Copyright © 2012 John Daniel Meade

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

# A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE HEXAPLARIC FRAGMENTS OF JOB 22-42

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
John Daniel Meade

May 2012

**APPROVAL SHEET**

A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE HEXAPLARIC

FRAGMENTS OF JOB 22-42

John Daniel Meade

Read and Approved by:

________________________________________
Peter J. Gentry (Chair)

________________________________________
James M. Hamilton

Date______________________________

To my wife and friend, Annie,

Γυναῖκα ἀνδρείαν τίς εὑρήσει;

τιμιωτέρα δέ ἐστιν λίθων πολυτελῶν ἡ τοιαύτη (Prov 31:10).

TABLE OF CONTENTS


Page

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS . . . . . . . . . . iv

LIST OF SIGLA AND SYMBOLS . . . . . . . . . . ix

LIST OF TABLES . . . . . . . . . . xii

PREFACE . . . . . . . . . . xiii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION . . . . . . . . . . 1

    Statement of Project . . . . . . . . . . 1

    Background . . . . . . . . . . 2

    Methodology . . . . . . . . . . 17

2. DESCRIPTION OF SOURCES . . . . . . . . . . 24

    Introduction . . . . . . . . . . 24

    Text Witnesses . . . . . . . . . . 24

    Text Groups . . . . . . . . . . 36

3. CRITICAL TEXT OF HEXAPLARIC READINGS WITH APPARATUS AND NOTES . . . . . . . . . . 50

    Chapter 22 . . . . . . . . . . 50

    Chapter 23 . . . . . . . . . . 68

    Chapter 24 . . . . . . . . . . 78

    Chapter 25 . . . . . . . . . . 98

    Chapter 26 . . . . . . . . . . 103

    Chapter 27 . . . . . . . . . . 112

Chapter Page

Chapter 28 . . . . . 123

Chapter 29 . . . . . 146

Chapter 30 . . . . . 159

Chapter 31 . . . . . 181

Chapter 32 . . . . . 205

Chapter 33 . . . . . 219

Chapter 34 . . . . . 237

Chapter 35 . . . . . 256

Chapter 36 . . . . . 265

Chapter 37 . . . . . 297

Chapter 38 . . . . . 320

Chapter 39 . . . . . 345

Chapter 40 . . . . . 370

Chapter 41 . . . . . 396

Chapter 42 . . . . . 418

4. FRAGMENTS OF DUBIOUS HEXAPLARIC SIGNIFICANCE . . . . . 444

5. SUMMARY . . . . . 488

Introduction . . . . . 488

Preliminary Findings . . . . . 488

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 495

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| *AGK* | *Die Älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob*. 4 vols. Edited by U. Hagedorn and D. Hagedorn |
| Arm | C. Cox, *Armenian Job: Reconstructed Greek Text, Critical Edition of the Armenian with English Translation* |
| F-Auct | F. Field, “Auctarium ad Origenis Hexapla,” in *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, vol. 2 |
| BDB | F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford, 1907 |
| *Beiträge* | *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob* |
| *BIOSCS* | *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* |
| Busto Saiz | *La Traducción de Símaco en el Libro de los Salmos* |
| CG | Nicholas R. M. de Lange, “Some New Fragments of Aquila on Malachi and Job?” |
| CCSG | Corpus Christianorum: Series graeca, Turnhout, 1977- |
| CCSL | Corpus Christianorum: Series latina, Turnhout, 1953- |
| Ceulemans | “A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles, with Emphasis on their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis” |
| Chr-*Kommentar* | *Johannes Chrysostomos Kommentar zu Hiob* |
| *Compendious* | *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Edited by J. Payne Smith |
| Cox | *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia* |
| *CPG* | *Clavis patrum graecorum*. Edited by M. Geerard. 5 vols. Turnhout, 1974-1987 |
| *Curaes* | *Curae Hexaplares in Jobum* |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Edition* | *Iob*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum |
| *Epitome* | Die Epitome einer Hiobkatene unter dem Namen des Leo Magister in der Handschrift Vaticanus gr. 709. |
| Field | *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta,* 2 vols. |
| Gentry | P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* |
| GKC | *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1910 |
| *HALOT* | L. Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited by M. E. J. Richardson. 5 vols. Leiden, 1994-2000. |
| Hyvärinen | K. Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila* |
| Iul-*Kommentar* | *Der Hiob Kommentar des Arianers Julian*. |
| Joüon-Muraoka | P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2 vols. |
| Klostermann | E. Klostermann, *Analecta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik.* |
| *Kollationen* | *Kollationen der hexaplarischen Fragmente des Buchs Hiob* |
| *Kommentar* | Olympiodorus. *Kommentar zu Hiob*. Edited by U. Hagedorn and D. Hagedorn |
| Marshall | "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragment of Ecclesiastes" |
| Middeldorpf | *Codex syriaco-hexaplaris*. Edited by H. Middeldorpf |
| Montef | B. de Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt: multis partibus auctiora*. |
| Morinus | P. Morinus, *Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V Pon. Max.* |
| *Nachlese* | *Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob* |
| Nic | Nicetas. *Catena Græcorum Patrum in beatum Iob: collectore Niceta Heracleæ metropolita ex duobus mss. Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ codicibus, Græcè nunc primùm in lucem edita, & Latinè versa*. Edited by Patrick Young |
| Nobil | F. Nobilius, *Vetus Testamentum secundum LXX Latine Redditum et ex* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *auctoritate Sixti V Pon. Max. editum: additus est Index Dictionum & Locquationum hebraicarum, graecarum, latinarum quarum observatio visa est non inutilis futura*. Edited by A. Carafa. |
| Nöldeke | T. Nöldeke, *Compendious Syriac Grammar* |
| Payne Smith | *Thesaurus syriacus*. Edited by R. Payne Smith. Oxford, 1879-1901 |
| PG | Patrologia graeca [= Patrologiae cursus completus: series graeca]. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857-1886. |
| PTS | Patristische Texte und Studien |
| Reider | J. Reider, *An Index to Aquila. Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew-Greek, Latin Hebrew, with the Syriac and Armenian Evidence*. Completed and revised by N. Turner |
| Salvesen | A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* |
| SBLSCS | Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies |
| Segal | J. B. Segal, *The Diacritical Point and the Accents in Syriac* |
| Smyth | H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*. Revised by G. M. Messing |
| Sokoloff | Michael Sokoloff, *A Syriac Lexicon* |
| Swete | H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* |
| Syh | *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice*. Edited by A. M. Ceriani |
| Thackeray | H. St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, vol. 1 |
| *TLG* | *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* |
| *Verzeichnis* | A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* |
| *VT* | *Vetus Testamentum* |
| VTSup | Vetus Testamentum, Supplements |
| Wevers | J. W. Wevers, “A Note on Scribal Error” |
| Woods | Nancy Woods, “A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job: Chapters 1-21” |

## LIST OF SIGLA AND SYMBOLS

### Versions

| | |
|---|---|
| Aeth | Ethiopic |
| Arab | Arabic |
| Arm | Armenian |
| Co | Coptic (Bohairic and Sahidic) |
| CPA | Christian Palestinian Aramaic |
| La | Latin version of Jerome |
| Glos | Old Latin version (marginal notes) of the codex Legionensis, Madrid manuscript, and the Bible of Valvanera |
| OG | Old Greek |
| Syh | Syrohexapla |
| Vulg | Vulgate (Rome, 1951) |

### Attributions

| | |
|---|---|
| α′ | Aquila |
| σ′ | Symmachus |
| θ′ | Theodotion |
| γ′ | οἱ τρεῖς |
| ε′ | πέμπτη ἔκδοσις |
| λ′ | οἱ λοιποί |
| π′ | πάντες |
| ο′ | οἱ Ἑβδομήκοντα |
| ἑβρ′ | ὁ Ἑβραίος |
| τὸ ἑβρ′ | τὸ Ἑβραϊκον |
| δγρ′ | διπλῆ γραφή |
| γρ′ | γράφεται |
| ܐ. | Aquila |
| ܣ. | Symmachus |
| ܬ. | Theodotion |
| ܠ. | "the Three" equivalent to γ′ οἱ τρεῖς |
| ܗ. | "Fifth column" equivalent to ε′ πέμπτη ἔκδοσις |
| ܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ. | "these of the rest" equivalent to λ′ οἱ λοιποί |
| ܟܠܗܘܢ. | "all of them" equivalent to π′ πάντες |

## Editions

| | |
|---|---|
| Ald | Aldina |
| Compl | Complutensis |
| Sixt | Sixtine |
| Gra. | Grabe |
| H.-P. | Holmes-Parsons |
| Ra. | Rahlfs |
| Sw. | Swete |
| Ti. | Tischendorf |

## Symbols

| | |
|---|---|
| - | indicates joining of manuscripts of a group (e.g. 138-255) |
| $C^{-575}$ | a manuscript, e.g. 575, is absent as a witness for the group |
| * | the original reading of a manuscript |
| $^{ap}$ | indicates a reading which is in the apparatus of a printed edition |
| $^{c}$ | indicates a later corrector of the manuscript |
| $^{cat}$ | indicates that the reading is found in the catena of the manuscript |
| $^{com}$ | indicates a reading in the commentary |
| $^{mg}$ | indicates a marginal reading of a manuscript |
| $^{p}$ | indicates that only part of the manuscripts of a group have the reading |
| $^{te}$ | indicates a reading in the Bible text standing in a printed edition |
| $^{txt}$ | indicates a reading in the Bible text of the manuscript |
| ạ | one point under a letter means that the reading in the manuscript is unsure |
| + | add |
| > | omit |
| [ ] | indicates against the tradition effaced signs, letters and words |
| ⟨ ⟩ | indicates against the tradition, the indication of letter or words |
| ÷ | obelus |
| ※ | asterisk |
| ∽ | lemnisk |
| ↙ | metobelus |
| ↓ | indicates evidence in variant apparatus |
| M | the Masoretic Text |

## Latin Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| adn | adnota(n)t, adnotatio |
| app | apparatus |
| cf | confer |

| | |
|---|---|
| cod(d) | codex, codices |
| corr | correxit (-xerunt) |
| del | delevit |
| ed | edition |
| fin | finis |
| inc | incertus |
| init | initium |
| lat | latinus |
| leg | legundum |
| mend | mendose |
| ms(s) | manuscriptum (-ta) |
| pr | praemittit (-tunt) |
| rel | reliqui |
| s | sive oder sermo |
| sec | secundum |
| scr | scripsit (-serunt) |
| sup lin | supra linea |
| tr | transponit (-nunt) |
| v | versus |
| var lect | varia lectio |
| verss | versiones (Co Aeth Arab Arm) |
| vid | ut videtur |

## Critical Edition Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| *Attr:* | attribution(s); cites the witnesses for the attribution(s) of the Hexaplaric fragment |
| E | Ecclesiastical Text; designates asterisked lines |
| HT | Hebrew Text, equivalent to the Masoretic |
| LXX | Greek Text of Ziegler's Iob edition; designates non asterisked lines |
| *NonGr:* | non-Greek witnesses |
| *Var:* | variant(s); cites the variants and witnesses to the variant of the Hexaplaric fragment |
| *Wit1:* | witness 1; cites the witnesses and partial witnesses to the hexaplaric fragment from marginal notes, catena, and Ziegler's *Iob* edition second apparatus |
| *Wit2:* | witness 2; cites the witnesses for the hexaplaric fragment found in Ziegler's Iob edition first apparatus |

## LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Correlated Sigla . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 45

# PREFACE

A project of this complexity and detail is not accomplished by any one scholar, since it requires an expertise in a number of specialized fields and a great degree of encouragement to complete it. I was fortunate to stand on the shoulders of giants.

I thank Nancy Woods for helping me in the initial stages of the project. She replied astutely to every one of my emails no matter how elementary the questions were. Thanks also are due to the kind scholars (especially Bernard Neuschäfer, Felix Albrecht, and Reinhart Ceulemans) at the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen for granting me access to all of their resources, especially their images of the Job catena manuscripts. I will never forget the trip that I made to Göttingen in June of 2011. I also thank Lorenzo Cuppi for proofreading the Armenian materials and saving me from many errors.

In the winter of 2010, I became acquainted with Dieter Hagedorn through email correspondence. I cannot begin to thank Dieter and his wife, Ursula, for the help and encouragement they have given a young scholar. Dieter answered my many queries about specific readings in the manuscripts, and through the exchanges my knowledge of the catena of Job both widened and deepened. The fresh collation of the asterisked materials in the catena manuscripts would have been impossible, if not for his labor of scanning and sending the necessary images to me. I shall never forget their generosity to me and Dr. Gentry, when we visited their lovely home in Köln in June of 2011.

Thanks must go to the faculty members of Southern Seminary for their patient, disciplined instruction. Drs. Russell Fuller, Terry Betts, and Kenneth Mathews deserve thanks for the education they provided me in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Old Testament scholarship. Dr. James Hamilton deserves thanks for joining the dissertation committee

and for providing a close and careful read of the manuscript. Mrs. Marsha Omanson also deserves thanks for reading the manuscript carefully for style and formatting. Finally, I owe thanks to Dr. Peter Gentry, *Doktorvater* and friend. Not only have I learned from him the specialized disciplines of the biblical languages, textual criticism, and exegesis, which one must master in order to undertake biblical scholarship, but he has also taught me about the teaching profession itself. By example he has taught me the pastoral nature of teaching and mentoring, expressed by his wise, patient, and encouraging counsel to me over the years.

If I had not the encouragement of the many to follow, I would not have finished this project. My church family at Clifton Baptist has been a constant source of encouragement to me and my family since becoming members in the summer of 2003. The elders and the members of the church have taught me about true community and fellowship in the gospel of Jesus Christ, and they have graciously disciplined and encouraged me as needed.

I wish to thank my parents, John and Phyllis, for their loving support over the years. They were the first to instruct me in the gospel, and the Lord was pleased to save me through their words and their lives. My in-laws have also supported me in significant ways since coming to know them.

My wife, Annie, to whom I dedicate this work, deserves the greatest thanks. Her friendship and companionship to me over eight years of marriage have been sweet, and her service and sacrifice for me have been exemplary of Christ himself. Without her I am nothing.

John Daniel Meade

Louisville, Kentucky

May 2012

# CHAPTER 1
# INTRODUCTION

As a result of the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla in the summer of 1994 at Oxford, a decision was made to create a new collection and edition of all Hexaplaric fragments.[1] Frederick Field was the last scholar to compile all known fragments in the mid-to-late nineteenth century,[2] but by 1902, Henry Barclay Swete had announced that more hexaplaric materials were "accumulating."[3] These new materials need to be included in a new collection of hexaplaric fragments, a collection which is called "a Field for the 21st century."[4] With the publication of two-thirds of the critical editions of the Septuagint (LXX) by the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen, the fulfillment of a new collection of all known hexaplaric fragments is becoming more feasible.

## Statement of Project

This project aims to produce a new critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments

---

[1]Alison Salvesen ed., *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th-3rd August 1994*, Texte und tudien zum Antiken Judentum 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), vi.

[2]Frederick Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1875).

[3]Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902; reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 76.

[4]See The Hexapla Institute [on-line]; accessed 20 March 2010; available at http://www.hexapla.org/; Internet. The Hexapla Institute is a reality despite Sydney Jellicoe's pessimism concerning a revised and enlarged edition of the hexaplaric fragments, which he did not think was in the "foreseeable future." Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 129.

for Job 22-42,[5] and it will build upon Field and upon the critical edition by Joseph Ziegler for the Göttingen *Septuaginta*.[6] The new edition will also incorporate new sources which Ziegler either did not use or to which he did not have access at the time he completed his edition.[7] Specifically the work on the hexaplaric fragments of Job will make a contribution to the field in three ways. First, it will contribute to an understanding of the complicated text history of the book of Job, including both its Greek versions and the Hebrew text. Second, it will contribute to the history of exegesis of the book of Job, both Jewish and Christian, since this edition will attempt to reconstruct the original text for both Origen's Hexapla and the readings of the three Jewish revisers (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion). Third, it will contribute to the needs of modern scholarship for a Field for the twenty-first century for the entire Old Testament.[8]

## Background

### Origen's Work and Intention for the Hexapla

When reconstructing the history of the Hexapla, scholars have asked at least two significant questions concerning its origins: (1) what was the original appearance of the Hexapla with special attention given to the presence or absence of the Aristarchian signs in the fifth column,[9] and (2) what was Origen's original intention for constructing

[5]Nancy Woods has recently completed Job 1-21 for her doctoral dissertation. See Nancy Woods, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job 1-21" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009).

[6]Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Iob, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, vol. 11.4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

[7]See "Adequacy and Availability of Sources" below for the details.

[8]Gerard J. Norton, "Collecting Data for a New Edition of the Fragments of the Hexapla," in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995*, ed. B. A. Taylor, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 251.

[9]For the relevant secondary literature see the following articles: Joachim Schaper, "The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th-3rd August 1994,*

it.[10]

**The Original Composition of the Hexapla.** We can only provide preliminary answers to these questions here, and we will do so in order. It is generally recognized that the Hexapla had the following six columns in this order from left to right: column 1 contained the Hebrew text, column 2 contained the Hebrew text transliterated into Greek,[11] column 3 contained the revision of Aquila (α′), column 4 contained the revision

---

ed. Alison Salvesen, Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 3-15; R. G. Jenkins, "The First Column of the Hexapla: The Evidence of the Milan Codex (Rahlfs 1098) and the Cairo Genizah Fragment (Rahlfs 2005)," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th-3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 88-102; idem, "Hexaplaric Marginalia and the Hexapla-Tetrapla Question," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th-3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 73-87; Olivier Munnich, "Les *Hexaples* d'Origène à la lumière de la tradition manuscrite de la *Bible* grecque," in *In Origeniana sexta: Origène et la Bible/Origen and the Bible: Actes du Colloquium Origenianum Sextum Chantilly, 30 août-3 septembre 1993*, ed. Gilles Dorival and Alain Le Boulluec (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1995), 167-85; Gerard J. Norton, "Cautionary Reflections on a Re-edition of Fragments of Hexaplaric Material," in *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, Orbis biblicus et orientalis 109 (Frieburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 129-55; J. A. Emerton, "The Purpose of the Second Column of the Hexapla," in S*tudies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions and Interpretations*, ed. Harry M. Orlinsky (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974), 347-55; Henry M. Orlinsky, "The Columnar Order of the Hexapla," in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations*, ed. Harry M. Orlinsky (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974), 369-81; idem, "Origen's Tetrapla—A Scholarly Fiction?" in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations*, ed. Harry M. Orlinsky (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974), 382-91. See also the treatment of the question in the following standard introductions to the Septuagint: Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), translation of *Introduccion al las Versionas Griegas de la Biblia*, Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros," (Madrid: n.p. 1979), 23; Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968); Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902; reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003).

[10]In addition to the works cited in n. 9, see the following articles which are germane to Origen's intention: T. Michael Law, "Origen's Parallel Bible: Textual Criticism, Apologetics, or Exegesis?" in *The Journal of Theological Studies* 59 (2008): 1-21, and S. P. Brock, "Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament," in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations*, ed. Harry M. Orlinsky (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974), 343-46.

[11]On the general acceptance of this theory until Pierre Nautin's objection in 1977 and a rebuttal to his reading of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 6.16), see Gerard J. Norton, "Observations on the First Two Columns of the Hexapla," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th-3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 103-24.

of Symmachus (σʹ), column 5 contained the LXX (οʹ), and column 6 contained the revision of Theodotion (θʹ). The most recent analysis of the existing fragments of the Hexapla, if the existing copies are like the original, show that the Hexapla probably had forty lines per page and there was probably only one Hebrew word per line. With these parameters, one estimates that the Hexapla would have filled almost forty codices of 400 leaves (800) pages each.[12]

Of these six columns, the fifth column appeared to have been the focus of Origen's work. It is clear that he used an asterisk (※) to show where words had been added to the LXX (usually from one of the Three especially Theodotion) and he used a metobelus (↙) to mark the end of the addition. In order to mark pluses in the LXX, which were not in the Hebrew text, he used an obelus (÷) and metobelus.[13] In Proverbs a combination of asterisk and obelus would mark a transposition from the LXX.[14] There has been debate over how Origen constructed the fifth column, specifically with respect to whether Origen corrected the original fifth column of the Hexapla with

---

[12]See Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea* (London: 2006), 104-05 n. 35. This reconstruction offers an update to Swete's comparison of the Hexapla with Cod. Vaticanus in Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 74.

[13]Origen describes this process in his *Commentary* on Matthew in XV, 14: τῶν γὰρ ἀμφιβαλλομένων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφωνίαν τὴν κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων τὸ συνᾷδον ἐκείναις ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὠβελίσαμεν <ὡς> ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα (οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντη περιελεῖν), τινὰ δὲ μετ' ἀστερίσκων προσεθήκαμεν, ἵνα δῆλον ᾖ ὅτι μὴ κείμενα παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων συμφώνως τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ προσεθήκαμεν ("For when there are doubts with the Septuagint on account of the discord of the copies, we, by making a judgment from the rest of the Versions, keep the agreement with these (f. pl. antecedent = the rest of the Versions), and we use an obelus for some [Greek readings] <because> they are not in the Hebrew (not daring to remove any of these), but we place other readings with asterisks, in order that it might be clear that we have added the [readings] not present with the Seventy from the rest of the Versions in harmony with the Hebrew") Origen, *Commentarium in Matthaeum*, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 40 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1935), XV, 14, 387-88.

[14]Frederick Field, *Frederick Field's Prolegomena to Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, trans. Gerard Norton and Carmen Hardin (Paris: J. Gabalda, 2005), 100-04.

Aristarchian/Alexandrian signs or whether he made a separate copy of the fifth column (either before or after the Hexapla) and applied the signs to it.[15]

Although this chapter is not the place to enter into a full discussion of the matter, the writer is convinced that the colophons and scholia in the hexaplaric manuscripts confirm that Origen did indeed apply the Aristarchian signs to the fifth column as he described in his Matthew Commentary. I depend, here, on private correspondence with Peter J. Gentry, in which he pointed me to some of the relevant colophons and scholia in both the Syro-hexapla (Syh) and Greek hexaplaric manuscripts.[16] I cite two of his translations, the first is the colophon of Ezekiel in Codex Marchalianus, and the other is the colophon from Proverbs in Syh. The first reads as follows: "Copied from the Hexapla according to the editions and corrected from Origen's own Tetrapla, which was corrected and annotated in his hand. I, Eusebius, added the scholia from this source. Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected." The second reads as follows:

> It was noted in the Greek book from which this book of Proverbs was translated into Syriac, after the end of them, as follows: The Proverbs were copied and collated from an accurate copy that was made and in which scholia were written in the margins by the hand of Pamphilus and Eusebius, in which were noted also these things: These things that we found were taken from the Hexapla Version of Origen and we corrected them. And again: in their own handwriting, Pamphilus and

---

[15] Grafton and Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*, 116-17. These authors conclude, "We think this [that the Hexapla had the signs and was supplemented from Theodotion] unlikely, since the fifth column marked with critical signs and supplemented from the sixth column would have been both redundant and confusing: redundant because where the Septuagint contained additional material lacking in the Hebrew and the *recentiores*, to leave the other five columns blank would have made the lack of a parallel to the Septuagint column abundantly clear, without the need for obeli marking the fifth column as well; confusing, because where the fifth column lacked material present in the others, to fill in the blank with the text of the sixth column would only have obscured the differences, even if the additions were marked with asterisks."

[16] He also pointed me to Robert Hiebert, "Syriac Biblical Textual History and the Greek Psalter," in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honor of Albert Pietersma*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry, JSOT Supplement Series 332 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield, 2001), 182-83. Hiebert has listed where one may access the extant colophons.

Eusebius corrected.

Gentry notes that the Syriac colophon contains punctuation which guides the reader to the proper understanding of the note. The first section of the colophon indicates that the last three sections come from a colophon in the Greek *Vorlage* and were translated into Syriac. The second section indicates that the Proverbs were copied exactly from the Hexapla by Pamphilus and Eusebius. The third section indicates explicitly that the things Pamphilus and Eusebius found were taken from the Hexapla version of Origen, and the fourth part states that Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected the text.

The first of these colophons mentions a Tetrapla, which shall be discussed briefly below. These notes state that at least the texts of Ezekiel and Proverbs—including the signs—have been copied directly from Origen's Hexapla. The burden of proof rests on the one who would show that the Aristarchian signs in these manuscripts were added at a later time or that these notes somehow refer to another composition besides the Hexapla itself; therefore, the easiest reading of the evidence is to combine Origen's description of his procedure with the colophons of the manuscripts, which claim to be copies of Origen's Hexapla or related titles of the same work (e.g., Tetrapla); therefore, Origen applied the signs to the Hexapla itself according to this reading of the sources.

The question over whether Origen composed a Tetrapla either before or after the Hexapla has a long history and it is a relevant question to the present study of Job.[17]

[17]See Field, *Frederick Field's Prolegomena to Origenis hexaplorum*, 29-33, where he casts doubt on Montfaucon's thesis that the Tetrapla was edited before the Hexapla. Jenkins, "Hexaplaric Marginalia and the Hexapla-Tetrapla Question," 73-87, where he concludes in the first place, "The Septuagint text of the Syrohexapla of the Psalter and Job derives more or less exactly from the Tetrapla, which was an edition with a Septuagint text quite distinct from the (later) fifth column of the Hexapla, and from the edition of Eusebius and Pamphilus" (85-86). Munnich, "Les *Hexaples* d'Origène, 181-83. Munnich presents the best general treatment of the question and his conclusion is worth citing in full, "In sum, if the tradition attests to the existence of the Hexapla and the Tetrapla, our documentation does not permit us to differentiate them. It seems even hazardous to distinguish them, in the upshot of Epiphanius, by the number of their columns, for one does not know what the copyists were understanding when they used the term, "hexapla": for the Psalms mentions the word, while it describes a synopsis of seven or eight columns; the *Barb. gr.* 549 cites a fragment of the synopsis in five columns and ascribes to it "Hexapla." In certain colophons the word is manifestly a synonym of the hexaplar of the Seventy. In the end, the term sometimes possesses a technical sense, which one is not able to restore with certainty, sometimes it possesses the sense of 'Origenic synopsis' in general, which, thenceforth, distinguishes itself poorly from

The colophon of Job in the Syh reads as follows: The book of Job, the righteous, is completed according to the tradition of the Seventy: Job was taken from the old Tetrapla. The colophon consists of two parallel units according to the punctuation, in which the first line identifies the text as from the Septuagint, while the second line clearly states that Job was taken from the Tetrapla. The adjective “old” is curious. Perhaps, it is meant to distinguish the Seventy as the oldest column in the Tetrapla, which refers only to the four Greek Versions minus reference to the first two Hebrew columns. This colophon juxtaposes the edition of the Seventy (the third column) with the oldest edition in the Tetrapla (the Seventy); thus, the scholiast does not intend to distinguish two different compositions, Tetrapla and Hexapla, but rather he probably refers to the Septuagint of the Hexapla with a different designation, Tetrapla. Syh Job also contains interesting scholia in the margins, which identify asterisked readings “not placed” in the Octapla of Origen[18] and readings which are or are not placed in the Tetrapla.[19] The question concerns whether the scholiasts understood Origen to have composed three separate works or whether these titles refer to the same work, the Hexapla. An answer to this question is outside of the purview of this chapter, but the present work concurs with the conclusion of Munnich that there was one composition of the Hexapla of Origen, which had neither a precursor nor a subsequent form, but later copyists sometimes used the term Hexapla in a technical sense and sometimes they used the term with the sense “Origenic recension” which distinguishes itself poorly from Tetrapla.

---

the term ‘tetrapla’” (182-83).

[18]See the discussion over the reference to the Octapla in Job 5:23 and 6:28 in Woods, “A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric,” 135-36; 149.

[19]See at least two references to the Tetrapla in Syh at Job 32:11, 13b-17. The first example shows a reading that is in other copies, but is not in the Tetrapla, while the second example identifies a reading in the margin as the Tetrapla and the reading in the text as according to the copies of Pamphilus and Eusebius.

**Origen's intention for the Hexapla.** Modern scholarship has proposed three reasons for why Origen constructed the Hexapla: (1) to reconstruct the original Septuagint based on the Hebrew text of his day, (2) to create an apologetic tool to aid in Christian and Jewish dialogue, and (3) for the purpose of exegesis.

The intention of the Hexapla according to Origen's own account and the final product was in some way text-critical.[20] But there is reasonable debate whether Origen was 'LXX centered' or 'Hebrew centered'.[21] When the Hexapla itself is taken into consideration along with this statement in the *Matthew Commentary,* Origen seems to refer to the "healing" of discrepancies within the LXX tradition using both the Hebrew and the *rest* of the versions as a criterion, yet however true Origen's purpose of reconstructing the original LXX may be, one cannot reduce his project to this purpose alone.

According to another statement found in his *Letter to Africanus*, Origen had an apologetic purpose for constructing the Hexapla.[22] This statement contains a purpose

---

[20]Origen's intention according to his *Matthew Commentary* XV, 14 is as follows: νυνὶ δὲ δῆλον ὅτι πολλὴ γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἴτε ἀπὸ ῥᾳθυμίας τινῶν γραφέων, εἴτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς <εἴτε ἀπὸ ἀμελούντων> τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει <ἢ> προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιρούντων. τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν θεοῦ διδόντος εὕρομεν ἰάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεσιν: (But now it is clear much difference of the copies has happened, whether from laziness of some scribes, or from the boldness of some wicked ones, <or from those who are negligent> in the restoring of what has been written, or even from those who add or take away those which seem good to themselves in the correction. Therefore we found means to heal the discord in the copies of the Old Covenant by using the rest of the versions as a criterion with God giving [grace].) Origen, *Commentarium in Matthaeum*, 387-88. See n. 13 for the rest of this quotation.

[21]For a full treatment of the issues, see Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 4-28. The general consensus of the 'text-critical' purpose of the Hexapla is that Origen was 'LXX centered', but according to Kamesar, Dominique Barthélemy and Pierre Nautin have argued that Origen was not 'LXX-centered'. For a representative of the 'LXX-centered' school, see Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 102.

[22]The statement is as follows: Ἀσκοῦμεν δὲ μὴ ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὰς παρ' ἐκείνοις, ἵνα πρὸς Ἰουδαίους διαλεγόμενοι μὴ προφέρωμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μὴ κείμενα ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἵνα συγχρησώμεθα τοῖς φερομένοις παρ' ἐκείνοις εἰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις οὐ κεῖται βιβλίοις. Τοιαύτης γὰρ οὔσης ἡμῶν τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς ζητήσεσι παρασκευῆς, οὐ καταφρονήσουσιν, οὐδ', ὡς

clause (ἵνα) in which Origen makes clear that he is comparing the Jewish versions with the LXX (presumably) so that they are prepared for debate with the Jews and so that they will not ridicule them,[23] yet, although there is a purpose clause in this text, one cannot reduce Origen, the man or his work, to apologetics.

Michael Law has recently written about a third purpose for Origen's Hexapla: exegesis. The article has merit since it attempts a more holistic approach to the question of Origen's intention, and he reports on Origen, the man, and his work. In essence, Law highlights Origen's exegetical purpose, but he does not argue for this intention exclusively. Rather, he believes that the best answer to the question will take into account all three purposes, and in this answer one is closest to the truth.[24]

## History of the Hexapla and Hexaplaric Research

The history of the Hexapla is brief, since it was not copied in its entirety due to its immense size and the cost of materials and copying in antiquity.[25] Sufficient evidence

---

ἔθος αὐτοῖς, γελάσονται τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν πιστεύοντας, ὡς τ' ἀληθῆ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀναγεγραμμένα ἀγνοοῦντας. (We endeavor not to be ignorant even of their [Versions], so that while disputing with the Jews we might not present to them the readings not present in their copies, and so that we might make use of the things which are found in those [books], although they are not present in our books. For because our preparation with them in the disputes is such, they will not despise, nor, as is their custom, will they laugh scornfully at the believers from the Gentiles, because they do not know the true readings which are in their books).

[23]See for a further defense of this view, Brock, "Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament," 216.

[24]Law, "Origen's Parallel Bible: Textual Criticism, Apologetics, or Exegesis?" 20-21.

[25]Grafton and Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*, 106-07. These authors show that a copy of Virgil's *Aeneid* would have cost 3,400 *denarii*, while a complete copy of the Hexapla would be upwards of 150,000 *denarii*, 75,000 for the copying and 75,000 for the luxurious copying materials. They add that the Hebrew script would have required extra expertise, and would have probably made the task more costly. Thus clearly, only the wealthy could afford this work, and these authors have shown that Origen's patron, Ambrose, a member of the upper echelon of Roman society, would have been able to finance the Hexapla. They also put these numbers in perspective in relation to yearly salaries. Origen, as a grammarian in Alexandria, would have made a yearly salary of about 70,000 *denarii* according to the Price Edict. This salary would not have been enough to finance a project like the Hexapla, but the project would have been in reach for a wealthy bishop like Cornelius of Rome, who

remains, however, to reveal that parts of the Hexapla were copied and translated and disseminated throughout Christendom. It is clear that Origen constructed it in Caesarea between AD 230 and 245, and that it spread widely through various means. In the *Life of Constantine*, Eusebius (d. *c*. AD 340) records a letter from the Emperor, who orders him to prepare "fifty copies of the sacred Scriptures," which were to be taken by two public carriages from Caesarea to the growing church in Constantinople.[26] The biblical text of Eusebius was almost certainly that of Origen's Hexapla. Although this task seems insignificant, it is now clear that these copies provided the biblical text for the Council of Ephesus in AD 431, and it is also clear that the Armenian constituency at this council brought the hexaplaric text home and their biblical text was revised according to it, so that now the Armenian Version in its current form reflects the hexaplaric text including the Aristarchian signs tradition.[27] It is also clear that Bishop Paul of Tella in about AD 616 translated the fifth column into Syriac and included the Aristarchian signs, a work now known as the Syro-Hexapla or Syro-Hexaplar. In AD 638, Caesarea was conquered by the Muslims, and it is speculated that the Hexapla manuscripts were destroyed at this time or were simply forgotten. Although the complete Hexapla had a relatively short life, its impact on the text history of the Greek Bible was already pervasive by the time of Jerome (d. *c*. AD 420). In a letter to Augustine, written *c*. AD 398, he says to him:

> And I am amazed how you do not read the books of the Seventy in their pure form, as they were published by the Seventy, but rather as emended by Origen or rather corrupted by the obeli and asterisks, and you do not follow the translation of a Christian man, especially when he (Origen) transferred these, which have been

---

annually donated 6 million *denarii* in food to the poor. Therefore Origen's patron, Ambrose, would have been able to finance the project (107).

[26]Eusebius, *The Life of Constantine*, trans. E. C. Cushing, ed. P. Schaff and H. Wace, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. 1 (Buffalo: Christian Literature, 1890; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 4.36-37.

[27]Claude E. Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia*, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 42 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 7.

> added from an edition of a man, a Jew and a blasphemer, after the Passion of Christ. Do you wish to be a true friend of the Septuagint? You should not read these [additions], which are under the asterisks; on the contrary, erase them from the chapters, so that you might show yourself to be a true patron. If you do that, you will be forced to condemn all the libraries of the churches. *For scarcely will one or another manuscript be discovered, which has not such additions*."[28]

Origen's work, therefore, had a wide influence on the text history of the Septuagint.

The history of hexaplaric research begins in 1578, when would be Pope Sixtus V, Felice Peretti, urged Gregory XIII to prepare a new edition of the Greek Bible.[29] When Peretti became Pope, this project flourished under the leadership of Carafa. He also added new editors to this team, and one of them was named Petrus Morinus, who was the editor responsible for the hexaplaric readings placed in the apparatus after each chapter. The edition known as *Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta* appeared in 1587, but it would be surpassed by the Latin translation known as the *Vetus Testamentum secundum LXX Latine* in 1588. In this edition, Flaminius Nobilius included many of the readings from the *recentiores* from Morinus, but he also supplemented these notes with his own. In 1622, Johannes Drusius completed the first commentary on the hexaplaric fragments in *Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. This edition included two introductory notes, one introduced the identities of the recentiores, while the other introduced the works of Quinta and Sexta. According to Law, Drusius added to the material, which had been handed down to him, and he translated the readings into Latin and then added his commentary.[30] In 1657, Brian Walton's London Polyglot (the *Biblia*

---

[28]*et miror, quomodo septuaginta interpretum libros legas non puros, ut ab eis editi sunt, sed ab Origene emendatos siue corruptos per obelos et asteriscos et Christiani hominis interpretatiunculam non sequaris, praesertim cum ea, quae addita sunt, ex hominis Iudaei atque blasphemi post passionem Christi editione transtulerit. uis amator esse uerus septuaginta interpretum? non legas ea, quae sub asteriscis sunt, immo rade de uoluminibus, ut ueterum te fautorem probes. quod si feceris, omnes ecclesiarum bibliothecas condemnare cogeris. uix enim unus aut alter inuenietur liber, qui ista non habeat.* Jerome, Epistle 112 to Augustine, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiaticorum Latinorum*, vol. 55, ed. Isidorus Hilberg (Vindobonae: Österreichischen Akadamie der Wissenschaften, 1996), 389.

[29]The reader will note my appreciation of T. M. Law's summary of this complicated history in T. M. Law, "A History of Research on Origen's *Hexapla*: From Masius to the *Hexapla Project*," *BIOSCS* 40 (2007): 30-48. See this article for more details.

[30]Law, "A History of Research on Origen's *Hexapla*," 35.

*Sacra Polyglotta*) included Nobilius's hexaplaric readings, but it is clear that Walton supplemented this earlier collection by drawing on the collection of Drusius. Walton both added material and corrected errors he found in the previous collections. After Walton, Matthew Poole (*Synopsis Criticorum*, 1669) and Lambertus Bos (*Vetus Testamentum ex versione septuaginta interpretum*, 1709) both published works which included hexaplaric fragments.

In 1713, Bernard de Montfaucon published what has been called "the watershed" of hexaplaric studies since this edition was the first definitive collection of hexaplaric fragments, *Orgenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*.[31] This work was the standard of hexaplaric scholarship for 150 years, until another collection of fragments was undertaken by Frederick Field in 1863 and was published in 1875.[32] Field brought hexaplaric scholarship to a higher level in the following ways: (1) he used Montfaucon's earlier edition, which served as his base text, (2) he provided an extended *prolegomenon* which addressed subjects such as the Three and an analysis of Sexta and Septima, (3) he discusses the obscure subjects of Ἑβραῖος, Σύρος, and Σαμαρειτικόν, and (4) perhaps his greatest innovation, he not only used the Syh, but he provided retroversions of the Syriac into Greek, which he indicated with a smaller type print in his edition lest they be confused with actual Greek lemmas.[33]

As was mentioned earlier, Swete in 1902 announced that hexaplaric sources had accumulated since Field's edition. This edition collected evidence from five quarters: (1) Greek manuscripts which contained the ο′ text, with some containing the Aristarchian

[31]Bernard de Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt: multis partibus auctiora* 2 vols. (Paris: Ludovicus Guerin, 1713). Law, "A History of Research on Origen's *Hexapla*," 38.

[32]See n. 2 on p. 1 of this chapter.

[33]Field had access to the pre-published edition of Ceriani's Syro-Hexapla, which is now known as A. M. Ceriani, ed., *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolitographice editus*, Monumenta sacra et profana, 7 (Milan: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874).

signs, (2) other LXX mss containing marginal notes, (3) manuscripts containing the Syro-hexapla including the Aristarchian signs and marginal notes, (4) catena manuscripts with attributions to one of the Three, and (5) citations from the Church Fathers. However, new evidence has come to light since Field's edition. In 1896, G. Mercati discovered fragments of the Hexapla from Psalms in palimpsest 0.39.[34] In 1897, F. C. Burkitt published a manuscript, which had portions of Aquila's translation of 1 and 2 Kings.[35] Finally, in 1900, C. Taylor published hexaplaric fragments of Psalm 22 (LXX 21) from the Cairo Genizah fragments.[36] Significantly, these discoveries have confirmed the arrangement of the Hexapla as passed down to us *via* patristic testimony, since these were actual fragments of copies of the Hexapla, not preserved in other sources. In addition to these fragments, Swete lists the collections of Pitra, E. Klostermann, and G. Morin.[37] With all of this new evidence surfacing, Jellicoe states about sixty-five years later that a new collection of hexaplaric fragments will not be published in the foreseeable future.[38]

A new edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Job is now within reach due to the publication of *Iob Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis* in 1982 by Joseph Ziegler. In this edition, Ziegler has provided the reader with two apparatuses, the first deals primarily with the variants from the Old Greek text above it (although this edition of Job contains an ecclesiastical text complete

---

[34]G. Mercati, ed., *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae, Pars Prima: Codex rescriptus Bybliothecae Ambrosianae O 39 Sup* (Vatican City: In Byliotheca Vaticana, 1958).

[35]F. C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897).

[36]C. Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Geniza Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection including a fragment of the twenty-second Psalm, according to Origen's Hexapla* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900).

[37]Pitra, *Analecta sacra spicilegio solesmensi parata*, iii (Venice: n.p., 1883); E. Klostermann, *Analecta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik* (Leipzig: A. Deichert (Georg Böhme), 1895); G. Morin, *Anecdota Maredsolana* iii, I (Mareds: n.p., 1895).

[38]Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 129.

with asterisks, not the Old Greek *per se*), while the second apparatus lists the evidence of each fragment from the Three. In the first apparatus, Ziegler provides evidence from Origen's fifth column, and he signals to the reader with a down arrow where readings from the second apparatus have influenced readings in the first apparatus; thus, Ziegler has provided researchers with the most complete collection of the evidence of the ο′ text and of the Three (although see below under "Adequacy and Accessibility of Resources").

In accordance with the desire of the Rich Seminar in 1994 for producing a new Field, the Hexapla Institute was formed, under the auspices of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and in partnership with The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Oxford University and Leiden University. The Hexapla Institute's purpose is as follows: "to publish a new critical edition of the fragments of Origen's Hexapla, an endeavor which might be described as, 'A Field for the 21st century' to be available in a print edition and as an online database."[39] This dissertation is another step toward attaining this goal.

**Relevance for Research**

The primary relevance of this research is to provide a new critical edition of hexaplaric fragments for Job 22-42, which evaluates and adjudicates between the readings and posits an original text and organizes the variants in an apparatus underneath. Although Ziegler's edition contains most of the hexaplaric materials in his edition, as mentioned above, these materials are not presented in a very convenient way nor do they constitute a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments. The Göttingen editions are critical editions of the LXX, and do not have as their goal the establishing of the text of the original Hexapla; thus they spread the hexaplaric material between the two apparatuses, which suits their purposes, but not the purposes of hexaplaric scholarship.

---

[39]The Hexapla Institute [on-line]; accessed 20 March 2010; available from http://www.hexapla.org/; Internet.

This new edition combines this evidence (and additional evidence) into one apparatus. In addition, the second apparatus does not differentiate between sources (e.g. catena, manuscripts, marginal notes), and thus does not discriminate the levels the authority of the different sources. The new edition avoids these weaknesses.[40]

Second, this project contributes to clarifying the text history of the LXX. Norton says, “The Hexapla assembled the most important Greek texts of the first two centuries A.D. This was the most important period for the development and stabilization of the Greek and Hebrew texts, and now that our knowledge of the period has been enriched by the discoveries at Qumran and in the Judean desert, the hexaplaric material can be reexamined profitably.”[41] Thus once the text of the Hexapla has been clarified, this text illumines the text histories of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint.

Third, once the hexaplaric editions have been published, it is possible to create a database from which an index and lexicon based on these materials can be written. The goal of a fully searchable on-line database using different criteria will be a real benefit to scholars.

Fourth, a complete lexicon of the hexaplaric materials may aid in the task of New Testament lexicography, for many words in the NT do not occur in the LXX, and rare words in the NT may be found or be best represented in the hexaplaric fragments.[42]

Fifth, the Hexapla influenced the Church Fathers as shown by their references to hexaplaric readings; thus the possibility that the Hexapla may have influenced the

---

[40]Gerard J. Norton, “Collecting Data for a New Edition of the Fragments of the Hexapla,” in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995*, ed. B. A. Taylor, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 254.

[41]Gerard J. Norton, “Cautionary Reflections on a Re-edition of Fragments of Hexaplaric Material,” in *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, Orbis biblicus et orientalis 109 (Frieburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 134-35.

[42]Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 460-61.

exegesis of the Church Fathers cannot be overlooked.

Finally, a catalog of the readings of the Three will probably aid in the study of rabbinic exegesis from the Second Temple period. The Three stand in the unique place of being the only Jewish Greek sources of exegesis of the Hebrew Bible as they sought to revise the LXX according to the Hebrew text.

**Adequacy and Accessibility of Sources**

The primary resource for this project is the Göttingen critical edition by Joseph Ziegler, specifically the first and second apparatuses.[43] Subsequent to this edition Ziegler also published *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob*.[44] Further works have been published since Ziegler's critical edition. The Hagedorn edition of hexaplaric fragments, *Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob*, published in 1991 contains additional materials unavailable to Ziegler in his critical edition.[45] The Hagedorns also recollated catena manuscripts of Job and provided extensive stemmata for the catena tradition.[46] Since the publications of both Ziegler and the Hagedorns, ms 161 has become available through Peter J. Gentry, and its readings were checked

---

[43]Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Iob, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, vol. 11.4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

[44]Joseph Ziegler, *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob,* Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3rd ser., 147, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, no. 17 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).

[45]Ursula Hagedorn and Dieter Hagedorn, eds., *Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob,* Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1 (Philologisch-Historische Klasse, no. 10 1991). The collation book to this work has been made available through Peter J. Gentry with permission from Dieter Hagedorn.

[46]Ursula Hagedorn and Dieter Hagedorn, eds., *Die Älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob: Band I Einleitung, Prologue und Epilogoe, Fragmente zu Hiob 1,1-8,2,* Patristische Texte und Studien 40 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994). Idem, *Die Älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob: Band II Fragmente zu Hiob 9,1-22,30,* Patristische Texte und Studien 48 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997). Idem, *Die Älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob: Band III Fragmente zu Hiob 23,1-42,17*, Patristische Texte und Studien 53 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000). Idem, *Die Älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob: Band IV Register. Nachträge und Anhänge,* Patristische Texte und Studien 59 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004).

systematically for this new collection. In addition to 161, ms 555 was also checked systematically, since Ziegler did not have access to this manuscript. Field had access to this manuscript, Codex Regius 2434 and called it "Regii duo" in his edition, but his readings need to be checked against the manuscript, which the Göttingen Septuaginta-Unternehmen has made available to me. Since the publication of Ziegler's edition, two new critical editions of relevant patristic commentaries have appeared.[47] Other patristic sources were checked through *Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca* (*CCSG*) and *Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina* (*CCSL*). *Biblia Patristica*, volumes 1-7 and Supplement is a cumulative index of citations in the Church Fathers, which was used to check citations. The Syro-hexapla edition used is that of Ceriani.[48] In addition to these resources, our knowledge of the Armenian tradition of Job has been greatly amplified since the work of Ziegler through the labors of Claude Cox.[49]

## Methodology

### The Aim of the Project

The aim of this project is *not* to reconstruct a critical edition of the Hexapla in its columnar order, as beneficial as that type of project might be. As romantic as this aim would be, Norton has already shown that such an edition is not practical, since we do not know how the whole Hexapla, word by word, was arranged. Certainty of the exact

[47]John Chrysostom, *Johannes Chrysostomos Kommentar zu Hiob*, ed. Ursula Hagedorn and Dieter Hagedorn, Patristische Texte und Studien 35 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990). Olympiodorus, *Kommentar zu Hiob,* ed. Ursula Hagedorn and Dieter Hagedorn. Patristische Texte und Studien, Bd. 24 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984).

[48]A. M. Ceriani, ed., *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolitographice editus,* Monumenta sacra et profana, 7 (Milan: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874.)

[49]Claude Cox, *Armenian Job: Reconstructed Greek Text, Critical Edition of the Armenian with English Translation* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006). Idem, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia*, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 42 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.) Idem, *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version,* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 21 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

arrangement for each biblical book eludes us at this time, but even if one were privy to this information, one would still not know the exact arrangement of each word in each line of the Hexapla as originally constructed.[50]

Therefore, the goal of this project is more manageable: to create a critical edition of hexaplaric fragments for Job 22-42. Ter Haar Romeny and Gentry outline three types of materials that are considered to be hexaplaric, which will be the criteria for this dissertation. The first type is strictly hexaplaric and includes the asterisks and obeli and any other scholia, which indicates pluses or minuses relative to the Hebrew text. The second type comprises materials which are considered hexaplaric because Origen incorporated them into it. These materials include readings from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which existed before the composition of the Hexapla and have come down in other sources besides the Hexapla. The Hebrew text in Greek letters is also considered hexaplaric according to this criterion. The third type is hexaplaric material by association and is as follows: ὁ Σύρος, τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν or ὁ Ἑβραῖος, and τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν. These works are not hexaplaric in themselves but they have traditionally been collected with hexaplaric materials.[51]

**Compiling and Presenting Information**

This project follows the methodology outlined by ter Haar Romeny and Gentry in their article on collecting hexaplaric materials for Genesis, and the few changes, which the Hexapla Project has made since that article appeared.[52]

---

[50]R. B. Ter Haar Romeny and P. J. Gentry, "Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Materials for the Book of Genesis," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998*, ed. B. A. Taylor, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 286-87.

[51]Ibid., 287.

[52]Ibid., 289-94.

**Choices between readings.** Ziegler's objective for his second apparatus was simply to list the hexaplaric evidence, and at times the witnesses are in conflict. This project's method aligns with Field and attempts to reconstruct the original text based on the available evidence. At times this reading is different from Field's because of the new state of the evidence.

**References to secondary literature and other remarks.** At times editorial notes refer to secondary literature to clarify or defend the choices made. This practice carries on the custom of Field and constitutes a separate apparatus in this edition.

**Latin and oriental sources.** For non-Greek sources, in the tradition of Field, I supply the original reading and also provide a retroversion into Greek, if no equivalent Greek witness is available. In places where a non-Greek reading differs from the Greek text due to translation technique and not a different *Vorlage* or where a retroversion cannot be confidently supplied, a Latin translation is supplied.[53]

**Variant readings from editions.** I supply variant readings from modern critical editions of patristic sources, and include all the instances where an author cites the same passage.

**Readings from earlier collections that can no longer be checked.** At times the Göttingen editor used "Field," but this project attempts to replace these attributions with Field's original sources, and wherever the source is able to be listed, it will be cited and Field's name will not be. In some cases it is not possible to go beyond the indication "Montef," "Combef," or "Nobil." "Montef" refers to readings given by Montfaucon with no other indication; "Combef" refers to readings found by Montfaucon in *schedis Combefisianis*; and "Nobil" refers to readings given by Nobilius with no further

[53]Ibid., 290-91.

information about his source.

**Other hexaplaric material.** Pluses and minuses indicated by asterisks and obeli, commentaries, and marginal notes in manuscripts, which were not recorded in either of Ziegler's apparatuses, will be included in this new collection. In cases of transposition of words or phrases that indicate hexaplaric influence, "non tr" will be used to indicate not transposition in relation to the Hebrew but in relation to the LXX.

The text tradition of the LXX has many unattributed sources (*sine nomine*), which are likely hexaplaric, since they have been included with other hexaplaric readings. In cases where an attribution can reasonably be determined, the attribution is placed in angle brackets. Where no attribution is possible, a question mark is placed in angle brackets, and these readings may be found in chapter 4.

## The Project Format

Each reading or entry contains the following elements, which are prescribed by the Hexapla editorial board.

**Hebrew and Greek texts.** The Hebrew lemma is given first followed by Ziegler's text of the LXX and in the case of the OG, this text will be labeled LXX. In the case of the asterisked lines, the text will be designated with E for Ecclesiastical text. The Hebrew Text is the consonantal Masoretic text (MT) of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) and is labeled HT.[54] This text is the base text of the edition, and if Origen's Hebrew text appears to be different, these observations will be noted in the apparatus. Verse references follow the LXX system, and where the Hebrew is different, the Hebrew reference is provided second in square brackets.

---

[54]L. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967/77, 1997).

**Readings with attributions.** After the LXX reading, the related hexaplaric readings are given. When there are textual variants, a preferred text is given, and variants and explanation are supplied underneath in an apparatus. Any lemma that has been derived by retroversion alone is indicated by a smaller font and explained in the final apparatus.

**Witness apparatuses.** The first apparatus contains the primary hexaplaric witnesses (*Wit 1*). Primary witnesses come mainly from the readings in the second apparatus of Ziegler's edition or the additional evidence in the *Nachlese*. The second apparatus for this project contains secondary witnesses (*Wit 2*). These are manuscripts of the text of the LXX, which have been corrupted by hexaplaric readings and they are principally found in Ziegler's first apparatus. If all witnesses contain the entire lemma, then the witnesses are simply listed. Otherwise, the sources which contain the longer lemma will be listed first and marked clearly as "lemma" and the shorter or incomplete variants will be preceded by the portion of the full lemma they contain.

The third apparatus presents variants to the attribution (*Attr*). First, variant attributions from the lemma are listed followed by their sources. Second, where an attribution is omitted, this is indicated by the Latin *sine nomine* "without name" followed by the manuscripts that omit the attribution.

The fourth apparatus presents the variants to the readings (*Var*). The lemma in question is listed to the left of the right bracket (]) and the variants and their sources are listed to the right and, in the case of multiple variants, are separated by vertical lines (|). The format of presenting variants follows the Göttingen editions (variants, transpositions [tr], omissions [om, >], additions [pr, +]).

The fifth apparatus lists all non-Greek sources (*NonGr*). Although the final form of the Hexapla project will include all known non-Greek sources (in particular the Coptic tradition of Job), this project will cover the original texts of Hebrew, Aramaic,

Syriac, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Armenian, and Latin sources. All non-Greek sources listed in Ziegler will be listed in the Witness apparatuses, but only the texts of the aforementioned languages will be included in this dissertation.

The sixth apparatus contains any relevant notes on the entire entry (*Notes*). Comments on the previous five apparatuses may be supplied, or on matters such as translation technique or usage of particular translators. This apparatus contains references to any relevant secondary literature. The goal of this apparatus is to explain the given lemma and its place in the text tradition of Job.

The following sample is taken from Job 24:22b and demonstrates the use of all six apparatuses.

**Job 24 22b**

HT (יָקוּם וְלֹא־יַאֲמִין) בַּחַיִּין׃

LXX (ἀναστὰς τοιγαροῦν οὐ μὴ πιστεύσῃ) κατὰ (τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς)

## σʹ περί

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 559\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓Syh ↓Pitra

*Wit2:* κατά] υπερ *L*; περι *lI* 257

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 643

*Var*: περί] περ 740; + τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς 260 Pitra Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܡܛܠ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܝܠܗ ❖

*Notes*: In 260, the fragment is embedded in the text (*Kollationen*, 163). The longer lemma of Syh and Pitra obtained from harmonization with the bible text of the LXX.

**Explanation of entry.** The HT and LXX for Job 24:22b are listed first. The parentheses indicate that these words are not under consideration but are supplied for context. The only word for consideration is κατά in the LXX and ב for the HT. The

lemma line shows the attribution to σʹ and the lemma περί. The first apparatus shows that ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 559\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓Syh ↓Pitra attest the lemma and attribution. The down arrow before a manuscript grouping or manuscript indicates that more information is given in the apparatuses below. The second apparatus reports that the *L* group ὑπέρ for κατά and that *l1* 257 have περί, which appears to be influenced by the hexaplaric fragment. The third attribution shows that the fragment is *sine nomine* or omitted from *C* (= 788-250) 643. The fourth apparatus shows that 740 has περ instead of the lemma and that 260 Syh Pitra contain a plus (τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς). The fifth apparatus supplies the full Syriac fragment from the margin of Syh complete with attribution to Symmachus. The sixth apparatus provides the editor’s comments on specific manuscripts and the variants.

CHAPTER 2

DESCRIPTION OF SOURCES

## Introduction

The description of sources for Greek witnesses, Greek commentaries, Latin commentaries, indirect traditions, translations, and printed editions is primarily from the *Edition*.[1] Since the publication of the *Edition* in 1982, however, critical editions of patristic commentaries, a four volume critical edition of the oldest catena of Job (*AGK*), and a correlated fascicle on the hexaplaric fragments, *Nachlese*, have been published by Ursula and Dieter Hagedorn. The Hagedorns gave me permission to use the collations of the latter (*Kollationen*), and it was made available through Peter J. Gentry. In addition, Field included manuscript witnesses not used by either Ziegler or the Hagedorns. Each of these sources has its respective sigla; therefore, an adaptation and revision of Nancy Woods' Correlated Sigla table is provided at the end of this chapter. Following the listing of the text witnesses, there will be a discussion of the text groups, with special attention given to the catena groups.

## Text Witnesses

The dissertation does not consist of a new collation of materials, but rather it is a new presentation of former sources collected in one edition; however, there are a few exceptions to this rule. Ra 161 and 555, manuscripts not used by Ziegler but used by Field, were made available by Peter J. Gentry and were incorporated into this edition. Ra 476, a manuscript not seen by the Hagedorns, Ziegler, or Field was also made available

[1]Joseph Ziegler, ed. *Iob*, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum, vol. 11.4. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

through Gentry, but it has not been fully collated for this edition, even though its place in the Hagedorns' stemma is clear (see Catena Groups). In addition to these manuscripts, Reinhart Ceulemans kindly informed me about Ra 788, which had not been collated previously by Field, Ziegler, or the Hagedorns. Zisis Melissakis of the Institute for Byzantine Research in Athens was generous to send me the images, but this important manuscript came to my attention too late in the writing process to incorporate fully into this edition (for its significance see Catena Groups). At places the readings in the *Edition* are corrected by the *Kollationen* and in many places the images of the manuscripts were consulted directly in order to verify the correct reading. The witnesses are listed according to Rahlfs's *Verzeichnis* number or as subsequently catalogued in the case of materials which have not received a Rahlfs's number previously.

**Greek Manuscripts**

Uncials

A London, Brit. Mus., Royal 1 D. VII, "Alexandrinus;" 5th C
B Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr.1209, "Vaticanus;" 4th C
C Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 9, "Ephraemi Syri rescriptus;" 5th C rescr. 13th C
S London, Brit. Mus., Add. 43725 "Sinaiticus;" 4th C
V Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 1, "Venetus;" 8th C

Minuscules

46 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl.; 4 8th–14th C
55 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Regin. gr. 1; 10th C
68 Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 5; 15th C
106 Ferrara, Bibl. Comun., 187 II; 14th C
110 Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 230, (Cat.); AD 1549
130 Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 23; 12th–13th C
137 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., D 73 sup., (Cat.) – Fragmentarisch; 9th–10th C
138 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., M 65 sup., (Cat.); 11th C
139 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., A 148 inf., (Cat.); 10th–11th C
147 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. Gr. 30 (A), (Cat.); 12th C
**149** Wien, Theol. Gr. 11 (Cat.); 11th C
157 Basel, Univ.-Bibl., B. VI. 23; 12th C
**160** Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, A. 66b.; 14th– 15th C

**161** Moskau, Russ. Staatsarchiv für alte Dokumente, Fond 1607, Inv. 1.7; 14th C
**228** Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1764; 13th C
248 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 346; 13th C
249 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Pii II. gr. 1, (Cat.); 12th C
250 München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 148, (Cat.); 13th C
251 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. V 27, (Cat.); 14th C
252 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. VIII 27; 10th C
253 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 336, (see Zi); 11th C
254 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 337; 10th C
255 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 338, (Cat.); 10th C
256 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 697, (Cat.); 13th C
257 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 745; 10th C
258 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 749, (Cat.) – Fragmentarisch; 9th C
259 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Palat. gr. 230, (Cat.) 1:1 und 14:5-16:8 fehlen; 10th–11th C
260 Kopenhagen, Kgl. Bibl., Gamle Kgl. Saml. 6, (Cat.); 10th –11th C
261 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. VII 30; AD 1323
296 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Palat. gr. 337; 11th C
336 Athos, Ιβηρων 555; 14th C
337 Athos, Ιβηρων 615; 14th C
339 Athos, Koutloumousiou 8; 11th C
**351** Berlin, Staatsbibl., Phill. 1407; 16th C
355 Bologna, Bibl. Comun., A.I.2, see Zi, 12; 12th C
**386** Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. X 29; 13th – 14th C
**395** Prague, Státní knihovna XXV B 3 (Ra = Kosinitza 22); 10th C
406 Jerusalem, Patr. Bibl., Agiou Staurou 36(18), see *Edition*, 12; 8th C (rescr. 12th –13th C)
**409** Jerusalem, Patr. Bibl., Agiou Taphou 5; 13th C
**471** Moskau, synod. Gr. 147; 13th/14th C
**474** Moskau, Staatl. Hist. Mus. (GIM), Syn. Bibl., Gr. 342 + 412; 10th und 11th C
**476** Moskau, synod. Gr. 392; 12th C
480 München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 32, (Cat.); 16th C
**491** München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 488, (Comm.); 13th C
**492** München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 491, (Cat.) 16th C
**503** Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. E 2.16 (Cat.); 12th-13th C
**505** Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. E 2.19 (= Misc. 47); 11th–12th C
512 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 176, (Cat.); AD 1562
513 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 178, (Cat.); 16th C
523 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. gr. 20; 13th C
534 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 18; 11th C
**540** Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 194; 13th C
542 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 10, Fragmentarisch; 9th C
543 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 11; AD 1186

**555** Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 134 (= Reg. 2434); 13th C
**556** Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 135 (= Reg. $1830^2$); AD 1362
**557** Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 136 (= Colb. 3066); 15th C
**559** Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 138; 16th C
**560** Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 151 (= Reg. 1890); 13th C
**570** Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 162 (= Reg 2873); 13th C
575 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 396; 13th C
608 Codex Oratorii in vico S. Honoratii; 10th C
612 Patmos, Ιωαννου του θεολογου 171 (Cat.) – Fragmentarisch; 7th–8th C
613 Patmos, Ιωαννου του θεολογου 209; 13th C
620 Patmos, Ιωαννου του θεολογου 419, 1:1 - 2:9e fehlt; 13th C
631 Raudnitz, Lobkowitz'sche Bibl. VI. E. f. 19; 14th C
**632** Rom, Bibl. Angel. Gr. 113 (B.1.2); 16th C
637 Rom, Bibl. Casan. 241; 11th C
643 Rom, Bibl. Vallic. 37, (Cat.); 10th C
644 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Barber. gr. 369, (Cat.); 13th C
680 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 750, (Cat.) – Portions; 10th C
681 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 751; 13th C
687 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1231, (Cat.); 12th C
703 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 2227, (Cat.) endet mit 41:15; 13th C
705 Athen, Nat. Bibl. 2410, (Cat.); 13th–14th C
706 Athen, Nat. Bibl. 2641; AD 914
728 Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Appendix I 13; 11th–12th C
732 Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 21, (Cat.); 10th–11th C
740 Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 538 (Cat.); AD 905
748 Athen, Byzantinisches Museum 2781, (Cat.) – Portions; 13th –14th C
754 Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 147; 11th C
765 Athos, Λαυρα 220 (B/100); 14th C
**788** Tyrnavos, Dêmotikê Bibl. 25; 10th C
795 Athos, Λαυρα Γ 51 (291); 12th–13th C
797 Athen, Benaki-Museum, Echangeables 72; 13th –14th C
849 Manchester, John-Rylands Library, Rylands Nr. 3; 6th–7th C
3004 Salamantinus Universitatis M 32 (1-2-1); 16th C, Ziegler falsch 704
**3005** Genua, Durazzo-Giustiniani A I 10; 9th–10th C
**3006.1** Sinai, Cod. Gr. 3; 11th C
**3006.2** Sinai, Cod. Gr. 3; 11th C
**3007** Sinai, Cod. Gr. 311; AD 1510
**3008** Athous Vatopedi 590; 12th C

Papyri

834 Berlin, Staatliche Museen, P Berlin Nr. 6788; 5th–6th C
913 New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, P Amherst 4 (A); 5th–6th C
955 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., PSI 1163; 4th C
974 Berlin, Staatliche Museen, P Berlin Nr. 11778; appx. AD 220

Other

Ω Vaticanus gr. 709; 12th C
– Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 2022; 10th–11th C

The manuscripts, whose numbers are in bold, were not used by Ziegler. The hexaplaric fragments of Ω are listed in an edition of this manuscript published by the Hagedorns.[2]

Manuscripts Not Used

The following manuscripts have been omitted as witnesses. The Hagedorns have informed me that they are all Nicetas catena manuscripts, and therefore their value would be to clarify the text history of the *cII* group, which in its own right would be desirable, but in all probability they are not significant for an edition of the hexaplaric fragments.

444 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., B. 117 sup.; 13th C
450 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., D. 473 infm Bl. 49-51; 16th C
454 Mailand, Bibl. Naz. Di Brera, AF.XIV.13; 16th C
496 Neapel, Bibl. Naz., II. B. 26; 15th–16th C
497 Neapel, Bibl. Naz., II. B. 27; 15th C
514 Oxford, Bodl Libr., Barocc. 195; 15th C
515 Oxford, Bodl. Linr., Barocc. 201; 12th C –13th C
525 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. Gr. 86; 16th C
531 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 9; 15th C
681 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 751, (Cat.); 13th C
697 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat gr. 1909, (Cat.); 16th C
717 Smyrna, Euaggel. Scolh, A-31; 15th C
725 Turin, Bibl. Naz., C. III. 1; AD 1562
749 Wien, Hofbibl., Suppl. Gr. 16; 16th C
750 Wien, Hofbibl., Theol. Gr. 73; 15th–16th C

The following manuscripts are secondary copies and derivatives of

[2]Ursula and Dieter Hagedorn, “Die Epitome einer Hiobkatene unter dem Namen des Leo Magister in der Handschrift Vaticanus gr. 709” (Köln, 2009) [on-line]; accessed 28 December 2010; available from http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/volltexte/2009/10160/pdf/Leo_Magister.pdf; Internet.

manuscripts used in the Hagedorns' stemma and are therefore excluded from *AGK*:[3]

362 New Haven Yale 257 (formerly Cheltenham Phillipps 14041); 15th–16th C, copy of 556 (Nicetas)
434 Matritensis Bibl. Nac. 4716 (O. 38); 16th C, copy of 556 (Nicetas)
471 Mosquensis synod. gr. 147; 13th–14th C, copy of 260
709 Sinaiticus gr. 4; 13th C (Nicetas)

Three of the four manuscripts are Nicetas mss, and 471 is a copy of 260, which is near the bottom of the stemma of *cI* according to the Hagedorns (K = 260).

**Greek Commentaries**

Der Iobkommentar des Arianers Julian = Iul

Hagedorn, D. *Der Hiob Kommentar des Arianers Julian*. Patristische Texte und Studien 14. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1973. Clavis II 2075

Der Iobkommentar des Didymus = Did

Didymus. *Kommentar zu Hiob: (Tura-Papyrus)*. Edited by Albert Henrichs, Ursula Hagedorn, Dieter Hagedorn, and Ludwig Koenen. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, Bd. 1-3, 33. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1968.

Hagedorn, D. *Der Hiob Kommentar des Arianers Julian*. Patristische Texte und Studien 14. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1973. Clavis II 2075

K. Treu, Archiv für Papyrusforschung 20 (1970): 145-149.

Der Iobkommentar des Johannes Chrysostomus = Chr

Hagedorn, D. and U. *Johannes Chrysostomos Kommentar zu Hiob*. Patristische Texte und Studien 35. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990.

*Fragmenta in beatum Job* PG 64, 505-656 (*Ex Catena Graecorum Patrum in beatum Job*, Nicetae collection, Patrick Iunius, ed.: Clavis II 4443).

[3]In *AGK*, the Hagedorns explain the manuscript witness's stemma, derivatives, and copies. The Hagedorns frequently reference witnesses which were fully or partially collated, but not selected as representative for the stemma. Thus, in Table 1. Correlated Sigla, the letters under *AGK* indicate manuscripts which provided the data for the edition. To understand how the manuscript relates to its copies or derivatives, one must see the critical edition, Ursula and Dieter Hagedorn, *Die älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob: Band I Einleitung, Prologue und Epilogoe, Fragmente zu Hiob 1,1-8,22*, PTS 40 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 1-97.

Der Iobkommentar des Olympiodor = Ol, Ol$^{X}$, Ol$^{Y}$, Olymp

Hagedorn, D. and U. *Kommentar zu Hiob/Olympiodor, Diakon von Alexandria*. Patristische Texte und Studien 24. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984.

**Ol, Ol$^{X}$, Ol$^{Y}$, Olymp.** In the *Edition*, Ol designates the commentary alone or together with the catena.

Ol$^{X}$ refers to Ra 257 for Job chapters 1-10 (folios 1-32), for these folios contain a commentary of Olympiodorus. Beginning in chapter 11, Ra 257 is a catena manuscript. The Hagedorns make a further distinction between the catena and the marginal notes within the later folios (33-81). In these folios, the catena of Olympiodorus was only of minimal significance, since it represents a text between mss 137 and 260 (*cI*), and therefore, they used 257 when referring to the catena. For the marginal notes in this manuscript, the scribe used a different *Vorlage*, which was related to the *C* group, and therefore, the Hagedorns used X to designate marginal notes.[4] In this edition, the siglum 257 designates the marginal notes and 257$^{cat}$ refers to the catena.

The situation is similar for Ol$^{Y}$, for the Olympiodorus commentary is found in chapters 1 -10, but beginning in chapter 11, ms 491 contains fragments which stood under “Olympiodorus” in the catena tradition.

When “Olymp” is cited, it refers to the catena material, alone. The *Kommentar* supersedes the work of the *Edition*; therefore, it was necessary to compare the *Edition* with it and *AGK*, in order to determine as accurately as possible what hexaplaric material comes from Olympiodorus.

### Latin Commentaries

Der Iobkommentar des Julian von Eclanum = IulE

---

[4]*AGK* 1, 17.

Julian of Eclanum. *Iuliani Aeclanensis Expositio Libri Iob*. Edited by L. de Coninck. CC 88: 1 – 109. Turnholt, 1977.

Der Iobkommentar eines Anonymus = An

Anonymi in Iob Commentarius: PG 17, 371-522.

Der Iobkommentar des Presbyter Philippus = $La^{P}$ $La^{Ph}$

Commentarii in librum Iob: PL 26 (1845): 619–802 = PL 26 (1884): 655–850 = $La^{P}$

Philippi Presbyteri viri longe eruditissimi, in historian Iob commentariorum libri tres, Basileae 1527 = $La^{Ph}$

Der Iobkommentar Gregors des Grossen = GregM

Moralia sive Expositio in Iob: PL 75: 509–1162; 76: 9–782. Neue ausgabe: CC 143–143A (1979): Libri I–XXII.

## Indirect Traditions

F. C. Burkitt. *The Text of Job in Latin Fathers: The Old Latin and the Itala* (Cambridge, 1896): 32–34.

*Biblia Patristica, Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la literature patristique*, vol. I (Paris, 1975); vol. II( Paris, 1977); vol. III (Paris, 1980).

