: (a) MN and most of the minuscules give the reading of B, yet without ἐγὼ εἶμι. They are supported by La. and Syr.1 (a more recent Syriac translation). The absence of ego from Leg. ms. is supported by marginal variants in three more of Vercellone’s Vulgate MSS (not in BM). Other Latin texts have ego. Leg. ms. itself has et quoniam hodie cognitus (for cognatus, obviously a late confusion not recorded in Rönsch’s Itala und Vulgata, who has instances of cognotus for cognitus) et constitutus fui sub rege, and Vercellone’s cod. F has a doublet, cognitus sum rex; both simply betray an increasing degree of adaptation to the Vulgate text (first person) on whose margin they are found. (b) The Armenian, according to BM’s translation, has hic consanguineus est hodie. (c) The Lucianic text runs as given above. In all these three variants the initial καὶ δὴ (ὃ) emends the corrupt Hebrew ἔστιν, and this resumption of ὅ from the preceding clause seems simply to require a verb. The repeated πέπτωκεν of Lucian, who against all the others adds the article before βασιλέως, looks somewhat makeshift. Arm.’s copula est is much more satisfactory; its hic introduces something that is necessary (Smith begins his reconstruction of the Hebrew with ויהי). If we see in L an elaboration of a primitive and rather defective text, the est of Arm. would appear to be the best form of this text, though it has hodie = σήμερον = εἰς which in Arm. is a doublet of hic = εἰς. This σήμερον has penetrated the entire evidence, however, with a difference. Both Arm. and min. y (121) have σήμερον after, instead of before, συγγενής. By this
'uncertain position' it is betrayed as a marginal reading which entered
the text in different places. Reflecting the corrupt Hebrew it must be
deleted. (Here at any rate the Armenian is not 'ein reiner O-text', as
Rahlfs says it is in Samuel and Kings (Ruth p. 142). Its hic keeps at a
distance from B Eth. O, which is still more strictly marked than that of
Lucian.) We can restore the Hebrew behind the Greek as far as מַלְכּ יִרְשָׁדָב
and no farther (Wellhausen, Text p. 160).

As long, then, as the Hebrew has not been convincingly emended, we
can only point to what is inconsistent and secondary in the Greek, but
we cannot with ultimate certainty restore its wording, exactly as it is
bound to have run. Yet one thing is beyond doubt, and this passage
has been discussed here to prove it: behind the seeming variety there is
but one old and genuine text; all else is a superimposed contamination,
the source of which we are able to trace, namely the Hexapla following
in the wake of the reconditioned Masorah.

As soon, then, as we keep strictly to the maxim of eliminating every
variant that betrays secondary, i.e. mainly hexaplaric, influences, there
remains almost nothing of competing old versions. On the contrary, we
realize then that our evidence, however multifarious it may look at
first sight, essentially represents one single translation. This will be
realized, as soon as we recognize that the semblance of widespread
divergence is due only to the later ramification caused by the more or
less thoroughgoing influence of the later scholarly recensions. I do not
pretend in this way to give a solution of all existing difficulties; and
certainly I do not say that everywhere our evidence yields a pure LXX
text in which we may acquiesce. In some books we have no LXX. Thus
Ecclesiastes is Aquila more than anything else, as was shown at length
by A. H. McNeile. In Judges we have at least four distinct groups of
MSS, yet none among them represents what Hort would have called
the neutral text; for B with about a dozen satellites here displays a
capricious post-Origenian recension, unparalleled elsewhere in the
LXX; and no attempt to work back here to the supposed original
behind the contradictory evidence can achieve a thorough restoration
of the whole book. In many passages we may succeed, yet in at least as
many others we are unable to reach behind the old recensions. It would
be the same in the NT if there were only Byzantine and Western texts.
It is to the credit of a method that it does not obliterate the limits that
are imposed on it by the objects with which it has to deal.

There are very few passages in which different translations seem to
compete. But, for example, in the Song of Deborah (Judg. 5) and in
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David’s dirge for Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. 1: 19 ff.) their relation to the existent Hebrew and its supposed older stages to some extent offer the key to the true Greek. The problem is different when a competing version may be considered an isolated piece of translation which never formed part of a translation of an entire book, but was made to serve as a liturgical lesson. This would, however, not necessarily involve that such a pericope was older than its present context.

So Ezek. 36: 24–38 has not been preserved in the LXX translation of Ezekiel. In our B text, which is the most faithful here, differences of language clearly indicate that it must have been incorporated from another source; and that this happened at a comparatively late date is seen from the Scheide papyrus which, written about 200, ignores these verses. If this should be due to ‘parablepsis’, as the American editors suggest, the translation which was omitted cannot have been the one which is in our editions. A similar suggestion about Deut. 28 has already been made (p. 241), and here also it is impossible to decide beyond doubt the relative date of this pericope with its peculiar features. As far as we can see, the insertion of a pericope never in itself implies that a translator abandoned his efforts in order to insert an already existing lectionary translation. This ought to be kept in mind when the ‘aberrant text’ (Thackeray) of the psalm in Hab. 3: 1–19 is considered, which exists in four minuscules (discussed at length in Thackeray’s Schweich Lectures, 1920, pp. 48 ff.). It seems to offer valuable contributions to the restoration of the Hebrew; yet most certainly it is an isolated piece of work which never comprised the whole book, let alone the whole of the Minor Prophets.

If then I cannot see that our evidence favours the assumption of the co-existence of several old translations, I do not wish to claim more than that everything unhomogeneous in our existing text can be explained from the intricate history of transmission which involves the mutual influence of different recensions. The text to which we are able to work back is one and one only.

On the other hand, this does not necessarily mean that behind it there may not have been an earlier phase of competing attempts at translating with ensuing compromises; but if there were, they have left no traces behind. The few fragments of a pre-Christian LXX text, Pap. Rylands 458 and Pap. Fouad 266, both containing parts of Deuteronomy and written about 150, notwithstanding some minor variants, display the translation which we still read. Therefore, when speaking about a plurality of translations at the outset, we tend to move in the
sphere of mere surmise, unsupported by the evidence. [The evidence from Philo’s LXX quotations Dr Walters dealt with in his book, *Philo’s Bible*. For his reaction to the preliminary publication of the evidence from the Greek Scroll of Minor Prophets see *Studia Patristica (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristl. Lit.* 63) 1, Part I, 1957, pp. 345 ff. Ed.]

5. On mistaken method in attempting emendation

As an example of mistaken method in emendation we may cite R. R. Ottley’s attempt to emend Isa. 8: 23 (*Isaiah*, II, 151 ff.), a truly desperate passage in the LXX. Here the Hebrew is completely clear, ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἁλαζών... ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν τριῶν, though Jerome and AV—not Luther—following the Three, go completely astray in their translation. Ottley is right in connecting ἐώς καὶ ὁμοίως with what follows. But in order to restore in the LXX the two complete clauses of the MT he creates a dittography ταχύ—ταχύ and conjectures an ἐπείτα to correspond to his πρῶταν. The dittography was to some extent anticipated by the C recension, but is nevertheless mistaken; and ἐπείτα is impossible, because doubtless ἡ ἡμέρα hides behind καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ of the LXX and thus comes much later in the context. (Similarly mere observation of the word order indicates that the literal translation ὁδὸν θαλάσσης (cf. A’ Θ’ is a secondary doublet of οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες. It may derive from Matt. 4: 15; *S* OLC and others omit it.) Ottley’s mistake was not that he was too bold. He started conjecturing too early. He ought first to have compared the MT and the LXX more carefully. Such comparison reveals the Greek equivalents of ημέρα and ημέρας as shown above. From this we see that ἡ ἡμέρα was not expressed in the LXX, which in Isaiah sometimes omits one of two verbs; but it shows equally clearly that in what is now ταχὺ ποιεῖ the translation of ημέρα was originally given. The parallels in Isaiah suggest a form of άτιμάζω, but that is almost all we can say. Was it an aorist or a future? A passive, which would afford the easiest solution, or an active with σέ or ύμᾶς? As to this last, the υ of ταχύ provides us with nothing of a clue, for it derives from the τάχυν of Symmachus. A formation of ταπεινώσω would be graphically easier, though less well supported by the Isaian parallels. We cannot go farther than proposing something like ἠτιμάσεν (ἐσταπεινώσεν) σέ (ὑμᾶς) or ἠτιμάσθης, ἀτιμάσθης (ἐσταπεινώθης, -ητε), yet we realize that in so doing we are moving in the right direction. At least this suggestion to some extent explains our present LXX. This corrup-
tion is mentioned to demonstrate that an adequate method does not cease to be adequate even if it fails to yield the final emendation in every instance. Even tentative suggestions are justified as long as they refrain from saying more than can be safely said.

6. On BM's treatment of the late correctors in the leading MSS

The treatment of an early majuscule on equal footing with the whole array of its later hands and correctors is not confined to B (see p. 7). Here is an example from Genesis where B is missing and A takes its place. Here, in 5:25, Swete and BM give the age of Methusela when he begat Lamech as 187, and the number of his years thereafter as 782, both in accordance with the Hebrew. It is, however, a well-known fact that 'the Hebrew and the Greek texts of Genesis here diverge, representing two different schemes of antediluvian chronology' (Thackeray, on Josephus, AJ 1, 82, The Loeb Classical Library, Josephus, iv, 38) and that variants of the Greek are due to conformation, partial or complete, to the Hebrew text'. In Gen. 5 this divergence of numbers applies to the age at birth of the first-born and, accordingly, to the later life of the begetter; for the sum total resulting in the lifetime is identical, except for Lamech. The only name where there are identical numbers throughout in the MT and the LXX is that of Jared (5:18–20), but even here the discovery of fresh primitive evidence may any day indicate that this identity is secondary. But in the instance of Methusela with which we started there are divergences in the two complementary numbers in the Greek, and it is obvious that the numbers which correspond to the Hebrew represent subsequent adaptations. Swete, who had to content himself with Baber's attempt at distinguishing the various correcting hands, records ογδο sup ras A\textsuperscript{1} (εξη., A\textsuperscript{a}vid.) in v. 25 and επτακ. καὶ ογδοη sup ras A\textsuperscript{a'}, without any reference to A\textsuperscript{*}, in v. 26. BM, who in their Prefatory Note to Genesis, p. v, list A\textsuperscript{a}, A\textsuperscript{b}, A\textsuperscript{c}, A\textsuperscript{d} as 'corrections by four successive later scribes', convey the impression that they have gone some way to fulfil Swete's hope 'for an entirely new handling of this subject... before the larger edition of the Cambridge Septuagint has passed through the press' (1, xxiii). Yet their annotation is still almost identical with that of Swete; the only difference is that in v. 25 they put 'A\textsuperscript{a}' instead of Swete's 'A\textsuperscript{1}ra\textsuperscript{a}', and in v. 26 they ascribe the reading 782 to A instead of to A\textsuperscript{a}. And yet, as ought not to have been overlooked, 782 cannot go together with 167 which they correctly record for A\textsuperscript{*} in v. 25. Apart from this incongruity the numbers in conformity with the
Hebrew which they have in their text, as has Swete, follow a late corrector of A against the authority of the first hand which is bound to have differed from the corrector in both instances; for else why did he erase the original before replacing it?

In point of fact the third-century Berlin papyrus 911, which BM could not yet know, agrees with A* (Sanders pp. 279, 367), and the new photographic facsimile of A (Part 1, British Museum, 1915) provided Rahlfs with the required number 802 from A* (Rahlfs, Genesis, 1926, pp. 16, 60). Therefore we cannot doubt any longer that the numbers 167 and 802, in contradistinction to 187 and 782 of the Hebrew, represent the original version of the LXX, for which they are further attested by the Origenian recension, by the Itala according to St Jerome's express witness, and by a number of smaller recensions too.

So it is only by an unjustified adherence to a late corrector of A that Swete and BM accept these secondary readings which, however, are not authorized by A*.

As a contrast I mention some inconsistencies by which more recent MSS and recensions betray that their occasional changes are due to isolated adaptations to a form of text influenced by the Hebrew. So min. 53 (f) inserts the Hebrew numbers of the ages of the first birth only in Gen. 5: 9, 12, 15, 21; for Enosh it gives, side by side, in the first place the number of the Hebrew (5: 9), then a defective number (5: 10) and as the sum total an arbitrary one (5: 11). The Syrohexaplar and the Catenae-recension C have 167 with the LXX in 5: 25, but 782 with the MT in 5: 26, and they care no more than does 53 in 5: 9–11 whether the sum total is in keeping with their preceding entries. As Rahlfs observes, 'solus 57 corr. "969" in "949" mutavit'. Still worse things happen in the inferior groups of the evidence of Josephus, to which I call attention here because Niese failed to characterize them as fully as did Cohn and Wendland in their edition of Philo. So in AJ 1, 86 SP have 65 = MT (as do M 54 in the LXX, Gen. 5: 21), and the erratic 177 (with 75 = L in Gen. 5: 25, where the Hebrew number is 187 and the Greek 167). In L there is still more confusion: where we expect Enoch's age at the birth of his first-born (65 MT, 165 LXX Gen. 5: 21), we find the corresponding number of Methusela after the MT, 187 (Gen. 5: 25), and where the correct text reads this latter number, L has the after-life years, 782 = MT. But the best MSS already have 165 = LXX in Gen. 5: 21, yet 187 = MT in Gen. 5: 25, in an exceptional adaptation to the Hebrew such as is found in the LXX evidence in DM and some minor groups. Thackeray's tabulation, Josephus iv, 39, fails to make this
point, since it is based on Swete’s and BM’s text with its secondary 187 (see above).

What is even worse, completely fresh corruptions were introduced into the Cambridge editions of the LXX by their close adherence to the MS reproduced. So in 2 Kings 19: 25 the former editions (and Rahlfs with them) read ἔπαρσεις ἀποικεσίων μαχίμων, where ἀποικεσίαι owes its origin to a confusion of ὀ sqr. stone heaps with the fem. singulare tantum πίθα which, being a collective, means the Jews in exile (μετοικεσίαν). (Jer. 9: 11 (10) discloses a similar confusion, corrected by A’ θίνας, C’ βουνοῦς.) For this both Swete and BM put ὄποι ὀκεσίων with B Eth. (‘απὸ] σὺν A’ Swete!) ὀκεσία, however, would be a novelty, and a preceding ἄπο could not be traced back to the Hebrew. Also in Judg. 18: 30 τῆς ὀκεσίας is a mere corruption found in min. m alone which here, as sometimes elsewhere (Pretzl, Biblica 7, 1926, p. 378), has undergone influences from the A text (τῆς μετοικεσίας), though the B group to which it belongs reads ἄποικίας.
NOTES

INTRODUCTION, pages 1–14

1 One example may stand for a great many. In the Song of Deborah, Judg. 5: 16, for ἀγγέλους, read άγγέλους, and so did Tischendorf?, though his source, the Sixtine, and Bos after it, read ἀγγέλων of the flocks, which tallies with the MT and was demanded by Flaminius Nobilis and L. Cappellus. BM record ἀγγέλων for uας, but HR have ἀγγέλων only, supplying the ἀγγέλων of Β in their addenda. Even ἀγγέλων has found defenders who saw in it an Aramaism. Except for Dan. LXX 4: 10 (13), 14 (17), 20 (23) this would be the only occurrence in the LXX of Aramaic ἀγγέλος angels; but there is something worse in the A text of Judg. 5: 16, άγγελον: this renders ἀγγέλος with the meaning of Syr. being awake, cf. ἡγρήγορος in Dan. Θ' 4: 10 (13) which is a hexaplaric doublet for the transliteration ιπ; cf. also ἡγρήγοροι for ἡγρήγοροι the blind in Lam. 4: 14. So also ἡγρήγοροι Test 12 Patr. (Reuben 5: 6 f., Napht. 3: 5). When Schürer (πι* 284) explains 'Wächter = Engel' he seems to neglect the homonymy which offers the better explanation: Syr. ἀγγέλαρα - Aram. ὄρα. In Job 40: 11 does ἀγγέλον = ἀνάρκητος?

2 Agellius is the author of the remarkable reading ἐλαιον for Ἁλεον Ps. 83 (84): 12, which was adopted by Flashar (ΖΑΝ 32, 1912, pp. 242 ff.).

3 The opposite opinion found its most pointed expression in R. R. Ottley's A Handbook of the Septuagint, 1920, p. 73: '[Swete's edition] is not only the best available edition of the LXX, but perhaps the best edited text of any ancient work in existence.' Yet the continuation makes it clear that his opposition was directed against the presentation of the variants in Westcott and Hort's NT and especially against its apparatus, in which he finds 'too much editor and too little manuscript'. So he expressly excepts from his judgement 'Tischendorf, Tregelles, Baljon, and Souter' who 'consistently give the reading of MSS, as such, in the notes'. Yet it remains true that he does not distinguish between a diplomatic reproduction of a MS and a critical edition.

4 This was shown for Sirach in Smend's very detailed and careful study, and for the Vet. Lat. texts by P. Corssen (Zwei neue Fragmente der Weingartner Prophetenhandschrift nebst einer Untersuchung über das Verhältnis der Weingartener and Würzburger Prophetenhandschrift, Berlin, 1899). For how early a period this holds true can be seen from the ChB (and Scheide) papyri and their relation to later types of text, which were not yet in existence as clear-cut individualities when those second- and third-century papyri were written. It is obvious that in biblical texts even more of such mixture can be expected than in secular ones; for most of our
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biblical MSS were not destined to be private property, but to be used in the services of the congregations. So it was important to have a correct copy, and this was secured by collating with other copies which might have represented a different type of text.

5 Rahlfs’ quotations from 911 must be checked by the final edition which was published a year after Rahlfs’ *Genesis*: Henry A. Sanders and Carl Schmidt, *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis*, Univ. of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, vol. xxi, New York, 1927.

6 When dealing with the grammatical aspect we shall find other indications of subsequent changes.

7 About *L* in the historical books Rahlfs says: ‘huius editionis innumeræ lectiones singulares praetereo’.

**CHAPTER 1, pages 17–28**

1 Hort is by no means the only one to deal with divergent spellings as though they were real variants. Some strong, though occasional, examples are found in von Soden’s *NT*. Though he sets out in general to present his text in a normalized spelling, it sometimes happens that he applies his critical principle of following two, as against the isolated third, of his three recensions even to merely itacistic variants. At least this seems to be the explanation for singular mis-spellings and wrong accentuations in this text, such as John 13: 27 ὅτι ποιεῖς ποιήσον τοξεῖον where he says in his apparatus ‘τοξειον Ὀ’, thus indicating that Ἡ Ἰ read the incorrect τοξεῖον [Hort τοξεῖον Ἰ, 154°]; or Mark 14: 36 παρενέγκαι against the minority reading of Ω Ὀ. Here, however, we have an alternative interpretation of long standing, as can be seen from its attestation both in the Greek and the Vet. Lat. of Mark 14: 36 and Luke 22: 42. The reason why I range it here is twofold: the only difference between the variant readings is the itacistic alternative ε-αι, which, but for the Latin evidence, no one would take to present a real variant; and in παρελθάτω Matt. 26: 39 we have the oldest authentic interpretation from which παρενέγκαι is seen to be secondary; if it was intentional at all, it cannot seriously compete with the imperative.

2 In this, however, we must not be rash. At times the LXX displays formations which are out of the fashion set by the papyri of its date (e.g. γέαι for γεί, Wackernagel, *ThLZ*, 1908, p. 638, and above, p. 59); here any interference would only destroy what must be considered legitimate peculiarities.

**CHAPTER 2, pages 29–81**

1 Neither grammars nor lexicons have recorded that the future δανίω is found in Philo. He keeps δανιεῖς in a quotation of Deut. 15: 8 (*post. Cain* § 142) and even in a paraphrase of Deut. 15: 6. In the former passage the only codex, Ῥ, reads -ει-, but Wendland, who kept it in his edition, later
acceded to Holwerda's δανείες ('oder δανείες ?', Philologus 57, 1898, pp. 277 f.). In the latter passage Cohn decides for the δανείες of F, the best MS (Proll. p. xxiii) although the remaining three, HPA, have -1-, A with a scholion demanding δανείες 'đi τό δανείζω δήμιον περιστοίμου μέλλοντα οὐ τοιοῦ βαρβαρισμός γάρ ἐστίν' adn. mg. man. rec. For other instances of future formations with a shortened vowel, cf. p. 29.

2 Cohn and Wendland's Philo spells all formations with -1- uniformly, and so does Stählin's Index to his Clem. Alex., μείξας Strom. vii, 82, 6 being the only exception in the text that I have noticed.

3 A present μίγνυμι is unlikely: Crönert, MGH, p. 29 and n. 6, p. 308; Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. pp. 697 n. 5, 771.

4 Glaser. Cf. φθίνω-φθεισ-; similarly κλίνω ought to have a future *κλεισω instead of the secondary κλινό. Cf. Herwerden, Lap. test. p. 66; Lautensach, Aoriste p. 142; Schwyzer pp. 740, 751, 737. τισ- as an aorist/future stem can only be related to τίω revere, value (= τιμω), which has no etymological relation to the word group τίω-ποιή (W. Schulze, KI. Schr. p. 205 n. 1). LS, which here is in general excellent, is wrong only in failing to see anything but an unmistakable itacism in τεισ- when it belongs to τίω.

5 -τεισ- must equally be restored in the hexaplaric quotations A' C' Θ' II Sam. 12: 6, C' Θ' Isa. 59: 18, and in A' Ps. 21 (22): 26, Taylor. The nominal derivation in -σις, however, requires some comment. It is rare, and LS cites only Ath. 11, 503 b. But when LS indicates that we should rather spell αποτεισις with -ει-, it is most certainly mistaken. The verbal adjective in -το- and the verbal abstract in -τί- (-σί-) has the weak form of the root: φθιτός, φθίσις, the latter with a change of accent (Schwyzer p. 357). Accordingly τίσις is metrically certain in Homer, Alcman, Theognis, and tragedy. This proves that in this root the pre-Attic equalization which we observe in μειγ- has not taken place. There is no reason to assume the opposite for the compound ἀπότοις, either in Athenaeus or in the few hexaplaric instances. Moreover ἀπότοις has its exact parallel in Sanskrit apaätis, and has preserved this conformity to it all through.

There remains the awkward necessity of restoring the original differentiation of spelling wherever hexaplaric translators imitate the figura etymologica of the MT by a noun. In Exod. 22: 5, 13 δὲ προποτεινυόν λαότοις ἀποτεισις (C' Θ' in 6 Θ' in 14). Therefore the marginal reading of Fb ἀποτείσις (= δὲ προποτεινυόν λαότοις) ἀποτεισις is likely to be A'. The spelling chosen is in accordance with what all editions aspire to, namely conformity to the Attic where there is no authority for a later change. This does not involve a decision about Aquila's actual spelling which is not known to us. Cf. Philo's Bible p. 149.

6 In Philo and Josephus ἀποτειν- should be restored in de Josephe 267, de decalogo 117, leg. ad Gaium 343; B. J. iii, 374.
NOTES TO PAGES 33–38

7 This intrusion of Aramaic forms will be considered in a later section.
8 Ziegler, as the Göttingen texts as a whole, does not record orthographic variants in his annotation, and in his chapter, ‘Orthographika’, which forms part of his Introduction, he merely says that the interchange of i—ει was too frequent to be noted (p. 102). Therefore I am unable to go beyond what is found in Swete’s apparatus.
10 Not, of course, when dealing with authors of the stylistic aspirations of Philo. νεικέω, νείκος etc., are not found in Philo, at any rate not in Leisegang, whereas he frequently uses φιλονικείν, ινικέω, ινικος. ἀντι-φιλονικείν, alleg. π, 156, which is not in Leisegang’s Index, is not cited in LS either. Cohn–Wendland are mistaken in consistently spelling -νεικ-. Admittedly Philo’s usage is that of the classics, i.e. mostly in the bad sense; but in passages like spec. leg. iv, 111 (about the water-animal’s valiant struggle against the current), aet. mund. 104, the word is used in a good sense, which cannot be expressed by -νεικ-. This vacillation is most easily understood, when we credit Philo with the correct spelling -νικ-. Cf. p. 284 n. 21 (on λογ(ε)ιον in Philo). In a passage like de ebr. 99, ἐπιδείκνυς, μάχαι, ρηματολογικια, the temptation for copyists to spell -ει- was strong.
11 Elsewhere Πελπί̇ς is rendered by εἰς τέλος – good Greek, as modern Greek and inscriptions show (Johannessen π, 303; Krebs, Präpositionen bei Polybius p. 113) – or by εἰς τόν άιόνα (Johannessen π, 299).
12 In the last passage νικός clearly means prize of victory in accordance with the imagery of the whole passage (cf. Bauer, NTWB s.a.). This is the prevailing sense of νίκημα in Hellenism. That the author should have replaced it by such a pronouncedly unclassical word, characterizes his sometimes ill-advised precisiness. To some extent he may be excused by the fact that the great grammarian Aristarchus proposed to read νικός, in the sense of ηττα (Wackernagel, Hell. p. 26) instead of νίκος in Homer’s ΠΙ. 276.
13 It is obvious that a compound formed with νεικεσ- as its second component could never be φιλόνεικος, but only *φιλονεικής: W.–Schmiedel, §5, 13a and §16, 5a with n. 26, and the admirable summary in LS, where, however, wrong information is earlier given sub προσφιλονεικ-.
14 Is this ‘Jo. Geo. Trendelenburg, Lubecae 1794 8°’ (Nestle, art. ‘Bibellübersetzungen’, RE3 m, 21?
15 In the continuation I prefer καὶ έτι of MN rell to δέτι τάος of Β O Sah., which closely follows MT. If I am right, this would be one of the relatively few passages of Samuel or Kings in which Β is influenced by O.
16 Compare also my remarks on Philo’s νεων(ι)εια, p. 41.
17 This key, however, does not open every door. We read τονηρά from τονηρός, and alongside of it τονηρέσθαι behave as a τονηρός, and, after
the same pattern, πανουργία along with πανουργееυσαι, πανουργημα, πανουργεύεσθαι i Sam. 23: 22 and πανουργεύεσθαι in Sir. 1: 6; 42: 18, the verb being found elsewhere only in Galen xv, 105 as a passive, and the noun in Schol. Ar., Equ. 800. This formation is derived from stems of all kinds — νεανιεύεσθαι (νεανίας), άναιδεύεσθαι (αναιδής), άλανεύεσθαι (αλανών); it mostly conveys a bad sense, except in άγνεύεσθαι, the usage of which, however, offers no complete parallel to the other verbs (cf. Debrunner, Wb. §215).

18 This Ionic usage enabled the Attic tragedians to interchange formations in -εία and -ία according to metrical requirements; the result of this may not therefore be taken as evidence for ordinary contemporary prose usage. Crönert, MGH pp. 32 f., who strongly advocates the forms in -ία, is refuted by the Ptolem. papyri which spell, e.g., έφοδεία exclusively.

19 Theodoret (qu. 32 in Levit.) says τό έξόδιον τό τέλος σημαίνει τών έορτών. This meaning is to be preferred to that given by LS 'a feast to commemorate the Exodus', or by Pollux, 4, 108 'μέλος τι...δ έξιόντεςήδον' or by Suidas 'carmen in recessu cani solitum'.

Since έξόδιον is used in connection with different festivals — Tabernacles (8th day) Lev. 23: 36; Num. 29: 35; Passover (7th day) Deut. 16: 8; dedication of Solomon's Temple (8th day) 2 Chron. 7: 9 — even passages like Deut. 16: 3 cannot establish the assertion, common to our lexica down to LS, that it means a festival commemorating the Exodus. Theodoret is right: it is the concluding day of a festival. As far as Pentecost is concerned it is the 50th day, ending the festival weeks beginning with Passover.

But this latter usage is later than the OT. Neither ηλιαυ nor έξόδιον has this meaning in MT or LXX. But in the NT we have Πεντηκοστή.

20 After the present writer (ThLZ, 1936, p. 282) Adolf Wilhelm has given a full treatment to this passage (Anzeiger d. Ak. d. Wiss. in Wien, phil.-hist. Kl., 1937, pp. 25–8, cf. p. 29). G. Kittel, in his article on λόγια (TWNT iv, 285 ff.) fails to take account of 2 Macc. 12: 43 for the reason that he keeps strictly to Rahlfs' text throughout. He does not even take it from Deissmann whom he quotes.

Both alternatives show that G. Kittel is not altogether exact in summarizing the 'pre-Christian use of λόγιον' by stating: 'Von dem Charakter des Orakelspruchs ist in der entwickelten Septuaginta-Sprache nichts mehr geblieben; die Vokabel ist zu einem der Träger des biblischen Wort-Offenbarungs-Gedankens geworden' (TWNT iv, 141)

He apparently does not take into account the passages in which λόγιον represents προφητικα, and he may have failed to do so because his survey is based upon Rahlfs' edition with its itacistic spelling, which it may not have occurred to him to refer to the family of words derived from λεγ-, λογ-

LS is wrong to quote Aristeas 158 in this connection. There λόγια simply means sayings, Sprüche (Wendland, also in §177), passages from the Bible,
more precisely the Shema Israel Deut. 6: 4 f., which the Israelites were bound to 'write upon the posts of their houses and on their gates' (Deut. 6: 9), ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶν (φλιών;) καὶ θυρῶν (Arist. 158).

The spelling λόγιον is confirmed by Philo, Josephus and the Latin Bible. In Philo, Cohn and Wendland unquestioningly follow the evidence and therefore have λογείον in the majority of passages, but λόγιον in few only, alleg. iii, 126, 132, fug. 185. Whitaker-Colson in their Loeb translation on the whole follow this Greek text, putting either oracle for λόγιον or place of reason, reason-seat for λογείον. The German translation tends to extend the range of λογείον by translating Stätte, even Schrein des Denkens, der Vernunft, i.e. place or shrine (temple) of thinking, of reason. Philo certainly applies various interpretations, yet none of them requires the artificial spelling -είον, some clearly preclude it, so alleg. iii, 132 or fug. 185. As to Philo himself, the most likely thing is that he used the same spelling throughout, however much his interpretations might vary (cf. p. 282 n. 10, φιλον[ε]ικ-). This can only have been λόγιον which, by the way, did not exclude the meaning place – temple would seem much too artificial even for Philo: λόγιον: λόγος = Ἀπολλώνιον: Απόλλων. The spelling λογείον is a mere itacism, from which it has always been mistaken to gather any profound mysteries. And still Wendland, who in Aristeas 97 preferred the λογείον of LM1 alone, translated Orakeltasche.

Josephus has a transliteration ὅ εσσην, with two different inflexions, the first in the second declension, AJ iii, 163 nom. ἐσσην, 166 τὸν ἐσσην, 170 τὸν ἐσσηνοῦ, 171 τῷ ἐσσηνῷ, the other in the third, 218 ὅ ἐσσην, 185, 217 τὸν ἐσσηνα, 216 τῷ ἐσσην. In 163 and 217 he explains that its Greek name was λόγιον = oracle. And the story which he tells about its marvellous qualities, as it is told in later Jewish sources too, renders the spelling λογείον etymologically certain. Therefore Niese rightly decided for it in 163, and this all the more as the evidence in 217 is unanimous. For the Vet. Lat. I refer to Billen, p. 205. Besides other translations, the occasional emeritio, which I cannot explain, and manuale, which in Mart. 14, 94 lemm. is translated book-cover, we have the transliteration logium = λόγιον. Had they read λογείον or even *λογι-ειον, place of the oracle, we would find *logëum, or -ium, which is nowhere found. Augustine and Ambrose read rationale, as did Jerome in the Vulgate. So he says rationale iudicii = λόγιον τῆς κρίσεως in Exod. 28: 15, 29 f. Since rationabilis is λογικός and irrationalabilis ἀλογός (Rönsch, pp. 112 f.), rationale stands for λόγιον. I can see no reason for Schlatter's conclusion, 'Den Brustschild des Hohenpriesters hat Josefus nicht λόγιον, sondern λογείον, Orakel-stätte, genannt' (Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus, Gütersloh, 1932, p. 66 n. 1).

22 It is the same in 1 Tim. 1: 18 where, however, the still closer connection with the verb στρατεύη excludes all confusion in the MSS.

23 To some extent this is excusable when a printed edition reproduces a single MS. So Grabe (1707) and BM (1897), reproducing A, in Judg. 8: 6
print στρατεία, an itacism opposite to that of Hort and his followers mentioned above. Clearly such itacisms cannot be accented.

