



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

U
The Text of
Zephaniah.

Thurs
for
Graduation.

Albion Union College,
May, 1896.

Gustav H. Lorenson & Co.

[1896]

mic. 11/78

Table of Contents.

Chapter I.	Introduction.	1-15
Chapter II.	Ancestry, Life, Times and writings.	16-30
Chapter III.	Massoretic and Greek Texts compared.	31-40.
Chapter IV.	Notes on the Greek Text	41-66.

Introduction.

Difficulties of Biblical Exegesis

The difficulties, which present themselves to the student, who busies himself with biblical research and exegetical interpretations are many. Truly and perplexing questions arise, which must be properly answered before the scholar can say that he has accomplished anything, before he can go to the intellectual world and say "There is something newly discovered by me, here is a contribution to the best of the world's literature. Many persons can be found who say this, very few, however, make the boast good and offer something worthy of attention.

I have encountered many difficult and obscure passages in the course of my study, which I have attempted to solve. While I cannot claim that I have written something, which will startle the world, nevertheless I offer with the hope that it may lead to still further investigation and research, which will enable me to offer something to the world, which may prove useful and valuable to biblical students.

One of the greatest difficulties in work of this kind is the absence of the tools, with which we must work. The tools, which are to help us in constructing our work are noticeably wanting. We work apparently with our bare hands, without any outside assistance. This lack of

3
working material is the great stumbling block
over which we slip and fall. But some
day this block will be removed and
then we will be able to march right
on the way to the pinnacle of success,
which we so earnestly strive after. We
will have all the books necessary for
our work and will not be able to offer
their lack as an excuse. But until
that happy time comes, we will tender
our excuse for the work which we present.

Another great difficulty, which
we must encounter in the pursuit of
biblical criticism is the fact that we
must for the most part deal with the
different Versions. If we desire to use
the Versions as a help to critical exam-
ination, we are compelled to take into

consideration the character of the art and the manner of the translator. We must place ourselves, for the time being, in his generation. We must work with him, with the same means which he had at his command at the time when he wrote. Otherwise we are liable to underestimate his work, to give him too little credit for what he has done. He may have done pioneer service in his own particular field, yet we would not allow him credit for his work, if we judged him according to the standards of our time. For this reason, we must consider the character of the translator, and the manner of his writing. The translator reproduces what is before him, yet he does not have to reproduce

in the same way that we do. There may be many personalities, which his time does not allow him to reproduce. Just as many editions of the Palmer have been expurgated, on account of the severity of the censors, so, too, the translator may be compelled to give a different reading to some of the verses in the bible. They seek to reproduce the original text in what, to them, seems the best way.

A translator does not reproduce exactly. This is an impossibility. He can express in his own language the thought and most of the words, but to give the exact idiom of the original is almost impossible. An idiom in one language may be translated by an idiom in another and yet not express the full

meaning of the idiom that is to be translated. Then again the translator may not be able to find the exact word which explicitly states the word to be translated. This may be due to several reasons. In the first place, the translator may be in a hurry and not caring to bother himself with the word, which exactly reproduces the original, he may take some synonym, which while not truly translating the original is approximately near to the same. Again, the translator may not be able to give a word which translates the word before him. What does he do in that case? He simply transcribes the original word into his language. An example of this can be found in 2 Kings 23⁵, where the

Septuagint renders ב. י. כ. כ., Χωραγίω. They do not understand the word, hence they cannot translate it. All that they can do in such cases is to transcribe the word or leave it out altogether.

There is another source of difficulty which manifests itself to the student. If the Versions cannot translate a thing, or if they cannot understand what the thing is, they ⁽²⁾either give an interpretation entirely original or, in many cases, leave the word out entirely. (See note on by ב. י. כ. כ. page 246). This gives rise to a Variant, which many try to explain away, by saying that because the Version does not have it, the Massoretic text must have added it, and that the word has no direct bearing on the verse.

Many forced explanations are caused, which would be unnecessary if we consider that the Version omitted the words because they were unable to understand them and translate them.

We have said that a translation does not reproduce exactly, and the Septuagint, also, does not exactly reproduce what is in the Hebrew. The Greek translation is subject to the same strictures and errors that other translations are. Their work is no more reliable than that of other workers in the field of translation. They adhere as closely as possible to the original Hebrew Manuscripts, but in this very adherence to the text, many errors arise.

In the old script of the Hebrew manuscripts, there is a great similarity in appearance among the different letters of the alphabet. This has led to many a false reading of the text and this source of error is one of the largest with which we have to deal. A good example of this misreading of the text can be found in our note^a on Zeph 1¹², 1¹⁴ and many other places in the different books of the bible.

Another source of error is where through the carelessness of the scribes and copyists some of the letters are transposed and consonants are inserted or left out. An example of the transposition of letters by the Septuagint, we find in Zeph 1, 9. where for אֵלֵינוּ, the Greeks

a. Notes 13 and 16.

read some form of $\eta\lambda$ as does also the Syriac after the $\delta\times$. Examples of the omission or addition of letters are superfluous as errors of this sort are met with on every page of the Septuagint.

If we were to have an old manuscript before us, we could see with what difficulty, the translators of the bible had to contend. In addition to the trouble arising from the similarity existing among the different letters and the difficulty in distinguishing the different letters one from the other, there is a still greater difficulty to overcome and this is the difficulty of an obliterated manuscript. Many of the old manuscripts have some places in them, in which it is impossible to read

the word on account of the defects in the text. The translator must complete his sentence, he must try to read the original text. He cannot do this on account of erasures existing in the manuscript. What does he do? He supplies the word, which he thinks belongs in the manuscript. If a dozen men were to see the original manuscript and would try to restore it, it is a safe inference to say that every one would restore it differently, every one will find a word, which he thinks belongs in the text. As a result of this, variants arise, which we seek to explain. If we were to have different manuscripts, we would have different variants.

Many of the differences existing

between the Septuagint and the massoretic text are due to the reading of what has been termed "doublets". This source of error arises in cases where men differ as to the translation of a word.

A certain form is capable of several translations, one man may take it one way, another, another. These two translations are placed side by side and gradually woven into the text and as a result, we have a double reading of the same word, which is regarded by some as a double form existing in the original manuscript. We have formed a doublet when we give these two readings. Errors arising from doublets are of frequent occurrence in the Septuagint and are of the chief sources of error.

13

There are also errors of ditto-graphy in the Versions and also in the Massoretic Text. Ditto-graphy is the reading of the same consonants twice in the same verse.

