Elji Asada

The Hebrew Text of Zechariah 1-8

BS1665
.2.A79

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
MAR 17 1980
THEOLOGICAL SERVICE
BS1665
.2.A79

THE HEBREW TEXT

OF

ZECHARIAH 1-8

COMPARED WITH THE DIFFERENT ANCIENT VERSIONS

BY

EIJI ASADA

TOKYO, JAPAN

CHICAGO

The University of Chicago Press

1896

T5466
.R477

THE HEBREW TEXT

OF

ZECHARIAH 1-8

COMPARED WITH THE DIFFERENT ANCIENT VERSIONS

BY

EIJI ASADA

TOKYO, JAPAN

CHICAGO

The University of Chicago Press

1896

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, MAY 1, 1893, IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

[Reprinted from The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Vol. XII., Nos. 3 and 4. Chicago, Ill.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Introduction. - - - - - - - - 5

Literature. - - - - - - - 6

Variations in General. - - - - - - 6

Variations due presumably to the Translators. - - 8

Variations due presumably to the MSS. - - - - 19

Variations of Doubtful Origin. - - - - - 25

THE HEBREW TEXT OF ZECHARIAH 1–8, COMPARED WITH THE DIFFERENT ANCIENT VERSIONS.

By Eiji Asada, Ph.D.,

Professor of Old Testament Literature in the Aoyama Methodist Seminary, Tokyo, Japan.

INTRODUCTION.

The purpose of this thesis is to compare the Hebrew text of the first eight chapters of Zechariah with the ancient versions, and to examine the variations presented in the versions. In the presentation of the results, I have received suggestions from Workman's *The Text of Jeremiah*, and from Patterson's *The Septuagint Text of Hosea*. But I have tried, as far as possible, to consider the nature of every variation more carefully than Workman did, and to classify the variations more logically than Patterson. It is not the purpose to write a commentary on the book or notes upon the text, but simply and concisely to present the variations in the different versions and classify them according to their probable origin. Consequently there is no attempt made to explain all technical names and expressions common in the works of textual criticism.

The most important of all the versions is the Septuagint, and I have examined it more carefully than any other version. The LXX. of Zech. 1–8 seems to be the work of one man, perhaps different from the translator of the remaining chapters of the book. The translation is a very careful and excellent presentation of the original. But it is less literal than the LXX. translation of other portions of the Old Testament, and presents many interesting variations. There are cases of suggestive additions, of careless omissions, of free paraphrase, and of unintelligible translation. The next in importance is the Vulgate, which gives a very accurate and faithful translation of Zech. 1–8, and con-

tains fewer variations than the LXX., the Peshiṭto or the Targum. Therefore, it seems that the MSS. used by the Latin translator were not much different from the MSS. underlying the present Massoretic text. The Targum Jonathan of these chapters, like all other Targumim, is full of paraphrases and interpretations. But it furnishes many important suggestions, and, in a few cases, gives a better reading than that of the Massoretic text.

The Peshiṭto of Zech. 1–8 is also useful for textual criticism. True it is that the Syriac translation is, in general, free, obscure, and inaccurate; but many of its variations are to be accepted in preference to the Massoretic text. Besides these four chief versions the Arabic version has been consulted, which differs but little from the LXX., and the valuable translations by literal Aquila, cautious Theodotion and clever Symmachus.

LITERATURE.

For the constitution of the text the following books and editions have been used and consulted:

Baer and Delitzsch's edition of the Hebrew text, Tischendorf's sixth edition of the Septuagint, and the texts of the other versions as found in the *London Polyglot*, Origen's *Hexapla*, and Stier-Theile's *Polyglot*.

Some of the works constantly consulted are:

Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel.*

C. H. H. Wright's *Zechariah and his Prophecies.*

W. H. Lowe's "Zechariah" in Ellicott's *O. T. Commentary for English Readers.*

A. Köhler, *Die Weissagungen Sacharjas*, chap. 9–14, Erlangen, 1861–2

Hitzig-Steiner's *Die zwölf Kleinen Propheten.*

T. W. Chambers' "Zechariah" in Lange's *Commentary.*

Maurer's *Commentarius in Vetus Testamentum.*

Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the O. T.*

Keil's *Minor Prophets.*

Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*, etc.

For the sake of convenience and simplicity, Syriac and Arabic words are written in ordinary Hebrew characters.

VARIATIONS IN GENERAL.

Variations are numerous, interesting and, in some cases, extremely peculiar. There are many cases in which the readings differ in respect to the tense of a verb. For instance, the trans-

lators give the present tense for the past (1:6 in LXX.), the past for the future (8:3, in Vulg.), the future for the past (7:13; 8:10 in LXX.), the future for the present (1:5 in LXX.), the present for הנני with participle (8:7 in LXX.), etc. The versions present also a few changes in regard to the person and number of a verbal form; *e. g.*, plural for singular (2:17 in Targum), 3d pers. for 1st pers. (2:15 in Pesh.), 1st pers. sing. for 3d pers. plur. 8:8 in LXX.), 3d pers. plur. for 1st pers. sing. (2:15 in LXX.), etc. It may be noted also that a finite verb is given for a participle (1:8; 2:7 in LXX.), a participle for a finite verb (2:17 in Pesh.), a finite verb for an indefinite (1:14, 17; 8:21 in Pesh.) an imperative for an infinitive (3:4 in LXX.), etc.

Not infrequently the translators change the form or construction of a noun, violating etymological or syntactical principles or disregarding the sense of the passage and its relation to the context. The genitive is translated by the accusative (1:17 in LXX.), the nominative by the accusative (7:2 in LXX., Vulg., Targ., Pesh.), the accusative by the nominative (7:7 in LXX., Vulg., Pesh.), the vocative by the accusative (2:11 in LXX.), etc. The plural is given in translation for the singular in the Hebrew (4:12; 7:5 in LXX.), the absolute state for the construct state (7:9; 8:16 in LXX.), a proper noun for a common noun where it was difficult to translate (6:14 in Vulg., Targ.), a common noun for a proper noun not familiar to the translator (7:2 in LXX., Pesh.), and a proper noun for another (5:11 in LXX., Targ., Pesh.; 7:2 in LXX.). A proper noun is sometimes mistaken for a verbal form (6:10, 14 in LXX.), and in one case an untranslatable foreign word is translated, and that of course inexactly (5:6 in LXX.).

The pronoun also suffers from various changes. For instance, 2d pers. is given for 3d pers. (3:8 in Pesh.), plural for singular (5:5 in Targ.), an interrogative pronoun for another (5:5 in Targ.), etc.

In one instance a cardinal number is rendered by an ordinal (1:12 in LXX. and Vulg.) In some cases one part of speech is given for another, *e. g.*, a finite verb for a noun (1:3 in LXX.), an infinitive for a noun (4:7 in LXX.), a noun for a verb (7:3 in LXX.), etc. The form of a sentence is often

changed, *e. g.*, the Hebrew declarative is rendered as an interrogative (1:6 in Vulg.; 8:6 in LXX., Vulg., Eng., Pesh. [?]), and *vice versa* the interrogative translated as a declarative (1:12 in Vulg.), the interrogative is turned into the imperative (1:6 in LXX.), the declarative into the imperative (6:8 in Targ.), etc.

Besides these, there are a great many more difficult and perplexing variations. The addition and omission of letters, words, phrases, and sentences is very common; and their causes are various. We find also a few inadequate substitutions, and, in some cases, unnecessary repetitions. The arrangement of letters and words is often changed, and a new construction is given. Inaccurate or free translations are occasionally given, and the readings in the original text are obscured.