24 For the confusion of στρατεία and στρατιά in A', cf. Philo's Bible p. 149. Confusion of στρατεία and στρατιά in spoken Greek seems unlikely because of the differences of accent. Philo's pun on ύδρεία watering-place and υδρία water-pot, post. Cain 137, Άγαφ ἄσκον πρὸς τὴν ύδρείαν, Ρέβεκκα δὲ ύδριαν ἐπιφέρεται, need not indicate that even he pronounced these words alike.

25 This ἀπαρτία from ἀποίρω = ψῦ from ψει is almost a homonym of the usual ἀπαρτία in its different meanings, some of which are found in the LXX as well.

26 Also W. Bauer, Wb. § 5, when quoting three passages from I Clem. Rom., acquiesces in -ια, merely saying 'in mancherlei Schreibung seit Aeschyl.' (col. 43).

27 Mayser 1 3, 34. LS is undoubtedly mistaken in considering ἐργολάβεια in Alciphron (IVp) anything else than an itacism.

28 If we had not these parallels, one might think of ἀπεφυγία exile for life which is derived from the verb, = τό ἀεί φεύγειν.

29 At any rate the diminutive meaning of -ιον is of later date than the formation of the compound suffixes -ειον, -ηιον and the others, as these do not share the diminutive meaning (Debrunner, Wb. p. 292 n. 2).

Quam difficilis esset plerumque distinctio deminutivorum (σιδήριον), pericticorum (σιδηρεϊον), gentilium (Ἀθηναίος), proriorum (Ἀθηναίος), possessivorum (ἐρμαῖος), Grammatici plurimum operae consumserunt, ut unicuique generi, in quantum fieri posset, suos terminos circumscriberent; in quo quum nec ipsi secum consentirent, neque librarios obedientes haberent, tota res turbata est.' This is the initial sentence of Lobeck's very full and still most useful note, Phryn. pp. 367–72.

30 So M.-Schw. § 1580, pp. 50–5, distinguish between λαμπαδεῖον chandelier, torch-holder and λαμπαδίον small torch, ἀστείον part of a shield and ἀστίδειον small shield, ἐσχαρεῖον scaffolding and ἐσχαρίον small hearth, κεραμεῖον potter's workshop and κεράμιον small jar, λυχνεῖον torch-holder and λυχνίον lamp, πλινθεῖον big plate and πλινθίον small brick, σκαφεῖον basin and σκάφιον small bowl, σφαγεῖον sacrificial basin and σφάγιον victim, offering, χαλκεῖον workshop of the χαλκεύς and χαλκίον copper vessel, χερνίβειον handbasin and χερνίβιον small handbasin.

31 Some have already been dealt with in connection with related nouns in -εία (λόγιον = θη on p. 41, -οίον, -ηιον on pp. 39 and 43).

32 Better on p. 466, 'ἀστείος (aber ράστιος zu ραστός)'. This ἀστικός = ἀστικός, found in some inscriptions, presents an analogy to προστικοῦ. προστικόν also in a scholion on 2 Kings 25: 20 (cod. 243 mg: Field 1, 699).

33 This seems to be better than Palmer, p. 56, who considers -ιαν Attic, -ειον Ionic. In modern Greek χαλκείον, a brazier's shop (Palmer), the function accounts for the formation.
Among others the wrong spelling is found in Theophr. Char. 9, 8. The accentuation is correct following Wheeler’s law (Nominalaccent pp. 60–104) according to which a dactylic word or word-ending is accented – ω. The rule, however, is not without exceptions, a general one being the suffix -τήριος.

For the remaining, considerable difficulties I refer to D. W. Gooding, The account of the Tabernacle pp. 55–7.

Thus ἀνθέμιον Eccles. 12: 6 is not unique in the LXX, as was assumed by A. H. McNeile (Eccles. p. 127).

Πάρκε is sometimes used (1) as a collective, so Num. 17: 23, together with the other collectives ΠΆΡΚES LXX ἕξενεγκεν βαλαστόν (ΠΆΡΚES) καὶ ἔξηγεναν ἀθην (ΠΆΡΚES); (2) as an isolated inappropriate singular Num. 8: 4; (3) as an impossible singular among plurals 1 Kings 7: 49, 2 Chron. 4: 21. BH3 suggests a plural in Num. 8: 4 ‘c. Samarit. (cf. LXX Vulg.’); it fails to make the same suggestion in 1 Kings 7: 49, after the Greek λαμπαδεία and Vulg. quasi lili flores, and in 2 Chron. 4: 21, where the LXX and the other translations omit the word and Vulg. alone reads the plural florentia. In both of the latter passages the context requires a plural μὴν. This absolute plural does not occur in the MT, which admits only the sing., and a plur. with suff. μὴν.

As to LS several corrections are required: it fails to record the special meaning of κρατήρ in Exod. 25: 30 (31) ff. and that of ἀνθέμιον. Here it does not take into account Grabe’s emendation of Exod. 38: 16 (37: 19) ἐς and thus for Eccles. 12: 6 gives the purest quality of gold, as though it were ἀκροθίνιον, ἀθην or ἰχνη, whereas LXX literally renders the Hebrew; and regarding λαμπαδείαν, it fails to realize that the LXX examples which it quotes under λαμπάδιον I 2 are exactly paralleled by its only example of λαμπταδείον torch-holder from an Eleusinian inscription (IV*). In point of fact -ον to, in the meaning torch-holder, is a mere itacism everywhere.

LS, after an article πολυανδρεῖον which gives some of the evidence from the inscriptions and papyri, has another on πολυάνδριον, which is quite otiose, because all its examples are mere itacisms. It does not mention the OT examples to which we shall have to come back in Ch. 9 (pp. 179 ff.). Here we may note that in 4 Macc. 15: 20 πολυανδρεῖον may = place where many people assemble, a connotation which is found (in plural) in Plutarch 2, 823 e (LS). This meaning is suggested by διὰ τῶν βασάνων and the following verse. I may perhaps add that the adjective πολυανδριος is of very doubtful evidence in LS. ‘π. τάφος = πολυανδρεῖον’ in the late historian Eunapius (IV/Vp) suggests -ει-, and δεμονες πολυανδριοι (sic, invit LS) on a défisio (Audollent 22: 30) of ΠΠP, which is incorrectly written throughout, does not command confidence either.

More than once their spelling is more correct than that of A, just as also in more far-reaching respects the standard text of A in Genesis is not a
good one, as had been amply demonstrated Nestle, S-Sl v, 21 ff. and is now shown by the entire old papyrus evidence.

41 The all-too-literal κρίσις τῆς πρωτοτοκ(ε)ίος for ἡ πρωτοτοκία, Deut, 21: 17, may not in fact have been shared by C and Θ; for our information derives solely from the notes which Masius took from his Syr., which has since been lost.

42 -ηνος is a rather rare formation (Debrunner, Wb p. 321; Schwyzer p. 490; nothing in Mayser).

43 Άταργάτην Strabo 16, 4, 27 is an itacism, just as Άτταγάθη in Hesychius may be a retrograde formation from an acc. in -ην (= -ιν).

44 It is difficult to understand why Redpath relegates Ασταρτίον, Ατεργατίον and Βηλιον to his supplement of proper names.

45 We may append here three formations which are not biblical. The most remarkable is in Philo. He employs συναγωγή once only, in a description of worship, quod omnis probus liber sit 81, but twice, somn. 11, 127, and legat. 311, συναγωγιον, according to our editions. Yet this very rare word can only mean picnic, like συναγώγιμον δείπνον in Attic fourth-century comedies, where every partaker brings with him (συνάγει) his share of the food. Pollux 6, 7 quotes it as place of picnic, besides συμπόσιον, συσσίτιον and others. Accordingly we must spell it συναγωγείον. Philo, in his flowery style, will thus have characterized the place of worship by the suffix otherwise appended to divine names. There is a very similar instance of a rather loose use of the suffix -ειον, namely σαββατείον, house in which the Sabbath service was held, perhaps a synagogue (LS). It is found in Josephus, AJ XVI, 164, in the verbatim quotation of an Imperial decree. Its pagan author may have confused Sabbath and Καίσαριος. If so, his intention would have been that of fashioning a correct temple name. Our last instance is taken from LS. Under μαρτυριόν it records 'III. shrine of a martyr'. The examples are VIP; the spelling is an itacism for μαρτυρεῖον. Hence Strathmann, TWNT IV, 513, 31 ff. must be corrected.

46 This goes back to the 2 Chron. 35: 24, where it is translated τὸ δύο τὸ δεύτερον. A similar expression is rendered τὸ δύο τὸ δεύτερον in Gen. 41: 43, where some MSS, mainly Lucianic (Rahlfs, Gen.: '75 l' 129'1'), read δευτερευς. Philo puts δευτερευς (somn. II, 46, migr. 160); and in 1 Esdras a small minority of minuscules have the δευτερον of Genesis.

47 Here the LXX, and in Ps. 57 (58): 9 C', say χόριον, and there is no foundation nor evidence for the alternative -ειον given in HR. It is almost certain that the dubious forms του τουτους (Pap. Fayum 347, IIp) and τεταρτευς (Suppl. Epigr. 1, 464, 22 from Galatia, IIIp), quoted by LS, ought to be spelled with -ει- as well (cf. τεταρτευς). And when in 2 Sam. 3: 4 A alone reads τεταρτως instead of τεταρτευς (corruption from supposed contraction?), Rahlfs was right in ignoring this slip, as τεταρτως could only mean in the fourth year (cf. τριτως 1 Sam. 9: 20; 30: 13) which makes no sense here.
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48 καθαρεύομαι 'to be καθάριος, Alex. Aphr. Problemata 2. 53' (LS) must be spelled with -ει-, although it is ΠΠ, -ι- being an itacism. For the formation see note 17 p. 282.

Also in Aristeas 145 the correct καθαρειότητι of cod. M must be restored to the text. It is a question of the cleanliness of some kind of fowl, διαφέρει καθαρειότητι. There are parallels in Aristotle, one expressing the same idea, καθαρειότατον ἕττι το 3δον (the bee, Hist. An. 626a 24), the other, though more remote in meaning, almost identical in form διαφέρει ἤ δψις ἐφ' χαι καθαρειότητι (EN 1176a 1).

49 The plural of γῆ was always rare (LS s.v.), and so it is in the LXX (Thack., p. 143) – there is room for it only in the meaning land, country, and even here the LXX prefers to express the plural by πᾶσαι ἢ γῆ or some other periphrasis. This observation of Thackeray's is useful in a different connection (pp. 188 f.). But we can see why both in the LXX and also on inscriptions (Schweizer, Perg. p. 139) the Ionic forms γέαι etc. were preferred – because they were not monosyllabic; indeed they may themselves be secondary and formed for this very reason (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 473 may point to the same). If this holds good for the plural only, the reason is that this was rare and therefore more isolated in the mind of those using it. In this connection it is useful to refer to Wackernagel's essay 'Wortumfang und Wortform' (NGG, 1906, phil.-hist. Kl., pp. 147–84 = Kl. Schr. pp. 148–85). There he deals with several aspects, but I should like to quote from him a passage which he took from Meillet (MSL 13, 359): 'Les mots autonomes de la phrase tendent dans presque toutes les langues à n'être pas monosyllabiques; seuls demeurent ou deviennent monosyllabiques les mots accessoires, qui, le plus souvent, s'unissent dans la prononciation à des mots voisins.'

50 The same corruption occurs in Josephus, AJ ix, 284, cf. Niese i, xxxiii. Here the spelling Κιτταιων for Κιτιεων combines two mistakes, one graphical (ττ-τι), the other phonetical (αι-ε). Actually there is in the LXX a second form of the name, Κίτιοι, Gen. 10: 4 (also in 961 ι Chron. 1: 7, Dan. Θ' 11: 30.

51 Another inconsistency is to be seen in Swete's text. Whereas in Numbers his evidence compels him to print -αίων, in 1 Maccabees he follows S (-έων) against S* AV in spite of the fact that his text of 1 Maccabees is a reproduction of A. When in Isa. 23: 1 he gives -αίων noting in his apparatus 'Κιτιεων B', B may be a slip for Q; for according to Ziegler's apparatus -έων is read by QV, whereas B has -αίων.

52 Mayser compares Ιγγειος-Ιγγαιος, etc., yet the formations in -γαιος are dialectical residues in the κοινή (Glaser pp. 80 f., Wackernagel, IF 25, 1909, p. 335).

53 Thackeray, in the context of his paragraph, is inclined to trace in the use of φορβεά for φορβεία by 'the literary translator of Job' something like higher stylistic aspirations. I do not think this probable; for this translator does not borrow from Attic; his well-known glosses are all epicisms, and,
moreover, φορβεά is found three times in a third-century papyrus without any stylistic aspirations.

In LS there is an appropriate account of σημέα; all the more one wonders why there is a special article φορβεά, distinct from φορβε(ι)ά, enumerating only our passage in Job, where, as we have seen, the evidence for φορβεά is unanimous, and Hesychius, whose spelling does not prove anything, apart from the fact that his evidence also includes -έα.

54 In The Bible and the Greeks, p. 233, C. H. Dodd points to the agreement against the LXX text of Poimandres and the Sacred Discourse in the emphatic form given to the divine command, σύνεσθε ἐν σύνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε ἐν πληθεί. He considers the pedigree of the two Genesis quotations difficult to establish, because the Sacred Discourse displays εἰς το σύνεσθαι ἐν σύνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε ἐν πληθεί, whereas Poimandres has imperatives in accordance with the LXX. Closer examination of the context of the Sacred Discourse certainly shows that there is an unbroken sequence of expressions introduced by εἰς. In the remaining instances, however, εἰς is followed by a noun, so perhaps we ought to read εἰς το 'σύνεσθαι ἐν σύνεσθαι καὶ πληθύνεσθε ἐν πληθεί', the το introducing the literal quotation from the expanded source. This formula of quotation would correspond to that in Poimandres, δὲ θεός εύθυς ἐπεβλήθη ἀγαθὸ λόγῳ. If I am right, the text of the Sacred Discourse has suffered an itacistic corruption, and that from reasons easily understood.

55 It is different in Lev. 23: 30, where the passive construction is due to imitation of the preceding verse and was therefore chosen by the translator. The explanation given above for the corruption of Deut. 7: 24; 12: 3 is confirmed by a set of corruptions in Esther which, though different, are due to a similar cause. These passages all record a royal injunction to destroy the Jews. As far as canonical passages are concerned, the Hebrew reads either a Piel as in 3: 9 (םִֽדְּרַבְּכָנ) and 8: 5 (םִֽדְּרַבְּכָנ) or a Hiph. as in 4: 8 (םִֽדְּרַבְּכָנ). Here we must read ἀπολέσαι throughout. In 3: 9 A alone reads -οςιν, in B ε (13: 3 f.) adgjpqswz La. (περίτε), in C ε (4: 17 f.) Aarw. Consequently we must restore ἀπολέσαι in 4: 8 with Nařv and in 8: 5 with AP La."id. The corruption ἀπολέσθαι makes the following accusative the subject of the clause, which the translator is unlikely to have done with the Hebrew before him. In Deut. 7: 24 Grabe is right against A, in 12: 3 with A. In Esther, on the contrary, he puts the mistaken reading in 4: 8 with A, in 8: 5 against it. This inconsistency is due to the fact that the Pentateuch volume was published by Grabe himself, whereas the volume containing Esther is posthumous.

56 In Exod. 8: 14 (10) BM have θι- in the text, their first apparatus noting θεί- as a mis-spelling of ΑΦ.

57 As I do not include in this work a full chapter on the lexicon of the LXX, I may add here that in Exod. 22: 6 (5) an anonymous translator preserved in B puts θημωνία for πετρι emphrasing pile of sheaves, as does a
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mistaken translation of Ψμι in Job 21: 32. In Job 5: 26 the same Hebrew is expressed by θημωνίσθη ἄλως. The same meaning for Ψμι (Exod. 22: 6 (5), Judg. 15: 5 – in the late B text), for γαίρι (Isa. 25: 10), and, in spite of the Hebrew, for γαίρι threshing-floor (Jer. 28: 33 ἄλων ὀρμος, cf. στέτος ὀρμος Job 5: 26) is conveyed by ἄλων. All this is missing from LS which, however, quotes a Pap. Ryl. (IIp) for ἄλως grain on the floor, a signification quite close to that which we find in the LXX.

58 In attributing the gloss to 15: 8a I am following Field. He briefly adds 'Nescio an Aquilae sit pigmentum'. He must have had in mind the appositeness of this translation of ἱθμωνία (nomen de-nom. from ἱθμός) heap. This would involve that τσωρτθη, attributed to A' C' Θ' by Mjvz, is either mistaken regarding A', or that there are here quotations from the two editions of Aquila. BM solve the difficulty by making θημωνίδοσθη belong to 15: 6b ἐπάγη = ἔσωσθη stood still, a combination much more far-fetched, even if an index in the text of F would suggest it – for indexes are often misplaced and misleading, as is amply seen in Lütkemann's and Rahlfs' edition of the hexaplaric marginal notes to Isaiah in cod. 710.

59 As a rule we should not be too easily content with metaplasms, but first try to put our text in order. The reasons for such seeming metaplasms, as will be seen, may be manifold. We have just had an example of itacism as its cause.

In other instances it is a peculiar way of spelling: so κσ for ξ, as in έκ ζουφιρ for έκ ζουφιρ, έκσοισες Jer. 28: 44 S and έκσοισες Deut. 28: 38 A for έκσοισε (Crönert, MGH p. 95 n. 5). So we can dispose of the strange hapax legomenon δράκος (3 Macc. 5: 2 δαψιλέσι δράκεσι λιβανωτοῦ with abundant handfuls of frankincense) = δράγμα, δράξ. There certainly is a homonym δράκος ἔμε (δέρκομαι) in Nic., Al. 481, but our δρακεσι is simply δρακσί spelled *δρακσί, its ε- coming from δαψιλέσι, or even from a spelling *δρακςCCl.

Elsewhere interpretation confirms the rarer form. So ζήλος is seen to be neuter, as soon as we read, against BS', οὐδὲν υφίσταται ζήλος 'nothing is able to stand before envy', Prov. 27: 4. BS took ζήλος to be the subject and therefore put οὐδένα (Helbing, Kasussyntax p. 88).

60 In a contribution to the dedicatory volume And other Pastors of Thy Flock, A German Tribute to the Bishop of Chichester, edited by Franz Hildebrandt; printed for Subscribers at the University Press, Cambridge, 1942, pp. 1 f. This short article contains two more emendations. In Prov. 26: 7 it suggests reading χωλοῦ πάρεσης σκελῶν καὶ παροιμία ἐκ στύματος δορήνων instead of ἐφελοῦ παρείαν σκελῶν καὶ παροιμίαν (ThLŻ, 1936, col. 277), and in Prov. 24: 51 (30: 16) στῆλωσις (instead of ἐπως) γυναικὸς = γυνὴ ἱσχυρή cf. Philo, spec. leg. iii, 62, Isa. 66: 9, Sir. 42: 10 (ThLŻ, 1938, col. 34).

61 The converse change is found in Menander's Epitrepontes 590 where the Cairo Papyrus, our only source, reads οὐσια and H. v. Arnim suggested ἱσθα (ed. Jensen, 1929, p. 41, cf. p. xiii: 'οι πρὸ την Ἐπ. 590 οἰσθα').
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The Origenic addition ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ, however, is an obvious adaptation to the corrupt context ἰσθα μεθ' ἡμῶν. Moreover, it came in from the margin, as is proved by its uncertain position. For our purpose therefore it is no more than a hint.

In itself σταθμός would not be impossible; for it is found with this meaning in Herodotus, Xenophon, on inscriptions and in contemporary papyri. Moreover, σταθμός renders ἱλίνα caravansary in Jer. 9: 2 (1), and σταθμοί is the appropriate equivalent of θυσίας in Num. 33: 1 f. Elsewhere, however, the special connotation of the Hebrew word is missed, as in Num. 10: 6, 12. In Gen. 13: 3 ἐθεῖν ἠλθεν the translation is either free or based on a different Hebrew; in Exod. 17: 1 we even read κατὰ παρεμβολὰς αὐτῶν for θυσίας. But here, in Num. 10: 31, we have νῦν, and there exists no parallel that would support the equation τὴν-σταθμοῖς. So we must acquiesce in the fact that the exact formation of παρεμβολή or παρεμβάλλω cannot be restored.

Also in Philo: de decal. 68 τὰς τοῦ σώματος δψεις as opposed to τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς δμμα: the same in de ebr. 44, sobr. 3 f., heres 78 f.

Rudolph was the first to see that v. 31a could easily be brought into conformity with the MT. However, he refrains from altering it, because he believes that both the LXX and Targum Onkelos deliberately tone down the wording of the MT which, he says, gave offence to them. To them the idea was unbearable that Israel, who were led by Yahweh Himself in the Ark, should need a human guide. There certainly is some toning down in Targum Onkelos, at least when it freely paraphrases 31b and hast seen with thine own eyes the mighty deeds that were done unto us. But there is none in the LXX once our emendation is accepted. While Rudolph's point deserves being considered as far as v. 31b is concerned, he is certainly mistaken in applying it to v. 31a. I cannot agree with his impression that Targum Onkelos here turns away from the MT. Forasmuch as thou knowest how we have encamped in the wilderness tallies with the MT where the LXX does not; it has both knowest (κατὰ) and encamped (παρεμβάλλομεν) which are missed in the Greek. The LXX discloses no intentional emasculation; it is merely corrupt and requires emendation.

Here (= Neh. 3: 15) it forms part of a strange translation, the starting point of which, however, can be stated: ...and the wall of the pool of Siloah by the king's garden (AV) καὶ τὸ τείχος κολυμβήτρως τῶν κοδίων τῇ κούρα τοῦ βασιλέως. Schleusner III, 417, following J. D. Michaelis, Supplementa ad lexica hebraica p. 2328, starts from ἱλίνα, which to him is related to an Arabic root meaning to excoriate, and thinks of κοράθιος as an addition making this interpretation certain. To me it is obvious that first of all the translator misread δῇ, taking it to be δῇ, and
then resorted to guesswork. In any case κουρά is the appropriate trans­
lation of τή, as is shown by Deut. 18: 4 and Job 31: 20.

κολοσσίων small rope (253a: Mayser 3, 38).

Also Ps. 103 (104): 17 (cf. Thack. p. 76): 'ερωδιον] ηρ- T: cf. prol. 7′
(T not reliable as to vowels); 'αρ- He(sych. of Jerus.) A′ (non 1219):
cf. Lev. 11: 19; Deut. 14: 16′ (Rahlfs, Psalms).

The Greek and Latin OT is the only evidence for the form αρ-, since
αρωδία[ών] is no longer read in more recent editions of Herodas viii,
fragm. 35.

Cf. Ph. Buttmann, Lexilogus 11, 79 (pp. 25 ff.), English translation by
J. R. Fishlake, 91 (pp. 466 ff.).

In 2, 3, Mayser is rather inconsistent, putting ρα- p. 135 and καταφρά-
p. 137, but καταρφα- pp. 224 and 285 (Index). LS is correct throughout.
And hence in Josephus AJ xi, 22, 26, 29. In 22 P has the mutilated
marginal note γρ καί ραι... (W reads ραμος throughout). Does this point
to 'Ραιθυμος or to a reading
DTPl, in which latter case 'Ραθυμος = ι
Esdras would be a secondary borrowing?

From Ezekiel onward Ziegler has at last restored the correct forms. In
Dan. (LXX) 2: 29 Syr. has ΕΟΠΑΚΑΣ in the margin.

Before this was known, Dawes, Tyrwhitt, and Porson had proved that
the metre nowhere admits εωρακα. It is amazing how slowly, even
reluctantly, this was accepted by the nineteenth-century grammarians.
In the parallel εάλων έαλωκα long and short α look alike. The rich col­
clection of examples in Crönert, MCH pp. 272 ff., should not be over­
looked.

Thackeray p. 91, as in other instances, is too prone to trace back to the
original mistakes which certainly belong to a much later stage. So
μεσοπωρων Sir. 34: 21 (Sw., 31: 21 Ra.) with its mistaken -ω- instead of
-ο- certainly does not represent the author’s hand, as it is corrupt for
εμεσον πόρρω which, as Smend teaches, corresponds to the Hebrew and
has rightly been preserved in his Hauniensis k, Sah. and a doublet in
the later Greek recension and the Latin.

άνωνητος is v.l. in Dem. 9, 40 (Wack., Dehnungsg. p. 48; not in LS).
LS likewise fails to record ‘die hellenistischen Nomina ωντ-, ετ-, μετ-,
παρωνομασία, deren Dasein kaum bestritten werden kann, da die
Zeugnisse für ω zu viele sind’ (Wack., ibid. pp. 49 and 58 top).

'σννωσία in der Septuaginta’ (Wack., Dehnungsg. p. 62) is a slip. It is
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C', and in Ezek. 22: 25 -ω- is the spelling of our evidence, whereas Field's quotation from C Jer. 11: 9 is his own retranslation from Jerome and Syr. Schl. v. 211, *sub* συνομοσία, quotes -ο- from 'Lex. Cyr. MS Brem.', -ω- as a variant from 'Suidas, Hesychius and others'. In the LXX we find συνωμόσια Gen. 14: 13 = ἔνοικας, and nowhere -ο-. 'Dagegen dringt in der Kaiserzeit der kurze Vokal mit Macht ein. Lehrreich sind Stellen wie Hesych's ἐνώμαλα δασεῖν· ἐνωμάλως ἔριζεν mit o in der Glosse und ὀ in der Glosse' (Wack., *ibid.* p. 63).

81 As far as I can see all verbs derived from those compound adjectives which have a lengthened vowel at the beginning of the second component are in -έω. In this context we may point to the existence side by side of perceptwunen and -αν. More closely it can be observed that perceptwunen is more than once found in Hippocrates, whereas perceptwunen is found only once as a variant in Hippocrates in a middle form, its active being confined to later medical writers. As an explanation we could imagine that perceptwunen was a legitimate derivation from perceptwunen, to which an original perceptwunen (correct from δύνη) was adapted in a rather recent development.

82 Sometimes the misplacement of the augment, far from being popular, originated from an unsuccessful attempt by half-educated people to apply – or rather to misapply – what they felt to be more correct and more elegant (Schweizer, *Perl.* p. 172 n. 1). His examples are imperatives: ἀνέωξον = ἀνοιξον, and ἐνκατφκησον = ἐγκατοίκησον. Cf. also ἀνεχθήναι Luke 3: 21.

83 'κατεάχθην Jer. 31 (48): 25' (*Crönert, MGH* p. 242 n. 1) is a mistake; this formation appears in John 19: 31. Here in Jeremiah our MSS rightly read κατεάχθη, which must also be read in v. 39 for the corrupt κατηλλαξεν of our entire evidence.

84 In passages like Jer. 22: 23 ττεριωδυνεῖν where Swete has δύνας with BS, and Rahlfs, more appropriately, ώδινας with AQ, while the secondary evidence combines δύνας, δύνας as τικτούσης, we must not assume that ώδιν exercised any influence on the spelling of κατωδυν-.

85 In Proverbs the LXX says άτιμώρητον είναι for ἰἱππι Niph. (11: 21; 19: 5, 9; 28: 20). That this represents a higher level of style, is seen from the parts of the LXX using τιμωρεῖν.

86 Our MSS and editions are sometimes inclined to overlook the Hebrew usage of the abs. inf. as a corroboration of the finite verb (cf. Driver's note on 1 Sam. 20: 6): so ἵππι in Nahum 1: 3 must be ἰἱππι οὐκ ἰἱππίσει as it is in Rahlfs and Ziegler, whereas Swete follows BS*W writing ἰἱππι (which in itself would make sense). In Jer. 26 (46): 28 even Rahlfs puts ἰἱππι against SQ*. The same Hebrew expression is translated in the same way by Θ' and the Lucianic MSS in Jer. 37 (30): 11, and Field rightly gathered from Jerome's Latin report that this applies to Α' as well as C' apparently putting καθαρίζειν as does Num. LXX 14: 18).
There is some additional evidence for the correctness of the participle ἀθωών, as Jer. 29 (49): 13 (12) Sw. (30: 6 Rahlfs) ἡγήσθη ἐν ἠτό πρώτον (cf. Cornill, Comm. p. 480) is translated ἀθωωμένη οὐ μὴ ἀθωοῦσι. In LS the quotation from Nahum 1: 3 requires a correction; moreover, when quoting the fut. pass. ἀθωοῦσιομείκα it ought not to omit the perf. pass. ἠθωόμενοι mentioned above, and lastly it does not record the noun ἡ ἄθωσις = ἡ ἰσχία ‘innocentia’, used (and created?) by A' Gen. 20: 5 (see Field’s footnote – HR do not avail themselves any more than BM of the treasures hoarded in Field’s notes) and Ps. 25 (26): 6.

87 In an A' addition of 1 Kings 10: 15 Rahlfs spells ἡω-, since only Ax 236 242 have the corrupt ἕω-, while in A' Ezek. 27: 8 the correct ἡω- was restored by the editors from Parsons onward (‘ἐπων. cod. 86’, Ziegler).

88 Here the LXX text requires some emendation. Judged from the translation of Jer. 38 (31): 22 θυγάτηρ ἡτιμώμενη, 30 (49): 4 cannot be right: instead of θυγάτηρ (ASQ; -ερ Β) ἱτίμας we must read ἱτίμας with L Thdt, in spite of the fact that a few verses away, Sw. 29 (49): 17 = Ra. 30: 10, L has ἱτίμα instead of ἱτιμᾶ for ἱτίμα (A' C ύπερηφανία).

89 A further remark may for once illustrate some of the difficulties in which the lexicographer of the LXX sees himself involved. In Isa. 23: 16 the translation ἰδέμβευσον, πόλις τὸρνη ἐπιλελισμένη (so all, including Tyconius civitas fornicaria oblita) most appropriately renders ἡ ἱτίμα πολεις is an itacism in B S C only; πόρνη is used as an adjective as often – πόρνη is a participle. Therefore Ziegler who first restored πόλις should cancel the comma after it. Should we state that A’ Jer. 38 (31): 22 and 30 (49): 4, in translating ἰδέμβευσον was thinking of the root βασίλισσα instead of πολέμοι (Song of Sol. 7: 1 Budde proposes ἱπια for ἱπια)? Then he, as LXX Isa. 23: 16, would have in mind what is expressed by κυκλοῦν ἐν τῇ πόλει in Song of Sol. 3: 2 f. (5: 7). In Jer. 38 (31): 22 the following ἰδέμβευσον – so difficult to explain – may have given him the suggestion; indeed he translates it by περικυκλώσει. Yet nothing definite can be stated; both βασίλισσα and βασίλισσα cover too wide a variety of meanings, including that of turning from the Lord, and the subsidiary sense of loose behaviour attached to ἰδέμβευσον, ἰδέμβευσο tallies too closely with the Hebrew description of apostasy as fornication away from God to allow a stringent interpretation of the two passages in A’ Jeremiah (and E’ Hos. 8: 6).

90 This corrects my earlier mistake in ThLz, 1936, p. 283.

91 Pap. Par. 47, 23, 19. The imagery quoted by Mayser from this papyrus is entirely identical with that of 4 Macc. 7: 1 ff. and therefore helps in its interpretation. Both conceive of life as a dangerous sea voyage. Both speak of τρικυμία mighty swell. Mayser could have supported his able commentary by a proper understanding of θεβρήσας υμᾶς (= ἡμᾶς) εἰς υὴν instead of translating in einen Wald von Not. In fact, it is mud, into which the writer complains that he has been thrown; only then does βαπτιζόμεθα we are being flooded (line 13) come out appropriately.
Incidentally, Rahlfs' mistaken decision is by no means based upon ignorance. As his note in Ps. 68: 3 indicates (Psalmi p. 192), he did anticipate my correction of Mayser's translation: 'sermo plebeius ιλυν limum, lutum et υλην materiam non plane discerneat, cf. papyrus a Mayser p. 34 inf. adlatus, in quo υλην non siluam miseriae (Mayser) significat, sed limum miseriae (cf. limum malorum Ovid. Pont. 4.2.16)'. But it can also be seen why he preferred Lucian's Atticizing forms, although, as P. L. Hedley puts it (Harvard Theol. Review 26, 1933, 69), 'the main feature in Rahlfs' principles of recension is the low value assigned to the Lucanian recension', and although Rahlfs himself did the most to reveal the extent of Lucian's Atticizing tendencies, in his note on Ps. 39: 3 he explains υλεως in these words: 'a forma solaeca υλις pro ιλυς'. In his opinion a solecism was due rather to the later course of transmission than to the translator. In his note on Ps. 68: 3 he gives another explanation, namely popular confusion of ιλυς and υλη, resulting in homonymy. It did not occur to him that the second overrides the first. It may even be, however, that the expression *sermo plebeius* in his second note is meant to attempt to describe, not the popular Greek of the LXX, but its supposedly subsequent degeneration in the hands of plebeian copyists. However that may be, Rahlfs does not fail to record that in Ps. 39: 3 'verbum graecum υλη habet Βο'.