There have been many centuries of commentators, who have worked on the Massoretic text and ^{have} tried to establish the true reading, without having the original manuscript. The Septuagint however, is practically without any comments at all. None have busied themselves with its text to see whether it is correct or not. And since we must base our work on the Septuagint, one can see with what difficulties we must contend. If, after these many years of notes and comments the Massoretic text is so faulty, how

13

must the Greek text be, which is without these notes. But until the original Greek and Hebrew texts are found and these compared with the Septuagint and Massoretic text of to-day, must we be content with the means which we have at our command.

This gives rise to the question: Is there a real original text? Must there be one original text? Could there not be more than one? Might we not suppose that the prophet dictated his work to several scribes at the same time? On the basis of this last question lies the solution of the difficulty. If the work was dictated to several scribes at the same time, could there not arise differences among their texts? Could not

the one have misunderstood the man speaking and not wishing to interrupt the others in their work, put down, what he thought he had heard the man say? In this way, two or more original texts may be extant, each one differing from the other. One of these original manuscripts the translators of the Septuagint may have had, the Massorites another. On this ground could we explain many of the seeming difficulties of biblical criticism.

16
The ancestry of Zephaniah (see above), Zephaniah

Zephaniah (called Zephaniah in the Septuagint) was, according to the superscription to his book in the fourth generation from a certain Hezekiah. Concerning this last name, a difficulty has arisen. Authorities differ on the question, 'Who was this ancestor Hezekiah? If he was the king Hezekiah of the Davidian family, why was there not written $\text{זְפַנְיָהוּ בֶן־חִזְקִיָּהוּ מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה}$, just as $\text{יְרֵמְיָהוּ בֶן־חִזְקִיָּהוּ מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה}$ was written in the same verse. There must be some good reason for Zephaniah to trace his ancestry back four generations. None of the other prophets has done this. Perhaps he sought to gain prestige and authority over the people, by showing that he was royal.

blood and was entitled to this respect
by virtue of his princely birth.

Most commentators have considered
Jephthah as an off-spring of the
royal house; two things however
seem to stand in the way of this belief.

From Hazeckiah to Josiah under
whom Jephthah is reported to have
prophecied, according to the old Hebrew
genealogical tables, ~~three~~ generations are
supposed to have passed, not ~~four~~ ^{five} as
counted in Jephthah's family table.
Among the sons of Hazeckiah we find a
Menasseh, but no Amariah. (2 Kings 1, 2
2 Chron. 29.)

It is a false presumption to
suppose that all families must have
the same number of children. If one

branch marries early and another
 much later it is highly probable that
 our family could in the course of four
 generations, produce one generation
 more than the other. Because in our
 short genealogical tables no son of
 Hezekiah by the name of Amariah is
 mentioned, does it necessarily follow
 that he had no son by that name?
 Do our historians give the names of
 all the sons of the kings, or do they not
 rather give the name of the successor
 to the throne and the names of those
 sons whose lives have been so connected
 with the life of the nation, that the historical
 narrative would have been incomplete
 without the mention of their names.
 Amariah may have been a son, born of

one of the concubines of the King Hezekiah, and it would have been superfluous for the historian to put down his name in the list of the royal family, as he was not eligible to the throne. Thiers thinks that the time between Hezekiah the King and Zephaniah is not so short to allow of the existence of four generations.

Of the life of Zephaniah, very little is known. That he lived during the reign of Josiah we learn from the superscription. No particulars of the personality of the prophet can be ascertained.

To what period of the 31 years (640-609 B.C.) of Josiah's reign does Zephaniah belong? Earlier or later than the 18th year, when the religious reforms began in accordance with the newly found law (2 Ki. 22³)

"From his sayings" says Strack "we are limited to the first decade of Josiah". Perhaps Zephaniah's prophecies caused the beginning of the reforms of the king.

Delitzsch places it after the 18th year of Josiah, according to the massoretic reading of 1, 11. where לְיָזְכְּרָא is spoken of.^a Driver holds the same view as Delitzsch. "The prophet's judgment on Jerusalem, with its various parties of Jahveh and Baal or Moloch or Star-worshippers (1, 4 ff.) its unprincipled priests and arrogant prophets (34) and its entire body of inhabitants who listen to no voice of truth and accept no correction (3, 1 ff. 7.) is altogether too unfavorable and presupposes too much positive heathenism, to allow us to think that that honestly meant and, at least outwardly, thorough cleansing of the

a. See Note 6.

temple and forms of worship by the pious
 king could have taken place in the last
 period. It would be better to fix on the
 middle period, between the 12th and 18th
 years of Josiah (so Hitzig et al.) as according
 to 2 Chron. 34³, he already made in the 12th
 year a beginning of such attempts, but
 cannot then have carried them out with
 his later energy and consistency. But
 the picture given of the miserable state of
 things agrees best with the first years
 of this reign, when the king, who had come
 to the throne in his 8th year, had not
 yet sufficient independence to be able to
 resist the corruption. The severe language
 of the prophet may have helped to stir
 up the king's conscience. But it is
 strange that in the inquiry, related of

the 18th year (2 Kings 22¹² ff.) Josiah does not send for Zephaniah — who, after his discourses, would have been the most suitable for the purpose, — but for the prophetic, Huldah. Or was Zephaniah then already dead?^{na.}

König rejects the date of the superscription and seeks, as historical background, to fix it in the decade following the death of Josiah.

Not the ancestry but the time of his writing and the circle of his hearers is important and on this point there can be no doubt. All point to the reign of King Josiah.

Most of Zephaniah's pictures point to a Scythian invasion of Judaea. About 630 B.C. a large horde of Scythians

from Eastern Asia, came through the continent, destroying every thing they came across. They came to Palestine, after being stopped at the borders of Egypt by the prayers and presents of Psammétique King of Egypt. They threatened to overrun Judaea and Jerusalem, but for some reason or other they did not do so.

Ewald thinks that the book of Zephaniah must have preceded a large movement of a people, an invasion, similar to that of the Gauls in Europe several centuries later, which seemed to threaten all the nations around Jerusalem. He must consider the invasions mentioned in Zephaniah as those of which Herodotus relates, referring to the Scythians. According to his account, large masses of these attacked Nineveh, then marched on to Egypt and on their return came to

Jerusalem.

Zephaniah wrote at the very beginning of these invasions. At that time there were appearing signs of those reforms, which Josiah so strenuously enforced during the second part of his reign. (2 Kings 22 ff.) He can well believe that he added his first words of rebuke to those of the preceding prophet.