All these variations may be classified in two groups: (1) *Variations due to the translators*, and (2) *variations due to the manuscripts*. In the first division, I include those additions, omissions and variations of every other kind, for which the translators are responsible; and under the second I classify those variations which existed in the MSS. used by the translators, those which are due to the condition of the MSS., and those which had their origin after the work of translation had been done; (3) *variations of doubtful origin*. In respect to some variations, I have found it extremely difficult to determine to which class they properly belong. It seems to be better to leave such variations unclassified than to attempt to theorize concerning their origin on the basis of mere conjecture. Therefore, I group them together under a third head as doubtful cases.

I.

I. VARIATIONS DUE PRESUMABLY TO THE TRANSLATORS.

1. *Variations arising from a different pointing.*—For בַּמְּצֻלָה (1:8) LXX. seems to have read בַּמְּצֻלָּה with *Dâgešh* in the ל, and renders *τῶν κατασκίων*. Pesh. follows this and translates דמטללין. Keil says that מְצֻלָּה is the form for "shady place." Fürst compares the word with סֻכָּה. Böttcher would read מְצֻלָּה. But Baer's reading בַּמְּצֻלָה (after Kimchi) seems to be best, and is supported by the Vulg. "in profundo."—For לִיהוֹת (2:4)

* Wellhausen, *Kleine Propheten*, p. 173: "Die Bedeutung des Wortes ist unbekannt."

LXX. reads לִידוֹת and renders εἰς χεῖρας. This makes the passage meaningless.—לְעֹבְדֵיהֶם (2:13). This reading is supported by the LXX., τοῖς δουλεύουσιν αὐτοῖς; Pesh. reads עבדיהון. But Baer gives the correct reading לְעַבְדֵיהֶם.—For אֲדֹנָי (4:13; 6:4) LXX. reads אֲדֹנָי, but the reading accepted by the Mass. Text, Vulg., Targ. and Pesh. is to be preferred.—For הַנָּזֶר (7:3) LXX. reads הַנֵּזֶר and gives τὸ ἁγίασμα "the holy place."—For מִשְׁפַּט (7:9; 8:16) LXX. reads מִשְׁפָּט.—For עֹד אֲשֶׁר (8:20) Vulg. reads עַד אֲשֶׁר and renders "usquequo."

2. *Variations arising from a different grouping or transposition of words.*—Some of the variations in this class are intentional changes made by the translators, and a few are due to the corruption of the text. But most of them seem to be due to the careless and hasty work of the translators.

In 1:5 Pesh. connects והנבאים with the preceding sentence, and destroys the beauty of the Hebrew parallelism.—Pesh. places ויאמרו (1:11) immediately after ויענו, but the Massoretic order is to be preferred.—עוד (at the beginning of 1:17) is connected by LXX. with the preceding verse.—In 2:6, Pesh. transposes the words רחבה and ארכה, but other versions agree with the Hebrew. —Pesh. places השטן (3:2) at the beginning of the address, *i. e.*, immediately after אל השטן.—For כסף וזהב (6:11) Vulg. reads זהב וכסף.—In 8:13 Pesh. places אל תיראו at the end of the verse, and spoils the rhetorical beauty of the whole passage (8:9–13) which, in the Hebrew, ends as well as begins with the same words, תתחזקנה ידיכם.—In 8:15, Vulg. transposes את ירושלם and את בית יהודה.

3. *Variations arising from ignorance, disregard, or an unsuccessful presentation of Hebrew idioms, or from a violation of Hebrew syntax.*—While some allowance must be made for the difference of idioms and syntax in different languages, one cannot overlook those variations which could have been avoided, if the translators had been more faithful to the original text.

LXX. attempts to give the force of the cognate accusative קצף . . . קצף (1:2), by rendering ὠργίσθη . . . ὀργὴν μεγάλην, which is somewhat awkward.—For ואמרת (1:3), Pesh. gives the actual impv. form אֱמֹר, and fails to present the force of the ו

consecutive. But the Heb. is more idiomatic and therefore preferable.—LXX. renders עמד (1:8) by *εἱστήκει*, which is less vivid than the original.—For זה שבעים שנה (1:12), LXX. gives *τοῦτο ἑβδομηκοστὸν ἔτος*. Vulg. follows LXX., and translates "septuagesimus annus." But in view of Targ., Pesh., and the Heb., we must reject the LXX. reading, which does not suit the context so well.—Targ. renders ובחר (1:17) by ויתרעי. This is impossible, because the verb is not followed by the preposition ל, but by ב.—For והלבש (3:4), LXX. gives *καὶ ἐνδύσατε*, and fails to express the peculiar force of the perf. העברתי, followed by והלבש (*cf.* Harper, *Hebrew Syntax*, § 28, 4, *a*). Targ. and Pesh. present the sense of these words fairly well, though they weaken the original force. Wellhausen reads והלבשו.—For אלה שני בני היצהר העמדים (4:14) LXX. gives *οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοὶ τῆς πιότητος παρεστήκασι*. This rendering would be for שני בני היצהר האלה עמדים.—For באמה (5:2), LXX. has *πήχεων*, and Vulg. "cubitorum," both of which renderings fail to express the force of the preposition ב. Targ. and Pesh. omit the preposition altogether. —For יוצאות מהתיצב (6:5), LXX. gives *ἐκπορεύονται παραστῆναι*; Vulg. "egrediuntur ut stent"; Pesh. דקימן הוי. But all these versions utterly fail to give the original meaning.—For ארק צפון (6:8), LXX. gives the extremely literal translation *γῆν βορρᾶ*.—עטרות (6:11), plural in form and singular in sense, is incorrectly rendered by LXX. *στεφάνους*; Vulg. "coronas"; Arab. אַכָּאלִיל. Targ. gives the compromising translation כליל רב, but Pesh. has the simple כלילא. The same word in 6:14 is again taken by Vulg. as plural, but by LXX. as singular. See Wellhausen, 179, on this verse.—In הלוא את הדברים (7:7) LXX., Vulg. and Pesh. disregard את and take הדברים as the subject of the verb "to be" understood. Wellhausen reads אלה for את. —Vulg. renders לבם (7:12) by "cor suum," failing to express the collective idea of the pron. suffix in the original.—LXX. renders עיר האמת (8:3) by *πόλις ἀληθινή* without the article. Wright translates "a city of the truth," without ascribing the absence of the article to the syntax of the construct state. But Targ. has קרתא דקושטא.—הר הקדש (8:3) is rendered by LXX. *ὄρος ἅγιον* without the article. But Targ. and Pesh. give the correct translation טורא קדישא.

4. *Variations which may be ascribed to carelessness and inaccuracy of the translators.*—Under this division may be included many of the omissions and additions of unessential particles, conjunctions, adverbs, pronouns, etc. For instance:

The LXX. λέγει for נאם (1:3, 4, 16; 2:9, 10, 14; 3:9, 10; 5:4; 8:6, 11, 17) loses sight of the peculiar force of the original word. The Targ. אֲמַר, and the Syr. אֲמַר are better.—נא (1:4) is omitted both by LXX. and by Pesh., but the general tone of such an earnest request as expressed in the passage favors its presence. For ויקץ (1:10; 4:5; 6:5), Pesh. gives ענא without the conjunction before it.—LXX. omits אתה (1:12) and fails to present the emphatic force in the original.—For לאמר (1:14), Pesh. gives ואמר, which, of course, is wrong. So also in 1:17.—In 2:17, Pesh. renders נעור by מתתער.—הנה (3:9) is omitted by LXX. —והנה (4:2) is omitted by Pesh.—In 4:6 ויקץ and לאמר (twice) are omitted by Pesh.—Pesh. renders ואקץ (4:11, 12) without the conjunction and destroys the idiomatic Hebrew.—המדיקים (4:12), which is the noun-predicate of אשר, is connected by Pesh. with צנתרות, confusing the gender. Symmachus also presents this error.—וזאת (5:7) is omitted by Pesh.—In 6:3 Vulg. read ברדים ואמצים.*—The second לאמר in 7:3 is omitted by Pesh.—For ויהי (7:13), LXX. incorrectly gives καὶ ἔσται. This error affects the LXX. translation of the following verbs.—Vulg. transposes אשר in 8:9.—From ולא נחמתי (8:14), Pesh. omits לא and renders ואהפקת. (So in London Polyglot, but Lee's edition has לא).—From וישבי ערים (8:20), Pesh. omits ו and takes ישבי ערים as appositive to עמים.—In 8:21, Pesh. seems to have read ויאמרו for לאמר.

