



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SEPTUAGINT TEXT OF HOSEA COMPARED WITH THE MASSORETIC TEXT.*

BY GAYLARD H. PATTERSON, PH. D.,

New Haven, Conn.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

In sympathy with all earnest effort to obtain a better text of the Old Testament, I was led, at the suggestion of my esteemed friend and teacher, Professor W. R. Harper, to take up the study of the Septuagint version of Hosea. Good use has been made of the Targum by Wünsche,† and Sebök‡ has investigated the variations of the Peshitta. But the most important of the versions for textual criticism, the Septuagint, has received little attention, having been investigated only in a general way by the commentators as well as by Vollers in *Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner*.

It is not my purpose to repeat the history of the version, the legend of its origin, etc., since this work has already been done by those who have wider experience. The purpose is simply to compare the Septuagint with the Massoretic text and note the conclusions that may be drawn from such comparison.

The great question, however, in the study of the LXX. to-day is whether the variations, which it presents, are due to arbitrariness of translation or to difference of recension. Thus it is my object to consider whether there are variations in the translation which would not be allowed a translator, and if so, whether these are due to arbitrariness on the part of the translator or to difference of recension.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the differences between the texts, it seems best to present a brief outline of the manner in which the investigation is conducted. Having studied the text verse by verse it was my intention to present the results in somewhat the same form as is followed in the works of Lagarde, Wellhausen, Ryssel, etc., but this, it seems, fails to present to the mind any clear idea of the variations as a class. Therefore, after a brief statement in regard to the condition of the text of the LXX., the variations are considered under three general divisions which I have named *Interpretation*, *Doubtful* and *Recensional*. Under *Interpretation* those variations which may, in any fair way, be attributed to

* Part of a thesis presented to the Faculty of the Department of Philosophy and the Arts, Yale University, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, by Gaylard H. Patterson.

† *Der Prophet Hosea übersetzt und erklärt mit Benutzung der Targumim und der jüdischen Ausleger, Raschi, Aben Ezra und David Kimchi.* Leipzig, 1868.

‡ *Die Syrische Uebersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten und ihr Verhältniss zu dem massoretischen Text und zu den älteren Uebersetzungen u. s. w.* Breslau, 1887.

the translation through free translation, different punctuation, confusion of letters, etc., are considered. Under *Doubtful* cases, those variations which are of such a nature that one cannot determine whether they are due to the translator or to a difference of MSS., are considered, and under *Recensional* those cases which can only be accounted for on the supposition that the translation is based on a MS. or MSS. differing somewhat from those underlying the Massoretic text. In these divisions the material is classified as in Workman's *Text of Jeremiah*. He adopts the old terminology "in an accommodated sense." With the Massoretic text as the basis, the variations of the second and third divisions are considered under additions and omissions of letters, words, phrases, etc., "alterations of mood, tense, gender, person, number and case." Substitutions of parts of speech, syntactical forms, etc. Thus the first consideration is as to the integrity of the text of the LXX. Then those variations, which may be attributed to the translator, are considered and thus one is familiarized with the general character of the translation in such a way that he may proceed to the consideration of the doubtful and recensional cases with an additional criterion by which to estimate the value of the variations in these cases.*

The Hebrew text used in the discussion is the edition by Baer and Delitzsch; the fac-simile of the Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus edited by H. L. Strack was also consulted. Tischendorf's sixth edition of the Septuagint is used and fac-similes of the Vatican and Alexandrian MSS. have been consulted.†

CONDITION OF THE GREEK TEXT.

With corruption in both the Hebrew and the Greek, results become very uncertain; so, while the examination of the text of the LXX. involves a special investigation of itself, a few cases of interest may be noticed here.

In 7:2 there is manifest corruption, for the reading ὅπως συνῴδωσιν ὡς ἄδοντες— is neither Greek nor Hebrew, nor is the variant ὅπως συνάδουσιν ὡς συνάδοντες, better. Ewald suggests that the text may have been ὡς συνῴδοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν.‡ This might then be a free translation, or perhaps they misread יזמרו for יאמרו. To suppose with Ewald that they read כְּמוֹ יְאוֹתוֹ בְּלִבָּב is to increase the difficulty.

In 10:6 the reading καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀσσυρίους ἤσαντες, ἀπήνεγκαν ξένια τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰαρείμ ἐν δόματι Ἐφραΐμ δέξεται, must be corrupt; ξένια and ἐν δόματι seem to be a double translation for the same word, though the latter may be for the Hebrew בַּשְּׁנָה (?).

In 13:3 the δακρῖων of the LXX. is probably a confusion of letters from ἀκρίδων

* Since the above divisions were made the excellent and recent work of Canon Driver has come to the writer's hands and he is pleased to find in it a very clear statement of the proper method of investigation. Cf. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford, 1890, p. xl.

† It is gratifying to know that an excellent edition of the Greek text is now being prepared for the Syndics of the University Press, Cambridge, by H. B. Swete, D. D.

‡ *Prophets of the Old Testament*. Vol. I, p. 273. London and Edinburgh, 1875.

which is a variant and a translation of the Hebrew consonants ; *καπνοδόχης* is another variant and a good translation of the Hebrew.

In 9:10 the reading *σκοπὸν ἐν σνκῆ* may have arisen in some such way as is suggested by Schleusner,* viz., *σκοπόν* is a confusion of letters of the word *κ(α)ρῖπον* with *σκοῖπον* and *σκ* of *σ(ν)κη*, which might then be a free translation. The parallelism establishes the Hebrew.

Instances of readings which seem to be due to the confusion or to the similarity in writing of the Greek letters are the following : The reading of the LXX. in 4:14, viz., *καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ σννιῶν σννεπλέκετο μετὰ πόρνης*, for which the Peshitta has *ܠܕܢܗ ܕܥܡܗ ܕܥܡܗ ܕܥܡܗ ܕܥܡܗ ܕܥܡܗ*, is best explained as a corruption, since the Peshitta, departing from the Massoretic text, agrees with the LXX. except that it has the negative. Compare with this 13:13, where Cyril† explains the LXX. *οὗτος ὁ ἕως σου ὁ φρόνιμος*, as used sarcastically ; and Cappelle conjectures that *ΝΖ* was read *ΖΖ*. But better than these is the explanation of Marck (cited by Simson), viz., *ἕως σου = ἕως οὐ*, *ς* having been copied a second time. In 2:16 the LXX. has *καὶ τάζω αὐτὴν ὡς ἐρημον* for *והולכתיה המדבר*. Concerning this Schleusner observes “ ubi loco τάζω * * * reponendum videtur ἄξω vel ἀνάξω αὐτὴν εἰς ἐρημον. Ἀξω habet quoque Cod. Basil.” These last instances as well as a conjecture of Drusius (cited by Wünsche) that *ἡμέραι* 7:5 is due to the manner of writing the dative *ΗΜΕΡΑΙ*, are sufficient to show that one must examine the ancient characters of the Greek before he can determine to what extent the manuscripts have been influenced by transcription alone. This and the evident corruption indicate that one must handle the text with great discrimination. “ But fortunately in this case sound results in detail must precede and not follow the establishment of a text sound throughout.”‡

INTERPRETATION.

Under this division, as already indicated, it is proposed to consider those variations which may be attributed to the translation, whether arising directly from interpretation, or in any way due to the translator. Since the Greek translator of this book must have found difficulty in interpretation owing to the peculiarities of the style of the Prophet, this becomes one of the obstacles in the way of the textual study of the book. These peculiarities may be stated summarily as follows : brief and unconnected sentences ; frequent neglect of gender, person and number ; intermingling of similes and metaphors ; scanty use of particles ; feeble parallelism ; rare words ; peculiar constructions ; inversions ; anacolutha and corruption of text. To what extent the translation has been affected by failing to observe these peculiarities will appear in the following.

* *Novus Thesaurus in Vetus Testamentum*. Glasgow, 1822.

† J. P. Migne's edition of *Patrologia Graeca*. Paris, 1859. Vol. LXXI., p. 311.

‡ *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Article, “Septuagint” by Wellhausen. Vol. XXI., p. 669.

§ Henderson's *Commentary on the Minor Prophets*, p. 1. Andover, 1868.

I. There may be noted cases in which a word is given a meaning belonging to it, but not the proper force according to the context, as in the case of

1. Nouns, when there is used,

a. A Common Noun for a Proper Noun. *βουνός* for **גבעה** in 5:8; 9:9 and 10:9, influenced perhaps by 4:13 and 10:8, where the common noun occurs. The first part of the words **ביתאון** and **ביתאל**, 4:15; 5:8; 12:5, etc.,* is always translated by *οἶκος*. Other examples are *σκοπία* = **מצפה**, 5:1; *ἰψηλός* = **רמה**, 5:8.

b. A Proper for a Common Noun. *Ἰαρείμ* = **ירב** 5:13 and 10:6. Compare, however, A.V. and R.V. In this case the article would be expected with **ב** and **ם** to the mouth of an Oriental are nearly related. Cf. Ps. 16:1. For *Μάχμας* cf. p. 195.

2. Verbs; in some cases

a. A fair meaning is given. *ἀπορρίπτω* = **דמה**, 10:7,15; *ἐπακόω* = **ענה**, 2:23,24; cf. A. V., while in 5:5 and 7:10 **ענה** = *ταπεινώω* (**עני**), etc.

b. Not in accordance with the context, as in 14:9; 2:17, where the same word is similarly translated. *ὁμοίω* = **דמה**, 4:5,6; *παραιοπάω* = **חרש**, 10:11, 13, etc.

3. Tense. A few cases will suffice to show that the translation cannot be relied upon in expressing accurately the force of a particular tense. In 1:2 *ἐκπορνεύουσα ἐκπορνεύσει* for **הַיְנָה הַזֶּה** is a simple translation of the idiom, but fails to convey the idea in its proper force. In 2:1 *ἦν* is used for **וְהָיָה** while the same is used for **יְהִי** 8:6, and in 11:4 *καὶ ἐσομαι*, while **וְאָהָיָה** = *καὶ ἐσομαι*, while **אִמְשַׁכֶּם** is translated by *ἐξέτεινα αὐτούς*, etc. Even upon superficial examination one discovers the inaccuracy of the translation in this particular. But when it is remembered that interpreters still disagree as to the force of the "Perfect" and "Imperfect" in particular cases, one is not surprised to find that the "present perfect," the "frequentative imperfect," etc., are not properly rendered. Such nice shades of expression cannot be expected in the translation. On the contrary it is just the slavishness of the translation that makes it possible to reconstruct the Hebrew text from it. No one would attempt it from a modern translation.

4. Government. There are cases in which the government or construction of a phrase or sentence is not exact as when

a. A verb is read transitively with an object when it should be intransitive, as *καὶ αἵματα ἐφ' αἵμασι μίσγουσι* for **וְרַמִּים בְּרַמִּים נִנְעוּ**; 4:2; *ἐμέρισαν καρδίας αὐτῶν* for **חָלַק לָבָם** 10:2; *ἀπέστρεψε τὴν ὄργην μου* for **שָׁב אָפִי** 14:5, etc. Compare also 13:15b, where, however, they may have pointed the verbs differently,

b. Which may also be the case in certain active verbs which are read passively, as in 12:11 *ὁμοιώθη* = **אָרַמָה**; 5:7 *ἐγεννήθησαν*(?) = **יָלַד**, etc.

* When *etc.* occurs, a few unimportant cases are not cited since the cases under this division are cited simply to set forth the general character of the translation; otherwise the treatment is exhaustive.

c. The subject and object of the verb are also sometimes confused. In 4:11 this affects the entire verse.

II. As indicated, some of the above variations may have arisen from a different pointing. To this cause many variations may be attributed and in some cases the LXX. reading is to be preferred. Sometimes the change is

1. A Noun for a Verbal Form.

דָּבַר for דִּבֵּר 1:2, also for דִּבֵּר 13:1. The Massoretic text gives a fair construction in Hebrew, and being the more difficult is to be preferred; it also gives a very good sense. The Peshitta and Targum, however, have the noun. אֲשׁוּר = אִשׁוּר 13:7. So also the Peshitta אֲשׁוּר and Vulgate, "in via Assyri-
orum," and Hitzig.* רֵעָה (adj.) = רֵעָה 12:2 and יִקְרִי = יִקְרָאָהוּ 11:7 wrongly, as also וּכְחָךְ for וּכְחֵבִי 6:9, and though in 4:19 צָרַר for צָרָר is adopted by Drake,† the sense and context are better sustained by the Massoretic text.