When these expeditions from the North began and even before they drew near to Jerusalem, a divine intuition came to the prophet, a light in the encircling darkness. The true God, who with watchful eyes sees the wickedness of his people and punishes the perverse, seemed to use the distant barbarians for his purpose, viz., to punish the old perverse kingdoms, as well as Jerusalem so long deserving to be punished.

The prophet predicts this people as coming with a terrible force and haste, bearing destruction to all, to the whole earth. Every one, who as yet had experienced no shame or fear, had to bow down and tremble; and everyone, who had remained faithful to Jahveh, sought him even more faithfully and zealously. The quicker and more eagerly all people seek the true position in religion, the sooner and surer comes prosperity and security.

Jephthah in his prophetic tale borrows his picture from Isaiah, but he lacks the clearness of vision and minuteness of detail, which characterizes Isaiah's prophecies. For example, "In Isaiah's view, Assyria is the rod of God's anger, and when the judgment is complete, and Jahveh returns to the remnant

of his people. The theodicy is completed by the
fall of the unconscious instrument of the
divine decrees before the inviolable walls
of the Holy Mountain. Gihonich looks
to an all conquering nation as the instrument
of divine judgment on Judah and the rest
of the known world. He represents the day
of Jahveh as the day of battle. He speaks of
the guests invited to Jahveh's sacrifice, of
alarm against the fenced cities, of blood
poured out as dust, of pillage and desolation
at the hand of an enemy. But beyond this all is
vague. We neither hear who the sword of
Jahveh is nor what is to become of him,
when he has accomplished his purpose.

The conqueror of the different coun-
tries is introduced in his book; but we
never hear what he has done or what

has befallen him. There must have been some stimulus from without that stirred Zephaniah to predict the destruction of the whole world. This stimulus, seems to have been found by some in the Scythian invasion of Western Asia, to which some of the earlier prophecies of Jeremiah appear to refer. Some doubt that the Scythians appeared in Zephaniah's time, while the movements in the far East, which preceded the first siege of Nineveh, are chronologically suitable and seem to afford a sufficient basis for Zephaniah's prediction.

This view is held by a few, who do not regard the uprising in the Eastern half of Asia as part of the Scythian invasion, while others regard the trouble in the East

as a preparation, a forerunner of the greater invasion a few years later. The danger threatening Nineveh and also Palestine is spoken of in Nahum.

Some people seem to think that Zephaniah's prophecies were occasioned by a sort of 'undefined anticipation of a general political convulsion', that is to say, affairs in Jerusalem were in such a terrible corrupt state that the prophet foresaw what was bound to come, if the people did not better their conduct. He saw the inevitable punishment ^{which} overhung Judea and seemed to threaten the whole world in its terrible destructibility. It was this uncertain, unstable state of affairs of his native land, which caused the prophet to break forth

into those utterances associated with his name. The political system was bound to undergo a change and the prophet was the first to realize this.

In Zephaniah is noticed a decided departure in prophetic originality. Much he reiterates verbatim from the older prophets, and his work is very pretty and painted on this account. v. ff 3, 11. 18.

New by him, however, is his view of the religiousness of the whole earth; where, as if by the way, Jerusalem's destruction is met. One sees here that a single little people, with its old nationality, must always sink itself in the common mass of the peoples of the world, while the truths, which as yet lived only in him, remain and are made more and more

valuable to all the nations of the earth.

The writing of the whole book by Zephaniah has not been attacked very strongly, nor with cogent proofs. Schwally believes only I and II 13-15 as true. Wellhausen sees in Chapter III two accounts of which the second (v 8-20) is after Ezekiel's time.

Turner holds III 14-20 as post-exilic. Cornill shows v 2 as Deutero-Isaiah.

The validity of the book as a whole has not been attacked.

M

דבר יהוה אשר היה אל צפניה בן
 כושי בן גדליה בן אמריה בן חנניה
 בימי יאשיהו בן אמון מלך יהודה
 אסף אסף כל מעל פני האדמה נאם
 יהוה אסף אדם ובחמה אסף עוף
 השמים ודגי הים והמכשלות את
 חרשעים והכרתי את האדם מעל
 פני האדמה נאם יהוה ונשיתי ידי
 עלי יהודה ועל כל יושבי ירושלים
 והכרתי מן המקום הזה את שאר
 הבעל את שם הכמרים עם הכהנים
 ואת המשתתחים הנשבעים ליהוה
 והנשבעים במלכם ואת הנסוגים
 מאחרי יהוה ואשר לא בקשו את
 יהוה ולא דרשוהו הם מפני אהנה
 יהוה כי קרוב יום יהוה כי הכין
 יהוה זבח הקדש קראיו וחיה ביום

G

דבר יהוה אשר היה אל צפניה בן
 כושי בן גדליה בן אמריה בן חנניה
 בימי יאשיהו בן אמון מלך יהודה
 אסף אסף (כל) מעל פני האדמה נאם
 יהוה אסף אדם ובחמה עוף השמים
 ודגי הים (והכשלותי) חרשעים והכרתי
 את האדם מעל פני האדמה נאם יהוה
 ונשיתי ידי על יהודה ועל כל יושבי
 ירושלים והכרתי מן המקום הזה את
 שמות הבעל את שמות (הכמרים עם)
 הכהנים ואת המשתתחים על הגנות לצבא
 השמים ואת המשתתחים הנשבעים
 ביהוה והנשבעים למלכם ואת הנסוגים
 מאחרי יהוה ואשר לאבקשו את יהוה
 ולא דרשוהו הם מפני אדני יהוה כי
 קרוב יום יהוה כי הכין יהוה זבח
 הקדש קראיו וחיה ביום זבח יהוה

ח

יום עברה היום ההוא יום צרה ומצוקה
 יום שעה ומשואה יום חשך ואפלה
 יום עין וערפל יום שופר ותרועה על
 הערים הבצרות ועל הפנות הגבוהות
 והצרות לאדם והלכו כעורים כי
 ליהוה חטאו ושפך דמם כעפר ולחמו
 כגללים גם כספם גם זהבם לא יוכל
 להצילם ביום עברת יהוה ובאש
 קנאתו תאכל כל הארץ כי כלה אף
 נבהלה ועשה את כל יושבי הארץ
 התקוששו וקשו הגוי לא נכסף בטרם
 לדת חק כמין עבר יום בטרם לא
 יבוא עליכם חרון אף יהוה בטרם לא
 יבוא עליכם יום אף יהוה בקשו את
 יהוה כל ענוי הארץ אשר משפטו
 פעלו בקשו צדק בקשו ענוה אולי
 תסתרו ביום אף יהוה כי עצה