Testamentum Iobi = Test

The *Testament of Job* is extant in four manuscripts:

P = Paris, Bibl. Nat. gr. 2658; 11th C
$P^2$ = Paris, Bibl. Nat. gr. 938; 16th C
S = Messina, Bibl. Universitaria San Salvatore 29; AD 1307
V = Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1238; 13th C

Die Iob-Zitate in den Sacra Parallela des Iohannes Damascenus = Dam

$Dam^{E}$ = Escorial, Real Bibl., *Ω*-III-9; 11th C
$Dam^{W}$ = Wien, Nationalbibl., Suppl. gr. 178; 11th C
$Dam^{O}$ = Rom, Bibl. Vat., Ottob. gr. 79; 15th C
$Dam^{V}$ = Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1236; 15th C

Vat. gr. 1236 is the *Vorlage* of the edition of M. Lequien (PG 95–96, 1712); when no manuscript is cited, but the Migne edition is referred to, Dam (Mi) is noted.

**Translations**

Latin = La

Jerome *Liber Job Altera Versio*. ed. J.P. Migne, PL 29 (1865): 63–118.

$La^{\mu}$ = Ms. Nr. 18 der Bibliotheque Publique in tours, die aus dem Kloster Marmoutiers stammt
$La^{\beta}$ = Ms. Auct. E. infra 2 Nr. 2426 der Bodleiana in Oxford
$La^{\gamma}$ = Ms. Nr. 11 in St. Gallen
$La^{A}$ = Zu diesen drei Hss. kommt noch die Hs. Hinzu, die Augustinus seinen *Adnotationes in Iob* zugrunde legt
$La^{P}$ $La^{Ph}$ = Die Zitate aus La im Iobkommentar des Presbyter Philippus

Syrohexapla = Syh

Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrsianus photolithographice Edited by A. M. Ceriani: Monumenta sacra et profana VII. Mediolani 1874.

Syropalestinian = Syp

J. P. N. Land. *Anecdota syriaca* IV (Lugduni Batavorum 1875; Neudruck Jerusalem, 1971) 223: 21:1-2, 5b, 6-8 (lückenhaft), 9a οἱ οἶκοι αὐτῶν = $Syp^{b}$.

F.C. Burkitt, The LXX Text of Iob 22:3b-12 in the Palestinian Syriac dialect: Anecdota Oxoniensia 9 (Oxford 1896; Neudruck Jerusalem 1971) 37-44.

F. Schulthess. “Christlich-palästinische Fragmente. Fragment IV.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (*ZDMG*) 56 (1902): 253f: 16:9b ἐπ’ ἐμέ–19.

A. Smith Lewis. *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary: Studia sinaitica* VI (London, 1897): 55f: 16:1-9b ἔβρυξεν; 56f: 16:20-17:16; 74f: 21:1-34 (21:1-9 = $Syp^{a}$).

A. Smith Lewis. *Codex Climaci rescriptus*. Horae Semiticae VIII (Cambridge, 1909): 18: 6:1-16a; 28-32: 6:16b-7:21.

Christian Palestinian Aramaic = CPA

C. Müller-Kessler and M. Sokoloff, eds. *The Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament and Apocrypha Version from the Early Period*. A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic, vol. 1. Groningen: STYX Publications, 1997.

Since the publication of the *Edition*, research has recognized "Syropalestinian" as a distinct dialect of Aramaic, now known as "Christian Palestinian Aramaic" (CPA), which is distinguished from Syriac in both language and script. The newly published CPA texts now replace the publications of *Codex Climaci rescriptus* by A. Smith Lewis and *Anecdota syriaca* by J. P. N. Land.

Coptic = Co [= Bo + Sa]

Sahidic = Sa

A. Ciasca. *Sacrorum Bibliorum framenta copto-sahidica*. Musei Borgiani II (Rome, 1889): 1-68.

$Sa^1$ A. Erman, Bruchstücke der oberaegyptischen Übersetzung des AT: Nachr. von der Kön. Ges. der Wiss. und der G. A. Univ. zu Göttingen Nr. 12 (Göttingen 1880) S. 21. In halt: 29:21–30:7a.

$Sa^2$ G. Maspéro, Fragments de la version thébaine de l'AT: Mémoires publ. par les membres de la mission archéol. franç. Au Caire VI/1, Paris 1892. Inhalt: 5:17–27.

$Sa^3$ F. Rossi, Un nuovo codice copto del Museo Egizio di Torino: Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei 290, Serie 5, 1893. Memorie della Classe di scienze morali storiche e filologiche I/1 (Roma 1894) 95–99. Inhalt: 20:29; 21:1-4, 11a, 12, 16b-18a; 22:1-3a, 4b-5, 17-19, 21-23a; 23:1-8a, 16b-17a; 24:4a, 5ab, 6, 14a, 18b-20ab; 25:2b-5; 26:14c; 27:1-4a, 11b-13a.

$Sa^4$ H. Thompson, The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Certain Books of the OT from a papyrus in the Brit. Museum, Oxford 1908. Inhalt: 38:27b, 28-31, 33-34a; 39:6a, 7-12 Fragmentarisch.

$Sa^5$ W. E. Crum, Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the collection of the John Rylands Library (Manchester 1909) S. 2 Nr. 3. Inhalt: 7:2-3. Fragmentarisch.

Sa[6] C. Wessely, Griech. und Kopt. Texte theol. Inhalts I: Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde IX (Leipzig 1909) S. 71-72. Nr. 26f; S. 82-83 Nr. 28a. Inhalt: 1:1-5; 16:11-19.

Sa[7/1] J. Schleifer, Sahidische Bibel-Fragmente aus dem Brit. Museum zu London I: Sitzungsber. der Kais. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien, Phil-Hist. Klasse 162,6 (Wien 1909). Inhalt: 6:19-25a.

Sa[7/2] J. Schleifer, ebd. II 164,6 (Wien 1911) S. 21–23 Nr. VII. Inhalt: 40:12b, 13b-23a, 25, 26b-31a, 32; 41:1-3, 5-7, 8b, 10.

Sa[7/3] J. Schleifer, Bruchstücke der sahidischen Bibelübersetzung, ebd. 170, 1 (Wien 1912) S. 22-23. Inhalt: 2:10de, 11, 12. Fragmentarisch.

Sa[8] L. Lieu, Nouveaux Fragments préhexaplaires du livre de Iob en copte sahidique: Mus 13 (1912) 147-185. Inhalt der vier Fragmente: I. 1:1-3:20a; 4:10b-5:14; II. 6:5-16a; 7:3b-12a; III. 9:10bβ-16aα, 23-29α; IV. 41:11-Ende.

Sa[9] W. H. Worrel, Job Fragment: The Coptic Manuscript in the Freer Collation I (New York-London 1916) 110-112. Neue (unveränderte) Ausgabe 1923. Inhalt: 24:19b-25a; 25:1-3a; 27:10-18.

Sa[10] W. Till, Saidische Fragmente des Alten Testamentes: Mus 50 (1937) 215. Inhalt der zwei Fragmente: I 15:25-26a, 28 (der asterisierte V. 27 fehlt). II. 15:34-16:2a.

Bohairic = Bo

H. Tattam, *The ancient Coptic version of the Book of Job the Just*, London 1846.

E. Porcher, “Le livre de Job. Version copte bohairique.” PO 18,2 (Paris 1924): 209-339.

E. Porcher uses three manuscripts:

M = Manchester 417, Collection Ryland
L = London 724 Add. 18997, Brit. Museum
P = Paris, Bibl. Nat., Copte 92.

Fayumic = Fa

Gerald M. Browne, Michigan Coptic Texts: Papyrologica Castroctaviana. Studia et textus 7 (Barcelona 1979) 1–8. Fragment: 30:21a ἀνελεημόνως -24, 26b-30.

W. E. Crum and H. I. Bell, Wadi Sarga. Coptic and Greek texts from the excavations undertaken by the Byzantine Research account: Coptica III (Hauniae 1922) 29f. Fragment: 30:8b, 9, 17, 18 (lückenhaft).

Aethiopic = Aeth

*Le Livre de Job*. Version éthiopienne publiée et traduite par F. M. E. Pereira. PO 2, 5 (Paris, 1907): 561-688.

F. M. E. Pereira used three manuscripts:

Cod. aeth. 11 (Cat. 7), Paris, Bibl. Nat. = $Aeth^{P}$
Cod. aeth. 55 der Sammlung von A. d'Abbadie, Paris, Bibl. Nat. = $Aeth^{A}$
Cod. aeth. V, Oxford, Bodl. Libr. = $Aeth^{B}$

Armenian = Arm

Claude E. Cox. *Armenian Job: Reconstructed Greek Text, Critical Edition of the Armenian with English Translation.* Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

Claude E. Cox. *Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion in Armenia*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 42. ed. Bernard A. Taylor. 317-348. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996.

Claude E. Cox. *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 21. ed. Claude E. Cox, 157-169. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986.

Cox's critical edition replaces Ziegler's work on Armenian Job. The apparatus cites App I of the *Edition* under *Wit2*, but corrections to the *Edition* are made in the *NonGr* line. At times, the Arm text (Arm) of the *Edition* has been designated as a variant in Cox's *Armenian Job*; therefore, the *NonGr* uses Cox's text and lists the *Edition's* Arm reading as a variant in parentheses.

Arabic = Arab

W.G. F. de Baudissin. *Translationis antiquae arabicae libri Iobi quae supersunt nunc primum edita*. Lipsiae 1870.

Arab has a hexaplaric reading in the text of Job 20:25b: *fulgura* = ἀστραπαί

*O*-253´.

Cairo Genizah = CG

N.R.M. de Lange. Some new fragments of Aquila on Malachi and Job? *VT* 30 (1980): 291-294.

This edition cites the Cairo Geniza material with the abbreviation CG.

**Editions**

Aldina = Ald; Complutensis = Compl; Sixtine = Sixt; Grabe = Gra.; Holmes–Parsons = H.-P.; Rahlfs = Ra.; Swete = Sw.; Tischendorf = Ti.

The sources for these editions are found in the *Edition* on pages 54-60.

## Text Groups

### *Edition* Text Groups

Ziegler's text groups for his *Edition* are listed below and are used without revision in *Wit1*, *Wit2*, *Attr*, *Var*, and *NonGr* in this edition. Ziegler's work on the Catena tradition of Job, however, has been surpassed by the research of the Hagedorns. As a result of their scholarship, Nancy Woods created a new grouping system, which incorporates the full number of catena witnesses and the most current analysis of the Hagedorns. An adaptation and revision of this new system is explained below. Ziegler's abbreviation system applies to *Wit2* citations of App I of the *Edition*, but *Wit1*, *Attr*, *Var*, and *NonGr* contains the catena groupings developed for this work.

*O* = La-Syh (Syrohexapla): Origen's recension
 253´ = 253-339
*L* = A-V (ab 30:8)-575-637-Iul-Chr: Lucianic recension main group
 A´ = A-406
 575´ = 575-637
 575' = 575-55
 575´' = 575-637-55
*lI* = 46-249-631: first Lucianic sub group
 46´ = 46-631
*lII* = 254-754: second Lucianic sub group
*lIII* = 106-130-261: third Lucianic sub group

*lI´’ = lI + lII + lIII*
*lI´ = lI + lII*
*lI’ = lI + lIII*
*L´’` = L + lI + lII + lIII*
*L´ = L + lI*
*L’ = L + lII*
*L` = L + lIII*
*L´` = L + lI + lIII*
*L´’ = L + lI + lII*

*C* = 110-137-138-139-147-250-251-255-256-257-258-260-612-643-680-705-732-740-765: Catena main group
$C^1$ = 139-147-256-705
$C^2$ = 260-643-732
$C^3$ = 255-258-612-740-765
137´ = 137-643
147´ = 147-256
255´’ = 255-612-740
*c* = 259-337-355 (Chap 1-15)-480-620-687-703-748: Catena sub group
$c^1$ = 259-687-748
$c^2$ = 337-620-703
259´ = 259-687
*C´ = C + c*

*b* = 248-252-542-543-644;
248´ = 248-68

*d* = 157-523-797
336´ = 336-728
534´ = 534-613

## The Catena Tradition[5]

The knowledge of the complexities of the Job catena tradition has become increasingly sophisticated. Field cites four catena manuscripts taken from Montef:

555 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 134 (= Reg. 2434); 13th C (Regii duo)
559 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 138; 16th C (Colb)
560 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 151 (= Reg. 1890); 13th C (Reg. unus)
608 Codex Oratorii in vico S. Honoratii; 10th C (Orat)

[5]The following discussion is an adaptation and revision of the one in Woods, “A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job: 1-21,” 26-29.

Of these four manuscripts, 555 (see below) and 608 are Nicetas manuscripts, while 559 proved to be significant for the *cI* stemma, since at times it appears to have descended from the *Vorlage* of 612 and at other times it appears to have descended from the *Vorlage* of 258 according to the Hagedorns (*AGK* 1, 12; cf. 48-50), and 560 proved to be a descendent of 612 (*AGK* 1, 13).

The picture becomes more complex when Field's nine additional manuscripts are listed in addition to Montef's manuscripts:

137 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., D 73 sup., (Cat.) – Fragmentarisch; 9th C –10th C
138 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., M 65 sup., (Cat.); 11th C
139 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., A 148 inf., (Cat.); 10th C –11th C
249 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Pii II. gr. 1, (Cat.); 12th C
250 München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 148, (Cat.); 13th C
255 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 338, (Cat.); 10th C
256 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 697, (Cat.); 13th C
258 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 749, (Cat.) – Fragmentarisch; 9th C
259 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Palat. gr. 230, (Cat.) 1:1 und 14:5-16:8 fehlen; 10th C – 11th C

In addition to these thirteen manuscripts, Field cites the *Nicetas Catena of Job* by Patrick Young, which used two manuscripts:

512 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 176, (Cat.); AD 1562
513 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 178, (Cat.); 16th C

Although Field made a distinction between the Nicetas catena and the thirteen catena witnesses, he did not make one between the witnesses of the latter, which may indicate that he viewed them as equal witnesses to the original catena of Job.

Although Ziegler did not use the four Montef manuscripts, his *Edition* incorporated twenty-eight manuscripts in his catena groupings, which made his study in 1982 the most up to date. In order to accomplish this research, Ziegler also used the analyses of catena materials published subsequent to Field done by Karo-Lietzmann (1902), Faulhaber (1903), Bertini (1923), Devreesse (1928), and Hagedorn (1985). Karo-Lietzmann divided the catena manuscripts into two types: Type I and Type II. Type I,

which Karo-Lietzmann divided into nine families, is essentially the Polychronius catena. Type II is the Nicetas catena. Based upon these two larger divisions, Ziegler developed the sigla *C* (Type I, Polychronius) and *c* (Type II, Nicetas) (*Edition*, 125-27).

The most comprehensive analysis of the Job catena materials, represented by sixty-nine manuscripts, is that of Ursula and Dieter Hagedorn, who have provided multiple works on the catena of Job, culminating in a four volume critical edition of the oldest catena of Job. Focusing upon the oldest catena tradition, essentially Ziegler's *C*, the Hagedorns' analysis summarized the findings into two groups, which they assigned Γ′ and Γ, the latter being the earliest revision of the former. Their labors on the catena of Job came to fruition in the following publication: *Die älteren Griechischen Katenen zum Buch Hiob*, vols. 1-4, and their analysis of the most important hexaplaric fragments found in the catena was published in *Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob*. The collation book, *Kollationen der hexaplarischen Fragmente des Buchs Hiob*, upon which *Nachlese* was based, was made available for this work.[6]

In order to incorporate all the catena witnesses from Field, Ziegler, and the Hagedorns the following new sigla were developed by Woods: *C*, *cI*, and *cII*. The manuscripts belonging to each group are cited according to Rahlfs' numbers:

*C* = 249-257-395-406-788-250-3005
*cI* = 110-137-138-139-147-476-251-255-256-258-260-395-474-559(3004)-612-643-680-705 732-740-754-765-3006
*cII* = 259-337-355-480-512-513-555-620-687-703-748

[6]The Hagedorns' work toward sorting the history of the catena materials included Didymus, *Kommentar zu Hiob: (Tura-Papyrus)*, ed. Albert Henrichs, Ursula Hagedorn, Dieter Hagedorn, and Ludwig Koenen, Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, Bd. 1-3, 33 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1968); D. Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian*, PTS 14, (Berlin, 1973); Olympiodor: Diakon von Alexandria, *Kommentar zu Hiob*, eds. U. and D. Hagedorn, PTS 24 (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984); U. and D. Hagedorn, "Zur Katenenüberlieferung des Hiobkommentars von Didymos dem Blinden," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 22 (1985): 55-58; idem, *Johannes Chrysostomos Kommentar zu Hiob*, PTS 35 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990). A critical commentary for each of these primary fathers, found in the catena, was needed before a critical edition of the catena itself could be published.

Some comments about these groupings and manuscripts are in order. First, Reinhart Ceulemans informed me about Ra 788 (Tyrnavos 25) in the summer of 2011. Unfortunately, I was not able to incorporate fully the contents of this manuscript in this edition, since it came to my attention too late in the writing process. The Hagedorns also became aware of this important manuscript through Ceulemans and have collated it and currently are preparing a publication on the relationship of 788 to 250. Dieter Hagedorn's analysis will show that this manuscript is an ancestor of 250 but not a direct ancestor, which means that 250 is probably derived from an intermediate witness. The significance of this analysis is that 788 is part of the *C* group (Hagedorns' α-*Vorläuferkatene*, *AGK* 1, 73). Ms 788 has been partially incorporated in this edition and will be incorporated fully at a later time. When it is listed, it is listed as either 788 or 788-250, when they attest the same reading.

Second, in this edition, the witnesses of the *C* group are always listed positively in *Wit1* (e.g. *C* (= 250 3005)), while the witnesses of *cI* are usually but not always listed negatively (e.g. $cI^{-139}$). It is necessary to understand that not all of the *cI* witnesses are included in the apparatus of the Hagedorns' *Kollationen* and *AGK*, since the Hagedorns' Γ stemma only represents the most important witnesses. The following is a listing of the Hagedorn' witnesses in order from top to bottom of their stemma: 740-255-138-612-(3006-559-754-474)-258-395-680-3006-137-260-643-732-139. The witnesses in parentheses show dependence on both 612 and 258 and are not placed directly on the stemma but are suspended between these witnesses (*AGK* 1, 48-50). They also determined the relationships of these manuscripts to their copies and derivatives. Ms 139 is considered to be the ancestor of 147 256 503 570 705 476,[7] three of which Ziegler also

[7]The Hagedorns did not have direct access to 476 at the time of their research and publications, but that 476 is a descendant of 139 can be verified. First, 476 agrees with 139 in the unique omissions of the whole catena fragments listed in *AGK* 1, 22, which means 476 is related to 139 and no other manuscript of the stemma. Second, 476 agrees with 139 in the significant variants from the original text in *AGK* 1, 22. In the first example, 476 agrees with 147, since the catena fragment, B̅ 11, is absent from both mss. The

determined (cp. Ziegler's *C*[1]). Since these six witnesses are descendents of 139, the Hagedorns did not cite these witnesses in their *Nachlese* or *AGK* (*AGK* 1, 21ff). Ms 476$^{cat}$ (there are no marginal notes) is cited sporadically in the critical text, but it is understood to be a descendent of 139 throughout.

Ms 765 is largely derived from 612, and therefore it is not cited in *Nachlese* or *AGK* (*AGK* 1, 45), and 251 is partially a copy of 395 and 138. Ms 110 is a late manuscript (1548/1549 AD) and it consists of only 24 folios. It was not incorporated into the Hagedorns' materials because it contains only excerpts of the catena, and it does not contain hexaplaric fragments but only a very occasional exegetical fragment (almost one per folio).[8] Ziegler must have evaluated its place in his *C* group on the basis of its bible text. As a copy of 559, 3004 is cited when there is a lacuna. In 559, there is a large lacuna from 29:6b-31:4, and 3004 is cited in place of 559 in these places.

Third, not all of the mss of *cI* are equally significant for preserving the hexaplaric fragments. Ms 258 does not preserve marginal hexaplaric notes after Job 2:10b. In *AGK*, Mosquensis 342 and Mosquensis 412 were listed by the Hagedorns with the sigla 474 for folios 1-16 (where the text is identical to 740) and with the sigla Σ for Mosquensis 412 for folios 17ff (the text is derived from a text similar to 612; *AGK* 1, 9). According to Dieter Hagedorn's personal notes, 474 only contained four or five hexaplaric notes, but their text was identical to 740, so he did not list them in the *Nachlese*.[9] The text of Σ was far more interesting for the catena, but this manuscript does not contain marginal hexaplaric notes. All of the marginal notes that are present in the

---

agreement with 147 is significant since it adds to the evidence adduced by the Hagedorns where the two mss share unique agreements compared with 139 (*AGK* 1, 25). Ms 476, therefore, is a descendent of 139 and it shares a few unique agreements with 147. For two relevant unique variants shared by 139 and 476 from the hexaplaric materials, see Job 32:11 θʹ and 32:11b-12a σʹ.

[8]Dieter Hagedorn, personal correspondance with author, January, 2012.

[9]Dieter Hagedorn, personal correspondance with author, January, 2012.

margin of 612 were omitted in Σ. In this edition, the sigla $474^{cat}$ is used where Σ is used in *AGK*. In *AGK*, 754/J was originally not a catena manuscript but a bible manuscript. At a later time, two different scribes wrote catena excerpts in the margins. The Hagedorns designate the first scribe 754 (11th C), whose hand can be traced up to Job 2:8, and the second scribe J (12th C), whose hand continues to the end of the book (*AGK* 1, 20). 754 preserved marginal notes and was listed in the *Nachlese*, but J omitted all marginalia, and therefore, it does not preserve hexaplaric fragments except in the catena materials. In this edition, the sigla $754^{cat}$ is used where *AGK* has J. In order to avoid confusion, this edition will always list $754^{cat}$ $474^{cat}$ $258^{cat}$ after *cI* where they are listed in *AGK*.

Fourth, the Hagedorns found places where ms 395 belonged to the *C* group, since the manuscript was contaminated in the first chapters with *C* readings, which show a close relationship to ms 3005.[10] In Job 22-42, 395 is part of the *cI* group.

Last, in this edition, 555 is cited independently of *cII*, but the reader should note that 555 is a Nicetas ms since it agrees with *cII* against the original text in significant places (see the following examples 24:4a σ′, 24:4b σ′, 27:1a α′, 29:25c σ′, 31:40a σ′).

Ziegler's *Edition* cites two more collections of catena fragments: Pitra and Klostermann. These collections are included in this edition only because they are cited in the *Edition*. They have a limited value, since they have been largely incorporated into other updated sources.

Pitra = *Analecta sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata*. Edited by Johannes Baptista Card. Pitra, vol. III. Venetiis, 1883: 556-557.

Pitra incorporated readings from the following manuscripts: 110 255 246 248 249 256 257 258 259 653 654 680 681 687 703. Woods showed that ms 246 (Rom. Vat. Gr. 1238) is suspect since it contains the Testament of Job, and not the biblical Job. She was unable

[10]Ursula and Dieter Hagedorn, *Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1 Philologisch-Historische Klasse, No. 10 (1991), (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 380.

to verify this suspicion since the microfilm of the ms was unavailable.[11] Ms 653 (Rom. Ottob. Gr. 9; 16th C) and Ms 654 (Rom. Ottob. Gr. 24; AD 1553) were excluded from the *Edition* because they are sixteenth century manuscripts.[12]

Also, Klostermann's citations of hexaplaric fragments from manuscripts 161 255 258 732 740 discussed by Ziegler in the *Beiträge*, are of limited value.[13] Four of the manuscripts in this group (255 258 732 740) are cited by new collations.

Klostermann = E. Klostermann. *Analecta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik*. Leipzig, 1895: 68-74.

Since 161 has become available again, it is also included in the list of Greek manuscripts. The notes of Klostermann have been checked against the manuscript, and ms 161 was freshly collated for this edition, and it appears to be related to the Nicetas catena (e.g. λ′ 30:30a) and it also has unique agreements with 248, which deviate from the original text (e.g. σ′ 39:2a). When 161 and 248 attest the same readings, they are listed as 161′.

## Notes and Editions

Drusius, Johannes. *Veterum Interpretum Graecum in totum V.T. fragmenta, collecta, versa, et notis illustrata a Johanne Drusio, Linguae Sanctae in illustrium Frisiae Ordinum Academia, dum viveret, Professore*. Arnhem, 1622.

*Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V Pon. Max.* Rom: Zannetti, 1587.

*Vetus Testamentum secundum LXX Latine Redditum et ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont Max editum*: *additus est Index Dictionum & Locquationum hebraicarum, graecarum, latinarum quarum observatio visa est non inutilis futura*. Edited by A. Carafa. Rome: Georgio Ferraro, 1588.

[11] Ziegler, *Edition* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 36. Ziegler included the manuscript 246 [sic: V = Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. Gr. 1238; 13th C] as a source under "Testamentum Iobi."

[12] *Edition*, 152.

[13] Joseph Ziegler, *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3rd ser., 147, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, no. 17 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 108-109.

Montef cites "Nobil" according to the *Vetus Testamentum*, 1587, in which Peter Morinus assembled the hexaplaric fragments for the edition.[14] Subsequently, Field cited these fragments as "Nobil." Although credit to Morinus may be lost, this edition retains the attribution Nobil to avoid confusion in the citations from Field. Ziegler's analysis suggests that notes from Nobil should be rightly ascribed to manuscript 248 as the source.[15] This conclusion was not confirmed in many of the "Nobil" fragments of Job 22-42, but it may still be generally true.

---

[14] Frederick Field, *Frederick Field's Prolegomena to Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, trans. Gerard Norton and Carmen Hardin (Paris: J. Gabalda, 2005), 198.

[15] *Edition*, 153.

Table 1. Correlated sigla

| Ra. Nr. | Library Number | *Edition* | *Nachlese* | *AGK* | *Hexapla* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | London, Brit. Mus., Royal 1 D. VII, “Alexandrinus” | *L* | | | |
| B | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr.1209, “Vaticanus” | B | | | |
| C | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 9, "Ephraemi Syri rescriptus" | C | | | |
| S | London, Brit. Mus., Add. 43725 "Sinaiticus" | S | | | |
| V | Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 1, "Venetus" | *L* | | | |
| 46 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 4 | *lI* | | | |
| 55 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Regin. gr. 1 | 55 | | | |
| 68 | Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 5 | 248´ | | | |
| 106 | Ferrara, Bibl. Comun., 187 II | *lIII* | | | |
| 110 | Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 230, (Cat.) | *C* | | | |
| 130 | Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 23 | *lIII* | | | |
| 137 | Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., D 73 sup., (Cat.) - Fragmentarisch | *C* | Γ | H | 137 |
| 138 | Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., M 65 sup., (Cat.) | *C* | Γ | R | 138 |
| 139 | Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., A 148 inf., (Cat.) | *C* | 139 | A | 139 |
| 147 | Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. Gr. 30 (A), (Cat.) | *C* | | 147 | |
| 149 | Vindobonensis theol. gr. 11 | | | 149 | |
| 157 | Basel, Univ.-Bibl., B. VI. 23 | *d* | | | |
| 160 | Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, A. 66b. | | | | 160 |
| 161 | Moskau, Russ. Staatsarchiv für alte Dokumente, Fond 1607, Inv. 1.7 | | | | 161 |
| 228 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1764 | | | 228 | |
| 248 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 346 | *b* | 248 | | 248 |
| 249 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Pii II. gr. 1, (Cat.) | *lI* | 249 (Γ´) | P | 249 |
| 250 | München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 148, (Cat.) | *C* | Γ´ | G | 250 |
| 251 | Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. V 27, (Cat.) | *C* | 251 | L | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 252 | Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. VIII 27 | *b* | 252 | 252 | 252 |
| 253 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 336, (see *Edition*) | 253´ | | | |
| 254 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 337 | *lII* | | | |
| 255 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 338, (Cat.) | *C* | Γ | Q | 255 |
| 256 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 697, (Cat.) | *C* | 256 | 256 | 256 |
| 257 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 745 | $Ol^{X}$ / *C* | Γ´ | X | |
| 258 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 749, (Cat.) - Fragmentarisch | *C* | Γ | V | 258 |
| 259 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Palat. gr. 230, (Cat.) 1:1 und 14:5-16:8 fehlen | *c* | | | 259 |
| 260 | Kopenhagen, Kgl. Bibl., Gamle Kgl. Saml. 6, (Cat.) | *C* | 260 | K | |
| 261 | Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. VII 30 | *lIII* | | | |
| 296 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Palat. gr. 337 | 296 | | | |
| 336 | Athos, Ιβηρων 555 | 336´ | | | |
| 337 | Athos, Ιβηρων 615 | *c* | | | |
| 339 | Athos, Koutloumousiou 8 | 339 | | | |
| 351 | Berlin, Staatsbibl., Phill. 1407 | | | 351 | |
| 355 | Bologna, Bibl. Comun., A.I.2, see *Edition*, 12 | *c* | | | |
| 362 | New Haven Yale 257 (ehem. Cheltenham Phillipps 14041) | | | 362 | |
| 386 | Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. X 29 | | | 386 | |
| 395 | Prague, Státní knihovna XXV B 3 (Ra = Kosinitza 22) | | Γ | Λ | |
| 406 | Jerusalem, Patr. Bibl., Agiou Staurou 36(18), see *Edition*, 12 | 406 | Γ´ | Θ | |
| 409 | Jerusalem, Patr. Bibl., Agiou Taphou 5 | | | 409 | |
| 434 | Matritensis Bibl. Nac. 4716 (O. 38) | | | 434 | |
| 471 | Mosquensis synod. gr. 147 | | | 471 | |
| 474 | Moskau, Staatl. Hist. Mus. (GIM), Syn. Bibl., Gr. 342 + 412 | | | Σ | |
| 476 | Mosquensis synod. gr. 392; 12th C; microfilm unavailable | | | 476 | |
| 480 | München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 32, (Cat.) | *c* | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 491 | München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 488, (Comm.) | $Ol^{Y}$ / *C* | | | |
| 492 | Monacensis gr. 491 | | | 492 | |
| 503 | Oxoniensis Bdleianus Auct. E 2.16 (= Misc. 44) | | | 503 | |
| 505 | Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. E 2.19 (= Misc. 47) | | | C | |
| 512 | Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 176, (Cat.) | | N (Iun.) | | |
| 513 | Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 178, (Cat.) | | N (Iun.) | | |
| 523 | Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. gr. 20, | *d* | 523 | B | |
| 534 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 18 | 534´ | | | |
| 540 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 194 | | | 540 | |
| 542 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 10, Fragmentarisch | *b* | | | |
| 543 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 11 | *b* | | | |
| 555 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 134 (= Reg. 2434) | | | | Reg. duo |
| 556 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 135 (= Reg. 1830[2]) | | | 556 | |
| 557 | Parisinus gr. 136 (Colb. 3066) | | | 557 | |
| 559 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 138 | | Γ | T | Colb. |
| 560 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 151 (= Reg. 1890) | | | 560 | Reg. unus |
| 570 | Parisinus gr. 162 (Reg 2873) | | | 570 | |
| 575 | Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 396 | *L* | | | |
| 608 | Codex Oratorii in vico S. Honoratii | 608 | | | Orat. |
| 612 | Patmos, Ιωαννου του θεολογου 171 (Cat.) - Fragmentarisch | *C* | Γ | Π | |
| 613 | Patmos, Ιωαννου του θεολογου 209 | 613 / 534´ | | 613 | |
| 620 | Patmos, Ιωαννου του θεολογου 419, 1:1 - 2:9e fehlt | *c* | | | |
| 631 | Raudnitz, Lobkowitz'sche Bibl. VI. E. f. 19 | *lI* | | | |
| 632 | Romanus Angelicanus gr. 113 (B.1.2) | | | 632 | |
| 637 | Rom, Bibl. Casan. 241 | *L* | | | |
| 643 | Rom, Bibl. Vallic. 37, (Cat.) | *C* | 643 | Δ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 644 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Barber. gr. 369, (Cat.) | *b* | | |
| 653 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Ottob. Gr. 9 | Pitra | | |
| 654 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Ottob. Gr. 24 | Pitra | | |
| 680 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 750, (Cat.) - Portions | *C* | Γ | E |
| 681 | Rom. Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 751 | Pitra | | |
| 687 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1231, (Cat.) | *c* | | |
| 703 | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 2227, (Cat.) endet mit 41:15 | *c* | | |
| 705 | Athen, Nat. Bibl. 2410, (Cat.) | *C* | | 705 |
| 706 | Athen, Nat. Bibl. 2641 | 706 | | |
| 709 | Sinaiticus gr. 4 | | | 709 |
| 728 | Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Appendix I 13 | 336´ | | |
| 732 | Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 21, (Cat.) | *C* | 732 | M |
| 740 | Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 538 (Cat.) | *C* | Γ | F |
| 748 | Athen, Byzantinisches Museum 2781, (Cat.) - Portions | *c* | | |
| 754 | Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 147 | 754 / *lII* | | J |
| 765 | Athos, Λαυρα 220 (B/100) | *C* | 765 | 765 |
| 788 | Tyrnavos, Dêmotikê Bibl. 25 25 | | | |
| 795 | Athos, Λαυρα Γ 51 (291) | 795 | | |
| 797 | Athen, Benaki-Museum, Echangeables 72 | *d* | | |
| 834 | Berlin, Staatliche Museen, P Berlin Nr. 6788 | 834 | | |
| 849 | Manchester, John-Rylands Library, Rylands Nr. 3 | 849 | | |
| 913 | New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, P Amherst 4 (A) | 913 | | |
| 955 | Florenz, Bibl. Laur., PSI 1163 | 955 | | |
| 974 | Berlin, Staatliche Museen, P Berlin Nr. 11778 | 974 | | |
| 3004 | Salamantinus Universitatis M 32 (1-2-1) | falsch 704 | Z | |
| 3005 | Genua, Durazzo-Giustiniani A I 10 | | Γ´ | U |
| 3006.1 | Sinai, Cod. Gr. 3 | | Γ | S |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3006.2 | Sinai, Cod. Gr. 3 | Γ | S |
| 3007 | Sinai, Cod. Gr. 311 | 3007 | W |
| 3008 | Athous Vatopedi 590 | | 3008 |
| Ω | Vaticanus gr. 709 | | |
| | Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 2002 | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Die syrischen Übersetzungen | | |
| Syrohexapla Ambrosianus, ed. Ceriani | Syh | |
| Syropalästinische Übersetzung | Syp | |
| Christian Palestinian Aramaic | CPA | |
| Die coptischen Übersetzungen | Co [ = Bo + Fa] | |
| Sahidische | Sa | $Sa^{1}$, $Sa^{2}$, $Sa^{3}$, $Sa^{4}$, $Sa^{5}$, $Sa^{6}$, $Sa^{7/1}$, $Sa^{7/2}$, $Sa^{7/3}$, $Sa^{8}$, $Sa^{9}$, $Sa^{10}$ |
| Bohairische | Bo | |
| Fajumische | Fa | |
| Aethiopische | Aeth | $Aeth^{P}$ $Aeth^{A}$ $Aeth^{B}$ |
| Die armenische Übersetzung | | |
| Armenische | Arm | Superseded by Cox. |
| Die arabische Übersetzung | | |
| Arabische | Arab | |
| Die alten Druckausgaben | | |
| Aldina | Ald | |
| Complutensis | Compl | |
| Sixtina | Sixt | |

CHAPTER 3

CRITICAL TEXT OF HEXAPLARIC READINGS
WITH APPARATUS AND NOTES

## Chapter 22

**Job 22 2**

HT (כִּי)־יִסְכָּן עָלֵימוֹ מַשְׂכִּיל׃

LXX (Πότερον οὐχὶ ὁ κύριός ἐστιν) ὁ διδάσκων σύνεσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην;

# θʹ κατασκηνώσει ἐφʼ ὑμᾶς σύνεσιν

*Wit1*: ↓252 Syh

*Wit2*: fin] + και (> 575-46ʹ) κατασκηνωσει εφ ημας (επ εμε Iul) συνεσιν La (※) 575-46ʹ-Iul

*Attr*: θʹ] αʹ 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܡܫܪܐ ܥܠܝܟܘܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܀
La ※ *et habitare facit super nos intellegentiam*

*Notes*: Apparently, Th construed סכן, which in the Qal (= "to be of use"), as Hiph of שׁכן, which in the Qal means "to settle" and in the Pi and the Hiph (= "to cause to dwell") (KB, 1497-99). The diacritical point below the line after the first radical letter marks the verb form in Syh as Aph'el (Segal, *The Diacritical Point*, 18-9). The Syriac verb ܫܪܐ in the Aph'el can mean "to make dwell" (Sokoloff, *Syriac Lexicon*, 1605). The evidence of attribution is divided between Syh (θʹ) and 252 (αʹ), and there is no way to determine the author with any certainty, since the Three all use the key terms in question. That the fragment belongs to both Aq and Th cannot be dismissed.

La contains the reading under the asterisk, marking it as hexaplaric.

**Job 22 3a**

HT הַחֵפֶץ לְשַׁדַּי כִּי תִצְדָּק
LXX τί γὰρ μέλει τῷ κυρίῳ, ἐὰν σὺ ἦσθα τοῖς ἔργοις ἄμεμπτος;

# σ′ μὴ χρῄζει ὁ ἱκανὸς ἵνα δικαιωθῇς

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓Ω ↓*cI*–395 ↓*cII* ↓555 161′(+ 161mg)

*Attr*: σ′] > *C* (= 250) Ω 161mg

*Var*: μή] ου γαρ Ω | χρῄζει (χριζει 559)] χρηζη 138-255; χρηζης 137 139 260 643 680 732 | ὁ] > 680* *cII* 555 161′mg

*Notes*: The variant χρηζη arises from the μη and itacism, perhaps because the scribe lost the context of the question. The variant χρηζης arose probably for the same reason.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 191-2; *AGK* 2, 372; Nic, 375).

HT (הַחֵפֶץ לְשַׁדַּי כִּי) תִצְדָּק
E (τί γὰρ μέλει τῷ κυρίῳ, ἐὰν σὺ ἦσθα τοῖς ἔργοις) ἄμεμπτος;

# Sub ※

*Wit1*: La

*NonGr*: La ※ *absque crimine* ↙

**Job 22 3b**
HT וְאִם־בֶּצַע כִּי־תַתֵּם דְּרָכֶיךָ׃
E ἢ ὠφέλεια ὅτι ἁπλώσεις τὴν ὁδόν σου;

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1*: ↓*cI*–138 139 260 395 3006 248 ↓Sa ↓Syhtxt

*Attr*: θ′ (θ′ ὁμοίως πρόσκειται(> 137) 740 255 612 559 680(**4b**) 137)] > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Sa | 3b sub ※ 740 255 612 559 680(**4a**) 137 643 732 248 Syhtxt

*NonGr*: Syhtxt ※ ܐܘ ܝܘܬܪܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܬܫܡܠܐ ܐܘܪܚܟ

※ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܠܟ ↘

σʹ ἢ κερδανεῖ, κἂν ἄμωμος ἡ ὁδός σου

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ [395]}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′$^{(+\ 161^{mg})}$

*Attr*: σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 161$^{mg}$

*Var*: κερδανεῖ] κερδανῇ 3005; κερδάνῃ 612 740; κερδάνει 137 260 559 643 680 732 3006 | κἂν] εαν *cII* 555 161′$^{(+\ 161^{mg})}$; και 137 260 643 732 | ὁδός σου] οδοσου 255

*Notes*: The subjunctives may have arisen from the connection with the prior use of ἵνα + subj. in 22:3a, while the present indicative κερδάνει may have arisen from harmonization with χρῄζει in v. 3a.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 191-2; *AGK* 2, 372; Nic, 375).

**Job 22 4a**

HT הֲמִיִּרְאָתְךָ (יֹכִיחֶךָ)

LXX ἦ λόγον σου ποιούμενος (ἐλέγξει σε)

θʹ μὴ διὰ τὸν φόβον σου

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257 788 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 260\ [395]\ 732}$ 523

*Wit2*: ἦ λόγον σου ποιούμενος] *timens te* La: cf M

*Attr*: θʹ] σʹ *C* (= 3005); > *C* (= 788) 137 643 680 3006

*Var*: μή] η 612 740 3006; > 137 643 680 | σου] + διαλεγχθήσεταί σοι *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: The variant η for μη in 612 and 740 is interesting. The attribution consists of θ over μ, which resembles the attribution to Methodios (*Kollationen*, 149). This attribution is the cause of the error in these mss, and was probably in the *Vorlage* of 3006 given its lower place in the stemma of the catena (*AGK* 1, 61).

The lemma in 3005 is continuous with the following fragment, which means that both fragments, preserved as one, are attributed to Sym in 3005. It is possible that 3005 preserves the original fragment to Sym, but it seems easier to posit that the Th attribution

would be accidentally omitted in one ms instead of being added in all of them, especially since 257 and 788 also preserve two separate fragments; although, these fragments are *sine nomine* in 788 (see *infra*).

HT (הֲמִיִּרְאָתְךָ) יֹכִיחֶךָ
LXX (ἦ λόγον σου ποιούμενος) ἐλέγξει σε

# σʹ διαλεγχθήσεταί σοι

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257 788 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 [395] 523

*Attr*: σʹ *C* (= 257 3005) 732] > rel; Ἄλλος Field

*Var*: διαλεγχθήσεται] διελεγχθήσεται *C* (= 788); διαλεχθησεται 138-255 559; διελεχθησεται 3006 | σοι] > *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: For the situation in 3005, see *supra*. The *C* group attests the attribution, which the *Edition* recorded only on the basis of ms 732.

**Job 22 5a**
HT (הֲלֹא רָעָתְךָ)—(רַבָּה)
LXX (πότερον οὐχ ἡ κακία σού) ἐστιν (πολλή)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1*: La

*Wit2:* ἐστιν] > Iul[cit] (197,11) = M

*NonGr*: La ÷ *est* (+ ↙ β)

**Job 22 6a**
HT כִּי־(תַחְבֹּל אַחֶיךָ חִנָּם)
E —(ἠνεχύραζες δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου διὰ κενῆς)

# Sub ※

*Wit1:* La

*Wit2:* init] οτι La (※ *quia*) *lI* 620 = M

*NonGr*: La ※ *Quia* (+ ↙ β)

*Notes*: The bible lemma of Ω also reads ὅτι ενεχυ || ρίαζες... showing that it has been influenced by the Hexapla, which incorporated the version of Aq (*Epitome*, 46; see *infra*).

HT כִּי־(תַחְבֹּל אַחֶיךָ חִנָּם)
LXX —(ἠνεχύραζες δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου διὰ κενῆς)

α′ ὅτι

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܡܛܠ

*Notes*: Aq was used for the Hexapla and is under the asterisk in La (see *supra*).

HT (כִּי־תַחְבֹּל אַחֶיךָ) חִנָּם
LXX (ἠνεχύραζες δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου) διὰ κενῆς

σ′ ἀναιτίους

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257 788 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 559 643 680 732 3006 *cII* 555

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788)

*Var*: ἀναιτίους] επαναιτιους 612

*Notes*: The index is over διὰ κενῆς in 3005 (*Kollationen*, 150).
The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 192; *AGK* 2, 374; Nic, 377).

**Job 22 8**
HT וְאִישׁ זְרוֹעַ לוֹ הָאָרֶץ
וּנְשׂוּא פָנִים יֵשֶׁב בָּהּ׃
LXX ἐθαύμασας δέ τινων πρόσωπον,
ᾤκισας δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

α′ καὶ ἀνδρὸς βραχίονος, αὐτοῦ ἡ γῆ, καὶ ὑψηλὸς προσώποις καθίσει ἐν αὐτῇ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܕܓܒܪܐ ܕܕܪܥܐ ܕܝܠܗ
ܐܪܥܐ. ܘܕܪܝܡ ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ
ܝܬܒ ܒܗ ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 42).

σʹ ἀνδρὸς γὰρ ἰσχυροῦ, αὐτοῦ ἡ γῆ, καὶ δεδυσωπημένος προσώπῳ κατοικήσει ἐν αὐτῇ

*Wit1*: Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܕܓܒܪܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܥܫܝܢ
ܕܝܠܗ ܐܪܥܐ. ܘܐܒܝܫܐ
ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܢܥܡܪ ܒܗ ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 42).

θʹ καὶ ἀνὴρ βραχίονος, αὐτοῦ ἡ γῆ, καὶ τεθαυμασμένος προσώπῳ κατοικήσει ἐν αὐτῇ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܘܓܒܪܐ ܕܕܪܥܐ ܕܝܠܗ
ܐܪܥܐ. ܘܬܡܝܗܐ
ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܢܥܡܪ ܒܗ ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 42).

**Job 22 10b**
HT וִֽיבַהֶלְךָ פַּחַד פִּתְאֹם׃
LXX καὶ ἐσπούδασέν σε πόλεμος ἐξαίσιος·

σʹ καὶ ταράσσει σε φόβος

# ἐξαίφνης

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI* ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var*: ταράσσει] ταραξει *C* (= 788-250) | σε] > 612 | φόβος] > *C* (= 257) | ἐξαίφνης] εξαισιος *cII* 555 161; εξεφνις 395; εξεφνης 559

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 194; *AGK* 2, 379; Nic, 381).

**Job 22 11b**

HT וְשִׁפְעַת־מַיִם תְּכַסֶּךָּ׃

LXX κοιμηθέντα δὲ ὕδωρ σε ἐκάλυψεν.

# αʹ θʹ καὶ πλῆθος ὑδάτων καλύψει σε

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260}$ *cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* αʹ θʹ] σʹ 139; οἱ ἄλλοι 512-513 555; λʹ 161; > *C* (= 788-250) 138 643

*Var:* πλῆθος] πλήθους 612 740

*Notes*: The *Edition* does not list the variant attributions for this fragment. Mss 512-513 555 probably indicate that the subgroup *cII* should be listed in support for this variant, but the Nicetas tradition needs to be established before making this judgment.

**Job 22 13-16**

HT
וְאָמַרְתָּ מַה־יָּדַע אֵל
הַבְעַד עֲרָפֶל יִשְׁפּוֹט׃
עָבִים סֵתֶר־לוֹ וְלֹא יִרְאֶה
וְחוּג שָׁמַיִם יִתְהַלָּךְ׃
הַאֹרַח עוֹלָם תִּשְׁמֹר
אֲשֶׁר דָּרְכוּ מְתֵי־אָוֶן׃
אֲשֶׁר־קֻמְּטוּ וְלֹא־עֵת
נָהָר יוּצַק יְסוֹדָם׃

E
καὶ εἶπας Τί ἔγνω ὁ ἰσχυρός;
ἦ κατὰ τοῦ γνόφου κρινεῖ;
νέφη ἀποκρυφὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐχ ὁραθήσεται
καὶ γῦρον οὐρανοῦ διαπορεύσεται.
μὴ τρίβον αἰώνιον φυλάξεις,

ἣν ἐπάτησαν ἄνδρες ἄδικοι,
οἳ συνελήμφθησαν ἄωροι;
ποταμὸς ἐπιρρέων οἱ θεμέλιοι αὐτῶν.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–138 680 3006 ↓248 ↓252 Arm ↓La ↓Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ η̅ 3005 740 255 612 559 395; (**13b**) ἐκ θʹ οἱ η̅ 137 643 732)] > rel

*Var:* lemma] > Sa | 13-16 sub ※ 3005(non **15b 16**) 740(non **14b 15b**) 255 612 559 395(non **13b 14-16**) 137(non **13a 16**) 260(non **15b 16**) 643(non **15b 16**) 732(non **13b 14b 15-16**) 139(non **13 15-16**) 252(non **13-14**) Arm La(non **16b**) Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]

※ ܘܐܡܪܬ ܡܢܐ ܝܕܥ ܐܠܗܐ.
※ ܐܘ ܠܡܦܠ ܒܥܪܦܠܐ ܕܐܢ.
※ ܥ̈ܢܢܐ ܛܫܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ.
※ ܘܚܘܕܪܐ ܕܫܡܝܐ ܢܕܪܐ.
※ ܕܠܡܐ ܫܒܝܠܐ ܕܠܥܠܡ ܢܛܪ ܐܢܬ:
※ ܠܗ̇ ܕܕܫܘ ܓܒܪ̈ܐ ܥܘ̈ܠܐ:
※ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܬܚܛܦܘ ܕܠܐ ܙܒܢܐ.
※ ܢܗܪܐ ܕܪܕܐ ܫܬܐܣ̈ܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ. ↘

La
※ *et dixisti Quid novit deus?*
※ *an per nebulam iudicat?*
*nubes latibulum eius* ↙ *non* (pr ※ β) *videbitur,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *ambitum caeli percurrit.*
※ *ergone semitam saeculi custodis*
*quam* (pr ※ μ) *calcaverunt* (*calca※uerunt* β) *viri iniqui*
*qui* (pr ※ μ) *capti sunt immaturi?*
*fluvius decurrens fundamenta eorum* (+ ↙ μ).

Arm
※ Եւ ասացեր թէ զի ծանեաւ Հզաւրն
※ կամ թէ ի միգի դատիցի
※ Ամպ ծածկութիւն նորա և ոչ երեւեսցի
※ և ընդ ծիր երկնից շրջեսցի
※ Մի զշաւիղն յաւիտենական պահեսցես
※ զոր կոխեցին արք արդարք
※ Որք յափշտակեցան տարաժամ
※ զետ բղխեալ հիմունք նոցա

*Notes*: The reading is attributed to Th in the majority of the catena tradition. La is not as clearly marked by the asterisks as the *Edition* suggests.

**Job 22 14b**

HT וְחוּג שָׁמַיִם יִתְהַלָּךְ׃

E καὶ γῦρον οὐρανοῦ διαπορεύσεται.

## σʹ περιγραφὴν δὲ οὐρανοῦ περιοδεύσει (s περιελεύσεται)

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | περιγραφήν] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* περιγραφήν] περιγραφή 740

*NonGr*: Syh ܗ. ܠܣܘܪܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܫܡܝ̈ܐ
ܡܬܟܪܟ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 42). περιγραφή renders חוּג here and περιγράφω renders Heb חָג in 26:10a (*Beiträge*, 33). These words are used only by Sym and are not found in the LXX, Aq, or Th.

**Job 22 15**

HT הַאֹרַח עוֹלָם תִּשְׁמֹר
אֲשֶׁר דָּרְכוּ מְתֵי־אָוֶן׃

E μὴ τρίβον αἰώνιον φυλάξεις,
ἣν ἐπάτησαν ἄνδρες ἄδικοι,

## σʹ ἆρα ὁδὸν τὴν ἀπ’ αἰῶνος φυλάξεις, ἣν πατοῦσιν ἄνδρες ἄδικοι

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | ἆρα τρίβον] ↓252

*Wit2:* ἄδικοι *O* ($Syh^{txt}$) $106^{c}$ $523^{mg}$ Compl Gra. Ra.] > 68 257; δικαιοι rel

*Attr:* σʹ] > 252

*Var:* ὁδόν] τριβον 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܒܪ ܠܐܘܪܚܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܢ
ܥܠܡ ܢܛܪ ܐܢܬ܀ ܠܗܝ
ܕܕܪܫܘ ܓܒܪ̈ܐ ܥܘ̈ܠܐ܀

*Notes*: The reading in 252 is a mixture of Sym and LXX. ἆρα is from Sym probably (Busto Saiz, 265), but τρίβον is from the bible text. ἆρα probably underlies ܒܪ in Syh (*Sokoloff*, 618); thus, there is no variant. The retroversion from Syh is probably ὁδόν (ܐܘܪܚܐ), since ܫܒܝܠܐ is retroverted to τρίβον in the bible text of v. 15.

HT (הַאֹרַח עוֹלָם תִּשְׁמֹר)
(אֲשֶׁר דָּרְכוּ מְתֵי־)אָוֶן׃
E (μὴ τρίβον αἰώνιον φυλάξεις,)
(ἣν ἐπάτησαν ἄνδρες) ἄδικοι,

# α′ ἀνωφελεῖς

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܕܠܐ ܝܘܬܪܢ܀

*Notes*: In Syh[txt] the index occurs at the end of the line following ܥܘ̈ܠܐ܀, which indicates that the marginal note is to be read in place of the bible text.
The Syriac phrase ܠܐ ܝܘܬܪܢ, attributed to Aq, occurs here and at Ps 5:6, where it is retroverted most probably by Field using forms from ανωφελ– "useless," since Aq uses this word and derivatives to render Hebrew און (cf. Jer 4:14).

**Job 22 16a**
HT (אֲשֶׁר־)קֻמְּטוּ וְלֹא־עֵת
E οἳ συνελήμφθησαν ἄωροι;

# σ′ ἁλώσονται πρὸ καιροῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–139 732 3006] ↓*cII* 555 161 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250) 740

*Var:* init] pr οἵ Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܬܬܨܝܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ
ܩܕܡ ܙܒܢܐ܀

*Notes*: The relative pronoun in Syh is probably added from the bible text even though Sym usually translates אשׁר (Busto Saiz, 229).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 195-6; *AGK* 2, 384-6; Nic, 382).

**Job 22 16b**

HT נָהָר יוּצַק יְסוֹדָם׃

E ποταμὸς ἐπιρρέων οἱ θεμέλιοι αὐτῶν.

# σʹ ποταμὸς παρασύρει τὸν θεμέλιον αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 260\ 559\ 643\ 732}$ ↓*cII*$^{-512\text{-}513\ 555}$

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 257 788)] > rel

*Var:* παρασύρει] περισυρει *C* (= 250); ]συρει *C* (= 788) | αὐτῶν] αυτου *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: There is a faint spot over the prefix of the verb in 788 so that one cannot decide between περι- and παρα-. There are no other instances of Sym's use of παρασύρει. Field does not have this reading, but F-Auct contains this reading with 257 in support of the attribution, and the manuscript indeed has this reading (F-Auct, 8; *Kollationen*, 151). The *Edition* has a doubtful attribution to Sym ⟨σʹ⟩, but, since the marginal notes of 257 are a reliable witness to the oldest Greek catena and therefore the hexaplaric fragments, they are trustworthy in this instance. Now 788 confirms that this attribution to Sym was part of the oldest Greek catena.

*AGK* does not contain this fragment in connection with Origen or any of the Fathers' comments on the text; the fragment is only preserved in the marginal tradition of the catena mss (*AGK* 2, 384-6; *Kollationen*, 151). Regarding the *Edition's* sources, Young's Edition (512-513), 161, and 555 do not contain this fragment. Ziegler must have attained the attribution to Or from one of his other *c* mss. This evidence is not sufficient to attribute the Sym fragment to Origen as the *Edition* has done.

**Job 22 17b**

HT (וּמַה־)יִּפְעַל (שַׁדַּי לָמוֹ׃)

LXX (ἢ τί) ἐπάξεται (ἡμῖν ὁ παντοκράτωρ;)

# θʹ ἐργᾶται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 161

*Attr:* θ′] σ′ *C* (= 788) 612; > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* ἐργᾶται] εργαζεται 748; pr τι *cII*–512-513 555

*Notes*: The index is at 22:17a (ποιήσει) in 3005 and 559 (*Kollationen*, 152). The placement of the fragment at 17a in these mss seems plausible when compared to the LXX, but comparison with the HT shows that Th renders פעל with ἐργάζομαι (Job 33:29a, 34:32b) and ποιέω (31:3b), and סור (17a) with ἐκκλίνω (40:2a), μεθίστημι (12:24a), and παρατρέχω (12:20a) (Gentry, 296-7). In the Psalter, Sym also renders פעל Qal with ἐργάζομαι (Busto Saiz, 511); therefore, the attribution in 788 may also be genuine.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 195-6; *AGK* 2, 384-86; Nic, 383).

**Job 22 18a**

HT וְהוּא (מִלֵּא בָתֵּיהֶם טוֹב)

LXX ὃς δὲ (ἐνέπλησεν τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν ἀγαθῶν,)

# α′ θ′ καὶ αὐτός

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 643 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′ θ′] θ′ *C* (= 788) *cII* 512-513 555 161; σ′ 138; > *C* (= 250 3005)

*Var:* καὶ αὐτός] αυτος δε *cII* 512-513 555 161; + ενεπλησε 555 161 (ενεπλησε(ν))

*Notes*: The attribution in 395 is reversed (θ′ α′), but it still preserves the correct authors.

The *Edition* considers this verse to contain two fragments: (1) α′ [θ′] καὶ αὐτός and (2) θ′ αὐτὸς δέ. There are two challenges to this analysis: (1) Ms 788 now confirms that Th is one of the genuine attributions in the oldest Greek catena, which explains how this attribution survives through all stages of the catena. (2) Th translates *waw* with καί 198x and Gentry only records two examples where Th renders *waw* with δέ, one of them being at 22:18a based on the evidence of *cII*, and the second at 11:20c, where Th and Sym are the authors of the fragment (Gentry, 366-369; Woods, 226-7). These factors indicate probably that Th does not use δέ to render *waw* and they favor the present proposal and render Ziegler's analysis improbable. The δέ, found in the Nicetas catena tradition, is from the LXX.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 195-6; *AGK* 2, 384-6; Nic, 383).

**Job 22 19b**

HT וְנָקִי יִלְעַג־לָמוֹ׃
LXX ἄμεμπτος δὲ ἐμυκτήρισεν.

# θʹ καὶ ἀθῷος ἐκγελάσεται αὐτούς

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | ἐκγελάσεται] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–139\ 260\ 559\ 612\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 395

*Var:* ἐκγελάσεται] εκγελασαται *C* (= 250); εγγελασεται 137 680

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܘܕܟܝܐ ܢܓܚܟ ܒܗܘܢ ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 43).

HT (וְנָקִי יִלְעַג־) לָמוֹ׃
LXX (ἄμεμπτος δὲ ἐμυκτήρισεν)—

# Sub ※ αὐτούς ↙

*Wit1:* Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* fin] + (※ Syh) αυτους rel = M

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܒܗܘܢ. ↘

*Notes*: The Th note for the verse contains the 3mp pronoun, which may indicate that Origen used Th for the revision of the fifth column in this instance (see *supra*).

**Job 22 20**
HT אִם־לֹא נִכְחַד קִימָנוּ
וְיִתְרָם אָכְלָה אֵשׁ׃
E εἰ μὴ ἠφανίσθη ἡ ὑπόστασις αὐτῶν,
καὶ τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν καταφάγεται πῦρ.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{–138\ 260\ 395\ 680\ 3006}$ 248 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Attr:* | θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ $\overline{\beta}$ 3005 740 255 612 559 137)] > rel | |

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 20 sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 559 137(non **20b**) 643(non **20b**) 732(non **20b**) 139(non **20b**) 248 Arm(non **20b**) La Syh$^{txt}$(non **20a**)

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܘܠܫܪ̈ܟܢܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܬܐܟܘܠ ܢܘܪܐ ↙
La ※ *nunquid non demolita est substantia eorum,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *reliquias eorum comedit ignis*? (+ ↙ μ)
Arm ※ Եթէ չէր ապականեալ հաստատութիւն նոցա

**Job 22 22a**
HT (קַח־נָא מִפִּיו) תּוֹרָה
LXX (ἔκλαβε δὲ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ) ἐξηγορίαν

# α′ θ′ νόμον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 138\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′ ↓252

*Attr:* α′ θ′] α′ *cII* 555 161′ 252; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* νόμον] νομων 559

*Notes*: In the manuscript tradition, this fragment is usually in close proximity with the Sym fragment in the margin (cf. 3005 788-250 257 740 612 248 and 252; see *infra*), except 257, which only has this note preserving the original, double attribution to Aq and Th. Because of the complex situation, one can imagine that the attribution to Th could fall out easily in the transmission of the marginal notes, as mss *cII* 161′ 252 attest.

The *Edition* interpreted the evidence differently. The attribution to Aq was considered original and the double attribution was considered secondary; therefore, it is inferred that Th is the other version, to which Or refers. The *Edition* then lists 33:26b, where ἐξομολόγησιν is attributed to ⟨θ′⟩ (see 33:26b for the full explanation).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 197; *AGK* 2, 389; Nic, 384).

# σ′ ἐξομολόγησιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓249 ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 139}$ ↓*cI*$^{cat}$ ↓474$^{cat}$ ↓505$^{cat}$ *cII* 555 161′ 252

*Wit2:* ἐξηγορίαν] + συν εξομολογησει *L′*$^{-A\ 637}$ Or

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250) 732; ἄλλος 249 *cI*$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 505$^{cat}$

*Notes*: In *C* (= 3005) and *cI* the fragment is preserved in the margin and attributed to Sym. In addition to *C* and *cI*, the fragment ἐξομολόγησιν is preserved in 249 *cI*[cat] 474[cat] 505[cat] *cII* 555 161 and in all of these witnesses except *cII* 555 161, it is in a comment attributed to Origen. This comment reads as follows: τὴν *ἐξηγορίαν* ἐζήτουν κατ' ἐμαυτόν, τί σημαίνει, καὶ εὗρον ἐν ἄλλῃ ἐκδόσει ἀντ' αὐτῆς "εξομολογησιν" (*AGK*, vol. II, 389). The *cII* group has the lemma in the same comment attributed now to Olympiodorus (= τοῦ αὐτοῦ), which attributes the lemma to Sym explicitly instead of ἄλλος (Nic, 384); therefore, the attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *AGK*, but Olympiodorus makes the exegetical connection between ἐξηγορία and ἐξομολόγησις in his *Kommentar*. This observation may indicate that Olymp received this interpretation from Origen, who received it probably from Sym (*Kommentar*, 197; *AGK* 2, 389).

Sym either had a Hebrew *Vorlage* which had תּוֹדָה or he misread ר as ד, since Sym renders it with ἐξομολόγησις in Ps 25(26):7, 41(42):5, and 146(147):7 (*Beiträge*, 34).

**Job 22 24**

HT וְשִׁית־עַל־עָפָר בָּצֶר
וּבְצוּר נְחָלִים אוֹפִיר׃

E θήσῃ ἐπὶ χώματι ἐν πέτρᾳ
καὶ ὡς πέτρᾳ χειμάρρους Ὠφίρ.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*[–138 139 255 680 732 3006] 248 Arm La Sa Syh[txt] Spec

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ β̄ 740 612 559[inc] 395 137(**24b**) 643)] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa Spec | 24 sub ※ 3005 740 612 559 395 137(non **24a**) 260 643 248 Arm La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ※ ܬܣܝܡ ܥܠ ܗܪܘܐ ܒܟܐܦܐ
※ ܘܐܝܟ ܟܐܦܐ ܕܕ̈ ܓܠܠܐ ܕܐܘܦܝܪ ↘

La *et* (pr ※ β) *pones* (pr ※ μ) *illud super aggerem in petram,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *in saxo torrentis Ofir.*

Arm ※ Նստցես յամրութեան վիմի
※ և իբրեւ ի վիմի ձորոյն Սովփերայ

*Notes*: An attribution is probably in 559, but it is too faint to read clearly.

**Job 22 24b**

HT ובְצוּר נְחָלִים אוֹפִיר׃
E καὶ ὡς πέτρᾳ χειμάρρους Ὠφίρ.

# σʹ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀκροτόμῳ ὡς ὀχετοῦς χρυσίου πρωτείου

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 732 3006 *cII* 555 161 | χρυσίου πρωτείου] ↓252 Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ 252; > *C* (= 250) 740

*Var:* τῷ] το 138; > *C* (= 257) | χρυσίου] χρυσειου 137 680; χρυσυο 138 | πρωτείου] προτειου 612; πρωτιου *C* (= 788-250); πρωτου *C* (= 257)

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܕܕܗܒܐ ܪܫܝܐ ❖

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 197; *AGK* 2, 390; Nic, 385).

**Job 22 28a**
HT וְתִגְזַר־אוֹמֶר וְיָקָם לָךְ
LXX ἀποκαταστήσει δέ σοι δίαιταν δικαιοσύνης,

# θʹ καὶ ὁριεῖς ῥῆμα, καὶ σταθήσεταί σοι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 *cII* 555 ↓161

*Attr:* θʹ] σʹ *C* (= 257) 260; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ὁριεῖς] ερεις 732; ορισεις 161

*Notes*: The attribution to Or in the *Edition* is not supported by *AGK* but only by Nic (*AGK* 2, 393; Nic, 386).

**Job 22 28b**
HT וְעַל־דְּרָכֶיךָ נָגַהּ אוֹר׃
E ἐπὶ δὲ ὁδοῖς σου ἔσται φέγγος.

# Sub ※

*Wit1:* La

*NonGr*: La ※ *et in viis tuis erit lumen,*

*Notes*: Perhaps this asterisk was misplaced for the asterisk that is in 29a.

**Job 22 29-30**

HT
כִּֽי־הִ֭שְׁפִּילוּ וַתֹּ֣אמֶר גֵּוָ֑ה
וְשַׁ֖ח עֵינַ֣יִם יוֹשִֽׁעַ׃
יְמַלֵּ֥ט אִֽי־נָקִ֑י
וְ֝נִמְלַ֗ט בְּבֹ֣ר כַּפֶּֽיךָ׃

E
ὅτι ἐταπείνωσεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐρεῖς Ὑπερηφανεύσατο,
καὶ κύφοντα ὀφθαλμοῖς σώσει·
ῥύσεται ἀθῷον,
καὶ διασώθητι ἐν καθαραῖς χερσίν σου.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 680\ 3006}$ 248 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$ Sa

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ $\bar{\delta}$ 3005 740 255 612 559 395) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 29-30 sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 559 395(non **30a**) 137 260(non **29a**) 643(non **29a 30b**) 732(non **29a 30**) 139(**29a** *sup* καί; non **30**) 248 Arm La(non **29a 30**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$
ܬ. ※ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܟܟܗ̇ ܘܬܐܡܪ ܕܐܬܥܫܢ
※ ܘܠܕܡܬܟܪܝܢ ܒ̈ܥܝܢܘܗܝ ܢܦܪܘܩ
※ ܢܦܨܐ ܠܙܟܝܐ
※ ܘܐܬܦܨܐ ܒܕ̈ܟܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܝ̈ܕܝܟ ↘

La *et* (pr ※ β) *inclinatum oculis salvabit.*

Arm
※ Զի խոնարհեցուցեր զանձն, և ասացեր թէ ամբարտաւանեցի
※ և զխոնարհս աչաք կեցուցէ
[※] Եւ փրկեսցէ զանարատն
※ և ապրեսցիս սրբութեամբ ձեռաց քոց

*Notes*: There are obeli in La at 29a, which may be intended for asterisks, but the line is not included in the *NonGr* line.

**Job 22 29a**

HT כִּֽי־הִ֭שְׁפִּילוּ וַתֹּ֣אמֶר גֵּוָ֑ה
E ὅτι ἐταπείνωσεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐρεῖς Ὑπερηφανεύσατο,

σʹ ἐὰν ταπεινοφρονήσῃ τις, ἐρεῖ ἑαυτῷ εἰς δόξαν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh

ܗ. ܐܢ ܢܬܪܟܟ
ܡ̈ܟܟܬܐ ܐܢܫ
ܐܡ̇ܪ ܗ̣ܘ ܠܗ
ܒܫܘܒܚܐ ܀

*Notes*: Although the form ܡ̈ܟܟܬܐ is difficult, it is the reading of the ms and Sokoloff lists it as a n.f.pl. (Sokoloff, 762). Field emended it to ܡ̈ܟܝܟܬܐ, a form which is not in the lexicon under the adj. ܡܟܝܟܐ (Field, 43), but, even though there is disagreement over the form, the retroversion is Field’s and does not need to be corrected.

**Job 22 30b**
HT וְ֝נִמְלַ֗ט בְּבֹ֣ר כַּפֶּֽיךָ׃
E καὶ διασώθητι ἐν καθαραῖς χερσίν σου.

σʹ καὶ διαφεύξεται καθαρότητι χειρῶν ἕκαστος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 *cII* ↓555 161′

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ θʹ 732; > *C* (= 250 257)

*Var:* καθαρότητι] καθαροτης 138; pr εν *C* (= 788-250) | χειρῶν] χειρος 555

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the second *C* ms to preserve the attribution to Sym. *AGK* does not contain this fragment in a comment by Origen; therefore, the attribution to Or in the *Edition* is not supported by *AGK* but only by Nic (*AGK* 2, 394-5; Nic, 387). The Nicetas catena itself may not attribute the fragment to Or, because the Sym fragment has been included in the bible text and is not in a alleged comment from Origen. These factors detract from the probability that this fragment has been passed down from Origen.

## Chapter 23

**Job 23 3b**

HT (אָבוֹא) עַד־תְּכוּנָתוֹ׃

LXX (καὶ ἔλθοιμι) εἰς τέλος;

# σʹ ἕως τῆς ἕδρας αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788 3005) ↓Ω *cI*–139 476 559 732 *cII* 555 161

*Wit2:* lemma] *usque ad solium eius* La = M

*Attr:* σʹ] > 138 Ω; [] *C* (= 257)

*Var:* ἕως] pr καὶ ὅτι ἔλθω Ω | τῆς] > *C* (= 257) Ω | ἕδρας] συνεδρας *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: The margin of 257 was cut and the attribution may have been lost. Συνέδρα is not listed in H-R, but it is listed in Hesych (s.v. συνέδρα: ἡ στάσις ἣν νῦν στατίωνα καλοῦσιν; *Kollationen*, 154). Ms 3005, therefore, has revised the text in this instance. The Hagedorns have correctly noted that Leo has converted the two hexaplaric fragments into a paraphrase for this verse (*Epitome*, 48), which explains the longer text in the first fragment and the use of καί instead of ἕως in the second (see *infra*).

# ⟨θʹ⟩ ἕως ἑτοιμασίας αὐτοῦ

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257) ↓Ω

*Attr*: θʹ] > Ω; [] 257

*Var:* ἕως] και Ω

*Notes*: Mss 257 and Ω contain two hexaplaric fragments. The first one is attributed to Sym according to 3005 and the majority of the catena tradition; therefore, he is not the author of the second fragment. Th uses ἑτοιμασία to render derivatives of the Hebrew root כון in Prov 4:18 (= נכון), Ezek 28:12 (= תכנית), and 43:11 (= תכונה). Of these occurrences, Ezek 28:12 includes also an attribution to Aq. This evidence indicates that the attribution to Th is probably correct, but Aq cannot be excluded with certainty (*Nachlese*, 399-400; *Epitome*, 48).

**Job 23 4a**

HT אֶעֶרְכָה לְפָנָיו מִשְׁפָּט

LXX εἴποιμι δὲ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ κρίμα

# σʹ προσθήσω ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ κρίσιν

*Wit1*: lemma] ↓*C* (= 257 788 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 476\ 559\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161 | ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ] Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788) Syh; [] 257

*NonGr*: Syh ⁘ ܩܕܡܘܗܝ ⁘

**Job 23 5a**

HT (אֵדְעָה) מִלִּים (יַעֲנֵנִי)

LXX (γνῴην δὲ) ῥήματα, (ἅ μοι ἐρεῖ),

# αʹ λαλιάς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257) Syh

*Attr:* αʹ] [] 257

*Var:* λαλιάς] λαλιᾶς ῥήματα 257

*NonGr*: Syh ⁘ .ܐ. ܡ̈ܡܠܠܐ

*Notes*: The reading in 257 is λαλιᾶς ῥήματα, which probably obtained from a misunderstanding of two originally independent fragments for the Hebrew word מלים. Aq translates מִלָּה with λαλιά in Ps 138(139):4, and Field’s retroversion of Syh (λαλιάς for ܡ̈ܡܠܠܐ) in this context is probable. These observations combined with a gap between the fragments in 257 led the Hagedorns to reconstruct the original text as follows: αʹ λαλιάς, σʹ ῥήματα (*Nachlese*, 400; see *infra*).