2. Verbal Form for Noun.

פָּרָא = פָּרֵא 8:9, but this is contrary to the 8th verse. שָׁבְבִים = שְׁבָבִים 8:6, wrongly, as also לִפְתַּח for לִפְתָּח 2:17. In 12:6 יְהִיָּה for יְהוֹה occurs the more easily, as יְהוֹה occurs in the preceding.

3. Verbal Form for Verbal Form.

In 3:1 רָע = אֶהְבֵּת רָע. Drake assumes this without doubt to be the true reading. Hermann‡ also adopts it, explaining the arrangement, however, as chiasmatic. The ordinary reading is adopted by all the later commentators, but it seems that a slight variation from the LXX. and Massoretic text, reading אֶהְבֵּת רָע after J. D. Michaelis,§ gives a better parallelism as well as uniformity in the use of the participles. The first two, thus, refer to the evil habits of the woman in relation to her *paramour* and the consequent adultery, while the next couplet refers to Israel's relation to "other gods" and the consequent idolatrous practice, indicated in the expression "love cakes of grapes." Thus it is the waywardness of the woman not the decoyment of idols that is censured.

In 7:5 הִחֲלִי for הִחֲלִי, not badly. Several other cases, however, are not so good, as: יִרְדְּפוּ = שֵׁת קָצִיר = שֵׁת קָצוּר 6:11; יִרְדְּפוּ = הַשְּׁבֵתִי = הַשְּׁבֵתִי 2:13; יִרְדְּפוּ = יִתְּנוּ = יִתְּנוּ 8:10; יִרְדְּפוּ = רִמְשָׁה = רִמְשָׁה 10:14; יִרְדְּפוּ = יִרְחִם = יִרְחִם 14:4; יִרְדְּפוּ = הַשְּׁבֵתִים = הַשְּׁבֵתִים 11:11; יִרְדְּפוּ = יִרְדוּ = יִרְדוּ 5:7.

4. A Noun for a Noun.

מִשְׁבֵּת- = מִשְׁבֵּת- 14:5; cf. 11:7, but wrongly as also אֹן = אֹן 12:4, perhaps a free translation here. אַחִיכֶם = אַחִיכֶם 2:3; אַחֹתֵיכֶם = אַחֹתֵיכֶם 2:3; אַחֹתֵיכֶם = אַחֹתֵיכֶם (?) אַחֹתֵיכֶם 2:3; אַחֹתֵיכֶם = אַחֹתֵיכֶם (?) אַחֹתֵיכֶם 2:3; אַחֹתֵיכֶם = אַחֹתֵיכֶם 5:6; אַחֹתֵיכֶם = אַחֹתֵיכֶם 5:6; אַחֹתֵיכֶם = אַחֹתֵיכֶם 10:13.

* Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. Leipzig, 2d edition, 1852, p. 56.

† Notes on Jonah and Hosea. Cambridge, 1853, p. 98.

‡ Studien und Kritiken, 1879, p. 515.

§ Deutsche Uebersetzung des Alten Testaments. Vol. XI. Goettingen, 1782, pp. 4 and 21.

5. Other Cases. עַם for עָם 12:1 ; מִים = מַיִם 11:10 ; (?) אֵין = אֲנִי 12:12. These and other cases are noted under other heads. Cf. VIII., pp. 201 sq.

III. There is also a number of variations arising from a different arrangement and construction of the text, consisting in

1. The different grouping of words, affecting

a. A change in a verse, as 4:5 לַיְלָה וְדַמִּיתִי אִמִּי = νυκτὶ ὁμοίωσα τὴν μητέρα σου. Vulgate, "Nocte tacere feci matrem tuam." The connective ׀ probably did not occur in the MSS. from which these translations were made. The parallelism and contrast between day and night favor the Massoretic text. In 9:6 the LXX., ἐκ παλαιπωρίας Ἀγύπτου, καὶ ἐκδέξεται αὐτοὺς Μέμφις, καὶ θάψει αὐτοὺς Μαχράς κ.τ.λ., misses the sense perhaps because of the general expression preceding מִצְרַיִם and the subject standing first; while the incorrect reading of מַחְמַד also conduced to this. Jerome* thought they confused ׀ and ׀. Μάχμας is elsewhere the translation of מַכְמִשׁ and so associating this with Egypt they have misread here.

In 9:4, וְלֹא יַעֲרְבוּ-לוֹ זִבְחֵיהֶם כְּלֶחֶם אוֹנִים לָהֶם = LXX., καὶ οὐχ ἡδύναν ἀντῶ αἱ θυσίαι αὐτῶν ὡς ἄρτος πένθους, κ.τ.λ. Variant. ἡδύναντο κ.τ.λ. Peshitta, וְלֹא יִתְקַבְּלוּן לְרַעוּא קוֹרְבָנֵיהוֹן. The one reading of the LXX. as well as the Peshitta and Targum take זִבְחֵיהֶם as the subject of the verb, giving the better construction. The variant of the LXX. has in its favor also the fact that ἡδύνω when used actively takes the accusative. Cheyne suggests that the Massoretic division "was possibly caused by a wish to preclude a misinterpretation of Hosea's language, viz., that the Israelites would go on sacrificing to Jehovah even when in captivity."† Other cases may be found in 9:11; 11:8; 12:1,2,3; 13:2 and 14:8; they need no comments.

b. A change in more than one verse, as in 4:14,15: יִלְבַּט׃ אִם-זֹנֶה אֶתָּה. LXX.—συννεπλέετο μετὰ πόρνης. Σν. Here the LXX. seem to have tried to bring the last of the verse into consonance with the phrase עַם הַזֹּנוֹת יַפְרְרוּ, and thus translate freely, reading עַם for אִם a very easy confusion. Sebök, however, suggests that the LXX. which he thinks the Peshitta followed, deluded by the sound of the letters, translated יִלְפַת, but this does not seem well supported by his references. At any rate a glance at the text shows it to be incorrectly construed.

In 9:8,9 for "מִשְׁטָמָה בְּבֵית אֱלֹהֵיוֹ: הֵעִמִּיקוּ שְׁחָתוֹ כִּימִי וְגו'" the LXX. has *μανίαν ἐν ὀίκῳ θεοῦ κατέπηξαν. ἐθάρησαν κ.τ.λ.* The two verbs coming together in the Hebrew were separated by the translator and the first was given to the preceding clause. The Massoretic text, however, gives a possible construction and being the more difficult is to be preferred. Other cases may be found in 4:11,12; 5:15 and 6:1, also 6:10,11.

2. The different grouping of letters, as in 4:4, where: וְעַמָּה כְּמַרְיִבִי כְהֵן =

* *Patrologia Latina*, Ed. J. P. Migne, Paris, 1845. Vol. XXV., p. 894.

† *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Hosea.* Cambridge, 1887, p. 94.

LXX. ὁ δὲ λαὸς μου ὡς ἀντιλεγόμενος ἱερέως. The LXX. reading suits the context better in placing כ so as to read עמי, cf. v. 6. The כ in the Massoretic text is probably from the first of the following word, and so this case might have been considered under *Recensional* variations, but being connected with an otherwise free translation it seemed best to consider both under *Interpretation*. The translation of the latter part may be thought to invalidate that of the first part, but the final Yôdh of כמרי was probably obscured in the MS., and thus this would be a fair translation following closely the order of the words, since in Greek the regular order would be the reverse. Thus the LXX. becomes a safeguard against such conjectures as that of Wellhausen* unless such corruption took place before the translation was made. One conjecture by Robertson Smith,† viz., כמרי בי, is antedated by a conjecture cited by Rosenmüller,‡ viz., “Quos conjecturae juvant, miror, in eam pariter non incidisse, qua legeretur כמרי בי cum affixo primae pers. singul. sicut contendens adversus me sacerdos, ita ut sensus exoriretur periodi; tum populus tuus tum sacerdos mihi contradicunt et adversantur. ‘Si genuina floret lectio in Alexandrina versione, videri haec posset isti conjecturae ex parte favori.’”§

In 6:5 for אור יצא ומשפטיו אור יצא the LXX. has καὶ τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς ἐξελεύσεται; the Peshitta, אור יצא אור יצא; the Targum, אור יצא אור יצא. These versions surely give the better reading here, not involving a change of person nor the necessity of supplying, as the Massoretic text does. As is evident, this simply requires the כ to be joined to the following word; it is favored by Cheyne and others.

Other cases are the following: For רבו תורתִי, 8:12, the translation in the LXX. is πλῆθος, καὶ τὰ νόμιμα αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. = רב ותורתו. In 7:11 for מצרים קראו אשור הלכו the LXX. has Αἴγυπτον ἐπεκαλεῖτο, καὶ εἰς Ἀσσυρίους κ.τ.λ. = מצרים קראו ואשור וגו'. In 11:2 for מפניהם the LXX. is ἐκ προσώπου μου αὐτοὶ. מצאו = נמצאו, 6:2,3. Cf. also p. 200 for 7:1.

IV. The character of the languages being so different, allowance must be made for certain variations due to the genius of each language; as in the case of

1. Asyndeton, which occurs much more frequently in Hebrew than in Greek. Cf. 1:1; 3:1, etc.
2. Verbal Apposition, when the second verb is often translated by an infinitive. Cf. 1:6; 5:11, etc.
3. Abstract Plurals, which are usually well translated by the singular, as in 1:2, אשת זנונים = γυναῖκα πορνείας. Cf. also 2:4,6; 5:4, etc.
4. Collectives, which are often translated by the plural, as in 2:20, where the

* *History of Israel*. Edinburgh, 1885, p. 138.

† *The Prophets of Israel*. New York, 1882, p. 406.

‡ *Scholion in Vetus Testamentum*. Leipzig, 1812. VII., 1, p. 124.

§ *Dissertationes Aurivillii*. Goettingae et Lipsiae, 1790, p. 606.

Hebrew עַם חַיִּת הַשָּׂדֶה = *μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ*. So also the other collectives of the verse and elsewhere. Some cases are more doubtful, as ἀμαρτίας for חַטָּאת 4:8; ἐφφραναν βασιλείς = יִשְׁמְחוּ-מֶלֶךְ 7:3.

5. Infinitives, as in 4:2, where the infinitives are translated by nouns, representing the sense fairly. However, the translator may have vocalized the words as nouns; the stronger expression is given in the received text.

6. Peculiarities.

a. In the translation of רַחֲמָה 1:6, etc., it cannot be determined whether the translator read מְרַחֲמָה a participle, or a perfect רַחֲמָה, since he would probably translate in the same way in either case. Thus the translation seldom gives any light on such forms.

b. In a western language the expression "their souls" is preferable to "their soul," but such an expression is quite common in Hebrew. In 4:8 for the Hebrew נַפְשׁוֹ the LXX. has τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν, reading נַפְשִׁים perhaps, as do many Hebrew MSS., or they may have referred the singular suffix to the community and thus translated in the plural; in either case the effect upon the noun is the same, requiring the plural. Cf. also 9:11, כְּבוֹדָם = αἱ δόξαι αὐτῶν; 13:8, לֶבָם = καρδίας αὐτῶν, etc.

c. In the Greek a part of speech frequently carries its force farther than in the Hebrew, and so where it would be repeated in Hebrew the one answers in Greek. Such is the case in 5:6, where בְּצִאֲנָם וּבְכִקְרָם = μετὰ προβάτων καὶ μόσχων. Note also the translation of מִיַּד שְׂאוֹל אֶפְרַם מִמּוֹת אֲנָאֵלָם, 13:14, viz., ἐκ χειρὸς ἄδου ῥύσσομαι καὶ ἐκ θανάτου λυτρώσομαι αὐτούς. Variant αὐτούς for καὶ.

d. Frequently the term אֲשׁוּרִי is translated as referring to the inhabitants, as in 7:11, etc.

e. Other Cases. In 2:23 אֶעֱנֶה אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהֵם = ἐπακούσομαι τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ αὐτός. In 5:1 שְׁמְעוּ-זֹאת = Ἀκούσατε ταῦτα.

