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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 Dodekaprophoton 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 Recessional. 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.
‡ Die Syrische Übersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten und ihr Verhältniss zu dem massoretischen Text und zu den älteren Übersetzungen 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 συνίστωσιν ὡς ἰδοὺντες—is neither Greek nor Hebrew, nor is the variant ὅπως συνίστωσιν ὡς συνάδοντες, better. Ewald suggests that the text may have been ὡς συνάδοντες ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν.‡ This might then be a free translation, or perhaps they misread ἡμέρας ἕξιν for ἡμέρας ἕξιν. To suppose with Ewald that they read ἐκ οἰκον χλῆς is to increase the difficulty.

In 10:6 the reading καὶ αὐτῶν εἰς Ἀσσυρίαν δέσαντες, ἀπήνυσαν ἐξνα τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἱαρέμ ἐν δόματι Ἐφραίμ δέξεται, must be corrupt; ἐξεῖναι and ἐν δόματι seem to be a double translation for the same word, though the latter may be for the Hebrew בשת ו(?)

In 13:3 the δακρίων of the LXX. is probably a confusion of letters from ἄκριῳν

---

* 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. x1.

† 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.

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

In 9:10 the reading σκοτών εν σκώφῃ may have arisen in some such way as is suggested by Schleusner,* viz., σκοτών is a confusion of letters of the word κ(α)ριῶν with σκοτῶν and σκ of σ(υ)γιν, 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 συνιῶν συνεπλέκετο μετὰ τὸρνης, for which the Peshitta has ἡσυχίας κατά συνεστάθη̣ν̣, 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. ὁντος ὁ ἑώρος σων ὁ φρόνιμος, as used sarcastically; and Cappelle conjectures that χρ was read χρ. But better than these is the explanation of Marck (cited by Simson), viz., νός σων = νός οἱ, γ having been copied a second time. In 2:16 the LXX. has καὶ τάξω αἰτήν ὡς ἐρημον for ἡρωμάτῳ ἡμέρας. Concerning this Schleusner observes "ubi loco τάξω... reponendum videtur ἀξω vel ἄναξω αἰτήν εἰς ἐρημον. ἀξω habet quoque Cod. Basil." These last instances as well as a conjecture of Drusius (cited by Wünsche) that ἡμέρα 7:5 is due to the manner of writing the dative ἙΜΕΡΑΙ, 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.
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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. βονός for δεμοῦ 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 μεταλαλείποντες and θεοβιβαζομενος, 4:15; 5:8; 12:5, etc., is always translated by ὁλόκαττος. Other examples are σκοπᾶ = κλείσεως, 5:1; εὐφηλὸς = ῥομα, 5:8.

b. A Proper for a Common Noun. Ταρείμ = ἥρ α 5:13 and 10:6. Compare, however, A.V. and R.V. In this case the article would be expected with ἡμῖν. β and α to the mouth of an Oriental are nearly related. Cf. Ps. 16:1. For Μάχιας cf. p. 195.

2. Verbs; in some cases

a. A fair meaning is given. ἀπορρέω = ἡμιρά, 10:7,15; ἔπακοι = ἐνέργεια, 2:23,24; cf. A.V., while in 5:5 and 7:10 ἔνεργεια = ταπεινῶν (ἐννεφε), etc.

b. Not in accordance with the context, as in 14:9; 2:17, where the same word is similarly translated. ὁμοίω = ἡμιρά, 4:5,6; παράσκυπαῖ = ὁρίζετε, 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 ἐκπορεύονται ἐκπορεύεσθε for ἡμῖν ἄγνωμεν is a simple translation of the idiom, but fails to convey the idea in its proper force. In 2:1 ἐπὶ is used for ἔσομαι, while the same is used for ἔσομαι 8:6, and in 11:4 ἡμῖν ἄγνωμεν = καὶ ἔσομαι, while ἑμῖν ἄγνωμεν is translated by ἐξητεῖνα αὐτῶς, 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 αἴματα ἐκ' αἴμασα μιλοῦσιν for ῥήματι γερέντων ἔτερυ: 4:2; ἐμέσως καὶ χάριν αὑτῶν for θελώ μελετήσαι 10:2; ἀπεστρέψε τὴν ὄργην μον for ἐνέβαλεν αὐτῷ 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 ὁμοίω ἄφετον; 5:7 ἡμῖν ἐγέννησαν(?)}, 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.

for 1:2, also for 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. 

2. Verbal Form for Noun.

8:9, but this is contrary to the 8th verse. as also for 2:17. In 12:6 occurs the more easily, as occurs in the preceding.

3. Verbal Form for Noun.

Drake assumes this without doubt to be the true reading. Hermann also adopts it, explaining the arrangement, however, as chiastic. The ordinary reading is adopted by all the later commentators, but it seems that a slight variation from the LXX. and Massoretic text, reading 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 wardness of the woman not the decoyment of idols that is censured.

In 7:5 for, not badly. Several other cases, however, are not so good, as: ; ; ; ; ; ; ; .

4. A Noun for a Noun.

14:5; cf. 11:7, but wrongly as also 12:4, perhaps a free translation here. ; ; ; ; .

† Notes on Jonah and Hosea. Cambridge, 1858, p. 98.
‡ Studien und Kritiken, 1879, p. 515.
5. Other Cases. For 12:1; 11:10; (?) 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: unction, “Nocte tacere feci matrem tuam.” The connective π 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., εκ παλατίων  Ἀγίου, καὶ ἐκείνης αὐτοῦ πένθος, καὶ ἔθεσε αὐτὸς Ἰακωβας κ.τ.λ., misses the sense perhaps because of the general expression preceding and the subject standing first; while the incorrect reading of κινδυνεῖ also conducted to this. Jerome* thought they confused  and . . . Μάχας is elsewhere the translation of κινδυνεῖ and so associating this with Egypt they have misread here.

In 9:4,  4:1, 4:1, 4:1 = LXX., καὶ εἰς  αὐτῷ ἠθέτασα αὐτόν ὡς ἀρτος πένθος, κ.τ.λ. Variant. ήθιναντο κ.τ.λ. Peshitta,  תֶּן הָעַלָּמֶנַה  תֵּבָּרְנָה. Targum,  תֵּבָּרְנָה. The one reading of the LXX. as well as the Peshitta and Targum take  as the subject of the verb, giving the better construction. The variant of the LXX. has in its favor also the fact that  ήθινα 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:  לִבְּתָם אֲסָרִי תַאֲחָה. LXX.—συνεπλήκτο μετὰ πόρνης. See. Here the LXX. seem to have tried to bring the last of the verse into consonance with the phrase υπὸ ων ραπουρα, and thus translate freely, reading  for MIN a very easy confusion. Sebök, however, suggests that the LXX. which he thinks the Peshitta followed, deluded by the sound of the letters, translated  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 “  the LXX. has μανιαν εν δίκω θεοι κατέπνησαν, εψφάργασαν 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:  יָעָמֶנַה בֶּרֶכֶּרֶבֶּר הָלָמֶנַה.