G

יום צרה ומצוקה יום שעה ומשואה יום
 חשך ואפלה יום עין וערפל יום שופר
 ותרועה על הערים הבצרות ועל הפנות
 הגבוהות והצרות לאדם והלכו כעורים
 כי ליהוה חטאו ושפך דמם כעפר
 ולחמו כגללים גם כספם גם זהבם
 לא יוכל להצילם ביום עברת יהוה ובאש
 קנאתו תאכל כל הארץ כי כלה אף
 נבהלה ועשה את כל יושבי הארץ
 התקוששו-----הגוי לא נכסף בטרם
 לא תהיו כמין עבר (יום) בטרם לא יבוא
 עליכם חרון אף יהוה בטרם לא יבוא
 עליכם יום אף יהוה בקשו את יהוה
 כל ענוי הארץ (אשר) משפטו פעלו
 בקשו צדק בקשו ענוה אולי תסתרו
 וביום אף יהוה כי עצה עזובה תהיה
 ואשקלון לשממה אשדוד בצהרים

ח

עזובה תהיה ואשקלון לשממה אשדוד
בצהרים יגרשוה ועקרון תעקר הוי
יושבי חבל הים גויכרתים דבר יהוה
עליכם כנען ארץ כלשתיים והאבחתין
מאין יושב והיתה חבל הים נות כרת
רעים וגדרות צאן והיתה חבל לשארית
בית יהודה עליהם ירעון בבתי
אשקלון כערב ירבצון כי יפקדם יהוה
אלהיכם ושב שבותם שמעתי חרפת
מואב וגדפי בני עמון אשר חרפו את
עמי ויגדילו על גבולם לכן חי אגני נאם
יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל כיסואב
כסדם תהיה ובני עמון כעמרה ממשה
חרול ומכרה מלח ושממה עד עולם
שארית עמי יבצום ויתרגוי ינחלום
צאת להם תחת גאונם כי חרפו ויגדילו
על עם יהוה צבאות נורא יהוה עליהם כי... את כל אלוהי

ג

יגרשוה ועקרון תעקר הוי יושבי חבל
הים גויכרתים דבר יהוה עליכם כנען
ארץ כלשתיים והאבדתין מאין יושב
והיה כרת נות רעים וגדרות צאן והיה
חבל הים לטאריית בית יהודה עליהם
ירעון בבתי אשקלון כערב ירבצון בע
יהודה כי יפקדם יהוה אלוהיהם ושב
שבותם שמעתי חרפת מואב וגדפי
בני עמון אשר חרפו את עמי ויגדילו
על גבולם לכן חי אגני נאם יהוה צבאות
אלהי ישראל כי מואב כסדם תהיה
ובני עמון כעמרה. משה חרול ומכרה
מלח ושממה עד עולם שארית עמי יבצום
ויתרגוי ינחלום צאת להם תחת גאונם
כי חרפו ויגדילו על (עם) יהוה צבאות
נורא יהוה עליהם כי... את כל אלוהי
הארץ וישתחוו לו איש ממקומו כל

כי רצה את כל אלוהי הארץ וישתחוו
 לו איש ממקומו כל איי הגוים גם אתם
 כושים חללי חרבי המה ויש ידו על
 צפון ויאבד את אשור וישם את גינוה
 לשממה ציה כמדבר ורבעו בתוכה
 עדרים כל חיתו גוי גם קאת גם קפד
 בכפתריה ילינו קול ישורר בחלון
 חרב בסף כי ארצה ערה זאת העיר
 העליזה היושבת לבטח האמרה
 בלבבה אני ואפסי עוד איך היתה
 לשמה מרבץ לחיה כל עובר עליה
 ישרוק יעץ ידו. הוי מראה ונגאלה
 העיר היונה לא שמעה בקול לא לקחה
 מוסר ביהוק לא בטחה אל אלוהיה
 לא קרבה שריה בקרבה אריות
 שאגים שפסיה צאבי ערב לא גרמו
 לבקר נביאיה פחזים אגשי בגדות

איי הגוים גם אתם כושים חללי חרבי
 המה ויש ידו על צפון ויאבד את אשור
 וישם את גינוה לשממה ציה כמדבר
 ורבעו בתוכה עדרים כל חיתו ארץ
 גם קאת גם קפד בכפתריה ילינו קול
 ישורר בחלון ערב בסף כי ארצ מצבה
 זאת העיר העליזה היושבת לבטח
 האמרה בלבבה אני ואפסי עוד איך
 היתה לשממה מרבץ לחיה כל עובר
 עליה ישרוק יעץ ידו הוי מראה ונגאלה
 העיר היונה לא שמעה בקול לא לקחה
 מוסר ביהוק לא בטחה אל אלהיה לא קרבה
 שריה בקרבה אריות שאגים שפסיה
 צאבי ערב לא [והשחן] לבקר נביאיה
 פחזים אנשי בגדות כהניה חללוקדש
 חמסו תורה יהוה צדיק בקרבה לא
 יעשה עולה בבקר בבקר משפט נתן

כהניח חללו קדש חמסו תורה יהוה
צדיק בקרבה לא יעשה עולה בבקר
בבקר משפטו יתן לאור לא נעדר
ולא יודע עולבשת הכרתי גוים נשמו
פנותם החרבתי חוצותם מבלי עובר
נצדו עריהם מבלי איש מאין יושב
אמרתי אך תירא אותי תקח מוסר
ולא יכרת מעונה כל אשר פקדתי
עליה אכן השכימו השחיתו כל עלילותם
לכן חבו לי נאם יהוה ליום קומי לעד
כי משפטי לאסף גוים לקבצי ממלכות
לשפוך עליהם נעמי כל חרון אפי כי
באש קנאתי תאכל כל הארץ כי אצא
על עמים שפה בחרה לקרא כלם כשם
יהוה לעבדו שכם אחד מעבר לנהר
כוש עתרי בת פוצי יובלון מנחתי
ביום ההוא לא תבושי מכל עלילתיך