V. Some minor variations may also be explained as free translations and may easily be detected. Such are the following:

1. Those which may be said to give the sense of what is expressed figuratively in Hebrew, as in 2:7, where for צִמְרִי וּפְשֵׁתִי the LXX. τὰ ἱμάτιά μου καὶ τὰ ὀθονία μου, gives the article for the material of which it is made and this is not far from the Hebrew. Cf. Lev. 13:47, where בְּגָד occurs with these words; cf. also 2:11. The translation of the last word of the verse, שִׁקְנִי, by πάντα ὅσα μοι καθήκει represents the idea of the Hebrew in a general expression. In 2:17 כְּרַמִּיהַ = τὰ κτήματα αὐτῆς, "which," as Simson observes, "is perhaps not to be emended to κλήματα with Drusus, but explains itself from the peculiarity of the LXX., in the use of synecdoche, preferring to place the genus for the species."*

2. In many places יוֹם seems to have been taken in a general sense and is translated by the plural. Cf. 4:6; 5:9; 7:5; 10:14, etc.

* *Der Prophet Hosea*. Hamburg und Gotha, 1851, p. 101.

3. There are also some cases in which the translator seems to have given a peculiar meaning to a form by reference to the root from which the word is derived, as in 2:17, where for **לְפַתַּח תְּקוּהָ** the LXX. has *διανοίξαι σύνεσιν αὐτῆς*, pointing the first as an infinitive, which, with the ordinary meaning of **תְּקוּהָ**, does not make good sense; but the translation is not so remote as to require the conjecture that they read **תְּקוּהָ** (Drusus). The words in their first meanings are not so far apart as they seem to be, **קוּהָ** meaning “to bind” and *σύνεσις* (*συνήμι*) “a joining together,” so that though **תְּקוּהָ** is not translated elsewhere by this word, it seems probable that it is the form which was before the translator. The vocalization, however, may have been **תְּקוּהָ** as Sebök suggests. The LXX. take this verse as one of warning and so the translation of this phrase is more in accordance with the context as thus understood. In 5:12 **עֵשׂ** is translated by *παραχῆ* and the root from which **עֵשׂ** is derived is frequently translated by *παραύσω*, so that, though the exact meaning is not given here, the translator’s intention is shown to be right.

4. There are other cases in which the meaning given a word or form is inexact, as in 1:6, where *ἀντιτασσόμενος ἀντιτάξομαι* for **נָשָׂא אִשָּׁא** does not seem so strange when one thinks of the different interpretations that have been given this clause by the commentators. Wünsche and Nowack say this translation demands the *Hîthpā’ēl*, but it is to be remembered that the translator must not be held responsible for modern knowledge of grammar; moreover such translation nowhere occurs for the *Hîthpā’ēl*. It is also to be noted that the same words occur in 1 Kgs. 11:34 for **נִשְׂא אִשְׁתּוֹ**, from which Schleusner conjectured that the translator read the same here. However, the emphatic infinitive construction points to the form here as the basis, and if the translations are in any way related then it seems probable that the translator of Kings read **נִשְׂא אִשְׁתּוֹ** which only involves the change of a **ת** to an **א**; not a difficult change with the old Hebrew characters. Though the translation itself cannot be supported, it is interesting in that it shows an attempt to translate the form which occurs in the received text. Moreover the influence of **כִּי** preceded by a negative perhaps had some force in affecting the translation. In this case it may be compared with that of the A. V. In 2:15 the LXX. has *ἐν αἷς ἐπέθυσεν αὐτοῖς* for **אִשֶּׁר תִּקְטִיר לָהֶם**, referring **אִשֶּׁר**, with **בִּם** omitted, to **יָמֵי**, to which Hitzig refers it also, since otherwise the latter part of the verse requires some additional explanation. Nowack takes **אִשֶּׁר** as an accusative of time. There is no reason for supposing that the translator* found **בִּם** in the MS.* used. In 3:2 the translation of **אֲכָרִיהָ** by *ἐμισθώσαμην* is probably based on the same text. Cf. the Arabic **كِر** in the eighth form. However, the translator may have referred it to **שָׁכַר**.

* The singular, *translator*, should not be taken as implying that the translation was made by one person, since this is not known, but it is used for sake of convenience. MS. is used in the same way.

In the difficult figurative language of 7:4sq. the translator seems to have found some difficulty, but has given the *words* fairly, though missing the sense. כּלם is translated by πάντες, either dropping ם on account of the same letter following, or probably it is used as expressing the meaning. (Cf. v. 7): κατακάυματος for שְׁבוֹת seems to have been taken as referring to the fire and thus the sense is missed. In v. 5 λοιμός for לִצִּין does not give the exact meaning of the word, but it is frequently used for לִץ. In v. 6 ἀνεκαύθησαν for קָרְבוֹ does not require the conjectures that the reading was חָרַב (Cappelle), קָרַח (Buxtorf), etc. The sense seems to have been adapted to the figure. The translation of אַרְבַּ by καταράσσω is free also. Cf. the translation of אַרְבַּ by καταρρέω in 1 Sam. 2:35.

In 12:7 the LXX. ἐγγιζε for קָרַב is probably a free translation. Though the phrase קָרַב אֵל to which the translation corresponds is one of frequent occurrence, Ezek. 40:46; 1 Sam. 14:36, etc., the other is also, as in Ps. 37:34; 27:14, and suits the following תָּמִיד better.

In 5:8 several words are rendered freely, as may be seen by a reference to the text, but the idea is conveyed; such is the case also in 8:4, but the idea in הַמְלִיכוֹ and הַשִּׁירוֹ is not so well expressed. Other cases of free translation are the following: יֹאסְפוֹ = ἐκλείψουσιν, 4:3; יִפְרִצוּ = κατευνώσουσι, 4:10; אִמִּיר = θήσομαι, 4:7; סָרַר סָרַר = παροιστρῶσα κ.τ.λ., 4:16; נִכְחַד = ἀπέστη, 5:3; בִּיהוּהַ בָּגְרוּ = ὄτι τὸν κύριον ἐγκατέλιπον, 5:7; לַחֲבָה = φέγγος, 7:6; בּוֹ זֹרְקָהּ = ἐξήνθησαν αὐτῷ, 7:9; נֶאֱמָנָה = πιστά (? אֱמוּנָה ?), 5:9; יִקְמְנוּ = ἐξαναστησόμεθα (?), 6:2; רוּחַ = ἀνεμόφθορα, 8:7; קִימוּשׁ = δλεθρος, 9:6; הִבָּהּ = ἐπόρευεν, 9:16; אִמְגַנֵּךְ = ὑπερασπιῶ (מִגָּ ?), 11:8; תְּלֵאבוֹת = ἀοικήτω, 13:5; שַׁחַל = πανθήρ,* 13:7; etc.

VI. There are some variations which appear to be slight turns given to expressions for the sake of clearness or interpretation. They are cases which, if retranslated into Hebrew, would require.

1. An alteration or substitution, as in 4:3, where for the Hebrew וְאִמְלֵךְ בָּהּ כָּל-יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ the LXX. is καὶ συμκρυνθήσεται σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν. The verb being taken as passive it was easiest to refer it to the land, and thus כָּל יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ is construed, as the following words, with בָּ. In 4:12 the force of בָּ in the first clause is either carried over to the second or the translator supposed the second should agree, reading וּבְמִקְלֹךָ, but this does not suit here. In 9:8,17 the suffixes are not translated, but in the connection the general term אֱלֹהִים seems to have been preferred, though the translator probably found אֱלֹהֵי in the MS. If the Greek καὶ τὰξω αὐτήν ὡς ἔρημον, 2:16, is original this is a turn in expression, but see p. 192. Cf. also שִׁבְלֵתַיִם = ἀτεκνωθήσονται, 9:12; שֵׁר לָהֶם = δέλαιοι εἰσιν, 7:13.

2. An addition, as in 2:10, where, for the Hebrew כֶּסֶף חֲרִבְתִּי לֵה וְהֵב עִשׂוֹ, the LXX. is καὶ ἀργύριον ἐπλήθυνα αὐτή. αὐτὴ δὲ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ ἐποίησε, which seems to have been caused by the peculiarity of the arrangement of the Hebrew.

* Modern interpreters also find difficulty in translating the Hebrew words for lion.

There is an attempt to convey the idea. But are the people represented as using silver which God had given and gold which he had not given ?

In 3:3, if *ἐτίρω* was in the original it is a wrong interpretation, but some editions do not have it,* and it is probably a correction.

In 4:2, misled by taking the infinitives as nouns, the translator makes these the subject of the verb פּרִצוּ which is translated *κέχρηται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, retaining the image of the breaking forth of water, as also the Vulgate in “inundaverunt,” and this probably explains the addition ; though it may be a copyist’s error, being repeated from the preceding verse.

In 7:1 for the Hebrew **וּגְנַב יָבֹוא פֶשֶׁט גְּרוֹד בַּחוּץ** the LXX. has *καὶ κλέπτῃς πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσέλθῃσεται, ἐκδιδώσκων ληστῆς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ*. The addition arose perhaps from carrying out **בֹּוא** more fully than the verb alone does. (Cf. 9:4, where the preposition is added to convey the idea.) The variation in the last is suggested by the preceding, but the initial ן of the following verse was no doubt read as a suffix to **בַּחוּץ**.

In 5:11 the Hebrew **עָשׂוּק אֶפְרַיִם** seems to have been too general an expression for the translator, and the vowel letters not being in the MSS.† perhaps he took this form as well as the following **רָצוּן** as active and supplied the object for the first. Similarly **וַיִּשְׁלַח**, 5:13, is not expressed in Greek without an object as easily as in Hebrew, so *πρέσβεις* is supplied as an object in Greek.

Other cases may be seen in the following : **אֵלֶּה** = *δένδρον συσκιάζοντος*, 4:13 ; **לְבַיָּא** = *σκύμβου ὀρυμοῦ*, 13:8 ; **רָעַנָן** = *πυκάζουσα*, 14:9 ; **הַיְשָׁלָם** = *ἀνταποδόσεώς σου* (?), 9:7 ; variant, *ἀνταπαδόσεως* ; **אֶהְבֶּהָ** = *ἀγαπήσεώς μου*, 11:4 ; etc.

VII. There are some cases in which the translator has missed the sense through a false construction or misunderstanding of a word, etc. There may be noted,

1. The misunderstanding of words and incorrect reading of suffixes often connected with such misunderstanding, as in 2:18, where **בַּעֲלֵי** = *βααλείμ*. This probably arose out of a difficulty in the mind of the translator in not understanding how Yahweh could ever have been called **בַּעַל**, or an unwillingness to admit it.

In 13:14 **דְּבַרְיָךְ** = *δίκη σου*, referring to the singular **דְּבַר** rather than to **דְּבָרִים**.

In 11:1 for the Hebrew **לְבָנַי** the LXX. is *τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ*, referring by the suffix to Israel probably, but this would be *their fathers*. Cf. Mt. 2:15. Note also the suffixes of the first for the third person in 12:5.

In 7:16 **רַמְיָה** = *ἐντεταμένον*, cf. Jer. 4:29 ; **כְּשֵׁלַת** = *ἀσθενήσει*, 4:5 ; **כְּשֵׁלַת** = *ἡσθνήσαν*, 14:2 ; **הוֹרוּ** = *κατάκαρπος*, 14:7.

* Field’s *Hexapla*. Oxford, 1875. Vol. II., p. 944.

† The “plena scriptio” probably was not common in the MSS. which the translators used. Cf. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. xxxii.

2. Wrong Constructions. Closely connected with the preceding is the misunderstanding of the word כִּמְרִי, 10:5, for which the LXX. reads καθὼς παρεπύκρναν αὐτόν, deriving it from מְרָה with כ, but this construction requires כֹּאשֶׁר. The uncommon word seems to have caused difficulty.

In 2:19 for וְלֹא יִזְכְּרוּ עוֹד בְּשֵׁמֶם the LXX. is καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθῶσιν οὐκ ἔτι τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν, taking כ in construction with the verb and translating as in the Hiph'il. Cf. Josh. 23:7; Isa. 48:1. Perhaps they vocalized as Hiph'il, but יִזְכְּרוּ seems well sustained. Cf. Zech. 13:2.

In 6:5 for חֲצַנְתִּי בְּנְבִיאִים the LXX. has ἀπεθέρισα τοὺς προφῆτας ὑμῶν. No object being expressed for the verb the phrase was probably taken in the sense of "slaying in" or "among the prophets" and read בְּנְבִיאֵיכֶם. The received text and interpretation are sustained by the parallelism.