92 ChB 965 in Isa. 18: 2 spells ἔτηστολάς βυβλίνας, thus confirming the testimony of B, which is hexaplaric in Isaiah, and therefore of very little weight. Pap. 967 reads Βυβλιων in Ezek. 27: 9 with B*Q* (cf. Thackeray §6.43).

93 This inflexion indicates that the noun became barytone after the metathesis and the metaplasm had taken place. The reason for this change of accent may have been homonymy with υλη.

94 Here also I have to offer some modifications of LS. For υλη it states 'IV (1) sediment, Ar., Fr. 879, cf. Sch. Ar., Pl. 1086, 1088 (hence υλις (δφ-, δι-), υλωδής II); mud, slime, UPZ 70.9 (II. b.c.); υλη, υλει and ιλι are cj. for υδει in Thgn. 961. (2) matter excreted from the human body...'. Here IV (2) *matter* is supported by materia which has survived in the modern languages. Of IV (1) we have already done away with the example from the second-century papyrus (Mayser's Par. 47, 23, 1.9) where we suggested ρυιν (p. 77 with note 91). Likewise among the proposed emendations in Theognis the first cannot be considered, since only a form ρυις/λυς is possible. So there is left only the fragment from Aristophanes preserved in the Lexicon of Photius, quoted by Lobeck (above, p. 78) which in Naber's edition runs, 'υλην το κοζίχον του ονου ή του ρηχους: 'Αριστοφανης'. The fragment thus consists of only one word (υλην) which gives no hint of its place in the verse or its prosody. It must have been ιλιν, since, in spite of the fourth-century inscription quoted above (p. 77, IG 2, 2498, 9), Aristophanes is not likely to have put the metaplastic form without giving rise to some more
thorough comments in the Scholia. The Scholiast's comments on Aristophanes' *Plutos* 1086, 1088 deal with τρύξ* must, dregs*, which can only be explained by ἴλος/ύλις and not by ὕλη. So in IV (1) nothing at all is left of ὕλη, and it would be tempting to put the further question whether IV (2) ὕλη matter excreted from the human body may not represent a homonymous ὕλη² = ὕλις, a creation so consequential as to give rise to the Latin and modern use of matter = purulent 'matter', pus. At any event, LS's evidence is of a date late enough to allow for this explanation (IIp), though the case formations in Soranus Medicus (gen. ἴλης) and Galen (ὑλες, ὕλων) cannot be easily transformed into formations of ὕλις; and even ὕλη phlegm, catarrh, *PMed* in Arch. Pap. 4, 270 (IIIp) appears to be covered by the passages from Galen quoted under ἴλος, impurity, σπέρμων. One would like to know more about the usage found in the *corpus Hippocraticum*; LS mentions it only under ἴλος, as is to be expected (2. dregs, sediment, *Hp. Mul.*, 1.66). I think this much will be granted that the meanings IV (1), (2) – sediment; mud, slime and matter; phlegm, catarrh – cannot be easily reconciled with those preceding them in article ὕλη I–III. This suggests a metaplasm which is in fact a mere itacism, exactly as in the cases mentioned above in n. 43 to p. 56 and on p. 66, but here resulting in the existence side by side of two nouns ὕλη.

There are plenty of late derivations of ὕλιζω. But one more comment on LS is to the point. When we come from ἴλοδής, muddy, slimy, the first example of which is from Hippocrates (*Coac.* 512), we realize at the first glance that in ἴλωδής two homonyme must be distinguished: (1) ἴλωδής woody, wooded, first found in Thucydides and Sophocles, and (2) ἴλωδής turbid, muddy, which is post-Christian, and became possible only when ὕλις and ὕλη were confused in the minds of the later Greeks. At an earlier period we would expect ἴλω- (ὁλι-)ώδής. However, it is not easy to be definite on this point, for there seems to be no adjective in Greek derived from nouns of the ττόλις type except ἴκτερωδής (found along with ἴκτερώδης in Hippocrates), which Chantraine p. 430, in any case, thinks has been influenced by ἴκτερικόω, although a Latin gloss offers ἴκτερις = aurugo' for ἴκτερος jaundice.

95 It was obviously abandoned in favour of the more frequent ἴνος. ἴνος could only have been the result of a contraction, but it would have been without support from parallel formations, because it was not a usual termination in Greek (Debr., *Wb.* pp. 161 f.).

96 There are no variants in Dan. LXX Θ’ 3: 46. στυτπτ- is introduced (I do not say re-introduced) by A in Sir. 21: 9, by 18 minuscules in Judg. 15: 14, where the A and B texts alike read στυτπτόου, and by five minuscules in Judg. 16: 9. Here only the B text now reads στυτπτόου. All the other classes of text, including A, have ἀστυτπτόγυμτος, in a context attributed to ὨΘ’ – that is the LXX column of Origen's hexaplaric text and Theodotion, who is its source here. It betrays itself as secondary by being an etymological translation of ὧετζ that which is
beaten out of the flax by hackling, from ῥυμ to shake out. At the other occurrence of ἰ, Isa. 1: 31, it is again used by C Θ', where A' uses the simple τίναγμα, which is not recorded in LS with the same meaning. This translation, justifiable on the ground of etymology, nevertheless makes difficult sense. Elsewhere, in Ps. 126 (127): 5 (4) ol vlool τὸν κτενεωγημένων for ἵνα ἰν sons of youth, arises from a mistaken etymology which confuses ῥυμ III with ῥυμ II, and, as a translation, is absurd.

97 The LXX has only the usual form καρύϊνος in the meaning of almonds, which LS should give when mentioning the two passages (17, 19); the Three and with them Eccles. 12: 5 avoid the ambiguity by putting αμύγδαλον. In Gen. 30: 37 οίς gives the anonymous translation of a later translator λεπτοκαρ = λεπτοκαρύϊνος, a word for which LS gives evidence only from glossaries. Field also notes λεπτοκαρύας acc. pl. of λεπτοκαρύα from Graecus Venetus, the medieval Jewish translator, a formation which is not in LS.

The -ος of λευκάθις o of different origin, for this adjective is derived from λευκάθιον (= λευκόν ίον = λευκόν flov) gillyflower and was originally λευκάθινος.

98 -ους was as impossible a termination as -νω (Lobeck; see above p. 78).

99 There is another example for the recession of the accent after the expulsion of a syllable, αίλουρος < αίελουρος. αίλουρος, faulted by Herodianus (π 227, 2 Lentz) and Moeris (Piersonus p. 27), is the usual form from Aristotle onwards and the only one found in compounds (αίλουροθαφος, -βοσκός IIIpp. papp.). Herodotus and Comedy have αίελουρος, which Herodian justifies by an etymology.

CHAPTER 3, pages 82-91

1 The spelling with a single σ has some tradition behind it. See Lobeck, Path. el. 11, 143 n.1, Par. p. 17, Phryn. p. 673, who quotes Porson, Supplementum ad Praefationem, Euripidis Hecuba, London 1808, xlviii (πρόσσχετε). And in the Attic inscriptions, as soon as double consonants are written at all, we can observe both irrational geminations of σ inside words and reductions of ςσ to σ at the juncture of words closely connected syntactically (M.-Schw. pp. 89 ff.). Whatever the phonetic merits of the simplified spelling, it has been generally abandoned, and it is good that it has been, for the sake of etymological perspicuity.

2 'ἄττο τῆς ττλήμης ή πλημμύρα παρήχθαι δοκεϊ Eust. ad Dion. 198' (Lobeck, Path. proll. p. 274, who attempts an impossible discrimination between πλημμύρα and πλήμυρα).

3 W. Schmiedel, p. xv, already censures the Concordance for having a special article έξεκκλησιάζειν and gives the right explanation.

4 Thackeray, p. 275, while rightly following B' in Song of Sol. 8: 5 does not question -αθ- in Hdt. 8, 27 to which he refers. LS gives correct information under λευκάθις and there even refers to υπολευκάθις; but
it fails to note that in the few authors whom it quotes for ὑπολεύκαθ(ονθ- (ὑπολεύκαθ- has no article and is not mentioned in Part X) and who range from II p–IV p, there is no reason to acquiesce in their incorrect spelling -ονθ-.

5 It is tempting to inquire here into the way in which the infiltration of nasals before consonants influenced the rendering of Hebrew proper names. This question is part of a comprehensive subject, and consequently cannot usefully be dealt with in passing. I confine myself therefore to one example which shows how slippery is the ground on which we move here. The names Ἄρτα», , Ἀρτα» are given as Μανθανίας, Μονθανοαν in our best tradition, just as Ἁθάνας (Tattannai, University of Pennsylvania, The Museum Publications of the Babylonian Section, 1911 ff., π 1, 38, cf. Torrey, AJSL 24, 244) is rendered θανθαναι in 2 Esdras 5: 3; 6: (6) 13, the spelling of 1 Esdras 6: 3, 7, 26; 7: 1 Ζεύς being changed by Bewer into Θεόννης, with the remark that the vowels also may be corrupt. The intrusive -ν-, much as it tallies with the Greek usage with which we are dealing, may be early evidence for the pronunciation mant-; for at the root of the Hebrew Ἴθ and the Aramaic Ἴθ and its fuller Assyrian form, Tattannai, there is the verb Ἴθ. Ἴθ is assimilated from Ἴθ (with the prefix Μ) and Ἴθ, if not a reduplication, could be an example of nouns with a Μ prefix which are rather rare in normal stems with three radicals. So we cannot do more than say that parallel tendencies in both languages are seen to be working in our Greek. Thus, when looked at as of Greek origin, these forms are secondary; and even if we decide to trace them back to the underlying Semitic usage, we are left in suspense as to whether we should consider them archaic or—worse—archaizing. For there is a late tendency to keep distinct the elements of a word which had become assimilated at an earlier stage of development, and also to use an etymological spelling. In the late 2 Esdras I am inclined to follow the second alternative.


7 Rahlfis and Ziegler both have Νασαραχ in the parallel Isa. 37: 38. While leaving aside the question of the original hiding behind Ζανσ and the other question whether or not the Greek still reflects it, it must be stated that the evidence for the omission of the initial Ν is strong in both passages. In Kings it is BOL, in Isa. A' SQVC" Bo. minn. A decision for Νασαραχ in Kings and Νασαραχ in Isaiah would therefore involve the assumption that at an early stage the Ν was inadvertently omitted in a kind of haplography with the following A. The fact that this happened in both passages would not be strong argument to the contrary, because there are more examples of subsequent assimilation between different books. (One of them, in the same context, is another proper name, Ḍαφες, 2 Kings 19: 12, Isa. 37: 12, for Ḍαϕ where Ḍαφ should be read in both passages.) In most of them the common corruption is more likely to have occurred during the course of transmission, so that we need not
presume that the later translator took the corruption over from the earlier book.

8 Brit. Museum, Greek Inscriptions iv, 2 n. 1079.

9 Glotta 14, 71 ff.


11 = recension R (Rahlfs, S-St iii, 20 f.). Cf. Philo’s Bible pp. 98–103, 114 f.

12 The majority BL read here νεισω (νεισων b only) and Origen even νισαν in his commentary on John §6 (Rahlfs, S-St 1, 78). J. A. Montgomery, Kings (ICC) p. 147, considers this ‘corrupted by dittogr. of preceding [μη]νι, resulting in a variety of forms, νισω, νισω (uncials), νισαν = Ε, by identification with Nisan’. His brief, but illuminating, statement deserves further elaboration. Quite obviously Νισαν is intended to make sense of νεισω. Neither form should therefore be admitted to our texts at the expense of 31ου. Moreover, Nisan, the Babylonian name of the first month, would yield a material change, for Π is the Canaanite name of the second month which is clearly required by the context. Actually Π is explained in the text by ‘the second month’, Πι by ‘the eighth month’.

In our evidence the three subsequent systems of Hebrew names for the months can be traced: (1) two of the four Canaanite names of which we know, both in the Hebrew and Greek, Πι–31ου, Πι–βουλ; (2) the cardinal numbers; (3) the post-exilic Babylonian names. In the O addition after v. 34 Syr.ν h replaces 31ου κα το δευτέρο μην by Ιναρ secundo and, without touching βουλ, appends Teshri altero. The latter equation is mistaken, for Tishri is the seventh month. Another source avoids this mistake; it is reflected by two marginal notes in M: 31ου 5: 17 (5: 32 b) Φεισω Μαρσοςαι and Εν μιλι 31ου μηνι το δευτέρο 6: 1 (5: 32 b) Εν το σειαρ. Here Φιαπ (Ειατ?) stands for ΤΦ and Μαρσομαι for μαρσονάς Jos., AF 1, 80. For βουλ R we may safely put βουλ after Ο, assuming a dittography ΑΛ.

13 [For this parsing of Φιαπ see Baumgartner3 p. 90. For a different view see BDB2 p. 78, which regards Φιαπ as a separate noun and Φιαπ as plur. of Φιαπ. Ed.]

14 Aquila κεκάφυς (-εις = MT?) with a meaning not represented in LS.

15 Hebrew ζαίν, ι, was not a ις, but a sonant ι, like English and French ι. Zion for Σιόν is a mistaken transliteration, as ι was a voiceless spirant, and not even a ις; it is not supported by the Greek and Latin Bibles which display Σιόν. Its ι may derive from Luther’s Ζιόν; in Ezekiel, however, for Φιαπ the Greek, Latin and English Bibles are on the wrong side, and Luther’s Herekeil is right, as far as the ι is concerned.

In the LXX the early texts give σ for τ and only the later ones ι. This was observed by Rahlfs (Genesis p. 36) who rightly made it his rule to prefer spellings with σ. He could have gone still further and adopted such readings also when preserved only by a small minority, as Ασχανας Gen. 10: 3 with 911 Bo.
In another passage Rahlfs ought not to have gone back upon what he had convincingly taught earlier (S-St m, 185), for in i Kings 1: 9 Ἐσλαθ, as read by L (MSS Σελαθ) is obviously preferable to Ζωαλαθ, which closely follows ἡγη, not only because of its σ for τ, but also for its vocalization which reveals this Lucianic tradition to be an early and independent, and therefore genuine, attempt at rendering the – unpointed – Hebrew.

He refers to Boos/Booz Ruth 2: 1 ff. I add Φαρέως cod. 241 Ruth 4: 12, just to indicate that this is not a genuine variant any more than those recorded by BM to Ruth 1: 19, 22; 4: 10, 13, 22 from ‘cod. 241’ after Holmes and Parsons; for ‘cod. 241’ is only Patrick Young’s seventeenth-century copy of Alex. A, as Rahlfs (Verz. pp. 336, 114 and Ruth §2.1, p. 52) had already stated three years earlier.

CHAPTER 4, pages 92-101

1 τραός, τραόντα (Ps. 93: 13 the diaeresis vanished in part of the copies, cf. Psalmi).

2 Of open compounds I know only φιλογιής with v.l. φιλυγιής Arist., EE 1222 a 32 and φιλόλογος Ign., Rom. 7: 2 and Orig., Fragm. in Luc. 71: 6, which, of course, is missing from LS as Christian (taken from Bauer3), cf. φιλυβρις Crates Theb. (V*).

Compare also μονοήμερον Wisd. of Sol. 5: 14 (μονημερον S(*)), which is supported by parallels, among them the metrical Batr. 303. χρυσόφος is found in Polyb., πεπλόφος in Mayor 1, 473 (Wackernagel, Hom. U. pp. 194 f., ‘stehen auf besonderm Brett’). From LS I take τετράπιπτων (tetraipon = quadriga) Gloss = τέθριπτων, and τετραπιπτορον group of four ιστορίας Tzetzes. μονο-ειδής, -ειλής, -είμων Phot. point to an original φιλοίατρος = φιλίατρος in Proclus, Par. Pol. 225. For ἀρχιατρος, ἱππαρχος compare W. Schulze, Kl. Schr. p. 82 n. 6; κατασκαφος, ὑποτευπαρχήσαντα Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 398: ‘late, intentional preservation of contractile vowels’. Compare also Bl.-Debr. p. 124.

3 There are some puzzling problems of textual criticism connected with τρωώ and τρωά. Both are sometimes found as alternatives in our evidence in a way that makes a clear-cut decision almost impossible. I am not thinking of passages like 2 Kings 10: 9 where ἐν τρωάς is found in A only, so that Rahlfs ought to have put A5 and not A6 in his apparatus. Yet in Eccles. 10: 16 and 11: 6 among the evidence shown by Swete and Rahlfs, B stands alone in giving τρωά (10: 16 τρωώς S, ἐν τρωώ AC; 11: 6 ἐν τῳ τρωώ B ἐν τῳ τρωώ [sic] S, ἐν τρωά AC). Rahlfs, leaving B here, puts ἐν τρωάς in both passages. Against that I formerly (ThLZ, 1936, p. 289) proposed to write ἐν τρωά, which, according to Field, Aquila, who is behind the translation of Ecclesiastes, put for ἡμέρα Isa. 50: 4. But now this support has vanished, for Ziegler’s Göttingen edition of Isaiah (1939), which no longer quotes Procopius, where his source, Eusebius, is available, gives ἐν τρωάς twice for Aquila. On the
whole, nevertheless, the LXX prefers πρωι, confining πρωια mostly to passages where it appears together with another time of day, evening. Following this observation we would have to put πρωι in 10:16 and εν πρωιξ in 11: 6 where εν εσπέρα is in the parallel link, yet the strange corruption in S seems to indicate that at the root here was B's εν τῷ πρωι. Certainty, if any, will not be attained, before a critical edition of the hexaplaric remnants is available for the whole OT as they are now in Ziegler's volumes of the Prophets. For the time being we often have to rely on 'Nobilius' or Petrus Morinus while in others η σε in Syr. hex may stand for either.

In Ps. 45 (46): 6 ἡμερήσις τὴν ἡμέραν is rendered by τῷ προσώπῳ BS, whereas A reads τῷ προσ πρωι, and Rahlfs decides for τῷ προσ πρωι with 2013, which is also the translation of Θ' (for fuller information see his Psalms, and his S-St π, 45 ('Eine Mischlesart soll 114 haben: τῷ προσώπῳ πρωι') and 64 f. (for the Latin variants). (See also Sperber, Septuaginta-probleme p. 86.) Here Mozley (The Psalter of the Church, 1905, p. 82) remarks: 'Perhaps τῷ προσώπῳ πρωι was the original of both' (BS and A), and S. R. Driver, in a contribution to Mozley's book, 'In πρωι there does seem to me some confusion with ἡμερήσις'.

There is a parallel in Judg. 19: 26, where ἡμερήσις τὴν ἡμέραν is rendered τῷ προσ τῷ πρωι in the earlier A text (AV* omitting πρωι), but προσ τῶν σφόδρων in the very late B text (both texts giving the reverse in 19: 25, where there is λέπι in the Hebrew). Only b, reads τῶ προσ πρωι, but there is nowhere any trace of a προσώπῳ. Though this does not strengthen the position tentatively taken up by Mozley and Driver, there is something in what they observe, and again we are left with the unpleasant feeling of being unable to proceed to a convincing emendation.

4 LS ignores this active διπτήμη (cf. Thackeray pp. 281 ff.). Although it records the formation ἐξίπτασθαι Prov. 7: 10, it fails to record ἀνιπτάμενο Isa. 16: 2 and καθιπτάμεν Sir. 43: 17 (18).

5 περιὶδόντα 3 Mace. 1: 27, is corrupt for παρ- which Rahlfs restores from MSS other than AV. There is a similar mistake in Num. 5: 12 where the figura etymologica ἐπίδον ἔν ἡμέρᾳ is rendered by παριδεῖν συντόν ύπεριδοῦσα. This, of course, must not be left as it stands. We may either correct παριδοῦσα in accordance with v. 6 and Lev. 5: 21 and following a doublet in f and Arm.-codd., or, since the Pentateuch translators are fond of variation, read ύπεριδεῖ as do the minuscules bw (the first of which at least is not Lucianic in the Heptateuch with the exception of the last twelve verses of Ruth, cf. Rahlfs, Ruth §2, §7, 14), in accordance with Num. 31: 16 and some passages in Leviticus. More about these difficult passages containing παριδεῖ and ύπεριδεῖ in Excursus XV (pp. 262 ff.).

6 The whole of Hedley's corrections were overlooked when BH3 was published as a complete volume.

7 We shall find more examples of such hereditary mistakes when considering verbal forms.
8 'Eine Akzentzurückziehung bedeutet auch der Zirkumflex von Ζευς, Λητώ gegenüber den Nom. Ζευς, Λητώ u. a.' Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 547. To explain this, I refer to Buttmann's comment upon Ξ and Χ as recorded in Excursus VIII, p. 228.

9 Thumb, Handbuch §62; Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 555.

10 As Kaegi has observed, the correct form ἀδελφε was recovered from oblivion in K. W. Krüger's Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen, Berlin, 1845 (§16, 1, 5): he drew on Ammonius Grammaticus, 117, who preserved Tryphon's teaching for us.

11 In the NT this error no longer occurs, so that Moulton-Howard and Bl.-Debrunner do not mention it. Yet, while the correct τρύβλια is in Niese's Jos., A7 xii, 117, in Meecham, The Letter of Aristeas p. 309, and in his index, the obsolete τρύβλια still appears in Wendland, both in Aristeas 320 and in the text of Josephus as repeated in his Testimonia (p. 119), and in Thackeray's text in Swete's Introduction and its reprint in Meecham's book.

12 Philo avoids it all through. In his paraphrases he once uses φαρμακεύς, det. pot. 38 τού ἐν Αλεξάντειν τοῦ σώματι σοφιστάς, οὗ φαρμακεύς ονομάζει. Here a grammatical gloss was entered into the text in various forms in all MSS: φαρμακεύς ὡς βασιλέας, φαρμακεύς ὡς βασιλέα. Elsewhere he has φαρμακεύτης, migr. 83, 85; spec. leg. iii, 93, 102, 104; 94 φαρμακεύτης καὶ φαρμακίδος. Is φαρμακεύσιν instead of φαρμάκου Rev. 21:8, received text, due to similar tendencies? If so, their result has not survived in 22:15.

13 L. Prijs, Jüdische Tradition in der LXX, Leiden, 1948, p. 12, speaks of a 'transformation of the unchallenged fem. sing. into masc.' which he considers the outcome of an exegetical tradition. Yet the problem which he wants to solve does not exist, at least if one is acquainted with the facts of Greek grammar. He thus proves too much, and it is hard to follow an author who readily provides explanations where there is nothing to explain. The weak points of his argument have been well exposed by R. Loewe's review in JJS iii, 1952, pp. 89–91. Long ago Wellhausen argued that sometimes a mere scribal mistake is at the root of an otherwise inexplicable tradition. He goes on to ask: Does the fact that something has been traced back to 'tradition' put an end to any further search? (Text p. 13, against Z. Frankel's explanation of 1 Sam. 28: 14 LXX, Vorstud. p. 188.) Elsewhere he states that the Targumim, especially the official ones, though generally based on the Masoretic text, sometimes disclose a faint recollection of a different reading (Bleek–Wellhausen, Einl. 4, 1878, p. 610). When he further says that the Jewish scholars of his time were prone to overlook this fact, or even to derive the reading from the exegetical tradition instead of the tradition from the reading, this certainly applies to almost the whole of Prijs' book. R. Loewe's strictures therefore indicate a most welcome development.

14 So the Sixtine more consistently than its model, the Aldine (Rahlfs, ZAW 33, 1913, p. 33).
Lev. 2: 14 χιδρα ερικτα (cf. above p. 30) shows an accumulation of hereditary mis-spellings, as does Philo’s quotation, sacr. 76, 86 ff.

Cf. Wendland, Philologus 57, 1898, p. 120, on Theophr., Char. 26, 5, §5 scheint sich die falsche Accentuation δταν παρακάθηται tis statt παρακάθηται durch alle Ausgaben fortgeschleppt zu haben. K.-Blass 12, 191, on the other hand, mentions ‘wie ἀπόσχωμαι, so auch ἀπόδωμαι, ἐπιθωμαι (bei mehr als 3 Silben der Form), z.T. auch πρόσθωμαι’ as the teaching of some grammarians which, however, seems to have been abandoned. At its root there is an assimilation to the verbs in -ω.

Even Schleusner iv, 458, though correcting the mistaken πρόσωμαι in Hesychius into προσμαι, shares in πρόη.

Swete’s and Rahlfs’ mistaken mood or accent occurs also in Thackeray’s tabulation, p. 251.

In his earlier editions, Gen. 1926 and Psalms 1931, Rahlfs accented εἶπον. He had justified this accent in n. 250 on Isa. 8: 9 (Lü.-Ra. p. 288), where he points out that the MSS of the LXX have a unanimous εἶπον. Even his Stuttgart text once reads εἶπον Prov. 7: 4.

How unsound it would be to trust this pseudo-tradition may be seen from the particulars of ‘Syracusan’ speech revealed in Lentz’s Herodianus 1, 460, one of the passages which do more for the knowledge of his ‘auf brüchigem Fundament errichtete Rekonstruktion Herodians’ (Wilamowitz, Geschichte der Philologie p. 65) than for the knowledge of Herodian’s actual teaching.

Moulton’s mistake, II §30, 1 is silently rectified on p. 209 n. 1.

Mayser gives the correct ἴδε (i² 2, 97), yet always the Attic λαβέ (i² 2, 137; p 1, 55, 149; ii 2, 272; ii 3, 5).

Chapter 5, pages 102–114

1 S* has βαῖον (βαε'ω c.s. βαιω c.s.). However, it is not safe to trust S in matters of spelling, and, moreover, a gen. in -εων is likely to be a secondary assimilation to the more frequent type of τόλις. Gen. plur. βαῖων is found in P. Mag. Leid. v, 7: 17 (cf. ἱςων from P. Tebt. 5: 70, IIa; Plin. 30, 142 ἑίου) and has some additional hexaplaric evidence. In C Song of Sol. 7: 8 (9) τῶν βαῖων (αὐτοῦ) certainly represents the gen. plur. of βάεις, the passage being a translation of ἧδεις. In Lev. 23: 40 the decision is less easy. In min. i (56) there is a marginal note βαιων ληγει ἐκ φοινικων καὶ μυρσινῆς which, according to BM, belongs to ὥραν; yet the context obviously favours Field who connects similar remarks with κάλλυνθα. Field draws on Catena Nicephori, οἱ ἀλλοι βαῖα λευκά, and quotes min. i with βαῖα. The latter is obsolete after the fresh collation in BM, and the former is without much warrant, Cat. Níc. being an eighteenth-century compilation as yet not fully checked (cf., e.g., Rahlfs, Verz. p. 377 n. 2, and Genesis p. 30). These remarks do not give the impression of ever having formed part of the text of either the LXX or a later translator, but are rather in the nature of gloss-like comments, the
more comprehensive one in min. i describing the Lulab which was later carried in the right hand (Baentsch on Lev. 23: 40). So in min. i βαίων could derive from βάϊς and βάϊα in Cat. Nic. be nothing but a nom. plur., formed by Nicephorus or his source after John 12: 13 τα βαία των φοινικων. Yet βαία φοινικων is read also in Test. Napht. 5: 4, according to Bauer who, though correctly recording that the papyri prefer the form βάϊς, nevertheless quotes 1 Macc. 13: 51 and C Song of Sol. 7: 8 (9) for βαίον, himself accenting βαίνος, βαίον as does Kappler in his edition.

2 It is therefore only correct, though perhaps novel, when LS records a proparoxytone 'βαίον, τό = βάϊς Ev. Jo. 12. 13'. This βαίον is a noun, a different way of Graecizing bai. Its adjective is βαίνος, which LS strangely accents as an oxytone. Here, for once, the traditional editions and Rahlfs are better, accenting the (corrupt) form in 1 Macc. 13: 37 βαίνην; for adjectives indicating the material from which a thing is made are barytone, e.g. ξύλινος, λίθινος, whereas -ινός is the appropriate suffix for adjectives indicating a time, e.g. δραμινός, δορινός (Debrunner, Wb §§318 f.). Of LS's two examples C Gen. 40: 16 should read καναβάϊνα, as Sturz proposed as early as 1808, p. 89, without being heeded by Field, whereas its other example, 1 Macc. 13: 37, has been discarded above.

3 This for two reasons:

(i) The 'Egyptian-Ionic word' βαρις flat-bottomed boat, which would fall under this heading, does not occur in the LXX. In Isa. 18: 2 the Greek could have put something like έν βαρίδι ττατυρίνη (Plut., de Is. et Osir. 18) for έπιστολάς βυβλίνας but, though the LXX of Isaiah uses plenty of expressions drawn from its Egyptian surroundings, it does not do so here. Its έπιστολάς βυβλίνας is certainly corrupt; Doederlein's έπι στόλοις βυβλίνας is not satisfactory Greek; άττόστολα βύβλινα might be more plausible.

(ii) The later word βαρις large house, tower (LS) and, in the LXX, fortified place, citadel, palace, this last representing Πολή Ps. 47 (48): 4, 14; 2 Chron. 36: 19; Lam. 2: 5, 7; and Πολή Ps. 44 (45): 9, (8) is simply a homonym of the former and originates neither from an Egyptian word, as LS says, taking both words as one, nor from an i-stem. For in the main it stands for, and is in some way or other derived from, Πολή (Aram. κατάρ) which is said to be borrowed from Assyr. birtu, citadel, fortified town — neither of which is an i-stem. From the point of view of accidence the homonymity of βαρις' and βαρις' is not complete, for the former shows a continual co-existence of, e.g., genitives in -εως, -ιος, -ιδος from Aeschylus down to Plutarch, whereas the latter keeps strictly to the declension of πόλις.

This βαρις', citadel, had adventures of its own in the history of the transmission of the LXX. In Dan. 8: 2 the LXX renders πολις by ἐν Σώσοις τῇ πόλει (also in ChB 367, III//III), whereas the has ἐν Σώσοις τῇ βάρει. In Esther 1: 2 our entire evidence reads ἐν Σώσοις τῇ πόλει, yet two Vet. Lat. MSS (La. and La.0) give t(h)ebari instead, so that they
at least must have found τῇ βάρει instead of τῇ πόλει, and this is likely to be genuine. In 8: 14 our text reads a mere ἐν Σουσόις, but f Eth. add τῇ πόλει, and the Origenian recension adds τῇ βάρει (Sc-a- kz), and the Latin civitate regis. Unfortunately 967 is missing in both passages. So we have no means of authoritatively checking this somewhat equivocal evidence. Anyhow, it is more likely that at some time during the transmission βάρις, which looked strange to revisors and copyists, was removed, so that in Esther 8: 14 Origen may have restored what had been lost before his time. Elsewhere βάρις was preserved, but augmented by a gloss, cf. 1 Esdras 6: 22 ἐν Ἐκβατάνοις τῇ βάρει τῇ ἐν Μηδία χώρᾳ (cf. Jos., Αῤῥ. x, 99 and acc. x, 264) with 2 Esdras 6: 2 ἐν πόλει, ἐν τῇ βάρει, τῆς Μηδίων πόλεως, where the latter shows a doublet (observed by Bewer, p. 61). In 2 Esdras 11: 1 where all others merely transliterate the Hebrew, putting ἐν Σουσόις αἰφρα, Lucian alone achieves uniformity by his ἐν Σουσόις τῇ βάρει.

4 There are itacistic spellings not only in the former, but also in ἐβην Deut. 14: 15 A.

5 But Lucian also adds τὰ πάντα in the following verse after συγκλειστα, which, nevertheless, must be συγκλειστα with f (cf. συνκλησ(μεν)αί αἱ πασα Ζ and συγκλειομένας 35).