† The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Hosea. Cambridge, 1887, p. 94.
LXX. ὁ δὲ λαὸς μου ὡς ἀντιλεγόμενος ἵρεῖς. The LXX. reading suits the context better in placing ב so as to read יְנֵה; cf. v. 6. The ב 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 יָדָה of יִבְרֵי בָּנֵי כֹּהֲנִים 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., קֹהֲנִים יִבְרֵי, is antedated by a conjecture cited by Rosenmüller,‡ viz., "Quos conjecturae juvant, miror, in eam pariter non incidisse, qua legeretur כֹּהֲנִים יִבְרֵי cum affixo primae pers. singul. sicut contendens adversus me suauerus, ita ut sensus exoriretur periodi; tum populus tuus tum sacerdos mihi contradicent et adversantur. 'Si genuina floruit lectio in Alexandrina versione, videri haec posset isti conjecturae ex parte favori.' "

In 6:5 for אֲלֵהֶם יִבְרֵי יִשֵּׁר יִתְנֵא the LXX. has καὶ τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς ἐξελείσθη; the Peshitta, יִבְרֵי בָּנֵי כֹּהֲנִים. 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 ב to be joined to the following word; it is favored by Cheyne and others.

Other cases are the following: For רֹבִי הָאָדָם, 8:12, the translation in the LXX. is πλῆθος, καὶ τὰ νόημα αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. = μετρῖς κρανίον. In 7:11 for מַעְרֵי אֲדֹנָי the LXX. has Αἰγυπτῶν ἐπεκαλεῖτο, καὶ ἕως Ἀσαφίους κ.τ.λ. = μετρῖς κρανίον ἐκράνιον. In 11:2 for מִלְּפָרְא לָחַם the LXX. is ἐκ προφέστων μου αὐτῶν. מִלְּפָרְא לָחַם = מַעְרֵי אֲדֹנָי, 6:2,3. Cf. also p. 200 for 7:11.

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, וְאֵין הַלְּוָהָל מַטָּה = γεναία παραγίας. Cf. also 2:4,6; 5:4, etc.

4. Collectives, which are often translated by the plural, as in 2:20, where the

---

Hebrew שֵׁלֶדֹת הַשָּׁרָה עִם נַחַל הַשָּׁרָה = μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τοῦ ἄγροι. So also the other collectives of the verse and elsewhere. Some cases are more doubtful, as ἁμαρτίας for הַפְּלֵפָה 4:8; εὐφρανεὶς = ποιμὴνικόν 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 הָרָה הַשָּׁרָה 1:6, etc., it cannot be determined whether the translator read הָרָה a participle, or a perfect הָרָה, 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 יִשָּׁרְתָה the LXX. has τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν, reading בִּלְשֵׁנָה 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, δόξα αὐτῶν; 13:8, בָּלָם = 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 בֶּן הבָּטֵר = μετὰ προβάτων καὶ μοσχῶν. Note also the translation of μὴ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῖς, 13:14, viz., ἐκ χειρῶν ἃ ἃν ρύσασθαι καὶ ἐκ βασιλέων ἀνεῳδοῖσαι αὐτοίς. Variant αὐτοίς for καὶ.

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

e. Other Cases. In 2:23 שֵׁלֶדֹת הַשָּׁרָה = ἐπακούσαν τῷ οἴδανό, καὶ αὐτῶς. In 5:1 שֵׁלֶדֹת הַשָּׁרָה = ἀκούσαν 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 הַפְּלֵפָה the LXX. τὰ ἐματὰ μου καὶ τὰ ὀδονὰ μου, gives the article for the material of which it is made and this is not far from the Hebrew. Cf. Lev. 13:17, where בֵּן occurs with these words; cf. also 2:11. The translation of the last word of the verse, "ἄνθρωπος," by πάντα δῶς μου καθήκει represents the idea of the Hebrew in a general expression. In 2:17 κρίμι = τὰ κτήματα αὐτῆς, "which," as Simson observes, "is perhaps not to be emended to κλήματα with Drusius, 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 שֵׁלֶדֹת seems to have been taken in a general sense and is translated by the plural. Cf. 4:6; 5:9; 7:9; 10:14, etc.

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 הָלִַפְתָה פָּרִַתָה the LXX. has ὀπανοῖξαί σίνεσιν αἴτης, pointing the first as an infinitive, which, with the ordinary meaning of הָלִַפְתָה, does not make good sense; but the translation is not so remote as to require the conjecture that they read לֹא חָלְקָה (Drusius). The words in their first meanings are not so far apart as they seem to be, לֹא חָלְקָה meaning “to bind” and σίνεσις (συνάψμα) “a joining together,” so that though this 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 לֹא חָלְקָה 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 וַיִּשְׁנֶּעְיָֽנּוּ is translated by ταραχή and the root from which וַיִּשְׁנֶּעְיָֽנּוּ is derived is frequently translated by ταράσσω, 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 ἀντιστασίμης ἀντιστάζων for נָשִׂיא נְשִׂיא 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 Hithpa’el, 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 Hithpael. It is also to be noted that the same words occur in 1 Kgs. 11:34 for נָשִׂיא נְשִׂיא, 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 נָשִׂיא נְשִׂיא which only involves the change of a ה to an נ; 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 נָשִׂיא 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 εἰς αἰώνας αἰώνιον for אָרִי נְשִׂיא לֶמַּד, referring to בּ, with ב omitted, to יַהֲנָי, to which Hitzig refers it also, since otherwise the latter part of the verse requires some additional explanation. Nowack takes בּ אָרִי as an accusative of time. There is no reason for supposing that the translator found בּ in the MS.* used. In 3:2 the translation of הָרַיְיָֽרִי by ἵμασθώμης is probably based on the same text. Cf. the Arabic קָרִי in the eighth form. However, the translator may have referred it to וְשָלָֽרִי.

* 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 7:4 sqq. the translator seems to have found some difficulty, but has given the words fairly, though missing the sense. לְךָ is translated by πάντες, either dropping ב on account of the same letter following, or probably it is used as expressing the meaning. (Cf. v. 7): κατακαίματος for ἱπποβαίνει seems to have been taken as referring to the fire and thus the sense is missed. In v. 5 λαμβάνει for ἑλέφθον does not give the exact meaning of the word, but it is frequently used for φθορά. In v. 6 ἀνεκαθήσθαι for ἀνάβασιν does not require the conjectures that the reading was בִּרְו (Cappelle), בּרָפ (Buxtorf), etc. The sense seems to have adapted to the figure. The translation of בּרֵא by καταράσσω is free also. Cf. the translation of בּרֵא by καταφραίνω in 1 Sam. 2:35.