In 11:6 for וְחָלָה חֲרַב בְּעַרְיוֹ וְכִלְתָּהּ בְּרִי the LXX. has καὶ ἠσθένησεν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ. The first verb is derived from חָלָה and both it and כָּלָה are taken intransitively, while בְּרִי is made to correspond with בְּעַרְיוֹ in the first clause and so is read בְּרִי. The translator seems to have been influenced by an attempt to bring out parallelism.

In 9:1 אֵל גִּיל is translated in the LXX. by μηδὲ εὐφραίνου; in the Vulgate, "noli exultare." The early translators probably overlooked the fact that אֵל is not thus used. They may have read אֵל תְּגִיל, but cf. Job 3:22, which favors the received text.

In 7:14 the LXX. makes לִבָּם the subject of the verb in the translation καὶ οὐκ ἐβόησαν πρὸς μὲ αἱ κορδία αὐτῶν, for the Hebrew וְלֹא זָעְקוּ אֵלַי בְּלִבָּם.

In 6:7 וְהָמָה כְּאֲדָם עִבְרוּ, the translation of which is αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰσὶν ὡς ἄνθρωπος παραβαίνων. עִבְרוּ is read עָבְרָה, qualifying כְּאֲדָם. This is a weak statement, but perhaps not more so than one interpretation of 4:4, viz., "thy people are as they that strive with the priest," or the expression in 5:10.

In 6:8 קְרִית פְּעֵל (א) אֵין = πόλις ἐργαζομένη μάταια; בְּעַמִּים הוּא = ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς αὐτοῦ (annexion ?), 7:8; וְלִפְקוֹד = τοῦ ἐκδικῆσαι, 12:3.

VIII. Again, there are some variations which seem to have arisen through the peculiar difficulty presented by the Hebrew or the MSS., or a strange misunderstanding of the text. In many cases a combination of these causes explains a reading. Since the reason for a variation of this nature is not very evident they need not be classified more definitely. The following are instances of such variation:

In 2:4 for the Hebrew וְתָסַר זִנּוּנִיהָ מִפְּנֵיהָ (פ) אֶפְשִׁיטָנָה (v. 5), the LXX. reads καὶ ἐξαρῶ τὴν πορνείαν αὐτῆς ἐκ προσώπου μου (v. 5 ὅπως ἂν ἐκδύσω αὐτήν). Perhaps the first person is used as anticipative of the same in the following verse. Though the sense is missed, the translation does not involve any important change in the

text. **תסר** for **אסר**; and **מפניה** for **מפני**, the former being much more common would naturally be taken in case of obscurity. **פן** in v. 5 was perhaps read **כ** unless the Greek should read *ὅπως μή(?)*. Cf. p. 192.

In 12:15 for the Hebrew **הכעים אפרים תמרורים** the LXX. has *ἐθίμωσεν Ἐφραΐμ καὶ παρώργισε*; variant, insert *ἐν* before Ἐφραΐμ. Is this an attempt to render the phrase by the combination of two verbs or was one originally an adverb in force, but altered? The second verb of the Greek is the one most frequently used for **כעס**, but the other is also used. There must be an alteration or corruption here, perhaps a double rendering.

In 14:8 it is suggested that the LXX. *ζήσονται καὶ μεθυσθήσονται σίτω*, is a double translation of **יחי רגן**, being read once **יחי**, once **י(ו)י**, to which *μεθυσθήσονται* corresponds, but this word with *σίτος* is unparalleled. This is probably to be traced to a tampering with the text of the LXX. Such "conflate readings" are probably rightly attributed to admixture from other versions. According to the following canon, "If two readings coexist, of which one expresses the Massoretic text, while the other can only be explained from a text deviating from it, the latter is to be regarded as the original,"* *μεθυσθήσονται σίτω* should be regarded as the original reading. This then may be a free translation of **ירו רגן**, which would not be bad in this connection.

In 14:3 **כל-תשא** = *ὅπως μὴ λάβητε*. In the unparalleled Hebrew the translator seems to have found difficulty, reading **כי ליה** perhaps for **כל**. The difficulty of the expression baffles the modern interpreter also.

In 12:1 for the Hebrew **ער רר עם אל ועם קרושים נאמן** the LXX. has *νῦν ἔγνω αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἅγιος κεκλήσεται*, mistaking blame for praise, but such a sentiment in this connection is altogether out of place. A slight change of consonants and pointing would admit the Greek reading, viz., **יעתה? ירעם אל ועם קרושים נאמן**.

Other cases in which a slight change will admit a peculiar reading are the following: 6:9 altered to "**החביאי וגו**" **כחך איש גדור(ים) החביאי וגו** may explain the LXX. *καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς σου ἀνδρὸς πειρατοῦ ἐκρυσψαν κ.τ.λ.*; also 11:7, **ואל על יקריו יחר**, † for which the LXX. is *καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὰ τίμια αὐτοῦ θυμωθήσεται*. 12:12 again, **בגלעד שרים**... **אם-גלעד אין** for the LXX. *εἰ μὴ Γαλαὰδ ἐστὶν... ἐν Γαλαὰδ ἀρχοντες*. With 8:9, **דורה** *ἠγάπησαν* compare **אתנתן**, 9:1. The translator has not used **תנה** anywhere; at least no translation requires it. 13:1, **רתת** = *δικαιώματα*, perhaps for **רת** Aramaic(?). In 8:7 **בלי** seems to have been omitted. **θυσιαστήρια τὰ ἠγαπημένα**, 8:12, repeated from 8:11 by copyist? In 2:8 **את וגרתי נדרה** = *καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰς ὁδοὺς*, free?

* Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, p. xlivii.

† Not **ואל** after Simson and Wünsche, as Nowack indicates.

IX. Another reason for variation in the translation is the confusion of consonants; these must often have been dim and obscure in ancient MSS. Moreover the similarity between some of the letters must have led to confusion. The MSS. used by the translator were probably written in the old Hebrew or "square" characters, and the letters may have been confused in the transmission of those MSS. before the translation was made. Hence it is difficult to determine, many times, whether the translator erred in reading these, or some copyist before him. It seems probable, however, that as good a MS. or MSS. as the average would be used in such a translation, and accordingly the following variations may fairly be considered as due to the translator.

In 1:4 for יהוא the LXX. has Ἰούδα. Jerome believed this to have been due to the inexperience of the translator, using this word because it was the more common. Simson also points out the fact that "Judah" is thus brought into consonance with "house of Israel" at the end of the verse. יהודה might also be confused easily with יהוא, especially the apocopated form יהוד. Thus in case of obscurity Judah would naturally be taken. But we, thinking of a definite fact, find that the context requires יהוא.

Instead of ליער (2:14) the LXX. has εἰς μαρτύριον, concerning which Jerome observed, "LXX. posuerunt testimonium, Reš et Daleth literarum falsi similitudine." This seems probable, since Yôdh (י) might easily be obliterated.

In 10:14 for בית ארְבֵּאל the LXX. has ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Ἰεροβοάμ; variant, Ἰεροβαάλ. The latter reading is that of the Alex. and Sin. MSS.; it is also the one Jerome gives for the reading of the LXX. It would seem then that ארְבֵּאל was read רִבְאֵל through confusion of א and י, perhaps also א and ע, while בית was translated. Possibly a confusion of Zalmunna with שִׁלְמֹן may have led to the peculiar reading here, referring to Jerubaal, mentioned in the same passage, viz., Judg. 8. Jerome endeavored to explain the reading from this, but the reference is to a place, not to a person. The passage in the Hebrew awaits a satisfactory explanation.

In 4:12 כִּי רוּחַ = πνεῦματι of the LXX. The reading was probably כ for כִּי and this the more readily since הַתְּעָה is without an object, unless the reading was הַתְּעָם as in some MSS.,* and is translated freely.

In 10:2; 5:15 and 14:1 אִשָּׁם is translated by ἀφανίζω. The translator probably read שָׁמַם. Cf. 2:12 and 5:9, where the forms from שָׁמַם are translated by derivatives of ἀφανίζω. It is possible, however, that the translator may have connected these two roots in some such way as Schmoller, whose opinion was that from the idea of suffering punishment comes the idea of being desolated, waste.

* Davidson's *Hebrew Text*. London. P. 123.

In 7:6 for אָפְהִים the LXX. has Ἐφραίμ, which is not easy to explain unless the reading of the MS. was אִפְהִים and this was confused with the form אִפְרַיִם in some way. Perhaps the left foot of הָ was obliterated and then the remaining form and Yôdh were transposed, or רַ may have been read for י, since these letters were sometimes confused in the old characters.* Compare also מִים for מָדַם, 6:8.

In 11:4 the LXX. has ὡς ῥαπίζων ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ τὰς σιαγόνας αὐτοῦ for the Hebrew כְּמַרְטִי עַל עַל לְחִיָּהּ, reading כְּמַרְטִי עַל and omitting one עַל: this is taken as a threat; cf. Isa. 50:6. The context shows it to be wrong. Ἄνθρωπος is used indefinitely, as several times.

In 8:6 ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ arose probably from confusing כִּי with בַּ and thus ׀ would seem a repetition or was obscured perhaps. בַּ and ׀, however, are very similar in the old "square" characters and may have been confused in the MSS.

Other examples of such confusion of letters may be seen in the following: אַם = עַם 4:14; לְעֵדָתָם = לְצֵרֵתָם 7:12; חֶקֶךָ שֶׁפָּר = חֶק כַּעֲפָר 8:1; יִרְעֵם = יִרְעֵם 9:2; יִשְׂרָאֵל = יִשְׂרָאֵל 10:11; לְפִי = לְפִי 10:12; שָׂר = שָׂר 10:14. Cf. also the more doubtful וַיִּשְׂם = וַיִּשְׂם 13:1; אִשְׁרֵנוּ = אִשְׁרֵנוּ 14:9; רִקֵּב = קֵטֵב 5:12 (cf. 13:14?).

X. Very peculiar are the variations in the translation of the particles. In many cases the variation may be affected by the context as in the case of כִּי which is frequently translated by ὅτι and διότι but after a negative by ἀλλά. But as an accurate knowledge of the use of particles seems to be one of the last attainments in the study of a language, the translator is not to be censured if he allow the context as he understands it to determine the force of a particle. This our translator seems to have done always, rather than to have used the particles at any time as an aid in discovering the meaning of a particular passage. The following groupings of the translations of prepositions, conjunctions, etc., will serve to show this:

כַּאֲשֶׁר = καθὼς ἄν, 7:12; ὅν τρόπον, 9:13.
 אַחֲרַי (אַחֲרַי) = ὀπίσω generally, but μετὰ ταῦτα, 3:5.
 אֶךְ = ἄρα, 12:12; πλὴν, 12:9; ὅπως, 4:4(?).
 יַחַד = ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, 11:8; יַחַד = ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, 2:2.
 לֹא = οὐ and οὐ μή frequently; ἤ, 6:6.
 עַל כֵּן } διὰ τοῦτο, 4:3, etc. Cf. לֵכֵן also, 2:8, 16, etc.
 } ἔνεκα, 13:6.

* Cf. Wellhausen's *Der Text der Buecher Samuelis*. Göttingen, 1872. Pp. 18 and 169.

כִּי	{ ὅτι and διότι, general. ἀλλ' ἦ, 1:6; 7:14. διὰ τοῦτο, 8:10; 9:6. ὅταν, 4:14. }	{ ἐκ, general. ἀπό, 2:20; 5:3, etc. διά, 8:4. }		
			כִּן	
ב	{ ἐν, general. ἐπί, 2:25; 3:5, etc. εἰς, 4:7; 5:5, etc. }	{ μετά, 6:2. μή, 2:11(?). εἰς, 7:4. ἦ, 2:9; 6:6. }		
			כ	
				{ ὡς, general. καθὼς, 2:5; 3:1, etc. κατὰ, 2:17; 4:7, etc. οὕτως, 4:9. }
{ ἐπί, general. κατὰ, 7:13; 8:1. ἐν, 7:14. διά, 9:15. }				
	אל			
		{ πρὸς, general. ἐπί, 3:3; 3:5, etc. εἰς, 7:15; 8:1, etc. ἐν, 4:8. }		
ל				
	{ dative general. genitive, 1:9; 2:14, etc. εἰς, 2:14; 2:21, etc. }			
		{ πρὸς, 5:1. ἐπί, 2:20; 3:3. ἐν, 9:5. }		
עם				
	{ μετά, general. πρὸς, 4:1; 12:3, etc. }			

Perhaps a table of some of the Greek particles with their equivalents in Hebrew, according to the translation, may be of interest in showing the peculiarities in an even more striking way.