6 Perhaps I should append the evidence concerning the name of the river Tigris (briefly mentioned by Thackeray §11, 13). Τίγρις Gen. 2: 14; Sir. 24: 25 (35); Τίγριδος Tobit S 6: 2 (1); Τίγριν Tobit S 6: 3 (2) is a normal paradigm. For Τίγριν Tobit B 6: 2 (1) and Judith 1: 6 a few minuscules, some in both instances, read -ην (Ὑγριν h, τιγρητα b), just as some minuscules have Τύγρης for Τίγρις Gen. 2: 14. In Dan. 10: 4 LXX (cod. 88) reads Τύγρης, while in Θ' the transliteration Ἐδδεκελ is replaced by Τύγρις in L and preceded by the doublet Τύγρις in BA. Though Rahlfs rightly explains 'ex LXX' it would not be safe to assimilate both forms. Τύγρης -ητος is attested elsewhere, and the only thing we can say is that Τύγρην as read by minuscules in the two passages mentioned above is an itacism. In Exod. 30: 24 we find the rare gen. Ἰρεῶς from Ἰρις = Ἠγρη, here orris. Elsewhere (Ezek. 1: 4 ἐ Ἐβραΐος) Ἰρίδοσ.

7 The dat. in τᾶς is in conformity to θῖβα Exod. 2: 6. The acc. plur. in 1 Enoch 8: 1 is fairly certain.

There remain several problems which our evidence does not allow us to solve completely.

(1) The genuine nature of the labial: β and μ are interchanged, not only in the noun, but also in the verb στιβ(-μ, -μμ-)ίς 2 Kings 9: 30 and Ezek. 23: 40. There are many examples of this interchange in our MSS. Copt. stêm favours μ, but I do not know the pedigree of the Coptic word.

(2) The gender: στιβαί can equally derive from το στιβαί and ἦ στιβαί, both being attested and even paralleled from similar borrowed words.
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(3) The quantity of the stem vowel: our lexicographical tradition, including the new LS, side by side postulate στιβι on the one hand, στιμι, στιμι on the other, and so do the Latin lexica, giving stibi, stimmi, stibium, without any decisive metrical evidence. According to the rule discovered by W. Schulze (see above p. 83) the doubling of the μ seems to indicate that the preceding i was long, the metrical evidence being very scanty; but then it is meaningless to attribute different quantities to the different spellings στιβι, στιμι and στιμι. I would suggest an -i- everywhere, since for Greek and Latin alike the Coptic stem seems to decide in favour of i everywhere.

ιβις affords a close parallel. Here i is evidenced by a fourth-century comic fragment and perhaps by B's ιβις and i in Latin by Ovid and Juvenal 15: 3.


9 A fully correct translation should begin with you shall make your count and after that append as an apposition every man... This mode of speech, a plural verb, with its understood subject made explicit by ἐκκατος, is close to the Hebrew and found frequently in the LXX, from Genesis onward (Gen. 41: 11 in the first person). There are many instances in Exodus. Some of them are divine injunctions, λαβέτωσαν 12: 3, συνα-γάγετε, συλλέξετε 16: 16, θέσθε, συνακεφαλάζετε 32: 27, or, as in our passage, future formations ἐξελεύσεσθε 12: 22 (οὐκ...ἐκκατος = ψι άν no one), καθήσεσθε 16: 29.

Philo's quotations of Exod. 12: 4, heres. 193 and alleg. iii, 165, must equally be corrected (Philo's Bible p. 62). It cannot be doubted that his Vorlage read the correct plural; for the parallel quotation congr. 106 has λαβέτωσαν ἐκκατος (Exod. 12: 3), and the complete context of alleg. iii, 162–8, which is based on Exod. 16: 4 συλλέξουσιν (Philo with bdn συνάξουσιν), receives the support intended from the interspersed quotation of Exod. 12: 4 only after the active συναριθμήσετε is restored.

10 καθίομαι Judg. 6: 18 B text, is read by Boru only, whereas ef (i: -ω-) jqsz* a*, Cyril. read -ιοομαι. Here as well, the true B text of Judges is not found in B itself, and Rahlf's ought to have refrained from following B. Accordingly Thack. p. 271 should be corrected. His explanation in n. 3 does not carry conviction.

11 I now find the same note of caution struck by Lobeck, 'De constructione Verbi μέλλειν et Affinium Verborum', Phryn. Parergon vi, 745 ff., especially in his concluding sentences on p. 756. Cf. also K.-Gerth, Syntax § 387 n. 4 (Π 1, 177 ff.).

12 Here, in Scheide, it is one of the examples of a closer adherence to the MT, and its reading is still more discredited by some corruptions in the following verse.

13 Perhaps we may in this connection record the formation ἄνοισατε found in the same brief book, 1: 10, for which, apart from Hdt. 1, 157
(Thackeray p. 235), there is some scanty evidence in Philo (LS p. 1922).

14 The only analogy would be much too far-fetched – the two participles in -ες which Pindar used with the meaning of the intransitive aorists η in -ον: ἐπιπέντε fallen, Ol. 2, 43 cf. ἔπιπένευ fell (down) and δρακεῖσ' ἀσφαλές living in safety Pyth. 2, 20 (Wackernagel, Vorl. ü. S. 12, 138).

15 As far as the LXX is concerned, there is a clear distinction between a causative present ὀναθάλω make to flourish, revive (Sir. 1: 18; 11: 22; 50: 10; Ezek. 17: 24) and an intransitive aorist ὀνάθαλον shoot up again, which is unmistakable in ὀναθάλω Sir. 46: 12; 49: 10, whereas ὀνάθαλε Ps. 27 (28): 7; Hos. 8: 9 and ὀναθάλη Wisd. of Sol. 4: 4 could also represent an aorist ὀνάθαλω (Helbing, Gr. p. 91). As against Debrunner we may state that in Ps. 27: 7; Hos. 8: 9 the context favours an aorist, that in Wisd. of Sol. 4: 4 a subj. aor. after καὶ is more likely than a subj. pres., and that in Sir. 46: 12; 49: 10, two closely related passages, an opt. aor. more appropriately represents the Hebrew jussive ἰν (49: 10 with a gap in the MS; in 46: 12 the corresponding part of the verse is missing from the Hebrew, but restored with certainty from 49: 10).

16 Here a definite decision can only be obtained by a special study of the speech of 4 Macc. which cannot be presented here in passing, as it were. An analogous formation is perhaps to be found in the Erotic Fragment Grenfell i col. 1: 17, ἐπὶμανοῦτο' ὄραν = ἐπὶμανεῖτο' ὄραν. Mayser i 2, 163 n. 2, calls it a seltsame Zwitterform, in which, he says, one can hardly see a newly formed word ἐπὶμαινεώ. Certainly not, for by stem and accentuation it is the participle of a normal intransitive aorist active η with passive meaning, ἐπὶμανοῦν = ἐπὶμανήν (not mentioned in LS).

17 Our editions contain an equally impossible middle ἔλεγξοατο ι Chron. 12: 17 (Ra. 18) with BS only (cα -σιτο), instead of the correct ἔλεγξατο of Any rell., which we must adopt. As there seems to be no parallel in Greek for a middle aor. of ἔλεγχων, and no middle formations are found in the immediate vicinity of our passage, we are left to state, without an explanation, a corruption in an evidence which elsewhere is some of our best.

As to the mistaken termination in -o- of a sigmatic aorist, compare a similar scribal confusion in Plat., Leg. iv, 719 e ἐδὲ ἐπὶκενέσσοι (σοι immediately following), changed to -σοι by Imm. Bekker. For more examples of late date, see Lobeck on Soph., Ajax 469, and Par. p. 557.

18 There is an interesting paragraph about the attraction or assimilation of voices in Wackernagel, Vorl. ü. S. 12, 132 f. (cf. pp. 49 f.). He adduces and interprets two examples from Aristophanes, who put χαίρωμαι for χαίρω in Pax 291 and χέσαιτο for χέσειε in Equ. 1057.

19 Minority variants such as Deut. 12: 28 ἐὰν τῇ ὁμήσης] εἰς τἀοις οὐ can be left out of account.

In Wackernagel’s concluding sentence, ‘Danach braucht man sich nicht zu quälen, um in das neutestamentliche ἵνι einen lokalen Nebensinn
hinein zu interpretieren,” only the first word is out of place now. Materially his conclusion remains correct, even after Sir. 37: 2 has been discarded as a biblical precedent. But neither W. Bauer nor LS duly adopt it; the former does not mark clearly enough the difference between the ancient and the more recent usage, and LS does not mention the latter at all.

21 ἀντιπεριβεβλημένη of the majuscules is mistaken, and so is the translation in LS, ‘Pass. to be clothed about θανάτῳ LXX Si 23. 12,’ which has every appearance of revealing a corruption. La. Syr. show that ἀντιπαραβεβλημένη is correct. παραβάλλεσθαι means to compare with, be parallel to, and so emphasizes this meaning still more; this compound, otherwise unrecorded in Greek, is missing from LS.

22 Cf. Ps. Sol. 16: 2 παρ’ ὀλίγου ἥξεισθαι ἢ μυχὴ μου ἐὰν θάνατον σύνεγγυς πυλῶν Ἰδοὺ...

23 Some other translators do not fall in with the Psalms and Sirach; thus Job so consistently uses ἐπτρέπομαι for θητεῖ χαίρεται which, when spelt in an incorrect, though not uncommon, way – ΑΠΨΑΘΕΙ (ΑΠΨ – ΠΑΥ) or even ΑΠΨΑΘΕΙ (ΑΠΨ – ΠΑΥ) – is still closer to the corruption. (Similar corruptions: Philo, de plant. 164 cod. H προσψάσασθαι for προσάψασθαι and, perhaps, ψάψασθαι for ἧψάψασθαι post. Cain 20, according to Wendland, Philologus 57, 1898, p. 253.) Thus G. Beer’s interpretation of the Greek, ‘παύσασθαι ἔση’ which is still in BH, certainly has parallels to support it, ἐὰν ἀνάσασθαι οὕτως 7: 18, ἐὰν ἀνάσασθαι οὕτως 21: 13, κατέπαυσεν ώρα 26: 12, all of them in Job. But it is less convincing, because it fails first to examine the Greek to make sure that it is not itself corrupt but points to a different Hebrew. Previously, in BH, he had more strangely recommended the variant which he believed he had detected behind the LXX: ‘LXX (παύσασθαι) ἔση;’ (= legendum). Cf. ThLZ, 1938, p. 34 n. 1.

24 See the quotation from Atticists in Meister ii, p. 32. There is some confusion in Mayser i, 448; and Wackernagel’s correction (ThLZ, 1908, p. 37) was not utilized in the second edition either, i 3, 92. With the correction κατάγαιος ‘vulgär (statt) κατάγειος’ the facts are represented correctly.

25 Cf. also ἐν καταγαίοις κρυφίοις Ps. Sol. 8: 9.

26 τὸ τοῦ μέγα μυνίωσιν. μυνίωσιν is one of his artificial epicisms. For here the Homeric termination -ωσιν is in a compromising way grafted upon an obviously Hellenistic formation, μυνίοιω instead of -ιω, cf. G. Boesch, De Apollonii Rhodii Elocutione, Diss. phil. Berol., 1908, p. 56.

27 γραμματεύς τῶν δυνάμεων, attested by Deissmann from the papyri and the LXX, is missing from LS which has only γρ. τῶν μυχίων. When in this connection Deissmann mentions the parallel passages 2 Kings 25: 19 and Jer. 52: 25, his position can be strengthened from two observations. (1) In 2 Kings 25: 19 the MT reads ἤξεισθαι θητεῖ χαίρεται and ought to have...
been translated τόν γραμματέα τόν δρόχοντα τῆς δυνάμεως. But the mistaken interpretation of ἵππος as a secretarial and consequently subaltern civil officer, led the translator to disregard the article before ἵππος and to translate τόν γραμματέα τοῦ δρόχοντος τῆς δυνάμεως. In the later passage, Jer. 52: 25, there is no article before ἵππος and its absence is probably a corruption due to the same misinterpretation.

(2) Origen's hexaplaric recension uniformly in both passages restores the correct interpretation of ἵππος ἵππος as an apposition in syntactic parallelism with ἵππος. In 2 Kings 25: 19 O replaces τοῦ δρόχοντος by τοῦ δρόχοντος as attested by x Arm.-ed (BH; Field fails to record the variant), and in Jer. 52: 25, where the LXX does not translate ἵππος, OL, with an asterisk in O (88 and Syr.), insert τοῦ δρόχοντος, the reading ascribed to Aquila, from whom Origen may have taken it. As neither Aquila nor Origen can be suspected of assimilating a biblical passage to a parallel, their Hebrew Bible must have read ἵππος in both passages, and nothing, not even the omission of ἵππος in LXX Jeremiah, entitles us with Kittel (1900) and Burney (1903) to assimilate 2 Kings to the corrupt Jeremiah by cancelling the article before ἵππος. BH does not touch the MT either where it is right (2 Kings) or where it is mistaken (Jeremiah).

In Jeremiah the LXX has the singular τοῦ γραμματευοντος for ἵππος, which Aquila, in accordance with the LXX in 2 Kings, renders by ἔκτασσοντα, and Symmachus by τόν όπλίζοντα. In the context τοῦ γραμματεύοντος τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ γραμματευοντος τῶν λαῶν τῆς γῆς it can only mean hold the office of a γραμματεύοντα, and the following dative is the classical construction, which was later replaced by the genitive (LS). Therefore we must not think of the dative after verbs expressing a command, and consequently we must not infer from this dative anything of the nature of a commanding position of the γραμματεύοντα. Nor is the dative τοῦ λαοῦ caused by the Hebrew, which has an accusative. As to the τοῦ εκτάσσοντα of LXX 2 Kings 25: 19, I doubt whether LS is right in translating keep muster-roll of. It could have added A. Jer. 52: 25 as a second occurrence. LS has a forerunner in Hesychius who obviously explains 2 Kings 25: 19 by saying, 'ἐκτάσσοντα, χαράσσοντα, γράφοντα.' But is it legitimate here simply to take the meaning from the Hebrew and the tradition based on it, and should we not rather be content with the ordinary meaning draw out in battle-order (of the officers), which LS records from Polybius and Diodorus? The final answer to this question cannot be given from isolated examples.

28 (1) This passage is missing from Thackeray's examples of omitted aspiration (§8, 8), as is Job 22: 21 εἰτ' ὁ καρπός (only A η instead of εἰτ') and Isa. 27: 12 καρτ' ἔνα ἔνα (A 106 26). As Thackeray says, following Mayser 1, 202, this is a spelling found in III*. Compare also καρτ' έκαστον IG9 1, 138, 10 (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 305). It has not been as usual to retain spellings like these in our texts, as it has been to retain examples of the reverse process such as ἐφετείος. οὐχ ἐχρόνισεν Gen. 34: 19 ChB 961
(Kenyon’s text, p. 65) is not borne out by the facsimile, which shows an unmistakable ΟΥΚΕΧΡΟΝΙΚΕΝ. It may be a slip, easily explained by the proximate χ.

(2) καθέκαστος ought to be written as one word, as Rahlfs rightly does with καθεῖς in 3 Macc. 5: 34 ὁ καθεὶς δὲ τῶν φίλων and in 4 Macc. 15: 14 καθένα στρεβλούμενον...δρόσα. He is, however, wrong in two other passages, one of them quite close to, and syntactically identical with, the last mentioned – 4 Macc. 15: 12 καθ’ ἐνα παθῶς καὶ ὄμοι πάντως instead of καθένα and 4 Macc. 8: 5 φιλοφρόνοις ἐμὲ καθ’ ἐνός ἐκάστου ὑμῶν θαυμάζω τὸ κάλλος instead of καθεῖς, a passage of which he makes nonsense by putting a comma after θαυμάζω. Other passages, of course, are different, as Isa. 27: 12 where καθ’ ἐνα ἐνα is clearly distributive, and 4 Macc. 15: 7 διὰ πολλῶς τός καθεὶς ἐκάστου αὐτῶν δώινος, where we have κατὰ c. acc. as the common Hellenistic substitute for a possessive or subjective genitive. καθέκαστος and καθεῖς both mean each one in particular, which in classical Greek was expressed by ἐκάστος (*ἀκάστος developed from *ἀκαστός τις, where *ἀκαστός originally meant separating oneself, by oneself, according to Wackernagel, Vorl. ii. S. ii, 119, who translates the well-known saying ἐποίη τις ἵν ἐκάστος εἰδειν τὴν γενεάν, everyone may practise the art which the special knowledge of each masters.) καθεῖς was so popular that the vulgar Latin, using a kind of calque linguistique (Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. p. 39), formed a hybrid cadunus, which survives still today in caduno, chacun (see also W.-Schmiedel p. 247 n. 11). Certainly we should write εἶς καθεῖς in Mark 14: 19, κατὰ εἶς being a spelling which does not express the actual pronunciation – in Matt. 26: 22 it was replaced by the correct εἶς ἐκάστος, and in John 8: 9 – and we would write καθεῖς in Rom. 12: 5 with greater certainty, if δ were adopted and not τό. Of course, we should keep in mind that for the Greeks with their scriptio continua there was no difference in writing, as there is for us who eagerly take hold of every means of discrimination in spelling that may be useful to convey to the reader a correct interpretation of the text by the unobtrusive ways suggested by our modern orthographical customs. So we may safely leave undecided how to write 1 Esdras 1: 31 (33) τὸ καθ’ ἐν πραξεῖν τῆς πράξεως λοιποῦ, where both ways make good sense (cf. 2 Chron. 35: 27).

(3) A word is needed to explain my writing πατρίαν. [In his text Dr Walters had originally quoted Lev. 25: 10 as ...τῆν πατρίαν αὐτοῦ. Ed.] The three passages in which we find πατρία for πατρίαν, are all corrupt, and this corruption sprang from the replacement of πατρία by the more familiar πατρία. In Lev. 25: 10 πατρίαν has been preserved in F Μ𝑁 min. Cyr. (ΜΝας γενεάν); in 1 Chron. 5: 7 Rahlfs rightly reads πατρία with Anacegim (ἐν τοῖς δήμοις L). In 1 Sam. 9: 21 L uses πατρία instead of the φυλή of the LXX and La. patria for Lucian’s πατρία; in Tobit B 5: 11 (16) the question ἐκ ποῖος φυλῆς καὶ ἐκ ποῖος πατρίδος σὺ εἶ is answered by a fresh question φυλῆν καὶ πατρίδαν σὺ ζητεῖς ἢ μισθίου... So not only the meaning, but also the context, calls...
for the adoption of πατρίδος which is read by AN and the bulk of minn.,
and also by the recension preserved in S. πατρίδος is only in B with a few
minn., three of which assimilate the other way about, by reading
πατρίδα in v. 12 (17).

CHAPTER 6, pages 115-126

1 No more should we accept at its face value his elaborate interpretation
of variants found in Gen. 49: 21, Job Θ’ 39: 4, and Wisd. of Sol. 16: 19.
In all three passages γένη μα yields the proper meaning. Thackeray is at
pains to trace hermeneutical intentions on the part of the MSS which
have γέννημα. But this is perhaps one of those niceties which, though
unconvincing, make such a lovable author of Thackeray. The wrong
spellings are scribal, nothing more. Wherever revisors intend to convey
a fresh meaning their changes are by no means confined to interchanges
of -ν- and -νν-.

2 From Bauer one can learn also what one cannot from Büchsel (TWNT 1,
684) that γεννάω, γέννημα when used of plants is either figurative or due
to the fact that animal and vegetable produces are taken collectively.
Here, of course, the instances with the verb γεννάω are most welcome,
because it does not admit easy correction as does the noun. An instructive
example for the figurative use of γεννάω is Ignatius, Trall. 11: 1 τάς
κοκάς παραφυάδος τάς γεννώσας καρπόν θανατηφόρον; for these παρα­
φυάδες are identical with ἀλλοτρία βοτάνη 6: 2 which is explained
ητίς ἐστιν αἱρεσις. As Bauer (Handbuch zum NT, Ergänzungsband p. 235)
correctly observes, ἀλλοτρία βοτάνη is not a simile of false doctrine. To
Ignatius αἱρεσις does not mean heresy but sect (cf. Eph. 6: 2). Elsewhere,
e.g. Eph. 10: 1, this βοτάνη is intended to denote the heretic himself as
the devil's plant for which there is no place in the Father's garden. Thus
far Bauer. The application is obvious: when γεννάω is used of παρα­
φυάδες, Trall. 11: 1, the reason is that Ignatius inadvertently breaks up
his simile, turning to the reality depicted, the αἱρεσις, or, more closely,
those forming it. In the Didache, on the other hand, vegetable and animal
produces are taken together: γεννημάτων ληνού καί άλωνος, βοών τε καί
προβάτων (13: 3), and here the last two nouns justify γεννημάτων
(W. Bauer 4 p. 282). Büchsel should not have omitted them. Nor is he on
solid ground when quoting Philo, opif. mund. 113 as 3όα τε αὐ καὶ φυτά
καρποὺς γεννώντα. If he were right, this example would compare with
Did. 13: 3. But Philo has γεννώντα. And since, moreover, ἵππος ἵππος, which
is καρπός κολλοὺς in Gen. 30: 2; Mic. 6: 7; Ps. 126 (127): 3; 131 (132): 11;
Lam. 2: 20 only, elsewhere ἐκγονα τ. κ. Deut. 7: 13; 28: 4, 11, 18, 53, or
τέκνα Isa. 13: 18, is nowhere quoted in Philo, except for Gen. 30: 2
(alleg. II, 46), and as in his own context he uses καρπός only of plants or
allegorically, it is unlikely that he intended καρποὺς γεννώντα to cover
3όα too. The verbs covering both follow immediately, ὁξισουσι καὶ
τελεσφοροῦσι.

4 The hexaplaric ἀκροβυστίζω and the Lucianic ἄνομίζω, which possibly draws on a hexaplaric source, look like a corroboration of J. Reider's observation (Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila, Philadelphia, 1916, p. 40) that, side by side with -ούν, -ἀειν, verbs in -ισαι were used or coined (ἄγνοηματφιν = ἂνοι) by Aquila to render the Piel or Hiphil, which are causative voices in the Hebrew. In 1 Chron. 21: 8 ἠςπέννη Δ I have done foolishly, LXX ἐματακώθην, is ἥφρονησα to L. Again this may point to a hexaplaric model: 1 Sam. 13: 13 C ἥφρονευσον or ἥφρονησας, 26: 21 C ἥφρονευσάμην. In 2 Sam. 15: 31 ἄφην-νυ ημ-ισπ LXX διοσκέδασσον (ματαίωσον L Θ) τὴν βουλήν, bms records for A' αφρονησον j με κακοφρονησον. This would be hard to accept for the LXX; but even for Aquila Field may be right in spelling both verbs with -ισ-.

5 There are, however, two examples of verbs in -έω with an indisputably declarative meaning, both translations of ἂπειρον Hiph.: ἄσεβείν to declare, treat as, ἄσεβης, condemn, and ἄνομεν to declare guilty (cf. the 'forensic' use of δικαιοῦν). They are translation Greek, foreign to Greek usage.

ἄσεβείν is found twice in Job. In 9: 20, τὸ στόμα μου ἄσεβεσε, the context excludes the translation does wrong. The meaning is condemns me. In 10: 2 our evidence offers μή με ἄσεβεσε διδάσκει καὶ δίκαι... neglecting the Athnach of -αρία-Λόνος -πέρον. To make sense, and a sense which can only be that of the Hebrew, we must read μή με ἄσεβεσε διδάσκει δικαί... (cf. JTS 32, 1947, pp. 195 f.). The insertion of καὶ, δι or γάρ to mark a supposed beginning of a fresh stichus is a frequent secondary feature which need not deter us from cancelling καὶ. There are more examples in Job of the omission of pronouns. A parallel to the omitted με after διδάσκει is found in the emended text of 4: 16 ἄνεστι, καὶ οὸς ἐπέγνων ἔδως which does not express the suffix of ἐδώς.

The other verb is ἄνομεν. There is only one instance of this usage.

6 In 1 Sam. 2: 22, where the LXX and probably the genuine Hebrew have a shorter text, there are five different additions, among them that of Ο with a strange ἐκοίμησεν γυναίκας, made them lie down. Here ἐκοίμησε is read as ικοίμησε and οὸν as the accusative particle.

7 κυκλεύω would not be impossible in itself, and there is a single example from Appian in LS. Only the sudden change is not likely, and similar scribal blunders are not infrequent in B, which in some books, especially Joshua, is either very carelessly written, or reflects a careless ancestor. For the rest a reading, even if debarred from our texts, does not lose its documentary value. So in the same verse 2 Kings 3: 25 for the following noun σφενδονηται we read σφενδονησταί in Amu and -ισταί in i, as in Judg. 20: 16 i and Judith 6: 12 fκ. Although these forms must nowhere be admitted into our text, they ought to be recorded; then it would be realized that LS's only example for σφενδονηστις, taken from Themistius
Soph. (IV), is not unique. σφενδονίζω (only Ps.-Callisth. 2: 16) for -άω is not supported by any variants in 1 Sam. 17: 49; 25: 29.

8 Josephus, AJ 1, 135, 137 f. shows confusions in both directions.

9 Thackeray (Schweich, p. 56 n. 3) interprets κατοικεῖ to mean will colonize the flood, cause it to be inhabited, by adducing the Peshitta version will turn the flood (sc. into dry land). Whether he thinks of the deluge, as it would seem, or of the heavenly waters (Duhm) - one cannot make inhabitable the deluge, only the land covered and destroyed by it. Moreover, how could κατοικεῖ be the translation of ἡράτην? κατοικεῖν c. acc. is rare in the Greek Psalms other than representing an acc. in the Hebrew (Helbing, Kassusyntax p. 74). The acc. τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ for ἤράτην may, on the other hand, have given rise to a secondary κατοικεῖ as Thackeray understands it. This corruption is repeated by Ga., Hi. and the Vulgate inhabitare fecit. Luther's wird eine Sintflut anrichten is far off the mark (Duhm).

10 8: 81 alone has a unanimous συνοικίσητε. In 8: 89; 9: 7, 36 Rahlfs restores the correct reading against BL, but he fails to do so in the first passage, 8: 67. Here Swete, followed by BM, increases the confusion by introducing into the already corrupt text an unfortunate conjecture τινος, which he bases on the minority reading τοις of Bh. But τοις is merely a scribal mistake for γαρ (cf. above, p. 8). Owing to their allegiance to B, the Cambridge editions are mistaken in all passages except 8: 81. Here, as in Jer. 22: 18; 41: 5 and elsewhere, the primary corruption of the verb gave rise to subsequent corruptions, owing to the necessity of adapting the construction of the sentence to the changed verb, and thus the different MSS of these passages present a whole range of partial and complete adaptations and are an instructive example of consecutive corruptions of this kind. Referring to my former treatment of the subject, I content myself with giving the emended readings: 8: 67 συνώκισαν γαρ τῶν θυγατέρων (gen. partit., or, if this appear too hard, ἄτο τῶν θ. = ἃς as in 2 Esdras 9: 2; observe that μετά, which is missing from Bh, forms part of the adaptations mentioned); 8: 89 συνεκδόσαμεν (9: 7 συνοικίσατε; 9: 36 συνώκισαν) γυναῖκας ἀλλογενεῖς.

11 In 2 Sam. 18: 2 ἀρέστειλεν = MT נָשַׁךְ] הָרִיסָשָׁה L1 = נָשַׁךְ \\
divided into three which is proposed for the Hebrew in BH.

12 They may have understood an inner object.

13 In Esth. 5: 11 ἐπιθύμησεν αὐτὸν πρωτεύειν = הלל. 

14 Also of persons: 1 Chron. 16: 5 δευτερεύον αὐτῷ = לְפֵּשַׁה ('δευτερεύον an official title, UPZ 2.159, 13, IIIa' LS p. 2060); so rightly B with the bulk of evidence (L δευτερος αὐτῶν); Esther 4: 8, in a Greek addition, δευτερεύον τῷ βασιλεῖ; Jer. 52: 24 τὸν Ιερέα τὸν δευτερεύοντα = נָשַׁךְ נַחֲלָה - in the parallel passage, 2 Kings 25: 18, וּלָוָה τָּה הָעִירָה must be emended into לָוָה וַיְה. as L and Aquila rightly read, cf. 23: 4, so Rahlfs rightly with SQ minn. (the δευτερούντα of AB appears in LS as δευτερέοι instead of -οω!). In this chapter Jer. LXX distinguishes between נָשַׁך to repeat, do for the second time, from which נָשַׁה derives,
represented by this δευτερέωντα 52: 24, and ητόδ το Piel, to alter, change, rendered ἡλλαξεν 52: 33 (cf. 2 Esdras 6: 11 f.). As has not yet been observed by those assuming different translators for the two halves of Jeremiah, there is in the first part, 2: 36, a confusion of these two roots, for δευτερώσω is ητόδ, whereas ητόδ can only mean to change = ητόδ (the reverse confusion in the Syr. translation of Sir. 7: 14, Smend, Comm. p. 66).

There are some more corrections and additions required in LS: δευτερῶ, means also to retell, divulge: λόγον Sir. 19: 7, abs. 19: 14, and δευτέρωσις Sir. 42: 1 (Ra. 41: 26) means retelling (delete καὶ after δευτερώσεως). της δευτερώσεως, 2 Kings 23: 4; 25: 18, is a more slavish translation of ητόδ ἀνάμειν than δευτερέων, and ητόδ should be given as an explanation in LS. 25: 18 has been emended earlier in this note.

15 Thus N minn. Rahlfs keeps the majority reading ἐπισκέψη, doubtless impressed by Driver's argument (? , p. 167), ἐπισκέψης is 'ποζζ, incorrectly vocalized for ποζζ'. His strong point is that ποζζ, which agrees with ποζζ only, is nowhere in the Greek. I would object that there is too much of the same verb in the close vicinity to assume misinterpretation, v. 18 Ληληττ ἐπισκέπηθεν, ποζζ ἐπισκέπησεται. Corruption in the Greek, -ποζζ-ποζζ-ποζζ is therefore more likely. Furthermore the reading of N minn. is neither a late adaptation of 19 to 18 nor hexaplaric. Both are excluded by the mas. της = της τρίτης καταβήσῃ, which has not affected our evidence at all.

16 There is one more inconsistency to be observed. Twice, thrice is δις, τρις, the second, third time is το δευτέρου, τρίτου, and this is what we would expect to find in translations of ητόδ and πως. δευτερῶ answers these expectations; as to three secular Greek displays a τριττεύω in a special meaning derived from τριττεύως, and a hapax legomenon τριττοῦς, belonging to τριττεύως. Both indicate that τριττ- and not τρισσ- would be correct and analogous to δευτερ-. There is, however, a parallel τρισσός = τριττός, being once found on an inscription from Mytilene (LS iii).

For the converse confusion see LS s.v. δευτερῶ το II 2 'neut. as Adverb, ἀπτας καὶ δευτερῶν once or twice Julian ad Ath. 278 c'. Add δευτερῶν...καὶ... εἰς τριττοῦ Papi. Rain. Vp (WSt 9, 260), Radermacher, Philologus 60, 1901, pp. 491 ff., twice or for the third time – here δευτερῶν = δις, but εἰς τριττοῦ not = τρις. W. Schulze, Graeca Latina, Progr. Göttingen, 1901, pp. 13 f., gives late (Christian) examples of δευτερῶν, τριττοῦ etc. = δις, τρις, comparable with tertio = ter in the rule of St Benedict. He also quotes a communication from Rahlfs regarding Lucian's substitution of τριττοῦ, εὔβουλον for the LXX's τρις, ἐπιτάξ (2 Kings 13: 19; 5: 10). This is interesting from another point of view: as this vulgarism is late, it obviously belongs to Lucian and not to the text upon which he was working; here for once he does not Atticize. δευτερῶν δις, Gen. 41: 32, is a plerophory taken from the MT.
Sometimes the Hebrew uses the adverbial expression without a special verb: שֶׁלֶש three times, e.g. 1 Kings 9: 25, translated τρεῖς καθόδους in the late hexaplaric insertion, whereas the LXX proper, 1 Kings 2: 35g, reads τρίς (our editions, including Rahlfs, who, however, had had the correct spelling in S-St III, 240, 265, spell τρεῖς; cf. above, p. 36). τρισσώς = שֶׁלֶש 1 Kings 7: 41–2 (45).

17 Frankel, Vorstud. pp. 86 f., and Lagarde, Anm. p. 58, each in his way, traced them back to different translators.

18 Cf. Num. 32: 20 ἐξοπλίσθητε] εξοπλησθεῖν n; ενοπλησθῆναι c.

19 There are variants for καταπεπελτωμένα Josh. 9: 11 (5) cobbled, clouted (of shoes), a hapax legomenon derived from πέλμα sole of the foot or of the shoe (Esther 4: 17d), namely, among others, καταπεπελτωμένα Θ ἐξοπλησθείς, καταπεπελτωμένα dy, readings which are reflected in the lexica of Hesychius, Suidas and others (cf. Schleusner III, 244, and LS). These are obvious corruptions. We therefore need not think of a conscious adaptation of καταπελτάζω from πελτατής and consequently relate the variants -πελτ- and -παλτ- with the traditional corruption of κατα-παλτής.