In 12:7 the LXX. ἔγγειτε for ἄνοιξά is probably a free translation. Though the phrase ἄνοιξά to which the translation corresponds is one of frequent occurrence, Ezek. 40:46; I Sam. 14:36, etc., the other is also, as in Ps. 37:34; 27:14, and suits the following ἀναπληρώσει 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 and הלילך is not so well expressed. Other cases of free translation are the following: ἀπὸ = ἐκλειψάτως, 4:3; περίπεσεν = κατευθύνοντα, 4:10; ἄγρευ = ἁσθωμα, 4:7; ἀνάμειμφα ἀπὸ τῆς σεληνοῦ = παραπληθοῦσα κ.τ.λ., 4:16; ἀνεμεμφάνετα = ἀπόστάση, 5:3; ἀνατίνα = τὰν κύριον ἐγκατέλημα, 5:7; ἑλέφθον = φίλος, 7:6; ἔπεσεν = ἐξαναστήθην, 7:8; ἐπονομάζεται = ἐξαναστήθησαν αὐτῷ, 7:9; ἐπονομάζεται = πιστά (?) ἐπονομάζεται, 5:9; ἔπεσεν = ἐξαναστήθησαν, 7:16; ἀνεκαθήσθαι = ἀρνάτω (ὁμώς ἐπικαθήστατο;), 9:8; ἀναπληρώσει = ἀνεκαθήστατο, 11:8; τὰ ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ = ἀνακήρυξα, 13:5; ἀνέκαθεν = πανήγυρι, 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 לְךָ לְךָ הָלְיוּ נִישָׁ עֲבֵר הָעֹז בַּעֲרָב the LXX. is καὶ συμφιλοθετεῖται σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτῷ. The verb being taken as passive it was easiest to refer it to the land, and thus נִישָׁ עֲבֵר הָוֹז is construed, as the following words, with ב. In 4:12 the force of ב in the first clause is either carried over to the second or the translator supposed the second should agree, reading כֶּלֶם בַּעֲרָב, but this does not suit here. In 9:8,17 the suffixes are not translated, but in the connection the general term לְדוֹלְו seems to have been preferred, though the translator probably found לְדוֹלְו in the MS. If the Greek καὶ τὰξιν αὐτῷ ὡς ἀποκριθεί τίνα, 2:16, is original this is a turn in expression, but see p. 192. Cf. also אֶלֶף לְדוֹלְו = ἀνεκαθήστατο, 9:12; ἀνέκαθεν = διάλεξαί εἰσίν, 7:13.

2. An addition, as in 2:10, where, for the Hebrew רכְבֹה יִרְדְּנֶת לְהָיִם, the LXX. is καὶ ἀποκριθείν ἐπιλήφθηνα αὐτῷ. αὐτῷ δὲ ἀργυρῷ καὶ χρυσῷ ἐπιφέρε, which seems to have been caused by the peculiarity 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 ἐτέρημ 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 μαρτύρει which is translated κλέωνται 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 הָנֹכַּר הָכָה נִשְׂם הָכָה the LXX. has καὶ Κλέων τῆς αὐτῶν εἰσφαίνεται, ηδονοχάλακον ἡσθίας εἰς τῷ ἄδρο αὐτῶν. The addition arose perhaps from carrying out אֲרֵב 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 γ of the following verse was no doubt read as a suffix to אֲרֵב.

In 5:11 the Hebrew עֶשֶׂה נְפָל תִּהְיָה 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 רֵית נָטַת as active and supplied the object for the first. Similarly הָיָלְלָה, 5:13, is not expressed in Greek without an object as easily as in Hebrew, so πρῶτες is supplied as an object in Greek.

Other cases may be seen in the following: ἀλά = δευνόν συσκιάζοντος, 4:13; αὐξ = σωμάτιν ὀργοῦ, 13:8; ἔδαμμεν = πέναζος, 14:9; ὑπερίσχετο = ἀνταποδόσεως σον (?), 9:7; variant, ἀνταποδόσεως; ἀνάπληθον = ἀγαθῆς ῃμο, 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 εἰς βασιλεύ. This probably arose out of a difficulty in the mind of the translator in not understanding how Yahweh could ever have been called βασιλεύ. or an unwillingness to admit it.

In 13:14 δίκη σον, referring to the singular ὁ βασιλεύ rather than to βασιλεύ.

In 11:1 for the Hebrew לַבֶּן the LXX. is τὰ τίκνα αὐτῶν, 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 ἡμήριόν, cf. Jer. 4:29; ἡμᾶς = ἀσθενήσει, 4:5; ἡμᾶς = ἡθενησε, 14:2; ἡμᾶς = κατάκαρπος, 14:7.

† The “plena scriptio” probably was not common in the MSS. which the translators used.
2. Wrong Constructions. Closely connected with the preceding is the misunderstanding of the word הִלְחָם, 10:5, for which the LXX. reads καθὼς παρεπίκραταν αὐτῶν, deriving it from המר with ב, but this construction requires נָבַשׁ. The uncommon word seems to have caused difficulty.

In 2:19 for the LXX. is καὶ ὅπειρα ὑπάρχουσιν οὐκ ἐτι τὰ ἰδνόματα αὐτῶν, taking ב in construction with the verb and translating as in the הִלְחָם. Cf. Josh. 23:7; Isa. 48:1. Perhaps they vocalized as הִלְחָם, but it seems well sustained. Cf. Zech. 13:2.

In 6:5 for the LXX. has ἀπεθάνεσα τοὺς προφήτας ἵματον. No object being expressed for the verb the phrase was probably taken in the sense of "slaying in" or "among the prophets" and read κομίζω. The received text and interpretation are sustained by the parallelism.

In 11:6 for the LXX. has καὶ ἠσθενεσαν εἰς ῥομφαία ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ κατέπαυσαν εἰς ταῖς χειραῖν αὐτῶν. The first verb is derived from הִלְחָם and both it and כְּלָה are taken intransitively, while כְּלָה is made to correspond with the first clause and so is read כְּלָה. The translator seems to have been influenced by an attempt to bring out parallelism.

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

In 7:14 the LXX. makes ἔλικα the subject of the verb in the translation καὶ οὐκ ἔβδοσαν πρὸς μὲ οἱ κατοίκοι αὐτῶν, for the Hebrew רָחַם אֲלֵיהוּ בָּלֵךְ.