ולא לעד עול בשחת הכרתי גוים נשמו
פנותם החרבתי חוצותם מבלי עובר
נצדו עריהם מבלי איש מאין יושב
אמרתי אך תירא אותי תקח מוסר
ולא יכרת מעונה כל אשר פקדתי עליה
אכן השכימו והשחיתו כל עלילותם
לכן חבו לי נאם יהוה ליום קומי לעד
כי משפטי לאסף גוים לקבצי ממלכות
לשפוך עליהם נעמי כל חרון אפי כי
באש קנאתי תאכל כל הארץ כי אצא
על עמים שפה בחרה לקרא כלם כשם
יהוה לעבדו שכם אחד מעבר לנהר
כוש עתרי בת פוצי יובלון מנחתי
ביום ההוא לא תבושי מכל עלילתיך

ח

אשר פשעות בו כי אצא סיר מקרבך
 עליצי גאותיך ולא תוסיפי לגבה
 עוד בהר קדשי והשארתי בקרבך עד
 עני ודל וחסו בשם יהוה שארית ישוע
 לא יעשו עולה ולא ידברו כזב ולא
 ימצא בפיהם לשון תרמית כי המה
 ירעו וירבצו ואין מחריד רגל בת ציון
 חריעו ישראל שמחי ועלצי בכל
 לב בת ירושלים הסיר יהוה משפט
 פנה איבך מלך ישראל יהוה בקרבך
 לא תירגירך עוד ביום הקוצ ואמר
 לירושלים גלתי ראי ציון גלית וידיך
 יהוה אלוהיך בקרבך גבור ושיע
 עליך בשמחה יחריש באהבתו יגיל
 עליך ברנה גוי ממועד אספת ממועד
 חיו משאת עליה חרפה העני עשה
 את כל מעניך בעת ההיא והושעתני

ג

עם עני ודל וחסו בשם יהוה שצרת
 ישראל לא יעשה עולה לא ידברו כזב
 ולא ימצא בפיהם לשון תרמית כי
 המה ירעו וירבצו ואין מחריד רגל
 בת ציון חריעו בית ירושלים שמחי ועלצי
 בכל לב בת ירושלים הסיר יהוה
 משפט מידאיך מלך ישראל
 יהוה בקרבך לא תירגירך עוד ביום ההוא
 יאמר לירושלים אל תירגירי ציון אל יפול
 ידך יהוה אלוהיך בקרבך גבור ושיע
 ישיש עליך בשמחה יחריש באהבה
 יגיל עליך ברנה ביום מועד אספת
 ממועד חיו משאת עליה חרפה העני עשה
 את כל מעניך והושעתני את הצלעה
 והנדחה אקבץ [ושמתי]ם לתהלה
 ולשם בכל ארץ יבשו בעת ההיא
 בהיטיבי אתכם ובעת קבצו אתכם

ח

את הצלעה והנדחה אקבץ ושמתים
לתהלה ולשם בכל הארץ בשתם
בעת ההיא אביא אתכם ובעת
קבצי אתכם כי אתן אתכם לשם
ולתהלה בכל עמי הארץ בשובי את
שבותיכם לעיניכם אמר יהוה



ג

כי אתן אתכם לשם לתהלה בכל עמי
הארץ בשובי את שבותיכם
לעיניכם אמר יהוה



Notes on the Text of Zephaniah.

Whenever the name $\mu\sigma\chi$ occurs in the Old Testament, the Septuagint translates it by Ἀνως , except this place in our text, Zeph¹ and 1 Chron. 3¹⁴ where they Ἀνωρως . Was the name $\mu\sigma\chi$ or $\gamma\sigma\chi$ as we find in Isaiah. It is evident that they read the "nun" and "vav" together and thus formed a "code". In this way they make the name $\gamma\sigma\chi$ instead of $\mu\sigma\chi$.

2. ἐκλευψει ἐκλειπω .

Psalms 14²⁸ $\text{ἐκλευψις} = \sigma\sigma\chi$

Zephaniah 3⁶ $\text{ἐκλειπω} = \eta\gamma\chi$ /

2⁹ $= \eta\gamma\chi$ for מג ליון

Elsewhere = $\sigma\sigma\chi$ 1s 60²⁰ Hosea 4³

= $\sigma\sigma\chi$ Ju. 47^{15,16} Is 29²⁰

G = $\sigma\sigma\chi$ $\eta\sigma\chi$ difficult because $\sigma\sigma\chi$ never =

90x1. We may also read וְהָיָה וְהָיָה

2. The LXX omit the word וְהָיָה , while Driver and others say it is the most important word in the whole sentence, as it tends to show the generality, the totality of the impending destruction. וְהָיָה may have crept into the text through the meaning of the verse.

$\text{וְהָיָה כְּכִשְׁלֹת אֶת הַר שֵׁעִי}$ is the reading of the Massoretic Text for which the LXX reads $\text{καὶ ἀνδραγαθῶν οἱ ἄνδρες}$.

= וְהָיָה 2 Chron 28¹⁵ Job 4³ Psalms 27² 3:10
105³¹ 107¹² 109²⁴ Hosea 4^{5.5} 5⁵ 14²

Nh. 3³ Jer. 6²¹ 46⁶ 12¹⁶ 50³²
Lm. 5¹³

= וְהָיָה , Ki. 2⁴ Psalm 9³ Hos. 5⁵ 14¹⁰

Nh. 2⁶ Jeek 12⁸ Daniel 11¹⁴ 19³³

וְהָיָה Meek 28 Lm 1¹⁴

הַכְשִׁילִים שֶׁנֶּחֱדָשׁוּ עַל יְדֵי עֲזַרְיָהוּ

וְהַכְשִׁילִי, וְהַכְשִׁילִי, וְהַכְשִׁילִי

If we should follow the context, we would have to make a verb of הַכְשִׁילִים and since we have the form וְהַכְשִׁילִי we would read וְהַכְשִׁילִי מַתְּחִילָה the object of the verb וְהַכְשִׁילִי.

The Massoretic reading makes little sense as does also the LXI reading.

"I will destroy man and beast, I will destroy the fowl of the heaven and the fish of the sea, the stumbling blocks with the wicked." What is the relation existing between the fish of the sea and the stumbling blocks and between the stumbling blocks and the wicked. The text is undoubtedly corrupt and the only

way we can make any sense out of it is to read $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁחַדּוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים}$. Then the verse would read. I will destroy man and beast, I will destroy the fowl of heaven and the fish of the sea, I will cause the wicked to tremble.

5. $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁחַדּוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים}$ the LXX read $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁחַדּוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים}$ the evil spirits. They read the "Aleph" for a "Lamin" and leave out the "God" of the plural ending. The MT is the correct reading. The Targum bears out the massoretic reading.