ὅπως	=	<u>אך</u> , 4:4	למען (8:3)
ὅπως ἂν	=	<u>פן</u> , 2:5(?)	ὅπως μή = כל (? לא), 14:3
διότι καὶ ἐάν	=	<u>אם</u> כִּי (9:12)	גם כִּי (9:16)
ἐν	=	<u>ב</u> * ל	על בקרב (5:4; 11:9)
εἰς	=	ב ל	כמו (8:12)
ἐπί	=	ב ל	<u>על</u> אל
πρὸς	=	ב ל	<u>על</u> אל
κατὰ	=	ב ל	עם אל
μετά	=	ב ל	על ב
διὰ	=	ב ל	עם מן
ἀπό	=	<u>מן</u> מתחת (4:12)	על מן
μή	=	<u>אל</u> לא	על מן
διὰ τοῦτο	=	<u>לכן</u> על כן	כִּי
πλὴν	=	<u>אך</u> (12:9)	זולתי (13:4)
ἐάν	=	<u>אם</u> (9:12)	אולי (8:7)
			οὕτως = ב
			גם כִּי (8:10)

* The equivalent most frequently used is underscored; in most cases the references in the above table suffice.

Thus the majority of the variations which may be attributed to the translator have been considered, and the general character of the translation in cases in which the text underlying it was similar to the Massoretic text, has been noted. It has been seen that passages in which the Greek text is corrupt or doubtful, are of such a nature, usually, as to indicate that they should not be used in textual study. The cases of free translation are such as may readily be detected, either in the peculiar reading or difficulty of the passage, or in the approximate sense expressed. Most of these are of such a nature that, if held to indicate difference of recension, one could only substitute a word related in meaning to that in the text.

Interesting cases of the use of the same Greek word for different Hebrew words, such as ἀνταποδίδωμι for שָׁלַם in 9:8 and 14:3, for שׁוּב in 4:9; 12:2,14; and different Greek words for the same Hebrew word, as חָבַל = διαφθορά, 11:4, and ὠδίνες, 13:13, which is used for בָּטָן, 9:11, show that the translator, not always influenced by a desire for uniformity, simply expressed what he regarded as the sense of a particular passage.

There are also slight traces of local influence in the translation as the probable reference to ῥαβδομαγεία, a sort of divination among the Greeks, in 4:12; also a reference to the rites of Venus and other deities in the τετελεσμέναι of 4:14. In both cases, however, the translation is fair and may have no reference to customs of the Greeks. But after having attributed to the translation all that can fairly be considered as belonging to it, in accordance with the general disposition or tendency of the translator,—his evident fairness of intention,—there still remains a number of variations unexplained.

DOUBTFUL CASES.

There is a number of variations the character of which is doubtful. One cannot say positively that they are due to difference of recension, but they seem to be due to this. In some cases the readings are certainly not as good as those given in the Massoretic text, but at the same time they bear evidence of having been translated from Hebrew, while in other cases they are much better than the received reading.

I. Under this division additions may be considered first.

1. No great stress can be laid on the addition of a letter or particle, yet there are a few cases in which such an addition gives a different and often a good reading.

In 2:13 the connective *καί* occurs between all except the first two nouns. Why not here? If the translator inserted it, why not between each word as in 1:1 and 2:7? If this difference is recensional, perhaps in the original construction the words following כל מְשׁוּשָׁה were adverbial accusatives as Briggs seems to take

them in the translation, "And I will cause all her mirth to cease in her feasts (and) her new moons and her sabbaths and all her festivals."* It is in fact the *mirth* of these feasts that is the prominent idea. Cf. Amos 8:10; Isa. 58:13. Adopting this construction of the passage, Cheyne's observation, that the sabbath did not pass away, becomes unnecessary.

In 13:13 **יִלְרָה חֲבִלִי** = ὠδίνες ὡς τικτούσης. It is difficult to determine whether ὡς is inserted to relieve the difficulty of the sudden change to the representation of Ephraim as a son immediately following, or is due to difference in MSS. It seems scarcely probable, if the translator had inserted it, that he would have been so exact in retaining the construct relation, with the particle intervening, though this construction may occur in Hebrew.

In 4:19 **מִזְבְּחוֹתֵם** = ἐκ τῶν θυσιαστηρίων αὐτῶν. If this is to be taken as it usually is, it is the only instance of such a plural for **זֶבֶח**. The reading of the LXX., **מִמִּזְבְּחוֹתֵם**, or perhaps with **ם** omitted in order to avoid the repetition of the same sound, is better. So Hitzig, citing Zech. 14:10, etc.

In 10:15, for **כָּכָה עֲשֵׂה לָכֶם בֵּית-אֵל**, the LXX. has οὕτως ποιήσω ὑμῖν, οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. The addition of an **א** before **עֲשֵׂה** and **יִשְׂר** before **אֵל** would give the reading at the basis of the LXX., viz., **אֵעֲשֵׂה לָכֶם בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל**, which gives good sense here. Why should Bethel be represented as doing this and not Yahweh? Cf. 10:11; 11:1, etc. Ewald made Yahweh, understood, the subject of **עֲשֵׂה** and **בֵּית-אֵל** accusative of place. However, οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ may have arisen from taking it as synonymous with the Hebrew, in its meaning, *house of God*; the other is generally **בֵּית אֵל**.

Other additions of this nature are *οὐδέ* in 1:7 (some MSS. have **וּבְסוּסִים**); *ἐτι*, 1:8; *ὡς*, 5:1, and *ὅτι*, 5:6.

2. There are also cases in which a word, phrase or even sentence is found in the Greek but not in the Hebrew. In 2:25 for **אֱלֹהֵי** the reading of the LXX. is *Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἶ σύ*, requiring **יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אַתָּה**, and this carries out the parallelism, giving a better balance of clauses, as well as a better meaning. Other gods are spoken of, as in 3:1, but Yahweh is the distinctive God of the Israelites.

In 6:1 the LXX. has *λέγοντες* as an addition. With this the Targum and the Peshitta agree, but in the connection it might be inserted in interpretation legitimately, and so one cannot say that the difference is recensional; nor of the addition *τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν* after *πρὸς κύριον* for **אֵל יְהוָה** can one say much more, though it is probable, as in 2:25, that the full expression occurred here.

In 13:4 a most peculiar and remarkable passage is found in the Greek, viz., *ἐγὼ δὲ κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὁ στερεῶν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ κτίζων γῆν, οὗ αἱ χεῖρες ἐκτίσαν πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὰν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οὐ παρέδειξά σοι αὐτὰ τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνήγαγον*

* *Messianic Prophecy*. New York, 1886. P. 170; (and) is inserted.

σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου κ.τ.λ. For this Newcome* has given the following Hebrew, which he supposes to have been the basis of the LXX., viz.,

ואנכי יהוה אלהיך
 נטה שמים וברא ארץ
 ידי עשו כל צבא השמים
 ולא הריתיך אתם ללכת אחריהם
 ואנכי מעלך מארץ מצרים
 ואלהים וגו'

The omission in the Hebrew he thought might have arisen through the carelessness of the scribes, passing from one **ואנכי** to the other. For *ἀνῆγαγον* he has the participle **מעלך** which is possible, though not what a retranslation of the Greek requires; in Ps. 81:11 the LXX. has the form *ἀναγαγόν* for **המעלך**. The Greek here requires **העליתך** though in this place perhaps the participle is better. The passage gives evidence of having been translated from Hebrew by the Hebraisms which it contains. The occurrence of the article in *τὸν οὐρανόν* and its omission in *κτίσεων γῆν* is peculiar. The position of the indirect object *σοι* when not emphatic is peculiar in Greek, but regular in Hebrew. However, if the passage did occur in the MS. before the translator it certainly is not from the hand of the Prophet. Sabaism among the Israelites is not mentioned until the time of Manasseh. At all events its influence came too late for Hosea's notice and moreover this is the only mention of it in the book, and it is not to be supposed that one of so intense a spirit as Hosea, would have been satisfied with giving it such a simple and passing notice as this. As to *ἀνῆγαγον* it may be noted that in this place it gives a better balance of clauses to retain it; in 12:10, however, it is not so well retained. Other cases of this nature are found in the occurrence of *γῆς* before *Αἰγύπτου* for **ממצרים**, 12:14; cf. 12:10 and 13:4; *θεὸν ἰμῶν*, 14:3, cf. 6:1; *αὐτούς* after *εὐρη* for **תמצא**, 2:9.

Some of the additions are cases in which a clause seems to be repeated from another verse, but one cannot say whether this was a copyist's error in the MS. from which the translation was made or is due to a Greek copyist. In 2:14 the addition *καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὰ ἐρπετὰ τῆς γῆς* is perhaps made by a copyist in order to assimilate it to verse 20, but one expects the promise to be wider than the threat of punishment. There can be no motive on the part of a copyist for the omission in Hebrew. In 8:13, *καὶ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις ἀκάθαρτα φάγονται* is probably taken from 9:3. With the addition *καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἐρπετοῖς τῆς γῆς* (4:3) cf. 2:14,20.

II. There was, no doubt, on the part of early translators and copyists, a

* *Critical Version of the Minor Prophets.* (In loco.)

tendency to make slight additions by way of explanation, etc., but there are also omissions which are not so readily explained.

In 10:10 for the Hebrew **בְּאִסְרָם . . . בְּאִתּוֹתַי וְאִסְרָם** the LXX. has (*ῆλθε**) *παιδεύσαι αὐτούς . . . ἐν τῷ παιδεύεσθαι αὐτούς*; the Vulgate, “cum corripientur propter duas iniquitates suas”; the Peshitta, **ܘܥܣܪܘܢ ܥܘܠܘܬܝܗܘܢ ܘܥܣܪܘܢ ܥܘܠܘܬܝܗܘܢ**. **בְּאִתּוֹתַי** seems to have been taken wrongly from **בּוֹא**, but the important point in this connection is in the last clause. The form on which the above translations of this clause are based must have been **בְּהוֹסְרָם** and this in connection with “iniquities” (undoubtedly the correct translation here) gives a good sense. This verb and **וְאִסְרָם** seem to have the same meaning and as Ewald observed **אִסַּר** in force is weak and obscure.

In 7:14, 15 for **וְזִרְעֵתֶם הִזְקֵתִי הִסְרֵתִי וְאֲנִי יְסֹרֵר בִּי** the LXX. is *ἐπαδεδύθησαν ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ γὰρ κατίσχυσα τοὺς βραχίονας αὐτῶν*, evidently omitting either **יְסֹרֵר** or **הִסְרֵתִי**. The translation requires as its basis **בִּי יְסֹרֵר**, very similar to the end of the previous verse, and the clauses of this verse are better balanced without **בִּי יְסֹרֵר**. **הִסְרֵתִי** is probably a corruption by repetition of the preceding letters. For, in addition to the peculiar association of these two verbs with the same object, what can **הִסְרֵתִי** mean in connection with **וְזִרְעֵתֶם**? Probably the basis of the LXX. was **יְסֹרֵר בִּי וְאֲנִי הִזְקֵתִי**.

In 4:18 the LXX. *ἠγάπησαν* for **וְאֶהְבֵּב הֵבוּ** gives no equivalent, but of course it is impossible to give an exact translation and so **הֵבוּ** may have been omitted. It seems more probable, however, that it is a repetition of the last three letters of **וְאֶהְבֵּב** by a copyist.

In 9:14 for **מֵה תַתֵּן תֵּן לָהֶם** the LXX. has *τί δώσεις αὐτοῖς*; variant, add *δὸς αὐτοῖς*. **תֵּן** is perhaps a copyist's repetition of the last two letters of **תַתֵּן**; it is supported, however, by one reading of the Greek, but this may be a correction.