In 6:7 has הָרְפָא אֲרִם עַבְרֵר, the translation of which is αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰσίν ὡς ἀνθρώποι παραβαίνοντον. כָּרָפָא עַבְרֵר is read qualifying כָּרָפָא, qualifying כָּרָפָא, qualifying. 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 (אֲלֵיהוּ כָּרָפָא מְשָלָל) = πάλιν ἀργαζομένη μάταια; אֲלֵיהוּ בָּעַמִּים = εἶν τοῖς λαοῖς αὐτῶν (annexion ?), 7:8; (אֲלֵיהוּ מִשְׁמַרְק) = τοῖς εἰκόνσις, 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 וְהָרֵם עֹנִיָּה מִפְּנֵיהֶם (v. 5 אֲפִיָּות אֲרִים מִפְּנֵיהֶם), the LXX. reads καὶ ἔξαρα τὴν παροικίαν αὐτής εἰς προσώποι μον (v. 5 ὡς οὖν ἐν ἐκδοσις αὐτῆν). 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. מַלְכִּי מֵפִּנִי תָּמִיר; and מַלְכִּי מֵפִּנִי מִלְּמֹר, the former being much more common would naturally be taken in case of obscurity. ַּמִּ in v. 5 was perhaps read יִכְּ unless the Greek should read διπώκ μή (?). Cf. p. 192.

In 12:15 for the Hebrew the LXX. has ἐθνώματι 'Εφαρμί καὶ παράγγειος; variant, insert ἐν before 'Εφαρμί. 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 כוּס, but the other is also used. There may be an alteration or corruption here, perhaps a double rendering.

In 14:8 it is suggested that the LXX. ζήσονται καὶ μεθενθήσονται σῖτῳ, is a double translation of kanno, being read once καὶ, once καὶ ἔστω, to which μεθενθήσον- ται corresponds, but this word with σῖτῳ 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,”* μεθενθήσονται σῖτῳ should be regarded as the original reading. This then may be a free translation of רַוְרָו, which would not be bad in this connection.

In 14:3 כָּלַחַש = διπώκ μή λάβητε. In the unparalleled Hebrew the translator seems to have found difficulty, reading כָּלַחַש, perhaps for כָּלַחַש. The difficulty of the expression baffles the modern interpreter also.

In 12:1 for the Hebrew the LXX. has 607 ἔν γενῶ αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἁγίος κεκλησταί, 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., ἔν γενῶ ἀλήθεια ἀλήθεια νόμιμον. Other cases in which a slight change will admit a peculiar reading are the following: 6:9 altered to “καὶ ἐκ των ἔρημων διαδραμάτων ἐκκαταλοικῆσαν κ.τ.λ.; also 11:7: ἀναλήψας ἀλήθειαν ἀλήθειαν ἀλήθειαν ἀλήθειαν κ.τ.λ. ἀρχέτος. With 8:9, ἀρχέτος compare ἀρχέτος ἀρχέτος, 9:1. The translator has not used ἀρχέτος anywhere; at least no translation requires it. 13:1, ἐρρήτω = ἐκκαταλοικῆσας, perhaps for ἐρρήτω Aramaic(?). In 8:7 ἔν καὶ γάρ σοι ἐκκαταλοικῆσαι των υἱῶν σου, free? * Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, p. xlvii. † Not ἐν καὶ γάρ σοι 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 נָעֲרָה the LXX. has Κοιδά. 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. נָעֲרָה might also be confused easily with נָעֲרָה, especially the apocopated form נוּרָה. Thus in case of obscurity Judah would naturally be taken. But we, thinking of a definite fact, find that the context requires נוּרָה.

Instead of לְלֵי (2:14) the LXX. has εἰς μαρτύριον, concerning which Jerome observed, "LXX. posuerunt testimonium, Roś et Daleth litterarum falsi similitudine." This seems probable, since Υοδή (†) might easily be obliterated.

In 10:14 for יִרְבָּאֵל the LXX. has εἰς τῶν οἶκων τῶν Ιεροβοάμ; variant, 'Ιεροβοάλ. 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 יִרְבָּאֵל was read יִרְבָּאֵל through confusion of נ and י, perhaps also נ and י, while ה יִרְבָּאֵל was translated. Possibly a confusion of Zalmunna with שָׁלֶמֶן 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 יִרְבָּאֵל = πνεύματι of the LXX. The reading was probably ב for ב, and this the more readily since יִרְבָּאֵל is without an object, unless the reading was יִרְבָּאֵל as in some MSS. and is translated freely.

In 10:2; 5:15 and 14:1 יִרְבָּאֵל is translated by ἀρανίζων. The translator probably read יִרְבָּאֵל. Cf. 2:12 and 5:9, where the forms from יִרְבָּאֵל are translated by derivatives of ἀρανίζων. 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 אָפֶּה the LXX. has Ἐφραῖμ, which is not easy to explain unless the reading of the MS. was Ἐφραιμ and this was confused with the form אָפֶּה in some way. Perhaps the left foot of ר was obliterated and then the remaining form and Yôdh were transposed, or ר may have been read for כ, since these letters were sometimes confused in the old characters.* Compare also בָּלָם וּבּ, 6:8.

In 11:4 the LXX. has ὡς κατείχεν ἀνθρώπος ἐπὶ τὰς σιαγόνας αὐτοῦ for the Hebrew כּוֹרָה, reading כוריה and omitting one; this is taken as a threat; cf. Isa. 50:6. The context shows it to be wrong. ἀνθρώπως is used indefinitely, as several times.

In 8:6 ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ arose probably from confusing י with ב and thus ב would seem a repetition or was obscured perhaps. ב and ב were, 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:

ירעָם כּוֹרָה = חַק כּוֹרָה = 7:12; 6:1; 3:10:10; 10:11; 10:12; יַרְשָׁר = אָסָר 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 יִכ which is frequently translated by δέ and ὥστε 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:

= καθάς ἀν, 7:12; ὥν τρώσον, 9:13.

(ὑπάρχει) = ὅπισώ generally, but μετὰ τῶντα, 3:5.

= ἄρα, 12:12; πλήν, 12:9; ὅπως, 4:4(?).

= ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, 11:8; ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, 2:2.

= οὐ and οὐ μὴ frequently; ζ, 6:6.