20 So Wackernagel; it must read τῆς ἤπι Πέρσας πορείας.

21 J. E. Powell, Lexicon to Herodotus, Cambridge, 1938, which is based on Hude’s text, avoids decision: ‘τρωγ(λ)οδυται (3) Αθηναῖς cave-dwelling: 4, 1834’.

22 In consequence of the peculiar arrangement of BM’s annotation we cannot tell whether B is the only one to give Ἰρυγο- . If Rahlfs here did not merely follow Swete in recording B, it is likely that B has some support; for otherwise he puts B’ or B’.

23 The list is not even complete. From Egypt Puchstein (pp. 52 f.) quotes two texts with σωθεύς κτρωγοδυτῶν (cf. Nachmanson, Eranos IX, 1909, pp. 48 f.).

24 These corrections are not confined to the LXX alone. In Eur., Electra 473, where Henri Weil, Sept Tragédies d’Euripide, 1879, appositely quoting Hes., II. vi 181, had correctly read πυρπνόος λέαινα, the Oxford text (G. Murray) once more accents πυρπνόος, and LS is mistaken throughout.

CHAPTER 7, pages 127–138

1 W. Bauer4 devotes separate articles to ἀποθνήσκω (p. 165) and to ‘θνήσκω’ (p. 657). In the former no perfect is mentioned, the latter exclusively consists of derivations from τέθνηκα. At least he ought to have included in brackets the heading θνήσκω. R. Bultmann in Kittel’s TWNT III, 7, need not have θνήσκω in the heading of his article, particularly as he himself says (p. 132°), ‘ἀποθνήσκειν (Perf. τέθνηκα ohne ἄπο- )’.

2 πρός does not justify Schleusner’s translation, ut adstarent praelectioni; nor did it come in after the corruption of ἐπίστασθαι into ἐπιστήμα.
taken place. It renders ήξ and has parallels in συνετός εν πράγμασιν (ἡξ) Prov. 16: 20, ὅ συνιεῖς εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔργα σουτὸν (ἡς) Ps. 32 (33): 15, and Ps. 27 (28): 5 (ἡς) and Ps. 72 (73): 17 (ἡς) ὅ συνιεῖς εἰς πτωχόν καὶ πάντα (ἡς) Ps. 40 (41): 2. We could rather guess that προς, which is very difficult Greek, led to the corruption which seemed to yield a better Greek, when understood according to Schleusner's translation.

3 LS s.v. 4 is therefore mistaken. Its 'Act.' may be mistaken for 'Trans.'

4 In the Hebrew God is the subject, and the verb is always a causative Hiphil, whereas the translator throughout transforms the sentences into the passive or intransitive, making the things affected to be the subject. Smend in his commentary considers that this was due to theological reasons, but I feel sure that the simple reason is that the translator either had difficulties in finding out the Hiphil forms in his unpointed text, which was not interpreted and safeguarded by a learned tradition, as in the canonical books, or that he found that it was easier and resulted in better Greek if he avoided these causative constructions. Misunderstanding of Hiphil forms is very frequent in the LXX, and on the whole those who write better Greek wish to avoid them in their translation.

5 This example shows what a loss we have suffered by the fact that Passow–Crönert is only a torso.

6 ἐπί ἀπάτη καί ἀπαγωγή τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους Justin, Apol. 1, 54, is corrupt. The context requires for the deception and allurement..., and this is ἀπαγωγή, cf. Demosth. 19, 322 (LS s.v. 4a).

7 In Job 3: 18 ἡ παρενεβολή, we must restore δέσμιοι ἀνειμένοι for the corrupt δέ ol αἰώνιοι, cf. Mal. 3: 20 ήπερ επαγωγή - μοσχάρια καί δέσμιον ἀνειμένα. In these passages the translators were obviously reduced to guess-work.

8 The LXX itself three times has συνεχόμενον (όυς) καί ἐγκαταλειμμένον (όυς) (1 Kings 20 (21): 21; 1 Kings 9: 8; 14: 26, in the last passage with an interpolated doublet καί ἐσπανίσμενους). In a section found only in hexaplaric MSS, 1 Kings 14: 10, we read the slightly different ἐπεχόμενον καί ἐγκαταλειμμένον. We must also take into account συνεχόμενος for τὴν 2 Esdras 16: 10 and συνεχόμενος νεεσσαραν ἐπεχόμενον καί ἐγκαταλειμμένον. In Sam. 21: 7 (8) for μαρτυρίαν ἀνειμένα. συνεχόμενος νεεσσαρ is a doublet; Lucian is correct in writing νεεσσαρ, -αν being a ditto- graphy of the following έν-. In the Hebrew the former passage means despondent, the latter resting before Jahve. The Hebrew nowhere points to a ritual tabu seclusion. (I am following £. Kutsch, 'Die Wurzel Χχ im Hebräischen' (VT ii, 1952, pp. 57–69).)

The reading of Origen in 1 Sam. 21: 7 (8), νοσερός c, νοσερός x, smacks of the later translators, for it betrays their manner of superficial Graecizing. The proper use of νοσερός is found in Jer. 14: 15; 16: 4 καί θανάτῳ νοσερό = ειςμενίν νικησαν.

9 Elsewhere only a negligible minority of MSS gives the mistaken reading. So in 1 Sam. 14: 31 the real evidence and with it our editions have
έκοτάσεν for ηγήσθη was tired, whereas the receptus, supported by bc\textsuperscript{3}d\textsuperscript{q}t, reads έκότασεν, which was disclaimed by Schleusner \textsuperscript{m}, 358. In three further passages A alone is corrupt, reading επόκοσεν [sic] for έκοτάσεν 1 Sam. 17: 39, κοπᾶσει for κοπήσει 2 Sam. 23: 7 and εκοτάσεν for έκοτάσεν 2 Sam. 23: 10. In 1 Sam. 17: 39 the correct Greek reading led to a unanimous emendation of the Hebrew (cf. Driver\textsuperscript{2} p. 146), and in 2 Sam. 23 the LXX renders μὴ in v. 7 with the sense take trouble, in v. 10 grow tired. In Num. 16: 48 (17: 13), where the LXX has a unanimous έκότασεν = ἐπαύσατο ceased (ἐπαύσατο 25: 8), the corrupt εκοτάσεν is confined to the inferior Philonic evidence in heres 201 and is repeated by it in the exposition. Somn. \textsuperscript{II}, 235 has the correct εκότασεν. In Hos. 8: 10 where κοπᾶσουσι stands for ηγήσθη (MT ηγήσθη) A* C\textsuperscript{-139} -53\textsuperscript{8} read an equally corrupt κοπᾶσουσι.

10 In Exod. some minn. read τορν-, but with them agree the translations Arm. Bo. Eth. La. Syr. (in v. 36 without Bo.). In Exod. 25: 17 the reading tornata is attested for C' Θ' by Syr.\textsuperscript{a} Moreover, Field fails to see that in v. 36 Aquila (ξημυγδαλωμένη) translates not ηγήσθη but ηγήσθη (cf. v. 33 μὴ - έξημυγδαλισμένοι). In Jer. 10: 5 only 228 reads τορν-.

\textbf{CHAPTER 8, pages 141-154}

1 Under ‘Sonstige Verba des Affekts’ Helbing displays ευδοκεῖν, observing that it is very often connected with έν, even where the MT has ηγήσθη with acc. or a suffix (p. 263). ευδοκεῖν έν for ‘to be pleased with’ is a Hebraism, for ‘have, take, pleasure, delight, in’ is syntactically quite different.

2 The Latin, which BM also quote, does, it is true, read hunc; but since this Latin, Vercellone’s margo codicis Legionensis, has survived in none of the other passages, we cannot tell whether the Latin followed the Greek in preserving this Hebraism.

3 In these parallel passages the LXX either avoids the difficult construction, as in 1 Chron. 9: 22, or puts the relative against the Hebrew, as in 1 Chron. 29: 3; 2 Chron. 15: 11.

4 εἰς = ηγήσθη was introduced by Lagarde, instead of the traditional meaningless εἰς έν. He alone put the comma after εἰς.

5 BH\textsuperscript{3} has a note: ‘ΘΑ frit melius ηγήσθη’, ‘ΘΑ’ and similar specifications are very often mistaken in BH\textsuperscript{3}, as I have shown in ThL\textsuperscript{Z}, 1938, pp. 32 ff. Here, at any rate, our entire evidence has the relative, the only variation being the omission of εἰς in d Arm. Bo.


8 But Jer. 4: 19 μετάφρασεν ἡ ψυχή μου, followed by a secondary doublet (cf. Cornill p. 52) σπαράσσεται ἡ καρδία μου (a different solution is suggested by L. Kohler, *ZAW* 29, 1909, p. 19). Also Sir. 51: 21 ἡ κοιλία μου ἐσπεύσατο for ἡ καρδία μου (so Smend).

9 In Hos. 11: 8 the AV does not follow Jerome who, as far as we can see, is here not supported by Symmachus. Luther does not follow Jerome in either passage.

10 In the LXX it is σπευδεῖν throughout, κατασπεύδειν only in Exod. 10: 16 and, in a causal meaning, quickly bring along, Esther 5: 5. In 1 Sam. 28: 20 Wellhausen (Text p. 141) rightly replaced ἐσπεύσαν by ἐσπεύσαν, considering ἐσπεύσαν in v. 21 and the repeated ἐσπεύσαν of the LXX. Yet his assumption that σπευδεῖν in both passages means to hurry and therefore necessarily stands for a corrupt ἔταράξθη (cf. v. 24, which he quotes), was mistaken and tacitly dropped by Driver and Nowack, who otherwise followed his suggestion. Its only alternative is Klostermann's ἐσπεύσαν which, however, ‘does not seem to express the right nuance’ (Driver p. 218). In our context the remarkable thing is that the LXX uses σπευδεῖν alike for ἔταράξθη be horrified in vv. 20 f. and ἐταράξθη to hasten in v. 24.

11 A similar fluctuation between do a thing hurriedly and do it in a state of trouble or being troubled is to be seen in the translations of τω, the Qal of which means be scared to flight, the Niphal to hurry anxiously, flee anxiously. In 2 Kings 7: 15 the LXX says θαμβεῖσθαι, the Quinta έσπευσαν. In 2 Sam. 4: 4 for υὐλόν ἐσπεύσαν the LXX has ἐν τῷ σπευδεῖν καὶ ἀναχωρείν, Symmachus θορυβεῖσθαι φεύγειν. In 1 Sam. 23: 26 we have quite an array of samples: the LXX σκέπτομένων, A’ θαμβούμενων, C’ περιστελλόμενος, Θ’ κρυπτόμενος.

12 From the ease with which I gathered the following examples from Field’s footnotes and the Glossary of Brockelmann’s *Syrische Grammatik* I take it that experts in Syriac will have in store more examples of roots disclosing the co-existence of both meanings. I found erschrecken, intr.; eilen; eilen; eilen; erschreckt, überrascht werden; Schrecken, Bestürzung (Brock. pp. 186*, 187*). There is an adjective erschrecken (Brock. p. 193*); yet in Ps. 6: 3 κατεσπουδάσθη, LXX έταράξθη, Syr.κατασπεύδει for Aquila in the meaning trepidant, = κατασπουδάσθησαν and not, as in Field, κατασπουδάσθη. The same (*κατεσπουδάσθη*) is found A’ Ps. 6: 11. From F. Schulthess, *Homonyme Wurzeln im Syrischen* (p. 90) I quote Mand. ḫaṣṣa to confuse (= Hebr. Ḫaṣṣa 1), but christ.-pal. ḫaṣṣa to hurry (secondary meaning = Hebr. Ḫaṣṣa 2).

13 For ἔσπευσθήσης, Ezek. 28: 19 Θ’ = ἐταράξθη (min. 86, no longer in Ziegler) Field proposed ἐμφανοτάτης.

14 Theodoretus reads κατέκαυσεν, some minuscules and Co. Eth. -παυσεν; Scharfenberg’s κατέκαυσεν would be unique; we would expect ἐπι- Elsewhere ὦυχεν is rendered ἐμφανὸς Ps. 49 (50): 2, ἐμφάνηθι 79
(80): 2, but in our passage the preceding stichus had already used ἐπέφανεν.

15 A confusion in the opposite direction is found in Zeph. 3: 1 ἀπολελυτρωμένη redeemed, as from λαος, for τὴν ἀποτίμησιν, from λαος π. (By another confusion Aquila puts λυτροσίας for τὴν (LXX ἀνθέμιον, cf. p. 50) in Eccles. 12: 6, cf. McNeile p. 127, who well compares LXX Judg. 1: 15.) In this sentence all three attributes are mistaken Hebrew homonyms, because the author did not understand his original: η περιστερά dove, η παραπρακτή from κατά, η περιστερά from κατά ΠΤΠ for σήμερον (only here for εἰμι) rebellious. Jerome’s remark ‘provocatrix, quod significantius Hebraice dicitur MARA, id est παραπρακτήν’ connects this note with our second example as well. Here Т’ says η επιφανής. The Vulgate, indeed, has provocatrix, but retains redempta and columba.

16 This neglect of Schleusner in favour of his predecessor Biel is not unparalleled. So Mozley (The Psalter of the Church p. xi) says: ‘Biel’s Lexicon has been in constant use’, without betraying any knowledge of Schleusner, although this represents a markedly advanced stage.

17 In all three passages Lucian and Jerome are correct and so represent an identical tradition. So 2 Esdras 23: 29

Lucian

τοὺς ἀλίσγοντας τὴν ιερωσύνην καὶ τὴν διαθήκην τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν Λευιτῶν ἀλίσγοντας ἡ-ε: it should be -οι-

Both agree with Syr. Arm. in reading סנה for the second נשלו. This נשלו is suggested as probable in BH, yet, since the interpretation which these witnesses have in common suggests itself so readily, it may not guarantee an unbroken tradition. ἀλίσγετιν, which we found in Lucian 2 Esdras 23: 29, is the rendering of λαος in Mal. 1: 7, 12 and Dan. LXX Θ’ 1: 8. In 2 Esdras 2: 62 Lucian reads ἀπώσθησαν ἐκ τῆς ιερωσύνης, in 17: 64 εξώσθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς λειτουργίας, closer to the LXX, both times closely followed by Jerome’s ejecti. In 1 Esdras 5: 39 the LXX translates ἐκωλύθησαν τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ Lucian ἐκωλύθησαν.

18 An eleventh instance is Ps. 138 (139): 20 Ε’, where δότι παραπράκτων σε ἐν κοσμοδούλλοις reflects τὴν ἁμαρτίαν (from τὸν Hiph.) which is the correct reading. The MT’s παραπράτων is corrupt, cf. Swete’s ζησι and L’ 55 εριστοί εἰστε. So J. G. Eichhorn, Einl. 1, 402; only he suggests δότι instead of δότι.

In Jer. 5: 23, where the MT reads נשלו (after רשל), Syr. הֵשֶׁכֶס records as the rendering of Α’ C שְׁפִּיקָרָה, which Field rightly retranslates καὶ παραπράκτων. Thus the transition to רשל is complete.
CHAPTER 9, pages 155-196

1 If the words are not an interpolation in favour of Asaph and his descendants, like those assumed by Rothstein in the Hebrew of 25: 1, 2. If so, they may once have been in the Hebrew, and ιτιάπι would form an isolated remnant.

2 (ν)ομο (γαι)εννα for (ν)ικα is perhaps the best known example. We read Μεσραιμ for (ν)ικα Gen. 10: 6, 13 and Μεστραιμ 1 Chron. 1: 8. (The euphonic insertion of a t-sound, for which I refer to p. 88, appears also in part of the evidence of the Genesis passages and in Lucianic and other MSS of the passage of which 1 Chron. 1: 11 forms part. Even Μεσραίμ, 1 Chron. 1: 8 A, is but a corruption of μεσΔΡΑΙμ, which is the reading of c2 in 1: 8.) There is Νεμραθ for (ν)ικα Gen. 10: 8 f., 1 Chron. 1: 10; Mic. 5: 6 (5); Νεμραιμ 1 Chron. 1: 8, 6, where all variants begin with Ne-; Νεσεραχ for (ν)ικα 2 Kings 19: 37 (Νεσελεχ A' Isa. 37: 36); and, as an example of a syllable other than the first, Βερ3ελλ(α)ι for (ν)ικα in 2 Sam./Kings and 2 Esdras.

3 Except 2 Kings 23: 4 εν σαδημωθ K. (ΛΕ' εν εμπυρισμφ του χειμάρρου Κεδρων) and Jer. 38 (31): 40 σαδημωθ εως νοχαλ K... In the former passage Burkitt considers the reading of ΛΕ' to be the original LXX ('The so-called Quinta of 4 Kings', in Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, xxiv, June 1902, p. 219). Burney (p. 357) enumerates the scholars who decided in the same direction following A. Klostermann. Rahlf's, who minimizes the importance of Lucianic readings as much as ever possible, nevertheless pertinently remarks (S-St iii, 249) that here, as in 23, ΛΕ' do not agree with the MT.

4 Schleusner cancels ανάπαυσις αυτη as inserted from another translation. This will be discussed later (p. 161). Here I only attempt to show that what at first sight looks like a triplet in Exod. 35: 2 is due to corruption. For the Hebrew "καταπαύσει τη δέ ημερα τη ηβδομη καταπαύσει," the lexicographer would not well think of "καταπαύσεις κυρίων...καταπαύσεις," originally understood as fut. καταπαύσεις (AM rell.), is an intruder from 34: 21, where Rahlf's rightly reads -εις twice with MSS other than B. An analogous mistake is found in Exod. 23: 12. Here BH3 is as mistaken in re-translating 'Έν έναπαυσις = (ν)ικα?', when (ν)απαυσις (AM rell. Bo. Co. Eth. La. Syr.) correctly renders (ν)ικα, as in Exod. 34: 21 in recording as a variant 'Έν (ν)απαυσις (cf. 23: 12a)'. Καταπαύσεις 34: 21; 35: 2, and on the other hand αναπαυσις 23: 12, which is also found as a variant to καταπαύσεις in 34: 21; 35: 2, clearly indicate (as has already been observed by Thiersch p. 99) that the translators and copyists used an intransitive active καταπαύσεις (Gen. 2: 2 f. for (ν)ικα: Helbing, Kasussyntax p. 169), yet a middle αναπαυσισθαι only (Thiersch p. 99), though LS produces evidence for a rare intr. αναπαυσισθαι from Thuc. 4: 11, Xen., HG 5, 1, 21 (cf. p. 342 n. 4). In support
of my emendation of Exod. 35: 2 two things may be observed: (1) there is no ἱητη in the parallels 16: 23; 31: 15, and consequently no ἔσται in the Greek; (2) in Lev. 23: 24, where ἔσται ὑμῖν appears twice invito Hebraeo, this is due to the mistaken translation κλητη for νηπι, to which Excursus XI is devoted (pp. 244 ff.).

5 I do not see the reason why Howard (Moulton–Howard n, 443) refuses to recognize the ‘well-known Hebrew equivalent for the superlative מושל, שלן’ in the NT. That ‘βασιλεὺς βασιλέων means ruler over kings’, is no cogent counter-argument, for the English translation which he gives, far from suggesting a different interpretation, just expresses the partitive relation between the two nouns: singled out from among (the) other kings, this king is a king par excellence (compare König’s definition). Moreover, Howard’s own illustrations both from an inscription and modern Greek usage witness against him.

6 Translators of later books rendered מושל by the plural οὐρανοῖ; but the translators of the Pentateuch, accustomed as they were to translate מושל by the singular, have here produced a kind of hyper-Graecism.

7 In Philo’s quotation sobr. 32 παῖς οἰκέτης is followed by the doublet δοῦλος δοῦλων, which was recognized and excised by Mangey (cf. Wendland, Rh. M. 53, 1898, p. 15). Whereas here the interpolation from Aquila’s translation penetrated the whole of our evidence (GFH), another one is confined to cod. U, which in de gig. 63 replaces the LXX text of Gen. 17: 1, εὐφρέστει ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ, καὶ γίνου ἀμέτρτος, by περιτάπτει ἐς πρόσωπόν μου, καὶ γίνου τέλειος, pure Aquila, as I was able to demonstrate (JTS 47, 1946, pp. 31 ff.). Cf. note 2 to Excursus XII, p. 344.

8 At first sight die primo et die octavo erit sabbatum, id est requies Lev. 23: 39 looks like a doublet, with id est introducing an interpretation of sabbatum. In point of fact Jerome, here as in other places, avoids the awkward sequence of the Hebrew on the first day ויהי, and on the eighth day ויהי, and for this turns to good use the existence side by side of the two translations of ויהי.

9 I am inclined to trace behind this variation an exegetical finesse on the part of Jerome’s rabbinic advisers. To them ויהי obviously meant rest. Further, they are bound to have interpreted ויהי ויהי, Exod. 16: 23, with its unique change of word order as a legitimate alternative of the construct state ויהי ויהי, an alternative which did not imply any change of meaning. If I am right, they anticipated what in our time has been taught by Alfons Schulz. In his latest contribution ‘Der Status constructus in der Geschichte der Exegese’ (ZAW NF 13, 1936, pp. 270–7) he first gives a selection of examples from the Hebrew Bible. Then he gathers instances from the Greek translations, the Vet. Lat. and the Vulgate, Jewish writings, and modern translations and expositions. He also discusses γέεννα τοῦ πυρός Matt. 5: 22; 18: 9, with its different translations, and ends with the claim that this inversion of the regular form of
the construct state, which does not affect the meaning of the complex expression, should be recognized as a rather rare but legitimate Hebrew usage. He does not mention נחש יתפוש.

In the LXX the most interesting example is Exod. 3: 2 ἐν πυρὶ φλογός for שבעתפומ (so Sam.). This unusual ἐ. π. φ. is confined to Bhqru, whereas the remainder, including the translations (the Sahidic is missing), read a normal ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς. To decide for the latter, as Rahlfs does, is certainly mistaken, and means relapsing behind the Sixtine and the Cambridge editions. It was different with the Complutensian and the Aldine, which were based on inferior evidence, and with Grabe whose edition in the main followed A.

Moreover, since Exod. 3: 2 is frequently quoted or alluded to, there are many reflections of ἐν πυρὶ φλογός in the Old and New Testaments and in the early Fathers. It is taken over by Sir. 8: 10; 45: 19 and Ps. Sol. 12: 4. In addition, the variant readings of Sir. 8: 10; 45: 19 strongly suggest that originally Sir. 28: 22 also read ἐν πυρὶ φλογός. In 8: 10; 45: 19 the Hebrew survives and reads נחש-יבשות. In 28: 22 the Greek and the Latin have εἰς φλογὶ τῆς in flamma sua and the Syriac, without εἰς, has the complex expression the beams of fire, which, I think, was lost in LXX La. The Hebrew is missing, but is likely to have read נחש ביבשות once more. This argument is confirmed by two other passages of the same books, φλοξ πυρὸς Sir. 21: 9 and Ps. Sol. 15: 4. They clearly show that the pattern of Exod. 3: 2 exercised its influence on the Greek translator only where the Hebrew included the preposition εἰς, in the flame of fire.

In Exod. 3: 2 we find, side by side, the idiomatic translation of Bhqru, and the later assimilation to the Hebrew in the majority. The evidence of OT quotations listed above is equally divided, with the exception of Ps. Sol. 12: 4, where the early version alone is attested. If we remember that in the textual history of the LXX the B-text soon became obsolete and was replaced by later forms closer to the Hebrew, we realize that wherever the early form of text has survived in full, or, as in Sir. 28: 22, in parts, it is bound to be the genuine text. It is from this angle that the quotations in the NT and the Fathers must be considered.

In the NT we have two references to Exod. 3: 2 - 2 Thess. 1: 8 combines fragments quoted literally from five biblical passages. The first is ἐν πυρὶ φλογός, and here reference to Exod. 3: 2 is obvious: Christ's parousia in a flame of fire is equated with the theophany before Moses. Acts 7: 30 introduces a shortened, but fairly literal, reproduction of Exod. 3. [The only unchallenged instance of a translation that is not influenced by Exod. 3: 2 is Isa. 66: 15 ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς שבעתפומ, though elsewhere Isaiah LXX shares many peculiar translations with the Greek Pentateuch.] Our editions up to and including Nestle11 (1952) all read ἐν πυρὶ φλογός in Thessalonians, but ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς in Acts. But there can be no justification for treating them differently. In both passages the
evidence is divided, and it is real progress that Nestle now recommends ε. π. φ. in his apparatus, doubtless for the reasons developed above. [W. Bauer’s excellent Wörterbuch, which has to make the best of the editions used, explains the secondary reading of Acts 7: 30 from the equally secondary text of Exod. 3: 2 in Rahlfs (5, 1447), and the good text of 2 Thess. 1: 8 from Ps. Sol. 12: 4 (5, 1705).] Here, as in the LXX, these quotations of Exod. 3: 2 are set into their proper relief by other passages with different lineage and therefore different wording, such as Rev. 1: 14; 2: 18; 19: 12 ὁς φλόξ πυρός = Dan. 10: 6 ὕψος πυρός, LXX Θ᾽ ὄσι ἀνάμμενες πυρός, or Heb. 1: 7 πυρός φλόγα = Ps. 103 (104): 4 τῦρ φλέγον. [BH ventures a retranslation into Hebrew of the minority reading in Ps. 103 (104): 4. From Rahlfs’ Psalms, 1931, it is, however, obvious that here πυρός φλόγα is a mere backreading from Heb. 1: 7, and that its evidence is not ‘ΘΑ’, but only Bo. Sa. Lb and a corrector of A.]

Among patristic quotations those found in Justin are the most instructive. Since our evidence is confined to a single careless MS (XIVp), and since the problems set by it still await solution, it is best to let the facts speak for themselves. Justin’s first reference to Exod. 3: 2 is found in Ap. 62 f. There is first an allusion, repeated twice, about Christ addressing Moses ἐν ἱδέα πυρός (ἐν θείᾳ θύλῃ) ἐκ βάτου. From this allusion we cannot gather the form of the underlying text; but more can be learned from the two quotations in 63. The second, 63, 11 (vv. 2, 14 f.), has the B-text ἐν πυρὶ πυρὸς ἐκ βάτου; but the first, 63, 7 (vv. 2, 6, 10, 14 f.), though occurring only a few lines earlier, presents a text that is secondary on more than one score: ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς ἐκ τῆς βάτου not only shares €. φ. π. with the bulk of MSS which here are inferior, but, in addition, seems to show late atticing tendencies. The LXX uses the Hellenistic ὁ βάτος throughout. In Exod. 3: 2 τῆς βάτου is in minn. finn too, and, moreover, an anonymous marginal note of Fb gives the full quotation. In it μέσον τῆς βάτου = μέσον θύλης, supported by the hexaplaric variant in the text, μέσον κακχ Αρμ. Syr. (ста), is much more literal than the LXX.

There are more indications that ἡ βάτος is late. It is read by Fbmsa2c2 (4) in Exod. 3: 3. In Deut. 33: 16 a small minority only, B Θ hklssx have τῶ βάτω. Justin, Dial. 91 joins the majority, and this quotation of vv. 13–17 shows more signs of late origin and even corruption. [Instead of the twice repeated καθ’ ἄραν Justin’s text first reads καθάρων, which is easily corrected, and then καρπῶν which is comparable to the corruption of Deut. 26: 14 (Philo’s Bible p. 22 n. 1).] Justin’s second reference to Exod. 3: 2 is still more elaborate. It extends through chs 59 f. of the Dialogue. Justin begins by advancing his proposition: Exod. 3 proves that the same God, who appeared to Abraham and Jacob, ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς ἐκ βάτου πέφανται καὶ ὠμιλήσε τῷ Μωυσέῳ. Asked by Trypho’s party to develop his argument further, he sets out to quote Exod. 2: 23–3: 16 in full [though actually our MS presents 2: 23 and 3: 16 only and connects
them by καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ μέχρι τοῦ; but this is merely a further example of the carelessness which is to be observed elsewhere, e.g. in Dial. 64 where Ps. 71: 1-5 and 17-19 are connected by καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ μέχρι τοῦ (Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek p. 188); in our passage the very words that Justin repeats in order to make his point have been omitted from the question of the proof-text], and concludes by stressing the teaching implied: Do you understand that the same God ὄν λέγει Μωυσῆς ἀγγελον ἐν πυρὶ φλογός λαλάκαναι αὐτῷ makes known to Moses that he himself is the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob? To this Trypho replies: we understand that ὅ φθεις ἐν φλογί πυρὸς was an angel. The discussion continues and Justin once more quotes Exod. 3: 2-4, and here v. 3 with ἐν πυρὶ φλογός ἐκ βάτου.

We find the same late form of quotation interspersed in two contexts that elsewhere retain its original wording. In Dial. it is put into the mouth of Trypho. But the easy way of explanation that Justin, here as in other places, makes Trypho cite the 'Jewish' translation is barred by the parallel in Apol. Should we therefore trace the difference back to Justin himself? Or is it one among many instances due to revisory activity during the course of transmission? There certainly are passages that allow themselves to be decided straightforwardly. But ours are not among them, and decision about them must be left for special treatment which is long overdue and for which fresh sources of information are now available. 

(D. Barthélemy, O.P., ‘Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante', Revue Biblique LX, 1953, pp. 18-29. This is a first report about a newly found MS of the Greek Dodekapropheton. Written in Ip, it is a Jewish recension of the LXX, readings of which are shown to agree with Justin's 'Jewish' quotations, with pre-hexaplaric approaches to the Hebrew found in the Achmimic and Sahidic versions and the Washington Pap. W (IIIp), with the Quinta and with many readings of the Three.)

The evidence for Philo and Clem. Alex. is not consistent either. In Philo there is a variant: fug. 161 ὅ βάτος (Exod. 3: 2 f.); somn. 1, 194 ἐκ τοῦ βάτου (Exod. 3: 4)] τῆς MA. Clem. Al. has allusions only. In Paed. II, 75 he uses ὅ βάτος thrice, in Protrept. 1, 8, 1 διὰ τῆς βάτου. These unrelated passages cannot be compared with Justin where the change occurs within related contexts.

10 Compare also Lev. 25: 8 where the LXX translates ἡμέρα τῶν ἁπαξαμένων by ἀναπαύσεις ετῶν. At first sight one would say that they thought of ἡμέρα. Yet in the light of what we shall see (pp. 178 f.) there arises the alternative possibility that from the habit of translating ἡμέρα τῶν ἁπαξαμένων by σάββατα ἁπαξαμένων (Exod. 16: 23; 31: 15; 35: 2; Lev. 16: 31; 23: 3, and, close by, 25: 4) there originated a temptation to interchange the two components of this combination freely. If so, ἀναπαύσεις = ἡμέρα and τολμανθρεύω = κηρί.

11 So obviously already Philo, as can be seen from spec. leg. II, 194: τὴν
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12 Observe also that ἀνάπαυσις οὗτη is missing in O and some later groups which depend on it. ἀνάπαυσις alone is missing in fir, one of the latest groups, and οὗτη transposed in N fir. So Schlesner’s text would be Origenian, and we may assume that Origen read ἀνάπαυσις οὗτη, which led to an omission in the MSS representing his text — if Origen himself had not already excluded it, putting σαββατον in its place. οὗτη is unique here among the passages quoted, yet it prevails Lev. 25: 10 ff. as against ἔστιν or ἐσται. In our passages the MT uses ἡν οὖν or ἡν promiscuously.

13 The source may well be Θ', considering A' has μηνίσκων and C' κοσμ(ι)ων. The A-text has μηνίσκους in 8: 21, and in 8: 26 there is a doublet τῶν δρυμισκών ενῳθ. Here ενῳθ is in the O group only (A abcf). So it is not the old text. Moreover, it is corrupt. Representing ποῦθε, it lost its initial v by haplography: ΝΗΠΙΦΘ (ΝΗΝΦΘ). We must keep in mind that in Judges we have no fully pre-Origenian text at all. The position is as though in the NT we had only Lucianic (‘Byzantine’) and ‘Western’ MSS (cf. p. 272).