6. $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁחַדּוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים}$ The LXX reads $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁחַדּוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים}$, the names of Baal. The difference in reading has an important bearing on the time of the Book. If we read $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁחַדּוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים}$, the remnant of Baal,

we place the book between the twelfth and eighteenth years of Josiah's reign, when the young king had already begun to institute his reforms. Therefore we must read $\text{by } \pi \text{ } \gamma \times \psi$.

If however we follow the LXX of $\text{by } \pi \text{ } \gamma \times \psi$ we must place the book before the twelfth year of the king, before the time of Josiah's reforms. To quote Driver. "From the fact that he speaks of a remnant of Baal's, 4. (which implies that in part the Baal worship had already been destroyed) it has been inferred further that he wrote after Josiah's twelfth year, in which according to 2 Chron 34³ the king's measure of reform was first

commenced. The Lxx, however for $\gamma\chi\psi$ cannot read $\delta\psi$ manner (cf. Hos. 2⁷ Jer. 13²) so that, if this reading be correct, this inference will fall to the ground. The Targum reads $\gamma\chi\psi$, the same as the Massoretic Text

7. $\delta\psi$ the Lxx reads the plural $\delta\psi\delta\psi$.

8. The Lxx cannot understand $\delta\psi\delta\psi$ and so they omit it.

$\delta\psi\delta\psi$ occurs in two other places in the bible. 2 Kings 23⁵ and Hos. 10⁵. In Kings the Lxx simply transcribe the letters, $\delta\psi\delta\psi$, and in Hosea they do not understand it and read something else for it. Here in Zephaniah they do not understand it and leave it out entirely.

9. The Lxx read the same consonants as

the MT, but they make יהוה the name
 of a God. cf. Jer. 49¹³. It is also read.
 יהוה 1 Kings 11⁵, 11³³, 2 Kings 23¹³. It would
 be better to take the word as the name
 of a God as Jahveh is compared to יהוה.
 10. וְיָחִיד אֶתְּחַלֵּץ the Lxx read ἀντιχομενους, which
 means to hold out against. Middle means
 to clear to hence to worship. ἀντιχομενους
 ἡ γὰρ ἀντιχομενους. Found also in Jer 8² ὡς
 ἀντιχομενους.
 11. וְיָחִיד the Lxx וְיָחִיד with a Cheth. They read
 וְיָחִיד in three places in the III Minor Prophe-
 ts. cf. Jer 2⁷. They also read וְיָחִיד in the
 Minor Prophets, cf. Amos 6¹⁰. This shows
 that they evidently had וְיָחִיד in their
 manuscripts. But the Massoretic
 reading is certainly the better
 reading.

12. לְהִיטֵן by the Lxx translate ἐμψαῖς.
 Either this text was corrupt or else
 they must have transposed the "Gimel"
 and "Lamedh" as the Syriac Version shows.

כִּי אֵיף. In the original Greek manu-
 script ἐμψαῖς may have been ἔμψι
 Πάτας and לְהִיטֵן omitted entirely. The
 massoritic reading seems to be the correct
 one.

13. פֶּן בְּדֹגֵי שָׂר שָׁר the Lxx read בְּדֹגֵי שָׂר. It is
 easy to understand the corruption of a
 "ה" for a "ח" and a "י" for a "ר". The reading
 of the MT is correct as the שָׂר שָׂר is the
 gate where fowls are sold and in connect-
 ion with it we should read בְּדֹגֵי שָׂר, as we
 know there was a place in Jerusalem by
 that name.

14. שָׁכַתָּה. The Lxx read ἐν κατὰ κεκομμενῇ.

taking ψ כותש from כותש כותש to beat.
 and ψ דה the Lxx take from דה דה to listen
 and not from דה דה to destroy, which
 seems to be the proper form.

6. פסוקים קפא יז ש פסוקים קפא יז the Lxx read
 פסוקים קפא יז ש פסוקים קפא יז, those who look with
 scorn on their commandments. They
 misread the text. This is probably due
 to the similarity existing among the
 letters of the old Hebrew alphabet.

479 = קפא } Note the words written
 479 = דגב } in the script of the
 original manuscript, we can readily
 understand how they might mistake
 the "x" for the "ד", the "פ" for the "ג"
 and the "ק" for the "ב".

They also took פסוקים קפא from פסוקים קפא to
 keep to guard. a commandment. The

context, however, requires the Massortie reading to complete the sense of the verse.

7. Neither the M. nor G. reading is clear.

The M. divides the verse קוֹל יְהוָה יְהוֹחֵ סָר

צֶרַח שֶׁם גְּבוּרָה. The voice of the day of Jehovah is better, than the mighty one crieth.

קוֹל יְהוָה יְהוֹחֵ סָר צֶרַח שֶׁם גְּבוּרָה.

The LXX reads ψ with a "ψ" and for ψ they read ψ , an adjective form, same as ψ and the "ח" they make a "ה" and join it to ψ , out of which they make a verb.

גְּבוּרָה is in apposition with יְהוָה. Rashi tries to substantiate the Massortie reading.

It seems as if the word קוֹל is superfluous, and could be omitted without injury to the meaning.

18 יְהוָה ה' ה' ה' ה' ה'.

9. What did the MSS read when they wrote over dyr . Be bound together. The following words are translated by ovrdw in the Septuagint.

קבץ Ezek.

יתקץ Job.

ויקץ Ex.

סבב צים Ex

קטרו Sam

The last word is the only one that in any way, in form or in sound resembles the word in the MS.

Hellmansen omits the whole verse and says that the text is not reliable.

התקששו from קשש to gather. Num 15³².

צים קשש = gather wood. Lethpael has

the same meaning as the Qal. for

קשש the LXX reads קששו . Little

sense can be made from either reading. Evidently some corruption in the text, which they (the Messorites)

could not make out.