= διὰ τοῦτο, 4:3, etc. Cf. ὅλο also, 2:8,16, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Particle</th>
<th>Equivalent in Hebrew</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>óπως = 4:4</td>
<td>ב gestión (8:3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>óπως ἀν = 2.5(?)</td>
<td>ב (9:12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διά και εάν = 9:12</td>
<td>ב (9:16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εν = ב* = 8:12</td>
<td>ב (4:12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς = ב = 8:12</td>
<td>ב (13:4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρὸς = ב = 8:12</td>
<td>ב (8:10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατά = ב = 8:12</td>
<td>ב (5:4; 11:9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μετά = ב = 8:12</td>
<td>ב (12:9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διά = ב = 8:12</td>
<td>ב (10:12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπό = מ ה = 4:12</td>
<td>ב (10:12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μῆ = מ = 4:12</td>
<td>ב (8:10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διὰ τοῦτο = מ ה</td>
<td>ב (12:9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλὴρ = מ = 12:9</td>
<td>ב (13:4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εάν = מ = 9:12</td>
<td>ב (8:7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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 Massorethic 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 ישלח in 9:8 and 14:3, for יושב in 4:9; 12:2, 14; and different Greek words for the same Hebrew word, as διαφθορά, 11:4, and ἀνταποδίδωμι, 13:13, which is used for בוס, 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 ἐλάχιστοντα, 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 Massorethic 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.

1. 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 מת掃ות 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 ἐοίνες τεικτούσης. 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 ἔστι γάρ εἰς τῶν θυσιασμάτων αὐτῶν. If this is to be taken as it usually is, it is the only instance of such a plural for ἐοίνες. The reading of the LXX., μετεικτούσης, or perhaps with ὡς omitted in order to avoid the repetition of the same sound, is better. So Hitzig, citing Zech. 14:10, etc.

In 10:15, for ἐκβάλλειν ζήσα τοὺς Ἱσραήλ, the LXX. has ὡς τοιχο γένοις ἵμαν, ἀκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. The addition of an ἐκ before ἤνεσα and ἰτα before ἰτα would give the reading at the basis of the LXX., viz., ἢνεσα λέον ις Ἰσραηλ, 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 ἢνεσα and ἰτα accusative of place. However, ἀκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ may have arisen from taking it as synonymous with the Hebrew, in its meaning, house of God; the other is generally μέρα.

Other additions of this nature are ὡς ἐν 1:7 (some MSS. have ἠκμοῦσιν; ἐτί, 1:5; ὡς, 5:1, and ἤτί, 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 Ἰερών θεος, the reading of the LXX. is Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἰς σύ, requiring Ἰερών Ἰαβαὶ Ἰσραήλ, 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 τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν after πρὸς κύριον for Ἰερών 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 στρατεύων τοῦ οἴνοπος καὶ κτίζων γῆν, οὐ δὲ χερίς ἐκτείνων πᾶσαν τῶν στρατιῶν τοῦ οἴνοπος, καὶ οὐ παρέδεξα σοι αὐτὰ τῶν πορεύσαντων ὑπὸ σω ἀπτῶν· καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνήγαγόν

* 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.,

 comenz יוהו אלוהים  
 נמה סחימ ויהי אדרמ  
 ירי עשה כל צבא הזרמים  
 חלא התרים והם ללעה אחרים  
 ואמנクリック מאָרְי מצרים  
 ואלאהם וגו׳

The omission in the Hebrew he thought might have arisen through the carelessness of the scribes, passing from one לֹא to the other. For ἀνήγαγὼν he has the participle μετεέλθει which is possible, though not what a retranslation of the Greek requires; in Ps. 81:11 the LXX. has the form ἀναγαγὼν for μετεέλθει. The Greek here requires μετεέλθει 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 τῶν οἵρανῶν and its omission in κτίζων 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 ἀνήγαγὼν 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 מִלְכָּה, 12:14; cf. 12:10 and 13:4; θεοῦ ἱμῶν, 14:3, cf. 6:1; αὐτοῖς after εὑρη for ἁλίμων, 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 πετεναν τῶν οἵρανων καὶ τὰ ἐρπητὰ 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 Ἀσσυρίως ἀκάθαρτα φάγωνται is probably taken from 9:3. With the addition καὶ σῶν τοῖς ἐρπητοῖς 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 בְּהַרְסָתוֹ the LXX. has (ἡδε*) παρέδειγμα αὐτοῖς...ἐν τῷ παρεδείγματι αὐτοῖς; the Vulgate, “cum corripientur propter
duas iniquitates suas”; the Peshitta, Ἀναφερεν παραδείγματα αὐτοῖς...ἐν τῷ παρεδείγματι αὐτοῖς. It seems to have been taken wrongly from ἀναφέρειν, 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 ὑποθέτειν and this in connection with
“inquiities” (undoubtedly the correct translation here) gives a good sense. This
verb and ὑποθέτειν seem to have the same meaning and as Ewald observed ἀναφέρειν
in force is weak and obscure.

In 7:14, 15 for σοφρίς β’ λατιν οὗτος ἐκτὸς ἐφεξέκοψεν the LXX. is ἐπαυδείθησαν ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ κατέσχεν τοῦς βραχίονας αὐτῶν, evidently omitting either σοφρίς or σοφρίς. The translation requires as its basis σοφρίς, very similar to the end of the previous verse, and the clauses of this verse are better balanced without
σοφρίς. σοφρίς 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 σοφρίς mean in connection with ἐφεξέκοψεν? Probably the
basis of the LXX. was σοφρίς β’ λατιν οὗτος.

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

In 9:14 for which the LXX. has τί δόσεσιν αὐτοῖς; variant, add δός αὐτοῖς. ἡν is perhaps a copyist’s repetition of the last two letters of ἡν; 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 ὑποθέτηται μόνον, the LXX. has καὶ ἐξελεύσάν μοι, ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰων ἐξελεύσάν με, a strange variation for which there seems to be no good
explanation unless it is connected with the substitution of οἴκῳ Ἰων for καὶ ἐξελεύσάν μοι, which may 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, ὑποθέτηται μόνον, for ὑποθέτηται μόνον; ἐξελεύσάν με for ἐξελεύσάν με: cf. p. 211. Elsewhere in the book ὑποθέτηται μόνον is found, but here the historical reference demands ἐξελεύσάν με. 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 αὐτοῖς for ὑποθέτηται μόνον, 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 Übersetzungen der Bibel, pp. 239-433. Breslau, 1887.
observes, was probably for ויבר. 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 חכמ and this
suits the context better.

In 13:8 the Hebrew is מַכָּלֵלַם יִשְׁמְךָ בְּלֵי־יָדָא; the LXX., καὶ καταφάγοντα
ingoν τοις ἵκαι ἐκείνοις δρημοί; the Peshitta, דָּלַעַה [חָזַק] חֲמָא. Sebők thinks
they may have read מַכָּלֵלַם יִשְׁמְךָ בְּלֵי־יָדָא or מַכָּלֵלַם יִשְׁמְךָ בְּלֵי־יָדָא
(th.e 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 coordinate with these), ב
before לָיִי 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 מַכָּלֵלַם יִשְׁמְךָ בְּלֵי־יָדָא the LXX. is τὴν ὀδόν αὐτῆς; the Peshitta, שָׂמַם. 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. דַּרְכָּה “has
nothing but difficulty in its favor” (Briggs).