# σʹ ῥήματα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-476\ 559\ 732\ 740}$ *cII* 555 161

*Wit2:* ῥήματα *O L*ʹʹ-S$^{c}$ 55 250 523 644 705 Ol] ιαματα (ιαμα 248 Aeth; add ιαματα 256) rel

*Attr:* σʹ] > 395; [] 257

*Var:* ῥήματα] λαλιᾶς ρηματα 257

*Notes*: On the Sym reading in 257 see *supra*. The Hagedorns report that incidentally D. Fraenkel has considered the possibility that ῥήματα was originally a textual variant for ἰάματα, which is the lemma of the catena here; in that case then it might have received the faulty attribution σʹ very early (*Nachlese*, 400). Translation technique supports Fraenkel's suspicion. Sym does not use ῥῆμα frequently, and there are no examples of his translation of מִלָּה with it (Job 32:11c: λόγος renders מִלָּה). He renders אִמְרָה (Ps 118(119):21) and אֵמֶר (Ps 5:2) with ῥῆμα (Busto Saiz, 579). Given that there are few examples of ῥῆμα in Sym's corpus and those few instances do not support this lemma, this fragment stands since there is not sufficient evidence to contradict the catena tradition.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 202; *AGK* 3, 4; Nic, 388).

# θʹ λόγους

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܡ̈ܠܐ ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 43). Because the lemma in Syh[txt] is the same Syriac word ܡ̈ܠܐ and it was retroverted with ῥῆμα, Field used λόγος for the retroversion. Since Th uses λόγος for מִלָּה (e.g. Job 32:15 and 36:4), and this word also provides a contrast with LXX (=ῥήματα) αʹ(= λαλιάς), and σʹ(= ῥήματα), it is most probably the lemma of Th.

**Job 23 6a**

HT הַבְּרָב־כֹּחַ יָרִיב עִמָּדִי

LXX καὶ εἰ ἐν πολλῇ ἰσχύι ἐπελεύσεταί μοι

# αʹ μήτι ἐν πλήθει ἰσχύος δικασθήσεται μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ

*Wit1*: 252

*Wit2*: ἐπελ. μοι] *diiudicabitur mecum* La = M

HT (הַבְּרָב־כֹּחַ) יָרִיב עִמָּדִי

LXX (καὶ εἰ ἐν πολλῇ ἰσχύι) ἐπελεύσεταί μοι

σʹ δικάζεταί μοι

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–137\ 139\ 260\ 476\ 559\ 643\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] > 138 680

*Var*: δικάζεται *C* (= 3005)] διαδικάζεται rel

*Notes*: Sym uses δίκαζειν for רוב (read as ריב) in Job 39:32 (42:2), and *C* (= 250 3005) and 395 preserve the original δικάζειν for ריב in Job 33:13, even though *cI* has διαδικάζειν. Job 23:6a is another instance in which *cI* contains an error of dittography due to homoioarcton and 3005 preserves the original text. The only two instances of διαδικάζειν in the Three and the LXX are the two variants of Sym in 23:6 and 33:13. It is most probable that Sym used the simplex δικάζειν given these factors. Ms 788 contradicts this proposal, but translation technique is definitive.

**Job 23 6b**

HT לֹא אַךְ־הוּא יָשִׂם בִּי׃

LXX εἶτα ἐν ἀπειλῇ μοι οὐ χρήσεται

σʹ μόνον αὐτὸς μὴ ἐπιτιθέσθω μοι

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257 788 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–476\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161 252

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788); [] *C* (= 257)

*Var*: αὐτός] αυτους 260 643 | ἐπιτιθέσθω] επιτιθαισθω 138 | μοι] > 680

**Job 23 8**

HT הֵן קֶדֶם אֶהֱלֹךְ וְאֵינֶנּוּ
וְאָחוֹר וְלֹא־אָבִין לוֹ׃

LXX εἰς γὰρ πρῶτα πορεύσομαι καὶ οὐκέτι εἰμί·
τὰ δὲ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτοις τί οἶδα;

σʹ ἰδοὺ ἐὰν προέρχωμαι αὐτόν, ἀφανής ἐστιν· κἂν ἀκολουθῶ, οὐδὲ αἰσθήσομαι

*Wit1*: *C* (= 257) ↓*C*cat (= 788-250 3005) ↓Ω ↓249 ↓*cI*cat 754cat 474cat 258cat 476cat ↓505cat *cII* 555 161′ ↓OlY

*Var*: προέρχωμαι] προσευχομαι OlY; προσερχωμαι 476cat 740; προσερχομαι Ω | αὐτόν] αυτω 249 Ω | κἂν ἀκολουθῶ] και ακολουθως OlY | οὐδέ 257 788-250 3005 Ω OlY] ουκ 249 *cI*cat 476cat 505cat *cII* 555 161′ | αἰσθήσομαι] αιδεσθησομαι *cI*cat (εδεσθησομαι 476cat) 505cat

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is supported by *Kommentar, AGK,* and Nic (*Kommentar*, 203; *AGK* 3, 6; Nic, 390).

# α′ ἰδοὺ ἀρχῆθεν πορεύσομαι καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει, καὶ ὀπίσω καὶ οὐ συνήσω αὐτόν

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 249 257)

*Attr:* α′] ἀλλός 257

*Var*: ὑπάρχει] υπαρχ() 257inc | συνήσω *conj.*] συνισω 249; συνησει 257

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* corrects the *Edition* in three places (*Nachlese*, 400). First, the Oxford Collation read 257 as ἀρχων, which is the reading in Field (F-Auct, 8), but the ending of ὑπάρχ- in 257 is indeed *incertum*. Second, 249 attributes the reading to Aq explicitly, which Field and Ziegler posited hypothetically, but in the absence of evidence they could not be certain. In this edition, the angle brackets have been removed from the attribution. Third, 249 preserves the first person singular reading of the verb, which Ziegler suggested in the absence of manuscript evidence.

**Job 23 9**

HT שְׂמֹאול בַּעֲשֹׂתוֹ וְלֹא־אָחַז
יַעְטֹף יָמִין וְלֹא אֶרְאֶה׃

E ἀριστερὰ ποιήσαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ κατέσχον· περιβαλεῖ δεξιά, καὶ οὐκ ὄψομαι.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–138 680 248 Arm ↓Co La ↓Syhtxt

*Attr*: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ $\overline{\beta}$ 3005 740 255 612 559 3006[inc] 137 643(**8b**) 139(**8b**); ἐκ Θεοδοτίωνος οἱ δύο 260) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Co | 9 sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 559(non **9b**; **10a**) 395 137 260 643(non **9b**) 732(non **9b**) 139(non **9b**) 248 Arm La Syh[txt](non **9a**)

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ↘ .ܬܐ ※ ܪܓܠܐ ܠܣܡܠܐ ܘܠܐ ܫܘܐ ܐܢܐ
La *ad* (pr ※ μ) *laevam quid aget? non apprehendam.*
*convertetur ad dexteram, et non videbo* (+ ↙ β).
Arm ※ Ձձախ այնորիկ որ տրարն զնա ոչ կալայ
※ և եթե արկցէ զաջ իւր զինեւ և այնպէս ոչ տեսից

*Notes*: The attribution is at 8b in 139 643, but it is clear that this note introduces the next two lines as from Th. The attribution may be next to 9a in 3006, but the image is not completely clear.

**Job 23 9a**
HT (שְׂמֹאול בַּעֲשֹׂתוֹ) וְלֹא־אָחַז
E (ἀριστερὰ ποιήσαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ) οὐ κατέσχον

# σʹ οὐκ ἐπιλήψομαι

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005)

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var*: οὐκ] ου *C* (= 3005); pr και *C* (= 788-250) | ἐπιλήψομαι] περιληψομαι *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* constitutes a significant update to the *Edition* with respect to the attribution (*Nachlese*, 400). Ziegler had access only to 250, which does not have an attribution, but he conjectured Sym as the author, due to translation technique and the reading in La and Vulg (*Beiträge*, 34). Mss 257 and 3005 confirm this conjecture, since both witnesses contain the attribution to Sym. Now 788 confirms the attribution to Sym. Regarding the variant περιλήψομαι in 3005, Sym does not use this verb for אחז and the only one of the Three to use it is Aq in Prov. 6:10.

In his paraphrase of the verse, Olymp availed himself of the version of Sym: εἰς εὐώνυμα τραπέντος ἐπιλαβέσθαι ἀμηχάνως ἔχω (*Nachlese*, 400; *Kommentar*, 203).

**Job 23 10b-11a**
HT בְּחָנַנִי כַּזָּהָב אֵצֵא׃
בַּאֲשֻׁרוֹ אָחֲזָה רַגְלִי

LXX διέκρινεν δέ με ὥσπερ τὸ χρυσίον. ἐξελεύσομαι δὲ ἐν ἐντάλμασιν αὐτοῦ

# α′ ἐδοκίμασεν με, ὡς χρυσίον ἐξελεύσομαι. ἐν ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ κατέσχεν πούς μου

*Wit1*: lemma] ↓Syh | ἐδοκίμασεν] ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[137] 476

*Attr:* α′ 138-255 260 559 643 680 740 3006 Syh] α′ σ′ *C* (= 788 3005); α′ θ′ *C* (= 257); σ′ 139 732; > *C* (= 250) 395 612

*Var*: ἐδοκίμασεν] εδοκιμασαν 559; εδοκιμασας 138; εδοκημασεν 3006; + δε Syh

*NonGr*: Syh

ܐ. ܒܚܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܗܒܐ
ܐܦܩ. ܒܥ̈ܩܒܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ
ܠܓܒܬ ܪ̈ܓܠܐ ܕܝܠܝ ❖

*Notes*: Mss 788 3005 attest the original, double attribution to Aq and Sym for the catena, which the Syh indirectly supports, since it has the same lexeme (ܒܚܢ = δοκιμάζειν) and form for both Aq and Sym; therefore, Greek ἐδοκίμασεν has been supplied for both Aq and Sym lemmas. Ms 257 includes Th with Aq, which is a mistake, since Syh shows that Th has a future tense in this verse, even though the lexeme is the same. The other witnesses that attest to either Aq or Sym as author have lost the other attribution through the transmission of the text (see *infra*). The retroversion is Field's, who wisely did not include a Greek equivalent for Syh ܕܝܢ, since there is no corresponding lexeme in the Hebrew text. He also suggested that ἐπελάβετο could be a retroversion for ܠܓܒܬ (Field, 44).

# σ′ ἐδοκίμασεν με, ὡς χρυσίον ἀπέβην. ἐν εὐθύτητί μου ὑπέμεινεν ὁ πούς μου.

*Wit1*: lemma] Syh | ἐδοκίμασεν] ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[137] 476

*Attr:* σ′ 139 732 Syh] α′ σ′ *C* (= 788 3005); α′ θ′ *C* (= 257); α′ 138-255 260 559 643 680 740 3006; > *C* (= 250) 395 612

*Var*: ἐδοκίμασεν] εδοκιμασαν 559; εδοκιμασας 138; εδοκημασεν 3006

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܒܚܡܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܗܒܐ
ܥܒܪܬ. ܒܬܪܝ ܘܐܬܐ
ܕܝܠܝ ܒܬܪܬ ܪܓܠܐ ܕܝܠܝ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field, who also suggested that ἐνέμεινεν or διέμεινεν could be a retroversion for ܒܬܪܬ (Field, 44).

# θʹ δοκιμάσει με, ὡς χρυσίον ἐξελεύσομαι. ἐν ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ ἐκράτησεν ὁ πούς μου.

*Wit1*: Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܢܒܚܘܢܢܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܗܒܐ
ܐܦܩܘ. ܒܥܩܒܬܐ
ܕܝܠܗ ܐܚܝܕܬ ܪܓܠܐ
ܕܝܠܝ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field. Th has influenced the transmission of the LXX (see *infra*).

**Job 23 11ab**
HT (בַּאֲשֻׁרוֹ) אָחֲזָה רַגְלִי (דַּרְכּוֹ)
E (ἐξελεύσομαι δὲ ἐν ἐντάλμασιν αὐτοῦ·)—(ὁδοὺς γὰρ αὐτοῦ)

# θʹ ※ ἐκράτησεν ὁ πούς μου

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[137] 476 La ↓Syh

*Wit2*: fin] + εκρατησεν (εκροτ. *lI*) ο πους La (※ *tenuit pes meus*) *lI* 253 = M

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ 740 255 612 559 680 3006; ἐκ Θεοδοτίωνος 260) 3005 Syh] > rel

*Var*: pr ※ *C* (= 250) (740 612 post 11a αὐτοῦ) 559 680vid 260 643 732 139

*NonGr*: Syh ❖ ܬ. ܐܚܝܕܬ ܪܓܠܐ ܕܝܠܝ ❖
La ※ *tenuit* ↙ *pes meus vias eius* ↙

*Notes*: Ms 680 has a faded asterisk before the fragment. There is no asterisk and the index is at ἐφύλαξα in 3005 wrongly. Beside 23:11b, 250 612 have an asterisk at the end of verse 23:11a with an index through it. There is no index, asterisk, or attribution in

395. In ms 255, the attribution is detached from the lemma and is at the top left of the bible text.

**Job 23 14a**

HT כִּי יַשְׁלִים חֻקִּי

LXX —

# α′ θ′ ὅτι ἀπαρτίσει ἀκριβασμόν

*Wit1*: *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* presents a new fragment. This translation is adjacent to 23:15a in 257, since 23:14 is absent from the LXX. Aq uses ἀπαρτίζω for שׁלם pi in III Reigns 9:25, and Gen 34:2, Deut 25:15, 27:6, Hos 10:14, Isa 60:20, and Am 1:6 (λ′) (Reider, 24). Aq also uses ἀκριβασμός for חֹק frequently, as in Gen 47:22 and Deut 4:14 (Reider, 10). In addition, Th renders חֹק with ἀκριβασμός in Prov 8:29 (*Nachlese*, 400).

**Job 23 15cd**

HT עַל־כֵּן מִפָּנָיו אֶבָּהֵל
אֶתְבּוֹנֵן וְאֶפְחַד מִמֶּנּוּ׃

E ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ κατασπουδασθῶ·
κατανοήσω καὶ πτοηθήσομαι ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

# α′ θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[137]\ 138\ 680\ 3006}$ 248 Arm ↓Co La ↓Syh$^{txt}$ Spec

*Attr*: α′ θ′ (ἐκ τῶν (τοῦ 732) α′ καὶ θ′ οἱ β̄ 3005 740 255 559 395 643 732(**15b**) 139(**15b**); ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἀκύλα καὶ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ δύο οἱ τοὺς ἀστερίσκους ἔχοντες 260)] θ′ 612 (ἐκ θ′ οἱ β̄) Syh$^{txt}$; ἐκ τῶν ακ[ 138; > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Co Spec | 15cd sub ※ 3005 740(non **15d**) 255 612 559 395(non **15c**) 260 643 732(non **15d**) 139(non **15d**) 248 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܥܠ ※ ܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܝܠܗ
※ ܐܬܗܪܒ.
※ ܐܬܒܩܐ ܘܐܙܘܥ ܡܢܗ. ↘

La ※ *idcirco a facie eius turbabor.*
*considerabo* (pr ※ μ), *et timebo ab eo.*

Arm ※ ի վերայ այսոցիկ: Յերեսաց նորա տագնապեցայց

※ և ի միտ առից և զարհուրեցայց ի նմանէ

**Job 23 15c**

HT עַל־כֵּן מִפָּנָיו) אֶבָּהֵל)

E (ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ) κατασπουδασθῶ·

# σʹ τετάραγμαι

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 257 3005) ↓*cI*–[137] 139 260 476 643 732 740 3006 ↓523 ↓252 Syh

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 3005) Syh] αʹ 252; > 138 255 257 395 523 559 612 680

*Var*: τετάραγμαι] pr κατα σπουδην *C* (= 3005)

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܙܥܙܥܬ ܐܢܐ ÷

*Notes*: Ms 3005 is the first Greek witness to Sym as the author, which agrees with Syh (*Nachlese*, 400). The agreement of these two witnesses shows that the attribution to Aq in 252 is an error. Furthermore, the *Edition's* anonymous reading κατατεταραγμῶ in 523 with no attribution has been corrected to read τετάραγμαι, and it is located between the lines above κατασπουδασθῶ (*Nachlese*, 400).

**Job 23 16b**

HT וְשַׁדַּי) הִבְהִילָנִי׃)

LXX (ὁ δὲ παντοκράτωρ) ἐσπούδασέν με.

# σʹ ἐθορύβησέν με

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[137] 139 476 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161ʹ ↓157

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 138 *cII* 161ʹ 555 157

*Var*: ἐθορύβησέν] εθορυβησε 138 559 643 | μέ] > *cII* 555 161ʹ 157

*Notes*: The *Edition* listed two additional readings from 157 (εθροησε με, εταραξε με), which are discussed in chapter four.

## Chapter 24

**Job 24 1a**

HT: (מַדּוּעַ מִשַּׁדַּי לֹא־נִצְפְּנוּ) עִתִּים

LXX: (διὰ τί δὲ κύριον ἔλαθον) ὧραι

# α′ θ′ καιροί

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) $cI^{-[137]\ 139\ 260\ 476\ 643\ 732}$

*Attr*: α′ θ′] > *C* (= 788-250)

**Job 24 1b-2a**

HT: וְיָדְעוּ (Q וְיֹדְעָיו) לֹא־חָזוּ יָמָיו׃
גְּבֻלוֹת יַשִּׂיגוּ

LXX: —
ἀσεβεῖς δὲ (ὅριον ὑπερέβησαν)

# ⟨σ′⟩ καὶ γινώσκοντες αὐτὸν οὐκ οἴδασι τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257)

*Wit2:* δέ] + ουκ ειδον ημερας αυτου *lI* Syh$^{mg}$ = M (1b); + ※ *nescierunt dies eius*: cf Walters p 202; tr δέ post ὅριον $L^{-575}$-613; om δέ 337

*Attr:* σ′] [] 257

*NonGr*: Syh ܠܐ ܚܙܘ ܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ
ܕܝܠܗ.

La ※ *nescierunt dies eius*?

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* has provided a new fragment (*Nachlese*, 400-1). The reading in 257 aligns with 1b in the Hebrew text, while the LXX renders יֹדְעָיו of 2a with ἀσεβεῖς δέ. *Wit2* provides the relevant data from the *Edition's* first apparatus, which shows that the first Lucianic sub-group contains an addition in the text, while Syh has the reading in the margin and La has the reading under the asterisk; thus, this hexaplaric fragment may have influenced these versions. In particular, Jerome's lemma *nescio* equals οὐκ οἶδα, while *lI* and Syh have the verb "to see," which is a literal translation of the Hebrew. In 257, the attribution could have been lost due to the mutilated margin (*Nachlese*, 401). Regarding the internal evidence, although οἶδα is used by Aq and Th,

there is no evidence that they use οἶδα for חזה or any other verb which means "to see." Sym uses οἶδα for ראה in Isa 53:2, which is the closest example to Job 24:1b. The *Nachlese* suggests that Th is the author since he is usually the author from which the asterisked material is derived (*Nachlese*, 401), but since only La puts this text under the asterisk, this conclusion is open to question. Because Origen used other versions and the evidence that Sym uses a Greek verb "to know" for a Hebrew verb "to see" elsewhere, this edition tentatively suggests that Sym is the author of this fragment.

The reading γινώσκοντες αὐτόν reflects the Qere (יֹדְעָיו) of the MT.

**Job 24 2a**

HT (גְּבֻלוֹת) יַשִּׂיגוּ

LXX (ἀσεβεῖς δὲ ὅριον) ὑπερέβησαν

# α′ προσελάβοντο

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250) ↓*cI*–[137] 260 476 ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* α′] θ′ α′ 395; θ′ 139 643; σ′ 732; > *C* (= 788-250) 680

*Var:* προσελάβοντο] προσελαβον 559; προσλαμβανοντες *cII*; προλαμβανοντες 555

*Notes*: *C* (= 257) preserves the attribution to Aq, while the witnesses at the bottom of the Hagedorns' stemma preserve either an attribution to Th or to Sym. Aq read the form from the Hebrew root נשׂג, not as a form from סוג as do modern scholars (cf. KB, 727). Ziegler listed the *cII* group as a separate fragment for this verse, but it appears that the Nicetas catena has borrowed the lemma of Aq and changed the form for its own purposes.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 206; *AGK* 3, 10-11; Nic, 394).

**Job 24 3a**

HT חֲמוֹר (יְתוֹמִים יִנְהָגוּ)

LXX ὑποζύγιον (ὀρφανῶν ἀπήγαγον)

# λ′ ὄνον

*Wit1*: *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–[137] 139 260 395 476 680 3006

*Attr:* λ′] Ἄλλος Field

**Job 24 4a**

HT יַטּוּ אֶבְיוֹנִים מִדָּרֶךְ

LXX ἐξέκλιναν ἀδυνάτους ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας

# σ′ παρέτρεψαν πενήτων ὁδόν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-[137]\ 139\ 476\ 3006}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 252

*Attr:* σ′ $cI^{-732}$ *cII* 555 252] θ′ 732; [] 257; > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 643

*Var*: παρέτρεψαν] παρετριψαν *C* (= 788-250) 255 612 740; + γαρ *cII* 555 | ὁδόν] οδους 260

*Notes*: Although the *C* group does not preserve the attribution, only Sym uses παρατρέπειν (Job 12:24, 34:5) and he renders נטה Hi with παρατρέπειν in Ps 140(141):4 (*Beiträge*, 24). This internal evidence, combined with the best witnesses of *cI*, indicate that Sym is probably the author of this fragment.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 206; *AGK* 3, 10-11; Nic, 394).

**Job 24 4a**

HT —(יַטּוּ אֶבְיוֹנִים מִדָּרֶךְ)

E (ἐξέκλιναν ἀδυνάτους ἐξ ὁδοῦ) δικαίας

# Sub ※

*Wit1*: $La^{\beta}$ $La^{\mu}$

*Var*: ※] ÷ $La^{\mu}$

*NonGr*: $La^{\beta}$ ※ *iusta* ↙
$La^{\mu}$ ÷ *iusta* ↙

*Notes*: The Latin mss are divided on whether the word should be included under the asterisk or the obelus. The fact that the reading is not in the Hebrew text, but it is in the OG may indicate that Jerome placed the reading under the asterisk originally; however, there is no other evidence for the asterisk in other sources, which suggests that La may have misplaced it here.

**Job 24 4b**

HT יַחַד חֻבְּאוּ עֲנִיֵּי־אָרֶץ׃

E ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκρύβησαν πραεῖς γῆς.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1*: ↓*cI*–[137] 138 139 260 680 3006 Arm ↓Co ↓Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr*: θ′ 740 255 612 559 395 643 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Co | 4b sub ※ 740 255 612 559 395 643 732 Arm Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ ※ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܐܬܛܫܝܘ ܡܟܝ̈ܟܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ.
Arm ※ առ հասարակ դաւղեցուցին զհեզս երկրի

*Notes*: The asterisk and attribution are well attested in the sources.

# σ′ ὁμοῦ ἀφανεῖς ἐποίησαν πραεῖς γῆς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[137] 139 476 732 ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* σ′] θ′ 612 260; > *C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Var*: ἀφανεῖς] αφανης *C* (= 788-250); pr γαρ *cII* 555 | ἐποίησαν] ἐποίησας 555

*Notes*: Since the Th reading is certain (see *supra*), the attribution in 612 and 260 is erroneous.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 206; *AGK* 3, 10-11; Nic, 395).

**Job 24 5a**
HT (הֵן פְּרָאִים)—(בַּמִּדְבָּר)
E (ἀπέβησαν δὲ ὥσπερ ὄνοι)—(ἐν ἀγρῷ)

# Sub ※

*Wit1*: Syh La

*Wit2*: ὄνοι] + (※ La Syh$^{mg}$) αγριοι La Syh$^{mg}$ 575-Iul

*NonGr*: Syh ※ ܕܒܪܐ ❖
La ※ *feri*

*Notes*: The index in Syh is over ܒܚܩܠܐ which comes after ܚܡ̈ܪܐ. Field suggests the retroversion ἄγριοι on the basis of Job 6:5, where ܕܒܪܐ translates ἄγριος in the LXX (Field, 45).

**Job 24 5b**

HT יָצְאוּ בְּפָעֳלָם מְשַׁחֲרֵי לַטָּרֶף

LXX ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ἐξελθόντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρᾶξιν

## α′ ἐξέρχονται ἐν κατέργῳ αὐτῶν ὀρθρίζοντες εἰς ἅλωσιν

*Wit1*: lemma] $C^{cat}$ (= 788-250 3005) 249 $cI^{cat-476}$ $474^{cat}$ $523^{cat}$ *cII* 555 161 ↓252 | ἐξέρχονται] ↓$C^{2}$ (= 257 788-250) ↓$cI^{-[137]\ 139\ 260\ 476\ 643\ 732}$

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= $250^{2}$)

*Var*: ὀρθρίζοντες] ορθριζωντες 252; + εκπορευονται 138 | εἰς] > 252

*Notes*: This fragment is in three different places in the catena: (1) at 24:5b in 249, (2) at 24:5a in 788-250 3005 260 523, and (3) at 6b in *cI* (*AGK* 3, 13).

The lemmas of Aq and Sym are combined in 138. Only the marginal note in 250 lacks the attribution. The fragment is clearly assigned to Aq in $250^{cat}$.

In 3005 this line in the bible text is erroneously marked with an obelus, and 788-250 has the following note: οὐ κεῖνται ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar*, but the question regarding the attribution of this fragment remains open. Ms 3005 attributes the fragment to Πολυχρονίος, while 138-255 395 523 and Nic attribute it to Ὀλυμπιοδώρος (*Kommentar*, 206-7; *AGK* 3, 13; Nic, 395).

## σ′ ἐξέρχονται εἰς ἐργασίαν αὐτῶν, ἐπορθρίζοντες θηρεύειν

*Wit1*: lemma] *C* (= $257^{1}$) 252 | ἐκπορεύονται] ↓*C* (= $257^{2}$ 788-250) ↓$cI^{-[137]\ 139\ 732}$

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250) 138 559; [] *C* (= $257^{1}$)

*Var*: ἐξέρχονται] προσερχονται (προερχονται *conj*. Field) 252; εκπορευονται *C* (= $257^{2}$ 788-250) $cI^{-[137]\ 139\ 732}$; εκπορευται 559

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* presents new evidence from 257 and suggests that either the readings belong to different authors or the wording of one of them represents an error (*Nachlese*, 401). Both suggestions may be correct, since there is no extant evidence that Sym uses ἐκπορεύομαι (H-R, 440c), which then creates the possibility that the fragment should be attributed to Th, who uses ἐκπορεύομαι for **יצא** (e.g. Ex 21:7). Sym uses προσέρχομαι to translate **יצא** only once out of three instances (Ps 59(60):12). This evidence shows that Sym prefers to render **יצא** with ἐξέρχομαι (e.g. Job 5:6, 39:4c, et al.; H-R, 495a).

HT בַּמִּדְבָּר (יָצְאוּ בְּפָעֳלָם מְשַׁחֲרֵי לַטָּרֶף)
LXX ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (ἐξελθόντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρᾶξιν)

# ἑβρ′ ἐπ’ ἐρήμου

*Wit1*: Nobil (apud Field)

*Notes*: The source of this reading is still unknown.

**Job 24 5c**
HT עֲרָבָה לוֹ לֶחֶם לַנְּעָרִים׃
E ἡδύνθη αὐτῷ ἄρτος εἰς νεωτέρους.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1*: ↓*cI*$^{–138\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ 248 252 Arm ↓Co La ↓Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr*: θ′ 740 255 612 559 137 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Co | 5c sub ※ 740 255 612 559 137 248 252 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܐ ※ ܗܢܐ ܠܗ ܠܚܡܐ ܠܛ̈ܠܝܐ. ↘
La ※ *suavis factus est eis panis in adolescentes.*
Arm ※ քաղցրացաւ նոցա հաց ընդ լկտիս

*Notes*: The sources attest to the asterisk and attribution sufficiently.

# σ′ ἡδὺς ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν ἄρτος εἰς νεανίσκους

*Wit1:* lemma] *C* ↓ (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–139}$ *cII* 555 ↓161′ | νεανίσκους] 252

*Attr:* σ′] θ′ 612; > *C* (= 788-250) 643 680

*Var*: νεανίσκους] νεωτερους 248

*Notes*: The variant in 248 comes from the bible text.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 207; *AGK* 3, 14-15; Nic, 395). The word, νεανίσκους, is found in the comment by Olymp, but he does not refer to any source for his interpretation.

HT (עֲרָבָה לוֹ לֶחֶם) לַנְּעָרִים׃
LXX (ἡδύνθη αὐτῷ ἄρτος εἰς) νεωτέρους.

# α′ παῖδας

*Wit1:* 252

**Job 24 6b**
HT (וְכֶרֶם רָשָׁע יְלַקֵּשׁוּ׃)—
LXX ἀδύνατοι (δὲ ἀμπελῶνας ἀσεβῶν ἀμισθὶ καὶ ἀσιτὶ ἠργάσαντο.)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *cI* (= 740 255 612)

*Var*: ἀδύνατοι sub ÷ 740 255 612

*Notes*: Since ἀδύνατοι is absent from the HT, the catena probably preserve the text of the fifth column of the Hexapla in this instance.

**Job 24 8a**
HT מִזֶּרֶם הָרִים יִרְטָבוּ
E ἀπὸ ψεκάδων ὀρέων ὑγραίνονται

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1*: $cI^{-138\ 139\ 260\ 680\ 3006}$ 248 La ↓Sa ↓Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr*: θ′ 255 612 559 395 137 643 732 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Sa | 8a sub ※ 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 732 248 La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܡܢ ܠܢܛܘ̈ܦܐ ܕܛܘ̈ܪܐ ܡܬܪܛܒܝܢ. ↘
La ※ *de stillicidiis montium madescent*.

*Notes*: The sources preserve the asterisk and attribution for this line sufficiently.

**Job 24 9b**
HT וְעַל־עָנִי יַחְבֹּלוּ׃
LXX ἐκπεπτωκότα δὲ ἐταπείνωσαν.

# σ′ καὶ πτωχὸν ἠνεχύραζον

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-476}$ *cII* ↓555 | πτωχόν] *C*$^{cat}$ (= 3005) *cI*$^{cat}$ 754$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 258$^{cat}$ ↓476$^{cat}$ [505$^{cat}$] 523$^{cat}$

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250) 138-255 476$^{cat}$

*Var*: ἠνεχύραζον] ηνεχυριαζ(ον) *C* (= 3005); ενεχυραζον 680 732 555

*Notes*: Ms 3005 preserves the fragment, but the scribe has updated the form of the verb (-ιάζω; LSJ, 565). Sym has brought the lexeme into closer alignment with the Hebrew text, but he has preserved the past tense of the verb in the OG. The witnesses *C*$^{cat}$ (= 250) 249 omit the relevant fragment from the catena.

*AGK* attributes the patristic comment to Olymp on the basis of 3005 and other witnesses (the attribution is omitted in 250 740 138-255 754 474 258 523); therefore, the attribution to Polychr in the *Edition* is not supported by *AGK* but only by Nic (*AGK* 3, 16-17; Nic, 397).

**Job 24 10a**
HT (עָרוֹם הִלְּכוּ) בְּלִי לְבוּשׁ
LXX (γυμνοὺς δὲ ἐκοίμισαν) ἀδίκως

# γ′ ἄνευ ἐνδύματος

*Wit1:* 249

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* is the first to list this fragment, which appears in 249 in the following comment: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀδίκῶς οἱ τρεῖς ἄνευ ἐνδύματος ἐκδεδώκασιν (*Nachlese*, 401).

**Job 24 12a**
HT מֵעִיר מְתִים יִנְאָקוּ
LXX οἳ ἐκ πόλεως καὶ οἴκων ἰδίων ἐξεβάλλοντο

## σ′ ἐκ πόλεως ἄνδρας στενάξαι ἐποίησαν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܡܢ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܠܓܒܖ̈ܐ
ܥܒܕܘ ܠܡܬܬܢܚܘ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field. It is interesting to note that both Sym and Th (see *infra*) have the vocalization of the MT (מְתִים = men, people), while the Peshitta vocalized the text as ܡ̈ܝܬܐ (= the dead). Furthermore, the Vulgate follows Sym's version (*de civitatibus fecerunt viros gemere*).

## θ′ ἐκ πόλεως ἄνδρες κεκράξονται

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܡܢ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ
ܓܒܖ̈ܐ ܢܩܥܘܢ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field.

**Job 24 12c**
HT וֶאֱלוֹהַּ לֹא־יָשִׂים תִּפְלָה׃
LXX αὐτὸς δὲ διὰ τί τούτων ἐπισκοπὴν οὐ πεποίηται;

## α′ καὶ θεὸς οὐ θήσει σπουδήν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܢܣܝܡ
ܒܛܝܠܘܬܐ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Ziegler's *Edition*.

## σ′ ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐκ ἐμποιεῖ τιμωρίαν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260}$ Syh

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var*: δὲ \ θεός] tr 559 | ἐμποιεῖ] εμπνεει *cI*–260 | τιμωρίαν] μωριαν *cI*–260 Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ
ܡܥܒܕ ܫܠܘܬܐ܀

*Notes*: Ms 3005 confirms ἐμποιεῖ in 250 (*Nachlese*, 401), and 788 also has this reading. The *Edition* read τι μωρίαν in 250, but the *Kollationen* confirms that this is a misunderstanding for τιμωρίαν as is found in 3005 (*Kollationen*, 161). The *C* (= 788-250 3005) group supports τιμωρίαν, and it seems that Jerome had this reading in front of him, when he translated the Vulgate (*et Deus inultum abire non patitur*; *Nachlese*, 401); therefore, the revision of the OG by Sym preserves the theme of God's punishment.

HT (וֶאֱלוֹהַּ לֹא־יָשִׂים) תִּפְלָה׃
LXX (αὐτὸς δὲ διὰ τί τούτων ἐπισκοπὴν οὐ πεποίηται;)—

# θʹ ἀφροσύνην

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܫܛܝܘܬܐ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field. The Hebrew word was not represented in the LXX, but it was present in HT and Syh preserves the Th version.

**Job 24 13a**
HT הֵמָּה הָיוּ בְּמֹרְדֵי־אוֹר
LXX ἐπὶ γῆς ὄντων αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν

# σʹ ἀλλ᾽ αὐτοὶ γεγόνασιν ἀποστάται φωτός

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 395 559 643 680 732 3006 Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 138

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܐܠܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܗܘܘ
ܡܬܪܚܩܢܐ ܡܢ
ܢܘܗܪܐ܀

*Notes*: The *Edition* contains a reading attributed to Sym in 732 at 24:13b which reads as follows: Σ(υμμάχου)· ὅτι οὐ συνῆκαν. The *Edition* placed the reading at

24:13b, which would align it with οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, which is a possible reconstruction. *AGK*, however, has reevaluated the evidence and concluded the following: (1) that the marginal note refers to οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν in 24:13a, (2) the scholion is a secondary addition from Ps 27:5a shown by the fact that it does not occur in 139 and 643, indicating that this unique reading in 732 was probably not in the *Vorlage* of these three mss (i.e. Δ→; see *AGK* vol. I, 27; *Kollationen*, 161), and (3) this scholion is proximate to another one taken from Ps 23:4a (*AGK* 3, 20). Job 24:13a must have prompted the scholiast to record the first note from Ps 23:4a and the particular scribe of 732 must have added the second note from Ps 27:5a independently and falsely attributed it to Sym.

Translation technique affirms this conclusion. Sym uses συνίειν seven times (H-R, 1317a; Ps 92:7 (Sym) in H-R is an error, for the reading is not in Field), six times the word renders בין (1 Sam. 3:8, Job 28:23, 34:16, Isa 6:10, Jer. 30:24, and Dan 12:10) and once it renders קשׁשׁ (Zeph 2:1). There are no occurrences of Sym using συνίειν for נכר Hi as the *Edition* supposes in 24:13b, but rather there is evidence that Sym renders נכר Hi with γνωρίζειν in Job 4:16 and ἐπιγινώσκειν in Prov 24:23. All of these factors demonstrate that the reading in 732 is not hexaplaric, but it was a secondary note added by the scribe of 732, who also attributed it erroneously to Sym.

**Job 24 14b-18a**

HT

וּבַלַּיְלָה יְהִי כַגַּנָּב׃
וְעֵין נֹאֵף שָׁמְרָה נֶשֶׁף
לֵאמֹר לֹא־תְשׁוּרֵנִי עָיִן
וְסֵתֶר פָּנִים יָשִׂים׃
חָתַר בַּחֹשֶׁךְ בָּתִּים
יוֹמָם חִתְּמוּ־לָמוֹ
לֹא־יָדְעוּ אוֹר׃
כִּי יַחְדָּו בֹּקֶר לָמוֹ צַלְמָוֶת
כִּי־יַכִּיר בַּלְהוֹת צַלְמָוֶת׃
קַל־הוּא עַל־פְּנֵי־מַיִם

E

καὶ νυκτὸς ἔσται ὡς κλέπτης.
καὶ ὀφθαλμὸς μοιχοῦ ἐφύλαξεν σκότος
λέγων Οὐ προσνοήσει με ὀφθαλμός,
καὶ ἀποκρυβὴν προσώπου ἔθετο.
διώρυξεν ἐν σκότει οἰκίας·
ἡμέρας ἐσφράγισαν ἑαυτούς,
οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν φῶς·
ὅτι ὁμοθυμαδὸν τὸ πρωὶ αὐτοῖς σκιὰ θανάτου,
ὅτι ἐπιγνώσεται ταραχὰς σκιᾶς θανάτου.
ἐλαφρός ἐστιν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ὕδατος

θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1*: *C* (= 3005) *cI*–138 680 3006 248 252 Arm La ↓Sa ↓Syh^txt

*Attr*: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ ῑ 3005(**15a**) 612(**15a**) 395 137(**15a**) 643(**15a**) 732(**15a**) 139(**15a**); ἐκ θʹ οἱ 740; ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ δέκα 260; ὁμ(οίως) πρόσκ(εινται) θ̅ 252) Syh^txt(**14b** only)] > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Sa | 14b-18a sub ※ 3005(non **14b**; **+ 18b**) 740(non **14b 16a 18a**; **+ 18b**) 255(non **14b 15a 18a**; + **18b**) 612(non **14b**; + **18b**) 559(non **14b**) 395(non **18a**; + **18b**) 137(non **14b 18a**) 260(non **14b**; + **18b**) 643(non **14b 18a**) 732(non **14b 16a 17 18a**) 139(non **14b 15bc 16 17 18a**) 248(non **14b**) 252(non **18a**) Arm(non **18a**) La Syh^txt(non **15a**)

*NonGr*: Syh^txt

ܬ ※ ܘܒܠܠܝܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܓܢܒܐ. ↘
※ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܒܝ ܥܝܢܐ.
※ ܘܛܘܫܝܐ ܠܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܣܡ.
※ ܦܠܫܘ ܒܚܫܘܟܐ ܒ̈ܬܐ.
※ ܒܐܝܡܡܐ ܚܬܡܘ ܗ̣ܢܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ.
※ ܠܐ ܐܫܬܘܕܥܘ ܢܘܗܪܐ.
※ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܟܚܕܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܨܦܪܐ
※ ܛܠܠܐ ܕܡܘ̈ܬܐ.
※ ܡܛܠ ܕܢܫܬܘܕܥ ܫܓ̈ܘܫܝܐ ܕܛܠܠܐ ܕܡܘ̈ܬܐ.
※ ܩܠܝܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ܝ ܥܠ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܕܡ̈ܝܐ. ↘

La
*et* (pr ※ μ) *nocte erit sicut fur.*
*oculus* (pr ※ μ) *adulteri observat tenebras*
*dicens* (pr ※ μ) *Non videbit me oculus,*
※ *et latibulum faciei posuit.*
*suffodit in tenebris domos* (*do※mos* β) ↙
*per* (pr ※ μ) *diem obsignaverunt semetipsos* ↙
※ *non cognoverunt lucem* ↙
*quia simul eis mane umbra* (pr ※ β) *mortis.*
*levis* (pr ※ μ) *est super faciem aquae* (+↙ β)

Arm
※ և զցայգ եղիցի իբրեւ զգող
※ Եւ աչք շնացելոյն պահեսցեն զխաւար
※ ասիցէ թէ ոչ զականիցէ զիս ակն
※ և քաւղ արկ զերեսաւք իւրովք
※ Փորեաց ընդ մութ զտունս
※ ի տուէ կնքեցին զանձինս
※ և ոչ ծանեան զլոյս
※ Եթէ միանգամայն առաւաւտ նոցա ի ստուերս

մահու է
※ եթէ ի միտ առնուցու զխռովութիւն ստուերաց մահու

*Notes*: The catena attributes ten lines to Th, but the section begins at 15a and goes through 18b. The *Edition* has not recorded this correctly. Syh attributes only 14b to Th, and the rest of the lines are anonymous.

**Job 24 15c**

HT וְסֵתֶר פָּנִים יָשִׂים׃

E καὶ ἀποκρυβὴν προσώπου ἔθετο

σʹ ἄλλος δὲ σκέπαστρον προσώπου περιθέμενος

*Wit1*: ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 643\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr*: σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var*: ἄλλος δέ] ἀλλ’ οὐδέ 680; > 512-513 555 | προσώπου] + κατα συμμαχον 512-513 555 | περιθέμενος] περιεθετο 3006

*Notes*: All of the mss have ἄλλος δέ as part of the lemma except Nic (*Kollationen*, 161). The *Edition* did not include these words, since there is no equivalent in the HT, yet Sym does render *waw* with δέ frequently (Busto Saiz, 226); however, Sym’s use of ἄλλος in this text is not clear. The *Edition’s* variant (περιτιθεμ. *C*$^{p}$) was not confirmed by the *Kollationen* or the mss checked by the editor.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 209-10; *AGK* 3, 20-21; Nic, 400).

**Job 24 16b**

HT יוֹמָם חִתְּמוּ־לָמוֹ

E ἡμέρας ἐσφράγισαν ἑαυτούς

σʹ ὡς ἐν σφραγῖδι κρύψουσιν ἑαυτούς

*Wit1*: lemma] ↓*C* (= 257 788 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139}$ *cII* 555 161ʹ 157 | κρύψουσιν] ↓Syh

*Attr*: σʹ] > *C* (= 3005) 138 559 680 Syh

*Var*: ὡς] pr και 732 | κρύψουσιν] εκρυψαν Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܫܘܚܪܗ ܠܝܬܘܗܝ

*Notes*: Syh has an anonymous scholion in the margin, which probably belongs to Sym, even though the *Edition* did not list it. The index is over ܫܘܚܪܗ, which is attributed to Th in the catena tradition (see *supra*). ܠܝܬ agrees with the lexeme of the Greek Sym fragment but not the tense of the verb.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 210; *AGK* 3, 21; Nic, 400).

**Job 24 17a**

HT כִּי יַחְדָּו בֹּקֶר לָמוֹ צַלְמָוֶת

E ὅτι ὁμοθυμαδὸν τὸ πρωὶ αὐτοῖς σκιὰ θανάτου,

## σʹ ἐὰν γένηται αὐτοῖς ὄρθρος σκιὰ θανάτου·

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 *cII* 555 157

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 395 740

*Var*: γένηται] γινεται 255; ιενειται 559 | ὄρθρος] pr ο *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 210; *AGK* 3, 21; Nic, 400).

**Job 24 17b**

HT כִּי־יַכִּיר בַּלְהוֹת צַלְמָוֶת׃

E ὅτι ἐπιγνώσεται ταραχὰς σκιᾶς θανάτου.

## σʹ φωραθεὶς γὰρ ἀνύπαρκτος ἔσται σκιασθεὶς θανάτῳ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 559 643 732 *cII* 555 157

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 395

*Var*: γάρ] > 740 | θανάτῳ] θανατου 395

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 210; *AGK* 3, 21; Nic, 400).

**Job 24 18a**

HT קַל־הוּא) עַל־פְּנֵי־מָיִם)

E (ἐλαφρός ἐστιν) ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ὕδατος

# σʹ ἐπιπλέων ὕδατι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 559 732 ↓*cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] ἐ 138; > *C* (= 788-250) 643

*Var*: ἐπιπλέων] επιπλεον 137 612 643 *cII*–512-513

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 210-11; *AGK* 3, 21-22; Nic, 401).

**Job 24 (18c)-19**

HT

לֹא־יִפְנֶה דֶּרֶךְ כְּרָמִים׃
צִיָּה גַם־חֹם יִגְזְלוּ
מֵימֵי־שֶׁלֶג שְׁאוֹל חָטָאוּ׃

LXX —

ἀναφανείη δὲ τὰ φυτὰ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ξηρά·
ἀγκαλίδα γὰρ ὀρφανῶν ἥρπασαν.

# αʹ οὐκ ἐκκλινεῖ εἰς ὁδὸν ἀνεπίβατον ἀμπελώνων, καὶ εἰς θέρμην ἐκβιάσονται

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh

ܐ. ܠܐ ܢܣܛܐ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ
ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܪ̈ܡܐ.
ܘܒܫܚܝܡܘܬܐ ܢܬܒܙܘܢ.
ܡܠܝܪܐܬ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field. The index in Syh is at the beginning of 19a, but the lemma of Aq equals HT 18c-19a, which is not represented in the LXX formally; although, the original translator may have paraphrased HT here.

# σʹ οὐκ ἀναστρέψει εἰς ὁδὸν τῶν ἀμπελώνων τοῦ διψᾶν, καὶ καῦμα ἥρπασαν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh

ܣ. ܠܐ ܢܗܦܘܟ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ
ܕܟܪ̈ܡܐ ܠܚܝ ܗܐ.
ܐܦ ܚܘܡܐ ܢܚܛܦܘ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field. The index in Syh is at the beginning of 19a, but the lemma of Sym equals HT 18c-19a, which is not represented in the LXX, even though it appears that Sym has borrowed a form of ἁρπάζω from 19b of the LXX.

# θʹ οὐκ ἐκκλινεῖ εἰς ὁδὸν ἀμπελώνων ἐν δίψῃ, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ συλῶσιν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh

ܬ. ܠܐ ܢܣܛܐ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ
ܕܟܪ̈ܡܐ ܒܝ ܗܡܐ. ܐܦ
ܓܝܪ ܗܢܘܢ ܡܚܠܨܝܢ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field. The index in Syh is at the beginning of 19a, but the lemma of Th equals MT 18c-19a, which is not represented in the LXX.

**Job 24 19a**

HT (צִיָּה גַם־חֹם יִגְזְלוּ)—

LXX (ἀναφανείη δὲ τὰ φυτὰ αὐτῶν) ἐπὶ γῆς ξηρά

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt

÷ ܥܠ
÷ ܐܪܥܐ ܝܒܝܫܬܐ. ↘

*Notes*: It is difficult to know whether Hebrew צִיָּה is rendered in the LXX as ξηρά. According to H-R this would be the only place in the LXX, and Job 24:19 is listed as less than certain (H-R, 957c). The evidence of the obelus suggests that there was no Hebrew text which corresponded to the LXX.

**Job 24 21b**

HT וְאַלְמָנָה (לֹא יְיֵטִיב׃)

LXX (καὶ) γύναιον (οὐκ ἠλέησεν)

# λʹ χήραν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) Ω ↓*cI*–139 260 559 612 680 732 3006inc Syh

*Wit2:* γύναιον] αγυναιον B´-S* A-Iul Co Glos; χηραν 252txt = M↓

*Attr:* λʹ] > 138 395

*Var*: χήραν] χηρα 137

*NonGr*: Syh ❖ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܓܒܪܐ
ܐܪܡܠܬܐ ❖

*Notes*: Ms 3006 may have the lemma but it is unverifiable (*Kollationen*, 163). Ms 252 has the lemma in its bible text and has γύναιον in the margin without attribution (*Edition*, 321; *Kollationen*, 163). The fragment is at 24:21a in 788-250 (*Kollationen*, 163). Ms Ω records this fragment at 21a: ἀντὶ τοῦ “χήραν” κεῖται παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς (*Epitome*, 50); thus, 788-250 and Ω preserve the reading of the Three as a revision to στεῖραν not γύναιον in 21b. The HT, evidence of Syh, *cI*, and 252 demonstrate that the fragment should be placed at 21b.

**Job 24 22b**
HT (יָקוּם וְלֹא־יַאֲמִין) בַּחַיִּין׃
LXX (ἀναστὰς τοιγαροῦν οὐ μὴ πιστεύσῃ) κατὰ (τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς)

# σʹ περί

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 559 732 3006 ↓Syh ↓Pitra

*Wit2:* κατά] υπερ *L*; περι *lI* 257

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 643

*Var*: περί] περ 740; + τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς 260 Pitra Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ❖ ܣ. ܡܛܠ ܚܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ ❖

*Notes*: In 260, the fragment is embedded in the text (*Kollationen*, 163). The longer lemma of Syh and Pitra obtained from harmonization with the bible text of the LXX.

**Job 24 23**

HT (יִתֶּן־לוֹ לָבֶטַח וְיִשָּׁעֵן)
וְעֵינֵיהוּ עַל־דַּרְכֵיהֶם׃

LXX (μαλακισθεὶς μὴ ἐλπιζέτω ὑγιασθῆναι,) ἀλλὰ πεσεῖται νόσῳ

# σʹ ἀποβλέπουσιν δὲ εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς ἑαυτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 260\ 732}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 137 395 559 643 680 3006

*Var*: δέ *C* (= 788-250)] > rel | ἑαυτῶν] αυτων *C* (= 788-250) 138; εαυτου 643

*Notes*: The δέ, which renders the *waw* of HT, is new. Only the *C* mss have preserved it. Ziegler must have omitted this word accidentally in the *Edition*, since the reading is also in 250.

Although many witnesses do not preserve the attribution, the witnesses at the top of the *cI* group's stemma preserve it (740 138-255 612). Sym uses ἀποβλέπειν to render עין in Zech 5:6, and less significantly Aq uses ἀποβλέπειν for ענן (Judg 9:37), חלון (3 Rgns 6:4), and נבט (Ps 33(34):6). There is no evidence for Th at present. Both external and internal factors support the attribution to Sym.

**Job 24 24ab**

HT (רוֹמּוּ) מְּעַט וְאֵינֶנּוּ
וְהֻמְּכוּ כַּכֹּל יִקָּפְצוּן

LXX πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐκάκωσεν τὸ ὕψωμα αὐτοῦ·
ἐμαράνθη δὲ ὥσπερ μολόχη (ἐν καύματι)

# γʹ ὀλίγον καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει, καὶ ταπεινώσει αὐτὸν καθὼς πάντα τὰ συγκλασθησόμενα

*Wit1*: 249

*Notes*: Ms 249 preserves the lemma, which was not previously listed by Field or Ziegler (*Nachlese*, 401). In 249, the lemma is introduced by the following: περὶ (lege: ἀντὶ) τοῦ ἐμαράνθη δὲ ὥσπερ ταράχη (lege: μολόχη) οἱ γ οὕτως ἐξέδωκεν· κτλ (*Nachlese*, 401; the emendations derive from the *Nachlese*).

**Job 24 25a**

HT וְאִם־לֹא (אֵפוֹ מִי יַכְזִיבֵנִי)

LXX εἰ δὲ μή, (τίς ἐστιν ὁ φάμενος ψευδῆ με λέγειν)

# σʹ ἀλλὰ νῦν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–139\ 260}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 138$^{inc}$ 255 643 732

**Job 24 25b**

HT וְיָשֵׂם לְאַל מִלָּתִי׃

E καὶ θήσει εἰς οὐδὲν τὰ ῥήματά μου

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1*: *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{–138\ 260\ 395\ 559\ 643\ 680\ 740\ 3006}$ La ↓Sa ↓Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr*: θʹ (+ ὁμ() πρ()κ() 3005) 3005 255 612 137 732] σʹ 139; > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Sa | 25b sub ※ 3005 255 612 137 732 La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܘܢܣܝܡ ܒܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܝܠܝ ↘
La [※ μ] *et ponet in nihilum verba mea*

*Notes*: Ms 3005 preserves the line under the asterisk with the attribution to Th in the left margin and the additional note, ὁμ(οίως) πρ(όσ)κ(ειται), in the right margin. Ms 139 has an attribution to Sym in the left margin, indicating that the line is hexaplaric even though it has the erroneous attribution to Sym. The text of La is certainly hexaplaric, but the mss do not preserve an asterisk for this line. La$^{μ}$ has an asterisk at 25a, which was probably intended for this line.

# σʹ καὶ τάξει τῷ θεῷ λόγον ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–260}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 395 3006

*Var*: τάξει] + παρα 138-255 395 559 612 680 740 3006 | θεῷ] + τον 137 139 395 559 643 680 732 740 3006

*Notes*: Sym attests the vocalization אֵל in this verse. The best witnesses omit παρά, and translation technique supports this external evidence since Sym does not use παρά + dative to render ל in the Psalter but frequently renders the ל with the dative case alone (Busto Saiz, 181-86). The definite article τόν may also have been added in the course of the transmission of the text, since it is not present in the earliest and best witnesses.

## Chapter 25

**Job 25 2a**

HT (עִמּוֹ וָפַחַד) הַמְשֵׁל

LXX Τί γὰρ προοίμιον (ἢ φόβος παρ’ αὐτοῦ)

# α′ θ′ ἐξουσία

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 3006

*Var:* ἐξουσία *C* (= 3005) 740] εξουσιας *cI*–740

*Notes*: The nominative is preserved by 3005 and 740, and it is probably the original text given the prominent place of these witnesses in the tradition of the catena (*Nachlese*, 402). Although in some cases marginal notes tend to preserve only the lemma of the Three and not the precise form (see *Notes* at 25:2b), in this verse the nominative is the best rendering of HT and a suitable revision of the Greek.

HT עִמּוֹ וָפַחַד הַמְשֵׁל

LXX Τί γὰρ προοίμιον ἢ φόβος παρ’ αὐτοῦ

# συρ′ τί γὰρ ὁ φόβος προοιμιάζεται καὶ εἰς δειλίαν ἄγει τὸν μέλλοντα δικάζεσθαι ὡς οἱ παρ’ ἡμῖν δικασταί;

*Wit1:* Iul

*Var:* ἡμῖν] υμιν cod

*Notes*: This instance is the second of the ὁ σύρος readings in Iulian’s commentary on Job (*Kommentar*, 155; *Edition*, 160).

**Job 25 2b**

HT (בִּמְרוֹמָיו׃) שָׁלוֹם (עֹשֶׂה)

LXX (ὁ ποιῶν) τὴν σύμπασαν (ἐν ὑψίστῳ)

# λ′ εἰρήνην

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–260

*Var:* εἰρήνην] ειρηνη 612

*Notes:* Ms 612 has preserved the correct lexeme in the marginal note but not the original case.

**Job 25 3a**

HT הֲיֵשׁ מִסְפָּר לִגְדוּדָיו

LXX μὴ γάρ τις ὑπολάβοι ὅτι ἔστιν παρέλκυσις πειραταῖς

# σ′ μὴ ἔστιν ἀριθμὸς τῶν στρατιῶν αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI cII* 555

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 3006

*Var:* στρατιῶν] στρατιωτων 256-740

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 216; *AGK* 3, 30-31; Nic, 406).

**Job 25 3b**

HT (וְעַל־מִי לֹא־יָקוּם) אוֹרֵהוּ׃

LXX (ἐπὶ τίνας δὲ οὐκ ἐπελεύσεται) ἔνεδρα (παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ)

# σ′ ἐπίταγμα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732}$ *cII* 555 ↓161′

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 138

*Var:* ἐπίταγμα *C* (= 788-250 3005) 161] επιταγματα rel

*Notes:* The *C* group with 161 preserves the singular, which agrees in number with the HT. The meaning is difficult to discern, since ἐπίταγμα occurs elsewhere only in 4 Makk 8:6 in the LXX corpus. Sym renders צוה Pi with ἐπιτάσσω in Job 36:32 and חקק Po with the same verb in Judg 5:14. He also renders רדה Qal with ἐπιτάσσω in Ezek 29:15 and 34:4. Probably, Sym interprets אוֹר metaphorically, but there is no extant parallel for his interpretation (Targ and Pesh also have the respective words for “light”).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 216; *AGK* 3, 30-31; Nic, 406).

**Job 25 4b**

HT ומַה־יִּזְכֶּה יְלוּד אִשָּׁה׃

LXX ἢ τίς ἂν ἀποκαθαρίσαι ἑαυτὸν γεννητὸς γυναικός

# σʹ διὰ τίνος δὲ ἄρρυπος ἔσται τεχθεὶς ὑπὸ γυναικός

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 139}$ *cII* ↓555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 3006

*Var:* δέ *C* (= 788-250 3005)] > rel | ἄρρυπος] αρυπος *C* (= 788-250) *cI*$^{-138\ 139}$ 555 | ὑπό] απο *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes:* The δέ has been added *pace* the *Edition* on the basis of the evidence of *C* (= 788-250 3005) and the *waw* in HT (*Kollationen*, 165; Busto Saiz, 226).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 216-17; *AGK* 3, 31-32; Nic, 407).

**Job 25 5a**

HT הֵן (עַד־יָרֵחַ וְלֹא יַאֲהִיל)

LXX εἰ (σελήνῃ συντάσσει, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιφαύσκει)

# λʹ ἰδού

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257 788-250) Ω *cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 395\ 559\ 643\ 680\ 732}$

*Notes*: Ms Ω reads as follows: τὸ μὲν "εἰ" οἱ λοιποὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ "ἰδοὺ" ἐκδεδώκασι (*Epitome*, 50).

HT (הֵן עַד־יָרֵחַ) וְלֹא יַאֲהִיל

LXX (εἰ σελήνῃ συντάσσει, καὶ) οὐκ ἐπιφαύσκει

# αʹ οὐ διαυγασθήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 559\ 643\ 732}$

*Attr:* αʹ] σʹ *C* (= 3005); > *C* (= 788-250) 138-255

*Var:* διαυγασθήσεται] διαυγισθησεται 138-255 612 680 740; διαυγησθησεται 3006

*Notes:* Ms 395 reads as διαυγασθήσεται with an α that has been formed by a blot (it is filled in), but the evidence may support a correction of an original ι. The *Nachlese* brings attention to the fact that LSJ cites only Aq Job 25:5 as evidence for the word διαυγίζω, which is otherwise unattested in Greek literature (*Nachlese*, 402). On the basis of the evidence of *C* (= 788-250 3005) and 395 (by conjecture) the reading may be restored correctly to διαυγάζω, a form attested also in the NT at 2 Pt 1:19 and a variant reading of αὐγάσαι at 2 Cor 4:4 (*Beiträge*, 35). Since there is no more evidence of the usage of this word in the Three and the Hebrew word אהל Hi is a *hapax legomenon*, translation technique cannot indicate whether the fragment belongs to Aq or Sym, but since 740 and 612 assign the reading to Aq, the fragment is attributed to him, but it could very well belong to Sym on the basis of 3005. More evidence is required in order to arrive at greater certainty. The lemma of 3006 arose from itacism ι-η (Wevers, "A Note on Scribal Error," 189).

**Job 25 6a**

HT אַף כִּי(־אֱנוֹשׁ רִמָּה)

LXX ἔα δέ, (ἄνθρωπος σαπρία)

# σʹ πόσῳ μᾶλλον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 559 643 732 ↓Pitra

*Attr:* σʹ] Pitra αʹ σʹ θʹ; > *C* (= 788-250) 138 395

*Var*: μᾶλλον] + ανθρωπος Pitra

*Notes:* Sym revised ἔα δὲ to πόσῳ μᾶλλον at Job 15:16a where HT is also אַף כִּי. Although ἄνθρωπος in Pitra could be construed as rendering HT, it is better to propose that Pitra's sources had no recourse to HT and added the word from their LXX bible text.

**Job 25 6b**

HT וּבֶן־אָדָם תּוֹלֵעָה׃

E καὶ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου σκώληξ

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1*: *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 255 740) Syh[txt]

*Attr*: θ′ Syh$^{txt}$] α′ θ′ σ′ 3005 740 255

*Var*: 6b sub ※ 3005 740 255 Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: ܬ ※ ܘܒܪܗ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܬܘܠܥܐ ↘

*Notes*: Ms 3005 confirms Gentry’s analysis and conclusion that this line does come from θ′ (Gentry, 24-6). Analyzing 26ab together, Gentry concluded rightly that θ′ uses καί for *waw* and the OG would not use ἄνθρωπος in two successive stichs; therefore, the second stich most probably comes from θ′. Given the paucity of data to analyze translation technique in this line, it is not possible to decide the author on this basis. The editor proposes that Th is the author on the basis of Syh and the usual practice of Origen to use Th in his fifth column more than the other revisers.

## Chapter 26

**Job 26 3a**

HT (מַה־)יָּעַצְתָּ (לְלֹא חָכְמָה)

LXX (τίνι) συμβεβούλευσαι; (οὐχ ᾧ πᾶσα σοφία;)

# α′ σ′ συνεβούλευσας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*−260

*Attr:* α′ σ′] α′ θ′ 395; > *C* (= 250) 138

**Job 26 5-11**

HT

הָרְפָאִים יְחוֹלָלוּ
מִתַּחַת מַיִם וְשֹׁכְנֵיהֶם׃
עָרוֹם שְׁאוֹל נֶגְדּוֹ
וְאֵין כְּסוּת לָאֲבַדּוֹן׃
נֹטֶה צָפוֹן עַל־תֹּהוּ
תֹּלֶה אֶרֶץ עַל־בְּלִי־מָה׃
צֹרֵר־מַיִם בְּעָבָיו
וְלֹא־נִבְקַע עָנָן תַּחְתָּם׃
מְאַחֵז פְּנֵי־כִסֵּה
פַּרְשֵׁז עָלָיו עֲנָנוֹ׃
חֹק־חָג עַל־פְּנֵי־מָיִם
עַד־תַּכְלִית אוֹר עִם־חֹשֶׁךְ׃
עַמּוּדֵי שָׁמַיִם יְרוֹפָפוּ
וְיִתְמְהוּ מִגַּעֲרָתוֹ׃

E

μὴ γίγαντες μαιωθήσονται
ὑποκάτωθεν ὕδατος καὶ τῶν γειτόνων αὐτοῦ;
γυμνὸς ὁ ᾅδης ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν περιβόλαιον τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ.
ἐκτείνων βορέαν ἐπ’ οὐδέν,
κρεμάζων γῆν ἐπὶ οὐδενός·
δεσμεύων ὕδωρ ἐν νεφέλαις αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οὐκ ἐρράγη νέφος ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ·
ὁ κρατῶν πρόσωπον θρόνου,
ἐκπετάζων ἐπ’ αὐτὸν νέφος αὐτοῦ.
πρόσταγμα ἐγύρωσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ὕδατος
μέχρι συντελείας φωτὸς μετὰ σκότους.
στῦλοι οὐρανοῦ ἐπετάσθησαν
καὶ ἐξέστησαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιτιμήσεως αὐτοῦ.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1*: *C* (= 3005) *cI*−138 139 260 680 3006 248 Arm La ↓Sa ↓Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr*: θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ ιδ̅ 3005 740 255 612 395 643; ἐκ θ′ οἱ ια̅ 559 137) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Sa | 5-11 sub ※ 3005(non **11b**; + **12a**) 740 255(non **8b**) 612 559(non **11**) 395(non **7b 9-11**) 137(non **5a 11b**) 643(non **8-9 11**) 732(non **5a 6 8-9 11**) 248(non **5 11b**) Arm(non **5a 11**) La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$

ܬ ※ ܕܠܡܐ ܓܢܒܪ̈ܐ ܡܬܬܘܠܕܝܢ.
※ ܠܬܚܬ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܘܕܫܒܒ̈ܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ.
※ ܥܪܛܠܝܐ ܗܝ ܫܝܘܠ ܩܕܡܘܗܝ.
※ ܘܠܝܬ ܬܟܣܝܬܐ ܠܐܒܕܢܐ.
※ ܕܡܬܚ ܠܓܪܒܝܐ ܥܠ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ.
※ ܕܬܠܐ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܥܠ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ.
※ ܕܐܨܪ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܒܥܢ̈ܢܐ ܕܠܗ.
※ ܘܠܐ ܐܣܬܕܩܬ ܥܢܢܐ ܠܬܚܬ ܡܢܗܘܢ.
※ ܗܘ ܕܐܚܝܕ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܕܟܘܪܣܝܐ.
※ ܘܦܪܣ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܥܢܢܐ ܕܠܗ.
※ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܐܚܕܪ ܥܠ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܕܡ̈ܝܐ.
※ ܥܕܡܐ ܠܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܥܡ ܚܫܘܟܐ.
※ ܥܡ̈ܘܕܐ ܕܫܡܝܐ ܦܪܚܘ.
※ ܘܬܘܗܪܘ ܡܢ ܟܐܬܐ ܕܠܗ. ↘

La
*nunquid* (pr ※ μ) *gigantes redigentur in nihilum*
*subter* (pr ※ β) *aquam et proximi eorum*
*nudus* (pr ※ μ) *infernus coram* (pr ※ β) *eo*
*et non est velamen perditioni.*
*extendens aquilonem super nihilum*
※ *suspendens terram super nihilum in aërem*
*ligans aquam in nubibus suis*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *non est scissa nubes ab eo* (+ ↙ β).
*qui tenet faciem solis*
*et* (pr ※ β) *extendens super eum nubem suam*
*praeceptum* (pr ※ μ) *circundedit super faciem aquae* (+ ↙ β)
*usque ad consummationem lucis.*
*columnae* (pr ※ β) *lucis caeli intremuerunt*
*et obstupuerunt ab increpatione eius.*

Arm
※ ի ներքուստ ջրոյ և ի դրացեաց նորա

※ Մերկ են դժոխք առաջի նորա
※ և չիք զգեստ կորստեան
※ Ձգեաց զհիւսիսի զոչընչիւ
※ կախեաց զերկիր ի վերայ ոչընչի
※ Ծրարէ զջուր յամպս իւր
※ և ոչ պատառեցաւ մէգ ի ներքոյ նորա
※ Որ ունի զերեսս աթոռոյ
※ թռուցանէ զնովաւ զմէգ իւր
※ Հրաման պատեաց զերեսաւք ջրոյ
※ մինչ ի վախճան լուսոյ ընդ խաւարի

*Notes*: There is a mistake regarding the asterisk in La in the *Edition* (146). There should be an asterisk at 7b in La$^{\beta}$, which then means eight out of the fourteen lines are asterisked according to La$^{\mu\beta}$. Probably, Jerome applied the asterisk to all fourteen lines and the scribes omitted them accidentally. Although La is a good witness to the hexaplaric text, it is a defective witness to the preservation of the asterisk in this instance. 248 and Arm are closer than La even though they have only eleven lines under the asterisk. The Catena tradition with Syh shows that all fourteen lines are under the asterisk and should be attributed to Th. The negative evidence of Sa confirms this conclusion.

**Job 26 5**

HT הָרְפָאִים יְחוֹלָלוּ
מִתַּחַת מַיִם וְשֹׁכְנֵיהֶם׃

E μὴ γίγαντες μαιωθήσονται
ὑποκάτωθεν ὕδατος καὶ τῶν γειτόνων αὐτοῦ;

# α′ μήτι Ῥαφαὶμ ὠδίνουσιν ἀποκάτωθεν ὑδάτων καὶ σκηνούντων αὐτά

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓252 Syh | Ῥαφαείν] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 139}$

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* Ῥαφαίμ Syh] Ραφαειν rel; αρα φαειν 559 | σκηνούντων] σκιν- 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܕܠܡܐ ܪ̈ܐܦܐܝܡ
ܢܚܠܘܢ ܠܬܚܬ ܡܢ
ܡ̈ܝܐ: ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܝܢ
ܒܗܘܢ .܀

*Notes*: The reading in 559 contains both attribution and text with improper word division (*Kollationen*, 166). The orthography of Ῥαφαΐμ is a problem. Syh represents the *lectio difficilior*, since it is probable that a Greek scribe has changed the original -μ, which best represents the HT, to the more familiar final consonant -ν. Conversely, one does not expect Syriac to preserve the original ִים termination but the normal ִין; therefore, Syh preserves most probably the original text of Aq.

σʹ μὴ θεομάχοι θορυβήσουσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ οἱ γειτνιῶντες αὐτοῖς

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | μὴ θεομάχοι θορυβήσουσιν καὶ οἱ γειτνιῶντες αὐτοῖς 252 | θεομάχοι] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$C^{cat}$ (= 788-250 3005) ↓Ω 249 *cI* $cI^{cat}$ $474^{cat}$ $258^{cat}$ $3007^{cat}$ *cII* 555 161 ↓$Ol^{Y}$ | καί—fin] ↓$C^{2}$ (= 788-250 3005) $Ω^{2}$ ↓$cI^{2-260}$ ↓$cII^{2}$ ↓$555^{2}$ ↓$161^{2}$

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ $732^{2}$; > $C^{1\ 2}$ (= 250) $C^{cat}$ (= 788-250 3005) Ω $cI^{cat}$ $474^{cat}$ $258^{cat}$ $3007^{cat}$ $512\text{-}513^{1\ 2}$ $138^{2}$ $139^{2}$ $643^{2}$ $3006^{2}$

*Var:* θεομάχοι] τοὺς θεομάχους 512-513 $Ol^{Y}$; pr οι $C^{cat}$ (= 788-250 3005) Ω $cI^{cat}$ $474^{cat}$ $258^{cat}$ $3007^{cat}$ | γειτνιῶντες] γειτονες *cII* 555 161; γειτνιοντες 255 643 732

*NonGr*: Syh

ܣ. ܕܠܡܐ ܬ̈ܬܟܬܫܘܢ ܥܡ
ܐܠܗܐ ܢܬܚܪܘܢ ܬܚܝܬ
ܡ̈ܝܐ܆ ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܫܒ̈ܒܝܢ
ܠܗܘܢ܀

*Notes*: The full lemma is found in Syh. Ms 252 preserves the lemma without ὑπὸ τῶν ὑδάτων, while the catena preserves the important word θεομαχοι in 5a and the interpretive clause καὶ οἱ γειτνιῶντες αὐτοῖς in 5b. The word, γείτονες, is the lemma of LXX and is only found in *cII*, and therefore is secondary. Mss 512-513 and $Ol^{Y}$ preserve the Sym fragment indirectly. There is no attribution, but the lemma of Sym has influenced the exegesis of the Nicetas catena and Olymp commentary (*Kommentar*, 221; Nic, 410).

According to *AGK*, Olymp preserves the exegesis of οἱ θεομάχοι without a hexaplaric attribution (*AGK* 3, 38-9).

**Job 26 5a**

HT (הָרְפָאִים) יְחוֹלָלוּ

E (μὴ γίγαντες) μαιωθήσονται

# συρʹ ματαιωθήσονται

*Wit1:* Iul

*Wit2:* μαιωθήσονται] ματαιωθησονται S* La(*redigentur in nihilum*) 55

*Notes*: The comment reads as follows: οἱ δὲ Σύροι ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘μαιωθήσονται’ ‘ματαιω-θήσονται’ ἐκδεδωκασι (*Kommentar*, 158).

**Job 26 7a**
HT (נֹטֶה צָפוֹן) עַל־תֹּהוּ
E (ἐκτείνων βορέαν) ἐπ’ οὐδέν

# αʹ ἐπὶ κενώματι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓Ω ↓*cI cII* 555 ↓157

*Attr:* αʹ] σʹ 157 Ω; > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* κενώματι] κενωματος Ω

*Notes*: Translation technique combined with the catena confirms the attribution to Aq. He translates תֹּהוּ with κένωμα in Gen 1:2, Deut 32:10, Isa 40:23 and 59:4. There is no evidence to suggest that either Sym or Th used this word. In 732 and 3005, the index is at 26:7b ἐπὶ μηδενός, but in 257 the index is at 26:7a ἐπ’ οὐδέν (*Kollationen*, 167).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 221; *AGK* 3, 39-40; Nic, 411).