III. There are also certain variations in number, person, gender, etc., which often give a good reading but yet are of a doubtful character. Such may be seen in 12:5, where, for **וְיִתְחַנַּן לּוֹ בֵּיתְאֵל יִמְצְאוּ**, the LXX. has *καὶ ἐδέθησάν μου, ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ὡν εὐροσάν με*, a strange variation for which there seems to be no good explanation unless it is connected with the substitution of *οἴκῳ Ὡν* for **בֵּיתְאֵל**, which may best be considered then in this connection, though not properly belonging here. About the time the translation was made and before this certain “tendency changes”† are said to have been made, such as, **בֵּיתְאֵל** for **בֵּיתְאֵל**, **מִזְבֵּחַ** for **מִזְבֵּחַ**; cf. p. 211. Elsewhere in the book **בֵּיתְאֵל** is found, but here the historical reference demands **בֵּיתְאֵל**. However, one cannot say whether this is due to the translator or to the MS. which he used, and the other variations are probably connected with this. At the end *πρὸς αὐτούς* for **עִמָּנוּ**, as Cheyne

* This occurred in some codices and seems to have been in the original for anyone, inserting later to make it agree with the Hebrew, would certainly have inserted the correct translation.

† See Geiger's *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, pp. 259-433. Breslau, 1857.

observes, was probably for עָמוּ. When used of the community the singular suffix is often translated by the plural, and so the LXX. may have taken it here. The Peshitta, which otherwise does not agree with the LXX., has **ܚܚܘ** and this suits the context better.

In 13:8 the Hebrew is **וְאִכְלִים שָׁם כָּל־בְּיָא**; the LXX., *καὶ καταφάγονται αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ σκύμνοι δρυμοῦ*; the Peshitta, **ܐܝܢܐ ܠܚܘܟܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܠܚܘܟܐ**. Sebök thinks they may have read **וְאִכְלִים** or **וְאִכְלִים** (the latter, if the person is changed, gives the proper consecution in tense, though the form in the text following in the same person as the preceding verbs may be regarded as coördinate with these), **כ** before **לְבִיא** being erased. He also takes the preceding verbs in the first person as establishing the Massoretic text; however, it is to be noted that the following verb is in the third person, and this arrangement would make the first two and the second two agree.

In 2:8 for **רִיבְךָ** the LXX. is *τῆν ὁδὸν αὐτῆς*; the Peshitta, **ܪܝܒܟܐ**. Preceding and following this the third person is used, and such a change is hardly justifiable, even in Hosea, where the change is not infrequent. **רִיבְךָ** "has nothing but difficulty in its favor" (Briggs).

In 4:8 for **נַפְשֵׁן** the LXX. has *τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν*; the Peshitta, **ܢܦܫܘܬܐ**; the Vulgate, "animas eorum;" Symmachus and Theodotion, *ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν*. Thus the versions as well as some MSS. read **נַפְשֵׁם** and this is demanded by the context. However, see page 197. Compare also **יִכְרַתוּ** = **יִכְרַת**, note **ו** following, 12:2; **בַּה** = **בַּם**, 9:2.

IV. There is also a number of cases in which a substitution of one part of speech for another or a variation of expression is such that it is difficult to determine whether the reading is due to difference of MSS. or to the translator. There may be noted,

1. Cases of the variation of a word or expression, as in 1:7, where, for the Hebrew **וְאֶת־בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה**, the LXX. has *τοὺς δὲ υἱοὺς Ἰούδα*, requiring **וְאֶת־בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה**, which was probably in the MS. before the translator. Both expressions occur in Hebrew for the same idea, and in the Greek *οἶκος* may be used, as well as the expression here used, to convey this idea, viz., that of posterity. There is a score of places in the Bible where this interchange occurs, the LXX. having one form and the Hebrew the other. Perhaps these may be recensional; they may, however, be explained as due to the translator's desire for variety of expression, as the use of *ἀγαπάω* for **רָחַם** in 2:25 (where, however, the variant *ἐλέεω* agrees with that in 2:3,6) must be explained. Similar to the foregoing is the variation in 2:1, **יֹאמֶר לָהֶם לֹא עַמִּי אַתֶּם יֹאמֶר לָהֶם בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים**; *ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς οὐ λαὸς μου ὑμεῖς, κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ κ.τ.λ.* If exact, the translation of the second verb requires **יִקְרָא**. For such variation compare Isa. 62:4 and 32:5, where, however, the LXX. in the first passage translates both words by *καλέω*, the last by *εἶπον* in both forms.

In 3:4 for **מצבה** the LXX. is *θυσιαστηρίον* = **מזבח**. Sebök explains the variation as due to the confusion of letters, ז for צ and ח for ה, or as a "tendency change." This latter seems more probable. Professor Ladd observes, "The effect from the dislike of idols and their surroundings may be seen in the change by the later Jews of the word **מצבה**—sacred stone images which served as altars but which were regarded as objectionable, although they appear in Genesis as used by the Patriarchs, often consecrated to the service of Jehovah,—into **מזבח**."* The Professor shows by a comparison of 2 Kgs. 3:2 with 1 Kgs. 16:32 that **מצבה** is the original in the latter; he also observes that the verb **קום** does not well apply to **מזבח** but to **מצבה**; cf. Deut. 16:22.

The peculiar translation of **אפור ותרפים** by the LXX. *ιερατείας οὐδὲ δῆλων*, may possibly be attributed to the same cause. If not, the translator may have taken **אפור** in its usual meaning as an article of sacerdotal dress, and this then as the insignia of priesthood, and connected with this the Urim and Thummim which *δῆλος* represents elsewhere (Thummim, Deut. 33:8; Urim, Num. 27:21 and 1 Kgs. 28:6). It may, however, be a free translation of **תרפים** as giving knowledge of things doubtful and hidden. In such cases there is too little basis for decision.

In 2:16 **אנכי מפתיה** = LXX. *ἐγὼ πλανῶ*. **פתה** is here taken in the bad sense and so Cheyne's citation of Ps. 107:40, where this word is the translation of **תעה**, hardly seems necessary, though this same verb is used for **תעה** in 4:12 and possibly occurred here. However, **פתה** is thus translated in Ezek. 14:9 and Prov. 1:10.

In 8:11 for the Hebrew **לחטא** the LXX. is *ἡγαπημένα*, requiring **אהובים(?)**, and this is better than the repetition of **לחטא** which may be a corruption from **לאהבה(?)**.

In 13:6 **שבעו** = LXX. *εἰς πληθυσμὸν* = **לשבעה**?; cf. p. 209, for **בית-אל**, 12:5.

2. Cases in which the variation may be due to a confusion of consonants.

In 5:2 for **ושחטה שטים העמיקו ואני מוסר לכלם** the LXX. is *ὁ οἱ ἀγρεύοντες τὴν θήραν κατέπηξαν. ἐγὼ δὲ παιδεύτης ὑμῶν*; the Peshitta, **ܘܫܚܬܐ ܫܬܝܡ ܗܥܡܝܩܘ ܘܐܢܝ ܡܘܫܪ ܠܟܠܡ**. The Massoretic text is so peculiar that one is inclined to look with favor on the versions of the LXX. and Peshitta, which carry on the figure of the preceding verse. But it is very difficult to determine what was the basis of these readings. *ἀγρεύω* occurs twice for **צוד**, though Trommius† gives **נאה** for this word in Job 10:16, while in Prov. 6:25 it occurs possibly for **לקח**. With only these few and doubtful cases one cannot easily find what was the basis here. *θήρα* is usually the translation of **ציד**, cf. Gen. 25:28; 27:4; and it seems

* *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*. New York. Vol. I., p. 607.

† *Concordantiae Graecae in Septuaginta, etc.* Amsterdam 1718, p. 18.

probable that צור (cf. Peshitta) was not the basis here or it would have been translated by *θηρεώ*. Moreover the peculiar position of the relative and the construction here is unexpected. The variation may be explained, though unsatisfactorily, by the confusion of letters, צי = ש, ר = ה and ס for ט, צירים(?), לכם = לכ(ל)ם. It is easier, however, with Sebök to suppose a confusion of sound in which הצירים = השטים. The MSS. seem to have been obscure here. Compare that preceding, viz., at the end of ch. 4; cf. p. 214.

In 9:13 for the Hebrew לצור שתולה בנוה the LXX. has *εἰς θήραν παρέστησαν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν*, simplifying the difficult Massoretic reading, and with slight alteration, giving a fair parallelism. However, there has been a confusion of letters, etc., and as the reading involves the unexpected change from בניהם in the first part to בניו in the second, also the use of ציד in a sense in which it does not occur elsewhere so far as I have been able to learn, it may be due to the translator. The form שתולה = שתול(ה) in this reading.

In 9:7 for the Hebrew ידעו ישראל אויל הנביא the LXX. has *καὶ κακωθήσεται Ἰσραὴλ ὡς περὶ ὁ προφήτης κ.τ.λ.* The difficulty of the Massoretic text renders the translation doubtful. The LXX. seems not to have had אויל and this may be a repetition of the last letters of the preceding word; however, as אויל is frequently translated by *κακόν* it may be contained in *κακωθήσεται*, which requires ירעו for ירעו. הנביא in this reading would be כנביא. The idea then is that at that time Israel will be humiliated as the prophet is now. The last clause of the verse is probably altered to render the verb conformable with the previous עונך. *ἐπληθύνθη* for רבה is better syntax than the A.V., viz., "great hatred." According to the received reading of this verse, as Cheyne suggests, it is necessary to supply some introductory words if the idea of reproach is conveyed. But if the true prophets are referred to, in what sense is ירעו used?

In 11:4 for the Hebrew ואת אוכיל לא וגו' the LXX. has *καὶ ἐπιβλέψομαι πρὸς αὐτόν, δυνήσομαι αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.* The peculiar form אוכיל may have misled the translator, and even if it comes from אכל an object would be expected. This and the fact that לא at the beginning of the following verse is inconsistent with 8:13; 9:3,6; 11:11, unless indeed one admit with Kuenen* that the prophet contradicts himself, favors the reading לו which interchange with לא is not infrequent in the קרי and כתוב, and this with אוכיל is no more difficult than the peculiar use of the word. *ἐπιβλέψομαι* may be a free translation of את or אביט(?). The misconception of the preceding part of the verse (cf. p. 204) is shown here also, but this does not greatly affect it for the purpose here considered.

In 5:11 for צו the LXX. has *τῶν ματαίων = שוא*, which is frequently translated by *μάταιος*.† If צו were the form the article would be expected. The

* *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*. London, 1877. P. 158.

† Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen*, p. 411, regards *ματαίων* as a free translation of צו (Vulgate), which was changed to צו on account of offensiveness.

error of a scribe would be the more easy, since the initial letters of **וּאֲנִי** are the same as the last letters of **שׁוֹאֵי** (Secker).

In 9:3 for the Hebrew **וְיִשָּׁב אַפְרַיִם מִצְרַיִם** the LXX. has *κατέφηκεν Ἐφραΐμ Αἴγυπτου* and this carries out the contrast with the first part of the verse very well, but possibly it is a confusion of **י** for **י** since the conjunction would be expected here. Cf. also 14:8, **יִשְׁבִּי** = *καθιόνται* = **יִשְׁבוּ** (?).

In 7:1 **כִּרְפָּאִי** = *Ἐν τῷ ἰάσασθαι με* = **כִּרְפָּאִי** (?). Cf. 6:11.

V. Closely connected with the preceding are a few cases of transposition of letters and words as in 8:13, where, for **וּזְבַחֵי הַבְּהֵמִי יִזְבְּחוּ בִשְׂרָר וַיֹּאכְלוּ**, the LXX. has *διότι ἐὰν θύσωσι θυσίαν καὶ φάγωσι κρέα*. The Hebrew is peculiar and difficult, if indeed it is Hebrew at all. Usually the LXX. follows the Hebrew order, especially in difficult passages, and the translation here would indicate that the Hebrew at the basis of it was, **כִּי אִם יִזְבְּחוּ זֶבַח יֹאכְלוּ בִשְׂרָר**, which gives the same arrangement of clauses as the received reading, or even better than this. **יִזְבְּחוּ הַבְּהֵמִי** looks very much like a peculiar repetition of the letters in **זֶבַח** slightly altered, viz., **ה** for **ח**. For the use of **אִם כִּי** cf. 9:12 (LXX.); cf. also **כִּי גַם**, 9:16.

In 6:3 for the Hebrew **כַּמְלֶקֶשׁ יוֹרָה אֶרֶץ** the LXX. has *πρώμος καὶ ὄψιμος γῆ*, and this order requires **יֹרָה וּמְלֶקֶשׁ (ל) אֶרֶץ**, taking **יֹרָה** as a noun as the A.V. also. The arrangement would then be similar to that in Joel 2:23, but the usual order may be taken because the word is taken as a noun, though this is not probable.