In 4:8 for מַכָּלֵלַם יִשְׁמְךָ בְּלֵי־יָדָא the LXX. has τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν; the Peshitta, שָׂמַם; the Vulgate, “animas eorum;” Symmachus and Theodotion, ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν.
Thus the versions as well as some MSS. read מַכָּלֵלַם יִשְׁמְךָ בְּלֵי־יָדָא and this is demanded by the
context. However, see page 197. Compare also יִכְרַה יִכְרַה, note 1 following, 12:2; יחֲרַה = יחֲרַה, 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 deter-
mine 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 מַכָּלֵלַם יִשְׁמְךָ בְּלֵי־יָדָא, the LXX. has τοῖς ὑπὸ ὑπὸς Ἰωάννα, requiring
וְיָדָא מַכָּלֵלַם יִשְׁמְךָ בְּלֵי־יָדָא, which was probably in the MS. before the translator. Both expressions
occur in Hebrew for the same idea, and in the Greek ὁ λόγος 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 ἀγαπᾷ for σεβθεί in 2:25 (where, however, the variant ἔλεεν agrees
with that in 2:3, 6) must be explained. Similar to the foregoing is the variation in
2:1, έκπαιδεύει τοῖς ὕπον ὕπον ὑπὸς Ἰωάννα, κληθονται καὶ αὐτοὶ νοῦ κ.τ.λ. If exact, the translation of the second verb
requires אֵלְכָה. For such variation compare Isa. 62:4 and 32:5, where, how-
ever, the LXX. in the first passage translates both words by καλεῖ, the last by
εἰπον in both forms.
In 3:4 for מִנְצָבָה the LXX. is θησαυστηρίων = Μονή. Sebök explains the variation as due to the confusion of letters, τ for γ and π for β, 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 מִנְצָבָה—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 מֵעַבָּדָה." The Professor shows by a comparison of 2 Kgs. 3:2 with 1 Kgs. 16:32 that מֵעַבָּדָה is the original in the latter; he also observes that the verb קום does not well apply to מֵעַבָּדָה but to מִנְצָבָה; cf. Deut. 16:22.

The peculiar translation of ἀπὸ ρητίν by the LXX. ἱερατικὸς αἰῶν ἀνάμικρυ, may possibly be attributed to the same cause. If not, the translator may have taken ἱερατικὸς 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 δήλως represents elsewhere (Thummim, Deut. 33:8; Urim, Num. 27:21 and 1 Kgs. 28:6). It may, however, be a free translation of ῥητίν as giving knowledge of things doubtful and hidden. In such cases there is too little basis for decision.

In 2:16 ἀντίμικαί ματριάδις = LXX. ἑώρ πλασθή. Φασά is here taken in the bad sense and so Cheyne’s citation of Ps. 107:40, where this word is the translation of מַעֲצָה, hardly seems necessary, though this same verb is used for מַעֲצָה in 4:12 and possibly occurred here. However, מַעֲצָה is thus translated in Ezek. 14:9 and Prov. 1:10.

In 8:11 for the Hebrew לא the LXX. is ἢγαπαθίμν, requiring ἀναβότειν(?) and this is better than the repetition of ἁλαθία which may be a corruption from ἀλαθία(?)

In 13:6 ἔστη = LXX. εἰς πλακομονήν = ἔστη αὐτήν; cf. p. 209, for בְּיהםם לא, 12:5.

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

In 5:2 for ἐνθάμενα the LXX. is διῆγεντες τὴν θήραν κατέπηξαν. ἑωρ δὲ παίδευσεν ἦμων; the Peshitta, בִּנְעָלָה בַּעֲנָה יִנֵּא בַּעֲנָה בַּעֲנָה בַּעֲנָה. 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. ἐγείρω occurs twice for ζύγο, though Trommiusīt gives לַכַּמ for this word in Job 10:16, while in Prov. 6:25 it occurs possibly for לַכַּמ. With only these few and doubtful cases one cannot easily find what was the basis here. ἄγαρ is usually the translation of , cf. Gen. 25:28; 27:4; and it seems

† Concordantiae Graecae in Septuaginta, etc. Amsterdam 1718, p. 18.
probable that ירִד (cf. Peshitta) was not the basis here or it would have been translated by θηρέω. 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, יִז = ש,  לך = ר for מ, עריך (א?), לָכֵּם = לָכֵּם. It is easier, however, with Sebôt to suppose a confusion of sound in which וְשָׁרֵם = וְשָׁרֵם. 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 לְצָרֶה הָרָה הָרָה the LXX. has εἰς θήραν παρέστησαν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, simplifying the difficult Masoretic 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 בְּנִיהָ in the first part to בְּנִי in the second, also the use of יִז 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 שַׁחֲרָה (תַּחֲרָה) in this reading.

In 9:7 for the Hebrew יֹרֶעָה שָׁרֵאל אָזֵת הנבְּרָא the LXX. has καὶ κακοθεσται Ἰσραήλ ὡς προφῆτης κ.τ.λ. The difficulty of the Masoretic text renders the translation doubtful. The LXX. seems not to have had יֹרֶעָה and this may be a repetition of the last letters of the preceding word; however, as יֹרֶעָה is frequently translated by κακοθεσται, it may be contained in κακοθεσται, which requires (א?יֹרֶעָה) for בְּנִיהָ in this reading would be בְּנִיהָ. 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 יֹרֶעָה. ἑπεξηγηθή for ἰνάβα 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 ἱνάβα used?

In 11:4 for the Hebrew "אִם אֱלֹהִים אֲנָ♪ הָ♪ נַגְּדָ♪ מַלְאָ♪ כּ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָッכ (א?יֹרֶעָה) may have misled the translator, and even if it comes from בְּנִיהָ, an object would be expected. This and the fact that נַגְּדָ♪ at the beginning of the following verse is inconsistent with 8:18; 9:3.6; 11:11, unless indeed one admit with Kuenen* that the prophet contradicts himself, favors the reading נַגְּדָ♪ which interchange with נַגְּדָ♪ is not infrequent in the יֹרֶעָה and with הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָ♪ הָparagus may be a free translation of נַגְּדָ♪ or נַגְּדָ♪(?). 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 נַגְּדָ♪ the LXX. has τῶν ματαίων = Νῦ, which is frequently translated by μάταιος.† If נַגְּדָ♪ were the form the article would be expected. The

+ Geiger, Urschrift und Ubersetzungen, p. 411, regards ματαίων as a free translation of נַגְּדָ♪ (Vulgate), which was changed to נַגְּדָ♪ on account of offensiveness.
error of a scribe would be the more easy, since the initial letters of אֲנָי are the same as the last letters of אֶלְיוֹ (Secker).