**Job 26 10a**
HT חֹק־חָג (עַל־פְּנֵי־מָיִם)
E πρόσταγμα ἐγύρωσεν (ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ὕδατος)

# σʹ ὅρον περιέγραψεν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓Ω ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 260}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) Ω 138$^{inc}$ 139 395 643 680 732 3006

*Var:* περιέγραψεν] + τὴν ψάμμον ἐπὶ θαλάσσης Ω

*Notes*: περιγράφω renders Heb חָג and περιγραφή renders חוּג in Job 22:14b (*Beiträge*, 33). These words are used only by Sym and are not found in the LXX, α′ or θ′. The addition in Ω could be the result of a free rendering based on Jer 5:22 (τὸν τάξαντα ἄμμον ὅριον τῇ θαλάσσῃ), yet also it cannot be excluded that in this citation there exists a marginal note of the α-*Vorlauferkatene* (i.e. *C*), which the Hagedorns did not come across previously (*Epitome*, 51).

**Job 26 11a**

HT (עַמּוּדֵי שָׁמַיִם) יְרוֹפָפוּ
E (στῦλοι οὐρανοῦ) ἐπετάσθησαν

# α′ διεκινήθησαν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260}$ *cII* 555 ↓161′ 252 ↓157 Syh

*Attr:* α′] σ′ *C* (= 257); > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 138 139 255 643

*Var:* διεκινήθησαν] εκινηθησαν 157 248; διεκεινηθησαν 3006

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܙܥܘ

*Notes*: The fragments of Aq and Sym are combined in 252 as follows: α′ σ′ διεκινήθησαν σπαίρουσιν (*Kollationen*, 168; see *infra*). The evidence for Aq as the author of this reading is sufficient to establish the attribution, which leaves the second lemma of 252 to be determined. Ms 248 has the simplex form, which is more common, but Aq uses it to render the following Hebrew verbs: רמשׂ (Gen 1:26, 28), נוע (Dan 10:10), and נוד (Regn. III 14:15) (Reider, 135). This is the only occurrence of רפף in the Hebrew Bible, and perhaps Aq chooses the complex form based on this consideration.

# σ′ σπαίρουσιν

*Wit1:* 252 ↓Syh

*Var:* σπαίρουσιν] επαιρουσιν Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܡܪܝܡܝܢ

*Notes*: Field's retoversion (ἐπαίρουσιν = ܡܪܝܡܝܢ) is probably right (Field, 47), resulting in a textual variant. יְרוֹפָפוּ is probably from the geminate root רפף, which means "to sway, totter" (*KB*, 1279). The reviser would probably use an intransitive verb to match the Hebrew meaning as may be discerned from Aq (see *supra*). Greek syntax

requires an intransitive verb, since στῦλοι must be the subject of the verb; therefore, the reading in 252, σπαίρω “gasp, pant, or quiver,” suits the context well. The reading in Syh probably arose from an inner Greek error due to confusion of letters of the rounded series Σ(C)-E, which is attested in Greek manuscripts (Wevers, 186); therefore, 252 preserves the original text.

**Job 26 11b**
HT וְיִתְמְהוּ (מִגַּעֲרָתוֹ׃)
E (καὶ) ἐξέστησαν (ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιτιμήσεως αὐτοῦ)

σʹ θαμβοῦνται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260}$ *cII* 555 161ʹ

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 257 788-250) 139 395

*Var:* θαμβοῦνται] εθαμβουντο *C* (= 3005)

**Job 26 12b**
HT (וּבִתוּבְנָתוֹ (Q וּבִתְבוּנָתוֹ)) מָחַץ רָהַב׃
LXX (ἐπιστήμῃ δὲ) ἔτρωσε τὸ κῆτος

σʹ συγκλᾷ ἀλαζονείαν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) Ω ↓*cI*$^{-260\ [680]}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 139

*Var:* ἀλαζονείαν Ω *cII* 555 161] αλαζονιαν *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-260\ [680]}$

*Notes*: The alternate spelling obtained from itacism.
The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 223; *AGK* 3, 42-43; Nic, 414).

**Job 26 13b**
HT חֹלְלָה (יָדוֹ נָחָשׁ בָּרִחַ׃)
LXX (προστάγματι δὲ) ἐθανάτωσεν (δράκοντα ἀποστάτην)

⟨?⟩ ἐξῴκισται αὐτόν

*Wit1:* 252

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] > 252

*Notes*: Ziegler reports that the translator is not able to be ascertained (*Beiträge*, 36).

HT (חֹלֲלָה יָדוֹ) נָחָשׁ בָּרִיחַ׃
LXX (προστάγματι δὲ ἐθανάτωσεν) δράκοντα ἀποστάτην

# σ′ τὸν ὄφιν τὸν συγκλείοντα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ [680]\ 732}$ *cII* 555

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* συγκλείοντα] συγκλιοντα 740 3006

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 224; *AGK* 3, 44; Nic, 415).

**Job 26 14ab**
HT הֶן־אֵלֶּה קְצוֹת דַּרְכּוֹ (Q דְּרָכָיו)
וּמַה־שֵּׁמֶץ דָּבָר נִשְׁמַע־בּוֹ
E ἰδοὺ ταῦτα μέρη ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐπὶ ἰκμάδα λόγου ἀκουσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῷ

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1*: *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 139\ 260\ 559\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓Sa ↓Syh$^{txt}$ Amb (Job 2,21)

*Attr*: θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ β̄ 3005 740 255 612 395 137(**14b**)] > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Sa Amb | 14ab sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 395 137(non **14a**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܗܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܪ̈ܚܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܬܘܒ ܠܢܘܦܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܢܫܡܥ ܒܗ. ↘

**Job 26 14bc**
HT וּמַה־שֵּׁמֶץ דָּבָר נִשְׁמַע־בּוֹ
וְרַעַם גְּבוּרָתוֹ (Q גְּבוּרוֹתָיו) מִי יִתְבּוֹנָן׃
E/LXX καὶ ἐπὶ ἰκμάδα λόγου ἀκουσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῷ·
σθένος δὲ βροντῆς αὐτοῦ τίς οἶδεν ὁπότε ποιήσει

σʹ τί δὲ ψιθυρισμάτων λόγων αὐτοῦ ἀκούσομεν, ὅπου βροντὴν δυναστείας αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς ἐννοήσει

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [680] 732 ↓*cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 643 3006

*Var:* τί] τα *C* (= 3005) | ψιθυρισμάτων] ψιθύρισμα τῶν 512-513; ψιθυρισματα *C* (= 3005); ψηθυρισματων *C* (= 788-250) 138 | λόγων] λογον 612 | αὐτοῦ \ ἀκούσομεν] tr 138 | ἀκούσομεν] –σωμεν 138-255 395 559 612 740 | ὅπου] οταν *cII* | βροντήν] βροντης 139 643 3006

*Notes*: The *Edition* follows the word division of the Nicetas catena ψιθύρισμα τῶν as two separate words (Nic, 415), which is possible. Here, *C*, *cI*, and even 555 were followed closely, and these witnesses attest to a genitive plural (though 3005 certainly has an accusative plural). Ms 3005 attests an accusative plural, which, even though a variant, indicates that an early scribe interpreted the text as a plural.

Internal considerations are not conclusive. The word, שֵׁמֶץ, is used only here and Job 4:12 in the Hebrew Bible. In 4:12, Sym renders it with ψιθυρισμόν, and the OG has the plural ἐξαίσια "remarkable things." This example may indicate that Sym intended a singular in 26:14 as well, but it is not clear why Sym used the -μος termination in 4:12 and the -μα termination here; therefore, Sym is not consistent in the only two examples. The singular ψιθύρισμα may best represent the singular in the HT in 26:14, but Sym changed the singular דָּבָר into the plural λόγων in the same phrase; therefore, Sym is not concerned with rendering the number of nouns in his source with a formal equivalence technique. The TLG retrieved fifty occurrences of the noun ψιθύρισμα, and of these instances seven are plural; thus, the plural is attested but not common.[1] Perhaps the later copyists divided the words according to common usage and not according to what Symmachus intended. These considerations make the internal evidence inconclusive.

Sym reads the Ketib (גבורתו) in 14b not the Qere.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 224; *AGK* 3, 44; Nic, 415).

[1]*TLG* [on-line]; accessed 17 October 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet.

## Chapter 27

**Job 27 1**

HT וַיֹּ֣סֶף אִ֭יּוֹב שְׂאֵ֥ת מְשָׁל֗וֹ וַיֹּאמַֽר׃

LXX Ἔτι δὲ προσθεὶς Ἰὼβ εἶπεν τῷ προοιμίῳ

# α′ καὶ Ἰὼβ προσέθηκεν ἆραι τὴν παραβολὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν

*Wit1:* ↓249 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓Syh$^{txt}$ ↓Ol$^{Y}$

*Attr:* α′] θ′ + ※ Syh$^{txt}$

*Var:* Ἰώβ] pr ο Ol$^{Y}$; Ἰώβ \ προσεθηκεν tr *cII* 555 | αὐτοῦ] > 249 | καὶ εἶπε] > *cII* 555

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܐܘܣܦ ܐܝܘܒ ܟܠ
ܫܘܪܝܐ ܐܡܪ

*Notes*: The lemma is established on 249 and Ol$^{Y}$. The *Edition* does not list the evidence of Syh in II App, but it lists four instances where Syh has placed the notation inaccurately (27:1, 27:18, 30:29, and 30:30; 77). There are three reasons to doubt the authenticity of Syh$^{txt}$ in this instance: (1) it does not contain a metobelus, which is highly unusual for this witness. (2) Not only is Syh the only witness to this asterisked line, but OG 29:1 preserves the same wording as here, thus showing that 27:1 is also OG. (3) The evidence of Syh contradicts Syh$^{txt}$, since the marginal note indicates that Th rendered the Hebrew שְׂאֵת with ἆραι (see *infra*), but the asterisked line in Syh$^{txt}$ does not have an equivalent for the Hebrew lemma; therefore, the evidence of 249 and Ol$^{Y}$ is more trustworthy than Syh.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is confirmed, since it is attested by *Kommentar* and Nic (*Kommentar*, 225; Nic, 417).

HT (וַיֹּ֣סֶף אִ֭יּוֹב) שְׂאֵ֥ת (מְשָׁל֗וֹ וַיֹּאמַֽר׃)

LXX (Ἔτι δὲ προσθεὶς Ἰὼβ)—(εἶπεν τῷ προοιμίῳ)

# θ′ ἆραι

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܠܡܫܩܠ

*Notes*: The index is over ܥܘܕ, which translates ἔτι. There is no word in the lemma, which corresponds to the marginal note, which is why the index is placed over the first word in the line.

**Job 27 2a**
HT (חַי־אֵל) הֵסִיר מִשְׁפָּטִי
LXX (Ζῇ κύριος,) ὃς οὕτω με κέκρικεν

σʹ ὃς παρεῖδε τὴν κρίσιν μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*⁻²⁶⁰ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* παρεῖδε] παρῖδεν *C* (= 3005) 395 680; παρειδεν *C* (= 788) 138-255 612 740; pr παρεδωκε μοι και 139

**Job 27 3a**
HT כִּי־כָל־עוֹד נִשְׁמָתִי בִי
LXX ἦ μὴν ἔτι τῆς πνοῆς μου ἐνούσης

σʹ ὅτι μέχρις οὗ ἡ ἀναπνοή μου ἐν ἐμοί

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*

*Wit2:* ἐνούσης] + εν εμοι *O L*-613 55 644 Co: cf M

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 138 3006

*Var:* ὅτι] > 3006 | ἡ] > 139 256

**Job 27 4a**
HT אִם־(תְּדַבֵּרְנָה שְׂפָתַי עַוְלָה)
LXX μὴ (λαλήσειν τὰ χείλη μου ἄνομα)

αʹ θʹ εἰ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI* (= 255 740)

*Var:* εἰ] σεμοῦ 740

*Notes*: The lemma and attribution of the *Edition* was based on 255 only, but now the *Nachlese* has listed 3005 in support of this lemma and attribution (*Nachlese*, 402). Ms 740 also preserves the attribution, but there is no explanation for the variant σεμοῦ (*Kollationen*, 170).

**Job 27 5b**

HT לֹא־אָסִיר תֻּמָּתִי מִמֶּנִּי׃

LXX οὐ γὰρ ἀπαλλάξω μου τὴν ἀκακίαν.

# σʹ οὐκ ἐκστήσομαι τῆς ἁπλότητός μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓249 ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 161′ ↓157

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* οὐκ] ου γαρ 249 | ἐκστήσομαι] αποστησομαι 157 | μου] > 559

*Notes*: The variant in 249 probably arose through LXX influence.
The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 226; *AGK* 3, 49-50; Nic, 419). Perhaps, Sym has influenced Olymp's exegesis of ἀκακίαν, since Olymp uses ἁπλότητα in a doublet, but Olymp shows no conscious dependence on Sym (*Kommentar*, 226).

**Job 27 6a**

HT (בְּצִדְקָתִי הֶחֱזַקְתִּי) וְלֹא אַרְפֶּהָ

LXX (δικαιοσύνῃ δὲ προσέχων) οὐ μὴ προῶμαι

# θʹ οὐκ ἀφήσω

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: This Th fragment is also in Origen's exegesis of 27:6a in place of οὐ μὴ προῶμαι (*AGK* 3, 50).

**Job 27 7a**

HT (כְרָשָׁע אֹיְבִי)—(יְהִי)
LXX (οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ εἴησαν οἱ ἐχθροί μου ὥσπερ) ἡ καταστροφὴ (τῶν ἀσεβῶν)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ↘ ܗܦܘܟܝܐ ÷

*Notes*: Syh and comparison of the OG with HT show that καταστροφή was sub obelus.

**Job 27 8a**
HT (כִּי מַה־תִּקְוַת חָנֵף) כִּי יִבְצָע
LXX (καὶ τίς γάρ ἐστιν ἐλπὶς ἀσεβεῖ) ὅτι ἐπέχει

# λʹ ὅτι πλεονεκτεῖ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 406 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 ↓161′

*Attr:* λʹ] αʹ σʹ 248; > 395; [] 406

*Var:* ὅτι] > 248 406 | πλεονεκτεῖ] ]ει 406

*Notes*: Prov 1:19 also has λʹ where πλεονέκτειν translates בצע (Reider, 194). In ms 406, only the verb termination can be seen (*Kollationen*, 171).

**Job 27 9a**
HT הַצַעֲקָתוֹ (יִשְׁמַע אֵל)
LXX ἦ (τὴν δέησιν αὐτοῦ εἰσακούσεται κύριος;)

# λʹ μή

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 395 643 680 732 3006

*Notes*: Ziegler was correct to cast suspicion on the placement of this fragment at 9b, since in 9b the HT has כי, and therefore one expects the Three to have ὅτι (*Beiträge*, 60). The evidence of 3005 is important, since it preserves the fragment next to 27:**9a** with an index over ἠ (*sic*) (*Kollationen*, 171). Internal evidence confirms that 3005 is correct, for the Three use μή for הֲ (Reider, 157; Gentry, 364; Busto Saiz, 265). Since the LXX has ἦ ... ἤ in 9ab, the scribe must have misplaced the fragment at 9b in the *Vorlage* of *cI*.

**Job 27 12b**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | (וְלָמָּה־זֶּה) הֶבֶל תֶּהְבָּלוּ׃ |
| LXX | (ὅτι) κενὰ κενοῖς ἐπιβάλλετε |

# σʹ ματαιολογεῖτε

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005)

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: This new fragment has been overlooked in the past, since it was only known in 250, which is anonymous, but now the *Nachlese* has discovered the fragment in 257 and 3005 with the attribution to Sym (*Nachlese*, 402). Furthermore, 788 also preserves the attribution to Sym with an index at κενά, showing that this attribution is part of the oldest Greek catena.

**Job 27 13b**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | וְנַחֲלַת עָרִיצִים מִשַּׁדַּי יִקָּחוּ׃ |
| LXX | κτῆμα δὲ δυναστῶν ἐλεύσεται παρὰ παντοκράτορος ἐπ’ αὐτούς. |

# σʹ θʹ καὶ κληρονομία ἣν οἱ ἀκαμπεῖς παρὰ τοῦ ἱκανοῦ κομίσονται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ θʹ] θʹ 255; σʹ 732; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* κληρονομία] κληρονομιαν 139 3006 | ἀκαμπεῖς] ακαμπης *C* (= 788-250) | τοῦ] > 138 | κομίσονται] κομησονται 395 559; κυμισονται 138; παρα του ικανου post κομισονται 137 139(μισουνται) 260 643 732 3006

*Notes*: The attributions are inverted (θʹ σʹ) in 137 138 555 559 612 680 740 3006.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 227; *AGK* 3, 52-3; Nic, 420).

**Job 27 14b**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | וְצֶאֱצָאָיו (לֹא יִשְׂבְּעוּ־לָחֶם׃) |
| LXX | (ἐὰν δὲ καὶ) ἀνδρωθῶσιν, (προσαιτήσουσιν·) |

## ⟨σʹ⟩ οἱ ἀπόγονοι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Notes*: Although the two *C* mss passed down this version anonymously, it is still a translation for צֶאֱצָאָיו, which the LXX rendered freely with ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀνδρωθῶσιν (*Nachlese*, 402). Ms 788 also preserves the fragment *sine nomine*.

The Hebrew lemma צֶאֱצָאִים concretely refers to plants or “that which emerges” and it has this meaning in Isa 34:1, 42:5, and Job 31:8. The metaphorical meaning refers to human descendants, which is the meaning in Job 27:14. There is evidence for the Three at Isa 22:24, where the LXX rendered the Hebrew with ἀπὸ μικροῦ. Hi preserves the Aq reading as *sasaim* and the Sym reading with *nepotes*. In the same verse, Th renders the Hebrew with σκεύος τὸ μικρόν. In Isa 65:23, there is a reading with a double attribution to Sym and Th τὰ ἔκγονα, where the LXX uses σπέρμα to render צֶאֱצָאִים. In Job 31:8, Sym uses τὰ ἔκγονα to render צֶאֱצָאִים, which probably has the meaning “plants” or “growth” in this context. In Isa 14:22 and Job 18:19, Aq has γονή for Heb נכד “progeny” and Sym has ἀπόγονος in Isa 14:22.

From the available evidence, Th and Aq may be dismissed as the author of this fragment. Th does not use the root -γον- for צֶאֱצָאִים, unless Isa 65:23 does apply to him as well as Sym, which seems improbable given the instance in Isa 22:24. In two places, Aq uses -γον- for נכד and he transliterates צֶאֱצָאִים once. Only Sym uses the root -γον- consistently to render צֶאֱצָאִים; however, Sym also uses -γον- to render נכד. It is noteworthy that the Vulgate at Job 27:14b has *nepotes*, and Jerome also translated Sym’s lemma with *nepotes* in Isa 22:24. Perhaps, the Greek for Sym in Isa 22:24 was from απογον-. Given the evidence of translation equivalents, the attribution to Sym is probable.

**Job 27 17b**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | (וְכֶסֶף) נָקִי (יַחֲלֹק׃) |
| LXX | (τὰ δὲ χρήματα αὐτοῦ) ἀληθινοὶ (καθέξουσιν) |

## αʹ θʹ ἀθῷοι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–138\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732}$

*Attr:* αʹ θʹ] αʹ *C* (= 257 3005) 3006; > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The attribution is inverted (θʹ αʹ) in 395 (*Kollationen*, 172).

Although there is strong external evidence for attributing this fragment to Aq alone, considerations of internal evidence support the lemma as it stands. Aq renders נָקִי with ἀθῷος in Deut 19:10 (Prov 1:11 and 6:17 in H-R depend on Nobil readings in Field and

are thus excluded at present), and Th also renders נָקִי with ἀθῷος in Judg 15:3 and he uses it in Sus(Dan 13):53. Ms 788 now confirms that the double attribution is correct.

# σʹ ἀναίτιοι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260}$

*Attr:* σʹ] θʹ *C* (= 3005); > *C* (= 788-250) 138

*Var:* ἀναίτιοι] ανετιοι 612 740

*Notes*: Sym translates נָקִי with ἀναίτιος in Ps 9(10):29(8) (Busto Saiz, 465), but beyond this instance, there is not another clear example. There is no clear evidence for Th's use of this word, since ἀναίτιον in Isa 59:7 is anon in Q and attributed to λʹ by Eus. Syh is the only witness to Th, and it cannot be the final arbiter due to the limitation of retroversions; therefore, the attribution to Sym is most probable, and instead of applying the attribution to Th to the first fragment, 3005 applied it incorrectly to the second fragment.

**Job 27 18 fin**

HT (בָּנָה כָעָשׁ בֵּיתוֹ וּכְסֻכָּה עָשָׂה) נֹצֵר׃

E (ἀπέβη δὲ ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ σῆτες καὶ ὥσπερ ἀράχνη)—.

# σʹ ※ ἃ συνετήρησεν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* fin] + ο πλουτος αυτου *L*ʹ-613-644$^{c}$ 55 795 Glos Dam; + (α sub ※ Syh) α συνετηρησε(ν) *O lIII C*ʹ-296: cf M; + α συ προσθησει 253

*Attr:* σʹ (ἐκ τῶν Συμ 3005(**19a**) 740 612; ἐκ τῶν σʹ 559) 255 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* 18 fin sub ※ 3005(**19a**) 740 255 612 559 395 137(pr αυτου) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܣ ܗܠܝܢ ↘ܕܢܛܪ.

*Notes*: This fragment is imbedded in the text of the relevant witnesses. The attribution and asterisk are placed erroneously at the beginning of v. 19 in 3005.

The Hexapla has influenced the transmission of the text. The best witnesses of *cI* and Syh$^{txt}$ preserve the lemma, attribution, and asterisk at the end of v. 18, but the middle to the bottom of *AGK* stemma (*AGK* 1, 61) preserve only the lemma of Sym, while the attribution and asterisk dropped out of the text.

**Job 27 19a**
HT עָשִׁיר יִשְׁכַּב (וְלֹא יֵאָסֵף)
E (πλούσιος κοιμηθεὶς) καὶ οὐ προσθήσει

# θʹ ※ καὶ οὐ προσθήσει

*Wit1:* Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܬ ܘܠܐ ܢܘܣܦ ↘.

*Notes*: The asterisk and attribution are imbedded in the text of Syh.

**Job 27 19b**
HT עֵינָיו פָּקַח וְאֵינֶנּוּ׃
E ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ διήνοιξεν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1*: *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-139\ 138\ 260\ 395\ 559\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ Arm La ↓Sa ↓Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr*: θʹ 3005 255 612] > rel

*Var*: lemma] > Sa | 19b sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 137 643 La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܥܝ̈ܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܦܬܚ ܘܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ↘.
La ※ *oculos suos aperuit, et non est*
Arm ※ զաչս իւր եբաց և ոչ եւս իցէ

**Job 27 20a**
HT (תַּשִּׂיגֵהוּ כַמַּיִם) בַּלָּהוֹת
LXX (συνήντησαν αὐτῷ ὥσπερ ὕδωρ) αἱ ὀδύναι

# αʹ σʹ ἀνυπαρξία

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 260}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* αʹ σʹ] σʹ *C* (= 3005) 139 395 *cII* 555 161

*Var:* ἀνυπαρξία] ανυπαρξιαι 137 139 643 732 3006; ανυπαρξ() 257

*Notes*: The authors are inverted (σʹ αʹ) in *C* (= 257). The accusative singular (ἀνυπαρξίαν) in 512-513 is not a variant, since the accusative case is required by the context. The *Edition* listed the plural equally alongside the singular and did not make a decision on the original text or attribution. The plural agrees with the number of the OG, which indicates that harmonization may have happened. The representatives of the oldest Greek catena *C* (= 788-250 3005) support the singular. The same Hebrew word occurs in Job 18:14b and the hexaplaric fragment, attributed to Aq and Sym, also contains the singular form (Reider, 23; Woods 333). These considerations lend weight to original singular form and the double attribution.

The Hebrew word means "sudden terror," which is not a meaning for the Greek word, ἀνυπαρξία. Ziegler, following Liebreich, suggests that the revision results from the reading of Aramaic *balhot*, lit. no existence/being, and this meaning corresponds to the Greek (*Beiträge*, 29; Liebreich, *JBL* 64 (1944): 400f).

**Job 27 20b**

HT לַיְלָה (גְּנָבַתּוּ סוּפָה׃)

LXX νυκτὶ (δὲ ὑφείλατο αὐτὸν γνόφος)

# αʹ σʹ θʹ νύκτος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 260}$

*Attr:* αʹ σʹ θʹ] θʹ *C* (= 788-250); οἱ γʹ *C* (= 257); 3006$^{inc}$

*Notes*: The order of the authors in 3005 (θʹ σʹ αʹ) and 395 (σʹ θʹ αʹ) differ from the order of the lemma.

**Job 27 21-23**

HT
יִשָּׂאֵהוּ קָדִים וְיֵלַךְ
וִישָׂעֲרֵהוּ מִמְּקֹמוֹ׃
וְיַשְׁלֵךְ עָלָיו וְלֹא יַחְמֹל
מִיָּדוֹ בָּרוֹחַ יִבְרָח׃
יִשְׂפֹּק עָלֵימוֹ כַפֵּימוֹ
וְיִשְׁרֹק עָלָיו מִמְּקֹמוֹ׃

E
ἀναλήμψεται αὐτὸν καύσων καὶ ἀπελεύσεται
καὶ λικμήσει αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ.
καὶ ἐπιρρίψει ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν καὶ οὐ φείσεται·
ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ φυγῇ φεύξεται·
κροτήσει ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς χεῖρας αὐτῶν
καὶ συριεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–138 260 680 3006 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ ς̅ 3005 740 612 559 395)] > rel

*Var:* lemma] > Sa | 21-23 sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 559 395(non **22b 23**) 137(non **21a**) 643(non **21a**) 732(non **21a**) 139(non **21a 22b 23**) 248 252(non **21 23a**) Arm(non **21 22**) La(non **22 23**) Syh[txt](non **22b-23a**)

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]
※ ܢܣܒܝܘܗܝ، ܚܘܡܐ ܘܢܐܙܠ.
※ ܘܢܕܪܝܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܕܘܟܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܢܫܕܘܗܝ، ܘܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ. ↘
※ ܘܢܫܪܩܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܕܘܟܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ. ↘

La ※ *tollet eum aestus, et* (※ pr β) *abibit et ventilabit eum de loco suo* ↙

Arm ※ Ծափ զծափի հարցէ ի վերայ նորա
※և քարշեսցէ զնա ի տեղւոջէ իւրմէ

**Job 27 23a**

HT יִשְׂפֹּק עָלֵימוֹ כַפֵּימוֹ

E κροτήσει ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς χεῖρας αὐτῶν

# α′ συγκροτήσει ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ταρσοὺς αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr:* Syh
ܐ. ܢܩܪܘܒ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ
ܦܣܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ.

*Notes*: Aq does use κροτέω for ספק (Reider, 141), and Field has suggested that the retroversion should be συγκροτέω (Field, 48 n. 14). Furthermore, he reconstructs the other elements of the retroversion by noting that Syh has ܦܣܬܐ for ταρσός in an Aquila fragment in Isa 1:6 (Field, 48 n. 14).

The Cairo Geniza (CG) fragment, T-S NS 309.9, preserves putative readings of Aquila (Lange, *VT* 30 (1980): 291-4), and the *Edition* followed de Lange closely in these verses. De Lange assigned κρούσει (= קרושי in CG) to Aq, but this suggestion is problematic, since there is no evidence that Aq uses this word (Reider, 141). In an unpublished article, Peter Gentry has shown that the CG texts are not derived from the Three in Ecclesiastes; thus, it is better to conclude that CG represents a late Byzantine revision of the LXX in this instance, not the version of Aq.

# ⟨σ′⟩ ψοφήσουσιν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ταῖς χερσὶν

αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr:* Syh ܢܩܦܘܢ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ
ܟܐ̈ܕܝܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ❖

*Notes*: The attribution to Sym is in brackets because there is no attribution in Syh. This fragment follows Aq and is separated by a punctuation mark. Since the Th fragment is under the asterisk and the Aq fragment is clearly marked, the attribution to Sym is probable. H-R records one instance of the verb ψοφεῖν in the Three in I Ki 21:13(14) where it has a double attribution to Sym and Th.

**Job 27 23b**

HT וְיִשְׁרֹק (עָלָיו מִמְּקֹמוֹ׃)

E (καὶ) συριεῖ (αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ)

## σʹ ἐκσυριεῖ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-260}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ἐκσυριεῖ] + αὐτόν *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: The scribe has added the 3ms pronoun to the lemma from the bible text in 3005.

## Chapter 28

**Job 28 1b**
HT (וּמָקוֹם לַזָּהָב) יָזֹקּוּ׃
LXX (τόπος δὲ χρυσίῳ,) ὅθεν διηθεῖται.

# λʹ ὅθεν χωνευθῇ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260}$ *cII* 555 161 ↓252

*Wit2:* διηθεῖται] δεηθηται 336; χωνευτη 256

*Attr:* λʹ] σʹ 252; οἱ γʹ *C* (= 257); > *C* (= 788-250) 680

*Var:* ὅθεν] οπου 252

*Notes*: The attribution and lemma are established by the catena. The limited evidence of translation technique favors the reading and attribution of 252, since there is evidence that Aq translates זקק with διυλίζειν in Ps 11(12):7 (Reider, 59). On the basis of this evidence Ziegler asserts that Aq cannot have translated זקק with χωνεύειν (*Beiträge*, 60). The word ὅθεν is the lemma of the LXX, and ὅπου is used by Symmachus in a number of places, and it is not used by Aq except for Ezek 20:34, where there is a double attribution with Symmachus, and Syh Job 28:4 (*Beiträge*, 60; H-R, 1004). Although these factors favor the reading of 252, more evidence is needed to establish the translational equivalents in order to accept the lemma of 252 over and against the catena tradition.

**Job 28 2b**
HT וְאֶבֶן יָצוּק (נְחוּשָׁה׃)
LXX (χαλκὸς δὲ) ἴσα λίθῳ λατομεῖται.

# ἑβρʹ ἀπὸ λίθων χωνεύεται

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI cII* 555 ↓161

*Var:* χωνεύεται] χωευεται 612; χονευεται 161

**Job 28 3a**
HT קֵץ (שָׂם לַחֹשֶׁךְ)
LXX τάξιν (ἔθετο σκότει,)

# αʹ τέλος

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 559 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

# σʹ προθεσμίαν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–559 *cII* 555 161

*Var:* προθεσμίαν] προθεσμια 740; προοιμιον 395

# θʹ πέρας

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 559 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

*Var:* πέρας] τερας 138-255 395 612 740

**Job 28 3b-4a**

HT
וּלְכָל־תַּכְלִית הוּא חוֹקֵר
אֶבֶן אֹפֶל וְצַלְמָוֶת׃
פָּרַץ נַחַל מֵעִם־גָּר

E
καὶ πᾶν πέρας αὐτὸς ἐξακριβάζεται·
λίθος σκοτία καὶ σκιὰ θανάτου,
διακοπὴ χειμάρρου ἀπὸ κονίας·

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–137 138 139 260 559 643 680 732 3006 248 252 Arm La ↓Sa ↓Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ γ̅ 3005 740 255 612 395(**3c**)) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] > Sa | 3b-4a sub ※ 3005(non **4a**) 740 255(non **3b**) 612 395(non **3b**) 248 252(non **3c 4a**) Arm(non **4a**) La Syh[txt]

*NonGr:* Syh[txt]
ܬ ※ ܘܠܟܠ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܗܘ ܒܨܐ
※ ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ.
※ ܟܐܦܐ ܚܫܘܟܐ ܘܛܠܠܐ ܕܡܘ̈ܬܐ
※ ܬܒܘܪܬܐ ܕܢܚܪ ܚܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܦܪܐ ↘

La *et* (pr ※ μ) *omnem finem ipse invenit.*
*lapis* (pr ※ μ) *tenebrae et umbrae mortis,*
*discissio* (*discussio* β; pr ※ μ) *torrentis a cinere* (+ ↙ μ)

Arm ※ և զամենայն վախճան ինքն ճշմարտէ

※ զքար և զխաւար և զստուերս մահու

**Job 28 3c**

HT אֶבֶן אֹפֶל וְצַלְמָוֶת׃
E λίθος σκοτία καὶ σκιὰ θανάτου,

## α′ λίθος σκοτομήνης καὶ σκιὰ θανάτου

*Wit1:* ↓252

*Var:* λίθος *conj*. Ziegler] λιθοις 252 cod

*Notes*: Ms 252 has the dative plural, but the *Edition* has correctly emended the text to agree with the HT.

## σ′ λίθος ζόφος καὶ σκιὰ θανάτου

*Wit1:* 252

**Job 28 4a**

HT (פָּרַץ) נַחַל מֵעִם־גָּר
E (διακοπὴ) χειμάρρου ἀπὸ κονίας·

## α′ χειμάρρους ὅπου κονία

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܐܪ̈ ܠܠܬܐ ܐܝܟܐ
ܕܥܦܪܐ

*Notes*: The index is over ܬܘܪܥܬܐ, which is the first word in the line, but the lemma only applies to the revision of the last three words. The retroversion is from Field (Field, 49).

HT פָּרַץ נַחַל מֵעִם־גָּר
E διακοπὴ χειμάρρου ἀπὸ κονίας·

## σ′ διακοπὴ φάραγγος ὅπου κονία

*Wit1:* 252

**Job 28 4b**

HT (הַנִּשְׁכָּחִים מִנִּי־רָגֶל דַּלּוּ מֵאֱנוֹשׁ) נָעוּ׃

LXX (οἱ δὲ ἐπιλανθανόμενοι ὁδὸν δικαίαν ἠσθένησαν ἐκ βροτῶν.)—

# σʹ ἐσείσθησαν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܐܬܬܙܝܥܘ

*Notes*: The index is over ܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ, the last word in the line, and the marginal note represents an addition to the OG, which corresponds to the HT נָעוּ. The retroversion is Field’s (Field, 49). Field also leaves open the possibility that ἐσαλεύθησαν could be the retroversion (Field, 49), but this lemma is attributed to Th in the catena tradition (see *infra*).

# θʹ ※ ἐσαλεύθησαν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*

*Wit2:* fin] + εσαλευθησαν La (※ *et commoti sunt*) *lI*ʹ-Iul$^{com}$ *C*ʹ-296 = M

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ τῶν(> 395 559) θʹ(θεʹ 3005) τὸ ἡμιστίχιον(-στοίχειον 3005) ὁμοίως(> 395; + δε 788 3005) καὶ οἱ θ̅(ο̅ 3005)) 788 3005 740 255 612 559 395] > rel

*Var:* sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 559 395] > rel

*NonGr*: La ※ *et commoti sunt*.

*Notes*: In 788 the scholion is as follows: τὸ ἡμιστίχιον ἐκ τῶν θʹ ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ θ̅. The attribution and the text under the asterisk are well attested in 255 395 559 612 740 and 3005 (*Kollationen*, 176). In 3005, there is an attribution to θʹ in addition to the asterisk. The catena attests to this half line (4b) and the following nine lines (5-9a) as coming from Theodotion (ἐκ τῶν θʹ τὸ ἡμιστίχιον ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ θ̅; see *infra*).

**Job 28 5-9a**

HT

אֶרֶץ מִמֶּנָּה יֵצֵא־לָחֶם
וְתַחְתֶּיהָ נֶהְפַּךְ כְּמוֹ־אֵשׁ׃

מְקוֹם־סַפִּיר אֲבָנֶיהָ
וְעַפְרֹת זָהָב לוֹ׃
נָתִיב לֹא־יְדָעוֹ עָיִט
וְלֹא שְׁזָפַתּוּ עֵין אַיָּה׃
לֹא־הִדְרִיכֻהוּ בְנֵי־שָׁחַץ
לֹא־עָדָה עָלָיו שָׁחַל׃
בַּחַלָּמִישׁ שָׁלַח יָדוֹ

E

γῆ, ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐξελεύσεται ἄρτος,
ὑποκάτω αὐτῆς ἐστράφη ὡσεὶ πῦρ.
τόπος σαπφίρου οἱ λίθοι αὐτῆς,
καὶ χῶμα, χρυσίον αὐτῷ.
τρίβος, οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτὴν πετεινόν,
καὶ οὐ παρέβλεψεν αὐτὴν ὀφθαλμὸς γυπός·
οὐκ ἐπάτησαν αὐτὴν υἱοὶ ἀλαζόνων,
οὐ παρῆλθεν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς λέων.
ἐν ἀκροτόμῳ ἐξέτεινεν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ,

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*$^{–137\ 138\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ τῶν(> 395 559) θʹ(θεʹ 3005) τὸ ἡμιστίχιον(-στοίχειον 3005) ὁμοίως(> 395; + δε 788 3005) καὶ οἱ θ̅(ο̅ 3005)) 788 3005 740 255 612 559 395] > rel

*Var:* lemma] > Sa | 5-9a sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 559(non **8 9a**) 395 248 252 Arm La(non **6b**) Syh$^{txt}$(non **5ab**)

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$

※ ܐܬܪܐ ܕܣܦܝܪܐ ܟܐ̈ܦܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇.
※ ܘܥܦܪܐ ܕܕܗܒܐ ܠܗ.
※ ܫܒܝܠܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܗ̇ ܦܪܚܬܐ.
※ ܘܠܐ ܚܙܬ ܠܗ̇ ܥܝܢܐ ܕܢܫܪܐ.
※ ܠܐ ܕܫܘܗ̇ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܫܘܒܗܪܐ.
※ ܠܐ ܥܒܪ ܥܠܘܗ̇ ܐܪܝܐ.
※ ܒܛܪܢܐ ܐܘܫܛ ܐܝܕܐ ܕܝܠܗ. ↘

La

*terra* (pr ※ μ) *de qua egressus est panis*
*super eam* (pr ※ μ) *versus est quasi ignis.*
*locus* (pr ※ μ) *sapphiri lapides eius,*
*et aurum eius agger ei.*
*semitam* (pr ※ μ) *quam non cognovit avis,*
*nec* (pr ※ μ) *vidit eam oculus vulturis,*

*nec* (pr ※ μ) *calcaverunt eam filii arrogantium,*
*nec* (pr ※ μ; *non* β) *transiit super eam leo.*
*in* (pr ※ μ) *durissimo lapide extendit manum suam*↙

Arm ※ Երկիր ի նմանէ ելցէ հաց
※ և ի ներքոյ նորա իբրեւ զհուր շրջեցաւ
※ Տեղի շափիղայի քարինք նորա
※ և հող նորա ոսկի
※ Շաւիղ է զոր ոչ ծանեաւ թռչուն
※ և ոչ դիտեաց զնա ակն անգեղ
※ Եւ ոչ կոխեցեն զնա որդիք ամբարտաւանից
※ ոչ անց ի նա առիւծ
※ Յապառաժն ձգեաց զձեռն իւր

*Notes*: The negative evidence of the Sa and the positive evidence of the catena 248 252, and the Armenian version establish the asterisk for all of the lines. Furthermore, the catena tradition establishes the attribution to Th for these lines (ἐκ τῶν θʹ τὸ ἡμιστίχιον ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ θ̅).

**Job 28 6b**

HT וְעַפְרֹת זָהָב לוֹ׃

E καὶ χῶμα, χρυσίον αὐτῷ.

# αʹ καὶ μόλιβος χρυσοῦς αὐτῷ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܐܒܪܐ ܕܕܗܒܐ ܠܗ܀

*Notes*: Job 19:24a contains an instance of μολίβος under an asterisk for Hebrew עפרת, and Syh rendered it with ܐܒܪܐ in that instance; therefore, internal evidence supports retroversion from Field (Field, 49).

# σʹ καὶ ὡσεὶ μόλιβος χρυσοῦς αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܘܐܝܟ ܐܒܪܐ ܕܕܗܒܐ ܕܝܠܗ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 49).

**Job 28 8a**

HT שָֽׁחַץ(לֹא־הִדְרִיכֻהוּ בְנֵי־)

E (οὐκ ἐπάτησαν αὐτὴν υἱοὶ) ἀλαζόνων

# α′ βαναυσίας

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: Ms 252 does not contain the word υἱοί, but Job 41:26b does have α′ ὑιοὺς βαναυσιάς in 248. The *Edition* supplied υἱοί in the absence of ms evidence.

# σ′ τέκνα σκανδάλου

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: Ms 252 appears as τέκνα σκανδάλ[ (252,86r). The lemma represents the conjecture of the *Edition*, which is most probable since HT and Aq are singular. Although Sym uses a different translation equivalent in Job 41:26, he still uses a singular noun in that verse (παντὸς βρωμώδους). The other possible form would be the genitive plural σκανδάλων, which would follow Th (see *supra*).

**Job 28 10a**

HT בַּצּוּרוֹת יְאֹרִים בִּקֵּעַ

LXX δίνας δὲ ποταμῶν ἔρρηξεν

# α′ ἐν στερεοῖς ῥεῖθρα διέσχισαν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh .ܐ. ܒܠ̈ܚܫܝܬܐ ܢ̈ܗܪܐ
ܦ̣ܪܩܘ܀

*Notes*: The lemma and attribution are established by Syh and the retroversion is from Field (Field, 49 n. 11). Aq uses στερεός for צוּר (Reider, 221). The evidence in CG, (ἀβροχίαι = אברוכיאיש), does not represent a variant of the Aq fragment, but a Byzantine version of the LXX, which read HT as either בַּצָּרוֹת or בַּצֹּרוֹת. Aq does translate this Hebrew word with ἀβροχία in Jer 14:1 (de Lange, 294), but since Aq usually agrees with the proto-Masoretic text, Syh probably preserves Aq, and CG probably preserves a separate version. Since the Aq reading is established, Cox is correct to suggest that the Arm fragment was intended to be a correction to the bible text, and Aq's name became attached to it accidentally (Cox, 335).

## σʹ τὰ ῥεῖθρα τὰ συνεχόμενα τῶν ποταμῶν διέσχισαν

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | ῥεῖθρα] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 395 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 559

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܪ̈ܕܝܐ ܡܬܐ̈ܚܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ
ܕܢܗܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܦܣܩܘ܀

*Notes*: Field suggests either συνεχόμενα or στενοχωρούμενα as the retroversion of ܡܬܐ̈ܚܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ (Field, 49).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 234; *AGK* 3, 64; Nic, 427).

HT בַּצּוּרוֹת (יְאֹרִים בִּקֵּעַ)
LXX δίνας (δὲ ποταμῶν ἔρρηξεν)

## θʹ ὀχυρώματα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI cII* 555 161 Syh

*Attr:* θʹ] σʹ 137; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ὀχυρώματα] ωχυρωματα 395

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܚܣܢ̈ܐ

*Notes*: The lemma reflects a Hebrew vocalization of בְּצוּרוֹת, “inaccessible” or “unassailable” (KB, 147).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 234; *AGK* 3, 64; Nic, 427).

**Job 28 10b**
HT (וְכָל־יְקָר רָאֲתָה) עֵינוֹ׃
LXX (πᾶν δὲ ἔντιμον εἶδέν) μου (ὁ ὀφθαλμός·)

## λʹ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{–137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓Arm

*Wit2:* μου ὁ ὀφθαλμός] αυτου ο οφθ. A-S$^{c}$-Iul; *oculus eius* La$^{μ}$ = M

*Attr:* λʹ] αʹ Arm

*NonGr*: Arm ակն նորա

*Notes*: Arm preserves the fragment with an attribution to Aq (Cox, 335-7).

**Job 28 11a**

HT (מִבְּכִי נְהָרוֹת) חִבֵּשׁ

LXX (βάθη δὲ ποταμῶν) ἀνεκάλυψεν

# ⟨αʹ⟩ ἐμότωσεν

*Wit1:* CG

*NonGr*: CG אימוטושין

*Notes*: Of the Three only Aq uses μοτοῦν, and he uses it to render חבשׁ (Job 5:18, Isa 3:7, 30:26, and 61:1) and חבשׁ pu (Isa 1:6 and Ezek 30:21; Reider, 160). The LXX translates חבשׁ with μοτοῦν only in Hos 6:2 (H-R, 935). The evidence favors that the Byzantine version has borrowed from Aq, even though this conclusion cannot be proven.

# θʹ ἐξηρεύνησεν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–260\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* θʹ] αʹ 612; > *C* (= 788-250) 395

*Var:* ἐξηρεύνησεν] –σαν *C* (= 788-250) 138-255 559 612 680 740

*Notes*: Although many strong witnesses have the plural –σαν, *C* (= 3005) preserves the original singular, which agrees with the HT.

The Th version presupposes a Hebrew *Vorlage* of חפשׂ, “to search, examine.” In Psalm 64:7, Th uses the same equivalent.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 234-5; *AGK* 3, 64-5; Nic, 428).

**Job 28 11b**

HT וְתַעֲלֻמָהּ יֹצִא אוֹר׃
LXX ἔδειξεν δὲ ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν εἰς φῶς.

# σʹ ἀπὸ δὲ ὑπερορωμένου προῆλθεν φῶς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 395

*Var:* προῆλθεν] εδειξε 139 260 643 680 3006; εδεξε 137

*Notes*: The variants εδειξε and εδεξε are from the LXX and are only found in the mss, which comprise the bottom of the Hagedorns' stemma (*AGK* 1, 61). Probably, ms 680 introduced it into the textual transmission.

**Job 28 12a**
HT (וְהַחָכְמָה מֵאַיִן) תִּמָּצֵא
LXX (ἡ δὲ σοφία πόθεν) εὑρέθη;

# αʹ θʹ εὑρεθήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) *cI*$^{-260\ 732}$ ↓512-513 ↓259 ↓555 ↓620 ↓161

*Attr:* αʹ θʹ] λʹ 259 512-513 555 620 161; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: The *Edition* did not include the variant attribution to οἱ λοιποί in II App, which is only found in witnesses of the Nicetas catena and 161. For this reading the Hagedorns have provided me with the evidence of Nicetas catena mss 259 and 620. Although the demonstration of the relationship of 161 to Nic still awaits further research, this instance provides evidence that 161 is closer to Nic than *C* and *cI*.

**Job 28 13a**
HT (לֹא־יָדַע אֱנוֹשׁ) עֶרְכָּהּ
LXX (οὐκ οἶδεν βροτὸς) ὁδὸν (αὐτῆς,)

# αʹ τάξιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* αʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* τάξιν] ταξις 559

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 235-6; *AGK* 3, 65-7; Nic, 428).

# θʹ σύνεσιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* σύνεσιν] συνεσις 559; συνεισιν 395

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 235-6; *AGK* 3, 65-7; Nic, 428).

# σʹ τὸ τίμημα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-732}$ ↓*cII* 555 161

*Var:* τό] > 512-513 703

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 235-6; *AGK* 3, 65-7; Nic, 428).

**Job 28 14-19**

HT

תְּהוֹם אָמַר לֹא בִי־הִיא
וְיָם אָמַר אֵין עִמָּדִי׃
לֹא־יֻתַּן סְגוֹר תַּחְתֶּיהָ
וְלֹא יִשָּׁקֵל כֶּסֶף מְחִירָהּ׃
לֹא־תְסֻלֶּה בְּכֶתֶם אוֹפִיר
בְּשֹׁהַם יָקָר וְסַפִּיר׃
לֹא־יַעַרְכֶנָּה זָהָב וּזְכוֹכִית
וּתְמוּרָתָהּ כְּלִי־פָז׃
רָאמוֹת וְגָבִישׁ לֹא יִזָּכֵר
וּמֶשֶׁךְ חָכְמָה מִפְּנִינִים׃
לֹא־יַעַרְכֶנָּה פִּטְדַת־כּוּשׁ
בְּכֶתֶם טָהוֹר לֹא תְסֻלֶּה׃

E

ἄβυσσος εἶπεν Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοί·
καὶ θάλασσα εἶπεν Οὐκ ἔστιν μετ’ ἐμοῦ.
οὐ δώσει συγκλεισμὸν ἀντ’ αὐτῆς,

καὶ οὐ σταθήσεται ἀργύριον ἀντάλλαγμα αὐτῆς·
καὶ οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται χρυσίῳ Ὠφίρ,
ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ·
οὐκ ἰσωθήσεται αὐτῇ χρυσίον καὶ ὕαλος
καὶ τὸ ἄλλαγμα αὐτῆς σκεύη χρυσᾶ·
μετέωρα καὶ γαβὶς οὐ μνησθήσεται,
καὶ ἕλκυσον σοφίαν ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσώτατα·
οὐκ ἰσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τοπάζιον Αἰθιοπίας,
χρυσίῳ καθαρῷ οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται.

## θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–138 260 680 3006 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh^txt

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ ιβ̅ 3005 740 255(**14b**) 612 559 395; θʹ 137 643(**14a 15a**) 139 (**14a 15a**)) Syh^txt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] > Sa | 14-19 sub ※ 3005(non **15 16a 19**) 740(+ **20a**) 255(non **14b**; + **20a**) 612(+ **20a**) 559(non **18b**; + **20a**) 395(non **16b-19**) 137(non **16b 17b**; + **20a**) 643(non **16b 18a**; + **20a**) 732(non **14-15 16b 17a 18-19a**; + **20a**) 139(non **14a 16b-19**; + **21b**) 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh^txt

*NonGr:* Syh^txt

ܬ ※ ܬܗܘܡܐ ܐܡܪ̇ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܒܝ.
※ ܘܝܡܐ ܐܡܪ̇ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܥܡܝ.
※ ܠܐ ܢܬܠ ܣܓܘܪܐ ܚܠܦܝܗ̇.
※ ܘܠܐ ܢܬܬܩܠ ܟܣܦܐ ܬܘܠܦܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇.
※ ܘܠܐ ܬܬܦܠܓ ܥܡ ܕܗܒܐ ܕܐܘܦܝܪ.
※ ܒܐܘܢܘܟܣ ܝܩܝܪܬܐ ܘܣܦܝܪܐ.
※ ܘܠܐ ܢܫܬܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܕܗܒܐ ܘܙܓܘܓܝܬܐ.
※ ܘܚܘܠܦܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇ ܡܐ̈ܢܐ ܕܕܗܒܐ.
※ ܪ̈ܡܬܐ ܘܓܒܝܫ ܠܐ ܬܬܕܟܪ.
※ ܘܬܘܦ ܣܚܘܒܬܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ
※ ܕܓܘ ܓܘܝ̈ܢ.
※ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܛܘܦܐܙܝܢ ܕܟܘܫ.
※ ܥܡ ܕܗܒܐ ܕܟܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܬܦܠܓܐ. ↘

La

*abyssus* (pr ※ μ) *dixit Non est in me,*
*et mare dixit Non est mecum* ↙
*non* (pr ※ μ) *dabitur aurum* ÷ *conclusum* (+ ↙ β) *pro ea,*
*et non appendetur argentum in commutatione eius.*
*non erit deterior auro Ophir,*
*onyche pretioso et sapphiro*

*non aequabitur ei aurum et vitrum,*
*nec* (pr ※ μ) *commutatio eius vasa aurea,*
*et Excelsa, et Gabis non erunt in memoria.*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *trahes sapientiam de absconditis.*
*non componetur ei topadium Aethiopiae.*
*auro* (pr ※ μ) *mundo non comparabitur.*

Arm ※ Անդունդք ասացին թե չէ առ իս
※ և ծով ասաց թե չէ ընդ ինեւ
※ Ոչ տացի զրաւական ընդ նորա
※ և ոչ կշռեսցի արծաթ ընդ զնոց նորա
※ Եւ ոչ բարձցի ընգ ոսկւոյն Սովփերայ
※ ընդ եղնգան պատուականի և ընդ շափիղայի
※ Ոչ զուգեսցի ընգ նմա ոսկի և ապակի
※ և ի գինս նորա անաւթք ոսկեղէնք
※ Բարձրութիւնք և խորութիւնք ոչ յիշեսցին
※ և ձգեաց զիմաստութիւն Քան զներքսագոյնս
※ Ոչ հաւասարեսցէ նմա տպազիոնն Եթեովպացւոց
※ ընդ ոսկւոյ սրբոյ ոչ բարձցի

*Notes*: La does not have all of the lines under the asterisk. According to the stichomotry of the *Edition*, La only preserves five out of the twelve lines under the asterisk. The single metobelus at 14b probably indicates that this line was intended to be under the asterisk.

**Job 28 15a**

HT לֹא־יֻתַּן סְגוֹר תַּחְתֶּיהָ

E οὐ δώσει συγκλεισμὸν ἀντ᾽ αὐτῆς,

# α′ οὐ δώσει ἀπόκλειστον ἀντ᾽ αὐτῆς

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: The reading of Aq only differs from the bible text with respect to the translation of סְגוֹר, which Aq renders with ἀπόκλειστος (see 3 Rgns 6:20; Field 1, 605; Job 41:7b, if the anonymous fragment in 248 is attributed to him).

# σ′ οὐκ ἀντιδοθήσεται χρυσίον πρωτεῖον αὐτῆς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ ↓687 252

*Wit2:* δώσει] *dabitur* La = M

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 3005) 252] > rel

*Var:* οὐκ] ουδε 687 | ἀντιδοθήσεται] αντισωθησεται *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-732}$; + αυτη *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138-255}$ | πρωτεῖον] πρωτιον *C* (= 788-250) | αὐτῆς 252] > rel

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* reports that ms 3005 also preserves the attribution to Sym, hitherto absent in the catena, which now confirms the attribution in 252 (*Nachlese*, 402).

The placement of this fragment at 15a (*pace Edition* at 16a) is based on the Hagedorns' new collation of the catena materials. The fragment occurs beside 15b in 138 139 255 612 643 680 740 3005 252 and at 15a in 788-250. The fragment does not occur at 16a in the catena mss (*Kollationen*, 179; *Nachlese*, 402). This suggestion gives the reading in 252 (ἀντιδοθήσεται) the advantage over the reading in the catena (ἀντισωθήσεται; *Nachlese*, 402). Also, this suggestion not only solves the tension between the variants in the *Edition* between πρωτεῖον and πρωτείῳ (see 16a *infra*), but also it may provide a way forward in solving the tension between the two readings attributed to Aq in 16a in the *Edition*, since now the problematic οὐκ ἀναβληθήσεται may be assigned to Sym theoretically (see *infra*; *Nachlese*, 403).

The attribution to Or in the *Edition* is not supported by *AGK*, since the hexaplaric fragment has been erroneously embedded in the comment by Origen only in mss 643 and 139 (*AGK* 3, 68-9); therefore, Or should not be the supposed patristic source of this fragment according to the oldest Greek catena.

**Job 28 16a**

HT (לֹא־)תְסֻלֶּה (בְּכֶתֶם אוֹפִיר)

E (καὶ οὐ) συμβασταχθήσεται (χρυσίῳ Ὠφίρ)

## ⟨αʹ⟩ ἀποσκολοπίζεται

*Wit1:* CG

*Attr:* αʹ] > CG

*NonGr*: CG אפושקולופיזיטי

*Notes*: There is no attribution in CG, but Aq seems to have coined the word ἀποσκολοπίζω (cf. LSJ), and he is the only translator to use this word from among the LXX translators and the Three (H-R, 141). In Aq this verb renders סלל (Ps 117[118]:5, Isa 11:16, 36:2, 40:3, 57:14) and סלה (Ps 118[119]:118) (Reider, 29). Ziegler makes

clear that in Isa 11:16, 36:2, and 40:3 Aq translates the noun מְסִלָּה with the participle ἀπεσκολοπισμένη (*Beiträge*, 37).

HT (לֹא־תְסֻלֶּה (בְּכֶתֶם אוֹפִיר
E (καὶ) οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται (χρυσίῳ ᾿Ωφίρ)

# ⟨σ′⟩ οὐκ ἀναβληθήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-732}$ ↓*cII* 555

*Attr:* ⟨σ′⟩] α′ rel; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* lemma] ου παραβληθησεται 703

*Notes*: The attribution to Sym should be considered as probable for three reasons: (1) when the *Nachlese* moved the Sym fragment from 16a to 15a, Symmachus could then be considered as a legitimate author of this fragment. (2) The Th reading (οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται) is secure as the text under the asterisk (see *supra*), and 3) translation technique confirms that the fragment in CG is best attributed to Aq (*Nachlese*, 403; see *supra*).

This proposal requires more demonstration. The data in H-R and Reider for Aquila's use of ἀναβάλλω must be corrected, for they are dependent on Field, who was in turn influenced by a suggestion in Montef. Both of these sources cite three uses of the verb ἀναβάλλω attributed to Aq: Job 28:16, 19, and Jer. 42 (50):12. Jer 42(50):12 contains an example of ἀναβάλλω for Hebrew II עטה, and therefore it only shows that Aq uses ἀναβάλλω, not his translation strategy for the relevant Hebrew word. Job 28:16 has already been explained alternatively to Field, but what of the reference to Aq in 28:19 in Field? Field relies on Montef, who says, "So Aq translates the same expression above v. 16" (Montef, 441). Montef does not list an Aq fragment at 28:19 but only notes that the reading could be from Aq. Field does not offer any additional evidence for the fragment at 28:19 (Field, 50). Ziegler and the Hagedorns do not list an Aquila fragment at 28:19b, probably because there is no evidence for doing so. Thus, there is no indisputable evidence that Aq translates סלה/סלל with ἀναβάλλω. The word ἀναβάλλω is not listed for Sym, but, since one may rule out attributions to Aq and Th, the attribution is assigned to him provisionally until new evidence from mss or translation technique comes to light.

HT (לֹא־תְסֻלֶּה) בְּכֶתֶם (אוֹפִיר)
E (καὶ οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται) χρυσίῳ (᾿Ωφίρ)

# ⟨α′⟩ ἐν σπιλώματι

*Wit1:* CG

*Attr:* α′] > CG

*NonGr*: CG אינאישפילומן

*Notes*: De Lange transliterated the form as follows: ἐν ἰσπίλωμαν, which Ziegler then contextualized (De Lange, 292). Only Aq uses σπίλωμα ’Ωφίρ in Isa 13:12 for כתם אופיר (H-R, 1284). According to Ziegler, Aq translates the Hebrew word according to Syr. ܟܬܡ "to be soiled" (*Beiträge*, 37-8). Aq also uses βάμμα for כתם in Ps 44(45):10 and probably, the anonymous reading in Syh Thr 4:1 also belongs to him (*Beiträge*, 38).

HT (לֹא־תְסֻלֶּה בְּכֶתֶם) אוֹפִיר
E (καὶ οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται χρυσίῳ) ’Ωφίρ

# σ′ πρωτείῳ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 161′

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Var:* πρωτείῳ] πρωτιω *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: The suggestion of the Hagedorns has removed the problem of the variant between the Sym fragment of 15a and this one (see *supra*; *Nachlese*, 403; *Beiträge*, 38). Since Sym is the only translator from the LXX and the Three to use this word and to use it frequently (7x), it is possible that he would use the same word twice in close proximity (*Nachlese*, 403).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 236-7; *AGK* 3, 68; Nic, 432).

**Job 28 17b**
HT וּתְמוּרָתָהּ כְּלִי־פָז׃
E καὶ τὸ ἄλλαγμα αὐτῆς σκεύη χρυσᾶ

# σ′ οὐδὲ ἀντικαταλλαγήσεται σκεύεσι χρυσοῖς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 395\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* οὐδέ] ουδεν 740 | ἀντικαταλλαγήσεται] αντικαταλαγησεται 559; ανταλλαγησεται 612; αντικαταλλαγη σʹ 3006

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 236-7; *AGK* 3, 68; Nic, 432).

**Job 28 18a**

HT רָאמוֹת וְגָבִישׁ (לֹא יִזָּכֵר)

E μετέωρα καὶ γαβὶς (οὐ μνησθήσεται,)

# σʹ ὑψηλὰ καὶ ἐπηρμένα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) $C^{cat}$ (= 788-250 3005) 249 ↓$cI^{-732}$ ↓$cI^{cat}$ ↓$754^{cat}$ ↓$474^{cat}$ ↓$258^{cat}$ ↓$476^{cat}$ ↓$3007^{cat}$ ↓$505^{cat}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 252 Syh ↓$Ol^{Y}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 3006 $cI^{cat}$ $754^{cat}$ $474^{cat}$ $258^{cat}$ $476^{cat}$ $505^{cat}$ $3007^{cat}$

*Var:* ὑψηλά] υψη 249 $Ol^{Y}$ | ἐπηρμένα $C^{cat}$ (= 788-250 3005) 249 138 $cI^{cat}$ $754^{cat}$ $474^{cat}$ $258^{cat}$ $3007^{cat}$ $505^{cat}$ 252 $Ol^{Y}$] ὑπερηρμένα *C* (= 788-250 3005) $cI^{-138\ 732}$; + οὐ μνησθήσεται *cII* 555 161 $Ol^{Y}$

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܪ̈ܡܬܐ ܘܡ̈ܬܥܠܝܬܐ ❖

*Notes*: This lemma is confusing in the *Edition* since it did not list all of the evidence for the fragment. The lemma is both in the margin of the mss and in the catena. The catena preserves the original text and the correct attribution to Sym $C^{cat}$ (= 250 3005), while the marginal note preserves the correct attribution but has a variant. The *Edition* did not list the evidence of the catena, probably because the attribution to Sym is missing in the catena in all witnesses except $C^{cat}$ (= 788-250 3005) (see *AGK*, vol III, 69, which correctly notes that the expanded reading of these witnesses corresponds to the stability of the α-*Vorläuferkatene* (i.e. the *C* group)). The catena also shows that the plus, οὐ μνησθήσεται, is secondary, since it is absent in the best witnesses and it is clearly situating the Sym fragment in the context of the LXX, which is a characteristic of the Nicetas catena. A decision between ἐπηρμένα and ὑπερηρμένα is difficult. The latter reading may have arisen accidentally from dittography of the υ, while Sym uses the former word commonly (H-R, 505). His use of the latter term is only attested here because the reference to Prov 18:10 in H-R and Reider is not the reading in Field, who has ἀρθήσεται as the lemma for the Three on the basis of Nobil, which is not good evidence. Based on these factors ἐπηρμένα is the original text.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* stands, since it is confirmed by *Kommentar* and *AGK* (*Kommentar*, 237; *AGK* 3, 69; Nic, 433).

**Job 28 18b**

HT וּמֶשֶׁךְ חָכְמָה מִפְּנִינִים׃

E καὶ ἕλκυσον σοφίαν ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσώτατα·

# σʹ γλυκὺ δὲ σοφία παρὰ τὰ περίβλεπτα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 ↓252

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 788 3005) 252] αʹ 259 512-513 555 620 161; θʹ 139; > rel

*Var:* δέ] > *C* (= 3005) | παρά] υπερ παντα 252 | περίβλεπτα] εσωτατα 161

*Notes*: Ms 3005 confirms the attribution to Sym hitherto known only from 252 (*Nachlese*, 403). Now, 788 confirms that the attribution belongs to the oldest Greek catena. The Hagedorns also bring a helpful correction to App II of the *Edition* regarding the attribution to Aq in the catena. The attribution to Aq is supported only by Nic, and not the rest of the catena (*Nachlese*, 403; Nic, 433). Mss 259 555 620 161 may also be added as Nic (*cII*) mss, which support the Aq attribution. Field attributes the fragment to Aq on the basis of the Nicetas catena, Colb (559), and Orat (608). Ms 559 has been recollated, and there is no attribution to Aq according to the Hagedorns (*Kollationen*, 180).

Περίβλεπτος belongs to the lexicon of Sym (Cant 1:11; see Ceulemans, 314), and in Thr 4:7, περίβλεπτα stands for פְּנִינִים as in Job 28:18b (*Beiträge*, 60; Field, 758). The reference to Prov 25:11 in Field is based on Nobil and Syh, and therefore has been omitted from evidence until it can be confirmed.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 237-8; *AGK* 3, 70; Nic, 433).

**Job 28 19b**

HT (בְּכֶתֶם טָהוֹר) לֹא תְסֻלֶּה׃

E (χρυσίῳ καθαρῷ) οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται.

# σʹ οὐκ ἀντισταθμισθήσεται

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 ↓248

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 3005) 139] > rel

*Var:* ἀντισταθμισθήσεται *C* (= 788-250 3005) 612] αντισταθμησεται 138; αντισταθμισεται 740; αντισταθμησθησεται 248 255 559; αντισταθμηθησεται 137 139 260 395 680 3006; αντισταθμη(θή sup lin)σεται 643

*Notes*: Ms 3005 may be added to 250 and 612 in support of the Greek word ἀντισταθμίζω “to counterbalance” “to compensate” (*Kollationen*, 180; *Beiträge*, 17). Ms 788 also has this reading. Ms 3005 also preserves the attribution to Sym. This reading has influenced the exegesis of Olymp in the catena (*AGK* 3, 71), and it appears in *Kommentar* as follows: οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται οὖν ἀντὶ τοῦ· οὐκ ἀντισταθμισθήσεται (*Kommentar*, 238).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is supported by *Kommentar* and Nic but not by *AGK* (*Kommentar*, 238; *AGK* 3, 71; Nic, 433).

**Job 28 21a**

HT (וְנֶעֶלְמָה) מֵעֵינֵי (כָל־חָי)
LXX (λέληθεν)—(πάντα ἄνθρωπον)

# θʹ ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* πάντα ἄνθρ.] pr εξ οφθαλμων *lI*; *ab oculis omnis hominis* La = M

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܡܢ ܥܝ̈ܢܐ ⁘

*Notes*: La$^{\mu\beta}$ does not preserve the asterisk, but the text has been influenced by the Hexapla.

**Job 28 21b-22a**

HT וּמֵעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם נִסְתָּרָה׃
אֲבַדּוֹן וָמָוֶת אָמְרוּ
E καὶ ἀπὸ πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκρύβη·
ἡ ἀπώλεια καὶ ὁ θάνατος εἶπαν

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 260\ 680\ 3006}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 3005 740 612 559 395; θʹ 137 643 732 139)] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 21b-22a sub ※ 3005 740 255 612(non **22a**) 559(non **22a**) 395 137 643 732(non **21b**) 248 252 Arm(non **22a**) La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܘܡܢ ܦܪ̈ܚܬܐ ܕܫܡܝܐ ܐܬܛܫܝܬ.

※ ܐܒܕܢܐ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܐܡܪܘ. ↘

La ※ *et a volucribus caeli abscondita est.*
*perditio* (pr ※ μ) *et mors dixerunt Audivimus eius gloriam* (+ ↙ μ)

Arm ※ և ի թռչնոց երկնից ծածկեցաւ

*Notes*: La has misplaced the metobelus, and thus 22a appears to be a longer line under the asterisk.

**Job 28 22b**

HT (בְּאָזְנֵינוּ שָׁמַעְנוּ) שִׁמְעָהּ׃

LXX (Ἀκηκόαμεν δὲ) αὐτῆς τὸ κλέος.

# ⟨α′⟩ ἀκοὴν αὐτῆς

*Wit1:* 252

*Attr:* α′ *conj*. Ziegler] σ′ cod

*Notes*: The fragment in 252 is as follows: σ′ [sup lin] ἀκοὴν αὐτῆς ἡ | ἀκοὴ ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς. The line cannot be read as one note, and therefore there were originally two notes, which have been combined into one, and one of the attributions has fallen out. The *Edition* suggested that this reading is from Aq, while the following one should be attributed to Sym. This fragment is a formal translation of the HT and thus suits Aq, while Sym may have used a dynamic approach to the line. Both Aq and Sym use ἀκοή frequently (H-R, 44).

# ⟨σ′⟩ ἡ ἀκοὴ ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς

*Wit1:* 252

**Job 28 23a**

HT (אֱלֹהִים) הֵבִין (דַּרְכָּהּ)

LXX (ὁ θεὸς) εὖ συνέστησεν (αὐτῆς τὴν ὁδόν)

# σ′ συνῆκεν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 680\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σ′] α′ *C* (= 788); > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: Since Aq renders בין Hi with συνίειν (Reider, 229), 788 may preserve an authentic attribution to Aq.

**Job 28 25-26a**

HT (לַעֲשׂוֹת לָרוּחַ מִשְׁקָל) וּמַיִם תִּכֵּן בְּמִדָּה׃
בַּעֲשֹׂתוֹ לַמָּטָר חֹק

LXX ἀνέμων σταθμὸν ὕδατός τε μέτρα·
ὅτε ἐποίησεν οὕτως,

# α′ καὶ ὕδωρ ἐσταθμίσατο ἐν καταμετρήσει ἐν τῷ ποιῆσαι αὐτὸν ὑετῷ ἀκριβασμόν

*Wit1:* lemma] *C* (= 257) | καί—καταμετρήσει] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*⁻⁶⁴³ ⁶⁸⁰ ⁷³² ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 788-250) 138

*Var:* ἐσταθμίσατο] εσταθμησατο *C* (= 788-250) 161 395 512-513 555 559 | καταμετρήσει] καταμετρισει 395 559

*Notes*: Ms 257 has preserved the second part of the fragment, which has hitherto been unknown (*Nachlese*, 403). For Aquila's use of ἀκριβασμός for חֹק, see Reider (10) and the new fragment attributed to Aq and Th at Job 23:14a (*Nachlese*, 400).

HT (לַעֲשׂוֹת לָרוּחַ מִשְׁקָל) וּמַיִם תִּכֵּן בְּמִדָּה׃
(בַּעֲשֹׂתוֹ לַמָּטָר חֹק)

LXX ἀνέμων σταθμὸν ὕδατός τε μέτρα·
(ὅτε ἐποίησεν οὕτως,)

# σ′ ὕδωρ δὲ ἐξίσωσεν μέτρῳ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*⁻⁶⁸⁰ ⁷³² *cII* 555

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Var:* δέ] > 138-255 559 | ἐξίσωσεν] ἐξίσω 555; εξισωσε 137 138 139 255 260 395 559 612 643 3006

**Job 28 26b-27a**

HT וְדֶרֶךְ לַחֲזִיז קֹלוֹת׃

אָז רָאָהּ וַיְסַפְּרָהּ

E καὶ ὁδὸν ἐν τινάγματι φωνάς·

τότε εἶδεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐξηγήσατο αὐτήν,

## θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–138 260 559 680 732 3006 248 Arm Bo La Sa Syh^txt

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 255(**27a**) 612; ομ() πρ() ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 740 395; θʹ 137 643 139)] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa; om 26b Bo | 26b-27a sub ※ 3005 740 255(non **26b**) 612 395 137 643 139(+ **26a**) Arm La Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ※ ܐܦ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܒܥܦܝ̈ ܐ ܕܩܠܐ.
※ ܗܝܕܝܢ ܚܙܗ̇ ܦܫܩܗ̇. ↘

La ※ *et viam tempestatis vocibus.*
*tunc* (pr ※ μ) *vidit eam et exposuit eam,*

Arm ※ և զճանապարհ նորա արձակմամբ բարբառոյ
※ Յայնժամ ետես զնա և պատմեաց զնմանէ

*Notes*: The asterisk is supported by all of the available evidence with the exception that the Bo omits 26b only, which means 27a was considered not to be under the asterisk in that tradition.