5. *Obscure rendering and the omission of difficult words.*—In many cases, the translators attempt to give the general sense of a passage, in which they find some word or words too difficult to render literally. This brings forth an obscure and sometimes unintelligible translation. It seems to be more common to omit difficult words altogether than to give an uncertain translation of them.

Pesh. renders ההדסים (1:8) simply by אילנא, and hesitates

* On 6:3 see especially Lagarde, *Nominal-übersicht*, 29 *rm.* LXX. ψαρός, Targ. קרטמין, of ashy-gray color. Aquila κάρτερος, agreeing with Hebrew; Lagarde proposes to read מאבים, "of whitish color."

to express what kind of trees they are. See also the Syr. of 1:10, 11. LXX. translates regularly by ὄρη (*cf.* 6:1).—In 6:3, Pesh. seems to feel the difficulty connected with אמצים, and omits the word altogether. *Cf.* 6:7.—In 6:14, Vulg. renders ולחן by "et Hem," and Targ. also takes it as a proper name. But Pesh. omits the uncertain word חן, and substitutes ולרושיא בר צפניא. *Cf.* v. 10.—מלך (7:2) part of a proper name, is rendered by LXX. and Pesh. as a common noun; ὁ βασιλεύς, מלכא. —שבתי . . . ושכנתי (8:3) is differently rendered by translators. Pesh. does not seem to be sure about the tense of these verbs, and avoids the difficulty by rendering both by the participles מתביא and שׁרא.—את כל אלה אשר שנאתי (8:17) is difficult in construction. LXX. renders ταῦτα πάντα ἐμίσησα, Theodotion adds ἃ before ἐμίσησα. Pesh. follows the LXX. Vulg. and Targ. have tried to translate the אשר, but have failed to give the force of את. On the other hand, LXX. and Pesh. have preserved the original construction of את כל אלה, and consequently neglected the word אשר.—The meaning of צום הרביעי וצום החמישי וצום השביעי וצום העשירי (8:19) must have been very obscure in the mind of the LXX. translator, for he renders νηστεία ἡ τετρὰς καὶ νηστεία ἡ πέμπτη, νηστεία ἡ ἑβδόμη καὶ νηστεία ἡ δεκάτη. But Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion understand the correct meaning, and translate rather inexactly νηστεία ἡ τοῦ τετάρτου, καὶ ἡ τοῦ πέμπτου, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἑβδόμου, καὶ ἡ τοῦ δεκάτου.—For עד אשר (8:20), Pesh. has מכיל, but LXX. omits אשר. To avoid the difficulty, Henderson supplies יהיה between the two words.

6. *Explanatory additions.*—When the translators think the original to be too concise, too elliptical, too figurative, too obscure or too anthropomorphic, they supply some words or phrases by way of explanation.

After בחדש השמיני (1:1) Pesh. adds the phrase בחד בירחא. This seems to be quite a common phraseology of the prophets (*cf.* Ezek. 26:1; 31:1; Hag. 1:1, *et al.*), and it would not be unreasonable to suppose that the phrase may have existed in the original text. Köhler suggests that the word חדש means the day of the new moon, *i. e.*, the first day of the month. But it is doubtful that "the first day of the month" should mean more than "the beginning of the month." Therefore, the phrase seems to

be an explanatory gloss; and even if it was in the original, we must be grateful to the editor for omitting it.—Before מעט (1:15) Targ. inserts על עמי, but this reading is not supported by other versions.—Before קרא (1:17) LXX. adds the extra sentence *καὶ εἶπε πρὸς μὲ ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοί.* But this insertion seems to be out of place.—Vulgate explains זרו (2:4) by the additional phrase, "per singulos viros."—After אלו (2:8) LXX. supplies *λέγων*, which is unnecessary.—After המלאך (3:3) Pesh. adds יהוה, and makes its favorite phrase.—In 3:4, Pesh. gives מלאכא as the subject of ויען.—For בגדים (3:5) Targ. and Pesh. seem to have read either בגדים טהורים or בזדים טובים. Wellhausen, 176: bei בגדים, vermisst man das adj. "rein."—Before החזהב (4:12 end), LXX. supplies *τὰς ἐπαρυστρίδας.*—After כהן (6:13) Targ. adds רב.—For ורחוקים (6:15) LXX. has *καὶ οἱ μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐτῶν.*—בחמישי ובשביעי (7:5) is rendered by Pesh. בירחא חמישיא ושביעיא.—In 7:11 Pesh. renders להקשיב by למשמעני, which does not suit the context.—For כאשר קרא (7:13) LXX. *ὃν τρόπον εἶπε.*—For לציון (8:2) LXX. seems to have read לירושלם ולציון, and renders *τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ τὴν Σιών.*—Targ. interprets את ירושלם (8:15) by ליתבי ירושלם.—For עמים (8:20), LXX. reads עמים רבים.—For לבקש את יהוה (8:21, 22), LXX. gives *ἐκζητῆσαι τὸ πρόσωπον κυρίου,* and Targ. למתבע אולמן מן קדם.

7. *Double translation.*—The translator gives, side by side, different renderings of single words, when he is not quite sure of the original meaning. For example: In 1:8, for שרקים LXX. gives *καὶ ψαροὶ καὶ ποικίλοι,* which would show that the translator himself did not know the exact meaning of the word. *Cf.* 6:3.

8. *Variations arising from misunderstanding or misinterpretation of a word or passage.*—For בן עדו (1:1) LXX. gives *υἱὸν Ἀδδώ,* thus making זכריה and בן עדו stand in apposition. The translator seems to have taken Zechariah not as grandson of Iddo, as in Vulg., but simply as his descendant. So also in 1:7. Lowe, however, inclines to take the *υἱὸν* as a corruption of *υἱοῦ.*—יהוה צבאות occurs forty-four times in the first eight chapters, and eight times in the remainder of the book of Zechariah (1:3, three times, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17; 2:12, 13, 15; 3:7, 9, 10; 4:6, 9; 5:4; 6:12, 15; 7:3, 4, 9, 12 twice, 13; 8:1, 2, 3, 4, 6 twice, 7, 9 twice, 11, 14 twice, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23; 9:15; 10:3; 11:5; 12:2, 7;