In 9:3 for the Hebrew רַע אֵפְרֹם מַעֲרָיו the LXX. has κατάφερεν Ἠφαίμ Αἴγιβνου and this carries out the contrast with the first part of the verse very well, but possibly it is a confusion of τ for γ since the conjunction would be expected here. Cf. also 14:8, ικαθαίνεται = ικαθαίνεται (?).

In 7:1 ἐν τῷ ϊδσάσαται με = ἐντυγία (cf. 6:11).

V. Closely connected with the preceding are a few cases of transposition of letters and words as in 8:18, where, for רֵחי הבּהוּ יִבְרֹה בַּשְּר יַאֲכָל, the LXX. has διότ' έαν θύσαι θυσίαν καί φάγωσιν 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, רֵחי יִבְרֹה בַּשְּר יַאֲכָל, and better, the LXX. looks very much like a peculiar repetition of the letters in רֵחי בַּשְּר יַאֲכָל slightly altered, viz., ר for ר. For the use of אָמ ה with אָמ see cf. 9:12 (LXX.); cf. also 9:16.

In 6:3 for the Hebrew רֹפֵל מַלְכֹּים יַזֵּר אֱלֹהִים the LXX. has πρόφασι καί ὁφημος γγ, and this order requires וּרְפֵל מַלְכֹּים (ל)אֱלֹהִים, taking וּרְפֵל 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 לֹא וּלְיָבָר, the LXX. has ὀπαστράφασαν εἰς οὐδέν; the Peshitta, אֵלֶם לֵא נִמְסֵמ. These versions give little help here; they seem to have taken these two words in the reverse order, viz., לֹא וּלְיָבָר, 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, וּלְיָבָר אֱלֹהִים, * is also impossible.

In 13:10 for the Hebrew נִזְהַר מַלְכָּם אֵלֶם the LXX. has τοῦ δ βασιλείας σω σιτος; which is a fair translation, taking τοῦ as an interrogative, and it seems probable that the letters נ and ל have been transposed, the original being נל, and this is confirmed by מַלְכָּם, which would naturally follow נל as an enclitic, but is peculiar after ר. The form רל would arise the more easily since it occurs in v. 7 and elsewhere. The forms in v. 14 were probably רל also. So the versions in 13:10.

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

**RECESSIONAL 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, 1886. *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 ἐντεινει the LXX. has ἐθερευ ἐκατον σκάνδαλα. Nowack and Simson regard this as an interpretation in explanation of the preceding ἦλθεν, 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 μεταστέλλειν to have dropped out of the text and vocalizes ἐθανάτος. It seems better, however, to vocalize ἐθανάτος, which is used of the setting up of idols (cf. Isa. 46:7 and 2 Kgs. 17:29), and to construe μεταστέλλειν 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 אבות הרוב (הvoie(קח מציון) the LXX. has ἔγατην υἱῷ αὐτῆς ἐκ φρονίματος 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 מטמאית with the translation "sie lieben Schande mehr als ihre Ehre." Cheyne favors this correction, referring מזא ליה 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 אנה נאם יוהו והנה אנה הרשימים the LXX. has λέγει κύριος ἐπακούσμαι τῇ οἰκραν. The first אנה 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 the LXX. has ἐμὲ κεκράζοντα δ’ θεὸς εγνώκαρν σε. יִשְׁרָעַל* 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 ינשמל פסים לישראל the LXX. has καὶ ἀνταπ-δώσομεν καρπὸν χειλῶν 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 יר 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 יר is not translated by καρπὸς. The Peshitta also, departing from the LXX. and Massoretic text in other particulars, agrees with the LXX. in reading יר. 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 καρπὸς 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 Κῆπη δέντρων, the καρπὸς 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 the LXX. has πάντες οἱ πῶνοι αὐτῶν ἐνέχωσοντα αὐτῷ, δι' ἄδικίας ὡς ἡμαρτεν. When ἀνέβλητο is used of discovering a fault it is usually followed by ὁ of person; but it is often used with ἣν in the sense "to suffice," and this gives a better sense here, adopting the suffix of the third person for the first in ἑαυτῷ. Thus Cheyne, "(but) all his profits will not suffice for (i.e., to expiate) the guilt which he has incurred," reading ἐλάβεν ἅπαν αὐτῷ ἄνεβλητον τοῖς ἁμαρταν; but this is a rather forced meaning, (to expiate?), and it seems better to follow the LXX., reading ἀπό for ἡμάρτησε and putting the preposition ὑπὸ (cf. 9:15) before ἅπαν, thus it would read ἐλάβεν ἅπαν αὐτῷ ἄνεβλητον ἅπαν αὐτῷ τοῖς ἁμαρταν, 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 the LXX. has καὶ ἐγὼ συνεπόδοισα τὸν Ἕφραίμ, ἀνέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βραχιόνα μου; the Vulgate, "portabam eos in bracheis meis"; the Peshitta, "אָלֶ֧ה בֵּצְהָנָ֖ךְ חַגֵּהֶשׁ מִשָּׁלְךָ". Of the peculiar forms ἑαυτῷ and καί one cannot say much except to note

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. The form מְלָכָה, however, is anomalous and according to the conception of the following verse. Cappelle* justifies it by making it equal to "attemperare pedem." The form מְלָכָה 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 לְךַל 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 לְכַל כַּלָּה, "I took them up in my arms." Cf. R.V., also Isa. 63:9.

In 2:18 for the Hebrew קְרַאָה אֵלֶּה תַּקְרָא, the LXX. has καλλίστε μὲ for both; the Vulgate, "vocabit me," for both; the Peshitta, מְלָכָה for both. The Hebrew, strangely, has the verbs in the second person and omits עֲלוֹ 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 כִּי עָתָה הָדוּת אֶפְרָיִם נְדַמְּלַחְשֵׁל the LXX. has δότι νῦν ἔχετωρον σεν Ἐφραίμ, ἵμανθη Ἰσραήλ; the Peshitta, נְדַמְּלַחְשֵׁל; the Vulgate, "quia nunc fornicatus est Ephraim, contaminatus est Israel"; the Targum, קֵלַלְלוֹ לְשָׁנָה בֵּית אָפְרָיִם שנְדַמְּלַחְשֵׁל. 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 רִפְּדָה כִּי כַּלָּה = katokía 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 שֵׁרַחּ נְדַמְּלַחְשֵׁל כִּי חָרָה the LXX. has τῇ διαφθορᾷ σοι Ἰσραήλ τις βοηθήσει; the Peshitta, סִלְלָה נְדַמְּלַחְשֵׁל. Sebök supposes כִּי כְּנֶפֶשׁ (Cappelle). כִּי כְּנֶפֶשׁ may have come from כִּי כְּנֶפֶשׁ (Cappelle). כִּי כְּנֶפֶשׁ may have come from כִּי כְּנֶפֶשׁ or כִּי כְּנֶפֶשׁ also, for the LXX. and Peshitta must have read כִּי כְּנֶפֶשׁ 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 כִּי כְּנֶפֶשׁ, reading כִּי כְּנֶפֶשׁ, "He hath destroyed thee, O Israel; yea who is thy help?" However, there is no

* Commentaria 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., יְהֵרָה is unnecessary since the construction with ב is good. Cf. Nah. 3:9; Pss. 118:7 and 35:2. Of course the translation of יְהֵרָה cannot be sustained as exact.