**Job 28 26b**

HT (וְדֶרֶךְ) לַחֲזִיז קֹלוֹת׃

E (καὶ ὁδὸν) ἐν τινάγματι φωνάς·

## αʹ εἰς κτύπον φωνῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 252 Syh

*Attr:* αʹ] σʹ 559^(vid) *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 788-250) 395 680 740

*Var:* εἰς] pr καὶ ὁδόν *C* (= 257) | κτύπον] κτυπων 643

*NonGr*: Syh ❖ ܐ.ܐ. ܒܢܩܫܐ ܕܩ̈ܠܐ

*Notes*: αʹ Job 38:25b is an exact parallel to this fragment.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* and it is inserted into the bible text of Nic and is not in text attributed to Olymp (*Kommentar*, 239-40; *AGK* 3, 74; Nic, 434).

# σʹ ὄμβρων βροντάς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257) 252 ↓Syh

*Var:* ὄμβρων] pr καὶ ὁδόν *C* (= 257) | ὄμβρων βροντάς] ομβρον φωνων Syh

*NonGr*: Syh .ܣ. ܡܛܪܐ ܕܩ̈ܠܐ ܀

*Notes*: Ms 257 is the first catena witness to this fragment and it confirms the fragment and attribution previously known only in 252 and Syh (*Nachlese*, 403; cf. σʹ 38:25b).

**Job 28 27b**

HT הֱכִינָהּ וְגַם־חֲקָרָהּ׃

LXX ἑτοιμάσας ἐξιχνίασεν.

# θʹ διέταξεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐξηρεύνησεν αὐτήν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* ↓555 161

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 250) 395

*Var:* αὐτήν] > *C* (= 3005) | ἐξηρεύνησεν] εξερευνησεν *C* (= 788-250); εξηρευνησε 555

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 240; *AGK* 3, 74; Nic, 435).

## Chapter 29

**Job 29 2a**

HT מִי־יִתְּנֵנִי כְיַרְחֵי־קֶדֶם

LXX τίς ἄν με θείη κατὰ μῆνα ἔμπροσθεν ἡμερῶν

# σʹ τίς δῴη μοι κατὰ τοὺς μῆνας τοὺς πρώτους

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ σʹ *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* μοι *C* (= 3005) 395] με *C* (= 788-250) *cI*–260 395 732 *cII* 555 161

*Notes*: The decision between μοι and με is difficult. Mss 3005 and 395 appear to preserve the original dative, which an early scribe changed to με in accordance with the LXX. The *Edition* chose the double attribution on the basis of the external evidence of the Nicetas catena, but Aq uses πρῶτος to render רִאשׁוֹן, and this occurrence is the only one in which Aq is recorded as translating קֶדֶם with πρῶτος (Reider, 207). Sym uses πρῶτος twice for קֶדֶם in the Psalter (67:34, 76:6; Busto Saiz, 577). This internal evidence supports the best external evidence of *C* and *cI*.

Symmachus may have influenced Iulian's commentary, which is as follows: τίς ἄν δῴη μοι ἡμέρας ἢ μῆνα (Iul-*Kommentar*, 176). There are three Iulian mss, which the Hagedorns grouped under the siglum Z (Iul-*Kommentar*, XXIII). It appears that Z also preserved the dative μοι over and against the accusative με of the LXX. The catena also preserves μοι (*AGK* 3, 80).

**Job 29 2b**

HT כִּימֵי אֱלוֹהַּ יִשְׁמְרֵנִי׃

LXX ὧν με ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλαξεν;

# θʹ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἃς ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλασσέν με

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* θʹ] αʹ σʹ *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐφύλασσέν *C* (= 788-250) 255 395 680 740] εφυλαξεν *C* (= 3005); εφυλασσε 137 138 139 161 260 555 559 643 3006; –λασεν 612

*Notes*: The *Kollationen* notes that Ziegler has cited the wrong authors on the basis of Nic (*Kollationen*, 183). Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Th. *C* and *cI* have established the Th attribution. Ms 3005 has ἐφύλαξεν, which is from the LXX.

The attribution to Iul in the *Edition* is not supported by Iul-*Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 176; *AGK* 3, 80; Nic, 437).

**Job 29 3a**

HT בְּהִלּוֹ (נֵרוֹ עֲלֵי רֹאשִׁי)

LXX (ὡς ὅτε) ηὔγει (ὁ λύχνος αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς μου)

# σʹ ἔλαμπεν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–137 260 732

*Wit2:* ηὔγει] λαμπει Max II 373

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 3005) 139] > rel

*Var:* ἔλαμπεν] ελαμπε 395

*Notes*: Ms 139 was the only manuscript to preserve the attribution to Sym, but now 3005 confirms this same attribution (*Kollationen*, 183).

**Job 29 4a**

HT כַּאֲשֶׁר הָיִיתִי בִּימֵי חָרְפִּי

LXX ὅτε ἤμην ἐπιβρίθων ὁδοῖς

# σʹ ὥσπερ ὅτε ἤμην ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητός μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–138 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161ʹ

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ὅτε] > *cII* 555 161ʹ | ἤμην] ημιν 161 | ἐν] > 559 | ἡμέραις] ημερες 612

*Notes*: Perhaps ὅτε came from the LXX, but the best witnesses to the text include it. Sym may have employed a doublet, and Nic and 161ʹ simplified the reading by omitting ὅτε.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 244; *AGK* 3, 82; Nic, 438).

**Job 29 4b**

HT בְּסוֹד אֱלוֹהַּ עֲלֵי אָהֳלִי׃

LXX ὅτε ὁ θεὸς ἐπισκοπὴν ἐποιεῖτο τοῦ οἴκου μου·

σʹ ὁπότε περιέφρασσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνήν μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ὁπότε] οτε *C* (= 788-250) | περιέφρασσεν] περιεφρασεν *C* (= 3005) 559 612; περιεφρα() 138; περιεφρασσεν 161 | ἐπί *C* (= 3005)] περι *C* (= 788-250); > rel

*Notes*: Sym read בסוך not בסוד, as in HT. Regarding ἐπί in 3005, the *Nachlese* posits that it is easier to see how an original preposition in Greek could fall out rather than one be added, since περιφράσσω takes an accusative direct object usually in Greek (*Nachlese*, 403). Accordingly, Sym would have attempted to translate Hebrew עלי with a Greek preposition, as two mss from the *C* group testify (*Nachlese*, 403). The *Nachlese* did not choose between ἐπί and περί as the original text, but this edition has posited that ἐπί is the original text based on the following rationale. First, ἐπί is the most natural translation for על and Sym uses ἐπί for על even when the OG does not have an equivalent (e.g. Job 8:15, 9:26). Second, one can posit that ἐπί was the original text and was changed to περί by a later scribe, who was adept to retain a preposition, but he did not recognize Greek valency between περιφράσσω and ἐπί. The scribe repeated the preposition used in the compound verb, which is common in Hellenistic Greek (Robertson, 560). The later strands of the catena simply omitted the preposition altogether in the interests of better style. Original ἐπί is able to explain the two variants, while περί cannot explain a later change to ἐπί. The text that begins with an original omission of a preposition cannot explain how a preposition would enter the text's transmission.

The *Edition* does not cite the evidence of Nic for this fragment. The attribution to Olymp in Nic is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* (*Kommentar*, 244; *AGK* 3, 82; Nic, 439).

**Job 29 8a**

HT (רָאוּנִי) נְעָרִים (וְנֶחְבָּאוּ)

LXX (ἰδόντες με) νεανίσκοι (ἐκρύβησαν)

# σʹ θʹ νέοι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) *cI*–138 260 [559] 732

*Attr:* σʹ θʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first *C* ms to preserve this attribution. The order of the attributions in the mss is θʹ σʹ.

**Job 29 8b**
HT (וִישִׁישִׁים) קָמוּ עָמָדוּ׃
LXX (πρεσβῦται δὲ πάντες) ἔστησαν·

# σʹ παρίσταντο

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 406 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [559] 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 395 740

*Var:* lemma] παριστ[ 406

*Notes*: Because the LXX translates the two verbs in HT with one verb, it is not certain whether the Sym version is for עָמָדוּ or קָמוּ (Field, 51 n 4). Sym renders עמד (Judg 3:19) and קום (1 Sam 20:25) with παριστάναι.

**Job 29 9a**
HT שָׂרִים (עָצְרוּ בְמִלִּים)
LXX ἁδροὶ (δὲ ἐπαύσαντο λαλοῦντες)

# λʹ ἄρχοντες

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 406 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [559] 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* λʹ] > *C* (= 406) 138 395

*Var:* lemma] pr οι 512-513 555

*Notes*: Job 34:19a has another instance of this equivalent in the Three.
The attribution to Or in the *Edition* is not supported by *AGK* (*AGK* 3, 85-7). Young’s edition preserves the hexaplaric fragment above the Or comment so that it is not clear whether the fragment was preserved in the comment by Or (Nic, 440).

**Job 29 10b-11a**

HT　　וּלְשׁוֹנָם לְחִכָּם דָּבֵקָה׃
　　כִּי אֹזֶן שָׁמְעָה וַתְּאַשְּׁרֵנִי

E　　καὶ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν τῷ λάρυγγι αὐτῶν ἐκολλήθη·
　　ὅτι οὖς ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐμακάρισέν με,

# θʹ　　Sub ※

*Wit1:*　$C$ (= 3005) $cI^{-138\ 139\ 260\ [559]\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ 248 252 Arm Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:*　θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 740 255 612 3004 395; ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ ομ() πρ() 3005; θʹ 137 643)] > rel

*Var:*　lemma] om Sa | 10b-11a sub ※ 3005 740(non **11a**) 255 612 3004(non **11a**) 395 137 643 248 252 Arm(non **11a**) Syh[txt]

*NonGr*:　Syh[txt]　※ ܘܠܫܢܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܕܒܩ ܠܦܩܪ ܚܢܟܗܘܢ.
　　※ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܕܢܐ ܫܡܥܬ ܘܛܘܒܬ ܠܝ ܠܗܘܕܐ. ↘

Arm　※ և լեզուք նոցա ի քիմս իւրեանց կցեցան

**Job 29 11b**

HT　　(וְעַיִן רָאֲתָה) וַתְּעִידֵנִי׃

LXX　　(ὀφθαλμὸς δὲ ἰδών) με ἐξέκλινεν.

# αʹ σʹ　　ἐμαρτύρησεν περὶ ἐμοῦ

*Wit1:*　$C$ (= 788-250) $C^{cat}$ (= 3005) ↓$cI^{-260\ [559]\ 732}$ $cI^{cat-476\ [559]}$ 523[cat] 3004[cat] 754[cat] 258[cat] *cII* 555 161

*Attr:*　αʹ σʹ] 3006[inc]

*Var:*　ἐμαρτύρησεν] -ρησε 137 139 643 555 161

*Notes*:　The attribution in 3006 is not visible according to the *Kollationen* (*Kollationen*, 185). Ziegler cites Schenker favorably where he doubts that the fragment comes from Aq, since the translation of the HT is too free (*Beiträge*, 60). There is no sound evidence which supports or disproves this statement. According to Reider, Aq translates עוד Hi with the compound διαμαρτύρεσθαι in Jer 49(42):19, in which there is a dative (ὑμῖν) following the verb, and Jer 39(32):44 Syh, in which the verb is either Ethpe or Ethpa Impf 3mp (ܢܬܣܗܕܘܢ), and is therefore passive as the retroversion in Ziegler's Jeremiah *Edition* shows (375). These examples do not demonstrate sufficiently

how Aq renders the object with this verb, when the verb is transitive. Until more evidence arises to disprove this attribution, the double attribution is established by the external evidence.

*AGK* assigns this comment as “partially from Olympiodor” (*AGK* 3, 87). The part of the comment which contains the note from Aq and Sym is not found in *Kommentar*; therefore, one cannot be certain that Olympiodorus is the source of this hexaplaric fragment, even though Nic has the comment under Olymp and the *Edition* asserts it (*Kommentar*, 246; *AGK* 3, 87; Nic, 441).

**Job 29 12a**

HT — (כִּי־אֲמַלֵּט עָנִי מְשַׁוֵּעַ)—

LXX — (διέσωσα γὰρ πτωχὸν) ἐκ χειρὸς δυνάστου

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* La

*NonGr*: La *liberavi enim ÷ pauperem de manu potentis,*

*Notes*: According to La, the obelus is placed before *pauperem*, but this placement is a mistake since “poor” is in HT, as the Vulgate makes plain: *quod liberassem pauperem vociferantem*. Probably, Jerome’s Latin version placed the obelus before *de*, in order to indicate that from there to the end of the line was present in the LXX but not in the HT, but a later scribe misplaced it.

**Job 29 13a**

HT — בִּרְכַּת אֹבֵד עָלַי תָּבֹא

E — εὐλογία ἀπολλυμένου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ἔλθοι,

# α′ θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 139\ 260\ [559]\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$ Eus (Dem) Max p 373 Cyp Lucif Spec

*Wit2:* ἔλθοι] επελθοι 248-644 336′ Syn Ol; ελθη Iul; *veniebat* La = Vulg

*Attr:* α′ θ′ (ἐκ τῶν(του 3004) α′ καὶ θ′ 788-250(**12b**) 740 255 612 3004 395; ἐκ θ′ ομ() καὶ α′ πρ()κ() 3005) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa Eus (Dem I, 6, 14 GCS 23) Cyp Lucif Spec | 13a sub ※ 3005 740 612 3004 137 643 248 252 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܐ ܬ ※ ܒܘܪܟܬܗ ܕܐܒܝܕܐ ܥܠ ܬܐܬܐ. ↘

La *benedictio* (pr ※ μ) *perituri super me veniebat*
Arm ※ Աւրհնութիւն կորուսելոյն ի վերայ իմ եկեսցէ

*Notes*: The line is accounted for in all of the extant traditions. The Church Fathers, combined with Sa, constitute negative evidence for the asterisk, since the line is omitted in those texts.

## σʹ εὐλογία ἀπολλυμένου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ κατήντα

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | κατήντα] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 395 [559] 643 680 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

*Wit2:* ἔλθοι] επελθοι 248-644 336′ Syn Ol; ελθη Iul; *veniebat* La = Vulg

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*NonGr*: Syh .ܣ. ܒܘܪܟܬܗ ܕܐܒܝܕܐ
ܥܠ ܐܬܝܐ ܗܘܬ܀

*Notes*: The Vulgate’s *veniebat* is probably dependent on Sym, since no other tradition attests to the imperfect tense.

**Job 29 13b**
HT וְלֵב אַלְמָנָה אַרְנִן׃
LXX στόμα δὲ χήρας με εὐλόγησεν

## θʹ καὶ καρδίαν χήρας ηὔφρανα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[559] 732 ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* χήρας] χειρας 395 | ηὔφρανα] ευφρανα 395 *cII* 555

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 246; *AGK* 3, 88-9; Nic, 442). The Nic edition by young has the hexaplaric fragment above the comment by Olymp; therefore, the Nic may not attribute the fragment to Olymp.

**Job 29 17b**
HT (וּמִשִּׁנָּיו)—(אַשְׁלִיךְ טָרֶף׃)
LXX (ἐκ δὲ) μέσου (τῶν ὀδόντων αὐτῶν ἅρπαγμα ἐξέσπασα)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh^txt

*Wit2:* μέσου] sub ÷ Syh; > Lucif = M

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ܡܢ ÷ ܡܨܥܬܐ ↙ ܕܝܢ ܕܫ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ.

*Notes*: Syh is the only witness to the obelus, but Lucif provides negative evidence for it. Μέσου is represented in La: *et de medio dentium eorum rapinas extorsi*, but Jerome did not include it in the Vulgate: *et de dentibus illius auferebam praedam*.

**Job 29 18a**

HT וָאֹמַר עִם־קִנִּי אֶגְוָע

LXX εἶπα δέ ἡ ἡλικία μου γηράσει

## σ′ ἔλεγον δὲ μετὰ τῆς νοσσιᾶς μου γηράσειν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 406 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^–[559] 732 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 406 3005) 3006

*Var:* δέ—γηράσειν] > *C* (= 406) | δέ] > 137 139 260 643 680 3006 | νοσσιᾶς] νοσιας 137 139 255 260 395 643 680 3006; νοσσια 612

*Notes*: Only ε̣λ̣ε̣γ̣ο̣ν̣ is visible in 406 (*Kollationen*, 185).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 247; *AGK* 3, 96; Nic, 447).

**Job 29 19-20**

HT
שָׇרְשִׁי פָתוּחַ אֱלֵי־מָיִם
וְטַל יָלִין בִּקְצִירִי׃
כְּבוֹדִי חָדָשׁ עִמָּדִי
וְקַשְׁתִּי בְּיָדִי תַחֲלִיף׃

E
ἡ ῥίζα διήνοικται ἐπὶ ὕδατος,
καὶ δρόσος αὐλισθήσεται ἐν τῷ θερισμῷ μου·
ἡ δόξα μου καινὴ μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ,
καὶ τὸ τόξον μου ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ πορεύσεται.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 139\ 260\ 680}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* ῥίζα] + μου La *L*ʹʹ-130-406-613 *C*$^{1}$ 248-644 Aeth Ol = M

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̅ 3005 740 255 612 3004 395 680(**21b**)) 3006 137 643 732(**19b**) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 19-20 sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 3004 395(non **20a**) 137(non **20b**) 3006(non **20b**) 643(non **20b**) 732(non **20b**) 248 252(non **19a**; + **21a**) Arm La(non **20a**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$

ܬ ※ ܥܩܪܐ ܦ̇ܬܝܚ ܥܠ ܡ̈ܝܐ.
※ ܘܛܠܐ ܢܒܘܬ ܥܠ ܚܨ̈ܕܐ ܕܝܠܝ.
※ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܡܚܕܬܐ ܥܡܝ.
※ ܘܩܫܬܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܒܐܝܕܗ ܐܙܠܐ. ↘

La *radix* (pr ※ μ) *mea patet ad aquas,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *ros morabitur in messa mea.*
*gloria mea nova mecum,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *arcus meus in manu mea gradietur.*

Arm ※ Արմատ ընդարձակեալ ի վերայ ջրոյ
※ և ցաւղ հանգիցէ ի վերայ հնձոց իմոց
※ Կարծիքն իմ ընդունայն եղեն ինձ
※ և աղեղն իմ ի ձեռին նորա գնայ

*Notes*: The evidence of the catena tradition, ms 248, Syh, and Arm combined with the negative evidence of Sa firmly establishes the asterisk for these lines. The misplacement of the asterisk in 252 and the omission of the asterisk before 20a in La are probably scribal errors.

**Job 29 20a**

HT כְּבוֹדִי חָדָשׁ עִמָּדִי
E ἡ δόξα μου καινὴ μετʼ ἐμοῦ

# σʹ ἡ δόξα μου ἀνανεάσει παροῦσά μοι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ [559]\ 732}$ *cII* ↓555 ↓161 Syh

*Var:* ἀνανεάσει] ανανεωσει 137 3006 555 161

*NonGr*: Syh ܗ. ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܕܝܠܝ
ܬܚܕܬ ܒܪ ܩܪܝܒܐ
ܠܝ ܀

*Notes*: The Sym fragment is at 29:18b in 137 139 250 255 395 612 680 740 3006 (*Kollationen*, 186). In 512-513 555 161, the fragment occurs at 29:18 after the Sym reading for that verse (Nic, 447). The reading does occur in the proper place in Syh and 260 (*Kollationen*, 186). In 3005, there is an index at the fragment in the margin, but a corresponding index does not appear in the text at 20a; therefore, it is not certain to which line the fragment corresponds.

Whether ܬܚܕܬ in Syh supports the lemma or the variant is indeterminable. If it is Peal, it would support the lemma, but if it is Pael as the diacritical point above the word suggests, then it would support the variant ἀνανεώσει (see Job 33:24 ἀνανεώσει = ܢܚܕܬ Syh).

**Job 29 21a**

HT (לִי־שָׁמְעוּ) וְיִחֵלּוּ

LXX (ἐμοῦ ἀκούσαντες) προσέσχον

# σ′ ἐπῄνουν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [559] 732 3006

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250) 395

*Notes*: Sym translated the form as from II הלל Pi, which occurs in Cant 6:9 with a double attribution to Aq and Sym (Field 2, 420; cf. Ceulemans, 464). In 788, the orthography is with iota *adscriptus* (ἐπήινουν).

**Job 29 24a**

HT אֶשְׂחַק אֲלֵהֶם לֹא יַאֲמִינוּ

LXX ἐὰν γελάσω πρὸς αὐτούς, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσωσιν,

# σ′ προσεγέλων αὐτοῖς, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἐπίστευον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[559] 732 *cII* 555 161′

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250) 612

*Var:* προσεγέλων] προσεγελουν 395; προσεγελω 250

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 248-9; *AGK* 3, 98; Nic, 449).

**Job 29 24b-25c**

HT וְאוֹר פָּנַי לֹא יַפִּילוּן׃
אֶבְחַר דַּרְכָּם וְאֵשֵׁב רֹאשׁ
וְאֶשְׁכּוֹן כְּמֶלֶךְ בַּגְּדוּד
כַּאֲשֶׁר אֲבֵלִים יְנַחֵם׃

E καὶ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου μου οὐκ ἀπέπιπτεν·
ἐξελεξάμην ὁδὸν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκάθισα ἄρχων
καὶ κατεσκήνουν ὡσεὶ βασιλεὺς ἐν μονοζώνοις
ὃν τρόπον παθεινοὺς παρακαλῶν.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–138 680 3006 248 252 Arm Sa Syh^txt La

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̅ ομ() πρ()κ() 3005; ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̅ 740 255 612 3004 395 643; ἐκ θεοδο(τίωνος) οἱ τέσσα(ρες) 260) 139(**24b**) Syh^txt] σʹ 139(**25a**); > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 24b-25 sub ※ 3005 740(non **25b**) 255 612(non **25c**) 3004(non **25a 25c**) 395(non **25b**) 137(non **24b**) 260 643 732(non **24b 25ab**) 139(non **24b 25b**) 248(non **25bc**) 252(non **25ac**) Arm La Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ܘ ※ ܘܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܠܐ ܢܦܠ ܗܘܐ.
※ ܓܒܝܬ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܘܝܬܒܬ ܪܫܐ.
※ ܘܫܪܝܐ ܗܘܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܡܠܟܐ ܒܡܙܪܙܐ.
※ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܒ̈ܝܫܐ ܒ̈ܝܫܬܐ ܡܒܝܐܐ ܗܘܝܬ. ↘

La *et* (pr ※ μ) *lux* (pr ※ β) *vultus* (pr ※ β) *mei non concidebat*
*elegi* (pr ※ μ) *viam eorum et* (pr ※ β) *sedi princeps,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *habitabam sicut rex cinctus fortibus*
*quasi* (pr ※ μ) *tristes consolans.*

Arm ※ և լոյս երեսաց իմոց ոչ նուաղէր
※ Ընտրեցի զճանապարհս նոցա և նստեի իշխան
※ և բնակեի իբրեւ զթագաւոր ի մէջ զաւրականաց
※ զոր աւրինակ զրզանաւքն մխիթարեին

*Notes*: The tradition of the asterisk is well preserved in the catena and the versions. The asterisk appears to be misplaced in 248 and 252.

**Job 29 25a**

HT אֶבְחַר דַּרְכָּם וְאֵשֵׁב רֹאשׁ

E ἐξελεξάμην ὁδὸν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκάθισα ἄρχων

## σʹ εἰ προειλόμην ὁδεῦσαι πρὸς αὐτούς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[559]\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > 740

*Var:* εἰ] > 3006 | προειλόμην] προηλομην 395 | πρὸς αὐτούς] > 3006

*Notes*: Ms 788 also preserves this fragment with the attribution to Sym.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 249; *AGK* 3, 98-9; Nic, 450).

**Job 29 25b**

HT (וְאֶשְׁכּוֹן כְּמֶלֶךְ) בַּגְּדוּד

E (καὶ κατεσκήνουν ὡσεὶ βασιλεὺς) ἐν μονοζώνοις

## σʹ ἐν στρατοπέδῳ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[559]\ 612\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161 252 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788) 139 395 643

*Var:* ἐν στρατοπέδῳ] των στρατιωτων Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ⁘ ܣ. ܕܦܠܚ̈ܐ.

*Notes*: The complete reading in 395 is ἐν μονοζώνοις· ἐν στρατοπέδῳ (*Kollationen*, 187). The Syriac retroversion constitutes a variant. Syh does not provide any examples for reconstructing the translation equivalent since the Greek word is used only seven times in the LXX, and Syh is not extant in these other instances. The retroversion finds support in the NT Peshitta, since στρατιώτης is translated by ܦܠܚܐ in Acts 10:7. Field is correct to reject Middeldorpf's suggestion that στρατιῶν is the proper retroversion, there is evidence of στρατιά for ܦܠܚܘܬܐ (Field, 52; *Curaes*, 625).

In Job 25:3, Sym translates the plural of גְּדוּד with στρατιῶν, where 256-740 had the variant στρατιωτων, showing that these words were confused. Syh, therefore, may represent a harmonization. In 19:12a, Sym had λόχοι for the plural of the same Hebrew word (Woods, 345ff); therefore, Sym appears to vary his equivalents when translating this word.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 249; *AGK* 3, 99; Nic, 450).

**Job 29 25c**

HT כַּאֲשֶׁר אֲבֵלִים יְנַחֵם׃

E ὃν τρόπον παθεινοὺς παρακαλῶν.

σ′ καθὼς ἀπάγοι αὐτοὺς ὁδηγῶν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI*−395 [559] 732 ↓*cII* ↓555

*Var:* ἀπάγοι] απαγει *cII* 555

*Notes*: The text of Sym seems to presuppose כַּאֲשֶׁר יֹבִ(י)לֵם יַנְחֵם for its parent text (cp. Jer 11:19 where Aq and Sym have ἀπάγειν for הוֹבִיל; Liebreich, 401; *Beiträge*, 39). Regarding יֹבִלֵם, Sym may have had a text that had already been corrupted by the change of א to י, which was a common change during this period (Segal, 35; Qimron, 31). This initial difference between Sym's text and HT may have given rise to the rest of his translation; thus, יַנְחֵם from נחה "to lead" most probably explains why Sym used ὁδηγῶν in his translation. The variant -οι/-ει arose from phonetic confusion in the Byzantine period (Wevers, 188), but the oldest Greek catena probably has preserved the original text and Nic has the error.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 249; *AGK* 3, 99; Nic, 451).

## Chapter 30

**Job 30 1ab**

HT וְעַתָּה שָׂחֲקוּ עָלַי
צְעִירִים מִמֶּנִּי לְיָמִים

LXX νυνὶ δὲ κατεγέλασάν μου,
ἐλάχιστοι νῦν νουθετοῦσίν με ἐν μέρει,

α′ καὶ νῦν ἐγέλασαν ἐπ’ ἐμοί βραχεῖς παρ’ ἐμὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | βραχεῖς—ἡμέραις] *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–139 [559] 732] *cII* 555 ↓161 | ἡμέραις ↓252

*Attr:* α′] θ′ 161 680; λ′ 252

*Var:* ἐμέ] εμοι 161 | ταῖς ἡμέραις] > 161 | ἡμέραις] pr εν 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܗܫܐ ܓܚܟܘ ܥܠܝ
ܙ̈ܥܘܪܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܡܢܝ
ܒܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 52).

Ms 252 has the following reading: ἐν ἡμέραις, which has the preposition ἐν, while the catena tradition preserves only the dative for the Hebrew ל (see the readings *infra*). The variant ἐν comes from the OG, while the catena and Syh preserve the original text of the Three. Ms 252 probably preserves only the original case of the noun for Sym, but Syh preserves the actual lemma of Sym, since Syh is best retroverted as χρόνοις (see *infra*).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 250; *AGK* 3, 100; Nic, 451).

σ′ νῦν δὲ μυκτηρίζουσίν με οἱ νεώτεροί μου τοῖς χρόνοις

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܗܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܡܝܩܝܢ
ܒܝ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܛܠܝܢ
ܡܢܝ ܒܙ̈ܒܢܐ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field. He also lists χλευάζουσι as a possible retroversion for ܡܡܝܩܝܢ (Field, 52). Sym uses μυκτηρίζω for לעג in Prov 1:26 (evidence of Nobil in Field, 313), and there are no extant examples of μυκτηρίζω for שׂחק. There is no extant evidence that Sym uses χλευάζω for שׂחק, but in Isa 37:22 Sym translates לעג with χλευάζω; therefore, Sym does not have a formal equivalent for these verbs and thus the retroversion remains only plausible.

# θ′ καὶ νῦν κατεγέλασάν μου οἱ νεώτεροί μου ἡμέραις

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓Syh | νεώτεροί—ἡμέραις] *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[559]\ 732}$ *cII* 555 ↓161 | ἡμέραις ↓252

*Attr:* θ′] α′ 161; λ′ 252; > 139

*Var:* μου 2°] > Syh | ἡμέραις] ημερα 740; pr εν 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܘܗܫܐ ܓܚܟܘ ܒܝ
ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܛܠܝܢ ܒܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ܀

*Notes*: For the reading of 252, see the Aq fragment *supra*.
The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 250; *AGK* 3, 100; Nic, 451).

**Job 30 1c**
HT אֲשֶׁר־מָאַסְתִּי אֲבוֹתָם
E ὧν ἐξουδένουν πατέρας αὐτῶν,

# ⟨θ′⟩ Sub ※

*Wit1:* Arm Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Var:* lemma] om Sa

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܡܣܠܐ ܗ̇ܘܝܬ ܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ↘
Arm ※ զորոց պախարակեի զհարս նոցա

*Notes*: The Armenian edition by Cox places this line under the asterisk, which now means the line is under the asterisk in both Syh and Arm. Sa provides negative evidence for the asterisk since the line has been omitted. The use of ἐξουδενόω for מאס

indicates probably that the fragment should be attributed to Th, since Aq uses ἀπορρίπτω for מאס and he uses ἐξουδενόω for בזה in a careful manner (Gentry, 487).

**Job 30 1d**

HT (לָשִׁית) עִם־כַּלְבֵי צֹאנִי׃

LXX (οὓς οὐχ ἡγησάμην ἀξίους) κυνῶν τῶν ἐμῶν νομάδων.

# α′ θ′ σ′ μετὰ τῶν κυνῶν τῶν προβάτων μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 [559] 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′ θ′ σ′] σ′ *C* (= 3005); λ′ *cII* 555 161; > 395

*Var:* τῶν 2°] + εμων 137 260 643 3006 | μου] > 137 260 395 643 680 3006

*Notes*: The majority of the mss preserve the attribution in the order α′ θ′ σ′, but 260 643 3006 preserve it in the order of α′ σ′ θ′. Mss 161 and 555 agree with the attribution in *cII*.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 250; *AGK* 3, 100; Nic, 451).

**Job 30 2-4a**

HT
גַּם־כֹּחַ יְדֵיהֶם לָמָּה לִּי
עָלֵימוֹ אָבַד כָּלַח׃
בְּחֶסֶר וּבְכָפָן גַּלְמוּד
הַעֹרְקִים צִיָּה אֶמֶשׁ
שׁוֹאָה וּמְשֹׁאָה׃
הַקֹּטְפִים מַלּוּחַ עֲלֵי־שִׂיחַ

E
καί γε ἰσχὺς χειρῶν αὐτῶν ἵνα τί μοι;
ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀπώλετο συντέλεια
ἐν ἐνδείᾳ καὶ λιμῷ ἄγονος·
οἱ φεύγοντες ἄνυδρον ἐχθὲς
συνοχὴν καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν,
οἱ περικλῶντες ἅλιμα ἐπὶ ἠχοῦντι,

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–138 139 260 [559] 680 3006 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ ⲋ̄ 3005 740 255 612 3004 395) 137 Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 3-4a sub ※ 3005 740(non **3c 4a**) 255(non **2a 4a**) 612 3004 395(non **4a**) 137 643 732(non **2 4a**) 248 252 Arm La(non **2a 3bc**) Syh^txt^(non **3 4a**)

*NonGr*: Syh^txt^ ܬ ※ ܐܦ ܒܥܬ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܝܕܝܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ
※ ܠܡܢܐ ܠܝ.
※ ܒܠܗܘܢ ܐܒܕ ܫܘܠܡܐ. ↘

La *et virtus manuum eorum quasi nihilum mihi erat.*
*in* (pr ※ μ) *eis periebat omnis vita.*
*in* (pr ※ μ) *egestate et fame instabiles* ↙
*qui fugiebant in desertum heri*
*propter angustias et miserias*
*qui* (pr ※ μ) *rodebant cortices arborum* (+ ↙ β)

Arm ※ Նա և զաւրութիւն ձեռաց նոցա ընդէր էր ինձ
※ Ի վերայ նոցա կորեաւ վախճան
※ ի կարաւտութեան և ի սովի անձնունդ
※ որ փախչէին երէկ յանջրդւոյ
※ յանձկութենէ և ի թշուառութենէ
※ Որք պատէին խարշափուն բանջարով

*Notes*: The Greek and Armenian traditions preserve six lines under the asterisk.

**Job 30 2b-3a**

HT (עָלֵימוֹ אָבַד) כָּלַח׃
בְּחֶסֶר (וּבְכָפָן גַּלְמוּד)

E (ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἀπώλετο) συντέλεια
ἐν ἐνδείᾳ (καὶ λιμῷ ἄγονος·)

# α′ παντελὲς ἐν ὑστερήσει

*Wit1:* ↓252 Syh

*Var:* παντελές] pr ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἀπώλετο (Ziegler *conj*.; ἀπόλετο cod) 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܟܠ ܟܠܗ
ܒܚܣܝܪܘܬܐ ❖

*Notes*: Field notes: *Syro-hex. legisse videtur*: ’A. παντελὲς ἐν στερήσει (Field, 52). Field offers no supporting evidence for this retroversion, and Sokoloff’s lexicon lists “lack, absence” or “deprivation” for ܒܚܣܝܪܘܬܐ. In the absence of evidence for Field’s retroversion, there is no need to posit that Syh contains a variant. Middeldorpf offers the

following retroversion and it appears accurate: παντελὲς ἐν ὑςερήσει (*Curaes*, 625). The plus in 252 comes from the bible text.

# σʹ πᾶν τὸ πρὸς ζωήν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 [559] 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′ ↓Suidas

*Wit2:* συντέλεια] -λειαι 261; pr η Olymp; τελεια Iul; *omnis vita* La

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 643 248 Suidas

*Var:* πᾶν] pr ἀπώλετο αὐτοῖς *cII* 555 161 | ζωήν] ζων 740

*Notes*: The fragment in 248 is as follows: πᾶν τὸ πρὸς ζωὴν συντελοῦν ἤτ(οι) εὐπορία αὐτ(ῶν) ἀπώλετο. The first part of the exegetical fragment betrays dependence on Sym, perhaps arising from the Nicetas catena (Nic, 453), but this exegetical fragment also shows that the Sym fragment has been contextualized with the use of the bible text. *C* and *cI* have preserved the original Sym fragment and *cII* and 248 have expanded it due to contextual concerns. I am thankful to Dieter Hagedorn for pointing to this reference in Suidas: Σ 1630: συντέλεια: πᾶν τὸ πρὸς ζωήν (= Symmachus): Ἰώβ· ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἀπώλετο συντέλεια (= Job 30,2b) ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδέποτέ τι χρηστὸν συνετέλεσαν (= *AGK* vol. III, 101) (Adler, A., Suidae Lexicon, Vol. IV, 476).

La (*omnis vita*) seems to have been influenced by Sym.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 251; *AGK* 3, 101; Nic, 453).

**Job 30 3a**

HT (בְּחֶסֶר וּבְכָפָן) גַּלְמוּד

E (ἐν ἐνδείᾳ καὶ λιμῷ) ἄγονος·

# ⟨ἑβρʹ⟩ μεμονωμένος

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: The *Edition* refers to Job 3:7a, where the same word is attributed to ἑβρʹ and translates the same Hebrew word, גַּלְמוּד (see also Woods, 96).

**Job 30 4a**

HT הַקֹּטְפִים מַלּוּחַ עֲלֵי־שִׂיחַ

E οἱ περικλῶντες ἅλιμα ἐπὶ ἠχοῦντι,

# α′ περικλῶντες ἅλιμον ἐπὶ φυτοῦ

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓Syh | ἅλιμον—φυτοῦ] 252 | ἐπὶ φυτοῦ] *C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 255 260 [559] 643 732 3006

*Wit2:* περικλῶντες *O*-339 575-254mg-336 248] περικυκλουντες rel

*Attr:* α′] σ′ 612

*Var:* ἅλιμον] αλειμμα Syh | φυτοῦ] φυτοις Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܕܡܩܦܠܝܢ ܡܫܚܐ
ܥܠ ܢܨ̈ܒܬܐ.

*Notes*: Mss 788 3005 are the first witnesses from the *C* group to attest to the fragment and attribution. There is a scholion in Syh which reads as follows: ܡܫܚܐ ܟܒܪ ܠܡܠܘܚܝܐ ܩܪܐ. ("oil" perhaps read "sea orach"). The latter term would be the equivalent of Greek ἅλιμον, which is the lemma of 252 and the bible text, but not the exact form (*Beiträge*, 39). Ziegler chose the reading of 252 as the original text and he correctly notes that ἄλειμα is an error for ἅλιμα in Syh, which would agree with the bible text (*Beiträge*, 39). The Syh reading is without break between the Aq and Sym fragments; thus, Aq appears as the author of the whole fragment according to Syh (see *infra*).

# σ′ ἀποκνίζοντες φλοιοὺς φυτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[559] 732 *cII* ↓555 ↓161′ ↓Syh

*Attr:* σ′] α′ Syh; > *C* (= 250) 3006

*Var:* ἀποκνίζοντες] αποκνυζοντες 161 | φλοιούς] φλυους 395; φλυ(οι sup lin)ους 260 | φυτῶν] φοιτων *C* (= 788-250) 612 555

*NonGr:* Syh ܟܕ ܡܩܪܦܝܢ
ܩ̈ܠܦܐ ܕܢܨ̈ܒܬܐ

*Notes*: The attribution to Sym fell out of Syh; thus, the whole fragment has been attributed to Aq incorrectly. Mss 788 3005 preserve the correct attribution to Sym.

**Job 30 4b**

HT וְשֹׁ֖רֶשׁ רְתָמִ֣ים לַחְמָֽם׃

LXX οἵτινες ἅλιμα ἦν αὐτῶν τὰ σῖτα,

## α′ θ′ καὶ ῥίζας τῶν ῥαθαμὶν ἐσθίουσιν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ.ܬ. ܘܥܩܪ̈ܐ ܕܪܐܬܐܡܝܢ
ܐ̇ܟܠܝܢ ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 53).

## σ′ καὶ ῥίζα ξύλων ἀγρίων ἡ σίτησις αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[559] 732 *cII* 555 161 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ῥίζα] ριζαι Syh | ἀγρίων] + ἦν Syh | σίτησις] σιτισις 137 3006

*NonGr:* Syh ܣ. ܘܥܩܪ̈ܐ ܕܩܝ̈ܣܐ
ܕܒܪ̈ܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘܬ
ܡܐܟܘܠܬܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ܂ ܀

*Notes*: Syh has ἦν (= ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘܬ), which probably came from the OG.

**Job 30 7a**
HT בֵּין־שִׂיחִים יִנְהָקוּ
E ἀνὰ μέσον εὐήχων βοήσονται·

## θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *cI*–138 139 395 [559] 680 732 252 *O* Arm Sa

*Attr:* θ′ 740 255 612 3006 137 643] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 7a sub ※ 740 255 612 3004 137 3006 260 643 252 *O* Arm

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ※ ܒܝܢܝ ܚܠܬ ܘܕܘܝܢܝ ܡܠܐ ܢܚܡܘܢ܂ ↘
La *et* (pr ※ μ) *inter arbores clamabant* (+ ↙ β)
Arm ※ Ի մէջ արձագանգաց գոչեսցեն

# σʹ μεταξὺ φυτῶν ἀγρίων ἠχοῦντες λιμῶδες

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 [559] 732 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] θʹ 139; > 643 740

*Var:* φυτῶν] φ.: τῶν 138 | λιμῶδες *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cII* 555 161] λιμωδεις 138 139 255 260 395 612 643 680 740; λιμωδης 3006

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* comments that the *Edition* was not quite clear that the oldest Greek catena contains two separate fragments for Aq (see *infra*) and Sym (*Nachlese*, 403); therefore, there is no variant attribution to Aq. The reading of 138 is dependent on the Hagedorns, who have read φ των. Furthermore, ms 680 has φυτῶν and not τῶν as in the *Edition*. The neuter λιμῶδες is considered the right reading in the *Nachlese pace* the *Edition*, since (1) this is the reading in the oldest Greek catena (788 also confirms this reading) and (2) Job 6:5a shows that Sym uses the adverbial function of the neuter singular, and wider Greek literature also confirms this usage (*Edition*, 340; *Nachlese*, 403; see esp. 389-90, where the Hagedorns provide an example from Plutarch; see also Woods, 141-2).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 252; *AGK* 3, 103; Nic, 454-5).

HT (בֵּין־)שִׂיחִים (יִנְהָקוּ)
E (ἀνὰ μέσον) εὐήχων (βοήσονται·)

# αʹ φυτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 [559] 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* αʹ] σʹ 612; > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The catena has separate readings for Aq and Sym (*Nachlese*, 403).

**Job 30 8a**
HT (בְּנֵי־נָבָל גַּם־בְּנֵי) בְלִי־שֵׁם
LXX (ἀφρόνων υἱοὶ καὶ) ἀτίμων ὄνομα

# σʹ ἀνωνύμων

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 [559] 732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 395 643; Ἄλλοι Field

*Var:* ἀνωνύμων] ανονυμων 680

*Notes*: The full reading of ms 395 is as follows: ἀτίμων· ἀνωνύμων (*Kollationen*, 190). The *Beiträge* draws attention to the Olymp *Kommentar* at Job 30:8: ἀνώνυμοι καὶ ἄδοξοι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (*Kommentar*, 252,23; *AGK*, vol III, 103; *Beiträge*, 39; Field, II 53 n 15). Probably, Sym has influenced the exegesis of Olymp in this case.

HT (בְּנֵי־נָבָל) גַּם—(־בְּנֵי בְלִי־שֵׁם)
E (ἀφρόνων υἱοὶ) καὶ ἀτίμων (ὄνομα)

# Sub ※

*Wit1:* La

*NonGr*: ※ *et ignobilium*↙

*Notes*: La preserves these two words under the asterisk, which is probably a mistake for the original placement before ἀτίμων ὄνομα.

**Job 30 9a**
HT (וְעַתָּה) נְגִינָתָם (הָיִיתִי)
LXX (νυνὶ δὲ) κιθάρα (ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτῶν,)

# σʹ μελῳδία

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [559] 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 139 643

*Notes*: The noun, μελῳδία, occurs in Aq and Sym and once in 4 Makk 15:21. Sym uses this noun once elsewhere in Ps 91:4 for הִגָּיוֹן (Busto Saiz, 548).

**Job 30 10b**
HT (וּמִפָּנַי לֹא־חָשְׂכוּ) רֹק׃
LXX (ἀπὸ δὲ προσώπου μου οὐκ ἐφείσαντο) πτύελον.

# σʹ πτύοντες

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[−139 260 [559] 643 732]

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: Πτυεῖν is used once by Sym and twice in the LXX (Num 12:14, Sir 28:12), where in Num it renders יָרַק.

**Job 30 11b-13a**

HT
וְרֶסֶן מִפָּנַי שִׁלֵּחוּ׃
עַל־יָמִין פִּרְחַח יָקוּמוּ
רַגְלַי שִׁלֵּחוּ
וַיָּסֹלּוּ עָלַי אָרְחוֹת אֵידָם׃
נָתְסוּ נְתִיבָתִי

E
καὶ χαλινὸν τοῦ προσώπου μου ἐξαπέστειλαν.
ἐπὶ δεξιῶν βλαστοῦ ἐπανέστησαν,
πόδα αὐτῶν ἐξέτειναν
καὶ ὡδοποίησαν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ τρίβους ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν.
ἐξετρίβησαν τρίβοι μου,

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[−138 [559]] 248 Arm Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ ε̅ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 3004 395 680) 3006 137 643 Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 11b-13a sub ※ 3005(non **13a**) 740(non **13a**) 255 612 3004(non **12 13a**) 395(non **13a**) 680(non **12 13a**) 3006(non **12ab 13a**) 137(non **11b 13a**) 260(non **12 13a**) 643(non **13a**) 732(non **11b 12ab 13a**) 139 (non **11b 12ab 13a**) 248(non **12c**) Arm Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]
ܬ ※ ܘܦܓܘܕܬܐ ܡܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܫܕܪܘ.
※ ܥܠ ܝܡܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܥܝܬܐ ܩܡܘ ܥܠܝ.
※ ܪ̈ܓܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܦܫܛܘ ܘܕܪܫ ܥܠܝ ܐܘܪ̈ܚܬܐ.
※ ܫܒ̈ܝܠܐ ܕܐܒܕܢܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ.
※ ܐܬܓܠܝܘ ܫܒ̈ܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܝ. ↘

Arm
※ և սանձս երեսաց իմոց առաքեաց
※ Յարեան ի վերայ աջոյ շառաւեղի
※ զոտս իւր ձգեաց
※ և ճանապարհ արար ի վերայ իմ Ընզ շաւիղս
կորստեան նոցա

※ շփեցան շաւիղք իմ

*Notes*: The stichometry differs between the *Edition* and the catena, which is problematic when the actual data of the mss is compared to Ziegler's II App. Most of the catena mss do not preserve 13a under the asterisk because 12c of the *Edition* is divided into two lines in these witnesses. 12c[1] is as follows: καὶ ὡδοποίησαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ, while 12c[2] (now the fifth line) is as follows: τρίβους ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν. Mss 255 612 have the same stichometry as these other witnesses but they have six asterisked lines even though the attribution states five lines.

This text is not placed under the asterisk in La according to de Legarde's text *pace* the *Edition*. Although the text of La is hexaplaric, it does not aid in determining the placement of the asterisk for these lines and therefore it has been omitted from the evidence.

**Job 30 11b**

HT (וְרֶסֶן מִפָּנַי) שִׁלֵּחוּ׃

E (καὶ χαλινὸν τοῦ προσώπου μου) ἐξαπέστειλαν.

# α′ ὁμοίως τοῖς ο′

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* ἐξαπέστειλαν $B^{c'}$-S* La 575'] -λεν rel

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܗ̇ܘ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ
ܕܗܠܝܢ ܫܒܥܝܢ ❖

*Notes*: This is the only example of this type of fragment in Syh Job 22-42; thus conclusions about its meaning will necessarily be preliminary. The index is over ܫܰܕܰܪ in $Syh^{txt}$. In this context, the scholion indicates that the Aq lemma is identical to the ο′ text. The Seventy is to be understood as a reference to the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla. In this instance Origen marked the text added to the OG with asterisks and attributed it to Th (see *supra*). The *Wit2* line, cited from Ziegler's I App, shows that the $O^{-La}$ group and catena preserved the singular, while a few notable witnesses attest the plural (e.g. S* La). The *O* group is split, since Syh has the singular and La attests the plural, which agrees with M. It is probable that the note intended to show that Aq agreed with a text similar to La, since this text also agrees with HT, a text which resembled Aq's.

**Job 30 12a**

HT עַל־יָמִין פִּרְחַח יָקוּמוּ

E ἐπὶ δεξιῶν βλαστοῦ ἐπανέστησαν,

# α′ ἐπὶ δεξιῶν βλαστῶντος

# ἀνέστησαν

*Wit1:* lemma] 252 | βλαστῶντος] Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܕܡܒܠܒܠܐ.

**Job 30 12c**

HT (וַיָּסֹלּוּ עָלַי אָרְחוֹת) אֵידָם׃

E (καὶ ὡδοποίησαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τρίβους) ἀπωλείας (αὐτῶν.)

# α′ ἐπιβλυσμοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 260 [559] 643 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ἐπιβλυσμοῦ] επικλυσμου (επικλησμου cod) *C* (= 250); επιβλησμου 395; επιβλυσμω 259-748 555

*Notes*: The *C* (= 257 788 3005) group has probably preserved the correct reading. The reading of 250 ἐπικλυσμός resembles the problem in 252 at 21:17b, where the Aq fragment was emended by Ziegler from ἐπικλυσμός to ἐπιβλυσμός, even though he was undecided on the original Aq version (*Beiträge*, 33; see also Woods, 389). Regarding the original version, there are two considerations: (1) since 250 is a descendent of 788, it is now clear that the reading in 250 is not a separate fragment, but a copyist's mistake for original ἐπιβλυσμός, (2) Aq uses ἐπιβλυσμός for אֵד "stream of fresh water" in Gen 2:6 and for אֵיד "final disaster" in Prov 1:26 (ms 248; only Nobil in Field), but he does not use ἐπικλυσμός unless Job 21:17b in 252 is admitted as an instance.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 254; *AGK* 3, 105; Nic, 456).

**Job 30 15b**

HT (תִּרְדֹּף כָּרוּחַ) נְדִבָתִי

LXX (ᾤχετό) μου ἡ ἐλπὶς (ὥσπερ πνεῦμα)

# σ′ τὰ καταθύμιά μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 395 [559] 732 *cII* 555

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250) 643

*Var:* μου] > 137

*Notes*: The *C* (= 257 788-250 3005) group demonstrates that the longer reading in Field, τὰ καταθύμιά μου δίκην ἀνέμου παρεληλυθότος, should be traced not to Symmachus but to the Nicetas catena, which falsely attributed the commentary to Olympiodorus (Field, 53; *Beiträge*, 39).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 254; *AGK* 3, 106; Nic, 457).

**Job 30 15c**

HT (וּכְעָב) עָבְרָה (יְשֻׁעָתִי׃)

LXX (καὶ ὥσπερ νέφος)—(ἡ σωτηρία μου.)

# α′ θ′ παρῆλθεν

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* ἡ σωτ. μου] pr παρηλθεν La (※ *transiit*) *lI* Aeth = M; + παρηλθεν $L'^{-637}$

*NonGr*: ܐ.ܬ. ܥܒܪ

*Notes*: The index is at the end of the line in Syh: ܘܐܝܟ ܥܢܢܐ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܕܝܠܝ. In La, ms μ has the asterisk before *transiit*, while ms β has it before *nubes* (※ *nubes transiit* ↙).

**Job 30 16a**

HT וְעַתָּה עָלַי תִּשְׁתַּפֵּךְ נַפְשִׁי

E καὶ νῦν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ἐκχυθήσεται ἡ ψυχή μου,

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) $cI^{-138\ 260\ [559]\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θ′ Syh$^{txt}$] ἐκ θ′ καὶ σ′ 3005 788 250 255 612 3004 395; (**16b**) ἐκ θ′ καὶ σ′ 740 3006 137 643

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 16a sub ※ 3005(*ad* ἡ) 788(*ad* ἡ) 740(**16b**) 255 612(*ad* ἡ) 3004 395 137(**16b**) 643 139(**16b**) 248(mend **16-18**) 252 (**16ab**) La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܘܗܫܐ ܥܠܝ ܬܬܐܫܕ ܢܦܫܐ ܕܝܠܝ. ↙

La ※ *et nunc super me effundetur anima mea,*

Arm ※ Եւ արդ զինեւ զեղցի անձն իմ

*Notes*: The asterisked line is attested at 16a in Syh La Arm and Sa (negatively). The Greek witnesses, therefore, are divided between those preserving the asterisk or having the attribution at 16a and those having the variant at 16b. The line is correctly attributed to Th and not both Th and Sym due to translation technique of the *waw*. Th renders *waw* with καί almost ubiquitously (Gentry, 366), while Sym avoids translating *waw* with καί (Salvesen, 220). Translation technique also confirms that the asterisk is at 16a, not 16b, for the same reason.

**Job 30 17a**

HT לַיְלָה (עֲצָמַי) נִקַּר (מֵעָלָי)

LXX νυκτὶ (δέ μου τὰ ὀστᾶ) συγκέκαυται

# λʹ συγκέκοπται νυκτός

*Wit1:* lemma] *C* (= 257) | νυκτός] *C* (= 788-250) ↓$cI^{-137\ 139\ 260\ [559]\ 643\ 732\ 740\ 3006}$

*Attr:* λʹ] Ἄλλος Field

*Var:* νυκτός] νοικτος 138

*Notes*: Although it might be plausible to analyze the fragment in 257 as an erroneous transfer of the OG (συγκέκαυται), more probably it represents a translation for נקר "to prick, to gouge" (*Nachlese*, 403-4). One expects revision of the OG, since it represents either exegesis or a different *Vorlage* (ר/ד confusion) which is in the Qumran Targum of Job (יקדון from יקד "to burn").[2]

**Job 30 18b**

HT כְּפִי כֻתָּנְתִּי יַאַזְרֵנִי׃

E ὥσπερ τὸ περιστόμιον τοῦ χιτῶνός μου περιέσχεν με.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) $cI^{-137\ 138\ 139\ 260\ 395\ [559]\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3004\ 3006}$ 248 Sa La $Syh^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ 3005 740 255 612 $Syh^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 18b sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 248 La $Syh^{txt}$

---

[2]J. P. M. Van der Ploeg, and A. S. van der Woude, *Le targum de Job de la grotte XI de Qumrân* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 43. Michael Sokoloff, *Targum to Job from Qumran*, (Jerusalem: Bar-Ilan, 1974), 59, 126.

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ܬ ※ ܐܝܟ ܒܪ ܦܘܡܐ ܕܟܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܚܕܪܢܝ. ↘
La *et* (※ pr μ; ※ *uirtute* β) *quasi ora vestimenti mei circundedit me.*

**Job 30 20b**
HT עָמַדְתִּי וַתִּתְבֹּנֶן בִּי׃
E ἕστησαν καὶ κατενόησάν με.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–137 138 139 260 395 [559] 643 680 732 3006 248 Arm Sa Syh^txt La

*Attr:* θʹ 3005 740 612 3004 Syh^txt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 18b sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 3004 248 Arm La Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ܬ ※ ܩܡܘ ܘܐܬܒܩܝܘ ܒܝ. ↘
La ※ *steterunt et consideraverunt me* (+ ↙ β).
Arm ※ կացին և հայեցան յիս

**Job 30 21a**
HT תֵּהָפֵךְ לְאַכְזָר לִי
LXX ἐπέβης δέ μοι ἀνελεημόνως,

# αʹ θʹ ἐστράφης εἰς ἀνελεήμονά μοι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: This fragment has not been listed until now, and it corresponds to HT תֵּהָפֵךְ לְאַכְזָר לִי (*Nachlese*, 404). There is evidence that Aq uses ἀνελεήμων for אַכְזָרִי (Reider, 19).

**Job 30 22b**
HT וּתְמֹגְגֵנִי תְּשֻׁוָּה (Q תּוּשִׁיָּה׃)
E καὶ ἀπέρριψάς με ἀπὸ σωτηρίας.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* 248 252 Arm Fa Syh^txt La

*Attr:* θʹ Syh^txt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Fa | 22b sub ※ 248 252 Arm La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܘܫܕܝܬܢܝ ܡܢ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ. ↘
La ※ *et proiecisti me a salute* (+ ↙ β).
Arm ※ և ընկեցեր զիս ի փրկութենէ

**Job 30 24a**

HT אַךְ לֹא־בְעִי יִשְׁלַח־יָד

LXX εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον δυναίμην ἐμαυτὸν χειρώσασθαι,

# α′ πλὴν οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἐκπορθῆσαι (s ἐξαναλῶσαι) ἐξαποστελεῖ ⟨χεῖρα⟩

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܒܪܡ ܠܘ ܠܡܚܪܒܘ
ܡܫܕܪ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 54). The word χεῖρα has been included in parentheses in accordance with the *Edition*, since it is in the HT and in the other revisers (see *infra*). The word, בְעִי, is a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew Bible; therefore, it is not possible to analyze translation equivalents for this word.

# σ′ ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐν ἰσχύι ἐξετείνετο χείρ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܐܠܐ ܠܘ ܒܚܝܠܐ
ܡܬܦܫܛܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܝܕܐ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 54).

# θ′ πλὴν οὐκ εἰκῇ ἐξέτεινεν χείρα

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܒܪܡ ܠܘ ܐܡܝܐ
ܦܫܛ ܐܝܕܐ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 54).

**Job 30 24a**

HT אַךְ לֹא־בְעִי) יִשְׁלַח־יָד)

LXX (εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον δυναίμην ἐμαυτὸν) χειρώσασθαι,

# Sub ※

*Wit1:* Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ↘ .ܠܡܓܡܠ ※

*Notes*: This instance of the asterisk in Syh is not in the *Edition*, but Field lists this text under the asterisk (Field, 54). This reading differs from the HT, but it is still represented in the HT.

**Job 30 26a**

HT כִּי טוֹב קִוִּיתִי וַיָּבֹא רָע

LXX ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπέχων ἀγαθοῖς,

# σʹ ἀγαθὰ προσεδεχόμην, ἦλθεν δὲ κακά

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ [559]\ 732}$ *cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἦλθεν] ηλθε 137 260 555 643 680 3006 | δέ] > 137 680; + μοι 138-255 612

*Notes*: The attribution to Chr in the *Edition* is not supported by the extant Chr-*Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (Chr-*Kommentar*, 157; *AGK* 3, 112; Nic, 460).

**Job 30 27**

HT מֵעַי רֻתְּחוּ וְלֹא־דָמּוּ
קִדְּמֻנִי יְמֵי־עֹנִי׃

E ἡ κοιλία μου ἐξέζεσεν καὶ οὐ σιωπήσεται,
προέφθασάν με ἡμέραι πτωχείας.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 260\ 395\ [559]\ 680\ 732}$ 248 Arm Co (= Sa Bo Fa) Syh$^{txt}$ La

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ β̅ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 3004; θ′ οἱ β̅ 643 137 3006$^{inc}$) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Co | 27 sub ※ 3005 740(non **27b**) 255 612 3004 137 643 139 248 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܟܪܣܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܐܬܪܬܚܬ ܘܠܐ ܫܬܩܬ.
※ ܩܕܡܘܢܝ ܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ ܕܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ. ↘

La *venter* (pr ※ β) *meus efferbuit, et non tacebit.*
*occupaverunt me dies inopiae* (+ ↙ β).

Arm ※ Որովայն իմ եռաց եւ ոչ դադարեսցէ
※ ժամանեցին ինձ աւուրք աղքատութեան

*Notes*: Ms 3006 probably contains the attribution since it follows 137 in the stemma, but the marginal note is very difficult to read. Only ].οἱ β̅ is visible in the margin of the ms.

**Job 30 27a**

HT (מֵעַי רֻתְּחוּ) וְלֹא־דָמּוּ

E (ἡ κοιλία μου ἐξέζεσεν καὶ) οὐ σιωπήσεται,

# σ′ οὐ ἐπαύσατο

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ [559]\ 732}$ *cII* 555 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* init] καί Syh | οὐ] ουκ *C* (= 788) | ἐπαύσατο] επασατο 680

*NonGr*: Syh ❖ ܫܠܝܬ ܘܠܐ .ܣ.

*Notes*: The καί probably arose from the bible text. The attribution to Olympiodorus in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 256-7; *AGK* 3, 112-3; Nic, 460-1).

**Job 30 28a**

HT קֹדֵר הִלַּכְתִּי) בְּלֹא חַמָּה(

LXX (στένων πεπόρευμαι) ἄνευ φιμοῦ,

## σʹ ἀθυμῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–138\ 139\ [559]}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250 3005)

*Var:* ἀθυμῶν] αθυμω 3006

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first *C* ms to preserve the attribution to Sym.

**Job 30 29b**

HT וְרֵעַ) לִבְנוֹת יַעֲנָה׃(

LXX (ἑταῖρος δὲ) στρουθῶν.

## θʹ ※ θυγατέρων στρουθῶν

*Wit1:* Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* στρουθῶν] *filiarum struthionum O*: cf M

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܚܒܪܐ ܕܝܢ ※ ܠܒ̈ܢܬܐ ܕܢܥܡ̈ܝܐ. ↘

## σʹ στρουθοκαμήλων

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–138\ [559]}$ *cII* 555 161 Ol$^{Y}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788) 395

*Notes*: The fragment and attribution are attested in *C* for the first time.
The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* stands, since it is confirmed by *Kommentar* (*Kommentar*, 257; Nic, 461). Although there is no explicit attribution to Sym, στρουθοκαμήλους, appears in the oldest catena of Job in commentary partly attributed to Olymp (*AGK* 3, 114).

**Job 30 30a**

HT עוֹרִי) שָׁחַר מֵעָלָי(

LXX (τὸ δὲ δέρμα μου) ἐσκότωται μεγάλως,

# λʹ ἐμελανώθη ἐπάνω μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\,[559]}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Wit2:* ἐσκότωται] μεμελανωται *O* (*innigrata est*) *L*$^{-637}$

*Attr:* λʹ] γʹ *C* (= 257); > 395 680 732 3006

*Var:* ἐμελανώθη *conj*.] εμελανωθ(η) *C* (= 257); εμελανθη *C* (= 3005) 139 255 260 395 612 680 740 *cII* 555 161; εμελανθ() *C* (= 788) 643 732 3006; εμελανθην 137 | ἐπάνω μου *C* (= 257)] εις βαθος *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*$^{-138\,[559]}$

*Notes*: The lemma comes from ms 257 exclusively, and the *Nachlese* considers it to be complete for the following reasons: (1) ἐπάνω μου is the correct rendering of מֵעָלָי and (2) ἐμελανώθη (from μελανόομαι), although used relatively infrequently (170x [*c*. 10x through 2nd century CE]),[3] is probably the correct reading of the Three, since it may be the only means for explaining the reading of *O* (μεμελάνωται), while the rest of the LXX tradition has ἐσκότωται (*Nachlese*, 404). Later scribes probably changed the less familiar ἐμελανώθη to the more familiar ἐμελάνθη (1485x [*c*. 400x through 2nd century CE]),[4] and 788 3005 already attest to this early modification as they agree with *cI* in this respect. Given this reconstruction, *cII* would have received a fragment with no prepositional phrase (it is absent from 788 3005 *cI*), and therefore, the *Nachlese* explains correctly that the addition, εἰς βάθος, which is attested only in *cII*, is an invention of the compiler of this catena (*Nachlese*, 404; *Beiträge*, 39).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported in *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 257-8; *AGK* 3, 115; Nic, 461).

**Job 30 30b**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | (וְעַצְמִי־) חָרָה (מִנִּי־חֹרֶב׃) |
| E | (τὰ δὲ ὀστᾶ μου)—(ἀπὸ καύματος.) |

# θʹ ※ συνεφρύγησαν

*Wit1:* *C*$^{txt}$ (= 3005) *cI*$^{txt}$ (= 740 255 612 3004) Syh$^{txt}$

---

[3] *TLG* [on-line]; accessed September 9 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet.

[4] *TLG* [on-line]; accessed September 9 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet.

*Wit2:* ἀπὸ καύμ.] pr συνεφρυγη *lIII C* (= 250 3005) *cI*$^{-[559]}$ *cII* 248$^{mg}$ 253′ 706 795 (-φριγη) = M; pr (※ *O*) συνεφρυγησαν *O d* 296 480 Aeth Ol$^{com}$ ; + συνεφρυγη *L*′′-396′-613; + συνεφρυγησαν S$^{c}$-644$^{c}$

*Attr:* θ′ 3005$^{txt}$ 740$^{txt}$ 3004 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma sub ※ 740$^{txt}$ 255$^{txt}$(※ pr τα) 612$^{txt}$(※ pr απο) 3004(pr ὀστᾶ) *O*

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܘܓܪ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܝ ※ ܐܬܦܠܘ ܡܢ ܚܘܡܐ. ↘
La *et ossa mea* ※ *frixa sunt* (+ ↙ β) *ab aestu.*

*Notes*: Ms 3004 preserves the asterisk and the attribution in the margin with an index at ὀστᾶ in the bible text. The *Kollationen* has provided detailed information regarding the presence, absence, and the placement of the asterisk in the *cI* group and has reported that 3005 preserves the attribution to Theodotion (*Kollationen*, 193). The *Wit2* line contains the data from *Edition*'s App I.

The plural is probably the original reading for the following reasons: (1) the *O* group contains this reading and it is most natural to suppose that these witnesses preserve Origen's insertion of the Th lemma (συνεφρύγησαν) into the fifth column. In contrast, Dhorme supposes that the Th lemma is singular originally, but has passed into Syh and La as a plural (Dhorme, 448). (2) Although it is possible that Th had a different vocalization than M, the problem is better treated by considering the translator's approach to the *Schema Atticum*, which Peter Gentry provided in his study. There are ten instances under the asterisk where the subject of the verb is neuter plural. The Greek verb is singular in four of these instances, but more significantly the Hebrew verb is singular (Gentry, 225). In the other six instances, the Greek verb is plural, and in all but two of these instances, the Hebrew verb is also plural (Gentry, 226). In Job 18:15b, Gentry suggests that there is a natural tendency in Th to ignore the *Schema Atticum* in Th, since in this case the Hebrew verb is singular, while the Greek verb is plural. In Job 12:7b, he posits that the verb is plural in Th since the verb in the OG is plural, yet this example is closest to this instance, since the Hebrew subject is singular (עוף), but the OG has a plural subject (πετεινά). The change from singular to plural may also have caused the change from a singular verb in Hebrew (ויגד) to a plural verb in the OG (ἀπαγγείλωσιν). Th translates the Hebrew singular collective nouns with Greek plurals and this happens with πετεινόν specifically in 12:7b and in 28:21b (see Gentry, 104, esp. n. 71). This same tendency may be operative with the word עצם as translated by ὀστᾶ. (3) The change from an original plural to singular may be explained *via* concern for the *Schema Atticum* in some sources. In this case the Lucianic group contains a singular verb in 30:30b, 18:15b, 12:7b, and 20:11a (A′-637-Chr Iul), where OG or Th contained a plural verb. It is probable that in our case, the catena preserves the correct attribution and the asterisk, but its text has been corrupted by the Lucianic recension due to Greek stylistic concerns.

**Job 30 31a**

HT (וַיְהִי) לְאֵבֶל (כִּנֹּרִי)
LXX (ἀπέβη δὲ) εἰς πάθος (μου ἡ κιθάρα,)

# γ′ εἰς πένθος

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* πάθος B´-S 252 542 575’ 706 797] πένθος rel

*NonGr*: Syh ܓ. ܠܐܒܠܐ ÷

*Notes*: The index is over ܠܐܒܠܐ in Syh$^{txt}$.

## Chapter 31

**Job 31 1a-4b**

HT

בְּרִית כָּרַתִּי לְעֵינָי
וּמָה אֶתְבּוֹנֵן עַל־בְּתוּלָה׃
וּמֶה חֵלֶק אֱלוֹהַּ מִמָּעַל
וְנַחֲלַת שַׁדַּי מִמְּרֹמִים׃
הֲלֹא־אֵיד לְעַוָּל
וְנֵכֶר לְפֹעֲלֵי אָוֶן׃
הֲלֹא־הוּא יִרְאֶה דְרָכָי
וְכָל־צְעָדַי יִסְפּוֹר׃

E

διαθήκην ἐθέμην τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου
καὶ οὐ συνήσω ἐπὶ παρθένον.
καὶ τί ἐμέρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπάνωθεν
καὶ κληρονομία ἱκανοῦ ἐξ ὑψίστων;
οὐχὶ ἀπώλεια τῷ ἀδίκῳ
καὶ ἀπαλλοτρίωσις τοῖς ποιοῦσιν ἀνομίαν;
οὐχὶ αὐτὸς ὄψεται ὁδόν μου
καὶ πάντα τὰ διαβήματά μου ἐξαριθμήσεται;

# α′ θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*−[559] 680 732 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* **1ab 2b-4** θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ $\overline{ζ}$ ομ() πρ() 740; ἐκ θ′ οἱ $\overline{ζ}$ ομ() πρ()κ() 3005 255 612 3004; ἐκ θ′ οἱ(> 3006 643) $\overline{ζ}$ 3006 137 643; ομ() πρ() ἐκ θ′ οἱ $\overline{ζ}$ 395 (**1b**)) Syh] > rel | **2a** α′ (τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν α′ (ακυλ() 3005 788-250 138-255 3004) 740 612 643] θ′ Syh; > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 1-4 sub ※ 3005 740(non **4b**) 255(non **2a 4b**) 612 (non **4b**) 3004(non **2b 3 4**) 395(non **1a 4b**) 137(non **3a 4b**) 3006(non **1 3b 4**) 260(non **3b**) 643(non **3b 4a**) 139(non **1 2a 3 4a**) 248 252 706 Arm La(non **2a 3b-4**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$

ܬ ※ ܕܝܬܩܐ ܣܡܬ ܠܥ̈ܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܝ.
※ ܘܠܐ ܐܣܬܟܠ ܥܠ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ.
※ ܘܬܘܒ ܦܠܓ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܢ ܠܥܠ.
※ ܘܝܪܬܘܬܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܣܦܩ ܡܢ ܡܪ̈ܘܡܐ.
※ ܘܠܐ ܐܒܕܢܐ ܠܥ̈ܘܠܐ.
※ ܘܡܢܟܪܝܘܬܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܥܒܕܝܢ
※ ܠܐ ܢܡܘܣܘܬܐ.

※ ܠܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܚܙܐ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܝܠܝ.
※ ܘܟܠܗܘܢ ܦܣ̈ܥܬܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܢܡܢܐ. ↘

La ※ *testamentum feci oculis meis,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *non cogitavi de virgine.*
*et quae est pars alia dei desuper* (+ ↙ β μ),
*et* (pr ※ μ) *hereditas omnipotentis de excelsis*.
*nonne* (pr ※ μ) *perditio erit iniquo,*
*et abalienatio facientibus iniquitatem*?
*nonne ipse videbit viam meam,*
*et omnes gressus meos dinumeravit*?

Arm ※ Ուխտ եդի ընդ աչս իմ
※ և ոչ հայեցայց ի կոյս
※ Եւ բաժանեաց Աստուած ի վերուստ
※ և ժառանգութիւն բաւականին ի բարձանց
※ Ոչ ապաքէն կորուստ անիրաւին
※ և տարագրութիւն այնոցիկ ոյք գործեն զանաւրէնութիւն
※ Ոչ ապաքէն ինքն տեսցէ զճանապարհս իմ
※ և ամենայն գնացք իմ թուեսցին

*Notes*: The *Edition* did not present the evidence clearly and therefore the reader may be led to an incomplete picture of the problems in these verses. The placement of the asterisk will be treated first and then the attribution.

There is reasonable certainty that all eight lines belong under the asterisk on the witness of 248 252 706 Syh Arm and the negative evidence of Sa, which omits the text. The catena tradition is conflicted in this instance. Ms 3005 is the only catena ms, which places all eight lines under the asterisk, while the rest of the mss place 1a-4a (7 lines) under the asterisk, and these mss attest that the “seven stichs” come from Theodotion. Unfortunately, 788-250 does not preserve any of these lines under the asterisk and therefore it also lacks the note attributing the text to Theodotion.