14:16, 21 twice). In all but three places, LXX. renders κύριος παντοκράτωρ, and twice κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων (1:9; 7:4). The Syriac translation חילהנא corresponds to the LXX. παντοκράτωρ. All the attempted translations fail to give the original meaning and are no better than the mere transliteration σαβαώθ (13:2). Vulg. gives "dominus exercituum," which is perhaps the meaning in the original.—LXX. renders יחיו (1:5) by ζήσονται, and this is followed by Vulg. which gives "vivent." But the context requires the present tense, which is well expressed in the Hebrew.—Vulg. takes the whole of 1:6 as a question, but LXX. changes the interrogative sentence in the verse into an imperative sentence with the verb δέχεσθε.—For צויתי (1:6) LXX. gives ἐντέλλομαι without any sufficient reason.—For וישובו (1:6) LXX. incorrectly gives καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν.—אשו זעמיתה (1:12) is rendered by LXX. ἃς ὑπερεῖδες and by Targ. טדאיתיתא עלידהון לו. But Vulg. and Pesh. agree with the Hebrew.—Vulg. translates זה שבעים שנה (1:12) by "Iste iam septuagesimus annus est," and does not include the sentence in the question introduced by עד מתי.—תפוצנה (1:17) is incorrectly rendered by Pesh. נסתרקן; Targ. יתמלין; LXX. διαχυθήσονται; but Vulg. gives the correct translation "affluent."—Targ. fails to give the original sense of 2:11.—For הישבים (3:8) Pesh. has הלין דקימין, which is not supported by any other version.—צמח (3:8) is certainly a difficult word. LXX. renders Ἀνατολήν; Vulg. "Orientem"; and Pesh. דנחא. These translators either take the word as an equivalent of Syr. צמחא, or read מזרח; *cf.* Zech. 6:12, Isa. 4:2, Jer. 23:5, 33:15. Aquil. renders the word by ἀναφυή, and Symm. by βλάστημα. The last two seem to express the original most satisfactorily.—For מפתח פִּתֻּחַהּ (3:9), LXX. gives ὀρύσσω βόθρον, probably reading פִּתְחָה; Aquil. διαγλύφω ἀνοίγματα αὐτῆς; Targ. אנא גלי חזיתהא; Pesh. בתה אנא תדעיה. None of these readings seem to be better than the Hebrew, which is followed by Vulg. and Symm.—For משתי (3:9) LXX. gives ψηλαφήσω, and this is followed by Pesh.—LXX. seems to regard למישר (4:7) as an Aramaic infinitive from the root ישר, and renders τοῦ κατορθῶσαι. But this word is undoubtedly a noun, as we find כמשרא in Targ. and אלא איך פקעתא in Pesh.; an imperative form of היה has probably been omitted before למישר.—ושמחו וראו (4:10) is rendered by Targ. ויהדי

כד יחזי and by Pesh. ונחרון ונחרזון.—For האבן הבדיל (4:10) LXX. gives τὸν λίθον τὸν κασσιτέρινον; Aquil. κασσιτέρου; Symm. τὸν κεχωρισμένον; Theod. ἀριθμοῦ; Vulg. "lapidem stanneum;" Targ. אבן משקולתא; Pesh. לכאפא דפודשנא. None of these translations can express the exact meaning of the original; for, in fact the Hebrew הבדיל is almost untranslatable.—שבלי (4:12) is rendered by LXX. κλάδοι, and by Vulg. "spicae." The former is better than the latter.—For היצהר (4:14), LXX. gives τῆς πιότητος; Aquil. στιλπνότητος; Symm. ἐλαίου; Theod. λαμπρότητος. —LXX. takes מגלה (5:1) either as a feminine form of מַגָּל or as an equivalent of the Aramaic מגלא, and renders δρέπανον. In this it is followed by the Pesh., but Aquil. and Theod. render διφθέρα; Symm. κεφαλίς or εἴλημα. LXX. is certainly mistaken.—For ברדים אמצים (6:3) LXX. gives ποικίλοι ψαροί; Targ. פציחין קטמנין; Symm. and Theod. prefer πελιδνοί to ποικίλοι, but Aquil. takes the usual meaning of אמצים and renders καρτεροί. In 6:7 האמצים is rendered by LXX. and Targ. in the same way. But Theod. suggests ἰσχυροί; Aquil. offers an emendation by giving πυῤῥοί; but Symm. strangely gives συνεσφιγμένοι.—הניחו את רוחי (6:8) is taken by Targ. as an imperative sentence.—מחלדי ומאת טוביה ומאת ידעיה (6:10) is rendered by LXX. παρὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων, καὶ παρὰ τῶν χρησίμων αὐτῆς, καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐπεγνωκότων αὐτήν. The translator was either ignorant that these are proper nouns, or regarded them as symbolical names. A similar case may be noted in 6:14, where לחלם ולטוביה ולידעיה is rendered by τοῖς ὑπομένουσι καὶ τοῖς χρησίμοις αὐτῆς, καὶ τοῖς ἐπεγνωκόσιν αὐτήν. (Codex A: αὐτῶν).—והוא ישא הוד (6:13) is variously rendered. LXX. translates the word הוד by ἀρετήν; Aquil. ἐπιδοξότητα; another copy εὐπρέπειαν; still another δόξαν; Vulg. "gloriam;" Targ. זיו; Pesh. renders the whole sentence by והו נקבל שובחא.—LXX., Vulg., Targ. and Pesh. take בית אל (7:2) as in the accusative of direction.—For לבית (7:3) LXX. gives ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ.—בחמישי ובשביעי (7:5) is rendered by LXX. ἐν ταῖς πέμπταις ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἑβδόμαις. But Aquil., Symm., and Theod. translate ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἑβδόμῳ. The latter is the correct rendering.—For ארץ המדה (7:14), LXX. incorrectly gives γῆν ἐκλεκτήν. שבתי . . . . ושכנתי (8:3); Vulg. attaches two different tenses to these verbs, and translates "reversus sum . . . . et habitabo." Pesh. avoids the difficulty by

rendering both by participles. Wright regards the first verb as a present-perfect, and the second as a present. But this does not suit the context so well as the LXX. *καὶ ἐπιστρέψω . . . . καὶ κατασκηνώσω*, which Targ. practically follows, by rendering אתוב . . . . ואשרי שכנתי.—Targ. renders ברחבתיה (8:5) by בפתהא in order to distinguish the word from רחבות at the beginning of the verse.—The second half of 8:6 is taken interrogatively by LXX., Vulg., Targ., and uncertain in Pesh. Hitzig, Köhler and others object to it.—מושיע (8:7) is rendered by LXX. *σώζω*, but by Vulg. "salvabo." The latter seems to be the meaning in the original.—לעם . . . . לאלהים (8:8) is rendered by Vulg. "in populum . . . . in Deum." This literal and unintelligible rendering shows that the translator did not understand the meaning of the passage.—For להבנות (8:9) LXX. gives *ἀφ' οὗ ᾠκοδόμηται.* From this, Hitzig concludes that LXX. read מהבנות. Hitzig does not seem to have read the LXX. translation of the entire verse very carefully.—מן הצר (8:10) is understood by Vulg. and Targ. to mean "on account of the affliction," but Pesh. gives the correct translation, מן קדם אלוצא.—זרע השלום (8:12) is rendered by Targ. זרעא יהי שלם, and by Pesh. זרעא נהוא בשלמא. But the Vulg. translation "semen pacis erit" seems to be best.—For ברכה (8:13) LXX. gives *ἐν εὐλογίᾳ* and weakens the sense of the original.

9. *Free translation or paraphrase.*—This is very common, as every biblical student knows, in Targ. and Pesh. The variations in this class may be divided into two groups.

(*a*) Cases in which the original sense is fairly presented.