In 13:5 for the Hebrew יְהֵרָה the LXX. has ἵγῳ ἵποιμανόν σε; the Peshitta, אֵלָה יְהֵרָה. Here, as Sebök well points out, יְהֵרָה suits the following בָּמָר as well as the next verse better. ר and ר are readily confused; note also the ה of יְהֵרָה which might easily be repeated. The Targum gives a free rendering in אֱלֹהַי אַזֲלָה יְהֵרָהוּ, but it shows the sense demanded here.

In 13:15 for the Hebrew יְהֵרָה the LXX. has διὸς όνος ἀναρέσον ἀδελφῶν διαστέλει; the Vulgate, “Quia ipse inter fratres dividit, etc.”; the Peshitta, מָזוּא מַרְאֵה יְהֵרָה. These versions require a ה instead of יְהֵרָה, for it is not probable that they took this verb as equivalent to the Arabic خَزَى. This then becomes a reference to the separation between Judah and Israel. Cf. Zech. 11:14.

In 5:8 for the Hebrew יְהֵרָה the LXX. has ἱξίστη βενομίν. Here again is a peculiar phrase in Hebrew, it being necessary to supply to convey the supposed meaning, while the LXX. יְהֵרָה בּוֹנִימִי is at once clear and forcible in this connection. Cf. the translation of יְהֵרָה, 11:10,11. Cheyne's translation of this is good, viz., “Benjamin is distraught.” For the conjecture of Meier,† viz., יְהֵרָה, 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 מַחְתַּנְתּוֹנָא עַצְבָּלָמָא (ב in some texts) the LXX. has καπεκίναν εἰδόλων; the Vulgate, “quasi similitudinem idolorum”; the Targum, יְעַרְבּי לְחֹם מַחְתַּנְתּוֹנָא (כְּרַמְתָּהוּ, מַחְתַּנְתּוֹנָא עַצְבָּלָמָא, which indicates that there was no art then in the manufacture of such images (Cheyne).

In 2:11 for מַכָּפָרָה the LXX. has τοῦ μη καλύπτειν, which requires מַכָּפָרָה, as this is the usual method of translation of the infinitive with ב. Commentators have succeeded in explaining the use of the ב 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 מַכָּפָרָה must be, another pointing of the consonants at the basis of the LXX. would be more forcible, viz., מַכָּפָרָה. Cf. Ezek. 1:11,23, etc. However, the reading מַכָּפָרָה is the one expected from the context.

In 5:7 for הֵרָה the LXX. has ἵρωσίβη. Kuinoel’s conjecture הֵרָה (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 ב
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* Biblia Hebræica. In loco.
† Studien und Kritiken. 1842. P. 1028.
and ד, but ד is not translated by ἵπτσιδα in the LXX., though this is not decisive. It seems more probable that the reading was ד. Cf. Joel 1:4 (LXX.). The sense of the LXX. is manifest, needing no explanation. If ד 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 מְצַכַּם the LXX. is γρέτταις χαναναίων. It is supposed by many commentators that the translation of the LXX. arose from the reading מְצַכַּם 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 מְצַכַּם (comp. נַחֲמָה, 12:8), and the sense would not be bad in this connection as well as suitable to the words in 12:8, if only מְצַכַּם were not so very unlike the letters מְצַכַּם.” Theory then is all that is against the reading of the LXX. מְצַכַּם (יָסָר) is not so translated in the LXX., but was chosen because of the similarity of the letters. מְצַכַּם 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 יֶהוֹלָלְפִים כָּפָה יִמֵּשָׁתָם מִלֵּךְ: שֵׁרָי מ the LXX. is καὶ κοπάσωσι μικρὸν τοῦ χρίτου βασιλείας καὶ ἀρχοντάς. Ewald’s rendering of the Hebrew, “cease a little” (pointing יֶהוֹלָלְפִים 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? כָּפָה in 1:4, cited by Nowack, is different. Nor yet that of Hitzig, Keil,‡ R.V., etc., “they shall begin to be diminished” (reading כָּפָה as inf. or “adjunct. 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 יֶהוֹלָלְפִים כָּפָה יִמֵּשָׁתָם מִלֵּךְ: שֵׁרָי מ, possibly 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 הָרִים כָּפָה יִמֵּשָׁתָם מ the LXX. has καὶ γομόρ  

† Der Prophet Hosea. Berlin, 1880, p. 150.
κρηθῶν καὶ νέβυλ ὄνων; never ἰμικόρον for ἤμαρ, 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 ἤμαρ 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 ἤμαρ as for ἤμαρ,* 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. ὄνων for ἤμαρ might be explained from the use of barley to make wine. Compare also the plural of κρηθῆ in Greek; or possibly, according to Schleusner, “Sed mihi ἤμαρ 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 θιλακος, 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, λέκαθος, which is just as likely to have come from ἤμαρ, 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(ν)λ(α)κ(ο)ς—α 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., Δεθέκ δὲ, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὑσαῖ τῷ προφήτῃ εἰρημένοι, οὐτί ἐμπαισαμένω ἔμαυτῷ λεθέκ κρηθῶν ἐν ἀντιγράφοις δὲ, γόμορ κρηθῶν, τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἔδεικνυ εἰς κάρ καὶ πέντε μόδις σημαίνεται ώστε,† 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 λέθεκ was an explanation of γόμορ. In the editor’s discussion of this passage, a reading from Ambrosius is cited, viz., “Et conduxi eam gomor hordai et semi-gomor hordai et nevol 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 χ (€). pp. 105, 106.

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, יָלָד ה; 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 כִּי הָיוּ אֲנָשׁי, shows that יָלָד ה 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 יָדַעַת אֲהֵבָה יְהוָה יָדַעַת as found in our Hebrew Bibles, but in the Babylonian codex the reading is יָדַעַת יָדַעַת אֲהֵבָה 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.