The attribution for these lines is more difficult to determine. Syh attributes all eight lines to Theodotion, while the catena witnesses are again divided. Most of the catena mss attest that seven stichs (ἐκ θ′ οἱ ζ̅) are from Theodotion. These witnesses also contain another marginal note, which the *Edition* omitted but the *Kollationen* has preserved: τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν Ἀκύλα (194). Mss 138 and 255 place the note at the end of 2a, near the word ἀπάνωθεν. Ms 788-250 preserves this note, but it is further to the right of the end of the line making less clear to what the note actually refers. Ms 740 places the note before the line, and ms 3005 places it also before the line but clearly below the line without an index. These factors make difficult it to ascertain what the catena tradition is attributing to Aquila, but there are two options: (1) the word ἀπάνωθεν, which seems to be the intention of 138 and 255 and is the most natural meaning of the pronoun τοῦτο, since στίχος is masculine, or (2) the whole line, which seems to be the intention of the rest of the mss which preserve this note, since some place it at the beginning of the line

(i.e. 740 3005) or at some distance from the last word of the line (i.e. 788-250). Realizing that the former interpretation is fully possible, the two marginal notes are better read as complementary and this assumption provides a basis for interpreting both notes. Since one marginal note indicates that seven lines come from Theodotion and the other that some *element* (τοῦτο) is from Aquila, it seems better to interpret the Aquila note as referring to the line, not simply one word in the line. Conversely, since the mss gave attention to line 2a and attribute it to Aquila, it seems probable that one should subtract 2a from the lines attributed to Theodotion, leaving him with seven lines; thus, originally, there were eight lines under the asterisk, and seven of these were attributed to Theodotion (1ab, 2b-4b) and one to Aquila (2a). The Aq fragment at 2a in the *Edition* should be removed and the asterisked data should be updated.

**Job 31 1b**

HT וּמָה אֶתְבּוֹנֵן עַל־בְּתוּלָה׃

E καὶ οὐ συνήσω ἐπὶ παρθένον.

# α′ καὶ τί κατανοήσω ἐπὶ παρθένον

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓252 | καί—κατανοήσω] Syh

*Var:* κατανοήσω] συνησω 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܡܢܐ ܐܬܒܩܐ܀

*Notes*: Ms 252 has borrowed the verb from the LXX and therefore it is to be considered secondary. The retroversion and the following rationale come from Field. First, Aquila renders Hebrew הִתְבּוֹנֵן with κατανοέω in Job 23:15 (θ′), 37:14, and 38:18. Second, Syh (ܐܬܒܩܐ) may be retroverted with κατανοέω on the evidence furnished in Job 30:20, Ps 93(94):9, and (142):5 (Field, 54). In *Curaes*, Middeldorpf conforms the Aq reading to Holmes-Parsons (συνίημι), even when he initially had κατανοέω (*Curaes*, 626; Field, 54).

# σ′ καὶ οὐδὲν ἐνενόησα περὶ παρθένου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*−[559] 732 *cII* 555 ↓252 Syh

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250 257) 3006

*Var:* καί] > 3006 | οὐδέν] ουδε 252; ουδ() 138 | ἐνενόησα] ενοησα 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܘܐܦܠܐ ܐܬܗܘܢܬ

ܥܠ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ܀

*Notes*: The *Edition* has ἐνόησα for Syh and 252, but it may have overlooked Field's rational for ἐνενόησα as the retroversion of ܐܬܗܘܢܝܬ. Field notes that ܗܘܢ may be retroverted with ἐννοέω according to Job 1:5, Isa 41:20, and most significantly Sym Psalms 140(141):4. The Syriac word may also be retroverted with νοέω according to Job 20:9, Prov 1:2, 3, and 19:5 (Field, 54-5). The evidence is divided, but the occurrence in the Psalter is sufficient to posit that Syh does not contain a variant in this case. The reading of 252 was caused by an inner Greek error of haplography due to homoioarcton or homoioteleuton. The reading παρθένου in 788 is παρθ(έν)ου.

**Job 31 5a**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | אִם־הָלַכְתִּי (עִם־שָׁוְא) |
| LXX | (εἰ δὲ ἤμην πεπορευμένος) μετὰ γελοιαστῶν, |

# θʹ μετὰ ματαιότητος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–138 [559] 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* θʹ] σʹ *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: The attribution to Sym in *cII* may have been caused by the Sym fragment in 252 (see *infra*).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 259; *AGK* 3, 118; Nic, 465).

# σʹ ἐν ματαιότητι

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: Sym uses μάταιος to translate שָׁוְא in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 546); therefore, 252 probably preserves the correct Sym reading.

**Job 31 6a**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | יִשְׁקְלֵנִי בְמֹאזְנֵי־צֶדֶק |
| LXX | ἱσταίη με ἄρα ἐν ζυγῷ δικαίῳ, |

# αʹ σταθμίσει με ἐν ζυγῷ δικαίῳ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* αʹ] > *C* (= 3005)

*Var:* σταθμίσει] σταθμησει 139 260 395 559 643 3006 555; ασταθμησει 137 | ζυγῷ] ζυγιω 740; λογω 680

*Notes*: Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Aq and the lemma belong to the oldest Greek catena. Ziegler asserts that ἐν ζυγῷ δικαίῳ is not from Aq but from the LXX, since Aq renders מֹאזְנַיִם with ζύγιον in Prov 11:1 and 16:11 and Aq has exact equivalents for צֶדֶק, צַדִּיק, and צְדָקָה (*Beiträge*, 60-1). There are two problems with Ziegler's suggestion: (1) the evidence from Proverbs is based on Nobil in Field and has not yet been confirmed. (2) The earliest evidence from the catena includes the prepositional phrase, and therefore until sound evidence to the contrary surfaces, the whole fragment should be considered as from Aq.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 259; *AGK* 3, 119; Nic, 465).

**Job 31 6b**

HT וְיֵדַע (אֱלוֹהַּ תֻּמָּתִי׃)

LXX οἶδεν δὲ (ὁ κύριος τὴν ἀκακίαν μου.)

# σʹ καὶ γνοίη

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732

*Attr:* σʹ] > 3006

*Notes*: In all manuscripts, except *C* (= 788-250 3005), the fragment is introduced with the words ἀντὶ τοῦ (*Kollationen*, 195). In 559, the fragment is at 31:7a, which may explain partially Field's misplacement of the fragment for εἰ ἐξέκλινεν (*Kollationen*, 195; *Beiträge*, 40; Field, 55).

**Job 31 8b**

HT וְצֶאֱצָאַי יְשֹׁרָשׁוּ׃

LXX ἄρριζος δὲ γενοίμην ἐπὶ γῆς.

# σʹ καὶ τὰ ἔκγονά μου ἐκριζωθείη

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732 *cII* 555 ↓161 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] λʹ Syh; > *C* (= 250 257) 138-255

*Var:* ἔκγονα] εγγονα 161

*NonGr*: Syh ܀ܗܠܝܢ ܕܣܦܪܐ. ܘܩ̈ܕܡ
ܩ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܝܠܝ
ܐܬܚܡܪܘܢ܀

*Notes*: The *Edition* has ἔγκονα for the *c* group, but 512-513 555 actually affirm the lemma; thus Ziegler's other *c* mss must have this variant. Ms 3005 is the first *C* witness to confirm the attribution to Sym. Now 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym belongs to the oldest Greek catena.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 260; *AGK* 3, 121; Nic, 466).

**Job 31 9a**
HT (אִם־) נִפְתָּה (לִבִּי עַל־אִשָּׁה)
LXX (εἰ) ἐξηκολούθησεν (ἡ καρδία μου γυναικὶ ἀνδρὸς ἑτέρου,)

# α′ θ′ ἠπατήθη

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005)

*Attr:* α′ θ′ 257] α′ 788 3005; > 250

*Notes*: The *Edition* lists this reading only as from 257, but the *Nachlese* has provided the evidence of 250 and 3005, the latter preserving the attribution to Aquila only (*Nachlese*, 404). Ms 788 adds further evidence that this fragment belongs only to Aq. The double attribution of 257, however, is still probably original, since the external evidence lists the attribution to Aq, and Th uses ἀπατᾶν to render פתה in Job 31:27; therefore, the double attribution in 257 is probably correct.

# σ′ ὥρμησεν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* presents this new fragment, which is only preserved in *C* (*Nachlese*, 404). Ms 788 confirms the fragment and the attribution to Sym, which was only known previously in 3005. The reason for the translation of נפתה "to be deceived" with ὅρμαω "to rush, hasten" is not immediately clear. The *Nachlese* suggests that Sym may have thought פנה meant "to head in a particular direction," but positing a different *Vorlage* is unnecessary, since in all probability Sym only clarifies the translation of the Greek text, ἐξακαλουθέω "to follow." Sym is primarily interested in revising the OG, since he uses the verb in the active voice (= LXX) and not the middle/passive (= HT Aq

Th). Sym, therefore, does not attempt a translation of HT *de novo*, but only attempts to revise the Greek text before him.

**Job 31 9b**

HT (וְעַל־פֶּתַח רֵעִי) אָרָבְתִּי׃

LXX (εἰ καὶ) ἐγκάθετος ἐγενόμην (ἐπὶ θύραις αὐτῆς,)

# λʹ ἐνήδρευσα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*–139 260 395 732 *cII* 555 ↓161′ ↓252

*Attr:* λʹ] σʹ αʹ 248; αʹ 252; > *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: The oldest Greek catena, *C* (= 788-250 3005), has preserved the proper attribution of this fragment, since the Three use ἐνεδρεύειν to render ארב (H-R, 472).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 260; *AGK* 3, 122; Nic, 467).

**Job 31 10a**

HT תִּטְחַן (לְאַחֵר אִשְׁתִּי)

LXX ἀρέσαι (ἄρα καὶ ἡ γυνή μου ἑτέρῳ,)

# ἑβρʹ ἀλέσαι

*Wit1:* Nobil

*Notes*: The reading is in Field with the following note: *Schol. apud Nobil.* (Field, 55). There is no record of this reading in the available sources.

**Job 31 11ab**

HT כִּי־הוּא (Q הִיא) זִמָּה
וְהִיא (Q וְהוּא) עָוֹן פְּלִילִים׃

LXX θυμὸς γὰρ ὀργῆς ἀκατάσχετος
τὸ μιᾶναι ἀνδρὸς γυναῖκα·

# σʹ ὅπερ ἐστὶ μύσος καὶ τοῦτο ὑπερβάλλουσα ἀδικία

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 643 732 3006 *cII* (= 512-513 555) ↓523

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 257 3005)] > *C* (= 788-250) *cI*–137 139 643 732 3006 523 512-513 555

*Var:* μύσος] μισος 138 559 | τοῦτο] τουτου *C* (= 257); τουτο και 523 | ὑπερβάλλουσα] υπερβαλλον 138 | ἀδικία] αδικιαν 138

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* says, "Both of these σ-Versions, while handed down in many cases, until now have remained unnoticed, because they are not marginal notes in all Γ-Hss with the exception of 740, but rather they appeared in exegetical comments and furthermore they were anonymous" (*Nachlese*, 404). The *cII* group (Nic) has preserved this fragment at the beginning of an exegetical comment at 12a, which we now know is a comment from Iul (*Nachlese*, 405; Iul-*Kommentar*, 190; Nic, 468). The *C* (= 257 3005) group has preserved the reading in the margins with the attribution to Sym at 11ab. Additionally, the Hagedorns show that Sym uses μύσος for זִמָּה in many places (cf. Le 18:17, Ps 25(26):10, Ezek 22:9, 23:21, 48) and 2) Sym has read פְּלִילִים as though from פלא, since he used ὑπερβάλλω (cp. Vulg. *maxima*). This last problem occurs also in Ezek 16:52 where Sym used ὑπερέβαλες for פִּלַּלְתְּ (*Nachlese*, 405).

**Job 31 12a**

HT כִּי אֵשׁ הִיא עַד־אֲבַדּוֹן תֹּאכֵל

LXX πῦρ γάρ ἐστιν καιόμενον ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν μερῶν,

# σʹ πῦρ δὲ τὸ ἕως συντελείας ἀναλίσκον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓249 ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ ↓754$^{cat}$ ↓523$^{cat}$

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 257 3005)] Χρυ(σοστομου) 139 3006; > *C* (= 788-250) 249 *cΓ*$^{-139\ 732\ 3006}$ 754$^{cat}$ 523$^{cat}$

*Var:* τό] + δια παντος και 249 | ἀναλίσκον] αναλισκων 138-255 740

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* lists this fragment among the hexaplaric materials for the first time (*Nachlese*, 405).

**Job 31 13a**

HT (אִם־) אֶמְאַס (מִשְׁפַּט עַבְדִּי וַאֲמָתִי)

LXX (εἰ δὲ καὶ) ἐφαύλισα (κρίμα θεράποντός μου ἢ θεραπαίνης)

# αʹ ἀπέρριψα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-680\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* αʹ] > *C* (= 250) 138 395

*Var:* ἀπέρριψα] απεριψα *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 261; *AGK* 3, 124-5; Nic, 469).

HT אִם־אֶמְאַס (מִשְׁפַּט עַבְדִּי וַאֲמָתִי)
LXX εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐφαύλισα (κρίμα θεράποντός μου ἢ θεραπαίνης)

σʹ εἰ ὑπερεφρόνησα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-680\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 788 3005)] > rel

*Var:* εἰ *C* (= 3005)] ἥ 740; ἢ́ 137 138 139 255 260 395 559 643 3006 *cII* 555; > *C* (= 788-250) 612

*Notes*: Ms 3005 is the first witness to preserve the attribution for this fragment, even though the *Edition* postulated this already. It is the only ms with the right spelling (εἰ instead of ἢ́). Ziegler did not list ἢ́ (*Nachlese*, 405). Ms 788 also preserves the correct attribution, but it does not have εἰ.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 261; *AGK* 3, 124-5; Nic, 469).

**Job 31 13b**
HT בְּרִבָם עִמָּדִי׃
LXX κρινομένων αὐτῶν πρός με,

αʹ ἐν τῷ δικάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς μετʼ ἐμοῦ

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: Nearly without exception Aq uses the construction ἐν τῷ + infinitive to render ב + inf. cstr. (Hyvärinen, 74). Ms 252 has the Aq fragment, which preserves his revision of the genitive absolute construction in the LXX.

**Job 31 14b**
HT וְכִי־יִפְקֹד מָה אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ׃
LXX ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἐπισκοπήν, τίνα ἀπόκρισιν ποιήσομαι;

σʹ ἐὰν ἐπιζητῇ, τί ἀποκρινοῦμαι αὐτῷ;

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732 *cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐάν] pr και *C* (= 788-250); + και 260 | ἐπιζητῇ] επιζητει 137 559

*Notes*: The preceding καί in 788-250 is an interesting variant that agrees with HT, but the misplacement of it in 260 probably indicates that it is an inner Greek error caused by harmonization with LXX.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 261; *AGK* 3, 124-5; Nic, 469).

**Job 31 15b**

HT (וַיְכֻנֶנּוּ) בָּרֶחֶם אֶחָד׃

LXX (γεγόναμεν δὲ) ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κοιλίᾳ.

σʹ ἐν ὁμοίῳ τρόπῳ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–732 3006 *cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 261; *AGK* 3, 124-5; Nic, 469).

**Job 31 17b**

HT (וְלֹא־אָכַל יָתוֹם) מִמֶּנָּה׃

E (καὶ οὐχὶ ὀρφανῷ μετέδωκα·)—

θʹ ※ ἐξ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 255 612) 248 *O*

*Wit2:* fin B´-S* A-637-534´ Aeth Arm Eus (Dem) Cyr Did Dam Antioch] + (※ *O*) εξ αυτου rel = M

*Attr:* θʹ 3005 255 612] αʹ 740; > rel

*Var:* ※ 3005 740 255 612 248 (pr καί) *O*] > rel

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ※ ܡܢܗ. ↘
La ※ *ex eo* ↙

*Notes*: The attribution and asterisk are one line above in 612, which clearly marks the lemma as from Th. The addition is in the bible text of 138 248 and 559. In 395, μετέδωκα ἐξ αὐτοῦ is the ordinary lemma text and has no asterisk or attribution, but the asterisk is at the following verse and in the margin: ὁμοίως ἐκ θ′ οἱ β̅ (see *infra*; *Kollationen*, 198).

**Job 31 18ab**

HT כִּי מִנְּעוּרַי גְּדֵלַנִי כְאָב
וּמִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי אַנְחֶנָּה׃

E ὅτι ἐκ νεότητός μου ἐξέτρεφον ὡς πατὴρ
καὶ ἐκ γαστρὸς μητρός μου ὡδήγησα·

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *cI*[−138 260 680 732 3006] 248 Arm La Co Syh[txt] Eus (Dem) Spec

*Attr:* θ′ (ὁμοίως ἐκ θ′ οἱ β̅ 740 255 612 559 395) Syh[txt]] [] 137; > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Co Eus (Dem) Spec | 18 sub ※ 740(non **18b**) 255 612 559 395 137 643(non **18b**) 139(non **18b**) Arm La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܢ ܛܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܝ
※ ܡܪܒܝܐ ܗܘܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܐܒܐ
※ ܘܡܢ ܒܪܗܣܐ ܕܐܡܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܗܕܝܬ. ↘
La *quia ab adolescentia mea enutriebam* (pr ※ β) *quasi pater*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *de ventre matris meae dux* (pr ※ β) *eis fui* ↙
Arm ※ Զի ի մանկութենէ իմմէ սնուցի իբրեւ զհայր
※ և յարգանդէ մաւր իմոյ առաջնորդեցի

**Job 31 19ab**

HT (אִם־אֶרְאֶה אוֹבֵד מִבְּלִי לְבוּשׁ)
וְאֵין כְּסוּת (לָאֶבְיוֹן׃)

E (εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑπερεῖδον γυμνὸν ἀπολλύμενον καὶ οὐκ ἠμφίασα,)
—

# Sub ※ μὴ ἐχόντα περιβόλαιον

*Wit1:* La Syh

*Wit2:* V-575-Iul: cf M

*Var:* lemma] om Syh

*NonGr*: La *aut* (pr ※ μ) *si despexi nudum pereuntem,*
*et* (pr ※ β) *non operui non* (pr ※ μ) *habentum velamen* (+ ↙ β).

Syh ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܬܟܣܝܬܐ.
ܗ̣ܢܐ ܠܐ ܣܝܡ ܗܘܐ
ܒܗܘ ܕܐܘܪܝܓܢܣ܀

*Notes*: La preserves the lemma under the asterisk, and it has the rest of verse 19 under the asterisk, which is not correct. Syh has the index at the end of v. 19b and preserves the lemma in the margin with the following scholion: “this was not placed in the exemplar of Origen” (*Edition*, 348; Field, 55).

**Job 31 20a**
HT (חֲלָצָיו Q) אִם־לֹא בֵרְכוּנִי חֲלָצוֹ
LXX ἀδύνατοι δὲ εἰ μὴ εὐλόγησάν με,

## α′ καὶ οὐκ εὐλόγησάν με ὀσφύες αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh .ܐ. ܘܠܐ ܒܪܟܘܢܝ
ܚ̈ܨܐ ܕܝܠܗ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 55). The Aq fragment agrees with the Qere.

**Job 31 20b**
HT וּמִגֵּז כְּבָשַׂי יִתְחַמָּם׃
LXX ἀπὸ δὲ κουρᾶς ἀμνῶν μου ἐθερμάνθησαν οἱ ὦμοι αὐτῶν,

## θ′ καὶ ἀπὸ κουρᾶς ἀμνῶν μου ἐθερμάνθησαν

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܘܡܢ ܓܙܬܐ ܕܐܡܖ̈ܐ
ܕܠܐ ܫܚܢ܀

*Notes*: The index was placed wrongly at verse 20a. The text of Syh 31:20b reads as follows: ܡܢ ܓܙܬܐ ܕܐܡ ܕܐܡܖ̈ܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܚܢ ܚ̈ܨܘܬܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ܀. The Th fragment has καί instead of δέ and it omits the subject, which the LXX made explicit.

**Job 31 21a**

HT (אִם־הֲנִיפוֹתִי) עַל־יָתוֹם (יָדִי)
LXX (εἰ ἐπῆρα) ὀρφανῷ (χεῖρα)

# σʹ κατὰ ὀρφανοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*−137 139 643732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* κατά] κατ’ 612 740; και τα 138-255 | ὀρφανοῦ] ορφα() μου 138; ορφανα μου 255; ορφανων *cII* 555 161′

*Notes*: The *C* (= 257 788-250 3005) group preserves the singular, which agrees with both the OG and the HT. The variants are best explained as deviating from this lemma. The *Kollationen* draws attention to the agreement of 248 with the Nicetas catena or *cII* group (*Kollationen*, 198). Field based his reading of the plural on Nic and Drusius and mss 248 and 259, another *cII* ms (Field, 55, esp. n. 20).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 262-3; *AGK* 3, 128; Nic, 471). The Sym fragment is embedded in the bible text according to Young’s edition and may not be connected to Olymp.

# αʹ θʹ ※ ἐπ’ ↙ ὀρφανῷ

*Wit1:* La Syh[txt]

*Wit2:* ὀρφανῷ] pr (※ *O*) επι *O* V (επ)-575-Iul Co Spec (*ad*) = M

*Attr:* αʹ θʹ] > La

*Var:* ὀρφανῷ] + ↙ La

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ※ ܐ ܬ ܥܠ ܒܒܬܐ↘
La ※ *super pupillum* ↙

*Notes*: The Syh has preserved the correct placement of the asterisk and the metobelus in this instance.

HT (אִם־הֲנִיפוֹתִי עַל־יָתוֹם) יָדִי
E (εἰ ἐπῆρα ὀρφανῷ χεῖρα)—

## γʹ ἑβρʹ ※ μοῦ ↙

*Wit1:* Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* χεῖρα] χειρας μου V; + (※ Syh) μου *O* 575-*lII*-Iul Aeth Spec = M

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܐܝܕܐ ※ ܕܝܠܝ ↘

*Notes*: Field notes Hieron.: *manum* ※ *meam* (Field, 55), but La$^{\mu\beta}$ does not confirm this reading. Perhaps, Field supplied the asterisk for this reading, since the addition of *meam* clearly indicates hexaplaric influence.

**Job 31 22a**
HT (כְּתֵפִי מִשִּׁכְמָה) תִפּוֹל
LXX ἀποσταίη (ἄρα ὁ ὦμός μου ἀπὸ τῆς κλειδός,)

## αʹ πεσάτω

*Wit1:* ↓248* 248$^{c}$

*Var:* πεσάτω 248$^{c}$] πεσέτω 248*

*Notes*: Field has “Nobil” as the evidence for this fragment, and 248 confirms the reading (Field, 55-6).

HT (כְּתֵפִי) מִשִּׁכְמָה (תִפּוֹל)
LXX (ἀποσταίη ἄρα ὁ ὦμός μου ἀπὸ) τῆς κλειδός,

## σʹ τοῦ ἀκρωμίου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* τοῦ] η του *C* (= 3005) | ἀκρωμίου] ακρομιου 3006; ακροτομου 161

*Notes*: The attribution is put in a place where it might be mistaken in 395 (θ over σ, under the entries in each row) (*Kollationen*, 199). The Sym and Th *lemmata* are combined (θʹ σʹ τοῦ αὐχένος τοῦ ἀκρωμίου) in 137 139 260 643 680 3006 (*Kollationen*, 199; see *infra*). The variant in 161, noted already in Klostermann (*Analecta*, 73), but not in Field, is treated in the *Beiträge*. Ziegler notes that Sym uses ἀκρότομος for צור in Job 22:24b Ps 30(31):3, and Ho 9:13 (αʹ σʹ); therefore, the *hapax legomenon*, ἀκρώμιον, should be preferred (*Beiträge*, 40).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 263; *AGK* 3, 128; Nic, 472).

# θʹ τοῦ αὐχένος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*–732 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 263; *AGK* 3, 128; Nic, 472).

**Job 31 23b-24a**

HT וּמִשְּׂאֵתוֹ לֹא אוּכָל׃
אִם־שַׂמְתִּי זָהָב כִּסְלִי

E καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ λήμματος αὐτοῦ οὐχ ὑποίσω.
εἰ ἔταξα χρυσίον ἰσχύν μου,

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 255 612) 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh^txt^

*Wit2:* ἰσχύν] εις (ως 706 Iul Chr VII 395^ap^) χουν B´-S C Syh-253 *L*ʼ-336´-644^c^ 55 252^mg^ 542 543 706 Aeth Arm Chr VII 395 Max II 373 Dion (Nic p 97); pr εις 613

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 3005 740 255 612) Syh^txt^] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 23b-24a sub ※ 3005(+ **23a**; non **24a**) 740(+ **23a**; non **24a**) 255(+ **23a**; non **23b 24a**) 612(+ **23a**; non **24a**) 248 252 Arm La(non **24a**) Syh^txt^

*NonGr*: Syh^txt^ ܬ ※ ܘܡܢ ܡܘܒܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܠܐ ܐܣܝܒܪ.
※ ܐܢ ܣܡܬ ܕܗܒܐ ܒܡܕܪܐ ܕܝܠܝ. ↙

La *et* (pr ※ β) *a pondere eius non sustinebo*

*si posui aurum robur meum*

Arm ※ և առաջի նորա ոչ համդարտեցից

※ Եթե կարգեցի զոսկի ի հող իմ

*Notes*: The catena has the asterisk at 23a-b and not at 23b-24a as the *Edition* presents. These mss are mistaken on the exact placement of the asterisks as 248 252 Arm Sa Syh make plain, but they still accurately testify to the attribution to Th.

**Job 31 23b**

HT וּמִשְּׂאֵתוֹ (לֹא אוּכָל׃)

E καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ λήμματος (αὐτοῦ οὐχ ὑποίσω.)

# σʹ καὶ τὸ βάρος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*–139 260 680 732 ↓*cII* 555 ↓161′ 157

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* καί] > 512-513 555 161 | τό] > 248 | βάρος] + αυτου ουχ υποισω 248

*Notes*: The plus in 248 comes from the LXX.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 263; *AGK* 3, 128; Nic, 472).

**Job 31 24a**

HT אִם־שַׂמְתִּי זָהָב כִּסְלִי

E εἰ ἔταξα χρυσίον ἰσχύν μου,

# σʹ εἰ ἡγησάμην χρυσίον ἀφοβίαν μου

*Wit1:* lemma] 252 | ἀφοβίαν μου] ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 732 *cII* 555 161′

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 395

*Var:* ἀφοβίαν] αφοβειαν 3006 | μου] > *C* (= 257) 138-255

**Job 31 25b**

HT (וְכִי־)כַבִּיר (מָצְאָה יָדִי׃)

LXX (εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐπ’) ἀναριθμήτοις (ἐθέμην χεῖρά μου,)

# σʹ ἐνδόξοις

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) $cI^{-137\ 138\ 260\ 395\ 732}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

**Job 31 27a**

HT וַיִּפְתְּ בַּסֵּתֶר לִבִּי

E καὶ εἰ ἠπατήθη λάθρᾳ ἡ καρδία μου,

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) $cI^{-138\ 139\ 260\ 395\ 559\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ 248 La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* εἰ] η 261-Iul; > La 110-256 296 = M

*Attr:* θʹ 3005 740 255 612 137 643 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 27a sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 137 643 248 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܘܐܢ ܛܥܐ ܒܛܫܝܐܝܬ ܠܒܐ ܕܝܠܝ. ↘

La *et* (pr ※ μ) *deceptum est clam cor meum* (+ ↙ β).

# αʹ καὶ εἰ ἐθέλχθη ἐν ἀποκρυφῇ καρδία μου

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: Ms 252 has ἀποκρύφης, but the genitive cannot be the object of ἐν. The *Edition* suggests ἀποκρυφῇ as the reading, while the *Kollationen* suggests emending the text to the dative plural, ἀποκρύφοις, which accounts for the final sigma (*Kollationen*, 200). Probably, the *Edition's* suggestion is correct given the singular in the HT.

# σʹ καὶ ἐπλατύνθη κρύφα ἡ καρδία μου

*Wit1:* lemma] 252 | ἐπλατύνθη] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-260\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] θʹ *C* (= 3005); > 255 612

*Notes*: The attribution to Th in the right margin of 3005 cannot be correct, since the same ms also attributes the asterisked line correctly to Th in the left margin. In this instance, 788-250 along with *cI* and *cII* preserves the attribution to Sym correctly.

**Job 31 27b**

HT וַתִּשַּׁק יָדִי לְפִי׃

LXX εἰ δὲ καὶ χεῖρά μου ἐπιθεὶς ἐπὶ στόματί μου ἐφίλησα,

## σʹ καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἡ χείρ μου περὶ τὸ στόμα μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788 3005) ↓$cI^{-139\ 732}$ ↓*cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788) 680

*Var:* προσεκύνησεν] -κινησεν 559 | περί] επι 703 | τό] του 559; > 703 | στόμα] στοματος 559

**Job 31 29b**

HT וְהִתְעֹרַרְתִּי כִּי־מְצָאוֹ רָע׃

LXX καὶ εἶπεν ἡ καρδία μου Εὖγε,

## σʹ καὶ ἐπανέστην ὅτι κατέλαβεν αὐτὸν κάκωσις

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-139\ 732}$ *cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250); [] *C* (= 788)

*Var:* καί] [] *C* (= 788) | ἐπανέστην] -εστι 138; -εστιν 3006; -εστη 559 | ὅτι *C* (= 788-250 3005) 138-255 740] οτε 260 395 555 559 612 643 680 3006; ο(τι) υτε 137 | κατέλαβεν] κ]ατελαβεν *C* (= 788) | κάκωσις] κακωσεις 612; κακωσης 3006

*Notes*: The *Edition* chose ὅτε instead of ὅτι, but 3005 788 also attest ὅτι. Evidence from translation technique confirms the reading of the best mss. In the Psalter, Sym translates temporal כִּי with ὅταν + subjunctive and not with ὅτε (Busto Saiz, 242-2). In the Psalter, Sym translates causal כִּי with ὅτι and sometimes with γάρ (Busto Saiz, 254-5).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported in *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 265; *AGK* 3, 133; Nic, 476).

**Job 31 31a**

HT אִם־לֹא אָמְרוּ מְתֵי אָהֳלִי

LXX εἰ δὲ καὶ πολλάκις εἶπον αἱ θεράπαιναί μου

# α′ σ′ θ′ εἰ μὴ εἶπον οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς σκηνῆς μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′ σ′ θ′ *C* (= 788 3005)] λ′ 512-513 555 161; (α′ εἰ μὴ εἶπον, θ′ οἱ ἄνδρες, σ′ τῆς σκηνῆς μου) 138-255 559 612 740; σ′ 260; (α′ εἰ μὴ πολλάκις: εἰ μὴ εἶπον θ′ οἱ ἄνδρες σ′ τῆς σκηνῆς μου) 395; (θ′ οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς σκηνῆς μου: εἰ μὴ πολλακις α′ εἰ μὴ εἶπον) 680; > *C* (= 250) 643 3006

*Var:* εἰ] εἰ]μη *C* (= 788) | μή] + πολλακις 161 512-513 555 | εἰ—ἄνδρες] > 260 643 3006

*Notes*: The *Edition* presents two separate fragments, one attributed to Aq (α′ εἰ μὴ εἶπον) and the other attributed to Sym and Th (σ′ θ′ οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς σκηνῆς μου), but, as the apparatus shows, there is no ms which attests to this division of readings and attributions, but rather there was one original fragment and attribution (*Kollationen*, 201).

There are four stages of development. First, mss 788 and 3005 attest to the original lemma and attribution. Both of these mss keep distinct the hexaplaric fragment from the exegetical fragment, since in 788 the hexaplaric fragment occurs on the left side of the bible text and the exegetical fragment (εἰ μὴ πολλάκις (= Ἄλλος Field, 56) *AGK* 3, 134) is on the right side, and in 3005, the hexaplaric fragment occurs at the top right of the folio, while the exegetical fragment occurs clearly below it, marked with an index. Most important the lemma appears as *one* continuous fragment in both mss. Second, the lemma was divided between the Three, and this divided fragment became the tradition of the archetype of *cI* as attested by 740 138-255 612. The lemma was divided into three distinct readings, and each reading was assigned to one of the Three. Third, mss 395 and 680 (significantly both mss are below 612 on *AGK* stemma) attest a further stage of development, since accidentally they have added (in different places) the exegetical fragment εἰ μὴ πολλάκις, though they still preserve multiple hexaplaric attributions to the different readings. Final, the Nicetas catena contaminates both the exegetical fragment and the hexaplaric fragment, since it combines the fragments under a reading attributed to λ′: οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ οὕτως ἐξέδωκεν· εἰ μὴ πολλάκις εἶπον οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς σκηνῆς μου (*AGK* 3, 134; Nic, 477).

**Job 31 31b**

HT מִי־יִתֵּן מִבְּשָׂרוֹ לֹא נִשְׂבָּע׃

LXX Τίς ἂν δῴη ἡμῖν τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ πλησθῆναι;

## θʹ τίς δῴη τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐμπλησθησόμεθα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–138 139 732] ↓512-513 ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* θʹ] > 512-513 555 161; [] *C* (= 788)

*Var:* τίς] τι]σ *C* (= 788); + ἄν 395 | καί] > 3006 | ἐμπλησθησόμεθα] εμπλησομεθα *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: In 788, the verb reads ἐμπλ(ησ sup lin)θησόμεθα. The letters in parentheses are represented by a ligature above the line; therefore, it is easy to see that the variant in 250 arose by the accidental omission of the ligature resulting in εμπλησομεθα. Although the *Edition* did not list the evidence of Nic, this fragment follows the previous one without attribution (Nic, 477).

**Job 31 32a**

HT (בַּחוּץ לֹא־יָלִין) גֵּר

LXX (ἔξω δὲ οὐκ ηὐλίζετο) ξένος,

## αʹ προσήλυτος

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: Aq uses προσήλυτος to render גֵּר (Reider, 205).

## θʹ ἑταῖρος

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: This occurrence of ἑταῖρος for גֵּר is the only one in the Th corpus.

**Job 31 32b**

HT (דְּלָתַי) לָאֹרַח (אֶפְתָּח׃)

LXX (ἡ δὲ θύρα μου παντὶ) ἐλθόντι (ἀνέῳκτο.)

# α′ ὁδοιπόρῳ

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: The translation equivalent is also in Jer 9:2(1) with a double attribution to Aq and Sym and Jer 14:8 with attributions to Aq and Th.

HT (דְּלָתַי לָ)—(אֹרַח אֶפְתָּח׃)
LXX (ἡ δὲ θύρα μου) παντὶ (ἐλθόντι ἀνέῳκτο.)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬܪܥܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܝ ÷ ܠܟܠ ↘ ܕܐܬܐ ܦܬܝܚ ܗܘܐ.

**Job 31 34a**
HT (כִּי אֶעֱרוֹץ) הָמוֹן (רַבָּה וּבוּז־מִשְׁפָּחוֹת יְחִתֵּנִי)
LXX (οὐ γὰρ διετράπην) πολυοχλίαν (πλήθους τοῦ μὴ ἐξαγορεῦσαι ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν,)

# ⟨α′⟩ ὄχλου

*Wit1:* 252

*Attr:* α′ Zieg *conj.*] > 252 cod

*Notes*: Ziegler observes that the genitive form ὄχλου is conspicuous and that it was certainly conditioned by πλήθους. He concludes that ὄχλος renders המון in Aq (*Beiträge*, 40; Reider, 180).

**Job 31 35a**
HT מִי יִתֶּן־לִי שֹׁמֵעַ לִי
E τίς δῴη ἀκούοντά μου;

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 255 612) 248 Arm Co La Syh$^{txt}$ Eus (Dem) Spec

*Attr:* θ′ (ομ() πρ()κ() 255(**35b**) 612) 3005 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Co Eus (Dem) Spec | 35a sub ※ 3005 255(**35b**) 612(**35b**) 248 Arm La[μ](**35b**) La[β] Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܡܢܘ ܢܬܠ ܠܝ ܗܘ ܕܫܡܥ ܠܝ. ↘
La *quis* (pr ※ β) *mihi tribuat auditorem*?
Arm ※ Ո տացէ ինձ լսել

*Notes*: In addition to the witnesses listed in the *Edition*, ms 3005 also preserves the asterisk in the correct place as well as the attribution to Th; thus, the catena is now represented. Ms 612 does not have the asterisk at 35a, but it does have the scholion: ομ() πρ()κ() (ὁμοίως πρόσκειται), which means the line is considered to be under the asterisk even when the asterisk is absent (*Edition*, 137-139).

**Job 31 39a**
HT (אִם־כֹּחָהּ אָכַלְתִּי) בְלִי־כָסֶף
LXX (εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῆς ἔφαγον μόνος) ἄνευ τιμῆς,

## λʹ ἄνευ ἀργυρίου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* λʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 138 680

**Job 31 39b**
HT וְנֶפֶשׁ בְּעָלֶיהָ הִפָּחְתִּי׃
LXX εἰ δὲ καὶ ψυχὴν κυρίου τῆς γῆς ἐκβαλὼν ἐλύπησα,

## αʹ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τῶν ἐχόντων αὐτὴν ἐλύπησα

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh .ܐ. ܘܠܢܦܫܐ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ
ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܗܘܢ
ܐܟܪܝܬ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from the *Edition*. Field used the Latin, *contristassem*, where Ziegler used ἐλύπησα (Field, 56).

HT (וְנֶפֶשׁ בְּעָלֶיהָ) הִפָּחְתִּי׃

LXX (εἰ δὲ καὶ ψυχὴν κυρίου τῆς γῆς) ἐκβαλὼν ἐλύπησα,

σʹ ἐλπίδος ἐστέρησα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 559

**Job 31 40a**

HT תַּחַת חִטָּה יֵצֵא חוֹחַ

LXX ἀντὶ πυροῦ ἄρα ἐξέλθοι μοι κνίδη,

σʹ ἀντὶ σίτου βλαστῆσαι ἄκανος

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓*cII* ↓555 Ol[Y] | ἄκανος] 252

*Var:* βλαστῆσαι] βλαστησατω *cII* 555

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* stands, since it is confirmed by *Kommentar* and Nic (*Kommentar*, 267; Nic, 482).

HT (תַּחַת חִטָּה יֵצֵא) חוֹחַ

LXX (ἀντὶ πυροῦ ἄρα ἐξέλθοι μοι) κνίδη,

θʹ ἄκανθα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 395 732 3006 *cII* 555 161 ↓252 ↓Syh

*Attr:* θʹ] αʹ σʹ θʹ Syh; > 138 252

*Var:* ἄκανθα] ἄκανθαι Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ.ܣ.ܬ. ܟܘܒܐ܀

*Notes*: Syh preserves a triple attribution to the reading ἄκανθαι, which is only the Th fragment, since 252 preserves separate words for Sym and Aq. The catena tradition preserves the original singular form, which comparison with the HT confirms.

αʹ ἄκαν

*Wit1:* 252

**Job 31 40b**

HT	(וְתַחַת־שְׂעֹרָה) בָאְשָׁה

LXX	(ἀντὶ δὲ κριθῆς) βάτος.

# σʹ	ἀτελεσφόρητα

*Wit1:*	↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 732\ 3006}$ *cII* 555 161 Klostermann

*Attr:*	σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 138 260

*Var:*	ἀτελεσφόρητα] τελεσφορητα 559; ατελεσφορα Klostermann

*Notes*:	Klostermann modified the lemma in 161 in two significant ways: (1) he understood the lemma to be in place of κνίδη in 40a, even though the ms reads ἀντὶ βάτος ἀτελεσφόρητα, and (2) he shortened ἀτελεσφόρητα to ἀτελέσφορα (*Analecta*, 73). Ziegler appeals to LSJ to show that ἀτελέσφορος does not occur because it is an incorrect shortening of the form, and that ἀτελεσφόρητος is a *hapax legomenon* (*Beiträge*, 40). *TLG* yields 70 instances of ἀτελεσφόρητος, while yielding no occurrences of Klostermann's shortened form.[5] The database also reveals that the first occurrence of the word is in Posidonius Phil. (2-1 BCE) and then occurs next in Methodius (3-4 CE). Thus, Sym is neither the only one nor the first to use this word, and this evidence may indicate that Sym is responsible for passing this word into the vocabulary of Christian authors (e.g. Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, and Eusebius), where it occurs 69 times.

---

[5]*TLG* [on-line]; accessed March 2 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet.

## Chapter 32

**Job 32 1b**

HT כִּי הוּא צַדִּיק בְּעֵינָיו׃
LXX ἦν γὰρ Ιωβ δίκαιος ἐναντίον αὐτῶν.

# σʹ διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν δίκαιον φαίνεσθαι ἑαυτῷ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–138 260 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Wit2:* αὐτῶν] –του *O* (Syh$^{txt}$) 55 68 157* 795 Aeth$^{A}$ = M

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 3006

*Var:* αὐτόν / δίκαιον] tr 161 | ἑαυτῷ] εαυτων 139 255 395 559 612 643; αυτων 740; εαυτον 680; επ αυτων *cII* 555 3006 161

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* draws attention to this text because ἑαυτῷ was not recorded as a variant in the *Edition*. It clarifies that *C* (= 3005 and 788 250 (εαυτωι)) and 137 preserve the singular as the correct reading, which is also the reading of HT (בְּעֵינָיו) and the Vulgate (*sibi*) (*Nachlese*, 405; *Kollationen*, 204). In 137, the ω is written above the τ and should not be confused with the ligature, which indicates the genitive plural termination.

Probably, the plural variant ἑαυτῶν, arose through harmonization with the LXX or through internal factors. Since 250 preserves the *iota adscriptum*, it is possible that this form became mistaken for a final -ν earlier in the transmission of the catena.[6] Furthermore, now it may be clearer how the singular, αὐτοῦ, arose in the *O* text and subsequent mss, since there is now clear attestation to a singular pronoun in one of the Three.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 268; *AGK* 3, 141; Nic, 482).

**Job 32 2a**

HT (וַיִּחַר אַף אֱלִיהוּא) בֶן(־בַּרַכְאֵל הַבּוּזִי)
LXX (ὠργίσθη δὲ ’Ελιοῦς ὁ)—(τοῦ Βαραχιὴλ ὁ Βουζίτης)

# λʹ υἱός

[6]I am thankful to Dieter Hagedorn for this suggestion.

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 138 139 260 395 643 680 732 3006

*Notes*: The index occurs at different places in the mss. In 3005, the index occurs after βαραχιήλ, which supposes the following reading: ὁ τοῦ βαραχιὴλ υἱός. In 559, the index is above ὁ and in 788-250 the index is above βαραχιήλ. There is no index in 255 612 and 740 (*Kollationen*, 204). The *Edition*, therefore, is potentially misleading in its reconstruction υἱὸς ⟨τοῦ βαρ.⟩.

**Job 32 2b**

HT (מִמִּשְׁפַּחַת) רָם

LXX (ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας) Ῥὰμ (τῆς Αὐσίτιδος χώρας,)

# σʹ Συρίας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 643 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250 257) 138

HT (מִמִּשְׁפַּחַת רָם)—

LXX (ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας Ῥὰμ) τῆς Αὐσίτιδος χώρας,

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *O*

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܡܢ ܓܢܣܐ ܕܪܘܡ ÷ ܕܥܘܨ
÷ ܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܝܘܒ ↘

La *de cognatione Ram ÷ Ausitidis regionis Iob* (+ ↙ β).

**Job 32 3b**

HT (עַל אֲשֶׁר לֹא־מָצְאוּ) מַעֲנֶה

LXX (διότι οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν ἀποκριθῆναι) ἀντίθετα (Ἰὼβ)

# σʹ ἐναντίον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–680 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > 138

*Notes*: The index is at ἀντίθετα in 3005, and the *Kollationen* notes that the index is at ἀντίθετα in 255 (*Kollationen*, 205).

**Job 32 4a**

HT (וֶ‍אֱלִיהוּ) חִכָּה אֶת־אִיּוֹב בִּדְבָרִים

LXX ('Ελιοῦς δὲ) ὑπέμεινεν δοῦναι ἀπόκρισιν 'Ιώβ,

# σʹ ἔπληξεν τὸν 'Ιὼβ λόγοις

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 732}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 3006

*Var:* ἔπληξεν] –ξε *C* (= 788-250) 137 260 559 612 643 680 740 3006 | λόγοις] λογον 138

**Job 32 4b-5c**

HT
כִּי זְקֵנִים־הֵמָּה מִמֶּנּוּ לְיָמִים׃
וַיַּרְא אֱלִיהוּא כִּי אֵין מַעֲנֶה
בְּפִי שְׁלֹשֶׁת הָאֲנָשִׁים
וַיִּחַר אַפּוֹ׃

E
ὅτι πρεσβύτεροι αὐτοῦ εἰσιν ἡμέραις.
καὶ εἶδεν 'Ελιοῦς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπόκρισις
ἐν στόματι τῶν τριῶν ἀνδρῶν,
καὶ ἐθυμώθη ὀργὴ αὐτοῦ.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *cI*$^{-260\ 732\ 680\ 3006}$ 248 252 Arm Co La Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ 740 138-255 612 559 395 137 643 139 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Co | 4b-5abc sub ※ 740(non **4b**) 138-255(non **4b**) 612(non **4b**) 559(non **4b 5bc**) 395(non **4b 5c**) 137(non **4b**) 643(non **4b 5c**) 139(non **4b**) 248 252 Arm(non **4b 5bc**) La(non **4b 5ab**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$
ܬ ※ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܩܫܝ̈ܫܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
※ ܡܢܗ ܒܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ.
※ ܘܚܙܐ ܐܠܝܗܘ ܕܠܝܬ ܦܘܢܝ ܦܬܓܡܐ:
※ ܒܦܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܓܒܪ̈ܐ.
※ ܘܐܬܚܡܬ ܒܪܘܓܙܐ ܕܝܠܗ

La
*quia seniores se erant in diebus.*
*et vidit Elius quia non est responsio*
*in ore trium virorum,*

*et* (pr ※ μ) *iratus est furor eius.*
Arm ※ Եւ ետես Եղիուս եթէ ոչ գոյ պատասխանի

*Notes*: La$^{\beta}$ has an asterisk before *daret* in 4a. This may be a misplaced asterisk intended for 4b.

The situation in the catena is complex. In 740, the stichometry of the ms does not match the stichometry of the *Edition*; therefore, there are six asterisks in 740, but these clearly mark only 5abc. In 612, it is the same situation, but seven asterisks appear, which again are clearly marking 5abc of the *Edition*. This same strategy was used in 255, in which only five asterisks were employed. The rest of the catena mss used only one asterisk at 5a. The catena treat 5abc as a totality or one line and, therefore, one asterisk at 5a is best interpreted as marking all three stichs of the *Edition* as under the asterisk. The apparatus reflects, therefore, that the archetype of *cI* preserves the asterisk for verse 5abc and not 4b. Ms 559 probably does not preserve the asterisk at 4b 5bc, and 395 probably does not preserve the asterisk at 4b 5c.

**Job 32 5c**
HT (וַיִּחַר) אַפּוֹ׃
E (καὶ ἐθυμώθη) ὀργὴ (αὐτοῦ.)

# σʹ ὁ θυμός

*Wit1:* *cI*$^{-139\ 732}$

**Job 32 6d**
HT (מֵחַוֹּת) דֵּעִי (אֶתְכֶם׃ )
LXX (τοῦ ὑμῖν ἀναγγεῖλαι τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ) ἐπιστήμην·

# αʹ θʹ γνῶσιν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\text{-}255\ 732}$

**Job 32 7a**
HT (אָמַרְתִּי)—(יָמִים יְדַבֵּרוּ)
LXX (εἶπα δὲ ὅτι) Οὐχ (ὁ χρόνος ἐστὶν ὁ λαλῶν,)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܐܡܪܬ ܕܝܢ ÷ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ↘ ܙܒܢܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘ ܕܡܡܠܠ.

**Job 32 7b**
HT (וְרֹ֣ב שָׁ֭נִים)—(יֹדִ֣יעוּ חָכְמָֽה׃)
LXX (ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ ἔτεσιν) οὐκ (οἴδασιν σοφίαν,)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh^txt^

*NonGr*: Syh^txt^ ܒܫ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܣܓ̈ܝܐܬܐ ÷ ܠܐ ↘
ܝܕܥܝܢ ܚܟܡܬܐ.

**Job 32 8a**
HT אָכֵ֣ן רֽוּחַ־הִ֣יא בֶֽאֱנ֑וֹשׁ
LXX ἀλλὰ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἐν βροτοῖς,

# σʹ ὄντως δὲ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώποις

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^−139 260 732^ ↓*cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250 3005) 643 740

*Var:* ἀνθρώποις] αυτοις 703; βροτοις 137 643 680 3006

*Notes*: The variant, βροτοῖς, is from the LXX.

**Job 32 8b**
HT (וְנִשְׁמַ֖ת שַׁדַּ֣י) תְּבִינֵֽם׃
E (πνοὴ δὲ παντοκράτορός ἐστιν ἡ διδάσκουσα·)—

# αʹ θʹ ※ αὐτούς

*Wit1:* Syh^txt^

*Wit2:* ἡ διδ.] + (※ Syh) αυτους *O*-253 *lII* Bo Aeth^P^ = M

*NonGr*: Syh^txt^ ܗܝ ܕܡܠܦܐ ※ ܐ ܬ ܠܗܘܢ. ↘

HT וְנִשְׁמַ֖ת (שַׁדַּ֣י תְּבִינֵֽם׃)
LXX πνοὴ (δὲ παντοκράτορός ἐστιν ἡ διδάσκουσα·)

## ⟨?⟩ ζωή

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: This fragment is unattributed, but it has a possible relationship to the Hexapla, since ζωή and πνοή are connected in Genesis 2:7 for נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים. In Gen 2:7, the Three have ἀναπνοὴν ζωῆς, while the LXX has πνοὴν ζωῆς. LXX Gen 2:7 could be the basis for the scholion but, in a source like 252, it is probable that this note is from the Hexapla.

**Job 32 11a**

HT הֵן הוֹחַלְתִּי לְדִבְרֵיכֶם

LXX ἐνωτίζεσθέ μου τὰ ῥήματα·

## θʹ ἰδοὺ ἐξεδεξάμην τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C*$^{cat}$ (= 257 788-250 3005) 249$^{cat}$ ↓*cI*$^{cat}$ ↓754$^{cat}$ ↓474$^{cat}$ ↓258$^{cat}$ ↓476$^{cat}$ ↓505$^{cat}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 ↓Ol$^{Y}$

*Attr:* θʹ *C* (= 788-250 3005) 249 *cI* (= 258 559 612 740)] σʹ 138-255; οἱ ἕτεροι ἑρμηνευταί *C*$^{cat}$ (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{cat–258\ 559\ 612\ 740}$ 754$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 258$^{cat}$ 476$^{cat}$ 505$^{cat}$ *cII* 555 161 Ol$^{Y}$

*Var:* ἐξεδεξάμην] εξελεξαμην 249$^{cat}$ 138-255$^{cat}$ 559$^{cat}$ Ol$^{Y}$; εδεξαμην 256$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 732$^{1cat}$ 740$^{cat}$ 754$^{cat}$ | τοὺς—ὑμῶν] > 139$^{cat}$ 476$^{cat}$

*NonGr*: La *ecce* (pr ※ μ) *patiens fui in (ad*$^{Y}$*) verba vestra*

*Notes*: Citing the full lemma from *AGK* aids in reconstructing this hexaplaric fragment and the one below, since it is clear that Olymp has combined two fragments from two different revisers into one citation under the general attribution “the other interpreters”: οἱ δὲ ἕτεροι ἑρμηνευταὶ οὕτως ἐκδεδώκασιν· “ἰδοὺ ἐξεδεξάμην τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἠκροασάμην ἐφ’ ὅσον ἐφρονεῖτε, ἐφ’ ὅσον ἐξητάζετε λόγους, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ἐφικέσθαι ὑμῶν ἐνενόουν” (*AGK* 3, 152).

In the margin, *C* (= 788-250 3005) 249 and a few mss of *cI* preserve the original attribution to Th for the section corresponding to 11a (σʹ in 138-255), while the rest of the witnesses preserve no additional attribution. In this regard, 3005 is most interesting because it is written in stichs and it alone has the attribution to Th at the first line with no attribution to Sym for 11b (*Kollationen*, 206; see *infra*). Ms 249 is not written in stichs, and it also contains only the attribution to Th.

La omits LXX 11ab but contains an asterisk at HT 11a, and it has certainly departed from the OG here. Jerome either translates the Hebrew *ad hoc* or he is dependent on Th for his rendering. The Latin prepositions *in* and *ad* would render HT ל suitably.

The *Edition's* attribution to Olymp stands, since it is supported by *Kommentar, AGK*, and Nic (*Kommentar,* 274; *AGK* vol. III, 152; Nic, 488).

**Job 32 11b-12a**

HT אָזִין עַד־תְּבוּנֹתֵיכֶם
עַד־תַּחְקְרוּן מִלִּין׃
וְעָדֵיכֶם אֶתְבּוֹנָן

LXX/E ἐρῶ γὰρ ὑμῶν ἀκουόντων,
ἄχρι οὗ ἐτάσητε λόγους.
καὶ μέχρι ὑμῶν συνήσω,

σʹ ἠκροασάμην ἐφ' ὅσον ἐφρονεῖτε, ἐφ' ὅσον ἐξητάζετε λόγους, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ἐφικέσθαι ὑμῶν ἐνενόουν.

*Wit1:* ↓$C^{cat}$ (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓249 ↓$cI^{cat}$ ↓$474^{cat}$ ↓$258^{cat}$ ↓$476^{cat}$ ↓$505^{cat}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 ↓$Ol^{Y}$

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 788-250) *cI* (= 138-255 258 559 612 740)] θʹ *C* (= 3005) 249; οἱ ἕτεροι ἑρμηνευταί $C^{cat}$ (= 257 788-250 3005) $cI^{cat–138-255\ 258\ 559\ 612\ 740}$ $474^{cat}$ $258^{cat}$ $476^{cat}$ $505^{cat}$ *cII* 555 161 $Ol^{Y}$

*Var:* ἠκροασάμην] > 139 | ἐφ' 2°—λόγους] > $139^{cat}$ $476^{cat}$ | ἐξητάζετε] εξεταζετε 3006 161 $Ol^{Y}$; εξητασητε 512-513

*Notes*: In the margin, several mss preserve an attribution to Sym for this fragment. Although 3005 and 249 attribute 11a and 11b to Th, it is more probable that the attribution to Sym fell out of these mss than that it was added to the others, since 11c and 12a are under the asterisk and the attribution to Th is well attested for these lines; therefore, this fragment should be attributed to Sym.

La contains an asterisk at 11b and 12a, showing that it does not represent what is in the OG but what is in the HT, and these lines either represent Jerome's *ad hoc* translation of HT or dependence on Sym (Field, 57-8 n. 17 favors the latter, while the *Edition* seems to favor the former).

The *Edition*'s attribution to Olymp stands, since it is supported by *Kommentar, AGK*, and Nic (*Kommentar*, 274; *AGK* vol. III, 152; Nic, 488).

**Job 32 11b**

HT (אָזִין עַד־תְּבוּנֹתֵיכֶם)—

LXX ἐρῶ γὰρ (ὑμῶν ἀκουόντων,)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* ἐρῶ γάρ] αγγελω γαρ 575-55 (-γελλω)-534: ex 13:17b; ερω γαρ Syh^mg (adn “*In multis exemplaribus ante* ὑμῶν ἀκουόντων *positum est* ἀναγγελῶ γάρ. *Non positum erat in Tetraplis*”); > B΄-S* Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ÷ ܟܕ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܫܡܥܝܢ.

Syh^mg ÷ ❖ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ ❖

+ ܩܕܡ ܠܗܘܢ + ܒܨܚ̈ܚܐ ܣܓܝܐܐ
ܩܕ̈ܡܐܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܒܪ
ܐܢܬܘܢ ܫܡܥܝܢ: ܣܝܡܐ
ܗܝ ܕܡܚܘܐ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ.
ܠܐ ܣܝܡܐ ܗܘܬ
ܒܐܪ̈ܒܥܐ ܦܬ̈ܐ +

*Notes*: Although the oblelus is not used, the scholion contains a reference to the Tetrapla, which did not place ἐρῶ γάρ or ἀγγελῶ γάρ before ὑμῶν ἀκουόντων. The words, ἐρῶ γάρ, are part of the OG as attested by the majority of witnesses, but the Tetrapla has omitted them, since they are absent from the HT.

**Job 32 11c-12**

HT
עַד־תַּחְקְרוּן מִלִּין׃
וְעָדֵיכֶם אֶתְבּוֹנָן
וְהִנֵּה אֵין לְאִיּוֹב מוֹכִיחַ
עוֹנֶה אֲמָרָיו מִכֶּם׃

E
ἄχρι οὗ ἐτάσητε λόγους.
καὶ μέχρι ὑμῶν συνήσω,
καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐκ ἦν τῷ Ἰὼβ ἐλέγχων,
ἀνταποκρινόμενος ῥήματα αὐτοῦ ἐξ ὑμῶν,

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*^−137 138 139 260 643 680 732 3006 248 252 Arm Sa La Syh^txt

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ δ̄ ομ() πρ()κ() 3005; ἐκ θ′ οἱ δ̄ ομ() πρ() 740 255 612 559 395) Syh^txt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 11c-12 sub ※ 3005(non **12bc**) 740 255 612(non **12a**) 559(non **12a**) 395 248 252(non **12c**) Arm La Syh^txt

*NonGr:* Syh^txt
ܬ ※ ܥܕܡܐ ܕܒܨܝܬܘܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ.
※ ܘܥܕܡܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܐܣܬܟܠ.
※ ܘܗܐ ܠܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܐܝܘܒ ܗ̇ܘ
※ ܕܡܟܣ.
※ ܕܡܦܢܐ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܢܟܘܢ. ↘

La *usque quo discuteretis sermones,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *donec intellegrem vos*:
*et* (pr ※ μ) *ecce non est qui arguat Iob,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *respondeat sermonibus eius ex vobis.*

Arm ※ մինչեւ քննիցէք զբանս
※ Եւ ձեւք չափ իմանայցեմ
※ և ահա ոչ էր որ յանդիմանէր զՅովբ
※ և տայր պատասխանի բանից նորա ի ձէնջ

*Notes*: The catena preserves the attribution at 11c, which indicates that Th is the author of all four stichs, even though the asterisks have not been applied accordingly.

**Job 32 11c**
HT (עַד־) תַּחְקְרוּן (מִלִּין׃)
E (ἄχρι οὗ) ἐτάσητε (λόγους.)

# α′ ἐξιχνιάσητε

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^–732

*Attr:* α′] σ′ 137 139 260 643 3006; > *C* (= 257)

*Var:* ἐξιχνιάσητε] –ται 740; εξιχνιαση 395 612; εξιχνιασει 137 139 260 559 643 680 3006

*Notes*: In 255, the index is at ἐτάσητε, while the fragment is next to 32:12a in 788-250 (*Kollationen*, 206).

**Job 32 13-18a**
HT 13(פֶּן־תֹּאמְרוּ מָצָאנוּ חָכְמָה)
אֵל יִדְּפֶנּוּ לֹא־אִישׁ׃

וְלֹא־עָרַךְ אֵלַי מִלִּין14
וּבְאִמְרֵיכֶם לֹא אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ׃
חַתּוּ לֹא־עָנוּ עוֹד15
הֶעְתִּיקוּ מֵהֶם מִלִּים׃
וְהוֹחַלְתִּי כִּי־לֹא יְדַבֵּרוּ16
כִּי עָמְדוּ לֹא־עָנוּ עוֹד׃
אַעֲנֶה אַף־אֲנִי חֶלְקִי17
אֲחַוֶּה דֵעִי אַף־אָנִי׃
(כִּי מָלֵתִי מִלִּים18a

LXX/E

13 (ἵνα μὴ εἴπητε Εὕρομεν σοφίαν) κυρίῳ προσθέμενοι·
14 ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ ἐπετρέψατε λαλῆσαι τοιαῦτα ῥήματα.
15 ἐπτοήθησαν, οὐκ ἀπεκρίθησαν ἔτι,
ἐπαλαίωσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν λόγους.
16 ὑπέμεινα, οὐ γὰρ ἐλάλησαν·
ὅτι ἔστησαν, οὐκ ἀπεκρίθησαν.
17 Ὑπολαβὼν δὲ Ελιους λέγει
18a Πάλιν λαλήσω· (πλήρης γάρ εἰμι ῥημάτων,)

⟨σʹ⟩

(13b) ἰσχυρὸς ἐκρίπτει αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἀνήρ. (14) καὶ οὐκ ἔταξεν πρός με λαλιάς· καὶ ἐν λόγοις ὑμῶν οὐκ ἀνταποκρινοῦμαι αὐτῷ. (15) ἐπτοήθησαν, οὐκ ἐποιοῦντο ἀπόκρισιν ἔτι· ἀπήρθησαν (s ἐξήρθησαν s ἀφῃρέθησαν) ἀπ’ αὐτῶν λαλιαί. (16) καὶ ὑπέμεινα (s ἀνέμεινα) ὅτι οὐκ ἐλάλησα, ὅτι ἔστησαν, οὐκ ἐποιήσαντο ἀπόκρισιν ἔτι· (17) ἀποκριθήσομαι κἀγὼ **τὸ μέρος μου**, ἀναγγελῶ τὴν γνῶσίν μου κἀγώ

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | τὸ μέρος μου] *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139}$

*Attr:* ⟨σʹ⟩] > *C* (= 250) Syh

*Var:* τό] pr και 137 260 395 643 680 732 3006

*NonGr:* Syh ※ ܚܠܛܐ ܢܥܪܐ ܠܗ̣ ܘܠܗ

※ ܡܪܝܐ. ܘܠܐ ܙܟܗ ܠܘܬܝ

※ ܡܡܠܠܐ. ܘܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܝܠܟܘܢ.

※ ܠܐ ܐܦܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ ܡܠܬܐ.

※ ܘܬܘܒ ܠܐ ܥܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܦܬܓܡ

※ ܡܠܬܐ ܬܘܒ. ܐܬܬܥܝܩܘ

※ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܡ̈ܠܠܐ. ܘܫܬܩܬ

※ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܠܬ. ܡܛܠ ܕܩܡܘ

※ ܠܐ ܥܢܘ ܦܬܓܡ ܡܠܬܐ ܬܘܒ.

※ ܐܦܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܡܢܬܐ

※ ܕܝܠܝ. ܡܘܕܥ ܐܢܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ

※ ܕܝܠܝ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ↘ +

La *dominus* (pr ※ μ) *abiecit eum, et non vir.*
*necdum* (pr ※ μ) *ad me locutus est,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *in sermonibus vestris non respondebo ei.*
*obstupuerunt* (pr ※ μ), *non responderunt ultra.*
*defecerunt* (pr ※ μ) *ab eis sermones.*
*quia* (pr ※ μ) *ergo expectavi, et non sunt locuti,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *steterunt, et non responderunt ultra,*
*respondebo* (pr ※ μ) *et ego partem meam,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *annuntiabo scientiam meam.*
(*homini* (pr ※ μ) *vero permisistis loqui talia verba.*)

*Notes*: The catena fragment is explicitly attributed to Sym, even though the Sym attribution for the whole lemma must remain an open question.

The retroversion is from Ziegler who departed from Field in the following places:

v. 13
ἰσχυρός] pr ὁ Field
ἐκρίπτει] απορριψει Field
v 14
καὶ οὐκ] ουδε Field
λόγοις] ρημασιν Field
ἀνταποκρινοῦμαι] αποκριθησομαι Field

The determination of attribution is a problem. Field is convinced this fragment belongs to Symmachus for the following reasons: (1) Th cannot be the author, since vss. 15-16 belong to him according to Syh$^{txt}$, (2) it is possible for Aq to be the author only if one removes ἀπόκρισιν ποιεῖσθαι for ענה (v. 16), since he hardly has use of such an interpretation, and (3) Symmachus remains, and two reasons commend him as the author: (1) part of the fragment (τὸ μέρος μου) is specifically attributed to him in the catena tradition and (2) Jerome appears to have followed him in verses 11bc and 12a (see *supra*), and he has followed him in these verses (Field, 58 n. 21).

The scholion in Syh reads as follows: ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܦܬ̈ܓܡܐ ܐ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܒܪ. ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܩܘܠܐ ܘܕܣܘܡܟܘܣ: ܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܓܘ. This note may be translated, “on

the one hand in the Tetrapla are [read] like these of the outside (i.e. the margin), but on the other hand in that [copy] of Eusebius and Pamphilus are read like these of the inside (i.e. the text).” The scholion introduces a contrast between the text of the margin (= Tetrapla) and the bible text (= Eusebius).

**Job 32 15-16**

HT חַתּוּ לֹא־עָנוּ עוֹד
הֶעְתִּיקוּ מֵהֶם מִלִּים׃
וְהוֹחַלְתִּי כִּי־לֹא יְדַבֵּרוּ
כִּי עָמְדוּ לֹא־עָנוּ עוֹד׃

E ἐπτοήθησαν, οὐκ ἀπεκρίθησαν ἔτι,
ἐπαλαίωσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν λόγους.
ὑπέμεινα, οὐ γὰρ ἐλάλησαν·
ὅτι ἔστησαν, οὐκ ἀπεκρίθησαν.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–138 260 732 3006 248 La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* 16b fin] + οτι αποκριθω καγω (+ το 130) μερος (+ μου 130) *lI’ C*′-296 = M (17a); + ※ *respondeam* (*respondebo*$^{\mu}$) *et ego partem meam, et adnuntiabo scientiam meam* La = M (17b); superadd *homini vero permisisti loqui talia verba* La = LXX (14)

*Attr:* θ′ (ομ() πρ() ἐκ θ′ οἱ δ̅ 740 255 612 559 395; ομ() πρ() ἐκ θ′ καὶ οἱ δ̅ 680(**14**); θ′ δ̅ 137 643; ἐκ θ′ οἱ δ̅ 788; ἐκ θ′ οἶδα 250; ομ() πρ()κ() 3005) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 15-16 sub ※ 3005(non **15b**) 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 643(non **16b**) 139(non **15 16b**) 248 La Syh$^{txt}$ | 16c (οτι αποκριθω καγω μερος) sub ※ 255 559

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܐܬܬܙܝܥܘ ܠܐ ܦܢܝܘ ܡܠܬܐ.
※ ܬܘܒ ܐܬܥܬܩܘ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ.
※ ܣܟܪܬ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡ̈ܠܠܘ.
※ ܡܛܠ ܕܩܡܘ ܠܐ ܦܢܝܘ ܡܠܬܐ. ↘

La *obstupuerunt* (pr ※ μ), *non responderunt ultra.*
*defecerunt* (pr ※ μ) *ab eis sermones.*
*quia* (pr ※ μ) *ergo expectavi, et non sunt locuti,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *steterunt, et non responderunt ultra,*

*Notes*: The asterisks are well preserved by the catena, Syh, La, and there is also the negative evidence of Sa.

The attribution to Th in the catena mss is preserved in various ways. In 680, the note, ομ() πρ() ἐκ θ′ καὶ οἱ δ̅ (ὁμοίως πρόσκειται ἐκ θ′ καὶ οἱ δ̅), appears at 32:14, and thus the attribution is misplaced in this ms, since it includes v. 14 as a fifth line, "from Th and the four." In the rest of the catena tradition the note occurs at 32:15a and affirms that the four lines are from Th; 3005 has not preserved the attribution.

**Job 32 18b**
HT הֱצִיקַתְנִי (רוּחַ בִּטְנִי׃)
LXX ὀλέκει (γάρ με τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς γαστρός·)

# σ′ συγκαίει

*Wit1:* ↓ *C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 732\ 3006}$ *cII* 555 161′

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250) 138

*Notes*: The attributions to Origen and Olympiodorus in the *Edition* are not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 278; *AGK* 3, 158-9; Nic, 491). Young's edition supports the attribution to Olymp but not to Origen; therefore, Ziegler does not cite his source for Origen.

**Job 32 19a**
HT (הִנֵּה־בִטְנִי) כְּיַיִן לֹא־יִפָּתֵחַ
LXX (ἡ δὲ γαστήρ μου) ὥσπερ ἀσκὸς γλεύκους ζέων δεδεμένος

# σ′ ὡς οἶνος νέος ἀδιάπνευστος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 138\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓*cII* 555 ↓161′

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250) 612 248

*Var:* ὡς] ὥσπερ 512-513

*Notes*: For the discussion of the fragment in 257 at 32:19b, see chapter 4.

**Job 32 20**
HT (אֲדַבְּרָה וְיִרְוַח־לִי אֶפְתַּח שְׂפָתַי) וְאֶעֱנֶה׃
LXX/E (λαλήσω, ἵνα ἀναπαύσωμαι ἀνοίξας τὰ χείλη·)—

# θ′ ※ ἀποκριθῶ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) $cI^{-139\ 260\ 643\ 732}$

*Wit2:* fin] + (※ Syh) αποκριθω *O*-253 $S^{c}$-*lI* = M

*Attr:* θʹ 3005 788 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006] > 740 Syh

*Var:* 20 fin sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 137(ἀνα※παύσωμαι) $Syh^{txt}$

*NonGr*: $Syh^{txt}$ ※ ܐ̇ܦܢܐ ܡܠܬܐ. ↘

*Notes*: The fragment with attribution appears in the margin of the catena and the asterisk precedes it in the majority of the mss. Syh preserves the asterisk in front of the lemma without the attribution.

## Chapter 33

**Job 33 2b**
HT　(דִּבְּרָה לְשׁוֹנִי) בְחִכִּי׃
LXX/E　(καὶ ἐλάλησεν ἡ γλῶσσά μου.)—

# θʹ　※ ἐν τῷ λάρυγγί μου

*Wit1:*　Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:*　2b fin] + (※ *O*) εν τω λαρυγγι μου *O*-253 *L*’$^{-A\ 637}$ = M

*Var:*　sub ※ La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*:　Syh$^{txt}$　ܘܡܠܠ ܠܫܢܝ ※ ܐܦ ܒܥܡܩܝ ܚܢܟܐ ܕܝܠܝ. ↘
La　*et locuta est lingua mea ※ in guttere meo.*

**Job 33 3a**
HT　יֹשֶׁר(־לִבִּי אֲמָרָי)
LXX　καθαρά (μου ἡ καρδία ῥήμασιν,)

# αʹ θʹ　εὐθεῖα

*Wit1:*　*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-139\ 732}$

*Notes*:　In ms 138, this note succeeds the following one without an attribution for the second note (*Kollationen*, 208; see *infra*).

# σʹ　ἁπλῆ

*Wit1:*　*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:*　σʹ] > 138

**Job 33 3b**
HT　וְדַעַת (שְׂפָתַי בָּרוּר מִלֵּלוּ׃)
LXX　σύνεσις (δὲ χειλέων μου καθαρὰ νοήσει.)

# αʹ θʹ　γνῶσις

*Wit1:*　↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 139\ 732}$

*Attr:* α′ θ′] σ′ *C* (= 3005); > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* lemma] γνῶσις θεοῦ 3006

*Notes*: The fragments of 3a and 3b are placed in close proximity in 250 and 3005. In 250, they are vertically arranged with no intervening text or space as follows: α′ θ′ εὐθεῖα, σ′ ἁπλῆ, γνῶσις. In 3005, the fragments of 3a are horizontally arranged as follows: α′ θ′ εὐθεῖα, σ′ ἁπλῆ with σ′ γνῶσις of 3b appearing directly under εὐθεῖα. This situation led probably to the confusion of attributions, but it is difficult to determine whether the error is in 3005 or *cI* (whose mss preserve the fragments of 3a together but the fragment of 3b is more remote as 740 and 612 attest). Ms 788 (ancestor of 250) clearly has the reading: α′ θ′ γνῶσις; therefore, it is most probable that the attributions have been confused in 3005, and 788 and *cI* preserve the original text.