For קצף . . . . קצף (1:2), Targ. gives הוהרגז . . . . דארגיזו על קדמוהי.—For ואשוב אליכם (1:3) Targ. has ואתפני במימרי לאיתבא לכון—For לא הקשיבו אלי (1:4), LXX. gives *οὐ προσέσχον τοῦ εἰσακοῦσαί μου*, and Targ. לא אצית למימרי. They seem simply to have paraphrased the same Hebrew text.—Pesh. paraphrases the whole of 1:5 as follows: איכא אנון אבהי כון ונביי דלבא לעלם חיין.—ישבת ושקטת (1:11) is rendered by Targ. יתבא שלוא ושקיטא.—For פרשתי (2:10) LXX. has *συνάξω.* The meanings of the words are opposite to each other. But this is a clear case of paraphrase, because the scattering of the people from Babylon is practically the same as the gathering of them into Jerusalem. One

would expect something like קבצתי (Wellhausen, *loc. cit.*, 175).—LXX. paraphrases בהלצות (3:4) by ποδήρη.—For על ראשה (4:2), LXX. gives ἐπάνω αὐτῆς. (It is equivalent to the preceding עליה, Wellhausen, 177).—For ברוחי (4:6) Targ. has במימרי.—Targ. takes הר הגדול (4:7) as referred to Rome, and gives a very full paraphrase of the whole verse.—For האיפה (5:6), LXX. gives τὸ μέτρον, and Vulg. "amphora," both of which are inferior to Symmachus' transliteration οἰφὶ.—For הנזר (7:3), Vulg. gives "vel sanctificare me debeo," and Targ. האבנע נפשי בתפנוקין.—For זה כמה שנים (7:3) LXX. gives ἤδη ἱκανὰ ἔτη.—For ולבם שמו שמיר (7:12), Vulg. has "et cor suum posuerunt ut adamantem."—For על כל הגוים (7:14) Targ. gives בני עממיא.—LXX. renders אל תיראו (8:13) by θαρσεῖτε, which is less exact than the Vulg. "nolite timere." *Cf.* 8:15.—For אלה הדברים אשר תעשו (8:16) Pesh. gives the free translation הלין פתגמיא עבדו.

(*b*) Cases in which the original sense is missed.

Targ. paraphrases the second half of 1:5 as follows: ואם תימרון נבייא לא לעלמא קיימין. But this does not agree with the context.—For הרי הרי ונסו (2:10), Targ. gives the paraphrase, אכלו למיבדריא ואמרו להון אתכנשו מארעא . . . This is so different from the Hebrew that I am inclined to regard it as a Targumic paraphrase of a different reading. At any rate, the reading is not in harmony with the remainder of the paragraph. In vv. 11–13, 14–16, 17, the commands are first given in the imperative form, and then followed by the reasons or grounds thereof, introduced by כי. Why should not v. 10 also have the same formula, seeing that its second half is a causal clause introduced by כי? It is true that אכלו introduces an imperative sentence, but it is not part of the divine message, which begins with אתכנשו.—For מנעך את ידי (2:13) Targ. gives מרים ית מחת גבורתי.—For היה לבש בגדים צואים (3:3) Targ. has הון ליה בנין דנסבין להון נשין דלא כשרן למהוניתא.—For בני הצהר (4:14) Targ. gives בני רברביא.—Targ. seems to disregard the suffix in עינם (5:6) and paraphrases אנון גלן קדם.—The Targumic paraphrase of v. 7 is extremely free.—For הניחו את רוחי (6:8), Targ. gives אמר להון עבידו ית רעותי. Wellhausen, 179: one would expect the imperfect יניחו.—For ומתחתיו יצמח (6:12) Targ. gives the strange paraphrase, עתיד דיתגלי ויתרבי.

—For הלא אתם האכלים ואתם השתים (7:6) Targ. has הלא לאיטבא לכון אתון שתן. This rendering is inferior to the elliptical construction in the original, and is favored by no other versions. —ואיש משענתו בידו מרב ימים (8:4) is incorrectly rendered by Targ. וגבר עובדוהי תקניא יגנון עלוהי מסגי יומיא.—Targ. wrongly renders part of 8:6 by כד תיקר דהלתי בעיני שארא דעמא הדין ביומיא האנון אף קדמי ייקרון.

10. *Interpretation rather than translation.*—For במצלה (1:8) Targ. gives בבבל, comparing "the shady valley" with Babylon.—טובים (1:13) is rendered by Targ. תקנין.—Targ. renders ערי (1:17) by קרוי עמי.—For קרנות (2:1) Targ. gives מלכון, which seems to be an interpretation, though the translator may have read מלכיות.—For כל דשר (2:17) Targ. gives כל רשיעיא, which cannot be accepted.—Targ. interprets צמח (3:8) by משיחא.—For זאת האיפה (5:6) Targ. has אלין עמא דהוו נסבין ויהבין במכילתא דשקרא.—For ארו שנער (5:11), LXX. gives γῇ Βαβυλῶνος; Targ. מדינת בבל; and Pesh. ארעא דבביל.—In the place of העטרת (6:14) Targ. has תשבחתא.—For בכסלו (7:1), Pesh. gives דהו כנון, which is no better than a mere transliteration as given in LXX., Vulg. and Arabic.—For הצום צמתני אני (7:5) Targ. has הצום תעני אתון מתענין קדמי.—Pesh. interprets גר ועני (7:10) by ולמסכנא ולדמתפנא לותי.—For ולבם שמו שמיר (7:12), LXX. gives καὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν ἔταξαν ἀπειθῆ. —הדברים (7:12) is rendered by Pesh. פוקדנא.—For כאשר קרא (7:13), Targ. gives כמא דאתנביאו להון נבייא.—עצומים (8:22) is rendered by LXX. πολλά, and by Targ. רברבין.

11. *The translators change the text*, so as to avoid difficulties, or to suit their own interpretation.

For הלוא (1:6), LXX. seems to have read אשר, or omitted the word altogether.—For ושכנתי (2:15), Pesh. evidently read ושכן. But LXX. has καὶ κατασκηνώσουσιν, which does not suit the context very well.—הם (2:17) is taken by Targ. as plural.—LXX. omits ואמר (3:5), taking the last part of the preceding verse, as well as the first sentence of this verse, as Jahveh's address to the angel attendants. But this omission is quite inconsistent with the LXX. translation of the preceding verse. Wellhausen, 176, adopts reading of the LXX. (שימו).—For המה (3:8), Pesh. evidently read אתם.—For תאנה . . . גפן (3:10)

Targ. read תאנו . . . גפנו, but this rendering weakens the figure in the original, which is a characteristic feature of Messianic speech (*cf.* Mic. 4:4).—For ביד (4:12) LXX. has ἐν ταῖς χερσί.—In 5:5, Targ. read בי for מה, and האלה for הזאת.—Pesh. omits ובנה את היכל יהוה (6:12), supposing, probably, that the copyist added here by mistake the first part of the following verse. But LXX. seems to regard והוא יבנה את היכל יהוה in 6:13 as an unnecessary repetition of the last sentence of the preceding verse, and omits it altogether. I think the LXX. reading is more plausible than the Syriac.—For ורגם (7:2) Pesh. has ושלח.—For הנבאים (7:3), Targ. gives ספריא.—For אל תחשבו בלבבכם (7:10), Vulg. has "non cogitet in corde suo," but the Heb. is more idiomatic and is supported by LXX., Targ., Pesh., and partly the Arabic.—For כאשר קרא (7:13), Pesh. gives על דקרית אנון. This reading is very smooth and seems to be correct.—משחקים (8:5) is rendered by Targ. משבחין (*cf.* 2 Sam. 6:5). For ברחבתיה (8:5), some Greek manuscripts of LXX. are based on the reading ברחבתיהם.—For ושכני (8:8) LXX. reads ושכנתי.—LXX. renders העם הזה (8:12) by τοῦ λαοῦ μου τούτου, which is not correct, containing an addition.—In 8:15, LXX. adds καὶ before זמותי, because the translator read השבתי for שבתי.—For ומבפט שלום (8:16), Pesh. gives ודינא ושלמא.