14 The two passages, 2 Esdras 20: 35 f. and 23: 31, are closely related; not only because they record the same subject matter, but also from the point of view of translation which, without being precisely identical, is very similar, e.g. της τῶν ξυλοφορίων εορτής: 20: 35 εἰς καιροὺς ἐπὶ χρόνον; 23: 31 εἰς καιροῖς ἐπὶ χρόνον. τά τῶν ξυλοφόρων, the offering of wood (for maintaining the altar-fire) is translated with the same circumstantiality, 20: 35 ξυλοφορίας, 23: 31 τῶν ξυλοφόρων, so that the result is a tautology, the offering of delivery (23: 31 of the deliverers) of wood. The similarity is sufficiently close to suggest an emendation. In 23: 31 τῶν ξυλοφορίων is correctly rendered by τὸ δόρον; in 20: 35, κλήρους ἐβάλομεν περὶ κλήρου ξυλοφορίας, the context shows clearly that we should read δόρου instead of κλήρου. Still more, we may wonder whether we should not read (with e) τῶν ξυλοφοριῶν in 23: 31. We should, of course, distinguish between the feminine plural ξυλοφορίαι and the festival name τά ξυλοφόρια. To this festival reference is made by Josephus, BJ ii 425 τῆς τῶν ξυλοφορίων εορτῆς, and by rabbinical sources which date it on the 15th of Ab
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(Schürer 3, 316). Later on, nine days extending from the first of Nisan till the first of Tebeth were fixed for the wood delivery, yet none of the fixed dates is in Tischri. Therefore one does not see for what reason LS maintains the traditional mistake of our lexica in translating Jos., BJ ii, 425 ‘the Jewish feast of Tabernacles’. In fact, this festival of wood-offering was only temporary, and never concurrent, let alone identical, with Sukkoth, 15th–22nd (23rd) of Tischri. The offering of wood never had any connection whatever with the feast of Tabernacles.

This differentiation applies also to the compounds. When at a late date Galen still says λιτρώδης 6, 559, he does so because he found λιτρον in Hippocrates. ‘The belief in his “Bible”, Hippocrates, is one of the worst manifestations of archaism’ (Wilamowitz, Die Griechische Literatur des Altertums p. 250).

Yet this does not necessarily protect from mistakes, any more than when Bewer proposes in Ezek. 21: 14 to read γυμνώθητι instead of the corrupt θυμώθητι. This, in fact, as έτοιμη (§5) in 21: 15 and the corrupt second διαπαρέσθην (for διαπαρέσθην) in 21: 33 indicate, must be corrected into έτοιμάσθητι as was early suggested by Lambert Bos.

Among them there is the precarious assumption that the co-existence of forms observable in λίβανος-λιβανωτάς, κλίβανος-κλιβανωτός, κίβος-κιβωτός, μάκελλα, μάκελλον-μακελλωτός, and also in λήδον-λήδανον, reflects two separate acts of borrowing, from the Semitic singular on the one hand, from the plural on the other. A. Müller (Bezz. Beitr. 1, 298) goes as far as to include even συκάμ-ιν-ος, but compare Lobeck, Ajas 3 p. 334 n. i.

When adducing Galen 19, p. 693, LS and Bauer suggest secular evidence for σικέρα. Moreover, in contrast to the Greek Bible, σικέρα shows inflexion: ούδε τοῦ ψυχροῦ ύδατος ή οἶνου ή ζύθου ή ἐτέρας σικέρας πόσις ἀβλαβής ἐστι. But an earlier passage of the same treatise on The Diagnosis and Therapy of Kidney Diseases (ch. 5, end, p. 679) should make us beware of rash inferences. After a paragraph referring to time-honoured household remedies, when everything better has failed, the text continues καί ταύτα δέ διὰ τό, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, ἀποτυγχάνειν δεῖ καὶ ἠμᾶς τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς ἐπὶ τά καθ' ἡμᾶς μέγιστα καὶ κυρίως μυστηριώδη χωρεῖν. τούτων γὰρ ἐγὼ πιστεύω καὶ ὁμολογῶ μη μόνον τά σωματικά πάθη καὶ ἀπηγορεύματα περὶ πάντων τῶν ἵπτρων φυγαδεύεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχικά τέλειος ἀφανίσθαι. λοιπὸν τὸν λόγον ὡς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἰδικῶς πρὸς σὲ τρέπωμεν – an obvious pointer to the sacrament of the altar. Thus we are by no means outside the biblical circuit, and these passages at least are anything but Galen.

Emeritus Professor Johannes Mewaldt in Vienna, the author of the article on Galen in RE, was kind enough to check my argument and to put his observations at my disposal. ‘There are particulars telling in favour of Galen as the author: 1. the reference to an earlier treatise of his, δέδεικται γὰρ ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν φυσικῶν δυνάμεων ὑπομνήμασιν etc.'
(p. 649, l. 13), a treatise which Galen is especially fond of quoting.
2. On p. 659, ll. 7–11, the author mentions in passing a case from his own practice and its successful treatment; this is very much in Galen's vein.
3. The dietetic prescriptions on p. 679 compare with those found in Galen's treatise περί λεπτομενούσης διαίτης ed. Kalbfleisch. However, there are indications that the treatise about Kidney Diseases as we read it now derives from a Christian. First of all the two passages mentioned above: the passage on p. 679, l. 3 (καὶ ταῦτα)–9 (ἀφαι/ζεσθοί) which does not fit into the context and is clearly an interpolation; and the passage on p. 693, l. 5, not only because of the mention and inflexion of σικερο, but also because of the mention of ζόθος which, according to the lexicons, is found nowhere in Galen; for in the context the mention of water and wine suffices. Further some stylistic features are odd and completely un-Galenic: the exaggerated form of address ἡλιε τῆς ψυχής (p. 680, l. 3); still more so the whole concluding passage beginning with l. 7 on p. 697; here the author speaks about himself as the addressee's δούλος and calls the addressee's physician in ordinary σύνδουλος μου; moreover, the protestation ἐπὶ τῆς μάρτυρι (p. 697, l. 16) is noteworthy. All this sounds Byzantine.'

From the above it would seem that it is no longer possible to place the treatise among the obvious forgeries of Galen. Impersonating the pagan physician is one thing, interspersing his work with Christian passages is another. The first is forgery, the second 'editing'.

19 'τὸ πάσχα (neben Dat. -ατι)' Schw., Gr. Gr. p. 585. Where does -ατι occur? Schmiedel quotes 'Suicers Thesaurus'.
20 σαρθά, Jos., AJ III, 252 (τῇ πεντηκοστῇ, ἢν 'Εβραίοι σαρθά καλοῦσιν, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο πεντηκοστήν), in a passage drawn from Lev. 23: 15 ff., however, is different. There is no equivalent for ἀπολύῃ, nor is it ever found for Pentecost in the LXX. The Aramaic borrowed word ἀπολύῃ, Pentecost, gives the impression of belonging to a period more recent than the LXX, and Josephus here reflects contemporary parlance, as does the NT, in the Aramaic words and phrases collected e.g. in Schürer n, 25.
21 It is different with such borrowed words in Jerome as are not in the LXX. For Ἵρμη slope, berm (Bertholet–Galling, Hesekiel, 1936, p. 148) he has an acc. plur. ethecas Ezek. 41: 15 f. (Rönsch p. 256), but porticus in 42: 3, 5. Most probably Aquila had something corresponding; in any case this would fit into the list of quasi-Greek whimsical coinages, which have been collected from Aquila by Field (1, xxiii).
22 Schwyzer (KZ 62, 1934/5, pp. 1 ff.) also compares ἡ γάμοι = Persian ganuj and Bacción = Babyl. Ba-ab-tar, old Persian Bâxtrîs.
23 Yet there still remains another example which it is hard to explain satisfactorily, σάτα from ἄρπα, Aram. yáap. As in σάββατα, -τον, so here the sing. σάταν is decidedly later than the plural. As ἄρπα itself may be borrowed (Lagarde, Beer, Hebr. Gramm. 1, 136), we may perhaps assume that there was in Hebrew an old fem. ̀אָנה such as in יְרַנְא he glorifies
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or ως... they are red (Isa. 1: 18), where χ is consonantal and closes the syllable, a feature which is more appropriate to Hebrew than to Aramaic. Moreover, here, in the name of a measure, a derivation from an emphatic state is as improbable as in the names of the letters of the alphabet.

24 There was a time when I thought I could decide this dilemma from the LXX. For, just as many of our MSS spell υαυλ-, a variant found in all passages except perhaps 1 Macc. 13: 51 which is not covered by BM, and just as when -v precedes, there are frequent haplographies, so that we find -αβλ- or -αυλ-, just so Origen alone (codd. cx) says αυλοί in 1 Sam. 10: 5 and αυλοίς in 2 Sam. 6: 5 (cf. νούλοις cod. 44, and in 1 Chron. 13: 8 αυλοκοις cod. 74). But a closer view at the annotation shows that in both passages Origen simplified the enumeration of the many instruments: he put αυλοί instead of νάβλα 1 Sam. 10: 5 (with many later recensions he here introduced the plurals of 2 Sam. 6: 5), omitted αυλοί, where it was in the MT and the LXX, later in the verse; and put αυλοίς instead of νάβλας 2 Sam. 6: 5, where instead of καί εν αυλοῖς he gives ἀλαλάμου (c) or -ῶν (χ). So it is obvious that he did not intend to use a masc. νοῖος for ναβλα, and that consequently he gives no support to a masc. cited for A' Ps. 150: 3.

LS is right in not following the Concordance with its rash heading νοῖος, but it is not complete when for νοῖον = νάβλα it quotes Hesychius only. The evidence of the Vulgate does not decide the issue. Its nablis 1 Chron. 15: 16, 20, 28; 1 Macc. 13: 51 is inconclusive, and nablum 1 Sam. 6: 5 in the Vet. Lat. Lav. does not substantiate the formation nabulum which appears for Jerome in the lexica. Only two arguments could possibly do so. (1) We might think of an imitation of Aquila's νοῖον; yet this is unlikely here, as nablis exists only in those books and passages in which Jerome but slightly revises the Vet. Lat., whereas in his own translations he prefers psalterium or other renderings. (2) Apart from the Latin Bible there exists nablium in Ovid's ars am. 3, 327. So the nom. of nablis is more probably nablum than nablium, which latter in view of Aquila's νοῖον is not quite impossible; in our Greek lexica we may have to insert a problematic *ναβλοίν, and certainly νάβλον instead of ναῦλον.

Earlier we recorded that in secular Greek there was a formation ὁ νάβλας. This is also recorded for A' and C' Isa. 5: 12 in the margin of cod. 710 (ed. Lütkeamann—Rahlfs, 1915). Yet the editors (p. 51 n. 205) make it probable that here νάβλας is a genitive and, as happens elsewhere, a mistaken adaptation to the gen. ψαλτηρίου of the LXX. At any rate, as they do not fail to point out, March. Q, which gives the whole sentence as it was in Aquila, has nom. νάβλα. A' Ps. 91 (92): 4 ν实际行动, after Field's emendation, points to the same.

25 These slight mistakes have been tacitly corrected in my résumé. In Lev. 25: 10-13 Deissmann reads ἐνιαύτος or ἐτος ἀφήρεως σημασίας and translates signal-year of the release. Yet the gen. σημασίας is almost without
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authority in 10, 11, 12 and is a corruption also in 13, though here it is read even by B* in support of GMN min. and Arm. Bo. Co. Eth. The correct translation of the Greek would be the year of release, the signal. Here the Greek puts side by side two co-ordinated nouns; just as we had observed it doing in Exodus and similarly in Leviticus, when for the Hebrew subordination by a construct state ἡμέρα ανάπαυσις or σαββατα σαββατών (cf. above, pp. 159 ff.), here he says ένιαυτός αφέσεως – σημασία αύτη (v. 10). Thus in vv. 11, 12 we have to understand (ήνιαυτός) αφέσεως σημασία αύτη έστιν 11/12 as an elliptical expression, which leaves (ήνιαυτός) to be understood; for ένιαυτός has no Hebrew equivalent in v. 10 either. There, ένιαυτός αφέσεως is the first translation of άνοιγμα, and σημασία the second. The analogy of the passages translating ἡμέρα ανάπαυσις becomes still closer as soon as we realize that in both expressions the following σημασία appears in the Greek translation as connected with the second component of the compound expression (cf. Lev. 16: 31 σάββατα [σάββατων] ανάπαυσις αύτη, where the later recensions, as was shown above in a note, p. 325 n. 12, far from reading a gen. ανάπαυσις, cancelled ανάπαυσις αύτη). From this observation we are able to emend v. 13 where our editions read ἐν τῷ έτει τῆς αφέσεως σημασία αύτής. The first thing that is obviously mistaken is the pronoun αύτής, for everywhere else we read the nom. αύτη, and it is extremely improbable that for once αὐτός should have taken the place of οὖτος. The difficulty of the passage explains to the full why B* and others (see above) here read a gen. σημασίας. But everything is in order, as soon as we draw the consequences from the fact that έτος τῆς αφέσεως and σημασία αύτη, as duplicates, are in the same case. So, if we do not prefer to write σημασία αύτη as a parenthesis, an expedient which I would hardly recommend, we must read ἐν τῷ έτει τῆς αφέσεως, σημασία ταύτη. Any refutation would have to start from the assumption that in the other passages άνοιγμα was actually rendered by αύτη and not by σημασία. The fact that here for once the Hebrew has the word for year, άνοιγμα ανάπαυσις, does not make any difference, for it is almost the same in v. 10 and vv. 11, 12, where year is put repeatedly in close proximity to ἐνοίκ. The only further slight divergence of v. 13 is that we read τῆς αφέσεως with an uncontested article, but this would not make disputable the close analogy and interrelation of all the parallel passages in vv. 10–13.

26 I cannot explain Aquila’s translation of ἐστιν, ὁ παρασφεῖται (Lev. 25: 10; Exod. 19: 13, the latter only in a retranslation by Field from Syr. Num. 36: 4 in BM). Having in mind the remarks of Schulthess, Homon. Wurzeln im Syrischen p. 2 and note 5, I would call attention to παρασφεῖται, παρασφεῖται, παρασφεῖται which render τῆς αφέσεως in the Greek Qohelet, in a way redolent of Aquila (McNeile pp. 115–68), and to εφερεῖται to εφερεῖται in one of the duplicate renderings of i Sam. 21: 13 (14) which is certainly not Aquila, as it appears already in the Vet. Lat. (differebatur, Leg. (2)).

27 For διάπτωσις 19: 6, 14, διαπτύτουσιν 19: 12, διαπτύτου 19: 13,
Schleusner π, 112 f., offers a brilliant emendation: διάπτυσις, διαπτύουσα, διαπτοων. Though διάπτυσις fall, failure would make some sense, -πτυ- would be an etymological translation by connecting this place name with talmudic ηπ (cf. G. Hölscher on Job 17: 6), spit upon something despicable. This way of etymological translation of place names is a clear indication for a late, Theodotion-like, translator of this passage; there are more to be found, if we compare our passage with its parallel, Jer. 7: 31 f. We may also refer to περικάθαρμα and περίφημα in 1 Cor. 4: 13. There are some interesting parallels in the LXX which illustrate the idea behind this etymological translation. So Isa. 40: 15 ως σίελος λογισθήσονται is a mis-translation which misreads (Schleusner v, 29; Ottley v, 299) πι fine dust into π σπittle, and Prov. 21: 18 περικάθαρμα for ΠΠ ransom is a translation which, as Gottfried Kuhn, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Salomonischen Spruchbuchs p. 96, explains, takes its rise from Aram. πολυανδρείον to wipe off. From this Kuhn tentatively suggests also in Prov. 21: 15 changing δεις δε ακάθαρτος into σίελος δε ακάθαρτος, assuming that the translator derived νησι (cf. p. 257 above) from νησι descend, flow down and giving parallels from Syriac. Considering these parallels, we may disregard some obvious objections: διάπτυσις is not found elsewhere, but its formation is justified from parallels; the participles are in the active and we rather expect the passive, but also this is not without parallels.

28 In 19: 2 πολυανδρείον υΙών τών τέκνων αυτών is corrupt, of course, and Cornill, Rudolph (also in BH3) were ill-advised in tracing it back to a Hebrew variant שֵׁם. The Complutensian had already found almost the right solution, putting π. υΙών Εννομ by mere conjecture. We must read π. υΙών Εννομ as in 19: 6. Our MSS preserve other attempts at making sense of τέκνων. So Lucian reads π. υΙών τών τεθνηκότων αυτών and cod. 228 gratis p. υΙών τῶν θνητών αυτών.

29 πολυανδρείον meeting-place for many people, common burial-place (this 2 Macc. 9: 4, 14; 4 Macc. 15: 20).

30 My intention is not to controvert the current explanation of πολυανδρείον, as expressed by Wellhausen, Geschichte3 pp. 205 f. and 302, but to give it a substructure from close observation of the Greek texts. γον and πολυανδρείον are not the only translations of Κι, not even in our phrase. φάραγξ Εννομ, Josh. 15: 8 bis; 2 Esdras 11: 30 (in an addition supplied by Σ-Σ), as well as φάραγξ υΙών Εννομ, 2 Kings 23: 10; even Jer. 7: 31 f.; 39 (32): 35, are supported by numerous renderings φάραγξ = Κι from Deut. 4: 46 onwards, including Ezekiel.

Moreover, it is difficult to derive the version of the parallels in Jer. 7 and 19 from an identical translator. It is because of this impression that I refrain here from checking Thackeray’s observations on the dividing line between the different translators in Jeremiah and Ezekiel and the relation between the Greek Jeremiah and Ezekiel. His results, which had not been entirely beyond doubt before (cf. L. Köhler, ZAW, 1909, pp. 9-10, note) have been further weakened, since the evidence of the
The same has been demonstrated repeatedly in the Heptateuch by Dr A. V. Billen.

It is easy to see that \( m^{marg} \) is right in ascribing this reading to \( \Theta' \), whereas \( b^{marg} \), which, moreover, has \( \text{θεραπας} \) instead of \( \text{θεραφιν} \), is mistaken in recording \( A' \) instead; similar mistakes are very frequent in the marginal notes of our MSS.

I do not see any reason for altering anything in the Hebrew; and if the evidence had to be given for \( CD^ljl \), as Kittel would still read in \( BH^3 \), he could base this reading on \( \Theta' \)'s \( \text{δικασα} \ \text{θεραφιν} \) rather than on \( C' \)'s \( \text{υνυλα των ελθωλων} \); for \( \text{υνυλα} \) is rarer for \( \psi \) than is \( \text{δικασα} \). The Theodotionic doublet in Lucian may be due to Lucian's wish to see \( \psi \) represented alongside of \( \psi \) which, as the Vet. Lat. proves, was the reading from which the LXX translated. Therefore, if any emendation were desired, we could only say that it is already found in some of the later translators; but in following them we ought to realize that this is but a repeated conjecture against which the MT and the LXX stand united, and both making good sense.

In Hebrew there is no special word that primarily means victory; therefore of the words covering this meaning \( \text{ἱσχύς} \) is rendered \( \text{Ισχύς} \) Exod. 32: 18 (cf. \( \kappaατίσχυεν \) for \( \text{ἴσχυς} \) Exod. 17: 11 and \( \deltaινετος \ \text{ισχυς} \) for \( \text{ευθείας} \) 2 Kings 5: 1 in what Benzinger, Burney and Kittel consider a doublet in MT and LXX from which \( L \) alone is free); and \( \text{σωτηρία} \) are always rendered \( \text{σωτηρία} \) according to the primary meaning of the Hebrew root.

\( \betaάτος \) is much less frequent in the LXX than \( \kappaόρος \). In 2 Esdras 7: 22 Rahlfs twice prefers \( \betaόδον \) which in both passages is the reading of Any only. In the first occurrence BVh Eth. read \( \text{ανομία κόρον} \), yet in the second they join with the rest which read \( \betaάτον \). The reading \( \betaόδον \) may also be behind the isolated \( \kappaόδον \) of \( A \) in 2 Chron. 2: 9 = \( \text{ἐσβάκη} \) for which all other MSS put \( \muερτον \) twice, though the second time \( A \) also reads \( \muερτον \). The formation with -\( δ- \) is also found in hexaplaric fragments, so Isa. 5: 10 A' C' \( \Theta' \) \( \betaόδον \), where, however, Jerome records, 'omnes alii bâum interpretati sunt’, because here the LXX translates \( \text{νη} \) by \( \kappaεράμυνων \). \( \betaόδον \) is further the reading of min. 71 (HP) in 1 Kings 5: 25 (11), where the others put \( \betaθ \) for Hebrew \( \text{νυ} \) which earlier in the same verse is translated \( \kappaόρος \). Here Syr. says \( 1\text{ίς} \), and I consider it probable that the spelling with -\( δ- \), which, as we have seen, has but poor evidence, is a late Aramaism. Another problem is closely connected with this, why has \( \betaάτος \) a \( τ \) for Hebrew \( \eta \) and not a \( θ \)? The answer may come from two quarters. Analogy with, and assimilation to, the other homonymous words \( \betaάτος \) may have been of some influence, yet the main reason is that mentioned above, p. 172, \( \text{viz.} \), -\( ττ- \) in the plural \( \text{δύου} \).
So we may reasonably ask whether the late variants βάδος and κάδος may not merely reflect the same variants in Luke 16: 6 and so range among the other 'back-readings' from the NT which have been observed here and there in this chapter.

36 With an inconsistency to be observed also in the use of other measure names, κόρος represents ἡμ in the two Pentateuch passages, Lev. 27: 16; Num. 11: 32.

37 Among the Three this tendency had been observed in Aquila alone. Now Lütkemann–Rahlfs (p. 50 n. 195) have produced strong evidence for Theodotion and Symmachus as well.

38 The marginal reading of min. 128 κυκλώσατι is likely to be Aquila's.

39 'κωλύειν (ἀρκωλ.) in several books renders הב. Λαγχάνειν = ד广播电视 take i Sam. 14: 47.'

40 Bl.–Debr. §400, 3, Bauer* p. 837, rightly displays the warning 'v.l.' Therefore, when expounding Acts 1: 17; Luke 1: 9, as does Dr L. S. Thornton (JTS 46, 1945, p. 52), one must understand that here the NT passages are prior to 'the solitary analogy of this use of λαγχάνειν in the LXX'. For here we have only the hexaplaric interpolation of the LXX and not its genuine text. The trouble is that B combines the primitive and the Origenian texts; Bauer, however, was not deceived, because his LXX references are based upon Rahlfs' edition.

41 The reason why the duplicate came into being is obvious. The original translators had used a text which here had no motres lectionis; so they interpreted ἡμελά, written κολότοι, as though it were ἡμελά, ἐργον (Wellhausen). A later translator or corrector, previous (?) to Origen and Lucian, was not satisfied with correcting the mistake proper, but retranslated the entire phrase which was only half incorporated by Lucian, but in its entirety by O and B, yet, in a way that betrays it as secondary, at different places.

42 ἐν Γαί ἐν γῆ Μωαβ, Deut. 34: 6, as read in Rahlfs' text, though not a doublet, is not the genuine LXX text. ἐν γῆ Μωαβ is missing in many MSS, including B Θ L Lugd.; it is secondary in the LXX and may even indicate a later addition in the MT (Steuernagel, but not BH). The marginal note in ν, 'Ο' A' C' Θ' αὐτόν ἐν γῆ Μωαβ', more precisely characterizes this addition as hexaplaric and it looks as though ἐν Γαί was missing there, as it is, indeed, in Origen's non-hexaplaric quotation, as far as one can judge from BM.

43 In Josh. 18: 16, where we must read ἐπὶ Γαί ἐννομ (cf. p. 247), a doublet ἐπὶ γῆ Γαί ἐννομ is indicated by the reading of pt, two Lucianic MSS, ἐπὶ τῆν Γαίν(ν)ομ. Moreover, γῆ is not the only corruption of γαί. In Josh. 15: 9, where BN imrzmsa read ἐς τὸ δρόος, M. Margolis (AJSL 32, 1915/16, p. 198; JPOS, 1925, pp. 60 ff.) convincingly restored ἐς Γαί δρόος (ΓΑΙ-ΓΕ-ΤΟ), the reading of dgnpt (= Lucian), Lat. (Geth), Arm., and Θ', pointing out that this Γαί reflects a Hebrew reading י (cf. 7: 2 ff.) instead of our present י. This variant is not recorded in BH*.
makes its first appearance in our Greek with 

\[ \text{ where } \text{ was adopted by Origen’s recension, and by } \text{ from the Hebrew or the Greek, cannot be decided; in any case his late testimony shows that this reading was still in existence when he wrote.} \]

This involves some minor changes in Rahlfs’ text. In the latter passage Lucian agrees with the worse MSS, in the former he puts \( \text{ with his usual inconsistency.} \]

More strictly the two good MSS read \( \text{ Both MSS derive from an identical archetype, in which there was a dittography of } \text{ for } \text{ which is a construct state followed by genitive, could never have had an article. Yet their difference is much more interesting and instructive than their common corruption. In view of the close connection of both MSS in Chronicles in general and their opposition to the other MSS here, both in what is good and what is bad in their reading, it seems excluded that their main difference, } \text{ in } \text{ and } \text{ should be due to a subsequent approximation of } \text{ to the MT. So here we have evidence for a Greek interchange of } \text{ which generally is not taken sufficiently into account in the textual criticism of the LXX; for the expositors are rather inclined to consider a Hebrew interchange } \text{ alone plausible. Here, as in many other things, Bewer in his brilliant study } \text{ Der Text des Buches Esra is free from common prejudices, listing } \text{ among the ‘most common confusions’ (pp. 2 f.). As far as a proof is required, our passage furnishes it.} \]

In the last letters \( \text{ which } \text{ have in common, } \text{ is corrupt for } \text{ and I do not hesitate, either, to change } \text{ into } \text{ Even the doublings or dittographies which are accumulated in } \text{ the more primitive of the two text forms, are but corruptions witnessing to a period when the transliteration was no longer understood. Thus } \text{ is rightly preserved in } \text{ and } \text{ in the later recensions.} \]

Lucian on his part, who is the only one to render \( \text{ by } \text{ in the following passage, where all the others give the translation } \text{ has } \text{ which looks like a Graecized } \text{.} \]

I do not think that \( \text{ of the preceding verse had any influence.} \]

Schleusner ii, 200; iii, 61 makes the good point that in 1 Sam. 13: 20 \( \text{ which our editions give with } \text{ is ‘lectio aperte vitiosa ac e compendio scribendi orta’, and that we must put } \text{ as read by all the others. } \text{ (also } \text{ means light summer garment and } \text{ on the other hand, is the instrument used by the man called } \text{ whereas } \text{ derives from the primary meaning of } \text{ do summer-work (cf. } \text{ summer). The expositors will correctly state that the first words in v. 21 of the LXX afford no sufficient help in restoring the corrupt Hebrew, yet, granted this, I think that to some} \)
extent we are able to retranslate these Greek words. In 8: 12 the same translator renders &i;Sp, iStftV) W^EI e**irjV by θερφιν θερισμόν αύτοϋ καί τρυγαν τρυγητόν αύτοο. So the Greek, when rendering καί θερισμόν αύτοο έτοιμος τοϋ θερίχειν, may have read something like ΤΧ3Π T?j ΊΓζΙΙ B**1E|^i31, a reading which involved a change throughout from fern, to masc. This rendering of θερισμόν by Θερφιν is confined to these two passages of 1 Samuel, and from it Schleusner draws the conclusion that θεριστήριον = δρέπανον in 13: 20 to our translator meant ploughshare. I do not see to what extent these considerations afford a real help in restoring the corrupt Hebrew, yet in such a desperate situation it may be worth while rescuing from oblivion these old observations. At any event it may be rash with LS to give the meanings, ‘Θεριστήριον sickle 1 Sam. 13. 20 (v.l.)’ and ‘θεριστήριον reaping-hook 1 Sam. 13. 20 (v.l. θεριστήριον)’. For in the LXX the latter is represented already by δρέπανον, which is the strong point supporting Schleusner’s interpretation.

48 Deut. 16: 9; 23: 25 (26) for ψισσήν sickle; in the interrelated passages Mic. 4: 3; Joel 3 (4): 10 and Isa. 2: 4 and in Isa. 18: 5 for ἱππόν vine-dresser’s knife (pruning-hook AV); for ψισσή sickle Joel 3 (4): 13; Jer. 27 (50): 16; and with this last use the translator of the Minor Prophets is so familiar that he twice misreads ἱππόν as ἵππον and translates δρέπανον, Zech. 5: 1 f. ἱππόν, on the other hand, is literally translated, at a late date, in the two places where it occurs: βούκεντρον Eccles. 12: 11 LXX A’ C and 1 Sam. 13: 20 f. A’ (Field). LS has no other evidence for the word.

49 Schwyzer, l.c. The name of this cypher was παρακύϊσμα (LS p. 1562 a under Μ and p. 2097* top).

50 Later on the respective spellings were taken at their face value and so came to rule the pronunciation.

51 μεχωνωθ 2 Esdras 17: 70, 72 BS’ is a corruption for χοθωνωθ (νυφύ) A rell. which has been corrected by Rahlfs.

52 There is yet another usage of άμνας which is not affected by what has just been discussed, ἱππόπολ ‘money’, which is rightly compared with pecus, pecunia: Josh. 24: 32 άμνάδων, Job 42: 11 άμνάδα; yet Gen. 33: 19 άμνάς in the majority of MSS, including 911, άμνάδων being read only in half of the Origenian tradition.

53 In 1 Kings 20: 21 B’ for once has the corruption ΓΟΥΖΑΝ. It is hard to understand why Swete and BM not only retain this corrupt form, but even accent it ΓΟύζον, as though it were understandable Greek.

54 This Hebraistic homonym was taken over by the Vet. Lat. which appears in the marginal notes of cod. Leg. Here the acc. is scizam in v. 20 and scizasam in 21. Vercellone does not fail to point to a different use of the Latin word, when Lucifer of Calaris translates the twice repeated σχίδακας of 1 Kings 18: 33 first by scizas and then by scizam. For σχίδακας is the LXX translation of τρίφυ pieces of wood, 1 Kings 18: 33–8, four times. This word appears in Vitruvius as schidia, which in its Greek form is preserved only in a gloss of Hesychius, who explains it by ὁμόλινα raw
flax. σχίδακε, if correct at all, is apparently a homonym, whereas σχίδιον in Rufus Medicus (IP), quoted by Oribasius Medicus (IV), where it means splint as a surgical contrivance, is but a special application of σχίδιον ι, dimin. of σχίζα. In Latin, schidia is a fem., surviving in Italian scheeggia. As far as they came to be identically pronounced, these two Latin words are homonyms. But sciza = σχίζα-Π was hardly ever alive in Latin, apart from its use in the Vet. Lat. Bible, from which Lucifer quotes.

For the discussion of John 1:14 Th. Zahn (Das Evangelium des Johannes) pp. 78 f. should not be overlooked.

EXCURSUS I, pages 197-204

1 Cf. Wisd. of Sol. 16: 18 Ινα αυτοι βλέποντες ειδόσιν (ιδωσιν SB), Vulg. ut ipsis videntes scirent. Fichtner compares 12: 27 Ινότες...ἐπεγνώσον.

2 HR, under γνωστός and έμφανζειν, wrongly connect γνωστός with the preceding words, following the Sixtine text έμφάνισον μοι σεαυτόν γνωστός Ινα Ιδο ο, with m Arm. Co. La., whereas Or.-lat. ut evidenter alone puts ινα before γνωστός. Grabe follows the Sixtine text though, as Bos remarks, ‘Alex. & Ald.’ have no Ινα. This is one of the not infrequent passages in which Grabe’s reproduction of A is inaccurate, but has nevertheless been passed on by our expositors as the reading of A, though in fact it represents either a slip or a conjecture of Grabe’s.

3 BH is here particularly unfortunate in referring to, and retranslating, the Greek (Exod. 33: 13). (1) γνωστός ειδο σε, after the itacism has been removed, is identical with ης κιν so that a retranslation ης ινα is inadmissible. (2) έμφάνισον μοι σεαυτόν is suggested to represent a Hebrew such as is found in 33: 18 for the only reason that our earlier Greek editions have this translation in vv. 13 and 18 alike. But in v. 18 this translation is confined to Bahr Co.(vid.) and has been rightly replaced by the reading of AFM rell. La. in Rahlfs’ text; it is a mere adaptation to the similar passage of v. 13, and the majority reading is seen to be pre-hexaplaric from the fact that there exists a slightly different hexaplaric reading (O). So έμφάνισόν μοι σεαυτόν does not represent a different Hebrew of v. 13 any more. (3) To correct ης κιν into ης κιν on the basis of the Greek γνω is a blunder in method. However we may explain or emend γνω, there is no reason whatever to project it back into the Hebrew.