In 395, the reading is συνεσις· γνωσις. Ms 3006 combined this fragment with the one in 4a erroneously (α′ θ′ γνῶσις θεοῦ), and Pitra supposed it to be the original fragment, though he attributed it to Sym, probably combining the lemmas of 3b and 4a under the variant attribution of 4a (*Kollationen*, 208; *Beiträge*, 40; Pitra, 557).

**Job 33 4a**

HT (רוּחַ־)אֵל (עָשָׂתְנִי)

LXX (πνεῦμα) θεῖον (τὸ ποιῆσάν με,)

# σ′ θεοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 139\ 732}$ ↓Pitra

*Attr:* σ′] σ′ θ′ *C* (= 3005); > *C* (= 250) 3006

*Var:* lemma] γνῶσις θεοῦ 3006 Pitra

*Notes*: For the attribution of Pitra, see *supra*. Given the new evidence of 788, the double attribution in 3005 is probably not the original text, even though Th renders the free form of the Hebrew bound phrase with the Greek genitive in 90% of the instances in Job (Gentry, 114). It is possible that the attributions between 3b and 4a were confused in 3005, since the original attribution for 3b did include one to Th. This attribution was incorrectly assigned to the fragment in 4b, since now 788 and *cI* attest only Sym here.

This lemma and 3b are combined in 3006 (α′ θ′ γνῶσις θεοῦ; *Kollationen*, 209; see *supra*).

**Job 33 5b-6a**

HT (עֶרְכָה לְפָנַי הִתְיַצָּבָה׃)
הֵן־אֲנִי כְפִיךָ לָאֵל

LXX (ὑπόμεινον, στῆθι) κατ’ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐγὼ κατὰ σέ.
(ἐκ πηλοῦ διήρτισαι σὺ ὡς καὶ ἐγώ,)

# σʹ ἆρα τοιοῦτός εἰμι οἷος σύ; οὐκ εἰμὶ θεός

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓249 ↓*cI*–139 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 249 559 740

*Notes*: This fragment equals 6a in HT. The fragment is at 33:6a in 559 (*Kollationen*, 209). The index is at 5b in 788.

**Job 33 6b**
HT (מֵחֹמֶר קֹרַצְתִּי גַם־אָנִי׃)
LXX ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ διηρτίσμεθα.

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–138 139 260 732 Syhtxt

*Attr:* οὐ κεῖται ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 680 137 3006inc(οὐ κεῖτ(αι) ἐν Ἑβρ...) 643

*Var:* 6b sub ÷ 3005 740 612 559 Syhtxt

*NonGr*: Syhtxt ÷ ܡܢܗ ܟܕ ܡܢܗ ܡܬܓܒܠܝܢ. ↘

*Notes*: The full fragment in 3005 is as follows: τὸ διηρτίσμεθα οὐ κεῖται ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ. The note indicates that διηρτίσμεθα is “not in the Hebrew,” even though the whole line is under the obelus. The fragment is difficult to read in 3006, but the reading is listed as read by the editor, and it was checked also by Dieter Hagedorn.

**Job 33 7a**
HT (הִנֵּה אֵמָתִי לֹא) תְבַעֲתֶךָּ
LXX (οὐχ ὁ φόβος μού σε) στροβήσει,

# σʹ ἐκθαμβήσει

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–138 139 732 ↓248

*Attr:* σ′] α′ 248; > *C* (= 788-250) 612

*Notes*: Aq uses the ἐκθαμβέω in Job 3:5 (for בעת) and 15:23. Also, Aq uses the noun ἐκθάμβησις in Isa 52:12, while Sym uses ἔκθαμβος in 3 Rgns 4:13 and Jer 51(28):32 and θάμβος in Isa 52:12. The external and internal evidence suggests that this fragment could be attributed to both Aq and Sym, but the catena has probably preserved the original attribution.

**Job 33 8a**

HT אַ֭ךְ אָמַ֣רְתָּ בְאָזְנָ֑י

E πλὴν εἶπας ἐν ὠσίν μου,

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *cI*–138 139 260 395 680 732 248 252 Sa La Syh^txt^

*Attr:* θ′ 740 255 612 559 137 3006 643] α′ θ′ Syh^txt^; > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 8a sub ※ 740 255 612 559 137 3006 643 248 252 La Syh^txt^

*NonGr*: Syh^txt^ ܐ ܬ. ※ ܒܪܡ ܐܡܪܬ ܒܐܕ̈ܢܐ ܕܝܠܝ. ↘

La ※ *veruntamen dixisti in auribus meis*

**Job 33 9b**

HT (חַ֣ף אָנֹכִ֑י) וְלֹ֖א עָוֹ֣ן לִֽי׃

LXX (ἄμεμπτος δέ εἰμι,) οὐ γὰρ ἠνόμησα·

# α′ καὶ οὐκ ἀνομία μοι

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܠܐ ܠܐ
ܢܡܘܣܝܬܐ ܠܝ ❖

**Job 33 10b**

HT (יַ֝חְשְׁבֵ֗נִי לְאוֹיֵ֣ב) לֽוֹ׃

LXX (ἥγηται δέ με ὥσπερ ὑπεναντίον·)—

# γ′ αὐτῷ

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* ὑπεναντίον] + εαυτω La (※ *sibi*) V-Iul-Chr = M

*Var:* lemma *conj*. Ziegler] αὐτῶν Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܠ. ܕܠܗܘܢ ܀

*Notes*: In Syh the index is at the end of the verse (+ ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ.). HT and La provide warrant for emending Syh from the genitive plural αὐτῶν to the dative singular αὐτῷ. The inner Greek error may have been caused by *iota adscriptum*, which was confused for -ν (see 32:1b for an analogous example).

**Job 33 11a**

HT (יָשֵׂם) בַּסַּד (רַגְלָי)

LXX (ἔθετο δὲ) ἐν ξύλῳ (τὸν πόδα μου,)

## ⟨α′⟩ ἐν ξυλοπέδῃ

*Wit1:* 252

*Attr:* ⟨α′⟩] > 252 cod

*Notes*: At 13:27a, ms 252 contains ἐν ξυλοπέδῃ for Hebrew בַּסַּד and attributes the reading to Aquila (Woods, 261; *Edition*, 359). Since there is no explicit attribution here, the probable attribution to Aq is placed in angle brackets.

**Job 33 13**

HT מַדּוּעַ אֵלָיו רִיבוֹתָ
כִּי כָל־דְּבָרָיו לֹא־יַעֲנֶה׃

LXX λέγεις δέ Διὰ τί τῆς δίκης μου οὐκ ἐπακήκοεν πᾶν ῥῆμα;

## α′ τί οὖν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐδικάσω; ὅτι πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀποκρινεῖται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 732}$ ↓*cII* 555 Syh

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250) 3006

*Var:* ἐδικάσω] εκδικασω *cII*–512-513 555 | ἀποκρινεῖται] αποκρινεται *C* (= 3005) 137 139 260 643 680 3006; αποκρινηται 395 559

*NonGr*: Syh

ܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ.
ܠܘܬܗ ܐܕܘܢ. ܡܛܠ
ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ
ܠܐ ܡܦܢܝܐ +

# σʹ

## τί οὖν αὐτῷ δικάζῃ; πάντες γὰρ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ ἀναντίρρητοι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 260 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* τί] δια τι *C* (= 3005); οτι s διοτι Syh | αὐτῷ] αυτο 740 | δικάζῃ *C* (= 788-250 3005) 395] διαδικαζη 255 559 612 740; διαδικαζει 680; διαδικαζου 555 | οἱ] > *C* (= 3005)

*NonGr:* Syh

ܗ. ܡܛܠ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܠܘܬܗ.
ܕܐܢ ܐܢܬ. ܟܠܗܘܢ
ܓܝܪ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܠܐ
ܚܪܝܢܐ +

*Notes*: Ms 395 agrees with the lemma established by *C* and not with the variant in *cI* (*Kollationen*, 210). Syh appears to have ὅτι or διότι for τί (Field, 59 n. 12). Field also notes that Syh rendered the Greek expression, αὐτῷ διαδικάζῃ, as if it were πρὸς αὐτὸν δικάζῃ (Field, 59 n. 12). His retroversion of the verb has been confirmed by the *C* group.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 281; *AGK* 3, 166; Nic, 495).

# θʹ

## τί πρὸς αὐτὸν κρίσις, ὅτι πᾶσιν τοῖς ῥήμασιν (s λόγοις) αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀποκρινεῖται

*Wit1:* Syh

*Var:* τί *conj*. Field] ὅτι cod

*NonGr:* Syh

.ܣ. ܡܛܠ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܡܛܠܐ ܕܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ
ܕܠܗ̇ ܠܐ ܡܦܢܐ +

*Notes*: Concerning the variant, Field says, “Likewise this ὅτι at the beginning of the fragment appears to have been written falsely for the interrogative” (Field, 59).

**Job 33 14a**

HT כִּי־בְאַחַת יְדַבֶּר־אֵל

LXX ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἅπαξ λαλῆσαι ὁ κύριος,

# σʹ ὅτι ἅπαξ λαλήσει ὁ θεός

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI*–732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788) 137 395 559 643 680

*Var:* λαλήσει *conj*. Field] λαλήσας *C* (= 788); λαλήσ(ας) *C* (= 3005); καλεισαι 680; λαλησαι rel | ὁ] > 260 | θεός] κυριος 137 139 260 643

*Notes*: Probably, Field’s conjecture is correct, since Sym normally translates the Hebrew imperfect with the future indicative (Busto Saiz, 132). This part is absent in 248 (*pace Edition*); only a related scholion is found (*Kollationen*, 210). Ms 248, therefore, has been omitted from the *Wit1* line.

**Job 33 14b**

HT וּבִשְׁתַּיִם לֹא יְשׁוּרֶנָּה׃

LXX ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐνύπνιον,

# σʹ ἐκ δευτέρου οὐκ ἀκυρώσει αὐτόν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 137 559 643 680 3006

*Var:* αὐτόν] αυτω 138 255 395 559 612 680 740; αυτων 137; αυτο *C* (= 788-250); αυτ() 3006; αυτ(ον) 643

HT		וּבִשְׁתַּיִם) לֹא יְשׁוּרֶנָּה:)
LXX		(ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐνύπνιον,)—

# Sub ※ *non considerabit illud*

*Wit1:* La

*NonGr*: ※ *non considerabit illud* (+ ↙ β),

**Job 33 15a**
HT		בַּחֲלוֹם חֶזְיוֹן לַיְלָה
LXX		ἢ ἐν μελέτῃ νυκτερινῇ,

# α′ ἐν ἐνυπνίῳ ὁραματισμοῦ νυκτός

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 732

*Attr:* α′] σ′ 559 612 740; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐν ἐνυπνίῳ] > 138 | ἐν] η *C* (= 3005) | ἐνυπνίῳ] > 260 | ὁραματισμοῦ *C* (= 788-250 3005)] οραματι μου 138-255 260 395 612 643 680 740 3006; ορα τι μου 559

*Notes*: Only the two *C* mss have preserved the right reading, ὁραματισμοῦ (*Nachlese*, 405). Previously, the *Edition* based the reading on the testimony of 250, but ms 3005 confirms this reading. Ms 788 confirms also the correct reading and the attribution. Aq uses ὁραματισμός for חֶזְיוֹן, while Sym uses ὅραμα (cp. the Aq and Sym versions at Job 4:13; Woods, 116).

**Job 33 15b**
HT		בִּנְפֹל) תַּרְדֵּמָה (עַל־אֲנָשִׁים)
LXX		(ὡς ὅταν ἐπιπίπτῃ) δεινὸς φόβος (ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους)

# θ′ ἔκστασις

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–139 260 732

*Attr:* θ′] > *C* (= 788-250 3005)

**Job 33 16b**
HT וּבְמֹסָרָ֥ם יַחְתֹּֽם׃
LXX ἐν εἴδεσιν φόβου τοιούτοις αὐτοὺς ἐξεφόβησεν

# α′ καὶ ἐν παιδείᾳ αὐτῶν πλήξει αὐτούς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732

*Attr:* α′] σ′ 740; > *C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Var:* πλήξει] πληξη 3006

**Job 33 19a**
HT (וְהוּכַ֣ח) בְּמַכְא֣וֹב (עַל־מִשְׁכָּב֑וֹ)
LXX (πάλιν δὲ ἤλεγξεν αὐτὸν) ἐν μαλακίᾳ (ἐπὶ κοίτης)

# σ′ διὰ πόνου

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–260 732

*Attr:* σ′] > 138 139 643

**Job 33 19b**
HT וְרִ֖יב (וְר֖וֹב Q) עֲצָמָ֣יו אֵתָֽן׃
E καὶ πλῆθος ὀστῶν αὐτοῦ ἐνάρκησεν,

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI*–138 139 260 643 680 732 248 252 Sa Syhtxt

*Attr:* θ′ 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 Syhtxt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 19b sub ※ 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 248 252 Syhtxt

*NonGr:* Syhtxt ܬ ※ ܘܣܘܓܐܘܬܐ ܕ ܓܪ̈ܡܐ ܕܠܗ ܐܬܐܒܬ. ↘

**Job 33 20b**
HT וְ֝נַפְשׁ֗וֹ מַאֲכַ֥ל תַּאֲוָֽה׃
E καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ βρῶσιν ἐπιθυμήσει,

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) 248 La Sa Syh^txt

*Attr:* θʹ 788-250 Syh^txt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 20b sub ※ 250 248 La Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ܬ ※ ܘܢܦܫܗ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܐܟܘܠܬܐ ܬܪܓ ܠܗ. ↘
La ※ *et anima eius desiderabit cibum* (+ ↙ β)

*Notes*: The *Edition* does not report any evidence of the asterisk for the catena, but ms 250 preserves the asterisk with the attribution to Th. Ms 788 also preserves the asterisk and the attribution to Th.

**Job 33 21a**

HT (בְּשָׂרוֹ מֵרֹאִי) יִכֶל
LXX (ἕως ἂν) σαπῶσιν (αὐτοῦ αἱ σάρκες)

# ἑβρʹ ἐκλείψωσιν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^–732

*Var:* ἐκλείψωσιν] εκλειψουσιν 138-255

*Notes*: The full note is as follows: ὁ ἑβραῖος ἐκλείψωσιν ἔχει. Ms 260 omits the ὁ before ἑβραῖος (*Kollationen*, 212).

**Job 33 22a**

HT (נַפְשׁוֹ) לַשַּׁחַת (וַתִּקְרַב)
LXX (ἤγγισεν δὲ) εἰς θάνατον (ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ,)

# λʹ εἰς διαφθοράν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* λʹ] > 680

**Job 33 23ce**

HT 23(אִם־יֵשׁ עָלָיו מַלְאָךְ)
(מֵלִיץ אֶחָד מִנִּי־אָלֶף)

(לְהַגִּיד לְאָדָם יָשְׁרוֹ׃)
24(וַיְחֻנֶּנּוּ וַיֹּאמֶר)
(פְּדָעֵהוּ מֵרֶדֶת שָׁחַת)

LXX 23(ἐὰν ὦσιν χίλιοι ἄγγελοι θανατηφόροι,)
(εἷς αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ τρώσῃ αὐτόν·)
ἐὰν νοήσῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐπὶ κύριον,
(ἀναγγείλῃ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μέμψιν,)
τὴν δὲ ἄνοιαν αὐτοῦ δείξῃ,
24(ἀνθέξεται τοῦ μὴ πεσεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς θάνατον,)
(ἀνανεώσει δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ὥσπερ ἀλοιφὴν ἐπὶ τοίχου,)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–138 Arm La Syh^txt

*Attr:* οὐ κεῖνται(κεῖται 3005$^{2}$ 395$^{1}$ 680$^{1}$ 139$^{1}$) ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ 3005(**23a 23e**) 788(**23a 23e**) 250(**23a 23e**) 740(**23a**) 255(**23a**) 612(**23b**) 559(**23a 24a**) 395(**23a 24b**) 680(**23b 24a**) 137(**23a**) 3006(**23c**) 260(**23b**) 643(**23b**) 732(**23a**) 139(**23a 23c**)

*Var:* 23ce sub ÷ 3005(+ **23b**) 788(+ **23b**) 740(+ **23abd**) 612(+ **23abd**) 559(+ **23abd 24a**) 395(※ pro ÷; + **23abd**) 137(+ **23d**) 260(+ **23d**) 643(+ **23bd 24a**) 732(※ pro ÷; non **23e**; + **23abd**) 139(+ **23d**) Arm La(+ **23a 24ab**) Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt
ܐܢ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܠܦܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐܟܐ
ܡܝ̈ܬܝܢ ܡܘܬܐ.
ܚܕ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܢܚܒܠܝܘܗܝ.
÷ ܐܢ ܢܬܗܘܢ ܒܠܒܐ ܠܡܬܦܢܝܘ
÷ ܠܘܬ ܡܪܝܐ. ↘
ܢܘܕܥ ܕܝܢ ܠܒܪܢܫܐ ܒܥܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
÷ ܫܛܝܘܬ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܚܘܐ. ↘

La *quod si fuerint ※ angeli mortiferi, ※ non respondebit ei* ↙
*unus ex eis non vulnerabit eum,*
*si intellexerit corde converti ad dominum,*
*et nuntiaverit homini culpam suam,*
÷ *stultitiam suam ostenderit* (pr ÷ β),
*subveniet* (pr ÷ μ) *sibi, ut non cadat in morte,*
*et renovabit corpus* (pr ÷ μ) *suum sicut litura in pariete,*

Arm ÷ Եթէ իմացի սրտիւ իւրով դառնալ առ Տէր
÷ և ցուցցէ զանմտութիւն իւր

*Notes*: The placement of the obelus has been preserved accurately by Arm and Syh. Comparison with HT shows probably that 23ce were invented by the OG translator and that 23abd consist of a dynamic translation of HT; therefore, the catena and La have preserved more lines under the obelus than the Hexapla probably did.

**Job 33 25b**

HT יָשׁוּב לִימֵי עֲלוּמָיו׃

LXX ἀποκαταστήσει δὲ αὐτὸν ἀνδρωθέντα ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

# α′ θ′ ἐπιστρέψει εἰς ἡμέραν νεανιότητος αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′ θ′] λ′ *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐπιστρέψει] επιστρεφει *cII* 161 555 | νεανιότητος *C* (= 788-250 3005)] νεοτητος rel

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* reports that only the *C* (= 250 3005) group preserves the right reading νεανιότητος, which was previously known only in 250 (*Nachlese*, 405). Ms 788 also preserves the correct reading. Ziegler arrived at this same conclusion based on 250 and the internal evidence of Aquila's translation technique. Aquila translates נעורים with νεότης and עלומים with νεανιότης (*Beiträge*, 40, 61).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 284-5; *AGK* 3, 172; Nic, 498).

**Job 33 26a**

HT יֶעְתַּר אֶל־אֱלוֹהַּ וַיִּרְצֵהוּ

LXX εὐξάμενος δὲ πρὸς κύριον, καὶ δεκτὰ αὐτῷ ἔσται,

# θ′ δεηθήσεται τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εὐδοκήσει αὐτόν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* θ′] σ′ 137 260 643; > *C* (= 788-250) 138 395 3006

*Var:* δεηθήσεται] pr και 260 643 | εὐδοκήσει *C* (= 788-250 3005)] εὐλογήσει rel

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* reports that only *C* (= 250 3005) preserves the right reading εὐδοκήσει, which was previously known only in 250 (*Nachlese*, 405). Ms 788 also confirms that this reading is part of the oldest Greek catena. Ziegler notes that the change from original εὐδοκεῖν to εὐλογεῖν occurred often in the transmission of the text (e.g. Ps 48(49):14; *Beiträge*, 40-1).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 285; *AGK* 3, 172; Nic, 498).

**Job 33 26b**

HT (וַיַּרְא פָּנָיו)—(בִּתְרוּעָה)

LXX (εἰσελεύσεται δὲ προσώπῳ) καθαρῷ (σὺν ἐξηγορίᾳ·)

## δγρʹ ἱλαρῷ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Wit2:* καθαρῷ] ιλαρω B′-S* *O* (Syhtxt sub ÷) 534txt Sa Arm: cf M

*Attr:* δγρʹ] λʹ 395 559 *cII* 555 161; δη γαρ 612; > 680

*NonGr*: Syhtxt ÷ ܦܐ̈ ܢܩܝܐ ↘
Syhmg ❖ܕܚܝܐ❖

*Notes*: In mss 788-250 and 255, the index is at καθαρῷ. Rightly, Ziegler notes that there is no equivalent for καθαρῷ in the Hebrew text, and therefore ἱλαρῷ cannot be assigned to οἱ λοιποί (*Beiträge*, 61).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* and the *Beiträge* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 285; *AGK* 3, 172; Nic, 498; *Beiträge*, 61).

HT (וַיַּרְא פָּנָיו) בִּתְרוּעָה

LXX (εἰσελεύσεται δὲ προσώπῳ καθαρῷ) σὺν ἐξηγορίᾳ·

## αʹ θʹ ἐν ἀλαλαγμῷ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 ↓161′

*Attr:* αʹ θʹ] αʹ 248

*Notes*: Aquila renders תרועה with ἀλαλαγμός (Reider, 11), and in Job 8:21 a double attribution to Aq and Th is probably original (Woods, 179). In 33:26b, the oldest

Greek catena probably preserves the original double attribution also, while 248 has lost the attribution to Th.

The *Edition* suggests that the anonymous fragment, μετὰ ἐξομολογήσεως, should be attributed to Th. There are two challenges to this proposal: (1) there are no known instances of ἐξομολογήσις in Th and (2) Th does not translate ב with μετά (Gentry, 315-22); therefore, it is more probable to correct the attribution of the fragment to both Aq and Th on the basis of the external evidence and to interpret the other fragment as an exegetical one, perhaps taken from the comment by Olympiodorus for the same verse (*AGK* 3, 172; see chapter 4 "Omitted Marginalia.").

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 285; *AGK* 3, 172; Nic, 498).

# σʹ ἐν ὑμνολογίᾳ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ *cII* 555 161ʹ

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐν] > 680

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 285; *AGK* 3, 172; Nic, 498).

**Job 33 26c**

HT (וַיָּשֶׁב) לֶאֱנוֹשׁ (צִדְקָתוֹ׃)

LXX (ἀποδώσει δὲ) ἀνθρώποις (δικαιοσύνην.)

# λʹ ἀνθρώπῳ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Wit2:* ανθρωπω *L* 542 543 Glos Aeth Ol = M; -πος 740

*Notes*: Ms 788 also attests this fragment and attribution for the *C* group. The fragment is written twice with two different hands in 255 (*Kollationen*, 214).

**Job 33 27a**

HT (יָשֹׁר עַל־אֲנָשִׁים)—(וַיֹּאמֶר)

LXX (εἶτα τότε ἀπομέμψεται ἄνθρωπος) αὐτὸς (ἑαυτῷ λέγων)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh[txt]

*Wit2:* αὐτός] > La 620 Glos

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ÷ ܗܘ ܠܗ ܒܗ: ܐܡܪ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ

*Notes*: There is no metobelus in Syh, but La and other witnesses omit only αὐτός.

**Job 33 28-29**

HT

פָּדָה נַפְשִׁי (Q נַפְשׁוֹ) מֵעֲבֹר בַּשָּׁחַת
וְחַיָּתִי (Q וְחַיָּתוֹ) בָּאוֹר תִּרְאֶה׃
הֶן־כָּל־אֵלֶּה יִפְעַל־אֵל
פַּעֲמַיִם שָׁלוֹשׁ עִם־גָּבֶר׃

E

σῶσον ψυχήν μου τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν εἰς διαφθοράν,
καὶ ἡ ζωή μου φῶς ὄψεται.
ἰδοὺ ταῦτα πάντα ἐργᾶται ὁ ἰσχυρὸς
ὁδοὺς τρεῖς μετὰ ἀνδρός.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI*$^{-138\ 260\ 680\ 732}$ 248 252 Arm Co La Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̅ 788-250 740 612 255 559 395; θʹ δ̅ 137 3006 643) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Co | 28-29 sub ※ 788-250 740 255 612 559 395(non **29b**) 137 643 139 248(non **28a**) 252(non **29a**) Arm La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]

ܬ ※ ܦܪܘܩ ܠܢܦܫܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܠܐ ܐܬܐ
※ ܠܡܬܚܒܠܢܘܬܐ.
※ ܘܢܦܫܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܬܚܙܐ.
※ ܗܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܦܥܠ ܚܝܠܬܢܐ.
※ ܐܘܪ̈ܚܬܐ ܬܠܬ ܥܡ ܓܒܪܐ. ↘

La

※ *salva animam meam, ne veniam in corruptionem,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *vita mea lucem videbit.*
*ecce* (pr ※ μ) *haec omnia faciet deus*
*vices* (pr ※ μ) *tres cum viro* (+ ↙ β).

Arm

※ Փրկեա զանձն իմ զի մի մտցէ յապականութիւն
※ և կեանք իմ տեսցեն զլոյս
※ Ահա զայս ամենայն գործէ Հզաւրն

※ երիս ճանապարհս ընդ առն

**Job 33 29a**

HT (הֶן־כָּל־אֵלֶּה) יִפְעַל(־אֵל)

E (ἰδοὺ ταῦτα πάντα) ἐργᾶται (ὁ ἰσχυρὸς)

# σʹ πράξει

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) $cI^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 395\ 559\ 612\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

**Job 33 29b**

HT פַּעֲמַיִם שָׁלוֹשׁ עִם־גָּבֶר׃

E ὁδοὺς τρεῖς μετὰ ἀνδρός.

# σʹ δὶς τρὶς πρὸς ἕκαστον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* τρίς 138-255 512-513] τρεις rel

*Notes*: The variant was caused by itacism.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 286; *AGK* 3, 174; Nic, 499).

**Job 33 30a**

HT לְהָשִׁיב נַפְשׁוֹ (מִנִּי־שָׁחַת)

LXX ἀλλ’ ἐρρύσατο τὴν ψυχήν μου (ἐκ θανάτου,)

# σʹ ὥστε μετακαλέσαι τὴν ψυχήν μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-732}$ ↓*cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 395

*Var:* μετακαλέσαι] μετακαλεσα(ι) 740; μετα το καλεσαι 3006 | μου] + εκ θανατου 512-513

*Notes*: The Nicetas catena added the words ἐκ θανάτου from the LXX.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 286; *AGK* 3, 174; Nic, 499-500).

**Job 33 31b-33**

HT

הַחֲרֵשׁ וְאָנֹכִי אֲדַבֵּר׃
אִם־יֵשׁ־מִלִּין הֲשִׁיבֵנִי
דַּבֵּר כִּי־חָפַצְתִּי צַדְּקֶךָּ׃
אִם־אַיִן אַתָּה שְׁמַע־לִי
הַחֲרֵשׁ וַאֲאַלֶּפְךָ חָכְמָה׃

E

κώφευσον, καὶ ἐγώ εἰμι λαλήσω.
εἰ εἰσὶν λόγοι, ἀποκρίθητί μοι·
λάλησον, θέλω γὰρ δικαιωθῆναί σε.
εἰ μή, σὺ ἄκουσόν μου·
κώφευσον, καὶ διδάξω σε σοφίαν.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 260\ 680}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ ε̅ 3005 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 643)] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 31b-33b sub ※ 3005 788 740 255(non **32b**) 612 559(non **33b**) 395(non **33a**) 137 3006 643 732(non **32**) 139(non **32 33**) 248 252 Arm La(non **33b**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$

※ ܚܪܘܫ ܘܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ ܐܡܠܠ.
※ ܐܢ ܐܝܬ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܦܢܐ ܠܝ.
※ ܡܠܠ ܨܒܐ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܡܙܕܕܩܘܬܟ.
※ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܐܢܬ ܫܡܥܝܢܝ.
※ ܚܪܘܫ ܘܐܠܦܟ ܚܟܡܬܐ. ↘

La

*tace* (pr ※ β)*, et ego loquar.*
*si* (pr ※ μ) *est tibi sermo, responde mihi* :
*loquere* (pr ※ μ), *volo enim iustificari te.*
*alioquin* (pr ※ μ) *audi me,*
*tace, et docebo te sapientiam.*

Arm

※ կարկեաց և ես խաւսեցայց
※ Եթէ գուցէ բան տուր ինձ պատասխանի
※ խաւսեաց քանզի կամիմ թէ արդարասցիս
※ Ապա թէ ոչ լուր ինձ դու

※ կարկեաց և ուսուցից քեզ զիմաստութիւն

**Job 33 33b**

HT הַחֲרֵשׁ וַאֲאַלֶּפְךָ חָכְמָה׃

LXX κώφευσον, καὶ διδάξω σε σοφίαν.

# σʹ σίγα, καὶ διδάξω σε φρόνησιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*⁻⁷³²

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 260 395

*Notes*: In 788-250 the fragment is placed incorrectly at 33:31b with an index (*Kollationen*, 215).

## Chapter 34

**Job 34 2a**

HT שִׁמְעוּ חֲכָמִים מִלָּי

LXX (Ἀκούσατέ μου, σοφοί·)—

# Sub ※ τὰ ῥήματα μου

*Wit1:* Syh[txt]

*Wit2:* fin] + τα ρηματα μου *O lI* = M

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܫܡܥܘ ܚ̈ܟܝܡܐ ※ ܡ̈ܠܐ ↘ ܕܝܠܝ.

*Notes*: In Syh the metobelus should have been placed after ܕܝܠܝ, since the pronoun, μου, is also omitted from the LXX.

**Job 34 3a-4b**

HT
כִּי־אֹזֶן מִלִּין תִּבְחָן
וְחֵךְ יִטְעַם לֶאֱכֹל׃
מִשְׁפָּט נִבְחֲרָה־לָּנוּ
נֵדְעָה בֵינֵינוּ מַה־טּוֹב׃

E
ὅτι οὖς λόγους δοκιμάζει,
καὶ λάρυγξ γεύεται βρῶσιν.
κρίσιν ἑλώμεθα ἑαυτοῖς,
γνῶμεν ἀνὰ μέσον ἑαυτῶν ὅ τι καλόν.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 680}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̅ 3005 788-250 740 612 559 395(**2a**) 137 3006 643 139(**4b**); ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ δ̅ οἱ τοὺς ἀστερίσκους ἔχοντες 260) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 3-4 sub ※ 3005 788 740 255 612 559 395(+ **2ab**) 137 260 643 732(non **3a**) 139 248 252(non **3b**) Arm La(non **4b**) Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]
ܐܦ ※ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܕܢܐ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܒܚܢܐ.
※ ܘܫܪܛܐ ܛܥܡ ܡܐܟܘܠܬܐ.
※ ܕܝܢܐ ܢܓܒܐ ܣܝܡ ܠܢ.
※ ܢܕܥ ܒܝܢܬܗܘܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܫܦܝܪ. ↘

La ※ *quia auris verba probat,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *guttur gustavit cibum.*
*iudicium* (pr ※ μ) *eligamus nobis,*
*sententiam inter nosmetipsos*

Arm ※ Զի ունկն զբանս քննէ
※ և կոկորդ զկերակուր ճաշակէ
※ Ընտրեսցուք մեզ դատաստան
※ զիտասցուք ի միջի մերում թե բարի է

*Notes*: The catena mss contain the attribution to Th at 3a with the exception of 139, which preserves the marginal note at 4b.

**Job 34 5b**

HT (וְאֵל) הֵסִיר (מִשְׁפָּטִי׃)

LXX (ὁ κύριος) ἀπήλλαξέν (μου τὸ κρίμα,)

# α′ ἀπέστησεν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′] σ′ 395; α′ σ′ *cII* 555 161

*Var:* lemma] παρέτρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστησεν ἀπ’ ἐμου (+ τό 161 512-513 555 703) κρίμα (+ μου 161) *cII*

*Notes*: The oldest Greek catena preserves separate readings for Aquila and Symmachus at 5b. The *cII* group preserves a corruption of the fragments by conflating the Aquila and Symmachus fragments and attributions and by adding elements from the LXX.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 289-90; *AGK* 3, 179; Nic, 502).

# σ′ παρέτρεψεν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-395\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′

*Attr:* σ′] α′ 248; α′ σ′ *cII* 555 161

*Var:* lemma] παρέτρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστησεν ἀπ’ ἐμου (+ τὸ 161 512-513 555 703) κρίμα (+ μου 161) *cII*

*Notes*: For the explanation of the variants see above. Ms 248 does not preserve the Aq fragment, but rather it preserves the Sym fragment with the Aq attribution. The omission of the Aq fragment may also contribute to the error of attribution in the fragment at 6a (see *infra*).

**Job 34 6a**

HT עַל־מִשְׁפָּטִי אֲכַזֵּב

LXX ἐψεύσατο δὲ τῷ κρίματί μου,

# α′ θ′ περὶ τὴν κρίσιν μου ψεῦσμα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′

*Attr:* α′ θ′] σ′ 395 161′; α′ σ′ *cII* 555; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* τήν] > 395

*Notes*: In ms 248, this fragment remained directly under the fragment of 5b. The Aq fragment was lost, but the attribution was retained and erroneously assigned to the Sym fragment of 5b and then probably the Sym attribution was misapplied to the fragment of 6a.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 289-90; *AGK* 3, 179; Nic, 502).

**Job 34 6b-7b**

HT
אָנוּשׁ חִצִּי בְלִי־פָשַׁע׃
מִי־גֶבֶר כְּאִיּוֹב
יִשְׁתֶּה־לַּעַג כַּמָּיִם׃

E
βίαιον τὸ βέλος μου ἄνευ ἀδικίας.
τίς ἀνὴρ ὥσπερ Ιωβ
πίνων μυκτηρισμὸν ὥσπερ ὕδωρ

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*$^{-138\ 260\ 680\ 3006}$ 248 252 706 Arm Co La Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θ′ 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 139 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Co | 6b-7 sub ※ 788(non **7**) 740(non **7**) 255(non **7**) 612(non **7**) 559(non **7**) 395(non **7**) 137(non **7**) 643(non **7**) 732(non **7**) 139(non **7**) 248 252(non **7b**) 706 La(+ **8a**) Arm(non **7**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܡܢܘ ܓܒܪܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܟ ܐܝܘܒ ܕܫܬܐ

※ ܡܢ ܥܘܠܐ.
※ ܡܢܘ ܓܒܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܝܘܒ ܕܫܬܐ
※ ܡܘܝܩܐ ܐܝܟ ܡ̈ܝܐ. ↘

La ※ *violentum iaculum meum absque iniquitate.*
*quis* (pr ※ μ) *est vir ut Iob,*
*bibens* (pr ※ μ) *subsannationem quasi aquam*?

Arm ※ բռնութեամբ է նետս իմ առանց անիրաւութեան

*Notes*: The asterisk in La at 8b may be a mistake for an obelus (see below).

**Job 34 6b**

HT (אָנ֣וּשׁ חִצִּ֣י) בְלִי־פָֽשַׁע׃
E (βίαιον τὸ βέλος μου) ἄνευ ἀδικίας.

# σʹ ἀναιτίως

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*<sup>–732</sup>

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250 3005) 138-255 740

*Notes*: Sym uses ἀναιτίως for חִנָּם in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 465) and in Job 9:17 (Woods, 192). Aq also uses ἀναιτίως for חִנָּם in Ps 34(35):7, 19. Although this translation equivalent is unattested in the LXX and the Three, the evidence for the attribution in *C* (= 788 257) and other *cI* mss is probably genuine, since Sym is not a literal translator.

**Job 34 8a**

HT —
LXX οὐχ ἁμαρτὼν οὐδὲ ἀσεβήσας

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*<sup>–138 732</sup> 706 Syh<sup>txt</sup>

*Attr:* οὐ κεῖται (κεῖνται 740 255 612 395(**7a**)) ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 260(**8b**) 643 139(**7b**)

*Var:* 8a sub ÷ 788 740 139(**7b**, **8b**) 706 Syh<sup>txt</sup>

*NonGr*: Syh<sup>txt</sup> ÷ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܚܛܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܪܫܥ. ↘

**Job 34 8c**

HT (וְלָלֶכֶת עִם־)אַנְשֵׁי(־רֶשַׁע׃)
LXX (τοῦ πορευθῆναι μετὰ)—(ἀσεβῶν;)

# Sub ※ ἀνδρῶν

*Wit1:* *O*

*Wit2:* ἀσεβῶν] pr (※ *O*) ανδρων *O lI* = M

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ↘ ܓܒܪ̈ܐ ※
La *viris* (pr ※ μ)

**Job 34 9**
HT כִּי־אָמַר לֹא יִסְכָּן־גָּבֶר
בִּרְצֹתוֹ עִם־אֱלֹהִים׃
LXX μὴ γὰρ εἴπῃς ὅτι Οὐκ ἔσται ἐπισκοπὴ ἀνδρός·
καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ αὐτῷ παρὰ κυρίου.

# θʹ ὅτι εἶπεν· οὐ κινδυνεύσει ἀνὴρ ἐν τῷ εὐδοκῆσαι αὐτὸν μετὰ θεοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* εὐδοκῆσαι *C* (= 788-250)] εὐδοκιμῆσαι rel | αὐτόν] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The reading of 788-250 is correct, since there is no evidence that Th used εὐδοκιμεῖν except for this variant. Th uses εὐδοκεῖν for רצה in Isa 42:1 and Cant 6:3(4).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 290; *AGK* 3, 181; Nic, 503).

HT (כִּי־אָמַר) לֹא יִסְכָּן־גָּבֶר
(בִּרְצֹתוֹ עִם־אֱלֹהִים׃)
LXX (μὴ γὰρ εἴπῃς ὅτι) Οὐκ ἔσται ἐπισκοπὴ ἀνδρός·
(καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ αὐτῷ παρὰ κυρίου.)

# σʹ οὐχὶ σωθήσεται ἀνήρ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ *cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* οὐχὶ σωθήσεται] ουκ ισωθησεται *C* (= 3005) 680

*Notes*: The variant in 3005 680 resulted from improper word division between οὐχὶ σωθήσεται. When the ι was transferred to the verb, the form of the negative changed from οὐχ to οὐκ.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 290; *AGK* 3, 181; Nic, 503).

**Job 34 10bc**

HT חָלִלָה לָאֵל מֵרֶשַׁע
וְשַׁדַּי מֵעָוֶל׃

LXX Μή μοι εἴη ἔναντι κυρίου ἀσεβῆσαι
καὶ ἔναντι παντοκράτορος ταράξαι τὸ δίκαιον·

σʹ ἀπείη τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνομία καὶ τοῦ ἱκανοῦ ἀδικία

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250 3005)

*Var:* ἀπείη] απηλη 3005; απιει 680; απο 137 139; ἀπ 643 3006 | ἀνομία] ανομιαν 612

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first *C* ms to preserve the attribution to Sym. The lemma of 643 3006 has two letter spaces between ἀπ and τοῦ. The fragment occurs at 9a in 788-250.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 291; *AGK* 3, 181; Nic, 503).

**Job 34 11b**

HT וּכְאֹרַח אִישׁ יַמְצִאֶנּוּ׃

E καὶ ἐν τρίβῳ ἀνδρὸς εὑρήσει αὐτόν.

θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI* (= 740) 248 252 Arm La Sa

*Attr:* θ′ *C* (= 788 3005) 740] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 11b sub ※ 3005 788 740 248 252 Arm La

*NonGr*: La ※ *et iuxta viam suam unus quisque repperiet.*
Arm ※ և ի ճանապարհի առն գտցէ զնա

*Notes*: Mss 788 and 3005 also preserve this line under the asterisk and attribute it to Th; therefore, the *C* group confirms the attribution known previously from 740 only.

# σ′ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ ἑκάστῳ συμβήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′

*Attr:* σ′] α′ σ′ 139; > *C* (= 250) 248

*Var:* καὶ κατά] κατα γαρ *cII* 555 161′ | τήν] γην 559 | ὁδόν] > 740

*Notes*: In 161 the fragment follows the one of 10bc without a break, and therefore it still preserves the attribution.

The variant κατὰ γάρ arose within the Nicetas catena and should not be understood as the original Sym lemma, which is preserved by *C* and *cI*. In context, Nic used the fragment of Sym as the final reason and had no use for the original καί.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 291; *AGK* 3, 181; Nic, 503-4).

**Job 34 15b**

HT (וְאָדָם עַל־עָפָר יָשׁוּב׃) —
LXX (πᾶς δὲ βροτὸς εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσεται,) ὅθεν καὶ ἐπλάσθη.

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *cI* (= 740 255 612) La Syh$^{txt}$

*Var:* 15b sub ÷ 740 255 612 La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ÷ ܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܦ ܐܬܓܒܠ. ↘
La ÷ *unde formatus est.*

**Job 34 16a**

HT וְאִם־בִּינָה (שְׁמְעָה־זֹּאת)
LXX εἰ δὲ μὴ νουθετῇ, (ἄκουε ταῦτα,)

# σʹ εἰ μὴ συνίεις

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 732 ↓512-513 ↓555

*Attr:* σʹ] λʹ 512-513 555; > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* εἰ μή] > 257 | εἰ] + δε *C* (= 3005) | συνίεις] συνιης *C* (= 257) 137 643[c] 680 | συνίεις] + ἄκουε 512-513 555

*Notes*: The *Edition* did not list the evidence of Nic in this instance, but the fragment is present and it is has been attributed to λʹ. Ms 257 appears to have συνιής, but it is possible that it has the lemma instead, if the epsilon is written more narrowly than usual.

**Job 34 17a**
HT הַאַף שׂוֹנֵא מִשְׁפָּט יַחֲבוֹשׁ
LXX ἰδὲ σὺ τὸν μισοῦντα ἄνομα

# σʹ ἆρα ὁ μισῶν κρίσιν ἐπιδήσει εἰς ἴασιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*–138 139 732 ↓512-513 ↓555

*Attr:* σʹ 740] αʹ 255 395 559 612; λʹ 512-513 555; > *C* (= 788-250) 137 260 643 680 3006

*Var:* εἰς] + την 137 260 643 680 3006

*Notes*: The external evidence is divided regarding the attribution. The use of ἆρα favors the attribution to Sym over the other revisers (Busto Saiz, 265). The *Beiträge* reports that Aq uses μήτι καίπερ for הַאַף (so Job 40:8) and he renders חבשׁ with μοτοῦν (*Beiträge*, 61).

Field and Ziegler considered εἰς ἴασιν to be a scholion, but there is no evidence for this conclusion. These words belong to the Sym fragment.

**Job 34 18a**
HT (הַאֲמֹר לְמֶלֶךְ בְּלִיָּעַל)—
LXX ἀσεβὴς (ὁ λέγων βασιλεῖ Παρανομεῖς,)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *O*

*NonGr*: Syh^txt^ ÷ ܪܫܝܥܐ ܗܘ ↘

La *Impius* (pr ÷ β)

HT (הַאֲמֹר לְמֶלֶךְ) בְּלִיָּעַל

LXX (ἀσεβὴς ὁ λέγων βασιλεῖ) Παρανομεῖς,

## ⟨α′⟩ ἀποστάτα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257)

*Attr:* ⟨α′⟩] [] *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* reports this fragment together with the following two fragments for the first time, but unfortunately the attributions have been cut from the margin of the manuscript (*Nachlese*, 405). The Hagedorns cite a parallel in Judges 19:22, where the readings from the Three are cited as revisions for παράνομος in the LXX. In Judges 19:22, for בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל Aquila has (υἱοὶ) ἀποστασίας, Symmachus has ἀπαίδευτοι, and Theodotion has βελιάλ, which leaves בליעל untranslated (*Nachlese*, 405-6). They include that Aq also translates בְּלִיַּעַל with ἀποστάτης in 1 Regn. 30:22.

## ⟨σ′⟩ ἀπαίδευτε

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257)

*Attr:* ⟨σ′⟩] [] *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: For the translation equivalent of Sym, see the comments above.

## ⟨θ′⟩ ἄδικε

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257)

*Attr:* ⟨θ′⟩] [] *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: Since the first two attributions are probably correct, it is also probable that the last fragment should be attributed to Th.

**Job 34 18b**

HT רָשָׁע אֶל־נְדִיבִים׃

E ἀσεβέστατε τοῖς ἄρχουσιν·

# Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) 248 La Sa Syn Chr Dam II 1208

*Var:* lemma] om Sa Syn Chr Dam II 1208 | 18b sub ※ 3005 248 La

*NonGr*: La ※ *Impiissime principibus*

*Notes*: Ms 3005 is the first catena ms to attest the asterisk for this line.

**Job 34 19a**

HT (אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נָשָׂא פְּנֵי) שָׂרִים

LXX (ὃς οὐκ ἐπῃσχύνθη πρόσωπον) ἐντίμου

# λʹ ἀρχόντων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

*Var:* ἀρχόντων] αροντων 612

**Job 34 22**

HT (אֵין־חֹשֶׁךְ) וְאֵין צַלְמָוֶת
(לְהִסָּתֶר שָׁם פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן׃)

LXX (οὐδὲ ἔσται τόπος)—(τοῦ κρυβῆναι τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὰ ἄνομα·)

# αʹ θʹ καὶ οὐκ ἔστι σκιὰ θανάτου

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* τόπος] + (※ La) και ουκ εστι σκια θανατου La *lI*-Iul = M

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܬ. ܘܠܐ ܐܝܬ
ܛܠܠܐ ܕܡܘ̇ܬܐ܀

La ※ *et non est umbra mortis*

*Notes*: The index in Syh is over ܐܦܠܐ, which corresponds to οὐδέ in the LXX. The lemma could be placed before or after the phrase "there is no place." La adds the text clearly after *locus*, which gives plausibility to Ziegler's suggestion in the *Edition* that the fragment comes after τόπος.

HT (אֵין־חֹשֶׁךְ וְאֵין צַלְמָוֶת)
לְהִסָּתֶר שָׁם פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן׃

E (οὐδὲ ἔσται τόπος) τοῦ κρυβῆναι τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὰ ἄνομα·

# α′ θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-260\ 732}$

*Attr:* α′ θ′ (ἐξ ἀκυλ(ἀκύλα 395) καὶ θ′ τὸ ἥμισυ καὶ ὁ ἑξῆς 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 680; ἐξ α′ και θ′ τὸ ἥμισυ καὶ ὁ ἑξῆς 137 3006$^{inc}$ 643 139)

*Var:* lemma sub ※ 3005(τοῦ ※) 788-250 740(※ τοῦ ※) 138-255(※ τοῦ ※) 612(※ τοῦ ※) 559(※ ※ τοῦ) 395(※ τοῦ ※) 680(※ τοῦ ※) 137(※ οὐδὲ) 3006(※ τοῦ ※) 643(※ | τοῦ ※) 139(※ sup κρυβηναι) | ἄνομα] + ※ 258 395

*Notes*: The *Edition* lists the attribution at verse 22 and notes that there is an asterisk at 23a in 255, but it makes no attempt to combine these observations, probably since the note is at 22 in 255 and 23a begins on another folio. When the asterisk in 788-250 and 3005 is consulted, the situation becomes clear (see *infra*). The *Edition* did not place the half line under the asterisk and in App II it only listed the marginal note and did not comment on the asterisk, which is in *C* and *cI*; therefore, the marginal note may potentially be misunderstood. The stichometry, combined with the use of an asterisk at 23a of 3005 is instructive, for verse 22(τοῦ—ἄνομα) is split over two lines in 3005, but the second line is indented, perhaps indicating that this line is the rest of the "half line," and not the "next line," to which the note refers. Verse 23a confirms this observation, since 3005 marks "the next line" with an asterisk. Ms 788-250 has a similar situation. The half line begins with an asterisk at τοῦ and the next line is the rest of verse 22. Verse 23a begins with an asterisk confirming that this line is "the next line," to which the marginal attribution referred.

The translation of the infinitive construct + ל with τοῦ + inf is common in Th and Aq but also the LXX (Gentry, 266; Hyvärinen, 72). The translation of און with ἄνομα is not attested in Th Job, for Th usually renders this word with ἄδικος/-ία (3x; see Gentry, 136, 139). Th does use ἀνομία one time in 31:3b, but Gentry explains this usage as variation, since Th used ἄδικος in 31:3a. The half line, therefore, may not be under the asterisk or from Th and Aq, but 23a is from the revisers and is under the asterisk in the catena and other witnesses.

**Job 34 23a**

HT כִּי לֹא עַל־אִישׁ יָשִׂים עוֹד

E ὅτι οὐκ ἐπ’ ἄνδρα θήσει ἔτι·

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 255 559 395) Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ Syh[txt]] αʹ θʹ (ἐξ ἀκυλ(ἀκύλα 395) καὶ θʹ τὸ ἥμισυ καὶ ὁ ἑξῆς 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 680; ἐξ αʹ και θʹ τὸ ἥμισυ καὶ ὁ ἑξῆς 137 3006[inc] 643 139)

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 23a sub ※ 3005 788-250 255 559 395(**22 fin**) Arm La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܓܒܪܐ ܣܝܡ ܬܘܒ. ↘

La ※ *quia non in homine positum est ultra* ↙

Arm ※ Զի ոչ եւս դիցէ ի վերայ առն

*Notes*: In 395 the asterisk appears at the end of verse 22, and thus it marks verse 23 as under the asterisk. For the double attribution to Aq and Th, see *supra*.

# σʹ οὐ γὰρ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπῳ κεῖται ἔτι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 249 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–732] ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′ ↓252 Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπῳ *C* (= 249 788-250 3005) 252 Syh] επανω *cI*[–732] *cII* 555 161′ | ἔτι] > 252 260 3006

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܥܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܣܝܡܐ ܬܘܒ ❖

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* reports that only *C* (= 249 788-250 3005) with 252 preserve the correct lemma ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπῳ (*Nachlese,* 406). Syh also preserves this reading instead of the variant ἐπάνω. It is probable that ἐπάνω is derived from the *nomen sacrum* for ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπῳ (= επ ανω with overline) (*Nachlese,* 406); therefore, the error arose from improper word division.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar,* 293; *AGK* 3, 187; Nic, 506).

**Job 34 23b**

HT לַהֲלֹךְ אֶל־אֵל בַּמִּשְׁפָּט׃

LXX ὁ γὰρ κύριος πάντας ἐφορᾷ

# θʹ τοῦ προαχθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἰσχυρὸν ἐν κρίματι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-732}$

*Attr:* θʹ] σʹ 139; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* κρίματι] κληματι 3006

*Notes*: The *Edition's* alleged variant (προσαχθ.) in 250 was not confirmed, and 250 supports the lemma (*Kollationen*, 219).

**Job 34 25b**

HT וְהָפַךְ לַיְלָה וְיִדַּכָּאוּ׃

E καὶ στρέψει νύκτα, καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) $cI^{-138\ 139\ 255\ 260\ 643\ 680\ 732}$ Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* ταπεινωθήσεται] ταπεινωθησονται C *O L′′*ʹ*C′ d* (157$^{c}$) 248$^{c\prime}$ 543 Arm Ol = M

*Attr:* θʹ 3005 788 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 25b sub ※ 3005 788 740 612 559 395 137 3006 Arm La(+ **25a**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܘܢܗܦܘܟ ܠܠܠܝܐ ܘܢܬܡܟܟܘܢ. ↘
La *et* (pr ※ μ) *vertet noctem, et humiliabuntur.*
Arm ※ և դարձուցէ ի գիշեր և խոնարհեսցին

*Notes*: The fragment in 3005 appears in the margin with an asterisk and attribution to Th. The index appears after ἔργα in 25a which then shows at what place the fragment is to be inserted. Ms 788 preserves the line under the asterisk and attributes it to Th; therefore, the *C* (= 788 3005) group confirms the attribution known previously only in Syh.

**Job 34 28-33**

HT

לְהָבִיא עָלָיו צַעֲקַת־דָּל
וְצַעֲקַת עֲנִיִּים יִשְׁמָע׃
וְהוּא יַשְׁקִט וּמִי יַרְשִׁעַ
וְיַסְתֵּר פָּנִים וּמִי יְשׁוּרֶנּוּ
וְעַל־גּוֹי וְעַל־אָדָם יָחַד׃
מִמְּלֹךְ אָדָם חָנֵף
מִמֹּקְשֵׁי עָם׃
כִּי־אֶל־אֵל הֶאָמַר
נָשָׂאתִי לֹא אֶחְבֹּל׃
בִּלְעֲדֵי אֶחֱזֶה אַתָּה הֹרֵנִי
אִם־עָוֶל פָּעַלְתִּי לֹא אֹסִיף׃
הַמֵעִמְּךָ יְשַׁלְמֶנָּה כִּי־מָאַסְתָּ
כִּי־אַתָּה תִבְחַר וְלֹא־אָנִי
וּמַה־יָדַעְתָּ דַבֵּר׃

E

τοῦ ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν κραυγὴν πενήτων,
καὶ κραυγὴν πτωχῶν εἰσακούσεται.
καὶ αὐτὸς ἡσυχίαν παρέξει, καὶ τίς καταδικάσεται;
καὶ κρύψει πρόσωπον, καὶ τίς ὄψεται αὐτόν;
καὶ κατὰ ἔθνους καὶ κατὰ ἀνθρώπου ὁμοῦ
βασιλεύων ἄνθρωπον ὑποκριτὴν
ἀπὸ δυσκολίας λαοῦ.
ὅτι πρὸς τὸν ἰσχυρὸν ὁ λέγων
Εἴληφα, οὐκ ἐνεχυράσω·
ἄνευ ἐμαυτοῦ ὄψομαι, σὺ δεῖξόν μοι·
εἰ ἀδικίαν ἠργασάμην, οὐ μὴ προσθήσω.
μὴ παρὰ σοῦ ἀποτείσει αὐτήν;
ὅτι ἀπώσῃ, ὅτι σὺ ἐκλέξῃ καὶ οὐκ ἐγώ·
καὶ τί ἔγνως λάλησον.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 260\ 680}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ ι̅δ̅ 3005 788-250 740 255 612) Syh$^{txt}$] ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̅ 395 137 139 643(**28b**) 3006; > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 28-33 sub ※ 3005(non **29bc 31 32a**) 788 740 255(non **30**) 612 559 395(non **28b 30 31b-33**) 137(non **29a**$^{\mathbf{1}}$ **32a**; + **34a**) 3006(non

**28b-32b 33c**) 643(non **28a 29b**) 732(non **28-33b**[1]) 139(non **28 29a**[1] **29bc 31-33b**[1]) 248 252 Arm(non **30b**) La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]

ܬ ※ ܠܡܝܬܝܘ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܩܥܬܐ ܕܡܣܟܢܐ.
※ ܘܩܥܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܣܟܢܐ ܢܫܡܥ.
※ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܫܠܝܘܬܐ ܢܬܠ ܘܡܢܘ ܢܚܝܒ.
※ ܘܢܛܫܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܡܢܘ ܢܚܙܝܘܗܝ.
※ ܘܥܠ ܥܡܐ ܘܥܠ ܒܪ̈ܢܫܐ ܐܟܚܕܐ.
※ ܕܡܡܠܟ ܠܒܪܢܫܐ ܢܣܒ ܒܐ̈ܦܐ.
※ ܡܢ ܥܩܡܘܬܐ ܕܥܡܐ.
※ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܘܬ ܫܠܝܛܐ ܐܡܪܐ ܕܐܡܪ:
※ ܢܫܡܬ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܒܩܢܐ:
※ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܚܙܐ ܐܢܬ ܚܘܐ ܠܝ.
※ ܐܢ ܥܘܠܐ ܦܠܚܬ ܠܐ ܐܘܣܦ.
※ ܕܠܡܐ ܡܢܟ ܢܬܒܥܝܘܗܝ.
※ ܬܘܒ ܕܣܠܩܬ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܢܬ ܗܘ ܓܒܝܬ
※ ܘܠܐ ܐܢܐ.
※ ܘܡܕܡ ܕܝܕܥܬ ܡܠܠ. ↘

La

*ut* (pr ※ μ) *perferatur ad eum clamor* (pr ※ β) *pauperis,*
*et clamorem pauperum exaudiet* (*exau※diet* β).
*ipse* (pr ※ μ) *quietem dabit, et quis poterit condemnare*(pr ※ β)?
*abscondet faciem, et quis videbit* (*ui※debit* β) *eum?*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *contra gentem et contra hominem simul* (pr ※ β).
*qui* (pr ※ μ) *regnare facit hominem hypocritam* (*ypo※critam* β)
*propter perversitatem populi.*
*quia* (pr ※ μ) *ad dominum* (*do※minum* β) *loqui coepi, non cessabo.*
*absque* (pr ※ μ) *me videbo* (*ui※debo* β)*, tu ostende mihi.*
*si* (pr ※ μ) *iniquitatem operatus sum* (pr ※ β)*, nonadiciam.*
*nunquid* (pr ※ μ) *a te exiget eam*
*quam* (pr ※ β) *reppulisti? tu* (pr ※ μ) *enim elegisti, et non ego*↙
※ *et si quid scis, loquere*.

Arm

※ Աճել զնովաւ զաղաղակ տնանկի
※ և զբողոք աղքատաց լուիցէ
※ Եւ ինքն տացէ լռութիւն ※ և ո պատժեսցէ զնա
※ և ծածկեսցէ զերեսս և ո տեսանիցէ զնա
※ Եւ ազգաց և մարդկան միանգամայն

※ թագաւորեցուցանէ զայր կեղծաւոր
վասն խստութեան ժողովրդեան
※ Զի որ ասէ ընդդէմ Հզաւրին թէ
※ առի և զրաւեցի առանց քո
※ Եթէ տեսեր ցոյց ինձ
※ և եթէ անիրաւութիւն արարի այլ ոչ յաւելից
※ Միթէ ի քէն ոք պահանջիցէ զայն
※ զի մերժեսդ դու ընտրեցեր և ոչ ես
※ և եթէ գիտիցես ինչ խաւսեաց

*Notes*: The catena tradition contains the attribution to Th at 28a except in 643, where the marginal note is at 28b. The note in 137 139 643 3006 contains an error of haplography (οἱ δ for οἱ ιδ), since it is clear that fourteen lines are from Th, not four. Mss 137 139 do not preserve the first part of 29a (καὶ αὐτὸς ἡσυχίαν παρέξει) under the asterisk, but only the second part. Likewise, mss 139 732 do not preserve the first part of 33b (ὅτι ἀπώσῃ,) under the asterisk. La preserves the asterisks since there is an asterisk in each line. The appearance of missing asterisks may be due to the different stichometries in these mss.

**Job 34 29a**

HT וְהוּא יַשְׁקִט וּמִי יַרְשִׁעַ

E καὶ αὐτὸς ἡσυχίαν παρέξει, καὶ τίς καταδικάσεται;

## σʹ αὐτοῦ δὲ ἠρεμίαν δόντος τίς κατακρινεῖ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\text{-}255\ 732}$ *cII* ↓555 ↓161 Syh

*Wit2:* ἡσυχίαν] ηρεμιαν 620

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 3006

*Var:* αὐτοῦ] του 137 139 260 643 3006 | δέ] > 137 139 260 643 680 3006 | δόντος *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*(= 740 138-255 612)] διδοντος 137 139 260 395 559 643 680 3006 | κατακρινεῖ] κατακρίνει 137 139 250 260 395 643 680 3006; -κρινη 161 555

*NonGr*: Syh

ܣ. ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܝܗܒ
ܫܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܢܘ
ܡܚܝܒ.

*Notes*: The best witnesses preserve δόντος not διδόντος. The word ἐρεμία belongs only to the lexical stock of Sym (*Beiträge*, 15; H-R, 620).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 295; *AGK* 3, 189; Nic, 507).

**Job 34 29c**

HT וְעַל (־גּוֹי וְעַל־אָדָם יָחַד׃)

E (καὶ) κατὰ (ἔθνους καὶ κατὰ ἀνθρώπου ὁμοῦ)

# σʹ περί

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*–137 138 139 255 260 559 643 680 732 3006

*Notes*: The index is at κατά 1° in 788.

**Job 34 31**

HT כִּי־אֶל־אֵל הֶאָמַר
נָשָׂאתִי לֹא אֶחְבֹּל׃

E ὅτι πρὸς τὸν ἰσχυρὸν ὁ λέγων
Εἴληφα, οὐκ ἐνεχυράσω·

# σʹ ὅτι πρὸς θεὸν ῥῆσιν ἀνέλαβον, οὐκ ἐφέξω ἀκωλύτως

*Wit1:* *C* $^{cat}$ (= 249 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{cat}$ 754$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 258$^{cat}$ 505$^{cat}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′ ↓Ol$^{Y}$ ↓Syh$^{cat}$

*Var:* ὅτι—ἐφέξω] > 732 | ῥῆσιν] ρημασιν Ol$^{Y}$ | ἀνέλαβον] -βεν Syh$^{cat}$ | ἐφέξω] εφθεγξω 138 Ol$^{Y}$; εφλεξω 256; ουχ εξω 251 *cII* 555 161′

*NonGr*: Syh$^{cat}$ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܢܣܒܬ. ܠܐ ܐܟܠܐ
ܠܐ ܡܬܟܠܝܢܐܝܬ.

*Notes*: The presentation of Syh in the *Edition* is not clear, since it lists the evidence of the Syro-Hexapla as Syh, which indicates the reading is in the margin. In this edition, the siglum, Syh$^{cat}$, indicates that the fragment is not found in the text or the margin. Rather, the fragment is embedded in a scholion from the commentary of Olymp in the lower part of the folio (Ceriani, 42). The comment is introduced as in the catena: ܣܘܡܟܘܣ ܕܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܫܠܡ ("Now Symmachus rendered thus" = ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος οὕτως ἐκδέδωκεν; cf. *AGK* 3, 190).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is established on the basis of *Kommentar*, *AGK*, and Nic (*Kommentar*, 296; *AGK* 3, 190; Nic, 508).

**Job 34 32a**

HT בִּלְעֲדֵי אֶחֱזֶה) אַתָּה הֹרֵנִי)

E (ἄνευ ἐμαυτοῦ ὄψομαι,) σὺ δεῖξόν μοι·

# σʹ σὺ διασάφησόν μοι

*Wit1:* *C*$^{cat}$ (= 249 257 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{cat}$ 754$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 258$^{cat}$ 505$^{cat}$ *cII* 555 161ʹ Ol$^{Y}$ Syh$^{cat}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{cat}$ ܐܢܬ ܦܫܩ ܠܝ.

**Job 34 33b**

HT כִּי־מָאַסְתָּ כִּי־אַתָּה תִבְחַר וְלֹא־אָנִי

E ὅτι ἀπώσῃ, ὅτι σὺ ἐκλέξῃ καὶ οὐκ ἐγώ·

# σʹ ὅτι ἀπεδοκίμασας· σὺ γὰρ ἐπελέξω καὶ οὐκ ἐγώ

*Wit1:* lemma] 249 | ἀπεδοκίμασας] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 260\ 732}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 138

*Var:* ἀπεδοκίμασας] αποδοκιμασης *C* (= 788-250 3005) 255 612; αποδοκιμασεις 137 138 395 643 680 740; αποδοκημασης 559; αποδοκημασεις 3006

*Notes*: Apparently, 249 shares a different source, which is independent of the other catena tradition (*Nachlese*, 406). In the *Edition*, Ziegler only cited the verb from the lemma, but the longer fragment agrees with HT and should be properly attributed to Sym. The *Nachlese* also shows that Sym uses ἐπιλέγομαι for בחר in 3 Rgns 18:25 and Ps 24(25):12b (*Nachlese*, 406). It concludes that given the fact that the two witnesses attest the same author but different forms of the verb ἀποδοκιμάζω, there must be an error of either the author attribution or the verb form in one of them (*Nachlese*, 406).

Since the attribution to Th for the asterisked lines is secure, one may exclude this possibility. According to Reider, there are no instances of ἀποδοκιμάζω for Aq, who instead uses ἀπωθέω for מאס (Reider, 27, 30). In contrast, Sym uses ἀποδοκιμάζω for מאס in Ps 35:5, 52:6, 77:59, and 88:39 (Busto Saiz, 471). It is best, therefore, to posit that there is an error in the verb form, which occurred in the transmission of the fragment. Ms 249 preserves an aorist active indicative, while the other catena tradition preserves an aorist active subjunctive. The former is the preferred translational equivalent for the Qal perfect in Sym (Busto Saiz, 118, 121). There are 326 examples of this phenomenon

compared to 3 examples where Sym uses the aorist subjunctive to translate the Qal perfect, and these three examples occur only when Sym introduces the clause with ἵνα. Therefore, ἀποδοκιμάσῃς is probably from 249, but how did the variant arise? There is evidence of the interchange ε > ο but the examples are mostly limited to situations before σ/ς and ν (Gignac, I, 290; Mayser, I, 96). The interchange between α and η is attested only sporadically (Gignac, I, 286; Mayser, I, 62).

**Job 34 34b**

HT		וְגֶבֶר חָכָם שֹׁמֵעַ לִי׃

LXX		(ἀνὴρ δὲ σοφὸς ἀκήκοέν) μου τὸ ῥῆμα.

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:*	La Syh[txt]

*Var:*	μου τὸ ῥῆμα sub ÷ La[β] Syh[txt]] 34b sub ÷ La[μ]

*NonGr*:	Syh[txt]	÷ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܝ. ↘

	La	*verbum* (pr ÷ β) *meum* (+ ↙ β)

*Notes*:	La[β] has preserved the correct words under the obelus, while La[μ] has preserved the entire line under the obelus.

**Job 34 35a**

HT		(אִיּוֹב) לֹא־בְדַעַת (יְדַבֵּר)

LXX		(Ἰὼβ δὲ) οὐκ ἐν συνέσει (ἐλάλησεν,)

# σʹ		οὐ φρονίμως

*Wit1:*	↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 260 643 680 732 3006

*Attr:*	σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:*	φρονίμως] φρονιμος 612; φρονημος 559; φρονημως 395

### Chapter 35

**Job 35 2b**
HT (אָמַרְתָּ צִדְקִי מֵאֵל׃)—
LXX σὺ τίς εἶ (ὅτι εἶπας Δίκαιός εἰμι ἔναντι κυρίου;)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ÷ ܐܢܬ ܡܢܘ̣ ܐܝܬܝܟ ↘

**Job 35 3**
HT כִּי־תֹאמַר מַה־יִּסְכָּן־לָךְ
(מָה־אֹעִיל מֵחַטָּאתִי׃)
LXX ἢ ἐρεῖς Τί ποιήσω ἁμαρτών;

# σʹ εἶπας γάρ, ὅτι οὐδὲν συμβαλεῖταί σοι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–139 260 732] *cII* 555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 643 161

*Var:* ὅτι] > 680 3006 | συμβαλεῖται] συμβαληται 395

*Notes*: The OG paraphrased the HT, combining the two stichs into one by summarizing the second *via* a participle. The Sym fragment corresponds only to the A line in the Hebrew text, not the B line, since there is no equivalent for ἁμαρτῶν or חַטָּאתִי in Sym.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 300; *AGK* 3, 197-8; Nic, 512).

**Job 35 6a**
HT אִם־חָטָאתָ מַה־תִּפְעָל־בּוֹ
LXX εἰ ἥμαρτες, τί πράξεις;

# σʹ ἐὰν ἁμάρτῃς, τί εἰργάσω αὐτόν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–137 139 260 643 732 3006]

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* αὐτόν] αυτω 255 559 612 680 740; αυτ() 138

*Notes*: The accusative, αὐτόν, is the reading of the *C* (= 788-250 3005) group and 395 (through conjecture) (*Nachlese*, 406). The word ἐργάζομαι takes a double accusative in the construction "to do something to someone" (LSJ, s.v. ἐργάζομαι, II, 2a; *Nachlese*, 406). The *Nachlese* also cites evidence of this construction from the post classical period (*Nachlese*, 406; Aelius Aristides, Ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἐπιτάφιος 84, 10 (I p. 139 Dind.); Idem Λευκτρικός α 414, 31 (I p. 623 Dind.)). The variant in the *cI* group may have arisen due to a ligature as in ms 138, which caused the scribe to guess the dative case, while the *C* group shows that the accusative case was original.

**Job 35 7b-10a**

HT

אוֹ מַה־מִיָּדְךָ יִקָּח׃
לְאִישׁ־כָּמוֹךָ רִשְׁעֶךָ
וּלְבֶן־אָדָם צִדְקָתֶךָ׃
מֵרֹב עֲשׁוּקִים יַזְעִיקוּ
יְשַׁוְּעוּ מִזְּרוֹעַ רַבִּים׃
וְלֹא־אָמַר אַיֵּה אֱלוֹהַ עֹשָׂי

E

ἢ τί ἐκ χειρός σου λήμψεται;
ἀνδρὶ τῷ ὁμοίῳ σου ἡ ἀσέβειά σου,
καὶ υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου ἡ δικαιοσύνη σου.
ἀπὸ πλήθους συκοφαντούμενοι κεκράξονται,
βοήσονται ἀπὸ βραχίονος πολλῶν.
καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν Ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας με,

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–138 680 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ ϛ̅ 3005 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 643 139) Syh$^{txt}$] ἐκ θʹ οἱ κ̅() 250 (**7a**); > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 7b-10a sub ※ 3005(non **9 10a**) 788 740 255(non **9a 10a**) 612 559 395(non **7b-9a**) 137 3006(non **7b 8b 9 10a**) 260(non **7b 9b**) 643(non **9b**) 732(non **7b 9b**) 139(non **9 10a**) 252 706 Arm La(non **9b**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$

ܬ ※ ܐܘ ܡܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܕܐ ܕܝܠܟ ܢܣܒ.
※ ܠܓܒܪܐ ܕܕܿܡܐ ܠܟ ܪܘܫܥܐ ܕܝܠܟ.
※ ܘܕܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܕܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܟ.

※ ܒܪ ܡܢ ܣܓܝܐܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܥܫܩܝܢ ܢܩܥܘܢ.
※ ܢܓܥܘܢ ܡܢ ܕܪܥܐ ܕܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ.
※ ܘܠܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
※ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܕܥܒܕܢܝ. ↘

La *aut* (pr ※ μ) *quid* (pr ※ β) *de manu tua accipiet*?
*viro* (pr ※ μ) *simuli tui* (pr ※ β) *impietas tua*,
*et* (pr ※ μ) *filio hominis iustitia tua* (pr ※ β).
*a* (pr ※ μ) *multitudine calumniantium clamabant* (*cla※mabunt* β) ↙
*vociferabuntur a brachio multorum*.
※ *et non dixit Ubi est deus qui fecit me*?

Arm ※ կամ զինչ առցէ ի ձեռաց քոց
※ Առն նմանոյ քեզ ամբարշտութիւնն քո
※ և որդւոյ մարդոյ արդարութիւնն քո
※ Ի բազմութենէ զրպարտեալք աղաղակեցեն
※ աղաղակեցեն ի բազկէ բազմաց
※ Եւ ոչ ասաց թէ ուր է Աստուած որ արար զիս

**Job 35 8a**

HT (לְאִישׁ־כָּמוֹךָ) רִשְׁעֶךָ

E (ἀνδρὶ τῷ ὁμοίῳ σου) ἡ ἀσέβειά σου,

# σʹ ἡ παρανομία σου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 732

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ σʹ 139; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἡ] > *C* (= 3005)

**Job 35 9a**

HT (מֵרֹב) עֲשׁוּקִים (יַזְעִיקוּ)

E (ἀπὸ πλήθους) συκοφαντούμενοι (κεκράξονται,)

# σʹ συκοφαντιῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–138 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: Sym agrees with the vocalization of MT, “oppressions”, while Th has read עָשׁוֹקִים “oppressors.”