II.

VARIATIONS DUE PRESUMABLY TO THE MSS.

1. *Errors made by the copyists of the versions.*—In this class I include those errors which are due not to the original Hebrew text, or to the translators, but to the copyists of the text of a translation.

(*a*) Addition: For ויתנו (7:11), Vulg. has "et averterunt," which seems to be, as Wright suggests, a mistake of the copyists for "et verterunt."

(*b*) Omission: For מבוא השמש (8:7), some Codd. of the LXX. have simply δυσμῶν, but others add ἡλίου.—In 8:13, LXX. has ὁ οἶκος Ἰούδα καὶ οἶκος Ἰσραήλ. The omission of the article before the second οἶκος is to be taken as a copyist's error.

(*c*) Repetition: For התורה (7:12), LXX. has τοῦ νόμου μου. The μου seems to be a repetition by mistake of the latter part of the preceding word, νόμου.

(*d*) Alteration: For הלוא השיגו (1:6), LXX. gives *οἵ κατελάβοσαν*. But it seems to be a corruption of *οὐ κατελάβοσαν*.

2. *Errors due to the condition of the texts used by the translators.*—That the texts used by the translators were in quite bad condition is evident from the existence of those peculiar variations which could not have arisen, if the writing had been clear, full, and exact. Some of the causes of these variations are:

(*a*) Omission of the final ם. "According to Lagarde, the three letters ה, מ, ת, when occurring at the end of a word, were not written in the MSS. used by LXX., but represented by the mark of abbreviation (″) which already appears on Hebrew coins." (Driver's *The Books of Samuel*, Introd., p. lxix). In my examination of Zech. 1–8, I have found at least one variation due to the omission of the final ם.—For ערי מטוב (1:17) LXX. and Pesh. read עריים מטוב, and Targ. ערי עמי טוב. It is possible that the מ of מטוב originally belonged to ערי, but it is more probable that the final ם was omitted, as usual, in the original MSS.; and LXX. and Pesh. seem to present the correct reading.

(*b*) Confusion of consonants. Considering the condition of the ancient MSS. used by the translators, and also their method of translation, it is not at all improbable that some consonants were confounded with others. In some cases the confusion seems to have arisen from a similarity in form, and in others, from a similarity in sound.

For להחריד (2:4) LXX. reads להחדיד and renders *τοῦ ὀξῦναι*. Schleusner thought that the LXX. translation has simply given the sense of the passage. But Vulg., Targ., and Pesh., though they do not give exact equivalents of the word, seem to have intended to translate להחריד, which is certainly the correct reading.—The confusion of ה with ח is quite common. In 2:6, LXX. fails to give the suffix of ארכה. In 3:9, פתחה is rendered by LXX. without the suffix. In 4:2, LXX. and Pesh. again omit the suffix from גלה. In 4:11, LXX. and Targ. do not give the suffix of שמאולה. Again in 5:2, LXX. omits the suffix from ארכה . . . ורחבה. There is one case in which ח is taken for ה, viz: in 4:3, LXX. reads הגלח for הגלה. Wellhausen, 177: "for מימין הגלה read מימינה, the suffix referring to

המנורה; *cf.* 11; הגלה is a false paraphrase."—For פרזות (2:8), LXX. reads פריות, and renders κατακάρπως; Symmachus ἀταιχίστως; Theodotion εἰς πλατός. But Vulg., Targ., and Pesh. agree with the Hebrew. Also see Wellhausen, *Kleine Propheten*, 175.—For כארבע רוחות (2:10), LXX. reads מארבע רוחות. Several MSS. and Vulg. read בארבע. This reading seems to be better than the Hebrew, because ארבע רוחות simply means "the four directions," and not the actual "winds." Wright, however, does not believe בארבע to have been the reading of Vulg. or Pesh., and holds that the latter, at least, has probably read לארבע. The reading of an original MS. כ for מ (both being very much alike; see Riehm-Baethgen, *Handwörterbuch*, article "Schrift") is very common. Mention may be made here of Hos. 9:7; Amos 5:8, 17; Mic. 1:2; Zech. 2:10; 6:14. This explains satisfactorily the LXX. translation ἐξ (= מ) for Heb. כ. Wellhausen, *loc. cit.* 175, says: "One would expect something like מארבע."—For הם (2:17), LXX. has εὐλαβείσθω; Pesh. ונדהל, and Targ. ספר. These translators seem to have read הת.—For the second וגם (3:7), LXX. reads ואם.—For נקה (5:3), Targ. gives לקי, which has perhaps, as Wright suggests, arisen from the confusion of נקה with נכה.—For עינם (5:6), LXX. reads עונם and renders ἡ ἀδικία αὐτῶν. Wellhausen, 178, follows LXX. and in addition omits as a gloss ריאמר זאת האיפה היוצאת. Pesh. seems to follow LXX., and gives הובא. Symmachus' suggestion πρὸς τοῦτο ἀποβλέπουσι is certainly based upon the Heb. עינם, but it is not an exact translation.—LXX. renders נהיה (8:10) by ἔσται, probably reading יהיה. Lowe thinks, however, that the LXX. translator read נהיה as an Aramaic future. At any rate, the verb should be taken as a past, as in Vulg., Pesh., and in some MSS. of the LXX.

(*c*) Corruption of the Text. Though the confusion of consonants is, in a sense, due to the corruption of the text, yet, under this special heading, I include those strange and remarkable variations which compel me to ascribe them to the fact that the original text was very badly corrupted and obscure.

For השיגו (1:6), Pesh. gives אתדכרו. Perhaps the text was corrupt, but it is possible that the translator read השימו.—For השאננים (1:15), Vulg. has "opulentas;" Targ. דשרן שלוא; Pesh.

דמתרגשין; the English Version (both A. and R.) follows the Targ. But LXX. gives the correct rendering, *τὰ συνεπιτιθέμενα*, which seems to be for הנשאים, as Schleusner well suggested.* —For יצא (2:7, after בי), LXX. seems to have read נצב and renders *εἱστήκει*. But the Heb. is to be preferred, because it suits the context better.†—LXX. renders the second half of 2:12 by *διότι ὁ ἁπτόμενος ὑμῶν ὡς ὁ ἁπτόμενος τῆς κόρης τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ αὐτοῦ*, as if the text had read בבבת . . . . . כנגע. This is followed by Targ. But Vulg. and Pesh. give faithful translations of the more vivid original Hebrew.—For ונלוו (2:15), LXX. incorrectly reads ונסו, and renders *καταφεύξονται*.—For ממשון (2:17), LXX. gives *ἐκ νεφελῶν*, and Pesh. מרומא. It is probable that the former read מ(מ)עגן, and the latter ממעלה.—For ישימו (3:5), LXX. has *ἐπίθετε*.—מהלכים (3:7), a very difficult word, is rendered by LXX. *ἀναστρεφομένους*, by Vulg. "ambulantes," and by Pesh. מהלכין. Hitzig's objection to Gesenius' interpretation of the word does not prove that the form is an Aramaic hiph. participle from הלך. Wellhausen, 176: מהלכים muss die Bedeutung "Zutritt" haben; *cf.* Jer. 30:21.—For האבן הראשה (4:7), LXX. probably reads האבן ירושה, as Schleusner supposed, and renders *τὸν λίθον τῆς κληρονομίας*. Vulg. translates "lapidem primarium," and Pesh. also has כאפא רישיתא. הראשה is rendered by Aquila *τὸν πρωτεύοντα*, by Symmachus *τὸν ἄκρον*, and by Theodotion *τὸν πρῶτον*. Targ. gives the interpretation, ית משיחיה דאמיר שמיה מלקדמין. Weighing all these translations, we must reject the LXX. reading and adopt the Heb. as the original, though it is very difficult.—תשאות חן חן לה (4:7) is also very difficult. LXX. seems to have derived the word תשאות from שוה, and renders *ἰσότητα χάριτος χάριτα αὐτῆς*. This is followed by Aquila's *ἐξισώσει χάριτος*, and the Vulg. "exaequabit gratiam gratiae eius." Symmachus gives *πρὸς χάριν αὐτῆς*; Theodotion offers *κατάπαυσις, κατάπαυσις αὐτῇ*; Pesh. has דשויותא ודרחמא. These translations sufficiently testify to the helpless corruption of the Hebrew text. Wellhausen: "Der Sinn der letzten Worte des Verses lässt sich nur muthmassen."—LXX. renders משוטטים (4:10) by *οἱ ἐπιβλέποντες*, and this is followed by the Syriac חיזין. But better is the Vulg. "discurrunt," which is adopted in the English Version.