4 Ιδε συ Job 34: 17 is corrupt; the secondary MSS AV append ούκ οιει in a conflation. Instead of Ιδε συ we should read οιει διε, as in 34: 12 (= ης κιν) and 40: 8 (= ης κιν as here in 34: 17).

5 Compared with our main issue there remains a minor domestic dispute which, as far as the genuine LXX is concerned, has now been settled by ChB 963. As Thackeray (p. 278) had recorded, B prefers a first aor. ειδοσαι in Deuteronomy, ειδοσαι 8: 3, 16; 32: 17 and ειδοσαι 4: 35. In 4: 25 B stands out quite alone, for ειδοσαι ας, can more easily be reconciled with ειδοσαι, the reading of all the rest; in the other passages
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a small group of MSS agrees with B, and in the first occurrence in 32: 17 ghsv° read εϊδεσαν more consistently than, and without the support of, B. But in the two passages preserved, 963 agrees with the majority against B’s secondary reading: 4: 35 εϊδεσαν, 32: 17 δ ουκ ηδι... Although the meaning is not affected here, this instance has an important feature in common with that of 1 Macc. 1: 31: the introduction of a secondary reading as a consequence of the preference given to B which, of course, except for occasional shortcomings does justify such preference in most of the other books.

Deut. 32: 17 offers an additional point of interest. The repeated ηδεσαν stands for different Hebrew expressions, first for תוד, which is normal, and secondly for תורפ the meaning of which is in dispute. If those who assume a רם III to know (G.-Buhl, W. Robertson Smith in Driver, Deuteronomy p. 363) are right, they have the support of the LXX which, however, may have taken recourse to a non-committal repetition of its preceding translation of תוד; if, on the other hand, Steuernagel were correct in maintaining the traditional identification with רם I to sense fright, horripilation, which is most crudely reflected by Aquila’s ουκ ετριξαν αυτους (Vulg. coluerunt, Luther gehort haben, AV feared), one could not help remembering ηδεσαν, though one would have to think twice before admitting it in the LXX. Instances in which homonymy or near alternatives occur in the Hebrew and Greek alike are among the most puzzling.

6 So when Hatch puts πρόσταγμα for φι in the gap between υετφ 26 and Ιδών 27 LXX, his model is 26: 10, but as this is only an insertion from Θ' with an unintelligent rendering of the corrupt φι, I prefer δρια after 38: 10 LXX.

7 Beside the passages dealt with by (Field and) Turner, 1 Chron. 17: 6; 2 Sam. 7: 7; 12: 9, there are many others in which this mode of speech occurs and must not be removed. Long ago A. Buttmann restored δ τι in Jer. 2: 36 = ηπ. The same must be read in Jer. 33 (26): 9: θωατορ αποθεων. δ τι επεφητευσαν...; (= ἵνα why). In Gen. 18: 13, however, τι is omitted by A alone, and 911, 961 have it with the entire evidence, a fact which does not come out clearly in Bl.-Debr. §300, 2.

EXCURSUS II, pages 205–210

1 Here Rahlfs’ annotation is much clearer than that in BM, who obscure the issue by using as their lemma the Lucianic text in a piecemeal way and presenting the single divergences of the hexaplaric text as variants of the Lucianic, a presentation which is still more complicated by the fact that έντολας and ακριβείας have interchanged their places in 247.

2 Here also there is an obvious corruption in A alone, ακριβασμον instead of ακριβειας ου; for Syr. displays ου in both verses, and the singular ακριβασμον and the omission of ου are both at variance with Aquila’s meticulous observance of the most minute features of the Hebrew original.
The omission of the plural in Syr., v. 34 does not support the corruption of A. Moreover, the omission of the two articles, after the Hebrew pattern, by which it differs from L, bears the mark of Aquila.

3 In *Philo's Bible* p. 54 n. 1, I have assembled more examples of this corruption.

4 In *Judg.* 5: 15 the record of z, A' διαλογισμος, C' ἀκριβεία must be challenged. To Aquila διαλογισμοι is πιστις (Jer. 6: 19) and διαλογισθεισα βασιλεια (Ps. 118 (119): 119). Symmachus, on the other hand, is quoted once only for ἀκριβ- = προόπη, and here together with A' Θ', *Prov.* 8: 15 ἡ αὐτή ἡ βασιλεία Ο' γράφουσιν δικαίουσιν, Α' Θ' ἀκριβάσονται δικαίου. We should therefore allot ἀκριβεία to A' and διαλογισμοι to C', who elsewhere renders προόπη by πρόσταγμα (Exod. 12: 14; 13: 10; *Lev.* 23: 41 with more instances rendering προόπη).

5 For this διαλογισθεισα τον θεον, 28: 7 ζητήσω (parallels adduced by *Smend on Sir.* 46: 15).


EXCURSUS III, pages 211-212

1 I rather doubt whether *Esther* 2: 9 really supports the suggestion made by D. Winton Thomas (ZAW *NF* 11, 1934, pp. 236 ff.; cf. *NF* 14, 1937, pp. 174 ff.) that the OT discloses a homonym root βασιλεια, here Piel, raise, exalt to honour, however convincing his other instances may be. Is not καλως = βασιλεια? If so, only καὶ ἐχρησατο αὐτη are left as the equivalent of βασιλεια. And if we compare *Gen.* 26: 29 νασαμεθα σοι καλως we might conjecture that the translator of Esther read βασιλεια instead of βασιλεια, if he did not in fact merely make a guess at the meaning. [In a private communication Prof. D. W. Thomas points out that βασιλεια = and he made her (it); it is not equivalent to βασιλεια (the construction used in *Gen.* 26: 29). Ed.] βασιλεια τείχος = in the house is covered by frequent parallels (cf. Driver, *Samuel* 2 p. 37). For νασαμεθα der beste Teil von (G.-Buhl) *Esther* 2: 9 is the only example, and it is not supported by the translations.

Vulg. is quite peculiar: *ut acceleraret mundum muliebrem, et traderet ei partes suas et septem puellas speciosissimas de domo regis, et tam ipsam quam pedisequas ejus ornaret atque excoleret*. Does this last reflect ἐχρησατο καλως? There is no translation of το γυναικων, which in fact takes 'in the house' as I propose to take it.

EXCURSUS IV, page 213

1 *Rahlfs, Verz.* p. 439, 'Abart der Septuaginta?'

1 In addition, the different order of the words *son of another woman* in both Greek texts calls for attention. gn (members of the main Lucianic group) and qa (members of the B-group) omit ulos; A and MN have it after γυναικός; low (of the Lucianic group) c (of the Origenic group) hy (of the M-group) after έτέρας; and only the B-group (minus qa) the Origenic group (minus c), the secondary Lucianic sub-group dptv, and b (of the M-group) have it in the place where the MT has it and where, owing to the slavish nature of this translation, we should expect it. This uncertain position indicates that ulos came in from the margin. Its insertion in different places points to various revisions. Unless we assume its loss at an early stage, we cannot retain ulos as part of the original translation.

2 This is a doublet if here, as in Prov. 5: 3 and 7: 5, we read ηνγιλ instead of ηνγιε, but without the transposition made by Lagarde.

3 There is an example of this in the very same chapter of Job, 31: 33 f. Here νανπσ, which is missing from the translation at the end of 33, emerges at the end of 34 in a clause which in other respects, too, has gone astray. If instead of el de καλ εκομαν δαυνατον εξελειν θύραν μου we read el de καλ εκωπησα (σιωπην = κολπον LXX 29: 21; Θ’ 30: 27) δαυνατον (cf. δαυνατειν 4: 4; 10: 13; 42: 2) εξελειν θύραν, we see that the rest has nothing to do with it: Μου originally belonged to ην δαυριαν of 33 which was torn away when the landslide took place. κολπον has to be brought back to 33, and even κανον may hide an ουνω earlier in the same 33. Elsewhere σιωπην has been lost by corruption more than once. So when Rahlfs reads έπερωτησαν τοφιον Prov. 17: 28 and remarks, ‘τοφιον > A’ (missing also in Syr.P.), we should make the Greek conform to the Hebrew by excising the dittography τοφιον and reading ἀποσιωπησαν = σιωπην. One could object that 34 b (of Job 31), as it stands, makes sense, since it is fashioned after the pattern of 32 b, and looks almost like its doublet. This objection would carry weight only if we felt we could not expect such clever manipulation of a text at any stage of the transmission of the Greek OT. In some instances, it is true, the ease with which a Greek divergence from the Hebrew can be redressed is far from proof that the text attained by conjecture represents what the translator actually wrote. I have a collection of such deceptive pseudo-emendations, which should warn us to be cautious.

4 The Greek Pentateuch refrains from adopting this mode of speech, where it is applied to inanimate things, in this way preferring good Greek to a literal translation of what could not be Graecized as it stood. So Gen. 15: 10 είνα κέραν εμπρός αντιπροσωπα αλλαλοις and Exod. 25: 20 τα πρόσωπα αυτών είς άλληλα. Exod. 37: 9 with its identical wording in the Hebrew is
missing in the LXX proper, but preserved in the hexaplaric group, and its contrast to the LXX is worth considering, καὶ τὸ (for so we have to read, κατὰ being the same corruption as that found in d, Exod. 25: 20) πρόσωπον αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, with an alternative version in Ἐβ, καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ἐτερος πρὸς τὸν ἐτερον ἐπενίζουτες (contra se invicem Arm., sese invicem Eth.) which agrees with the variant ἑτερος τὸν ἑτερον (25: 20 in the Samaritan and Syriac, 39: 9 in the former only).

EXCURSUS VI, PAGES 219-225

1 Nestle, ZAW, 1901, pp. 334 ff., and 1904, pp. 322 f.
2 So Buhl in Gesenius, but no longer in BH3.
3 One word more may be said about the remarkable strength of the evidence. B’ means that the Lower Egyptian group is here deserted by S which joins Ga L”55 = MT. But we do well to remember Rahlfs’ own characterization of S (Psalmi § 3, p. 26), ‘S often omits words which are missing in the MT’, which means that S in these passages is under hexaplaric influence and has a text which is closer to the MT. Therefore we may safely state that the addition was originally in the text of the entire Lower Egyptian group, just as it is the reading of the only representative of the Upper Egyptian group, Sa., and that of the entire occidental group, R” = R La.R La.A+Aug., Tert., Cypr.

4 In Josephus, whose interpretation of Cain is the same as Philo’s, κτισιν AJ 1, 52 is an itacism for κτίσιν (L. E. Zonaras possessionem Lat.), as was emphasized by Nestle, S-Siv, 19, and Schlatter, Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Jose fus, Gütersloh, p. 3 n. 2.

5 Jer. 39 (32) describes a symbolic action. By buying a field from a cousin the prophet indicates that by the will of God fields shall still be bought in this country (vv. 15, 43). τὸ βιβλίον τῆς κτήσεως is here constantly rendered by κτισθείσατε and the evidence of the purchase by τὸ βιβλίον τῆς κτήσεως. κτισθῆσονταί v. 15 B*S* with many minn., therefore, is certainly corrupt. Following Thackery’s observation (p. 274) it was removed from the text by Nestle–Dahse and Rahlfs. Accordingly W. Foerster (TWNT III, 1026, 11.1.21) ought not to have reckoned it true evidence.


7 When publishing the remnants of two columns of Pap. 266 (JTS 45, 1944, pp. 158 ff.) W. G. Waddell unquestioningly filled in the gaps from Swete's edition, i.e. B. It would therefore be unwise to decide whether καὶ Κτισέν σε was in fact missing from this pre-Christian papyrus, however welcome this fact would be.

8 The translation of יַעַבֶּד is mistaken in both passages. In Ps. 138 (139): 13 the LXX reads ἀντέλαβομεν μου ἐκ γαστρός. Mozley thinks of ἀναστήσαμεν from יַעַבֶּד to support, assist, cf. Ps. 53 (54): 6. But to retranslate יַעַבֶּד with Mozley, and with BH3 expressly to state ‘I מ’ is gratuitous: why should the translator’s text over which he is caught bungling have differed from 339
ours? The local τῆς conveyed little meaning after ἀντελάβου and therefore the translator preferred the more usual temporal expression ἐκ γαστρᾶς. In Prov. 8: 23 both the MT and the LXX went astray. In the MT the word was pointed ἔθεμεν as from πόλεμις = ordinata Vulg., eingesetzt Luther, set up AV, instead of ἔθεμεν from ἐθέμενι as originally intended. The LXX went a third way; its ἐτοιμάσατο με represents ἔθεμεν (Vögel, Lagarde) from τήν to found, which we are surprised, indeed, to find seriously proposed as a possible 'emendation' in BH. The correct rendering has survived only in Syr.b anon. εἰσόδημον (? A'). In the psalm passages Syr.b records A' εἰσιδώσω, C' ἐπηρτίσαι, E' ἔχωνευσος (Jerome conflasti, of which the first represents κρένα, the third κρόν). A correct translation of this κρένα has been achieved in two passages of the LXX. The first forms part of the description of the mystery of origin of the embryo, Job 10: 8-12, εὐεργέται = ἔθεμεν, v. 11. The second was recovered by A. Schulz (Theol. Revue, 1931, p. 498). In 2 Macc. 7: 22 he restored ἐς τὴν εἰς μὴν ὑψώσετε κοιλίαν for ἔφανετε which, though unanimously attested, is no doubt corrupt. Here Schulz found a reminiscence of Ps. 138 (139): 15 ἐν Κόλομ Ι was curiously wrought (AV), but the context in the first form of the earth makes us think of v. 13 rather than 15 and, indeed, ἐς τὴν εἰς μὴν κοιλίαν does reflect πόλεμις so closely that v. 13 with its κρένα can alone be the source of ἔφανετε in 2 Maccabees. Similar reflections are found elsewhere, closest in Wisd. of Sol. 7: 1 εἴ κοιλίς μὴτρός ἐγγύην σόφες, and Eccles. 11: 5. For parallels in the Koran and elsewhere I refer to Hölscher, Das Buch Hiob, 1937, p. 29.

9 Smend (p. 278): ‘Probably the meaning to create of קָרָב does not derive from that of appportioning, but rather from that of smoothing, shaping, as is probably the case with לָבֵה too’. This explanation fails to take account of the facts that קָרָב I to smooth and קָרָב II to allot on the one hand, and לָבֵה I to create, produce and לָבֵה III to clear, cut down a forest, on the other, are homonymous roots and as such have nothing in common except the incidental identity of their radicals. For the same reason לָבֵה refuses to be turned to account for our present argument.

EXCURSUS VIII, pages 228-236

1 Schwyzer II, 60 maintains that the particle δι with the vocative is an originally independent interjection, after which there was a pause. See also Buttmann II, 379.

2 Latin and still more German are very restrained in their use of o and oh, so that any exceptions from this rule are rather likely to be Graecisms, due to the influence of the classical rhetoric as exercised in our grammar school education and consequently confined to the educated classes. On the other hand there are languages which go even further than Attic; thus in ancient Irish no vocative can be used without being preceded by an interjection. Much more, including the pertinent literature, is found in Wackernagel’s admirable survey, Syntax I, 311 f.
3 For thus we have to write it – avoiding any thought of homonyms in classical Greek, such as δ, expressing pity, envy, contempt, or δδ, δδ, expressing laughter – in the translation of Judges, which stands on a much lower level than Joshua; 6: 22 αα is in all recensions (only MN... reading ααα), except Lucian who displays οιμμοι, La. eu me; 11: 35 αα is in the late B text only, the others having οιμμοι.

4 Here and in 41 (34): 5 an emendation in the Greek is required, and in our passage in the Hebrew as well. In both passages the burning of spices at the funeral was no longer understood at a later date. This resulted in a change of καοσαι = ηηη into καοσαι which seemed to make better sense along with κωσοπαι. Consequently the construction was changed from dative to accusative, a seemingly major operation which, however, is not without parallels in the LXX. In 41 (34): 5 this has been seen already and recently accepted in the apparatus of BH3. The consequences for 22: 18 have not been drawn. Here BH3 says with Cornill that for the second ἔρπτη, which is unlikely in itself, the LXX reads ὠομοί. Yet after LXX 22: 18 has been restored in conformity with LXX 41 (34): 5, it is obvious that the genuine Hebrew was οιμμοι.

5 We may therefore read Ezek. 6: 11 ηηη for ηηη, which thus disappears from the Hebrew lexicon, 18: 10; 21: 20 being corrupt. Therefore we cannot restore εύγε η for the corrupt εύγε ηε Mic. 2: 1, but should read ηε ηε, comparing Mic. 7: 4 where ηε has been restored for the corrupt ηε after the Greek.

6 ἴδυ μοι δτι Isa. 44: 16 and ἐπεχόρητε for you shouted ηηη, Ezek. 25: 3.

7 Did he read ἴδυ μοι δτι Isa. 44: 16 and ἐπεχόρητε by way of dittography, or did he merely guess? At any rate, the meaning woe to has been in his mind.

8 Cf. Plato, δτ, τι λέγεις, Protag. 309.

EXCURSUS IX, pages 237-241

1 With this we must not confuse another interchange (Bl.-Debrunner §363; Mayser π 1, 234 f.), that of ind. fut. and subj. aor., suggested and made easier by their formal relationship, e.g. Isa. 10: 14 δισθεύεται με η άντειμο μοι. Its rareness in the papyri, like that of the deliberative subjunctive (Isa. 1: 5 τι έτι πληγητε and Bl.-Debr. §366), may be due to the kind of documents represented in the Ptolemaic papyri.

2 δοσει τις ψηλαφήσα τυφλός is optatius in simili (Thiersch p. 101, who, apart from this passage, quotes Gen. 33: 10; Num. 11: 2; 22: 4; Deut. 8: 5; 32: 11).

3 We have the same corruption in the doublet in Josh. 1: 8 εύοδωθήση καλ ευδοκώσει τός δοσις σου Bcz, where we must read ευδοκώσει with the others and Rahlfis as well, although there is a complication in the variant ευδοκώσω, given by bdgnpt Syr. La. (Lugd. Lucifer). Just as in this last variant, which is mainly, but not exclusively, Lucianic, the corruption -σω for -σεις is in Ezek. 20: 4, where I emended it in 1936 and two years later was justified by the Scheide papyrus which reads έκδικήσεις.
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It is different, however, with Exod. 23: 7. Here the MT interrupts a series of divine interdictions by a prediction of God about himself, ἐὰν ἐν δώροις ζητήσῃ for I will not justify the wicked. In the LXX we read the second person, and this has impressed many of our expositors and BH who accordingly transform the MT after the LXX, omitting ἐὰν and (BH) even adding μη. But the Greek is an obvious modification, as is the aberrant text of Sam. (cf. Daube, ΖAW NF 9, 1932, p. 150), in that it adapts the words to those preceding (οὐκ ἐποκτένεις καὶ οὐ δικαιώσεις) and following them (εἰ τι πώς ἐως καὶ δώρα...). The latter addition especially bears so clearly the mark of an afterthought that it is unsound to take it as a basis from which to question the MT. Moreover, in the Elohistic document of which 23: 7 forms part the divine law-giver sometimes falls back on the first person (22: 22 (23), 26 (27)), and for this reason too the MT is obviously superior to the LXX. At any rate, δικαιώσεις is not a mechanical corruption of a -σω, for -σω was never in the LXX.

4 ἀναπαύσεις, post. Cain 24 (emended by Tischendorf -σει σε = LXX), and ἀναπαύσεις, min. 16, both show wrong active futures, as ἀναπαύσατε σε for -ται - a middle which is mistaken in the causative active with God as the subject. But only κατα-, ἀποπαύω exist with middle sense (Helbing, Kasussyntax p. 170, and above, p. 320 n. 4); the imp. πάθε, πον, with its relative 'indifference also towards voice' (Wackernagel, Vorl. u. S. r, 122) is different and must be kept apart.

5 Lugd. here reads a strange non refrigerabit te. Here Robert is remarkably astray when suggesting, 'Peut-être le traducteur a-t-il lu ἐκούσι'; it is easy to see that the Latin is due to misreading ἀναπαύσει σε instead of ἀναπαύσει σε. There is a further complication which is not recorded in BM. Robert, the editor of Lugd., quotes from Tertullian eritis in requiem, which would seem to go back to a form of text like οὐκ ἐν ἀναπαύσει and so, in its turn, equally to attest a reading ἀναπαύσει. This eritis is not without interest: for v. 66 there are quotations from Fathers giving a plural, whereas our other texts have only singulars between the plurals of 62, 63 and 686. It is well known that the interchange of the second person sing. and plur. is a puzzle peculiar to Deut.

6 See also Deut. 33: 27 to which Billen (p. 137) has drawn attention. 'Later σκέπασις was made into a verb and σε added.' Here the Cambridge editions actually deviate from B* in favour of Bab, which stands for a later tradition, represented by AMΘ abcefhijstuvwyz (-σει σε) and Mbcijnwza, La. Lugd. (ἀρχή), the transition being seen in A* minn. σκέπασις. Rahulfs, with the best evidence, reads σκέπασις θεοῦ ἀρχῆς. But in this we could acquiesce only if we supposed that the LXX understood ὁ ἄρχων ἦσσας as a twofold stat. constr. Closest to the MT is Ambros., de Patr. 9, protegens deus initii = σκέπασις θεοῦ ἀρχῆς. Did he read σκέπασις? Eth. alone has deus prius, but apparently along with σκέπασις.
σέ •", as Lugd. reads coperiet te ab initio. θεοῦ instead of θεός is but a slight corruption, as a genitive follows. σκέττασις as a predicate was not recognized by any witness. I think we must read σκέττασις θεός ἀρχής. In the continuation ύπο Ισχυν seems to go back to a guess ἡρημ instead of the MT's ἡρημ; when BH3 in the first apparatus records a conjecture ἡρημ, I wonder whether ἱμναμι would not be better, as its narrower meaning place of refuge (Isa. 4: 6) is more exactly what we require.

7 I then briefly quoted Ps. 51 (52): 7 ...ο θεός καθελε ιε... βίτι ιε σκ ατεί σε και μεταναστεύσα σε... where the MSS obliterate the original variety by mutual adaptation, as Rahlfs rightly notes in Psalmi (1931). As to the meaning of the original, Justus Olshausen, an expositor still worth listening to, commented in 1853, Auch wird dich Gott (dafür, wie sich gleichsam von selbst versteht), ausrotten: to him there is no doubt that the passage has a distinctly future meaning. So it would be in complete conformity with what we found in Deut. 28: a hymn expressing the experiences of Deut. 28, and that, in the Greek translation, in the manner of the Greek Deut.

In Ps. Sol. 17: 23-5 Ra. (26, 27 Sw.) v. Gebhardt was mistaken in assuming opt. aor., and Rahlfs is right in accenting inf. aor. throughout.

8 In his quotation, heres 76, Philo retains the ανοίξαι of Deut. 28: 12, but obviously without understanding the peculiar mode of speech involved. Wherever he comments on a sentence with a verb in the optative, he describes it as a εὐχή. But although elsewhere he shows himself frequently interested in matters of grammar or semasiology, it did not occur to him that εὐχή covers various meanings. Thus he rightly calls God’s blessing of Shem (Gen. 9: 25 ff.) an εὐχή (sobr. 53), well-wishing, blessing. Accordingly he marks the transition from the blessing of Shem to that of Japhet by the words, τῷ μὲν δὴ ημι εὐχέται τοῦτο τῷ δ' ιαφεθ ὁποῖον, θεασώμεθα· πλατύναι... (sobr. 59). Deut. 28: 12 also is interpreted as a εὐχή, but here as one prayed by Moses: εὐχήν εὐξώμεθα ἃν καὶ Μωυσῆς, ἣ ἡμῖν ἀνοίξει...; alleg. iii. 104, and εὐχέται γὰρ Μωυσῆς ἄ ιεροφάντης, ἴνα ἀνοίξει...; immut. 156, and this interpretation is made sure by the addition in immut. ἐπήκοοι δὲ αἱ τοῦ θεοφιλοῦ εὐχαί. From this we realize that Philo was unfamiliar with the use of the opt. aor. as a future (in a futuric sense). But this lack of understanding must not forthwith be taken as an indication that this usage was obsolete when Philo wrote. It remained outside the horizon of his educated Greek.

**EXCURSUS x, pages 242-243**

1 The same corruption is in · Philo, post. Cain 53 where Holwerda and Wendland emend βουλευθείς (Philolog. 57, 1898, p. 258) and prob. 155 βουλεύμαι και βουλευμάτων Mangey (Cohn vi, ix).
EXCURSUS XII, pages 247–249

1 Siceram is in Leg. 1 Sam. 1: 11, where the LXX reads μθυνομα, and BM record 'σικερα ο Co. La.'. In addition Verc. π 176 a quotes Basil π 14, ουνον και σικερα ου μη πιοι, and Tertull. et vinum et ebriamen non bibet. The Vulgate omits the sentence, which is not in the MT. Vercellone approves of an earlier suggestion that it may have been taken from Judg. 13: 24 or Luke 1: 15. Houbigant defended the addition because it added to the picture traits required of a nasir. But young Samuel was not originally thought of as such (Wellhausen, Text p. 38).

2 Referred to in a marginal scholion on Exod. 12: 11 in min. j: α' ύττερ-βασις, δπερ φιλον (leg. Φιλων) διαβατήριον ονομάζει. This reference is important, because it provides us with obvious evidence for the fact that in a certain quarter interest in Aquila and meddling with Philo co­existed.

3 Here Niese is right in introducing the festival name in ια (MSS -ια and -ιαν, Lat. transcensionem). An appropriate parallel to this is τα ξυλοφόρια (cf. p. 325 n. 14) which Josephus, BJ π, 425 uses without precedent in the LXX.

EXCURSUS XIII, pages 250–255

1 Perhaps this addition is itself a doublet and the text of Cas. 1 consequently a triplet.

2 As we have to deal here primarily with LXX we may neglect D^K and D^nVg in the closely related very late Psalms 58 and 82 which an expositor of the Hebrew OT would have to consider here.

3 It is interesting to survey the renderings of our three main Western translations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulgate</th>
<th>Luther</th>
<th>AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod. 21: 6</td>
<td>dis</td>
<td>'Götter'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: 8 f.</td>
<td>ad deos twice</td>
<td>'Götter' twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: 20</td>
<td>dis</td>
<td>Götttern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: 28</td>
<td>dis</td>
<td>'Götter'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see that Jerome follows the Three by a uniform dis, whereas the two others make some discrimination, but on slightly divergent lines. In Luther the discrimination is confined to putting inverted commas where the tradition understood the priestly jury, and with this tradition he here includes 22: 28; the AV understands jury in the two first passages where this interpretation recommends itself. In 22: 20 (idols) it takes μιθρακει as a singular and makes it tolerable by a qualifying any (god), in 22: 28 it shares with the others the interpretation idols and the plural translation the gods. So in their different ways the three translations disclose the varying interpretations of Jewish exegetical tradition.

4 In Josh. 24: 14 a similar addition, only with a different wording, is in the LXX except gn (= L) La. Here BH1 with the re-translation מוז in the
chief apparatus certainly gives the required sense, but may nevertheless be rash. For it neglects the possibility that the addition is due to the Greek which, if so, assimilated v. 14 to the similar passages in the close vicinity, vv. 20, 23 where ἄλλοτριος renders לְבוּ; so BH* should have put 'LXX + τοὺς ἄλλοτρίους ex vv. 20, 23', and this in the first apparatus, for the note is not intended to indicate a change of the Hebrew. In v. 16, however, ἔρεποι renders בֹּלֶת; therefore I believe that in v. 20 we must adopt ἄλλοτριοι with the great majority of our evidence against the ἔρεποι of B which may be due to a more recent influence from v. 16.

**EXCURSUS XV, pages 262–264**

1 If the spelling λήθη in Rahlfs' text of Lev. 5: 15 is not simply a misprint – misprints are extremely rare with him – it may be an attempt of his to make an odd construction run more smoothly. Yet to convert λήθη, which stands for the 'inner' object, ὕππυς, into the subject is quite arbitrary. Earlier I had thought of omitting οὐτόν as an intrusion from the בֹּלֶת passages just quoted; but now I rather feel that the translator took over the complete phrase wholesale. To interpret it after his mind we have to supply an impersonal subject as in the parallel phrases. Therefore we should spell λήθη as all the other editions do.
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In this index the Greek words discussed in the present work are listed under the exact forms discussed in the text. All such forms are listed, but only they; for example, if ἔλυον is the only form of λύω to be discussed in the text, the word ἔλυον is listed under epsilon, and no entry appears under λύω. Words which occur in the text but are not discussed and no information is given on them, are not necessarily listed.