In 7:16 for the Hebrew **יִשׁוּבוּ לֹא עַל** the LXX. has *ἀπεστράφησαν εἰς οὐδέν*; the Peshitta, **לֹא מַחֲזֵק**. These versions give little help here; they seem to have taken these two words in the reverse order, viz., **עַל לֹא**, unless the sense is "to the not high one," "no god" (Gesenius), which is not probable. In the former case **לֹא** would hardly be used as this arrangement requires. Williams' conjecture, **לֹא אֵיךְ**,* is also impossible.

In 13:10 for the Hebrew **אֲחִי מַלְכֵךְ אֶפְרַיִם** the LXX. has *πῶ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου οὗτος*; which is a fair translation, taking **אֲחִי** as an interrogative, and it seems probable that the letters **י** and **ח** have been transposed, the original being **אֵיךְ**, and this is confirmed by **אֶפְרַיִם**, which would naturally follow **אֵיךְ** as an enclitic, but is peculiar after **אֲחִי**. The form **אֲחִי** would arise the more easily since it occurs in v. 7 and elsewhere. The forms in v. 14 were probably **אֵיךְ** also. So the versions in 13:10.

In 13:15 there is clearly a transposition of letters, **אֶרְצוֹ** for **אֲרֻצֵּר**, but amiss.

RECENSIONAL VARIATIONS.

There are still other variations of a different nature from those already considered. These are of such a character that they can only be explained by

* *The Hebrew Prophets*. London, 1866. *In loco*.

supposing the translator to have used a MS. differing somewhat from the MSS. underlying the present Massoretic text. An examination of these cases will show this. There may be noted,

I. Additions.

In 4:17 for הַנְּחִילֶיךָ the LXX. has ἔθηκεν ἑαυτῷ σκάνδαλα. Nowack and Simson regard this as an interpretation in explanation of the preceding עֲצָבִים, but as Ewald perceived there is an incompleteness in the verse as it now stands, "And Ephraim shall not be left with his idols as is strongly enough expressed, v. 19." The sentiment too is foreign to the spirit of Hosea and especially so if satirical. This also is against the reading of Ewald, viz., "the scandal giveth him restoration." He supposes some such word as מִכְשׁוֹל to have dropped out of the text and vocalizes הַנְּחִי. It seems better, however, to vocalize הַנְּחִי, which is used of the setting up of idols (cf. Isa. 46:7 and 2 Kgs. 17:29), and to construe (? מִכְשׁוֹלִים) as object of the verb. Thus the reading would be, *Ephraim is joined to idols, he hath set a stumbling-block for himself.* The last clause then carries out the idea preceding and gives good parallelism; note also the connection with the following verse according to the LXX.

In 4:18 for אַהֲבוּ (הַבִּי) קֶלֶן מַגְנִיָּה the LXX. has ἠγάπησαν ἀτιμίαν ἐκ φρονήματος αὐτῆς. By the addition of a letter (א) and a change of pointing, a variant, and in this case a much better reading, is obtained. The MSS. underlying the Massoretic text seem to have been corrupted or obscure in this place as the peculiar Hebrew and variations of the LXX. in the last verses of this chapter as well as the opening of the next chapter indicate. The Hebrew of this clause is certainly very peculiar, but accepting a suggestion of the LXX., an excellent reading is obtained. Hermann* pointed out the fact that though the present reading of the LXX. gives no fit sense, yet a restoration of that which was its basis gives a form susceptible of a good translation: he suggests מְנֹאֲוִיָּה with the translation "sie lieben Schande mehr als ihre Ehre." Cheyne favors this correction, referring גִּאֲוֹן to Yahweh, the Pride of Israel, her God. Cf. Zech. 11:3. He would then translate "they love infamy rather than her Excellency." The peculiarity of the Greek shows that the translator was following Hebrew.

II. There are also a few cases of omission which indicate that certain letters and words were not in the MS. before the translator.

In 2:23 for the Hebrew אַעֲנֶה נָאִים יְהוָה אֵינָה אֶת הַשְּׂמִיִּם the LXX. has λέγει κύριος ἑπακούσομαι τῷ οὐρανῷ. The first אַעֲנֶה occurs unexpectedly here in the Hebrew and evidently was not in the MS. before the translator, for it is not his tendency to omit.

In 8:2 for לִי יִעֲקֹב אֱלֹהֵי יִדְעֲנֹךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל the LXX. has ἐμὲ κερᾶζονται Ὁ θεὸς ἐγνώκαμέν σε. יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs in a peculiar position and is probably taken from the following verse; a copyist's error, since there can be no reason for its omission.

* Studien und Kritiken. 1879. P. 517.

In 14:3 for the Hebrew וּנְשַׁלְמָה פְּרִים שְׁפִתָּינוּ the LXX. has *καὶ ἀνταποδόσομεν καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν*. Here the omission of a letter causes an important change and relieves a clumsy construction of the Hebrew. The difficulty of the received reading is the only thing in its favor, if indeed the construction is justifiable. But it is just such peculiarities that a careful study of the LXX., and restoration of the text underlying it, will show to be incorrect readings. The proposal of Newcome to read פְּרִי after the LXX. relieves the difficulty and receives some confirmation also from Heb. 13:15, where the connection points to this passage rather than Isa. 57:19. This does not occur in the LXX. of Isa. 57:19, and נֵיב is not translated by *καρπός*. The Peshitta also, departing from the LXX. and Massoretic text in other particulars, agrees with the LXX. in reading פְּרִי. The explanation of this variation given by Pococke, shows to what conjectures one is driven by the theory that the translation of the LXX. is based on the same MSS. as those underlying the Massoretic text, or rather that there were no variations in the MSS. He observed, 'For this end I conceive that *καρπός* here is by the Greek taken in the same notion that *κάρπωμα* or *κάρπωσις* is by them elsewhere used, viz., for a whole burnt offering, which usually the Rabbins tell us were some of them called קִיץ לַמִּזְבֵּחַ, the *καρπός* or summer fruit of the altar, so were such free-will offerings, they say, called; because they were to the altar as summer fruits to a table after a banquet.*'

III. There are also some cases of variation through change of person, number, etc. The character of these is here considered.

In 12:9 for **כָּל יְגִיעֵי לֹא יִמְצְאוּ לִי עוֹן אִשֶּׁר חָטָא** the LXX. has *πάντες οἱ πόνοι αὐτοῦ οὐχ ἐνρεθίσονται αὐτῷ, δι' ἀδικίας δὲ ἡμαρτεν*. When **מִצָּא** is used of discovering a fault it is usually followed by **בְּ** of person; but it is often used with **לְ** in the sense "to suffice," and this gives a better sense here, adopting the suffix of the third person for the first in **יְגִיעֵי**. Thus Cheyne, "(but) all his profits will not suffice for (i. e., to expiate) the guilt which he has incurred," reading **לֹא יִמְצְאוּ לְעוֹן אִשֶּׁר חָטָא**; but this is a rather forced meaning, (to expiate?), and it seems better to follow the LXX., reading **לֹא יִמְצְאוּ לִי** and putting the preposition **עַל** (cf. 9:15) before **עוֹן** thus it would read **כָּל יְגִיעֵי לֹא יִמְצְאוּ לוֹ עַל עוֹן אִשֶּׁר חָטָא**, i. e., *all his profits will not suffice him because of the guilt which he has incurred*. This gives the same connection with the next verse as the reading suggested by Cheyne as it also gets "rid of the unnatural distinction supposed above between 'iniquity' and 'sin.'"

In 11:3 for **וְאֵנֹכִי תְרַגְלֹתִי לְאִפְרַיִם קָחַם עַל זִרְעֹתַי** the LXX. has *καὶ ἐγὼ συνεπόδισα τὸν Ἐφραΐμ, ἀνέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονά μου*; the Vulgate, "portabam eos in bracheis meis"; the Peshitta, **וְאֵנֹכִי חָבַסְתִּי בְּרַחְטֵי מְרַגְלֵי מְרַגְלֵי מְרַגְלֵי**. Of the peculiar forms **תְרַגְלֹתִי** and **קָחַם** one cannot say much except to note

* *Theological Works*. London, 1740. Vol. II., p. 684.

that the translation of these forms is such as to indicate, at least, that the Hebrew was followed, and so the following may be relied upon as accurate. *συνεπόδισα* is evidently an effort to translate the root רגל, though influenced by the conception of the following verse. Cappelle* justifies it by making it equal to “attemperare pedem.” The form קחם, however, is anomalous and according to the translations was at least taken as the equivalent of לקחתים, and this must have been the original since קחם cannot be explained as an infinitive or participle. At all events the translation “taking them by their arms,” A.V., is contrary to the use of על and it also involves the difficulty already mentioned, while “he took them on his arms” (R.V. margin) involves a sudden change of person as well as philological objections. It seems better, therefore, with Cheyne, Nowack and others, to read על זרועת' לקחתים (?), “I took them up in my arms.” Cf. R.V., also Isa. 63:9.

In 2:18 for the Hebrew תקראי אישי ולא תקראי לי the LXX. has καλέσει με for both; the Vulgate, “vocabit me,” for both; the Peshitta, لعنه لعنه for both. The Hebrew, strangely, has the verbs in the second person and omits לי after the first verb, though two codices have it.† The LXX., as indicated, translates both clauses in the same way and the verb is in the third person, agreeing with that preceding and following. The Vulgate, seldom agreeing with the LXX., is confirmatory here.

Similar to this is a peculiar change in 5:3, where, for כי עתה הזנית אפרים נטמא ישראל the LXX. has διότι νῦν ἐξέπórνευσεν Ἐφραΐμ, ἐμίανθη Ἰσραήλ; the Peshitta, ܟܝ ܥܬܗ ܗܙܢܝܬ ܐܦܪܝܡ ܢܬܡܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܠ; the Vulgate, “quia nunc fornicatus est Ephraim, contaminatus est Israel”; the Targum, ܐܪܝ ܕܥܝܢ ܕܥܝܢ ܕܝܫܪܐܝܠ ܒܝܬ ܐܦܪܝܡ ܐܫܬܡܢܘ ܒܝܬ ܝܫܪܐܝܠ. It would seem that the persons should agree, and the third person of the first verb in the versions is certainly as good as the received reading. Note also והשכבתים = κατοικιῶ σε, 2:20.

IV. Finally several substitutions of letters, words and phrases occur, and they are of such a character as to show that they are not due to the translator.

In 13:9 for the Hebrew שחתך ישראל כי בי בעורך the LXX. has τῆ διαφθορᾶ σου Ἰσραὴλ τίς βοηθήσει; the Peshitta, ܟܝ ܥܬܗ ܕܝܫܪܐܝܠ ܫܚܬܚܩ ܕܝܫܪܐܝܠ ܒܝ ܒܝܥܘܪܟܝܗ. Sebök supposes כי may have come from מי† (Cappelle). כי may have come from מי or כ also, for the LXX. and Peshitta must have read מי בעורך and that this is a better reading than that of the Massoretic text, a simple comparison of the texts shows, as well as the peculiar readings and ellipses supposed in attempts to translate the received reading. Cf. R.V. Cheyne retains כי, reading כי מי בעורך, “He hath destroyed thee, O Israel; yea who is thy help?” However, there is no

* *Commentarii et Notae Criticae*. Amsterdam, 1689, p. 558.

† *The Hebrew Text*, p. 123.

‡ So also Driver in an incidental note, p. lxviii.

reason for its omission by the translator. The conjecture of Houbigant* and others after him, viz., **יעורך** is unnecessary since the construction with **ב** is good. Cf. Nah. 3:9; Pss. 118:7 and 35:2. Of course the translation of **שחתך** cannot be sustained as exact.

In 13:5 for the Hebrew **אני ידעתך** the LXX. has *ἐγὼ ἐποίμανόν σε*; the Peshitta, **אנא נחמך**. Here, as Sebök well points out, **רעיתך** suits the following **במדבר** as well as the next verse better. **ד** and **ר** are readily confused; note also the ' of **אני** which might easily be repeated. The Targum gives a free rendering in **אנא סופקית צורכיהון**, but it shows the sense demanded here.

In 13:15 for the Hebrew **כי הוא בין אהים יפריא** the LXX. has *διότι οὗτος ἀναμίσει ἀδελφῶν διαστελεῖ*; the Vulgate, "Quia ipse inter fratres dividit, etc.;" the Peshitta, **... לפיכך**. These versions require **יפריד** instead of **יפריא**, for it is not probable that they took this verb as equivalent to the Arabic **فرى**. This then becomes a reference to the separation between Judah and Israel. Cf. Zech. 11:14.