לֹא־תִהְיֶה לָאֱלֹהִים the לֹא־תִהְיֶה. He has explained above (note 16) how the "x" and "7" resemble each other in the old script. The "7" both readings have and the "ד" and "ר" are easily misread. The seems to have been analyzed into a "vav" and "yod" ך. This would give us our consonants. The context would seem to require the לֹא־תִהְיֶה reading as we have in the same verse בְּרַחֲמֶיךָ לֹא־יִבֹּא occurring twice. ך is omitted as seemingly out of place. Rashi says that the sentence is not complete. He would make it read כִּסְּךָ עֲבַר לִפְנֵי רֹחַ. Ibn Ezra says the same. כִּסְּךָ עֲבַר אֲשֶׁר תִּדְפֹּנוּ רֹחַ. There is evidently some corruption in the text as we have the whole phrase, בְּרַחֲמֶיךָ לֹא־יִבֹּא

וְאֵלֶּיךָ ... אֵלֶּיךָ twice with only a single
 word changed. Once we have אֵלֶיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ and
 once אֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ. There is a repetition here, which
 is unnecessary. It does not add anything
 to the verse either in force or in meaning.
 This is one of the doublets of which we
 speak in our introductory chapter. The
 Massonites may have followed the
 reading and inserted one of the two
 phrases. Only once should the phrase be
 read. The וְאֵלֶּיךָ in the first clause of the
 verse may have crept in from וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ.
 Then we would read the verse:

בְּשֶׁרֶם לֹא תִהְיוּ כְּסָפָה עַבְדֵּי בְּשֶׁרֶם לֹא יִבְּאוּ עֲלֵיכֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ
 This version gives the same reading.
 He says that after עַבְדֵּי, the word וְאֵלֶּיךָ
 is missing and rightly, as it is a
 correction of the following וְאֵלֶּיךָ.

the LXX reads $\chi\alpha\sigma$ (as ar dos) falsely for $\chi\beta\sigma$.

20. $\chi\gamma\sigma$ $\psi\chi$ the LXX reads $\chi\gamma\sigma\psi\chi$, omitting the $\psi\chi$ and the "Naw" after $\psi\chi$. They make $\chi\gamma\sigma$ an imperative, the same as $\psi\chi$.

21. The LXX omits $\chi\gamma\sigma$ and rightly, as it is entirely out of place. The M. evidently got the $\chi\gamma\sigma$ from the following verse. $\chi\gamma\sigma$ and $\psi\chi$ are transposed. Willhauser reads the same as the LXX.

וְיִתְּנֶה כִּרְתֵּי נֹתְרִיָּה וְאֶדְרוֹת צֶאֱן

This reading makes כִּרְתֵּי נֹתְרִיָּה. Krti. Revised Version translates it as if it were derived from $\chi\gamma\sigma$ to dig. $\chi\gamma\sigma$, takes it the same way. $\chi\gamma\sigma$ $\psi\chi$ $\chi\gamma\sigma$

23. The LXX inserts $\chi\gamma\sigma$ after $\chi\gamma\sigma$. This seems to be the proper place for it and not in the

preceding verse.

Wellhausen says that we should read $\pi\gamma$ by $\pi\gamma$. but there is no need of this correction as the $\pi\gamma$ reading is clear.

The G. also inserted $\pi\gamma\pi' \pi\gamma \pi\gamma \pi\gamma$. Evidently $\pi\gamma\pi' \pi\gamma$ was misread $\pi\gamma\pi' \pi\gamma$ in some manuscripts and the Lxx inserted it after $\pi\gamma\pi'$ and then not being able to understand it, added the word $\pi\gamma$. The D. ascoric reading is the better one. $\pi\gamma\pi' \pi\gamma$ is the $\pi\gamma$, while $\pi\gamma\pi' \pi\gamma$ is the $\pi\gamma$.

From the translation of the Greek, we can not tell which they read.

24. Lxx read $\pi\gamma\pi'$ for $\pi\gamma\pi'$, perhaps on account of its nearness to $\pi\gamma$. It is better.

$\pi\gamma\pi' \pi\gamma \pi\gamma \pi\gamma$ the Lxx translate $\kappa\alpha\iota$
 $\Delta\alpha\mu\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\tau'\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\varsigma \delta\gamma\mu\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\alpha \alpha\delta\omega\varsigma$

for קפחב they read קפחב. for חרוב, חרוב for
חלל חרוב they read חלל חרוב

חלל חרוב in Ex. 22nd the Greek translates

ἀλωμος = threshing floor. This and the
passage in Zephaniah are the only ones
where חלל is used in that sense. Here
in חלל the "ח" is omitted.

26. The LXX translate חרוב ἐν γαρ γορυαί
taking it from חרוב to see, to appear.

M. reads חרוב and the LXX חרוב but
it makes good sense. It is impossible
to establish the true reading.

27. חרוב חרוב is an unusual reading, the LXX
חרוב חרוב is the more frequent expression.

חרוב is a corrupt reading, pure nonsense.
It should be חרוב, the raven.

It is impossible to make out the correct
reading of חרוב חרוב. The LXX reads חרוב חרוב

Wellhausen writes $\pi\tau\gamma \pi\tau\gamma x$? He raises the question, what does it mean, but offers no solution to the problem. Kitzig takes the two words as two verbs as does also Ewald. $\pi\tau\gamma x$, "dann er zerstört, legt bloß".

The accusative does not have to be expressed. Kitzig refers to a parallel passage in which we have $\pi\tau\gamma$ in the third person (see verse 11.) but this proves nothing as we have shown that $\pi\tau\gamma$ in the above passage is a false reading. For two synonymous verbs at the end of a sentence, see Is. 19⁵. The punctuation $\pi\tau\gamma x$ agrees with the old reading $\tau\gamma x$ Cedar.

Wellhausen says $\pi\tau\gamma$ in this verse does not mean a voice but refers to some bird, perhaps the owl.

The Septuagint joins verse 15 of

Chapter II to the following chapter. It appears
 logo better with the opening verses of
 the third chapter than it does with the
 preceding verses of the second chapter.
 29. The Septuagint reads $\pi\chi\tau\delta$ without a "vav"
 as does the correct Masoretic Text. (See
 Baer and Delitzsch edition of the Minor Prophets) Note
 on this verse $\pi\chi\tau\delta$ since vav in C. 1.2 136 23 FSP
 Complut.

For $\pi\chi\tau\delta$ the LXX reads the same consonants
 but translates it $\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\gamma\alpha$ = the dove.

30. The LXX reads the same consonants $\epsilon\gamma$
 but translates it Ἀγαβέας .

31 $\iota\delta\tau\lambda$ the LXX translates ἑξελίπον . The
 Revised Version translates the Greek. The
 Greeks did not read $\iota\delta\tau\lambda$. They must have
 read some form as $\iota\gamma(\chi)\psi\tau$ with the "x"
 omitted, cases of which are found in the

bible of Jer 51. we have here the form
 ק'ש'א'ר. 17. 17. 17. of all the cases of
 ק'ש'א'ר in the bible
 17. 17. none are found, which

in anyway resemble ב'ר'א. The nearest
 approach is ק'ש'א'ר, with the "x" omitted.
 The evidence read a "b" for a "v". This
 would give 17. 17. 17. with an (x) inserted.