ὁ 341
αα 341
δα 341
ααα 341
ἀβιρα 305
ἀβύσσους 47
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ἀγαθώς 2ο8
ἀγαπς( 59
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ἀγίαι 245
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ἀδελφῶν 156, 234
ἀδικία 181-2, 331
ἀδικία θεραφιν 331
ἀδικίας 181, 208
ἀδιου 308
ἀδρος 86
ἀδρύνω 86
ἀδυνατεὶν 338
ἀδύνατον 338
ἀδυνατω 338
ἀεί φεύγειν 285
ἀείκεια 44-5
ἀείκης 44
ἀείκης 44-5
ἀείκης 44
ἀείκεσθαι 44
ἀείκεσθαι 45
ἀεικασμενος 45
ἀεικιος 45
ἀειον 279
ἀειον του αειων 160
ἀειων των αειων 160
ἀειστεία 37-8
ἀειστειαι 37
ἀειων ἀειωτερων 325
ἀεινεύσθαι 283
ἀεινομετίζειν 312
ἀεινουνται 108
ἀεινωται 108
ἀειχιστεία 149, 162, 210
ἀειχιστειει 149-50, 210
ἀειχιστεισ τοῦ αἰματος 149
ἀειχιστεισ 149
ἀειχιστεισν το ταιμα 149
ἀειχιστεισν του αἰματος 149
ἀεινες 43
ἀειωνιδας 111
ἀειωνια(ς)ς 111
ἀειφε 94, 230, 302
ἀειφε 94
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX OF GREEK WORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ιν 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λήμμα 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιλουσιν 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ηλιοω 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ινσσι 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ινδοι 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αρνόνων 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιτισσείν 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιλίτζω 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιλιθα 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίσσις 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόν 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόν 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εφ 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εις 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εις 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εδώ 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ενων 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δος 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ια 303-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιβδος 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιν 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιν 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ινα 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ινη 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ινην 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ινος 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ινον 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ισ 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ις 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ις 102-3, 303-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιδω 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ινων 102, 303-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κτρα 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χγουρια 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χγουρια 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χγουριειμ 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χγουριμ 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χγουριοις 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χγουρίοις 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χγουρίων 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λεα 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαια 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>απτισσίμεβα 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιι ς 304-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χιος 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κεος 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κεβ 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κεδός 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κεν 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κενος 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κες 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κες 172, 186, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιεις 137, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεια 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεις 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεις 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευειν 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευς 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλευς βασιλεων 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεων 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεως 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βατος 172, 183, 323, 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βατον 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βατων 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βεβούλεμαι 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βεβούλημαι 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βεβ 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βελη 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βέλος 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βελοστάσεις 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βεν Εννοι 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βεργελλαί 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βεργελλί 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βηλ 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βηλειου 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βηλιον 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βητα 167, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βευ 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βερώσκω 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βεκός 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βεκός 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλαστον 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλαστός 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλέποντες 197-9, 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλέπω 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλέπων τα πάντα 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλέπωσιν 198-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλέπετε 197-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοθησαι 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοθήσεις αυτοις 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοθός 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βο 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουβέλειν 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boos 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βοος 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοτάνη 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουβαλ 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουβαστειον 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουβάστιος 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουβαστις 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουβαστος 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βοκεντρον 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βολιλεσθαι 141, 242-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βολιλεται 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλεύσθαι 242-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλευσθε 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλευθες 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλευμασι 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλευμάτων 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλευμένων 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλεώ 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βολη 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βολη ταραχήσεται 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βολην έξεστησεν 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλήμα 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλής 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουλοματ 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βουνος 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βςων 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρόμια 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρόμος 72-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρομωδής 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρόδια 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρωμάτων 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρωμήσει 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρόμιας 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρωξίας 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βυβλίανα 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βυβλίνας 295, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βυβλίνοις 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βυβλίων 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βύσος 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βωμός 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαγγαλίζω 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάζα 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαν 179, 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γαν 179, 187, 332-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γαι το πολυανδρείων 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαν 193, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γαι-ΓΕ-ΤΟ 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γανενα 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαν (γανενα) 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαν 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαλάται 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαλαζίωι 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάρ 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάς 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαστρός 339-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γε 187, 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γέαι 59, 193, 280, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεγενήσεται 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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eιιη διαστος 310  
eιιη καθεις 310  
eιιη καταφυν 83  
eιιη καταθομος 82  
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Νασαραχ 174, 298
ναυλας 173
ναυλλον 83
ναυλοις 328
ναυλον 173, 328
ναυλος 173, 328
ναυλω 173
ναυτεια 39
ναυτια 39
ναυτιαν 39
ναχαλ 32ο
Τέα πόλις 124
νεανεία 4
νεανείαν 4'
νεανία 37, 4·
νεανίας 37, 283
νεανιεία 4', 282
νεανιευεσθαι 283
νεανίευμα 4
νεανιεύομαι 4>
Νεάττολιν 124
νεβελ 173
Νεβρωδ 32ο
νεεσσαρ 3'
νεεσσαραν 3
νεικέω 282
νείκος 32, 34
νεισων 299
Νέμεσις σδικαία 89
Νέμεσις Ζικεα 89
Νεμριμ 320
νενοσσευμένος 8ο
νεομηνία 113-14
νεοσσιή 8ο
νεοσσοί 8ο
νεοσσοϊς 8ο
νεοσσός 79-8ο
Νεσεραχ 88, 174. 298, 320
νεσερεχ 174, 3
νετίφων 132
νεφέλαι 128
νεφελαις 128
νεφέλας 128
νεφρούς 223
νηστείαν 325
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νικος 258
νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
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νικος 32, 34~6>
νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
νίκνον 164
νικος 32, 34~6>
νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
νίκνον 164
νικος 32, 34~6>
νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
νίκνον 164
νικος 32, 34~6>
νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
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νικος 32, 34~6>
νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
νίκνον 164
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νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
νίκνον 164
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νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
νίκνον 164
νικος 32, 34~6>
νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
νίκνον 164
νικος 32, 34~6>
νικηθέν 258
νίκημα 282
νίκνον 164
νικος 32, 34~6>

οδασιν 202
οδατε 201-3
οδεν 200-1
οει 335
ομ δε 335
οικευ 119-20
οικεια 277
οικειας 277
οικειων 277
οικετεια 41
οικετευο 41
οικετης 160, 321
οικετια 41
οικειεν 119-20
οικου 142
οικος παραπτικραίνων 152
οικου 219
οικω 174
οιμοι 83~4, 229~30
οιμοι, κύριε 229~30
οίνος 231
οισα δα 290
οισα 67-8
οισαδα 67
ολονιαμα 180
ολιγονυχιοι 147
ολικα 48
ολικεον 48
ολικον 48
ολοξερδος 123
Ολυμπια 49
ομα 291
ομω 310
ον 142, 317
ονειδισμα 181
ονιμα 63
ος δες 147
οτισω 258
οτιλέω 123
οτιλιζοντα 309
οττανεον 48
οττανεος 47
οττανον 47-8
οτως ειδητε 200
οραν 73, 307
οράσει 333
οράρινος 304
οραριον 301
οραριεσθειν 63
οραεια 336
ορμισκον ενφωθ 325
ορος 332
οσ 27
οσος 89
οσιος 330
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πατρίς 310
παύ 342
παύε 342
παύομενος 131
παύσασθαι 308
πεδία 134-5, 187
πεδιλος 134
πέν 41
πειράμαι 130
πειράζω 130
πειραθείσα 130
πειρασθείσα 130
πειρασμοί; 5°
Πειρασμού 151
πέλεια 57
πελειά; 57
πελειοί 56
πελιθόν 132
πελιδνό 5°
πελιδνό; 5°
πελιοί 56
πελιό; 56
πελιτνό; 56
πέλμα 3«5
πέλτη 123
πελταστή; 3'5
πευτεκαθιεκάττη 137
Πευτεκαθιεκάττη 283
πεπλόύφο; 3°°
πεποιθώ; 105
πέπτωκεν 271
πέρα 70-1
πέρα 70
περαία 71
πέραν 70-1
πέρανδε 71
πέρας 71, 292
περασί 71
πέρατο; 292
περιδόντα 3°'
περιΐπτάμενα 93
περιίσταμένου 93
περικαθαριεϊτε 117
περικάθαρμα 33°
περικυκλώσει 294
περιοδυνάω 293
περιούσιο; 221
περιπατεί 3
περιποιήσεται 249
περιστελλόμενο; 318
περιστερά 3'9
περιστήβιον 4
περισφύριον 68
περισφυρί; 68
Περίσφυρον 68
περίφερα 123
περιφέρεια 3
περιφρά; 123
περιποιήσεται 249
περίψημα 3
περίψημα 84
περίώδυνο; 293
Πέρσαι 124
Περσαίπολι; 123
Περσά; 124, 3·5
Περσέπολι; 123
πετεινα 135
πέτραι; 135
πηδάω 66
πηδυλί; 66
πηδύω 66
πηδών 137
πήχει; 192
πηχυν 9
πετυχαν 274
πικράναι 150
πικρία 151
πίπτω 97-8
πίπτον g8
πλασθηναι 117
πλατύναι 240
πλήθει 289
πλήθυναι 238
πλημμελή; 84
πληγή; 1οβ
πλήγι 34'
πλήθει 289
πληθύνεσθε 289
πλημή 84
πλημύρα 84, 297
πλημύρειν 84
πλήμυρα 84
πλήμυρον 84
πληθυσμός 75
πλούτου 235
πλάνευμα 215
πνεύμα 215
πνεύμα 98
πόδας 134
πόδες 134
ποδοκάκη 82
ποδοκάκη 82
ποιη 274
ποίης 307
ποιήσαι 110
ποιήσαι 110
ποιήσης 307
ποιήτη 281
ποιν 268
πόλει 294
πόλεις 294, 333
πόλειον 131
πολεμισμένη 131
πολιορκία 146
πόλεις 91, 102, 104, 124, 294
πόλεως 118
πολυανάδερεθ ι, 179, 286, 330
πολυάνδρευον 51
πολυάνδριοι 286
πολυάνδριον 51, 179, 286
πολυάνδριον 286
πολύν 160, 245
πονηρέσασθαί 282
πονηρία 282
πονηρός 282
πονηροτάτος 222
πόνος 181
πόνους 180-1
πορεία 51
πορεία 290
πορείας 124, 315
πορείαν 51
πορεύεσθαί 61
πορευεσθε 62
πορευεσθε 62
πορευεσθε 62
πορεύεσθαί 134
πορθμείον 45
πόρνη 294
πόρνης 214
πόρρω 292
Ποσειδώνιον 32
πόσθη 165
πόσθων 165
Ποσειδώνιον 32
ποτήρι 211
πράξεως 310
πράξως 71
πράξως 71
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πυρός φλόγα 333
πυρός 124-5
πυρός 124
πνροφόρος 125
πνροφόρος 125
ττυρπνόον 126
πνρπνάος 124, 3»5
πύρπνοος 3'5
πνρπολείν 124
πυρφόρος 124-5
ρδ 72
όόβδΟν 220

ράβδος βαΐνη ιο2
ρόδιος 72
ραθυμεΐν 72
βαθνμία 72
'Ραθυμος 72, 292
ράθυμος 72
ραθνμονντων 38
(Sat 292
ράιδιος 72
'Ραιθυμος 292
φαμος 292
pijrav η ι
'Ραουμ 72
'Ράουμος 7
ρέστος 72
ραστώνη 72
Ραφαΐν ι88
Ραφές 298
(iacov 72
ρεμβάζω 77
ρεμβάς 77
ρεμβασμός 77
όεμβευουσα 76, 294
φέμβευσον 294
ρεμβεύω 76» 294
ρεμβεύων 76
ρέμβομαι 77, 294
-ρέμβομαι 77
ρεμβομένη 76
ρεμβώδης 77
'Ρεουμ 72
ρήμα 264
(Ιητίνη 66
ρίγος 98
ρΊπτω 97-8
ρτΗνη 66
ρίφη 258
ρΊψαι g8
ρΤψον 98
s

φοβοπώλης 76
ροΐσκος g2
ρομβεύω 77

όόμβος 77
ροποπώλης 76, 294
(Μσις j go
όωδιός 7ο
όωποπώλης 76, 294

σημασίας 328-9
σημεα 28g
σήμερον 151, 270-1
Οηων gi
σίαλος 33°
σίγλα 165
σίγλος 164-6
Caßßajtoc 287
σιγλοφόρον 165
σαββατα 171-3
σιγλοφόρος 165
σάββατα 159, 172
σάββατα άνάπαυσις ι6ο, σίγμα 167
σιδηρείον 285
'79, 325, 3«9
σάββατα σαββατων 159, σιδήριον 285
σίελος 33°
ι6ο, 329
σάββατα σαββατων 16ι, σ^ω 167
Οκελικόν 165
325
σικερα 169^-71,247-8,326-7,
σαββατείον 56, 287
344
σαββατον ι6ι
σίκερα 169
σάββατον 327
σικεραν t6g
σαββατων 158-61
σικερας i6g
σαββατων 159
σικλίον 164
σαββατων 159
σίκλον 164
σαδημωθ 320
σίκλος 164-5
σάκκος 163
σϊρήν 33
σαμβύκη 163
σιρομάστης 36
Οαμφων 88-9
σιρωνων 158, 162
Cavip 83
σιρώνων 162
CaouX 185
ΟσΙννης 298
σάπφειρος 36
σίτος ώριμος 2go
σάπφιρος 36, 163
σαράβαρα 162, 176-7, ι86 σίττα 167
σίττε 167
σαραβάροις 162
σιωνων 158, 162
σαρωνιμ 162
σιωπδν 338
σάτα 327
σκαφείον 54, 285
σάτον 327
σκάφην 83
Οατορνίλος 164
σκαφιον 54
Caropvtvoç 164
σχάφιον 285
σαυτώ ιοο
σκελών 2go
σαφώς 2θ8
σκεπα^όμενος 3 '
σδικαία 8g
σκεπάσας 342
σδωσιν 203
σκεπάσει 3 4
σέ ιοί
σκεπάσεις 3 4
σε ιοί
σκέπασις 34 ~3
Οεαλαθ 300
σκεπάσω 24g
σεαυτώ ιοο
σκηνή ig6
Οελλαθ 300
σκηνοΰν ig6
σειαρ 299
σκολιόομαι 76
σειρήν 33
σκοτόδινος 36
σειρήνες 32-3
σκοτοδινία $6
σειρήνιοι 32
σκοτόμαινα 114
Οίων gi
σκοτομαίνη 114
σειρομάστης 36
σκοτομενη 114
σελήνη 314
[[dA]]0)CIN 89
σκστομήνη : ΐ 4
σημασία 178, 329
σκότος γνόφος θύελλα ι6ο
σημασία 329
σκότος δεινόν 36
8
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ακούθοπολίς 124
ακούθοπολίται 124
σκωφρωτάται 131
ακούθον πόλις 124
ακούθον πόλις 124
σκωλφάτης 77
σκώλος 76
σοι 61
σου 61
νομός 89
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
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νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
νικελάν 80
νικελαν 80
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of Greek Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>φαρμακευτής 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φαρμακίας 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φαρμακίδας 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φαρμάκος 95-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φάρμακος 95-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φάρμακος 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φασχε 170, 248-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φασκα 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φευγείν 106, 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φεύγων 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθίνω 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθιτό 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλονεική 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλογυναική 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλογυνή 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαίρουνται 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαρησομένου 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χειρά 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χέριβετον 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χωρούσαν 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω 228-36, 340-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω 228-36, 340-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω 228-36, 340-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ωδίνησεν 128
ωί 230
ώμοι 230
ώμόλινα 334
ώμον 183
ώνείδισεν 128
ώνυχίσστο 64

ώπλεον 123
ώρατον 303
ώραν 323
ώριμος 290
ώς 228, 235, 256
ώσιν 197, 198
ωσμίλαξ 83

ωσπινήθρες 83
ώφελία 44
ώφελω 44
ώφελης 44
ώφελία 44
ἄχετο 291
ἄχετο 291
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NOTE TO THE READER

In this index words which occur in the text but are not discussed and no information is given on them, are not necessarily listed. Apart from them, however, an attempt has been made to list every form discussed of every word discussed. The verbs, like all the other words, are listed under the exact forms discussed in the text; which means, for example, that if נַעֲמָה is the only form of שַׁדַּי to be discussed in the text, the word נַעֲמָה is listed under שַׁדַּי, and no entry appears under שַׁדַּי.


eh: 62, 63 n. 55

םת: 63 n. 55

םתנכן(ה): 62

אשנכן: 150

אש: 187

חַנּ: 221

ח: 132

יִנְגֵ: 251

יִנְכֵ(ה): 200 n. 3

יִנְכֶ: 199, 200 n. 3

יִנְכָה: 35

יִנְכִ: 229-30, 236

יִנְכ: 230

יִנְג: 181, 182 n. 33, 208

יִנְגֵ: 197-8

יִנְגָה: 34

יִנְגִ: 218, 230 n. 5

יִנְגָה: 142 and n. 4, 215, 216 n. 4

יִנְגִ: 149

יִנְגָ: 132

יִנְגָה: 216

יִנְגָה: 216 and n. 4, 263

יִנְגָה: 156

יִנְגָה: 214-16

יִנְגָה: 274

יִנְג: 63

יִנְג: 252 and n. 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>תייל</td>
<td>74 n. 80, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יב</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הבנ</td>
<td>70 n. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תחת</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הרכ</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בת</td>
<td>76, 172, 183 and n. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הימים</td>
<td>172, 183 n. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התות</td>
<td>216 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יא</td>
<td>187-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יא</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>א</td>
<td>149 n. 15, 150 n. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הי</td>
<td>149, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הים</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הי</td>
<td>149, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הים</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הים</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>182 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הימים</td>
<td>36, 182 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תות</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לד</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לד</td>
<td>182 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>66 n. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>121 n. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>155-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>144, 188-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>70 n. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>179, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עו</td>
<td>179 and n. 30, 188-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ע</td>
<td>161 n. 10, 186, 188-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ע</td>
<td>179, 186-7 and n. 45, 188-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>33, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>149 n. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>142, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>103 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>70 n. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>33-4, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>66 n. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>167, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>216 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>179 n. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>189 and n. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>39, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>208 n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>230 and nn. 5, 6, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הע</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Word</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָבִּי</td>
<td>68 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲבָנָה</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵלֶּל</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>178 n. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>189 n. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>67, 148 n. 13, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>146-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>146 n. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>179 n. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>185 n. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>158 n. 2, 188-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶלֶל</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בֶּשָּׁר</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>147 n. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֶּשָׁר</td>
<td>200, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּשָׁר</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּשָׁר</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>75 n. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>182 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>224 and n. 9, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>221, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>183 n. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>67 n. 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>67 and n. 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>145, 147 n. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>147 n. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>242-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>194 and n. 54, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>201 n. 6, 205 and n. 4, 206-7, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>205 and n. 4, 206-7, 209-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>206, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>205 n. 4, 206, 209-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>206-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>206, 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>206, 209-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>206-7, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>207, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>216 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>189 n. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>189 n. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>189 n. 47, 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>187 and n. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>205 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>41 and n. 21, 47 and n. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>185, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>186, 256-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>62, 199, 211 n. 1, 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>211 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>172 n. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>172 n. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>150 n. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>147 n. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>230 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>131 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁר</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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tered: 117
לד: 75 n. 84
לו: 116
לד: 117
לד: 172
לד: 172
לד: 147 n. 10
לד: 147 n. 10
 lf: 62
lf: 256
 lf: 256
 lf: 110
 lf: 150 n. 18
 lf: 258
 lf: 149 n. 15
 lf: 75 n. 86
 lf: 262
 lf: 223 n. 8
 lf: 224
 lf: 230 n. 4
 lf: 131 n. 9
 lf: 109, 14, 242
 lf: 109
 lf: 211 n. 1
 lf: 256
 lf: 259
 lf: 148 n. 14
 lf: 121 n. 15
 lf: 130, 255
 lf: 240
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 lf: 224-5
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 lf: 149 n. 15, 197
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 lf: 197-8, 201
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>תַּנְכִּי</th>
<th>202</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שָׁנָה</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּית</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָמַר</td>
<td>230 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נֹשֶׁה</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּית</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּית (1)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּית</td>
<td>120 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֵּית</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעִדוּשָׁה</td>
<td>182 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַשָּׁבָא</td>
<td>119 n. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּשָׁבָא</td>
<td>119 n. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר (1)</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר (1)</td>
<td>120 n. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר</td>
<td>31 n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר (1)</td>
<td>120 n. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר (1)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר (1)</td>
<td>211 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָשָׁר (1)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֹא מַנְחָה</td>
<td>178 n. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָכֵי</td>
<td>121 n. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָעִדוּשָׁה</td>
<td>150 n. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִינוֹת</td>
<td>150 n. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּנָנָה</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּנָנָה</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּנָנָה</td>
<td>67, 181, 200–1, 214, 239 n. 3, 261, 262, 271–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּנָנָה</td>
<td>61, 137, 188 n. 46, 201, 213, 242, 252, 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָכָּנָנָה</td>
<td>185 and n. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָכָּנָנָה</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָכָּנָנָה</td>
<td>103 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָכָּנָנָה</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָכָּנָנָה</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָכָּנָנָה</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִשְׁחֵר</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>179 n. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>179 n. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>183 and n. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>118, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן (1)</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>192 n. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>128 n. 2, 157–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>39, 75 n. 86, 105 n. 9, 142, 184, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>156–7 and n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>147, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>130, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן (1)</td>
<td>144–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>146 n. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן (1)</td>
<td>161 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>161 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן (1)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>79 n. 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>189 n. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>211 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>156–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַכָּנָן</td>
<td>144–5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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תָּמִית: 202 n. 7
תְּנִיה: 147
מָתֶר: 147 and n. 10
מִרְד: 148
שֶׁפֶךְ: 76
מוֹךָשִׁים: 76
מְרִיכָה: 150 and n. 18
תָוּמ: 127
תָּמִית: 112
מְנוֹל: 130 n. 8
מְנוֹל: 196
עַלֹּת (י): 112
עִיֲנוּר: 189 n. 48
עַלֶּקֶק: 206–7, 210
עָפְקִית: 206, 208–9
עַלֶּקֶק: 206
עִיֲנוּר: 189
עִיֲנוּר: 189 n. 47
עָפְקִית: 205 n. 4
עַלֶּקֶק: 179 n. 27, 257
עִיֲנוּר (ל): 201
עַלֶּקֶק: 119
עָפְקִית: 267
עַלֶּקֶק: 108, 129
עָפְקִית: 192
עָפְקִית: 192–3
עָפְקִית: 96
עָפְקִית: 95
עָפְקִית: 95
עָפְקִית: 185 n. 41
עָפְקִית (ו): 187
עָפְקִית: 185 n. 41
עָפְקִית: 67 n. 63
עָפְקִית: 137
עָפְקִית: 70 n. 68, 135, 215
עָפְקִית: 174
עָפְקִית: 150
עָפְקִית: 239
עָפְקִית: 120 n. 10
עָפְקִית: 170-1
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| מָשָׂא | 170 |
| מְנַשֵּׁשְׁתָּי | 95 |
| מִשְׁאָל | 193 |
| מִנְחָה | 193 |
| פֶּן | 193 |
| קֶם | 193 |
| ילד | 193 |
| נָחֹלָה | 170 |
| עָמל | 193 |
| עֲמַר | 193–4 |
| עֶבֶר | 185 |
| הַמַּעֲשָׂא | 87 n. 5 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 256 |
| אָכַל | 151 |
| רָכַב | 256 |
| רַכַּב | 256 |
| פְּלַס | 256 |
| פְּלַס | 43 n. 25 |
| נְמַעֲשָׂא | 43 |
| נְמַעֲשָׂא | 67 n. 63 |
| מַעֲשָׂא | 239 n. 6 |
| מַעֲשָׂא | 239 n. 6 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 261 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 146 and n. 8 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 177, 262–6 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 93 n. 5, 154, 262–4 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 262 and n. 1, 263–4 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 93 n. 5 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 263 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 88 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 263 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 239 n. 6 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 137 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 114 n. 27 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 35 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 35 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 88, 158 n. 2, 252, 256 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 160 n. 4, 244–6 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 245 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 132 and n. 10 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 132 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 153–4 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 151 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 149 n. 15 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 154 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 149 n. 15 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 118 n. 5 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 129 n. 7 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 150 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 149 n. 15, 150 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 150–2, 154 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 150 and n. 18 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 152 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 90 n. 12 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 150, 152 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 180–1 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 151–2 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 152 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 135 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 151 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 217 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 215 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 150 and n. 18 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 150, 152–4 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 118 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 135 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 135 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 119 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 206 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 63 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 143 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 57 and n. 46, 121 n. 14 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 121 n. 14 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 114 n. 28 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 115 and n. 3 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 259 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 52 n. 41 |
| מְמַעֲשָׂא | 205 |
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א: 67, 118 n. 4, 229

ר: 74

ל: 147 n. 10

ל: 147 n. 12

ל: 144

ל: 173

ל: 168, 173

ל: 168

ל: 168, 173

ל: 66

ל: 66

ל: 144 n. 6

ל: 149 n. 15
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<td>160, 251</td>
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<td>160</td>
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<td>הַגָּדַר</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
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<td>211 n. 1</td>
</tr>
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<td>יָד</td>
<td>87 n. 5, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֹּרֶב</td>
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<tr>
<td>אָבִית</td>
<td>172 n. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָבִית</td>
<td>172 n. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָבִית</td>
<td>172 n. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּבֶל</td>
<td>77 n. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּבֶל</td>
<td>77 n. 89</td>
</tr>
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<td>בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
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<td>סֹאָה</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
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<td>לֵו</td>
<td>150 n. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְרִים</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְרִים</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֲבוֹדָה</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֲבוֹדָה</td>
<td>223 and n. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֲבוֹדָה</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֲבוֹדָה</td>
<td>117 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עֲבוֹדָה</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֹא</td>
<td>223 n. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֹא</td>
<td>161 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְנָאָט</td>
<td>102 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְנָאָט</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְנָאָט</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְנָאָט</td>
<td>114 n. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְנָאָט</td>
<td>162, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְנָאָט</td>
<td>230 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>טְפִיפָה</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>טְפִיפָה</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָד</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָד</td>
<td>263-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָד</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָד</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָד</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָד</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>4 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>129 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>71 n. 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>4 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>182 n. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>182 n. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>4 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>231 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>186 n. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>4 n. 1, 77 n. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>4 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>128 n. 2, 131, 137, 216, 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>49–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>88, 177, 262–4 and n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>197, 220–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>211 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>211 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>130 and n. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָב</td>
<td>162 n. 14, 194 n. 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 עברית: 199
 ריע: 216
 התו: 216 and n. 4, 217
 אקו: 198
 אימ: 188
 הדר: 141 n. 1
 ממ: 259
 לזר: 88 n. 7
 גז: 179 n. 27
 בז: 267
 כז: 211 n. 1
 גז: 223 and n. 8
 יזר: 118 n. 5, 259
 פז: 117, 239 n. 3
 שז: 135

 הוז: 188
 בדר: 162
 תזר: 216
 שזר: 200 n. 5
 שזר: 132
 הזרו: 200 n. 5
 זר: 114 n. 27
 יזר: 68
 פז: 124-5, 230 n. 4

 יזר: 129 n. 7
 יזר: 198
 הב: 77 n. 89
 בכר: 76
 בכר: 206, 220
 בכר: 161 n. 9
 בכר: 160 n. 4, 244
 בכר: 96
 הוב: 179
 הוב: 160 n. 4
 פז: 159-61 and nn. 4, 9, 10,
 178 n. 25, 179
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<td>161 and nn. 9, 10, 172</td>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>159-61 and nn. 4, 8, 9, 10, 178 n. 25, 179-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>161 n. 10, 179-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>77 n. 89</td>
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<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>77 n. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>88</td>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
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<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>33</td>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>70 n. 68</td>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>70 n. 68</td>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
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<td>31 n. 5</td>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>31 n. 5</td>
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<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>160 n. 6, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>121 nn. 14, 16, 211 and n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
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</tr>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
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</tr>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>161 n. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>161, 178 n. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>79 n. 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>165-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>68 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>4 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>197-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>197-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>107 n. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
<td>115 n. 3</td>
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<td>בּוֹאַה</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יְבֵן</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְדֵּי</td>
<td>75 n. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָה</td>
<td>77 n. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתֵּנָה</td>
<td>223 n. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתִין</td>
<td>223 n. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתַנָּה</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתְלֶה</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתִי</td>
<td>131 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתַנָּה</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתֵּנָה</td>
<td>121 n. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתֵנָה</td>
<td>121 n. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתְלֶה</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>239 n. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>201, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתְלֶה</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתְלֶה</td>
<td>121 n. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתְלֶה</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתְלֶה</td>
<td>180–2 and n. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתְלֶה</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>118 n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>160 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>182 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>87 n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>87 n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְפֹּתָלֶה</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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**INDEX OF LATIN WORDS**

In this index the Latin words discussed in the present work are listed under the exact forms discussed in the text. All such forms are listed, but only they; for example, if *nolite* is the only form of *nolo* to be discussed in the text, *nolite* is listed and no entry appears under *nolo*. Words which occur in the text but are not discussed and no information is given on them, are not necessarily listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ab initio 343</th>
<th>abductos 129</th>
<th>abominatio 181</th>
<th>accelerarct 337</th>
<th>acquiescere 180</th>
<th>actibus 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ad deos 344</td>
<td>ad te 180-1</td>
<td>adduceentur 181</td>
<td>adduxisti 181</td>
<td>adstaren 315</td>
<td>agnornumi 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adkia 245</td>
<td>alienum 125</td>
<td>altare 190</td>
<td>alter 299</td>
<td>Amen 235</td>
<td>an 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angustiae 146</td>
<td>annus 161</td>
<td>aruit 227</td>
<td>Asafh 156</td>
<td>Asaph 156-7</td>
<td>atheram 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aureas 103</td>
<td>aurugo 296</td>
<td>bär(i)ca 172</td>
<td>bibet 344</td>
<td>Bidae 157</td>
<td>braccae 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caduno 310</td>
<td>cadunus 310</td>
<td>calcationis 129</td>
<td>caldaria 103-4</td>
<td>caldarias 103-4</td>
<td>capientes 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castra 248</td>
<td>celeberrimus 245</td>
<td>celebrare 245</td>
<td>civitas 294</td>
<td>civitate 305</td>
<td>clangentibus 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cognatus 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cognitus 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cognoscere 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cognoscor 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>collega 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>colles 187-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coluerunt 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>columba 57, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comestionem 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conflasti 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>constitutus fui 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contentionem 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conterat 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contristabuntur 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contristati sunt 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conturbata sunt 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>convocare 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coperiet 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>corriges 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crater 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creavit 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crepitus 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) tunica 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cubiti 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cubitum 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>damnabunt 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dannant 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dannaverint 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debitis 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decinemini 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>definitor 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dempsit 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deos 250, 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>desinemini 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>detentus 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>detinemini 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>detinere 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deus 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dies 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>differebatur 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dii 250, 254, 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diis 251-2, 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diriges 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dolores 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dolum 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domini 245, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dominus 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>domo 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dormi 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dormivit 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>duodecim 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ea 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eadem 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ebriamen 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ebrietas 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ego 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>egressaque est 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ejecti 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboratorum 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emeritio 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ennom 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eparystridas 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eritus 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ethecas 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eu me 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evidenter 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evocandam 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exacerbatione 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>excidit 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>excoeret 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exuici 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expertus 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exueria 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>facientem 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>far 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fecit 221, 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feriae 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>festivitate 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>festivitates 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>filii 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>filius 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>filiorum 156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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filius 214
flamma 322
florentia 286
flores 286
fornicaria 294
fornicariae 214
foveam 190
foveas 190
fratres 156
fratribus 156
frumentarius 125
Geennom 247
Gehenna 247
gemitus 181
gentilis 144
gigantes 203
Godoliae 156
Godolias 156-7
habentem 128
habitandum 120
habitationes 120
hodie 271
hominem 268
iudicaverint 250
iudicavint 250
iudicii 284
iuraverit 9
Iyar 299
Jacobi 193
Jacobó 193
jus 319
laterna 171
lapidum 132
Leviticum 319
libra 183
lili 286
limum 295
lvidia 57
lvidus 57
logium 284
lucerna 171
Lulab 304
lutum 295
malorum 295
manna 170-1
mannam 170-1
manuale 284
materiam 295
maturavit 227
memoriale 244
messis 227
minas 193
misericordia 295
mortui 203
muliebrem 337
multitudinem 179, 245
mundum 337
muros 144
mutavit 276
nabla 328
nablis 328
nablum 328
nablium 328
nescierunt 202
nolite 199
noscam 199
numerabitur 105
nummus 183
obitum 9
oblita 294
offeret 251
ollas 103
opus 132
orabit 253
orabunt 253
ordinata 340
ornaret 337
paganus 144
palmea 102
partes 337
partitus 9
pascha 171, 247-
paschae 248
peccatum 181
peccaverit 253
peccavit 253
pecunia 334
pecus 334
pedibus 64
pedisequas 337
peχ(τ)es 62
peχ(τ)ex(τ)es 62
peribit 62
perire 289
perspicietis 199
phase 170, 249
phialas 103
polluunt 319
porticus 327
possessionem 339
possidenti 9
possidentiae 9
possidet 221
potio 248
potione 248
praelectioni 315
prima 156-7, 244
prius 342
proceres 251
prosacerdos 253
protegens 342
provocatrix 319
psalterium 328
puellas 337
quadriga 300
quies 160
quoniam 181
rationabilis 284
rationale 284
rations 207
receptaculum 190
redempta 319
refrigerabit 342
regis 305, 337
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requiem 342
requies 160-1, 244, 321
requietio 161
requietionis 161
resina 66
rogabit 253
rotis 132
ruinam 179

sabbata 160-1
sabbata sabbatorum 161
sabati 161, 244
sabbatum 161, 244, 321
sacerdos 252-4
sacerdotale 319
sacerdotes 250, 252-3
sacerdoti 251
sacerdotibus 252
sacerdotium 319
sancta 160-1, 244
sanctae 245
sanctas 245
sanctum 244
sanctus 161, 244
sanguine 187
satiabo 187
saturabo 187
schidia 334-5
scirent 335
scito 300
sciza 335
scizam 334
scizan 334
scizas 334
Sdrahel 88
Secunda 156-7
secundo 299
Secundus 156-7
separatus est 9
separaverit 9
septem 337
septima 244

servus servorum 160
servus 268
sicera 171, 247-8
sicera 247-8, 344
sidos 89
siluam 295
silva 78
sintera 247
solemnis 244
solidum 132
solus 276
sors 156-7
specie 323
speciosissimas 337
sprevit 263
stabilit 253
stibi 306
stibium 306
stimmi 306
super eum 146
suscitabunt 203
suscitabunt 203
synagogam 245
tactibus 9
tebari 304
temporibus 245
tentatus est 130
ter 314
terranthon 144
terruit 260
tertio 314
Teshri 299
tetraipon 300
texieris 9
texuit 9
thebari 304
tornatilis 132
tornatorem 132
torques 165
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traderet 337
transcendent 249
transcensionem 344
transibo 249
transitus 249
trepidant 318
tres 103
tria 103-4
tritra 129
trogoditar 126
tubia 244
tunica 172
tuos 251
turbantis 144
ungues 64
ut 199, 335

vallem 247
valles 188
venerabilis 245
ventris 73
vices 193
victima 249
videam 199
videant 199
videbis 204
videbist 199
videns 204
videntes 335
viderunt 204
videte 200
vidit 201
vinum 344
virg 102
virorum 179
virum 268
viscerum 146
vivificabunt 203
vocabilis 245
vocabitur 245
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## NOTE TO THE READER

The reader is asked to note that verse-enumeration often differs not only between the MT and the LXX, but also between different editions of the LXX. In such cases any given passage will generally be found listed under each one of the several systems.
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- 8 (3), 69, 95; (7), 69; (10), 289; (14), 289
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**Exodus (cont.)**
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