In 5:8 for the Hebrew **אחרוך בנימין** the LXX. has *ἐξέστη βενιαμίν*. Here again is a peculiar phrase in Hebrew, it being necessary to supply to convey the supposed meaning, while the LXX. **חרד בנימין** is at once clear and forcible in this connection. Cf. the translation of **חרד**, 11:10,11. Cheyne's translation of this is good, viz., "Benjamin is distraught." For the conjecture of Meier,† viz., **אחרית**, I fail to find the support which he finds in the LXX. It is evident that the Massoretic reading might readily have been corrupted to the present form. Cf. Judg. 5:14.

In 13:2 for the Hebrew **כתבונם עציבים** (**ב** in some texts) the LXX. has *κατ'εἰκόνα εἰδῶλον*; the Vulgate, "quasi similitudinem idolorum"; the Targum, **ויעברו להון מתכא מכספהון** (**כרמותהון**). These versions require the reading **כתבנית עציבים**, which indicates that there was no art then in the manufacture of such images (Cheyne).

In 2:11 for **לכסות** the LXX. has *τοῦ μὴ καλύπτειν*, which requires **מכסות**, as this is the usual method of translation of the infinitive with **מן**. Commentators have succeeded in explaining the use of the **ל** as that of purpose, but an ellipsis must be supposed, such as, *which should have covered*. Strange infinitive force! If referred to the nouns as **לכסות** must be, another pointing of the consonants at the basis of the LXX. would be more forcible, viz., **מכסות**. Cf. Ezek. 1:11,23, etc. However, the reading **מכסות** is the one expected from the context.

In 5:7 for **חריש** the LXX. has *ἐρυσίβη*. Kuinoel's conjecture **חריש** (cited by Drake) is due to the theory that the variations must be explained so as to harmonize with the Massoretic text, and this only involves the confusion of **ר**

* *Biblia Hebraica. In loco.*

† *Studien und Kritiken.* 1842. P. 1028.

and **ר**, but **הרש** is not translated by ἐρυσίβη in the LXX., though this is not decisive. It seems more probable that the reading was **חסיל**. Cf. Joel 1:4 (LXX.). The sense of the LXX. is manifest, needing no explanation. If **הרש** is taken in the sense of month, the most natural meaning, as it occurs without the article, then, as Prebendary Huxtable observes, "The Hebrew scriptures perhaps furnish no other example of that particular form of personification by which a period of time is spoken of as itself effecting what is done by other agents in it."**

In 4:18 for **סר סבאם** the LXX. is ἤρτισε χαναναίους. It is supposed by many commentators that the translation of the LXX. arose from the reading **סבאים** and the confusion of the Sabeans with the Canaanites, but this again is due to a theory. Only on the supposition that the MS. underlying the translation differed somewhat from those underlying the Massoretic text, can such variations be explained satisfactorily. A remark of Ewald shows that a fair reading is given by the LXX., viz., "*it attached itself in close friendship to the Canaanites*; in which case we should have to read **סר כנען** (comp. **נוסר**), and the sense would not be bad in this connection as well as suitable to the words in 12:8, if only **כנען** were not so very unlike the letters **סבאם**." Theory then is all that is against the reading of the LXX. **סר** (**יסר**) is not so translated in the LXX., but was chosen because of the similarity of the letters. **בחר** is the word most commonly so translated, but does not seem quite suitable here, though a better word does not suggest itself to the writer.

In 8:10 for **וַיְחַלּוּ מֵעַט מִמֶּשָׂא מֶלֶךְ שָׂרִים** the LXX. is καὶ κοπάσουσι μικρὸν τοῦ χρίειν βασιλέα καὶ ἀρχοντας. Ewald's rendering of the Hebrew, "cease a little" (pointing **וַיְחַלּוּ**) and "sorrow a little" (A.V.), are both open to Nowack's question, Why a *little*?† Nor is the reading given by Simson, Wünsche, etc., better, viz., "in a little, etc." What usage is this? **מעט** in 1:4, cited by Nowack, is different. Nor yet that of Hitzig, Keil,‡ R.V., etc., "they shall begin to be diminished" (reading **מעט** as inf. or "adj. verb"). Cheyne well asks, "Why 'begin'?" None of the above explanations being satisfactory, the only remedy is with Cheyne to turn to the LXX. which reads **וַיְחַלּוּ מֵעַט מִמֶּשָׂא מֶלֶךְ שָׂרִים**, possibly **וַיְחַלּוּ** as Ewald read, may be retained; the rendering would be "that they may cease for a little from anointing a king and princes." The reading "king and princes" is found in some Hebrew MSS. and in the versions: it is confirmed also in the following citations by Reuss,§ viz., ch. 3:4; 7:5; 8:4 and 13:10, where "king" and "princes" are thus associated.

In 3:2 for the Hebrew **וְחָמַר שְׂעָרִים וְלָתַךְ שְׂעָרִים** the LXX. has καὶ γομῶρ

* *Bible Commentary*. London, 1876. Vol. VI., p. 440.

† *Der Prophet Hosea*. Berlin, 1880, p. 150.

‡ *Commentary on the Minor Prophets*. Edinburgh, 1878. Vol. I., p. 116.

§ *La Bible*. Part II. Les Prophètes. Paris, 1876. *In loco*.

κριθῶν καὶ νέβελ οἴνου; never ἡμικόρον for לֶתֶךְ, as Gesenius and a number of commentators give it, so far as I have been able to learn. Cheyne suggests that probably the translator was unacquainted with the “lethech;” but this fails to account for the transliteration of a Hebrew word. As לֶתֶךְ is one of the ἀπαξ λεγόμενα and there is no measure corresponding to it in the Egyptian dry measure, which, as Cheyne observes, “in other details agrees exactly with the Hebrew,” it is very difficult to determine the cause of the variation and at the same time suspicion is cast on the Hebrew word. γόμορ is used as often for חמר as for עמר,* and so one cannot determine which was in the MS. before the translator, or some aid in explaining the variation might be derived from it. οἶνον for שְׁעֵרִים might be explained from the use of barley to make wine. Compare also the plural of κριθή in Greek; or possibly, according to Schleusner, “Sed mihi שְׁכָרִי legisse videntur.”

No explanation on the ground of the use of a MS. similar to that of the Masoretic text is satisfactory. Why should the translator give a Hebrew word in Greek letters if he did not find it in the MS. before him? Newcome supposed that θύλακος, which Symmachus used in the translation here, had crept into the Greek from the Hebrew. This change, however, would not have occurred long before the translation of the LXX., while the word is found in the Odyssey and was used also by Aristophanes; moreover there is another word, λήκυθος, which is just as likely to have come from לֶתֶךְ, but it occurs in Aristophanes, Euripides and Herodotus. It seems more probable that the Hebrew came from the Greek, from confusing the two words, perhaps, with a transposition of consonants, viz., θ(v)λ(a)κ(oc) — λ(η)κ(v)θ(oc) — a very easy confusion with the different arrangement of the consonants in the Greek words. The former was used for meal, etc., and from the Greek translation, may have passed into Hebrew in this disguised form. There seems to have been great confusion among the Fathers in the reading of this passage. A remark by Epiphanius, viz., Λεθῆκ δὲ, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ τῷ προφήτῃ εἰρηται, ὅτι ἐμισθωσάμην ἑμαυτῷ λεθῆκ κριθῶν· ἐν ἀντιγράφοις δὲ, γόμορ κριθῶν, τὸ αὐτὸ εἶσι· δέκα γὰρ καὶ πέντε μῶδιοι σημαίνονται οὗτοι,† shows that he regarded the “lethech” and the homer as the same measure wrongly, thinking that there were two homers, one of twelve and the other of fifteen baths, the “lethech” corresponding to the latter. This looks as if there had been an understanding that the two expressions were equivalent or that λῆθεκ was an explanation of γόμορ. In the editor’s discussion of this passage, a reading from Ambrosius is cited, viz., “Et conduxī eam gomor hordei et semi-gomor hordei et nevel vini.” This combines the two readings, but affords no light on the question considered, except in showing that the texts of

* Driver, however, gives a number of instances showing γ to be the transliteration of γ (ג ?), pp. 105, 106.

† *Patrologia Graeca*, edited by J. P. Migne. Paris, 1858. Vol. XLIII., pp. 272, 273.

the versions have been tampered with. Whatever the origin of the variation may be, the reading of the LXX. is at least as satisfactory as the received reading.

The explanation of this, referring to 2 Kgs. 7:18, and the inference that a homer and a half of barley would have a value of fifteen shekels, which plus the fifteen shekels of silver would equal the price of a slave, Ex. 21:32, is simply arbitrary. It rests upon the following uncertainties: the value of (1) barley, (2) a slave, (3) לֶחֶךְ; the reason for the amount being (1) the price of a slave, (2) part money, part barley. The best explanation of the received reading is that this amount was given for provision (Huxtable), and this applies to the LXX. also. Cf. I Sam. 25:18; II Sam. 16:1. An offering might also have been contemplated, cf. I Sam. 1:24; perhaps a jealousy offering, cf. Num. 5.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

Thus it is seen that, while there are many variations in the LXX., most of these can be satisfactorily explained. It is inevitable that there should be some corruption in the Greek text, and this renders the reading in some places doubtful, but such cases are nearly always manifest and thus one is warned not to use these for critical purposes. The fact also that the translator's aim was to produce a translation for the use of the people of his times, and not that the Hebrew text might be reconstructed from it, allowed him to translate as he understood the Hebrew, and thus to interpretation a number of minor variations may be attributed. Yet the fairness and the literalness of the translation are, withal, astonishing; and these would no doubt seem even greater if we had the MS. from which the translation was made.

The faithful reproduction of Hebrew idioms and even the order of words in Hebrew is remarkable. In ch. 1:9 the translation *καὶ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἶμι ἐμὸν*, shows that if לאלהים has dropped out of the text, as many suppose, it must have been before the LXX. was translated. Many other passages showing that the LXX. is a protection against rash conjecture, might also be adduced. But is the value of such a translation to end with this? So, many treat it. An example may suffice to show how the translations of the LXX. are usually treated, viz., in ch. 2:22 the text of the Western Jews is יְדַעַת אַתְּ יְהוָה as found in our Hebrew Bibles, but in the Babylonian codex the reading is יְדַעַת כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה. Now if our Hebrew text had happened to have read as the Babylonian codex, no doubt those who regard the LXX. as of no value, would have found here a false translation of the LXX., supporting the text by the Vulgate, "scies quia ego Dominus." Both translations, however, may be sustained on the supposition that there were different readings in the Hebrew MSS., as there are in this case. This illustrates the difference between the explanation of the variations, by those who hold that there were different recensions of the Hebrew text, and that given by those who do not admit this.

In the present investigation it has been the aim to explain all the variations which can fairly be attributed to the translation as due to this. But after one has studied the character of these variations, whether due to free translation or to imperfect transmission of the text, and has noted the general tendency of the translator in those instances in which it is evident he has given a free translation, he finds that there are some variations which might possibly be attributed to the translator, but are more likely due to difference of recension or perhaps in some cases to imperfect transmission of the text. There are still other variations, however, which cannot be explained in this way. These can only be explained as arbitrary or recensional, but the general fidelity of the translator will not allow the former explanation, moreover the excellence of the readings in many cases will not admit it. Certainly the important variations are not numerous, but one would not expect many variations in Hebrew MSS. of a book the size of Hosea.

The peculiar addition in ch. 13:4 may be thought to reflect on the character of the MS. used by the translator. Yet such peculiarities may easily be detected, and it is to be remembered that if we had the early Hebrew MSS. it would be necessary to use critical judgment in choosing a variant reading, just as is the case with the MSS. of the New Testament. It seems of great importance therefore that the text of the LXX. receive more attention, that it may be had in its very best and most complete form, in order that a more careful comparison of the version with the Massoretic text may be made. Great results certainly may be expected from such study, even in the Minor Prophets, where the translators are supposed to have treated the text with great liberty.

It seems strange that the American Revisers, otherwise less conservative than the English Committee, should have disagreed with the latter in that they refused any reference to the Septuagint and other versions. Care must certainly be used and great discrimination in the study of the versions for textual purposes, but to throw such a valuable critical aid as the Septuagint out of consideration, is to reject what Providence has preserved ; it is to close one's eyes to the light.