* See, however, Wellhausen, *loc. cit.* 174, and Isa. 37:29.
† Wellhausen, *loc. cit.* 174, suggests עמד (*cf.* 3:5).

—For מעליהם (4:12), LXX. seems to have read מעלים.—For כמוה (5:3), LXX. reads either למות or כמות, and renders ἕως θανάτου. This, however, may be due to the omission of the final ה in the original MSS. Tischendorf's text omits the second כמוה. Vulg. has "sicut ibi scriptum est" for the first מזה כמוה, and "ex hoc similiter" for the second. Wellhausen: probably read מזה כַּמֶּה (= ܡܙܐ) "since how long."—For על כסאו (6:13), LXX. gives (καὶ ἔσται ἱερεὺς) ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ. Wellhausen, 179, proposes to read מימינו.—For האבכה (7:3), LXX. seems to have read בא כה, as Wright suggests, and renders εἰσελήλυθεν ὧδε.—For שבתי זמיתי (8:15), LXX. gives παρατέταγμαι καὶ διανενόημαι. Wright's suggestion that the translator read השבתי is plausible.—בשעריכם (8:16) is supported by all versions but Targ., which seems to have read בעיריכם, and renders בקרויכון. —For וישבי עדים (8:20), Vulg. reads וישבו בערים and renders "et habitent in civitatibus."

3. *Recensional variations.*—These are the variations which can be best explained by supposing the translators to have used MSS. more or less different from the MSS. on which our Massoretic text is based. Some of the variations in this class are to be preferred to the Massoretic text, while others should be rejected. We note the following:

(*a*) Errors made by the copyists of the Hebrew text. These are the deviations from the correct Hebrew text, which are solely due to the copyists of the Hebrew text, and which were adopted by the translators. (α) *Addition:* For אל תהיו (1:4) LXX. reads ואל תהיו.—For יהוה (1:13, 16; 8:17) LXX. reads יהוה צבאות, Pesh. following LXX. in 1:16 and 8:17.—For ביתי (1:16) LXX. reads וביתי.—After ואמר (1:6) LXX. adds πρὸς αὐτὸν, and is followed by Pesh. But other similar passages favor the Hebrew reading. (β) *Omission:* From לעבדיהם (2:13) Pesh. omits ל.—In 4:2, the *Kethîbh* ויאמר must be a copyist's error (Wellhausen, 141). The *Qerê* suits the context better, and is found in many MSS., LXX., Itala, Vulg., Targ. and Pesh. —From ויזעק אתי (6:8) LXX. omits אתי, and in this is followed by Pesh.—For באו (6:10) LXX., Pesh. and Targ. (in *London Polyglot*) read בא.—From 6:12, LXX. and Pesh. omit לאמר in both cases.—צבאות (7:4) is omitted in some Codd., Targ. and

Pesh.—(γ) *Repetition:* For שבעה ושבעה (4:2) LXX. and Vulg. read simply שבעה. We are either to take these words distributively, or perhaps better to regard the second as a mere repetition by mistake of the first (so Hitzig, Ewald, Henderson). Köhler and Wright conjecture that there are two sets of seven pipes each. Briggs favors this view. But this interpretation does not seem to be more natural than to regard the second שבעה as a copyist's error. (Wellhausen, 176–7).—(δ) *Explanatory* or *marginal glosses*, which crept into the text: For לדריוש (1:1) Vulg. reads לדריוש המלך, as in Hag. 1:1 and 15.—After צויתי (1:6) LXX. adds ἐν πνεύματί μου. This may have been copied from 7:12.—After את הודה (2:4) LXX. adds καὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατέαξαν.—After ולמועדים טובים (8:19) LXX. gives καὶ εὐφρανθήσεσθε. —(ε) *Changes made by the copyists* to avoid difficulties or ambiguities: For אתו (1:6) some Codd. and Theodotion have ὑμῖν.—For בין ההדסים (1:8) LXX. seems to have read *בין הָהָרִים and renders ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν δύο ὀρέων; and in this is followed by the Arabic. Hitzig thinks that the LXX. translator may have read ההדורים.—For הור ציון (2:11) LXX. has εἰς Σιών, which does not suit the context. Lowe, however, compares this with a similar mistake in Ezek. 21:15.—For אתך (3:4) LXX. has αὐτόν. Wellhausen, 176, proposes to read אתו.—For נרתיה (4:2) LXX. reads נרות.—For וידעת (4:9) some Codd., Vulg., Targ. and Pesh. read וידעתם (plur.; so Wellhausen, 177).—For והנה (5:7) LXX. has ἰδού, and Vulg. "ecce"; Wellhausen, 178, adopts והנה from LXX. text, or simply ו.—For עמכם (8:23) LXX. reads עמך in both cases. Some copies have μετὰ σοῦ for the first, and μετὰ ὑμῶν for the second, and Pesh. is like this. But Vulg. and Targ. support the Hebrew.—(ζ) *Changes which cannot be easily accounted for:* For ובחר (2:16) Targ. gives ויתרעי and Pesh. ונצטבא.—For ויקשו ללכת (6:7) LXX. gives καὶ ἐπέβλεπον τοῦ πορεύεσθαι, and other copies καὶ ἐζήτουν, καὶ ἐπέβλεπον τοῦ πορεύεσθαι. It is possible that the translator read ויבקרו.—For זרע השלום (8:12) LXX. seems to have had a different text, and gives ἢ δείξω εἰρήνην. Wellhausen, 181, reads: כי אזרע השלום.—For והלכו יושבי אחת אל אחת (8:21) LXX. gives the strange translation καὶ συνελεύσονται κατοικοῦντες πέντε πόλεις εἰς πόλιν μίαν. But other copies have κατοικοῦντες μίαν εἰς μίαν.