32. The text reads much less than the
 MS. The have now our own version.

This is evidently the correct reading as the
 Syriac Version of the Hexapla gives the
 same reading. The Hebrew would read

וְלִי גִיד וְלִי בִשְׁחָת

This is a case of detography, in which the
 Massoretic text repeats the same phrase
 without adding any new thought.
 They simply repeat the same consonant

* xxxxx xxxxxx Great xxxxxx.

If we read as in the M.T. there is a difficulty of explaining $\pi\psi\epsilon$; we must read $\pi\psi\epsilon$. While, on the other hand, $\pi\psi\epsilon$ is entirely irrelevant to $\epsilon\iota\gamma\gamma\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$.

The Var of $\chi\epsilon\iota$ is added.

One thing we derive from the variant is that $\gamma\epsilon\chi$ has no connection here and may well be omitted, although the Lxx translates it.

33. $\pi\psi\epsilon$ the Lxx read $\epsilon\iota\gamma\gamma\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ the proud.

34. The Targum reproduces the plural as does also the Gt. The text here agrees with the Palestinian text.

$\pi\psi\epsilon$ the Lxx read $\pi\psi\epsilon$ with a "n" $\epsilon\iota\gamma\gamma\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ Prepare. The M. reading is correct.

$\pi\psi\epsilon$ the Lxx $\pi\psi\epsilon$ which is better $\epsilon\iota\gamma\gamma\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ they read $\epsilon\iota\gamma\gamma\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$

35. The LXX has the same consonants as the MT
 but the vowels are different. $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\nu. = 7\chi^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Same consonants for $70\chi^{\frac{1}{2}}$ but take it
 from 70χ to gather.

36. $\sigma\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta\eta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ the LXX read
 $\sigma\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\ \rho$. Baobab, omitting the first δ and making
 $\sigma\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\ \delta$ masculine. Could we not suppose
 that there is a mistake in the Septuagint
 and if in Baobab we insert an "alpha" we
 would have the Massoretic reading $\beta\alpha\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\zeta\eta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu$
 which is the better reading.

37. $\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$ the LXX reads $\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$ or $\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}$, which is
 nonsensical. We must keep the Massoretic
 reading, which agrees with the Palestinian
 text.

38. Codex Γ reads the same consonants as
 our Massoretic Text but makes one word out
 of it $\beta\eta\kappa\ \phi\omega\iota\varsigma$. Some of the Greek texts omit

entirely and this with justice. /

προσδεξομαι εν διδοταγματεις μου. "A much later reading is εκ στευσοντες με των δεσποτων ουκ ουκ προσδεξομαι εν διδοταγματεις μου. A Q."

We would then read the verse—

אָפּגאָבן זיין כּוּשׁ יוֹב לִין אֶנְחָתִי

39. For יִי־לֵךְ the LXX has ἰλγ of. Is 28" ἰλγ 2 and 1 Cor. 7¹⁶ ἰλγ 2; and by changing the position of the "i" and the "y" we have the word which the Greeks read.

40. For יִשׁוּעַ the LXX read ἰωσὴφ.

41. For תִּפְּחֵן the LXX have ἡλυτρωται σε εκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν σου.

ἡλυτρωται σε = he hath redeemed thee = 779.

εκ χειρὸς = דִּבִּי, which is added in the LXX.

For תִּפְּחֵן the LXX have the same consonant but from תִּפְּחֵן to be.

42. For $\gamma\delta\chi^2$: the Lxx read $\gamma\delta\chi^1$ = our will say
 Then they add the explicit subject. He will
 say. i. e. $\kappa\alpha\theta\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$ = $\eta\epsilon\gamma\omega$ $\gamma\delta\chi^1$

In $\gamma\delta\chi^1$ the Lxx have $\lambda\alpha\gamma\omega\upsilon$ = be of good
 cheer. cf. Joel 2^{11,22} Hg 2⁵ Zach. 8^{13,15}

43. $\psi\eta\tau$ The Lxx read $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\upsilon\eta\tau\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\tau\eta$
 $\alpha\gamma\alpha\eta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\omega\upsilon$. They read $\psi\eta\tau$ for $\psi\eta\tau$
 and they take the "z" of $\eta\tau\alpha\chi\alpha\beta$ and join it
 to $\psi\eta\tau$ and read it as a "z". They also take
 the "z" of $\eta\tau\alpha\chi\alpha\beta$. $\psi\eta\tau$ with a "z" following
 it is found in Lamentations 5²¹ $\kappa\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$
 and also in Ps. 103⁵ $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\upsilon\eta\tau\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\tau\eta$

44. For $\gamma\gamma\iota\delta\delta\iota\gamma$ בוגי the Lxx read in $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$
 $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\tau\gamma\varsigma$. The "nun" they read as Beth. The "nun"
 and "yod" are frequently interchanged and
 the "nun" of $\gamma\gamma\iota\delta\delta$ is joined to the preceding
 word we then have $\gamma\gamma\iota\delta\delta\iota\gamma$, which is the
 better reading, and gives a little sense,

anything which we cannot extract from
the Syriac reading.

5. That led the Greeks read $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha$
has overabundant overabundant.

In Mich 4:7 $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha$ translated
by the LXX has overabundant overabundant.

The only possible form in Hebrew, trans-
lated by overabundant in the Septuagint is
found in Psalm 38 $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha$. For $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha$
must read some form of $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha$.

by the Palestinian text reads $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha$

10 the Greeks read $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha$.

For $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha$ they read $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha$ the infinitive
H. $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha$. The LXX makes a differ-
ent combination of the consonants than
the MT. $\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha$.

$\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha$

This is by far the better reading and

gives more sense than the Massoretic.
 47. $\epsilon[\pi\psi\omega]\zeta\beta\alpha$. The old reading of the
 Greek is without $\pi\psi\omega$ and this our
 Greek text still has. Later versions of
 the Septuagint, however, have a translation
 of $\pi\psi\omega$. Evidently the original reading
 in the manuscript was $\epsilon\cdots\zeta\beta\alpha$. This space
 later scribes filled in with $\pi\psi\omega$.

48. $\epsilon\pi\psi\zeta$ the LXX read $\iota\psi\zeta$. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\upsilon\psi\tau\alpha\iota$
 and they will be put to shame.

49. $\iota\alpha\chi\zeta$ the LXX read $\zeta\beta\pi\zeta$; but we
 cling to the Massoretic reading