(*b*) The original readings preserved in the ancient MSS. used by the translators. All the recensional variations are not corruptions and incorrect readings, but some of them are to be preferred to the Massoretic text, and seem to be the original readings. We mention the following:

In 1:8, Pesh. correctly omits והנה.—Before שרקים (1:8) LXX. and Pesh. have the conjunction ו.—For ויאמר אלי המלאך הדבר בי (1:9) Pesh. gives ועונא מלאכא דממלל בי ואמר לי. This is perhaps to be preferred, in view of the similar formulae in this paragraph (1:10, 11, 12, 13).—For בארץ (1:11) LXX. reads בכל הארץ.—In 1:13, LXX. adds ו before דברים נחמים.—In 2:2 LXX. and Pesh. read מה אלה אדני.—In 2:4, LXX. omits לאמר and gives πρός μέ instead. This reading agrees with the form of the similar passages in 1:9; 2:2, 6, 8, etc., and is probably correct.—For לידות (2:4) Targ. seems to have read לזרות and renders למיתבר. This suits the context remarkably well, and even adds a rhetorical force, and therefore I am inclined to take it as the original reading.—From ונסו (2:10) LXX., Vulg., and Pesh. omit the conjunction ו.—For לי (2:15) LXX. and Pesh. read לו.—In 3:1, LXX. and Vulg. read ויראני יהוה.—For ויאמר יהוה (3:2) Pesh. read ויאמר מלאך יהוה (*cf.* Wellhausen, *loc. cit.*, 175).—For עונך (3:4) LXX. reads עונך. Wellhausen considers ויאמר אליו עונך . . . . as a parenthetical insertion.—For אליכם (4:9) LXX. reads אליך. This suits the context well, and seems to be the correct reading, though all the other ancient versions favor the Hebrew.—For בית אל (7:2) LXX. Targ., Pesh. and Baer read ביתאל as one word.—Before גר (7:10) LXX., Vulg. and Targ. add the conjunction ו.—Before לאמר (8:1) many Codd. and Pesh. read אלי. In spite of the objection of the Massorah this seems to be the correct reading in view of 4:8; 6:9; 7:4, 8.

III.

VARIATIONS OF DOUBTFUL ORIGIN.

While there are not a few doubtful cases among the variations which have thus far been discussed, it is even more true of the variations under this special heading, variations which are extremely difficult to explain. Their origin may be accounted for as:

1. *Recensional, or a change made by the translator.* For instance:

In 2:4, את קרנות הגוים is rendered by LXX. τὰ τέσσαρα κέρατα. The Hebrew is to be preferred.—For רגם (7:2), part of a proper name, LXX. has Ἀρβεσεσέρ.

2. *Recensional, or due to the carelessness on the part of the translator.* Note the following examples:

For יהורה (2:4) LXX. reads יהוה.—For בת ציון (2:14) Targ. reads בית ציון, and renders כנשתא דציון. The translator, however, may have been misled by the usual *scriptio defectiva* in the original MSS.

3. *Recensional, or misinterpretation of the translator.* Thus:

For ואמר (3:5) Vulg. and Pesh. read ויאמר, and, as the result, the former gives the duplicate statement that Joshua was clothed with new garments, and both present an unpleasantly abrupt change from the direct imperative הסירו to the indirect jussive ישימו. It is best to follow the Heb. and Targ., and read ואמר, because it suits the context best and also strengthens the contrast between צניף and בגדים.—For הנגב (7:7) LXX. gives ἡ ὀρεινή; Pesh. seems to follow LXX. and renders טורא.

4. *Due to the corruption of the text, or an intentional change made by the translator.* So we have:

In 1:6, LXX. has an additional word δέχεσθε, which is probably for קחו, as has been suggested; and this reading may have arisen from some confusion connected with the word חקי.—For גוים (8:22) Targ. has מלכין. The translator may have given his interpretation of the original.

5. *Recensional, or due to the condition of the text:*

For הנבאים (1:5) Pesh. read נביאי. The absence of the final ם in the original text may have misled the Syriac translator to read ינביאי for הנבאי.—For וישובו (1:6) Pesh. has ואתרעיו.—For ונחם (1:7) Pesh. gives ויבנא.—In 2:9, Pesh. omits לה and gives בגוה in its place.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

It is undoubtedly true that some of the explanations offered in this thesis are far from satisfactory. But, taking it for granted that most of them are correct or probable, it may not be uninter-

esting to observe some of the characteristic variations in the different versions. Most of the variations in the tense of a verb are found in LXX. The changes from one part of speech into another are found only in LXX. and Pesh. Variations due to a different pointing are characteristic of LXX., but those due to a different grouping of words are rare outside of Pesh. LXX. has many additions, but Pesh. has only a few, and Vulg. none. Omissions are most numerous in Pesh., and half as many in LXX., but very rare in Vulg. and Targ. Variations arising from a violation of the principles of Hebrew syntax are found almost exclusively in LXX. Some explanatory glosses are given in Targ. and Pesh., but more in LXX. Obscure rendering is a characteristic of Pesh., and too literal translation is common in LXX. Paraphrase and interpretation are abundant in Targ., but most of the strange, inexplicable variations are found in LXX. Misinterpretations are quite numerous in all versions, but original readings are preserved more in LXX. and Pesh. than in the other versions.

EMENDATIONS OF THE MASSORETIC TEXT ON THE BASIS OF THE ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS AND VERSIONS.

1: 8. Omit והנה with Pesh. and read ושרקים following LXX. and Pesh.
9. Read ויען המלאך הדבר בי ויאמר אלי with Pesh.
11. Read בכל הארץ, following LXX.
13. Read ודברים נחמים with LXX.
15. Read הנשאים with LXX. (but LXX. συνεπιτιθεμένα) and see Wellhausen, *Kleine Propheten*, 174.
17. Read ערים with LXX.
2: 2. Read מה אלה אדני, following LXX. and Pesh.
4. Read אלי for לאמר, following LXX.; and לזרות for לידות, following Targ.
10. Omit the conjunction ו from ונסו, (so also Wellhausen, *loc. cit.*, 175) following LXX., Vulg. and Pesh.; and read בארבע with several MSS., Vulg. and Pesh.
15. Read לך for לי, following LXX. and Pesh.
3: 1. Insert יהוה after ויוראני, following LXX. and Vulg.
2. Read ויאמר מלאך יהוה with Pesh.
4. Read עוניך, following LXX. (so Wellhausen, 175).
4: 2. Read ואמר with the *Qerê*; and omit ושבעה.
9. Read אליך with LXX.

5: 9. Read בכנפיהן, following one of Baer's MSS.
10. Read הנה for המה, following two MSS.
6: 6. Read יצאו with Ewald. Wright's objection to this emendation is not conclusive.
10. Read ומאת טוביה with Baer, following some ancient Hebrew and Greek MSS.
13. Omit והוא יבנה את היכל יהוה, following LXX.
7: 2. Read ביתאל (so Baer-Delitzsch) as one word, following LXX., Targ. and Pesh.
10. Read וגר with LXX., Vulg. and Targ.
13. Read כאשר קראתי, following Pesh.
8: 1. Insert אלי before לאמר, following many Codd. and Pesh.
9. Omit ההיכל with Hitzig.

VITA.

I, Eiji Asada, was born on the 22d of May 1865, in a small town called Hanaoka in the southern part of Japan. In the Spring of my sixth year I was sent to a public school at Tokuyama, four miles from my birthplace, and was graduated from the same in July 1879. Then I went to Yamaguchi High School, Hiroshima High School and Kyoto High School, from the last of which I was graduated in June 1883. In the following Spring I entered the First Higher Middle College, Tokyo, and completed the Science course in June 1887. After having spent one year in the department of Mathematics in the Imperial University, Tokyo, I came to the United States of America in order to take some theological studies. In September 1888 I entered the Theological Seminary of the Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., and was graduated from the same in May 1891 with the degree of D.B. While in the school of Theology I became so interested in Semitic studies and Old Testament work that I attended Professor Harper's Summer school for five sessions and studied Old Testament literature and Semitic languages. In 1891-2 I pursued the same studies in New York City under Professors Briggs and Brown at the Union Theological Seminary, and also under Professor Gottheil at Columbia College. In October 1892 I entered the Graduate School of The University of Chicago, and took further studies in Semitics and the Old Testament for one year under Professors W. R. Harper, Hirsch, R. F. Harper, Price and Goodspeed.

DATE DUE

DEC 3 1 '85

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Stockton, Calif.

BS1665 .2.A79
The Hebrew text of Zechariah, 1-8
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00012 5833