**Job 35 9b**

HT (יַשְׁוְּעוּ) מִזְּרוֹעַ (רַבִּים׃)

E (βοήσονται) ἀπὸ βραχίονος (πολλῶν.)

# σʹ διὰ βίαν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\text{-}255\ 732}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* διὰ βίαν] διαβασιν 137 139 260 395 643 680 3006

**Job 35 10b**

HT נֹתֵן זְמִרוֹת בַּלָּיְלָה׃

LXX ὁ κατατάσσων φυλακὰς νυκτερινάς

# θʹ ὁ διδοὺς αἰνέσεις ἐν νυκτί

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732\ 3006}$ ↓Ol$^{Y}$

*Attr:* θʹ] θʹ εʹ *C* (= 3005); σʹ 139; > *C* (= 250) 137 260 395 559 643 680

*Var:* αἰνέσεις] ενεσεις 559; ανεσεις Ol$^{Y}$ | ἐν] + τη 139 260 643

*Notes*: The fragment probably comes directly from Olymp as *Kommentar* indicates (*Kommentar*, 302).

HT (נֹתֵן) זְמִרוֹת (בַּלָּיְלָה׃)

LXX (ὁ κατατάσσων) φυλακὰς (νυκτερινάς)

# αʹ μελῳδίας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 395\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* αʹ] > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* μελῳδίας] μελωδια 138 680

*Notes*: The fragment is at 35:11a in 138 250 255 559 680 740 (*Kollationen*, 222).

**Job 35 11a**

HT מַלְּפֵנוּ מִבַּהֲמוֹת אָרֶץ

LXX ὁ διορίζων με ἀπὸ τετραπόδων γῆς,

# σʹ διδάσκων ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 260\ 643\ 732}$ ↓512-513 ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] λʹ 512-513 555 161

*Var:* lemma] > 137 3006

*Notes*: Although the *Edition* does not cite the evidence, Nic contains this fragment in a patristic citation attributed to Origen but attributes it to λʹ instead of σʹ (Nic, 514; cf. *Beiträge*, 61-2). *AGK* does not confirm this hexaplaric fragment in the comments by Origen for this verse; thus, Nic probably invents it (*AGK* 3, 203-4). The whole fragment reads as follows in Nic: κατὰ δὲ τοὺς λοιπούς· διδάσκων ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς καὶ σοφίζων ὑπὲρ τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά (Nic, 514). Probably Nic has combined a genuine hexaplaric fragment of Symmachus, part of the Aquila fragment (σοφίζων comes from Aquila, but *via* a bible text revised by Lucian such as the one employed by Iulian; Iul-*Kommentar*, 225; see *infra*), with part of the Olymp commentary (cp. κατὰ ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά; *Kommentar*, 302), and he attributed the fragment to οἱ λοιποί, since he probably knew he was combining fragments of the Three.[7] He then attributed the whole citation to Origen erroneously.

Mss 137 and 3006 contain only the attribution but not the text of the fragment (*Kollationen*, 222). Ms 680 contains a divided lemma as follows: σʹ διδάσκων ἡμᾶς θʹ ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς (*Kollationen*, 222).

A final observation about the text history of this fragment and the following one is in order. The *C* group preserves the original fragments of Sym and Aq, while *cI* at the top of the Hagedorns' stemma contains revision (cp. the attribution in *C* and *cI* at 11b; *AGK* 1, 61) and the bottom of it contains deterioration, since the readings themselves are lost (e.g. 137). Nic, then, represents the final revision and contaminated form of the fragments, since the specific attributions are lost and the hexaplaric fragments are combined with a comment from Olymp.

**Job 35 11b**

HT (וּמֵעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם) יְחַכְּמֵנוּ׃

LXX (ἀπὸ δὲ πετεινῶν οὐρανοῦ;)—

---

[7] I owe this last observation to Dieter Hagedorn (p.c.; 4/10/2011).

# α′ σοφίζει ἡμᾶς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 732}$ ↓248 Syh

*Wit2:* οὐρανοῦ] + σοφιζει ημας V-575 253 523 644* 706 795 = M; + σοφιζων με Iul; + ※ *sapientiorem me facit* (fecit$^{\mu A}$) La

*Attr:* α′ *C* (= 3005) 248 Syh] α′ θ′ 137 138-255 139 395 559 612 643 680 740 3006; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* lemma] > 137 139 643 3006 | σοφίζει] σοφιζη 559; σοφιζεις *C* (= 788-250); σοφιση 248

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܡܚܟܡ ܠܝ ܀

*Notes*: In Syh the index is after ܕܒܫܡܝܐ, which is at the end of the line, indicating that this fragment should be inserted *post* οὐρανοῦ. The *Nachlese* comments that the attribution to Aquila in 248, *C*, and Syh appears more reliable than the attribution to α′ θ′ in *cI* (*Nachlese*, 406), but 788 confirms that the attribution is not present in 250; therefore, only 3005 preserves this attribution for the *C* group.

Mss 137 139 643 and 3006 contain only the attribution but not the text of the fragment (*Kollationen*, 222).

**Job 35 12a**

HT שָׁם יִצְעֲקוּ וְלֹא יַעֲנֶה

E ἐκεῖ κεκράξονται, καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσῃ

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θ′ 788 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܬܡܢ ܢܩܥܘܢ ܘܠܐ ܢܫܬܡܥ. ↘

La *ibi* (pr ※ μ) *clamabunt, et non audiet*

Arm ※ Անդ աղաղակեսցեն և մի լուիցես

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first Greek witness to preserve this asterisked line and the attribution to Th; therefore, it confirms the attribution in Syh.

**Job 35 15-16**

HT וְעַתָּה כִּי־אַיִן פָּקַד אַפּוֹ
וְלֹא־יָדַע בַּפַּשׁ מְאֹד׃
וְאִיּוֹב הֶבֶל יִפְצֶה־פִּיהוּ
בִּבְלִי־דַעַת מִלִּין יַכְבִּר׃

E καὶ νῦν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπισκεπτόμενος, ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ
καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω παραπτώματι σφόδρα·
καὶ Ιωβ ματαίως ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ,
ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ ῥήματα βαρύνει.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–138 260 395 732 680 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̅ 3005 788-250(**14b**) 740 255 612 559 137 3006 643 139(**16a**)) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 15-16 sub ※ 3005 788 740 255(non **15b**) 612 559(non **15b 16**) 137(non **15b**) 3006 643(non **15a**) 139(non **15a**) 252(non **15a 16**) Arm La(non **16a**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$
ܬ ※ ܘܗܫܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܕܣܥܪ
※ ܠܪܘܓܙܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܒܡܣܟܠܘܬܐ ܛܒ.
※ ܘܐܝܘܒ ܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ ܦܬܚ ܦܘܡܗ
※ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܒܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܣܓܐ. ↘

La *et* (pr ※ β) *nunc, quia non est visitans* (*uisi※tans* β) *iram suam,*
*nec*(pr ※ μ)*cognovit delicta vehementer*(*uehe※menter* β) ↙
*et Iob vane aperit os suum,*
*in* (pr ※ μ) *ignorantia verba multiplicat.*

Arm ※ Եւ արդ քանզի չէ որ կրեաց զբարկութիւն նորա
※ և ոչ որ գիտաց զյանցանս իւր յոյժ
※ Ապա ուրեմն Յովբ զուր բանայ զբերան իւր
※ և ծանրացուցանէ անգիտութեամբ զբանս ↙

**Job 35 15a**

HT (וְעַתָּה כִּי־אַיִן) פָּקַד (אַפּוֹ)

E (καὶ νῦν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν) ἐπισκεπτόμενος, (ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ)

σʹ ἐπιλογιζόμενος

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 139\ 732}$

**Job 35 15b**

HT וְלֹא־יָדַע בַּפַּשׁ מְאֹד׃

E καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω παραπτώματι σφόδρα·

σʹ μηδὲ γνωρίζων παραπτώματα σφόδρα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 139\ 732}$

*Wit2:* παραπτώματι] παραπτωματα La (*delicta*) 637 *c* Arm

**Job 35 16b**

HT בִּבְלִי־דַעַת מִלִּין יַכְבִּר׃

E ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ ῥήματα βαρύνει.

σʹ ὡς ἀναίσθητος λόγους βαρεῖς ἐποιήσατο

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 3005) 139 740

*Var:* ὡς] + ο 3005 | ἀναίσθητος] ανοητος *cII* 555 161′; ανεσθητος 612 | βαρεῖς] βαρει 138 | ἐποιήσατο] > 139 256 260

*Notes*: The variant in 248 is from the Nicetas catena (*Kollationen*, 223). The *Edition* chose ἀνόητος as the lemma even though the best external evidence favors ἀναίσθητος. This word only occurrs here in Sym's corpus. Sym uses ἀνόητος in many instances. Busto Saiz lists the following Hebrew equivalents in the Psalter: כְּסִיל (48:11 *cum* αʹ), בַּעַר (91:7), and אֵין בין Hi. (31:9). H-R includes four references to Ecclesiastes: 4:13 is retroverted from Latin and is omitted, כְּסִיל (9:17), חסר לב (10:3), and סכל (10:14). There are three instances in Isaiah: Isa 32:4 (נמהרים), 35:4 (נמהרי לב), 56:10 (לֹא ידעו) and one at Zach 3:1 (יוֹנה). Even though Sym uses ἀνόητος, there is no exact analogue to Job 35:16b; therefore, the lemma is established on the basis of the best external evidence.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 304; *AGK* 3, 207; Nic, 516).

## Chapter 36

**Job 36 2a**
HT כַּתַּר(־לִי זְעֵיר וַאֲחַוֶּךָּ)
LXX Μεῖνόν (με μικρὸν ἔτι, ἵνα διδάξω σε·)

# θʹ ὑπόμεινον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 732

*Attr:* θʹ] σʹ 260 643 3006; [] *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: The attribution was lost in 257 due to mutilation of the margin.

**Job 36 2b**
HT כִּי עוֹד לֶאֱלוֹהַּ מִלִּים׃
LXX ἔτι γὰρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστιν λέξις.

# ⟨σʹ⟩ [ἔτ]ι γὰρ περὶ θεοῦ [εἰ]σὶ λόγοι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257)

*Wit2:* ἐστιν λέξις] εν εστιν λεξεις A; εστι λεγειν Syn; *sunt sermones* La = M

*Attr:* σʹ] [] *C* (= 257)

*Var:* περί *conj.*] παρα cod

*Notes*: This fragment occurs directly under the fragment for 2a and thus has undergone the same mutilation of the margin. The lemma has been taken from this reading of the ms: ἔτ]ι γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ | εἰ]σὶ λόγοι. The *Nachlese* presents this new fragment from 257. The author and the initial parts of the two lines have been cut off from the margin (*Nachlese*, 406). The *Nachlese* retained the possibility of supplying μοι before εἰσί in the lacuna. Although ἐμοί is in the LXX, the pronoun is absent from the Hebrew and it is probably better to omit it from the reconstruction.

D. Fraenkel argues that Symmachus is most suitable for the author of this fragment since מלה is rendered with λόγος and כי is rendered with γάρ (*Nachlese*, 406). Fraenkel's observation about γάρ is confirmed, since Th Job uses ὅτι 36x for כי and γάρ only 5x (Gentry, 370-1). Aq does use γάρ for כי in Gen 26:20 and 47:22, but he uses ὅτι in the majority of instances (Hyvärinen, 53). In contrast, Sym uses γάρ for כי commonly in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 255). Regarding the rendering of מלה with λόγος, Fraenkel's observation is less helpful. There are no instances of λόγος rendering מלה in

the corpus of Aq; therefore, no positive evidence suggests an attribution to him, though no negative evidence denies one to him. The evidence is divided between Th and Sym. Th uses λόγος to render מלה 4x (Job 24:25b, 32:11c, 32:15, and 36:4a), while Sym uses the same equivalent 4x (Job 16:4, 32:11c, 35:16, and 36:4a)—both authors use λόγος to translate other Hebrew words. To these obervations of Fraenkel one may add that Th does not use περί or παρά to render ל in Job (Gentry, 324-32). These factors support the attribution to Sym.

The manuscript has the ligature for παρά, which consists of π with an oblique stroke over it. This ligature is similar to the one used for περί, which consists of π with a horizontal stroke over it. According to the instances listed in H-R, Sym does not render ל with παρά + genitive, and this construction is not attested in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 181-187). The full analysis of Sym's use of παρά is as follows:

παρά = מן Isa 52:14, 57:20, Ps 44(45):3, and Ps 44(45):9.
παρά = עם Jud 9:6 and 3 Rgns 1:9 α′
παρά = על Cant 1:8
παρά = כ Ps 72(73):2
παρά = ב Isa 57:1 θ′
παρά + acc. = ל Gen 4:7
παρά = no equivalent Ps 9:29 (10:8)

In contrast Sym uses περί + genitive for ל eight times in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 184). The *Nachlese* compares this fragment with the the commentary of Olymp, which shows dependence on Symmachus: ἔτι περὶ θεοῦ λέγειν ἔχω (*Nachlese*, 406; *Kommentar*, 306). The evidence of translation technique and Olymp probably indicates that 257 contains an error of παρά instead of περί, which is a common error in the mss using these ligatures; therefore, περί is conjectured as the original text.

**Job 36 3a**

HT (אֶשָּׂא דֵעִי) לְמֵרָחוֹק
LXX (ἀναλαβὼν τὴν ἐπιστήμην μου) μακρὰν

# σ′ διὰ μακροῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250) *cI*[−139 732]

*Attr:* σ′] [] *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first *C* witness to attest the attribution to Sym.

**Job 36 4a**

HT כִּי־אָמְנָם לֹא־שֶׁקֶר מִלָּי
LXX ἐπ’ ἀληθείας καὶ οὐκ ἄδικα ῥήματα·

## σʹ ὅτι ὄντως ἀψευδεῖς οἱ λόγοι μου

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Notes*: The fragment is at 36:3b in 559 (*Kollationen*, 224).

## θʹ ὅτι ἀληθῶς οὐκ ἄδικοι οἱ λόγοι μου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 732

*Attr:* θʹ] αʹ θʹ 395; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ὅτι] + ουκ 260

*Notes*: The fragment is at 36:3b in 559. Ms 260 contains two markers of negation (*Kollationen*, 224).

**Job 36 4b**

HT תְּמִים דֵּעוֹת עִמָּךְ׃

LXX ἀδίκως συνίεις.

## θʹ ἄμωμοι γνώσεις μετὰ σοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 395 643 732 680 3006

*Attr:* θʹ] αʹ *C* (= 3005); σʹ 138; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: The fragment is recorded at 36:4a in 138-255 612, but it belongs at 4b in accordance with the Hebrew text (*Kollationen*, 225). Although the attribution to Aq in 3005 is interesting, Aq renders תֹּם with ἁπλότης in Job 21:23a (Woods, 395), and there are no instances of Aq using ἄμωμος to render this word.

**Job 36 5b-9**

HT

כַּבִּיר כֹּחַ לֵב׃
לֹא־יְחַיֶּה רָשָׁע
וּמִשְׁפַּט עֲנִיִּים יִתֵּן׃
לֹא־יִגְרַע מִצַּדִּיק עֵינָיו
וְאֶת־מְלָכִים לַכִּסֵּא

וַיֹּשִׁיבֵם לָנֶצַח וַיִּגְבָּהוּ׃
וְאִם־אֲסוּרִים בַּזִּקִּים
יִלָּכְדוּן בְּחַבְלֵי־עֹנִי׃
וַיַּגֵּד לָהֶם פָּעֳלָם
וּפִשְׁעֵיהֶם כִּי יִתְגַּבָּרוּ׃

E δυνατὸς ἰσχύι καρδίας
ἀσεβῆ οὐ μὴ ζωοποιήσει
καὶ κρίμα πτωχῶν δώσει.
οὐκ ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ δικαίου ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ·
καὶ μετὰ βασιλέων εἰς θρόνον
καὶ καθιεῖ αὐτοὺς εἰς νῖκος, καὶ ὑψωθήσονται.
καὶ εἰ πεπεδημένοι ἐν χειροπέδαις
συσχεθήσονται ἐν σχοινίοις πενίας,
καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν
καὶ τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἰσχύσουσιν.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*–137 138 139 260 643 680 732 3006 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ θ̅ 3005 788; ἐκ θ′ οἱ δ̅ 740 255 612 559 395(**6b**)) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 5b-9 sub ※ 3005 788 740(non **7a 7c 8-9**) 255(non **7c 8-9**) 612(non **7c 8-9**) 559(non **7bc 8-9**) 395(non **5b 6a 7b-9b**) 248(+ **10a**) 252(non **9**) 706 Arm La(+ **10a**) Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]
ܐܠ ※ ܬܩܝܦ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܠܒܐ ܠܪܫܝܥܐ ܠܐ ܢܚܐ.
※ ܘܕܝܢܐ ܕܡ̈ܣܟܢܐ ܢܬܠ.
※ ܠܐ ܢܫܩܘܠ ܡܢ ܙܕܝܩܐ ܥܝ̈ܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܥܡ ܡ̈ܠܟܐ ܥܠ ܟܘܪܣܝܐ.
※ ܘܢܘܬܒ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܙܟܘܬܐ ܘܢܬܬܪܝܡܘܢ.
※ ܘܐܢܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܢܝܢ ܒܩ̈ܘܦܠܐ ܐܣ̈ܝܪܐ.
※ ܢܬܬܚܕܘܢ ܒܚ̈ܒܠܐ ܕܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ.
※ ܘܢܘܕܥ ܐܢܘܢ ܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ.
※ ܘܣܟ̈ܠܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܬܚܝܠܝܢ. ↘

La
*fortis* (pr ※ μ) *robore cordis*
*non vivificabit impium,*
※ *et iudicium pauperum dabit.*
*non auferet a iusto* (pr ※ β) *oculos suos,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *cum regibus in solio,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *sedere eos* (pr ※ β) *facit in perpetuum, et*

*exaltabuntur*.
*et* (pr ※ μ; + ※ β) *qui compediti sunt compedibus,*
*capientur* (pr ※ μ) *in* (pr ※ β) *funibus paupertatis,*
*et annuntiabit eis opera* (pr ※ β) *eorum,*
*et delicta* (pr ※ μ), *cum fuerint roborati* ↙

Arm ※ հզաւր է զաւրութեամբ
※ Զնիրտ ամբարշտի ոչ կենդանացուսցէ
※ և իրաւունս տացէ աղքատի
※ Ոչ արկցէ զաչս իւր յարդարոյ
※ և ընդ թագաւորս է յաթոռ
※ և նստուսցէ զնոսա ի սպառ և բարձրասցին
※ Եւ կապեալք ձեռակապաւք
※ վարակեսցին տոռամբք տնանկութեան
※ Եւ պատմեսցէ նոցա զգործս նոցա
※ և զյանցանս նոցա թէ զաւրացան

*Notes*: Ms 3005 has nine lines under ten asterisks with two asterisks at the catena's first line, which equals 5b and 6a in the *Edition*; therefore, 3005 preserves all of the lines under the asterisk and attributes them all to Th. Ms 788 preserves nine lines under nine asterisks (the first line = 5b 6a of the *Edition*). The *cI* group, therefore, represents the deterioration of the catena tradition over time, since the mss at the top of the stemma have only the first four lines under the asterisk and the mss at the bottom of the stemma preserve no lines under the asterisk. In La, 6a may be included with 5b as one line as in *C*.

**Job 36 5b-6a**

HT כַּבִּיר כֹּחַ לֵב׃
לֹא־יְחַיֶּה רָשָׁע

E δυνατὸς ἰσχύι καρδίας
ἀσεβῆ οὐ μὴ ζωοποιήσει

## α′ παμπληθύων ἰσχύι καρδίας, οὐ μὴ ζωοποιήσῃ ἀσεβῆ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܣܓܝܐܐ، ܘܠܐܝܬ
ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܠܒܐ ܠܐ
ܢܚܐ ܠܪܫܝܥܐ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field, corrected by Ziegler (Field, 64; *Beiträge*, 41). The index is over ܣܓܝܐ. Ziegler suggests that if the retroversion πάμπολυς is correct, then one would prefer Sym as the reviser of 36:5b, given that πάμπολυς is only witnessed by Sym (Ps 39(40):6 Ps 88(89):51), and Job 36:31b. In place of πάμπολυς one could also render παμπληθύων; this is the version of Aq for מַכְבִּיר in Job 36:31b (*Beiträge*, 41).

**Job 36 9b**

HT (וּפִשְׁעֵיהֶם) כִּי יִתְגַּבָּרוּ׃

E (καὶ τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν,) ὅτι ἰσχύσουσιν.

# α′ ὅταν δυναμωθῶσιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ Klostermann

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* lemma] + κατ' αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν 740 Klostermann

*Notes*: Aquila was able to distinguish between the demonstrative and the temporal meaning of כִּי by using sometimes ὅτε and other times ὅτι (Hyvärinen, 53).

Klostermann considered κατ' αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν to be a part of the Aquila fragment, but it is better considered to be a scholion, which was added erroneously to the fragment through the textual transmission (Klostermann, 73; *Beiträge*, 62; *AGK* 3, 214; F-Auct, 10). Mss 788-250 and 3005 provide sound evidence for this conclusion, since these mss keep the hexaplaric fragments distinct from the scholion. In 788-250, the Aquila fragment is on the left side of the bible text, while the scholion is on the right side (788, 155). In 3005, the hexaplaric fragments are underneath the scholion, and these three notes are kept distinct in the margin (3005,149r). Later transmission of the fragments shows that the two hexaplaric fragments were not kept distinct from the scholion. Ms 740 preserves the scholion directly under the Aq fragment without any divider (740, 202v), and in the same manner ms 255 preserves the scholion after the Sym fragment (see *infra*); thus, the scholion corrupted the fragments of Aquila and Symmachus and it confused later scholars.

# σ′ ὅτι κατεδυνάστευον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-139\ 732\ 3006}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* lemma] + κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν Field

*Notes*: Field's longer lemma, ὅτι κατεδυνάστευον κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, is incorrect, and in a note he says, "The remaining, κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, appears to be a scholion" (Field, 64, n. 7). The *C* group preserves the fragment attributed to Sym, while the plus comes from the same scholion, which was listed above for the Aq fragment (see *supra*; *Beiträge*, 41; Field, 64).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 307-8; *AGK* 3, 214; Nic, 518).

**Job 36 10a**

HT וַיִּגֶל אָזְנָם לַמּוּסָר

LXX ἀλλὰ τοῦ δικαίου εἰσακούσεται·

## λʹ καὶ ἀποκαλύψει τὸ οὖς αὐτῶν εἰς παιδείαν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 732}$

*Attr:* λʹ] > *C* (= 250) 139

*Var:* οὖς] + αυτ(ων) *C* (= 788-255) | παιδείαν] παιδειας 559

*Notes*: In 139, the reading occurs as bible text at the end of 10a (*Kollationen*, 225; *Edition*, 373, App I.). In 395, it is possible to interpret the fragment as part of the bible text as in 139 or as the first exegetical note, since it follows the bible text (*Kollationen*, 225). The reading in 788-250 is as follows: οὖς αὐτ(ῶν) | αὐτῶν. The dittography arose due to the reading, which is divided over two lines.

**Job 36 10b-11**

HT
וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי־יְשֻׁבוּן מֵאָוֶן׃
אִם־יִשְׁמְעוּ וְיַעֲבֹדוּ
יְכַלּוּ יְמֵיהֶם בַּטּוֹב
וּשְׁנֵיהֶם בַּנְּעִימִים׃

E
καὶ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐπιστραφήσονται ἐξ ἀδικίας.
ἐὰν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ δουλεύσωσιν,
συντελέσουσιν τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγαθοῖς
καὶ τὰ ἔτη αὐτῶν ἐν εὐπρεπείαις.

## θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 139\ 680\ 732}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$ Clem

*Attr:* θʹ (ὁμοίως ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̅ 788(Δ:) 740; ὁμοίως οἱ δ̅ ἐκ θʹ 612 559; ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̅ 3005(**11a**) 395 137 3006 643; ὁμοίως ἐκ θυ̅ οἶδα 250) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa Clem | 10b-11 sub ※ 3005(non **10b**; **+12a**) 788 740 255(non **10b** **11a**) 612 559 395(non **11c**) 137(non **11a**) 3006(non **11c**) 260 643(non **11b**) 248(non **11c**) 252 Arm La(non **11c**) Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]

ܬ ※ ܘܐܡܪ ܕܢܦܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܥܘܠܐ.
※ ܐܢ ܢܫܡܥܘܢ ܘܢܦܠܚܘܢ ܒܥܒܕܘܬܐ.
※ ܢܫܡܠܘܢ ܝܘ̈ܡܝܗܘܢ ܒܛܒ̈ܬܐ.
※ ܘܫܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܒܫܘܦܪܘܬ ܦܐ̈ܝܘܬܐ. ↘

La *et* (pr ※ μ) *dixit Quia convertentur* (*conuer※tentur* β) *ab iniquitate* ↙
*si* (pr ※ μ) *audierint te et servierint* (*serui※erint* β),
*complebunt* (pr ※ μ) *dies suos in bonis,*
*et annos suos in gloria.*

Arm ※ և ասաց զի դարձցին յանիրաւութենէ
※ Եթէ լուիցեն և ծառայեսցեն
※ կատարեսցեն զաւուրս իւրեանց ի բարութիւնս
※ և զամս իւրեանց ի վայելչութիւնս

*Notes*: The scholion in 788 does not have the line over the delta, which would mark the numeral and it also has two vertical dots (:) after it, which usually mark the end of a scholion in this ms, but to a later scribe they may have been understood as the ligature for final -α. The scribe of 250, either working from 788 or an intermediate ms, understood the text in precisely this way, for he wrote οἶδα.

**Job 36 10b**

HT (וַיֹּאמֶר) כִּי־יְשֻׁבוּן (מֵאָוֶן׃)
E (καὶ εἶπεν) ὅτι ἐπιστραφήσονται (ἐξ ἀδικίας.)

# σʹ ἵνα μετανοήσωσιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*[–139 260 732]

*Var:* μετανοήσωσιν] μετανοησουσι 740; μετανοησουσιν 612; μετανοησωσι *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: Ms 3005 is the first representative of the *C* group to preserve both the fragment and the attribution.

**Job 36 11b**

HT יְכַלּוּ (יְמֵיהֶם בַּטּוֹב)
E συντελέσουσιν (τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγαθοῖς)

# σ′ παλαιώσουσιν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Var:* παλαιώσουσιν] παλαιωσουσι 680

*Notes*: Ms 788 preserves this fragment, while it is absent from 250. This fragment and the following one have influenced the Nicetas catena (καὶ μετ’ εὐδοξίας τὸν βίον παλαιώσουσιν); although, there is no attribution (Nic, 519, 22).

**Job 36 11c**
HT (וּשְׁנֵיהֶם) בַּנְּעִימִים׃
E (καὶ τὰ ἔτη αὐτῶν) ἐν εὐπρεπείαις.

# σ′ μετ’ εὐδοξίας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI*–139 732

*Attr:* σ′] > 138

*Var:* εὐδοξίας] εὐαξίας 612vid | μετά] εν *C* (= 788)

*Notes*: Ms 788 preserves this fragment while it is absent from 250. Also, 788 assimilated its text to the bible text resulting in ἐν + genitive singular or accusative plural.

**Job 36 13**
HT וְחַנְפֵי־לֵב יָשִׂימוּ אָף
לֹא יְשַׁוְּעוּ כִּי אֲסָרָם׃
E καὶ ὑποκριταὶ καρδίᾳ τάξουσιν θυμόν·
οὐ βοήσονται, ὅτι ἔδησεν αὐτούς.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–138 680 732 248 252 Arm La Sa Syhtxt

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ β̅ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 643 139; ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ δύο 260) Syhtxt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 13 sub ※ 3005 788(non **13b**) 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 260 643(non **13b**) 139(non **13b**) 248 252 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܘܢܣ̈ܒܝ ܒܐܦ̈ܐ ܒܠܒܐ ܢܣܝܡܘܢ
※ ܚܡܬܐ.
※ ܠܐ ܢܩܥܘܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܣܪ ܐܢܘܢ. ↘

La *et* (pr ※ μ) *hypocritae corde* (γ; > βμ) *ponent* (pr ※ β) *furorem.*
*non clamabunt, quia ligavit eos* (+ ↙ β)

Arm ※ Եւ կեղծաւորք սրտիւք զրգռեցին զարտմտութիւն
※ ոչ գուժեցին զի կապեաց զնոսա

**Job 36 13a**

HT (וְחַנְפֵי־לֵב) יָשִׂימוּ אָף

E (καὶ ὑποκριταὶ καρδίᾳ) τάξουσιν θυμόν·

# σʹ ἐποίησαν ὀργήν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 643 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > 138

**Job 36 14a**

HT תָּמֹת (בַּנֹּעַר נַפְשָׁם)

LXX ἀποθάνοι (τοίνυν ἐν νεότητι ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν,)

# σʹ θανατωθήσεται

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ] > 138-255

**Job 36 14b**

HT (וְחַיָּתָם)—(בַּקְּדֵשִׁים׃)

LXX (ἡ δὲ ζωὴ αὐτῶν) τιτρωσκομένη (ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων,)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 138 732

*Attr:* οὐ κεῖται παρ’ (παρα 788-250 3006) Ἑβραίοις τὸ ἡμιστίχιον (ημιστιχιν 255 612; ημιστιχον 559[inc] 680 260 643 139) 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 680 137 3006[inc] 260 643 139(**14a**); οὐ κεῖται ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ εἰς τὸν στίχον 395

*Var:* τιτρ. ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων sub ÷ 3005 788 740 255 612 559 395(※ pro ÷)

*Notes*: Ms 559 may have ἡμιστίχον or ἡμιστίχιν, since the letter in question (ι or ο) is a blot in the manuscript. In ms 3006, the ending of ἡμιστίχιον is not clear since only ημιστιχ-- can be read. The obelus along with the marginal notation is well attested in the catena tradition. Ms 139 preserves the note at 14a instead of 14b.

Comparison with HT shows that only τιτρωσκομένη is intended to be under the obelus, even though the marginal note indicates the “half line” is under the obelus.

**Job 36 16**

HT
וְאַף הֲסִיתְךָ מִפִּי־צָר
רַחַב לֹא־מוּצָק תַּחְתֶּיהָ
וְנַחַת שֻׁלְחָנְךָ מָלֵא דָשֶׁן׃

E
καὶ προσέτι ἠπάτησέν σε ἐκ στόματος ἐχθροῦ·
ἄβυσσος, κατάχυσις ὑποκάτω αὐτῆς·
καὶ κατέβη τράπεζά σου πλήρης πιότητος.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[−138 680 732] 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ γ̅ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 643 139(*bis*); ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ τρεῖς 260) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 16 sub ※ 3005 788 740(non **16a**) 255(non **16bc**) 612(non **16c**) 559(non **16bc**) 395(non **16bc**) 137(non **16ac**) 3006(non **16ac**; ※ sup υπακατω; + **17**) 260(non **16c**) 643(non **16a**) 248 252 Arm La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]
ܬ ※ ܘܐܘܣܦ ܥܡ ܗܘ ܐܛܥܝܟ ܡܢ
※ ܦܘܡܐ ܒܥܠܕܒܒܐ.
※ ܬܗܘܡܐ ܐܫܝܕܘܬܐ ܬܚܘܬܝܗ̇.,
↘ ※ ܘܢܚܬ ܦܬܘܪܐ ܕܝܠܟ ܟܕ ܡܠܐ ܕܫܘܡܢܘܬܐ.

La
※ *et quia decepit* (pr ※ β) *te ab ore inimici*
*abyssus effusi* (pr ※ μ) *subter* (pr ※ β) *eam,*
*et descendit* (pr ※ μ) *mensa tua plena pinguedine.*

Arm
※ Եւ զերծոյց զքեզ ի բերանոյ թշնամւոյ

※ անդունդք որոյ տարածումն ի ներքոյ իւր
※ և էջ սեղան քո լի պարարտութեամբ ↙

**Job 36 16c**

HT וְנַחַת שֻׁלְחָנְךָ (מָלֵא דָשֶׁן׃)

E καὶ κατέβη τράπεζά σου (πλήρης πιότητος.)

# σʹ καὶ θέσις τῆς τραπέζης σου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ 680; > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 395 559 740

*Var:* θέσις] θεσι 680

**Job 36 19c-20**

HT
וְכֹל מַאֲמַצֵּי־כֹחַ׃
אַל־תִּשְׁאַף הַלָּיְלָה
לַעֲלוֹת עַמִּים תַּחְתָּם׃

E
καὶ πάντας τοὺς κραταιοῦντας ἰσχύν.
μὴ ἐξελκύσῃς τὴν νύκτα
τοῦ ἀναβῆναι λαοὺς ἀντ αὐτῶν·

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–138 680 732 3006 248 252 336ʹ 543 Arm La Sa Syh^txt

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ γ̅ 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 139; ἐκ θ οἱ ε̅ 3005; ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ τρεῖς 260) Syh^txt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om 252 336ʹ 543 Sa | 19c-20 sub ※ 3005 788 740 255 612 395 137(non **19c**) 260 643(non **19c**) 139(non **19c** **20a**) 248 Arm La(non **19a** **20a**) Syh^txt

*NonGr:* Syh^txt
ܬ ※ ܘܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܚܝܠܝܢ ܒܚܝܠܐ.
※ ܠܐ ܠܒܪ ܬܓܕ ܒܠܠܝܐ.
※ ܠܡܣܩ ܥܡܡܐ ܚܠܦܝܗܘܢ. ↘

La
*et omnes qui habent fortitudinem,*
*noli extollere per noctem,*
※ *ut ascendant populi pro eis* ↙

Arm
※ և զամենայն զաւրաւորս զաւրութեամբ

※ Մի ձգեսցես ի գիշերի
※ ելանել ժողովրդոց փոխանակ նոցա

*Notes*: Ms 3005 preserves five lines from Th (19c-20 and 21b-22a), which are marked with the asterisk (see 21b-22a *infra*).

**Job 36 20**

HT אַל־תִּשְׁאַף הַלָּיְלָה
לַעֲלוֹת עַמִּים תַּחְתָּם׃

E μὴ ἐξελκύσῃς τὴν νύκτα
τοῦ ἀναβῆναι λαοὺς ἀντ αὐτῶν·

σʹ μὴ προθυμηθῇς νυκτὸς, ἐπαναβήναι λαοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-732}$ *cII* 555 161ʹ

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* προθυμηθῇς] προθυμηθεις *C* (= 3005) 559 | ἐπαναβήναι] αναβηναι 161 | λαούς] λαου 138 | τοῦ] > 139-256 | τόπου] τους τοπους 680 $3006^{inc}$

*Notes*: Ms 248 is added to the *Wit1* on the basis of the *Kollationen*, which noted that the *Edition* did not list it (*Kollationen*, 227). Regarding τόπου, the text of ms 3006 is uncertain, for it may support the lemma or the variant found in 680, but it is more probable that it supports the lemma since it would then agree with 137 260 643 (*Kollationen*, 227).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 311-12; *AGK* 3, 220-21; Nic, 522).

**Job 36 21b-22a**

HT כִּי־עַל־זֶה בָּחַרְתָּ מֵעֹנִי׃
הֶן־אֵל יַשְׂגִּיב בְּכֹחוֹ

E ἐπὶ τοῦτον γὰρ ἐξείλω ἀπὸ πτωχείας.
ἰδοὺ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς κραταιώσει ἐν ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ·

θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) $cI^{-138\ 395\ 559\ 680\ 732}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa $Syh^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 788-250 740(**22a**) 255 137 3006 643; ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ β̅ 260; ἐκ θ οἱ ε̅ 3005(**19c**)) Syh^txt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 21b-22a sub ※ 3005 788 740 255 612(non **22a**) 137 260 643 139(non **21b**) 248 252 Arm La(non **22a**) Syh^txt(non **22a**)

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ܬ ※ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܬܒܚܪܬ ܠܟ ܡܢ ܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ. ↘
ܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܬܚܝܠ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
La *hoc* (pr ※ μ) *enim elegisti super inopiam*
*ecce deus roborabitur in fortitudine sua.*
Arm ※ քանզի զնա փրկեցեր յաղքատութենէ
※ Ահա Հզաւրն զաւրացուսցէ զաւրութեամբ իւրով

**Job 36 21b**
HT כִּי־עַל־זֶה בָּחַרְתָּ מֵעֹנִי׃
E ἐπὶ τοῦτον γὰρ ἐξείλω ἀπὸ πτωχείας.

# αʹ ὅτι ἐπὶ τούτων ἐξελέξω ἀπὸ θλίψεως

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ
ܓܒܝܬ ܡܢ ܐܘܠܨܢܐ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field, who presents evidence for the retroversion of θλῖψις from ܐܘܠܨܢܐ in Syh Job 15:24 and θλιβῶδες in Aq Gen. 22:7 (Field, 65, n. 24; *Curaes*, 629).

# σʹ ἵνα ταύτην προκρίνῃς πτωχείας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^–732 Syh

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 788) 139 Syh] > rel

*Var:* προκρίνῃς] προκρινεις 3006 | πτωχείας] πτωχειαν 137 139 260 395 680 3006; πτωχειαν̣ 643; πτωχιας *C* (= 788-250)

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܡܛܠ ܕܗܕܐ ܬܦܪܘܫ
ܛܒ ܡܢ

ܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ܀

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first *C* ms to support the attribution to Sym and it thus confirms the attribution in Syh. In the corpus of the LXX, Wis 7:8 has the only other instance of προκρίνειν (H-R, 1207). In the Psalter, Sym uses ἐπιλέγεσθαι (24(25):12) and αἱρεῖσθαι (118(119):173) to render בחר Qal (Busto Saiz, 625), but these instances are not comparable to Job 36:21b, since Sym rendered this verse as a comparison.

**Job 36 22b**

HT (מִי)—(כָמֹהוּ מוֹרֶה׃)

LXX (τίς γάρ) ἐστιν (κατ᾽ αὐτὸν δυνάστης;)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ܡܢܘ ܓܝܪ ÷ ܐܝܬ ↘ ܐܟܘܬܗ ܬܩܝܦܐ.

*Notes*: The *Edition* and Field did not include this instance of the obelus, but it belongs to the the hexaplaric materials since the text is present in the LXX but it is absent from the HT.

**Job 36 23a**

HT מִי־פָקַד (עָלָיו דַּרְכּוֹ)

LXX τίς δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἐτάζων (αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα;)

# σʹ ὃς ἐξετάζει

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*^–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ἐξετάζει] εξετασει *C* (= 788-250)

**Job 36 23b**

HT (וּמִי־) אָמַר (פָּעַלְתָּ עַוְלָה׃)

LXX (ἢ τίς) ὁ εἴπας (Ἔπραξεν ἄδικα;)

# σʹ ἐρεῖ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*^–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ 395 559 612 680; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: Sym has the future tense, while HT has the perfect. 4QJob[a] has the imperfect (יאמר), which either indicates that Sym had a different *Vorlage* or an early interpretation of the HT (*DJD*, XVI, 175). The error may be explained as due to haplography or dittography of the י.

**Job 36 24b-25a**

HT אֲשֶׁר שֹׁרְרוּ אֲנָשִׁים׃
כָּל־אָדָם חָזוּ־בוֹ

E ὧν ἦρξαν ἄνδρες·
πᾶς ἄνθρωπος εἶδεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ,

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI*$^{-138\ 260\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 788-250 740(**25a**) 255(**25a**) 612 559 395 137; σʹ ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 643 139) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 24b-25a sub ※ 788 740 255 612(non **24b**) 559 137 643(non **25a**) 139(non **25a**) 248 252(mend **23b-24b**) 706(+ **25b**) Arm La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܠܗ ※ ܥܠ ܗܘܢ ܕܐܫܬܒܚܘ ܓܒܪ̈ܐ.
※ ܟܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܚܙܐ ܒܗ. ↘

La ※ *quem laudaverunt viri.*
*omnis* (pr ※ μ) *homo respecit ad eum,*

Arm ※ զոր սկսան արք արդարք
※ Ամենայն մարդ ետես ինքեամբ

HT אֲשֶׁר שֹׁרְרוּ אֲנָשִׁים׃
E ὧν ἦρξαν ἄνδρες·

# ⟨σʹ⟩ ἧς ἐξουσιάζουσιν ἄνθρωποι

*Wit1:* 252

*Attr:* σʹ] > 252 cod

*Var:* ἧς *conj* Field] ἡ cod

*Notes*: The emendation of Field has warrant, given that the antecedent would probably have been the feminine noun πρᾶξις for פֹּעַל (in v. 24a) as in Ps 27(28):4 and Ps 76(77):13 and for other derivatives from the same root such as פְּעֻלָּה (Ps 27(28):5) and מִפְעָל (Ps 65(66):5) (F-Auct, 10; Busto Saiz, 573). The Psalter does not provide any evidence of Sym's use of ἐξουσιάζω for Hebrew שִׁיר. Probably, Sym read the Hebrew שֹׁרְרוּ as from I שׂרר "to rule, reign."

**Job 36 25b**

HT אֱנוֹשׁ יַבִּיט מֵרָחוֹק׃

LXX ὅσοι τιτρωσκόμενοί εἰσιν βροτοί.

# σʹ ἕκαστος ἀποβλέπων μακρόθεν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 732}$ *cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 139 643 740

*Var:* μακρόθεν] μακρωθεν 3006

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 313; *AGK* 3, 224; Nic, 523).

**Job 36 26**

HT הֶן־אֵל שַׂגִּיא וְלֹא נֵדָע
מִסְפַּר שָׁנָיו וְלֹא־חֵקֶר׃

E ἰδοὺ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς πολύς, καὶ οὐ γνωσόμεθα·
ἀριθμὸς ἐτῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπέραντος.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI*$^{-138\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 788-250(**26b**) 740 255 612 559 395(**25b**) 137 643 139; ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ δύο 260) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 26 sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559(non **26b**) 137(non **26b**) 260 643 139(non **26;** + **27**) 248 252 706 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr:* Syh$^{txt}$ ܬܐ ※ ܗܐ ܚܝܠܬܢܐ ܣܓܝܐܐ ܗܘ̣ ܘܠܐ
※ ܗܘ̇ ܝܕܥܝܢ.
※ ܡܢܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܫ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܘܕܠܐ ܣܘܦܐ. ↘

La ※ *ecce deus multus, et nesciemus* ↙
*numerus* (pr ※ μ) *annorum eius* (pr ※ β) *infinitus*

Arm ※ Ահա Հզաւրն սաստիկ է և ոչ իմասցուք
※ թիւ ամաց նորա անսպառ

**Job 36 26a**

HT (הֶן־אֵל שַׂגִּיא) וְלֹא נֵדָע

E (ἰδοὺ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς πολύς,) καὶ οὐ γνωσόμεθα·

# σʹ ὑπὲρ τὴν γνῶσιν ἡμῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–260]

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 137 139 395 559 612 643 680 3006

*Var:* ὑπέρ] υπο 138 | γνῶσιν] γνωσι 732 | ἡμῶν] > 680

*Notes*: Ms 3005 confirms that the earliest Greek catena preserves the attribution to Sym.

**Job 36 27b-28aβb**

HT יָזֹקּוּ מָטָר לְאֵדוֹ׃
אֲשֶׁר־יִזְּלוּ שְׁחָקִים
יִרְעֲפוּ עֲלֵי אָדָם רָב׃

E καὶ ἐπιχυθήσονται ὑετῷ εἰς νεφέλην·
ῥυήσονται παλαιώματα,
γνοφωθήσονται ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους πολλούς
(ἐσκίασεν δὲ νέφη ἐπὶ ἀμυθήτων βροτῶν.)

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250) 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Wit2:* **28b**] ※ *et tenebrascent super homines plurimos O* (pr Syh) Arm (add); pr γνοφωθησονται (και γνοφ. 575) επ ανθρωπους πολλους (πολλοι V) V-575-336ʹ-Iul = M (28b)

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ κ̅γ̅ 250(**28a**)) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* **27b-28aβ**] om Sa | 27b-28aβ sub ※ 248(om **28**β) 252(om 28β; + **28b**) Arm(**28β post 28a**) La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܘܬܬܐܫܕ ܡܛܪܐ ܕܫܒܝ̈ܠܐ.
※ ܢܪ̈ܕܘܢ ܥܢ̈ܢܘܬܐ.
※ ܢܚ̈ܫܟܘܢ ܥܠ ܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ. ↘

La ※ *effundetur imber per semitas suas.*
*fluent* (pr ※ μ) *nubes* (pr ※ β),
※ *et tenebrascent super homines plurimos*.

Arm ※ և զեղցին անձրեւով յամպս
※ Բղխեսցեն հնացեալք
հովանացոյց զամպս ի վերայ անբաւ մարդկան
※ միգասցին ի վերայ բազում մարդկան

*Notes*: The note in ms 250 has twenty-three lines attributed to Th. In 250, the stichometry differs from the *Edition*. The ms preserves 28cdef after 37:5a, and except for 28b, it attributes the total correct number of lines to Th. The twenty third line in ms 250 ends with the word θαυμάσια, which occurs at the end of 5a in the *Edition*; therefore, 250 is the only catena witness to attest Th as the author of 36:28ab-37:5a (see *infra*).

The lemma follows the stichometry of Syh, which attributes the lines to Th, and therefore the lines agree with HT. Arm places 28β after 28b as represented in the *NonGr* line. Ziegler notes that 28β created a doublet in the witnesses represented in the *Wit2* line except La, which preserved only the text of Th by excluding 28b. Syh contains the doublet, but it preserves the Th lemma under the asterisk and places OG 28b under the obelus rightly (see *infra*; *Edition*, 143).

**Job 36 28a**

HT אֲשֶׁר־יִזְּלוּ שְׁחָקִים

E ῥυήσονται παλαιώματα,

# σʹ ἅτινα ῥυήσονται ἐκ τοῦ αἰθέρος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–732] *cII* 555 161 252

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 3006

*Var:* ῥυήσονται] ρυσονται 740 | αἰθέρος] εθερος 138 395

*Notes*: Ms 252 has been added to the evidence on the basis of the *Kollationen* (*Kollationen*, 229).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 314; *AGK* 3, 225; Nic, 524).

HT (אֲשֶׁר־יִזְּלוּ) שְׁחָקִים

E (ῥυήσονται) παλαιώματα,

## ⟨α′⟩ ⟨ῥοπαί⟩

*Wit1:* ↓$C^{cat}$ (= 249 257 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{cat–139}$ ↓$505^{cat}$

*Attr:* α′] > $C^{cat}$ (= 249 257 788-250 3005) $cI^{cat–139}$ $505^{cat}$

*Var:* ῥοπαί *cj*. Hagedorn] αἱ τροπαί $C^{cat}$ (= 249 257 788-250 3005) $cI^{cat–139}$ $505^{cat}$

*Notes*: This is a new instance of the well attested τροπαί for original ῥοπαί, not noted by Ziegler previously (*AGK* 3, 225). The Hagedorns made this conjecture based on the evidence that Aq uses ῥοπαί consistently in places where LXX-Job has παλαιώματα (see also *Beiträge*, 42, 62; for a full discussion of this problem and the relevant factors see Job 37:18a *infra*).

**Job 36 28bcdef**

HT יִרְעֲפוּ עֲלֵי אָדָם רָב׃
—
—
—
—

LXX ἐσκίασεν δὲ νέφη ἐπὶ ἀμυθήτων βροτῶν.
ὥραν ἔθετο κτήνεσιν,
οἴδασιν δὲ κοίτης τάξιν.
ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἐξίσταταί σου ἡ διάνοια
οὐδὲ διαλλάσσεταί σου ἡ καρδία ἀπὸ σώματος;

## Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* 248 252 706 Arm La Syh

*Var:* 28b sub ÷ Syh | 28cdef sub ÷ 3005 740 255(non **28c**) 138(non **28cd**) 612(non **28df**) 559 395 680 137(non **28f**) 3006 260 643 732 139 248 252 706 Arm(non **28b**) La Syh

*NonGr*: $Syh^{txt}$

÷ ܐܛܠܠ ܕܝܢ ܥܢܢ̈ܐ ܥܠ ܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ
÷ ܠܐ ܡܬܡ̈ܠܠܢܐ.
÷ ܫܥܬܐ ܣܡ ܠܒܥܝܪ̈ܐ.
÷ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܛܟܣܐ ܕܡܫܟܒܐ.

÷ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ
÷ ܡܬܬܡܗܐ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܟ:
÷ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܐ ܠܒܐ ܕܝܠܟ ܡܢ ܦܓܪܐ. ↘

La *et tenebrascent super homines plurimos.*
÷ *horam constituit iumentis,*
*et sciunt* (pr ÷ β) *cubilis ordinem.*
*in* (pr ※ μ) *his omnibus non stupescit* (*stu÷pescit* β) *animus tuus,*
※ *nec mutatur cor tuum a corpore.*

Arm ÷ ժամանակ եդ անասնոց
÷ և գիտեն զկարգ հանգստեան
÷ Ի վերայ այսր ամենայնի ոչ իցեն զարմացեալ միտք քո
÷ ոչ սարսիցէ սիրտ քո ի մարմնի քում

*Notes*: The stichometry in Syh varies from the other witnesses since it includes the doublet caused by the Th reading, but it clearly preserves what is from Th and therefore the revision which agrees with HT. In Syh, 28b is placed under the obelus since it was considered not to be in agreement with HT, but rather it was considered to be OG (see *supra*). In La, 28b is included, since it does represent a translation of HT 28b, but it is not under the obelus, since it represents only the translation of the line in that version.

Besides preserving the obelus accurately, the catena also has an extended note on these lines at 36:28c. There are two versions of this note, which are listed below with the relevant ms evidence.

The witnesses, *C*[cat] (= 788-250) *cI*[cat] 474[cat] [505[cat]] 523[cat], have the following note: οὗτοι οἱ Δ̄ (τεσσαρες 680; τεσσαρες στιχοι 137→) οὐ κεῖνται ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ· διὸ καὶ ὠβελίσθησαν. ἔν τισι δὲ ἀντιγράφοις ἐνταῦθα κεῖνται· *ὥραν* (ὥραν — fin > 395[cat] 523[cat]) *ἔθετο κτήνεσιν, οἴδασι* (οἴδασι — fin καὶ ἑξῆς οἱ ἕτεροι Γ̄ στίχοι 137→) *δὲ κοίτης τάξιν. ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἐξίσταταί σου ἡ διάνοια, οὐδὲ διαλλάσσεταί σου ἡ καρδία ἀπὸ σώματος;* (*AGK* 3, 226; *Edition*, 83-84). Ms 788-250 places the four lines after 37:5a in the bible text but records the same verses in the catena at 36:28c as shown in the note (see below for the note at 37:5a). Most of the catena tradition contains the four lines under the obelus here and after 37:5a in the bible text with the accompanying scholion.

Ms 3005 has the following marginal note: οὗτοι οἱ ὠβελισμένοι Δ̄ στίχοι ἔν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις ἐνταῦθα κεῖνται, ἐν ἑτέροις δὲ ἔμπροσθεν μετὰ ΙΘ̄ στίχους εἰσὶν τεταγμένοι μετὰ τὸν στίχον, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή· *βροντήσει ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν φωνῇ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια.* ἐγὼ δ' ἐν ἑτέρῳ τούτους τέταχα τόπῳ. (*AGK* 3, 226). Ms 3005 along with the whole catena tradition has the four lines under the obelus both here and after 37:5a in the bible text. The note refers to a copy like 788-250, which only has the lines after 37:5a in the bible text.

The relevant scholion at 37:5a in the catena tradition, attested in the witnesses *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] 505cat (οὗτοι – Δ̅), is as follows: οὗτοι οἱ ὠβελισμένοι οἱ Δ̅ ἔν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις ὀπίσω κεῖνται πρὸ εἴκοσι (Κ̅ 3005 740 138-255 612 559 258 395) στίχων μετὰ τὸ *ἐσκίασε δὲ νέφη ἐπὶ ἀμυθήτων βροτῶν* (βροντων 3005 740 138-255 612 559 258 395 680 137 732 139), ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετραπλοῖς ᾿Ωριγένους ηὕρομεν (ηυραμεν 255 258; > 139) (*AGK* 3, 235; *Edition*, 83-84). The note contains a clear reference to the Tetrapla of Origen, which contained these four obelised lines after 36:28b.

**Job 36 29-37 5a**

HT

36:29 אַף אִם־יָבִין מִפְרְשֵׂי־עָב
תְּשֻׁאוֹת סֻכָּתוֹ׃
30 הֵן־פָּרַשׂ עָלָיו אוֹרוֹ
וְשָׁרְשֵׁי הַיָּם כִּסָּה׃
31 כִּי־בָם יָדִין עַמִּים
יִתֶּן־אֹכֶל לְמַכְבִּיר׃
32 עַל־כַּפַּיִם כִּסָּה־אוֹר
וַיְצַו עָלֶיהָ בְמַפְגִּיעַ׃
33 יַגִּיד עָלָיו רֵעוֹ
מִקְנֶה אַף עַל־עוֹלֶה׃
37:1 אַף־לְזֹאת יֶחֱרַד לִבִּי
וְיִתַּר מִמְּקוֹמוֹ׃
2 שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ בְּרֹגֶז קֹלוֹ
וְהֶגֶה מִפִּיו יֵצֵא׃
3 תַּחַת־כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם יִשְׁרֵהוּ
וְאוֹרוֹ עַל־כַּנְפוֹת הָאָרֶץ׃
4 אַחֲרָיו יִשְׁאַג־קוֹל
יַרְעֵם בְּקוֹל גְּאוֹנוֹ
וְלֹא יְעַקְּבֵם כִּי־יִשָּׁמַע קוֹלוֹ׃
5 יַרְעֵם אֵל בְּקוֹלוֹ נִפְלָאוֹת

E

36:29 καὶ ἐὰν συνῇ ἀπεκτάσεις νεφέλης,
ἰσότητα σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ,
30 ἰδοὺ ἐκτείνει ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἠδὼ
καὶ ῥιζώματα τῆς θαλάσσης ἐκάλυψεν.
31 ἐν γὰρ αὐτοῖς κρινεῖ λαούς,
δώσει τροφὴν τῷ ἰσχύοντι.
32 ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἐκάλυψεν φῶς
καὶ ἐνετείλατο περὶ αὐτῆς ἐν ἀπαντῶντι·
33 ἀναγγελεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ φίλον αὐτοῦ·
κτῆσις καὶ περὶ ἀδικίας.
37:1 καὶ ταύτης ἐταράχθη ἡ καρδία μου

καὶ ἀπερρύη ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς.
[2]ἄκουε ἀκοὴν ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ κυρίου,
καὶ μελέτη ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξελεύσεται.
[3]ὑποκάτω παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πτερύγων τῆς γῆς.
[4]ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ βοήσεται φωνή,
βροντήσει ἐν φωνῇ ὕβρεως αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οὐκ ἀνταλλάξει αὐτούς, ὅτι ἀκούσει φωνὴν αὐτοῦ.
[5]βροντήσει ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν φωνῇ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια·

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* lemma] 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$ | **36 29b-30**] $cI^{-138\ 680}$ | **36 31b-37 2**] $cI^{-138\ 260\ 680\ 732}$ | **37 3b-5a**] $cI^{-138\ 260\ 680\ 732}$

*Attr:* lemma θ′ Syh$^{txt}$ | **36 29b-30** ἐκ τῶν θ′ τὸ ἡμιστιχ() καὶ οἱ β̅ 612 559 137 3006 643; ἐκ τῶν θεοδοτ() τὸ ἡμιστιχον καὶ οἱ β̅ 260; ἐκ θ′ τὸ ἡμιστίχ() καὶ οἱ β̅ 740 395; ἐκ θ′ τὸ ἡμιστιχιν(*sic*) καὶ οἱ β̅ 255 | **36 31b-37 2** ἐκ θ οἱ θ̅ 740 255 612 395 | **37 3b-5a** ἐκ θ′ οἱ δ̅ 255 559 740; ἐκ θ′ οἱ ιδ̅ 395; ἐκ θ′ οἱ ε̅ 137

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 36 29-37 5a sub ※ 248 252 706 Arm(+ **28ij**) La Syh$^{txt}$(non **37:1b**) | **29b-30**] 740 255 612 559(non **29b 30b**) 395(non **30**) 137(non **29b**) 3006 260(non **30**) 643 732(non **29b 30b**) 139 | **36 31b-37 2b**] 740(non **1b**) 255 612 559(non **31b-33b**) 395(non **32b 33a**) 137(non **2b**) 3006(non **2b**) 643(non **31b 32a 33a 2a**) 139(non **36 31b-37 2a**) | **37 3b-5a**] 740(non **5a**) 255(non **4c 5a**) 612(non **5a**) 559(non **5a**) 395(non **3b 4c 5a**) 137(non **4a**) 3006 643 139(non **4a-5a**)

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$

ܬ ※ ܘܐܢ ܬܣܬܟܠ ܡܬܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܥܢ̈ܢܐ.
※ ܫܘܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܟܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܗܐ ܡܬܚ ܥܠܘܗ̇ ܗܐܕܐ.
※ ܘܥܩܪ̈ܐ ܕܝܡܐ ܚܦܐ.
※ ܒܗܘܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܐ̇ܢ ܠܥܡ̈ܡܐ.
※ ܢܬܠ ܡܐܟܘܠܬܐ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܚܝܠܬܢ.
※ ܥܠ ܐܝ̈ܕܝܐ ܚܦܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ.
※ ܘܦܩܕ ܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܒܗ̇ܘ ܕܦܓܥ.
※ ܡܚܘܐ ܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܪ̈ܥܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܩܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܪ̈ܝܐ ܘܡܛܠ ܥܘܠܐ.
※ ܘܕܗܕܐ ܐܬܙܝܥ ܠܒܐ ܕܝܠܝ. ↘
ܘܫܘܪ ܡܢ ܕܘܟܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ

※ ܫܒܒ ܫܒܒܐ ܒܪܘ ܥܢܢܐ ܕܫܟܢܬܗ
※ ܕܡܪܝܐ.
※ ܘܗܘ ܦܪܣ ܡܢ ܦܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܗܘܡ.
※ ܬܚܝܬ ܟܠܗ ܫܡܝܐ ܪܥܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܢܘܗܪܗ ܥܠ ܟܢܦܝܗ ܕܐܪܥܐ.
※ ܒܬܪܗ ܢܓܘܡ ܒܩܠܐ.
※ ܢܪܥܡ ܒܩܠܐ ܕܝ ܒܪܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܠܐ ܢܥܩܒ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܫܬܡܥ ܩܠܗ.
※ ܢܪܥܡ ܚܝܠܬܢܐ ܒܩܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ
※ ܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ. ↘

La *si* (pr ※ μ) *cogitaverit extendere nebulam* (*nebu※lam* β),
*aeque* (pr ※ μ) *ad tabernaculum expandit eam.*
※ *ecce effundit super eum lucem suam,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *radices maris* (pr ※ β) *contexit.*
*in* (pr ※ μ) *eis iudicabit populos,*
※ *dabit escam plurimis.*
*in manibus contexit lumen* (pr ※ β),
*et* (pr ※ μ) *mandavit de eo in contrarium,*
*ut* (pr ※ μ) *nuntiaret* (pr ※ β) *super illo amico suo*
possessionem (pr ※ μ; possessio※nem β) *contra eum qui ascendere nititur.*
*sed* (pr ※ μ) *et in* (pr ※ β) *his obstupuit cor meum,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *evulsum est de* (pr ※ β) *loco suo.*
*audite* (pr ※ μ) *sonitum terroris,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *strepitum* (pr ※ β) *oris ipsius exeuntem.*
*subter* (pr ※ μ) *universum* (pr ※ β) *caelum circuit,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *lumen eius in finibus terrae* (pr ※ β).
*post* (pr ※ μ) *eum fremet vox.*
*tonabit in sonitu* (pr ※ β) *superbiae suae,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *non poterit investigari, cum audita fuerit vox eius.*
*tonabit* (pr ※ μ) *fortis in voce sua mirabiliter*↙

Arm ※ և ձմերայնոյ անձրեւաց զզաւրութիւնս իւրեանց
※ Ի ձեռին ամենայն մարդոյ կնքէ
※ Եթե իմանայցես զտարածել ամպոց
※ զհաւասարութիւն խորանի նորա
※ Ահա ձգէ ի վերայ նորա ճանապարհաւ
※ և զարմատս ծովու ծածկեաց
※ Զի նոքաւք դատեսցի զժողովուրդս
※ տացէ կերակուր զաւրացելոյն
※ Ի ձեռս ծածկեաց զլոյս

❊ և ետ պատուէր վասն նորա պատահելոյ
❊ Պատմեսցէ զնմանէ բարեկամաց իւրոց
❊ և զստացուածոց և զանիրաւութենէ
❊ Եւ ի վերայ այնորիկ խռովեցաւ սիրտ իմ
❊ և ծորեաց ի տեղւոջէ իւրմէ
❊ Լուր զլուր ի բարկութեան սրտմտութեան Տեառն
❊ և խորհուրդ ի բերանոյ նորա ելցէ
❊ Ի ներքոյ ամենայն երկնից իշխանութիւն նորա
❊ և լոյս նորա ի վերայ ծագաց երկրի
❊ Զկնի նորա գոչեսցէ բարբառ
❊ որոտասցէ ձայնիւ բարձրութեան իւրոյ
❊ և ոչ փոխանակեսցէ զնոսա ❊ զի լսելի արասցէ զձայն իւր
❊ Որոտասցէ Հզաւրն սքանչելի բարբառով իւրով

*Notes*: Arm begins at verse 28ij in Cox's text.

**Job 36 29a**

HT אַף אִם־יָבִין מִפְרְשֵׂי־עָב

E καὶ ἐὰν συνῇ ἀπεκτάσεις νεφέλης,

# α′ ἐὰν συνῇ ἐκπετασμοὺς πάχους

*Wit1:* ↓252 ↓Syh

*Var:* συνῇ] συνῇς Syh | πάχους] > 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܐ. ܐܢ ܡܣܬܟܠ ܐܢܬ
ܡܬܦܫܘܬܐ ܕܥܢܢܐ܀

# σ′ κἂν ἐννοήσῃ ἐκτεῖναι νεφέλην

*Wit1:* 252

*Var:* νεφέλην *conj*] νεφελιν 252 cod

*Notes*: Ms 252 has νεφελιν, which arose from νεφέλην due to itacism.

**Job 36 29b**

HT תְּשֻׁאוֹת סֻכָּתוֹ׃

E ἰσότητα σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ,

σʹ ἐξ ἴσης ὡς σκηνήν

*Wit1:* 252

**Job 36 30a**

HT הֵן־פָּרַשׂ עָלָיו אוֹרוֹ

E ἰδοὺ ἐκτείνει ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἠδὼ

αʹ ἐκπετάζει ἐπ’ αὐτὴν φῶς αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161ʹ ↓252 Syh

*Wit2:* ἠδώ] *lucem suam* La = M

*Attr:* αʹ 248 680 Syh] σʹ *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*$^{-680}$ *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 250) 252 643

*Var:* ἐκπετάζει] εκπετασει 252; εκπεταζη 3006; pr ιδου 248 252 | αὐτήν] αυτο 248$^{c}$ 252; αυτ(ων) 138; αυτον 512-513 | φῶς] pr το 512-513

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܡܦܫܛ ܥܠܝܗ̇
ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܀

*Notes*: The reading of 248 is difficult to determine. Ziegler’s 248$^{c}$ is not obvious, but it is possible to construe the reading in the ms as αὐτό with the ligature for -ήν over it, and therefore it is reflected in the apparatus as it appears.

Mss 248 680 Syh and internal evidence determine that Aq is the author of this fragment. According to H-R, there is no evidence for Sym’s use of ἐκπετάζω for פרשׂ; he uses ἐκπεταννύμαι for עוף Qal in Ps 89(90):10 and ἐκπετάζω for עוף Pol in Ezek 32:10 (attributed to αʹ σʹ θʹ). Busto Saiz lists καταμερίζειν for פרשׂ Pi (Ps 67 (68):15) and ἐξαπλοῦν for פרשׂ Hi (Ps 43(44):21) (Busto Saiz, 711). In contrast, Aq uses ἐκπετάζω for פרשׂ in Job 11:13b (Woods, 222-3), and he uses the noun ἐκπετασμός for מפרשׂ in Job 36:29a (see *supra*). In addition, Reider lists Ex 9:33, 25:19(20), Deut 32:11, and Isa 37:14 in support of this translation equivalent in Aq (Reider, 75). Perhaps the attribution to Sym in the margin was influenced by the attribution to Sym in the catena of Olymp (see *infra*).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 314-5; *AGK* 3, 227; Nic, 525).

HT (הֵן־פָּרַשׂ עָלָיו) אוֹרוֹ

E (ἰδοὺ ἐκτείνει ἐπ’ αὐτὸν) ἠδὼ

# σʹ φῶς αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* $C^{cat}$ (= 249 788-250 3005) $cI^{cat}$ $754^{cat}$ $474^{cat}$ $258^{cat}$ $505^{cat}$ $Ol^{Y}$

*Wit2:* ἠδώ] *lucem suam* La = M

*Notes*: The fragment belongs with the Olymp materials. The entire quote is as follows: – ἡδὼ δὲ ἑρμηνεύεται “φῶς αὐτοῦ”· οὕτω (οὕτως $Ol^{Y}$) γὰρ καὶ (> $Ol^{Y}$) ὁ Σύμμαχος ἐκδέδωκεν, ἕτερα δὲ ἀντίγραφα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡδὼ “τόξον” ἔχουσιν – (*AGK* 3, 227; *Kommentar*, 315).

# ἑβρʹ ὠρώ

*Wit1:* Nobil (apud Field)

*Notes*: This fragment remains unattested in the mss.

**Job 36 30b**
HT (וְשָׁרְשֵׁי (הַיָּם כִּסָּה׃
E (καὶ) ῥιζώματα (τῆς θαλάσσης ἐκάλυψεν.)

# αʹ σʹ ῥίζας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 257 3005) $cI^{-139\ 612\ 732}$

*Attr:* αʹ σʹ] σʹ *C* (= 3005); αʹ *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: The attributions are inverted in 138-255 (σʹ αʹ). The evidence of *C* is split three ways. It appears that 257 has preserved the correct double attribution, which entered into the *cI* group, and one or the other attributions has fallen out of 788-250 and 3005.

**Job 36 31a**
HT כִּי־בָם (יָדִין עַמִּים)
E ἐν γὰρ αὐτοῖς (κρινεῖ λαούς,)

# σʹ διὰ γὰρ αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788 3005) $cI^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ 248 252 Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788)

*NonGr*: Syh ܗ. ܒܐܕ̈ܢܝܗܘܢ ܠܚܢܝ ܀

*Notes*: Ms 788 preserves the fragment but not the attribution. Ms 250 does not attest this fragment.

**Job 36 31b**

HT יִתֶּן־אֹכֶל לְמַכְבִּיר׃

E δώσει τροφὴν τῷ ἰσχύοντι.

# σʹ παρέξει τροφὴν παμπόλλην

*Wit1:* lemma] *C* (= 257) *C*cat (= 249 788-250 3005) *cI*cat 754cat 474cat 258cat [505cat] 523cat OlY *cII* 161 | παμπόλλην] ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*−137 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓252

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 252

*Var:* παμπόλλην] παμπολλον 680

*Notes*: The fragment belongs to the Olymp tradition and is preserved as follows: ὁ Σύμμαχος “παρέξει τροφὴν παμπόλλην” ἐκδέδωκεν (*AGK* 3, 228; *Kommentar*, 316; Nic, 526). The designation Σ(υμμάχου) παμπόλλην is found additionally in numerous mss in the margin (*AGK* 3, 228); *Wit1* presents this evidence as a second lemma. The full lemma is in the margin of 257, not the text of its catena. Ms 250 contains an additional attribution to Sym (σʹ) in the margin beside the relevant catena text. Ms 788 actually preserves the attribution to Sym in the marginal note. Ms 252 is “anon” and does not preserve the attribution to Sym, as the *Edition* lists in II App (*Kollationen*, 230; *Edition*, 377).

HT (יִתֶּן־אֹכֶל) לְמַכְבִּיר׃

E (δώσει τροφὴν) τῷ ἰσχύοντι.

# αʹ τῷ παμπληθύοντι

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: This is a *hapax* for Aquila and the Three and does not occur in the LXX (H-R, 1052; Reider, 183; cf 36:5b-6a for a parallel reading of Aq).

**Job 36 32a**

HT (עַל־)כַּפַּיִם (כִּסָּה־אוֹר)

E (ἐπὶ) χειρῶν (ἐκάλυψεν φῶς)

# σʹ παλάμαις

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) $cI^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: Ms 788 preserves the attribution to Sym, while it has fallen out of 250.

**Job 36 32b**
HT וַיְצַו עָלֶיהָ בְמַפְגִּיעַ׃
E καὶ ἐνετείλατο περὶ αὐτῆς ἐν ἀπαντῶντι·

# σʹ καὶ ἐπιτάξει αὐτῷ ὥστε ἀπαντῆσαι

*Wit1:* lemma] *C* (= 257) $C^{cat}$ (= 249 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{cat}$ ↓$754^{cat}$ ↓$474^{cat}$ ↓$258^{cat}$ [$505^{cat}$] $523^{cat}$ *cII* 555 ↓161ʹ ↓$Ol^{Y}$ | ὥστε ἀπαντῆσαι] ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓$cI^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* καὶ ἐπιτάξει αὐτῷ] ουτως $Ol^{Y}$ | καί] > 248 | ἐπιτάξει] επιταξη 248 | αὐτῷ] αυτο 161 | ἀπαντῆσαι] απατησαι $cI^{cat-260^{c}}$ $cI^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ $754^{cat}$ $474^{cat}$ $258^{cat}$

*Notes*: This Sym fragment belongs to the Olymp tradition and is preserved as follows: ὁ Σύμμαχος “καὶ ἐπιτάξει αὐτῷ ὥστε ἀπαντῆσαι” ἑρμήνευσεν (*AGK* 3, 229; *Kommentar*, 316; Nic, 526). Mss 248 and 257 preserve the full fragment in the margin, while much of the catena preserves only ὥστε ἀπαντῆσαι in the margin. Ms 250 preserves an additional attribution to Sym in the right margin beside the fragment in the catena.

**Job 36 33a**
HT יַגִּיד עָלָיו רֵעוֹ
E ἀναγγελεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ φίλον αὐτοῦ·

# αʹ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἑταίρῳ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* 252 ↓Syh

*Attr:* α′] > Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ❖ܡܗܘܕܥ ܚܠܦܘܗܝ
ܠܚܒܪܐ ܕܝܠܗ

## σ′ ἀπαγγελεῖ περὶ τούτου ἑταίρῳ ἑαυτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓$C^{cat}$ (= 249 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-260\ 732}$ ↓$cI^{cat}$ ↓754$^{cat}$ ↓474$^{cat}$ ↓258$^{cat}$ ↓505$^{cat}$ ↓*cII* ↓161 ↓555 ↓Ol$^{Y}$ ↓Syh

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* περί—ἑαυτοῦ] περὶ ἑταίρου αὐτοῦ Syh | ἀπαγγελεῖ] αναγγελει $C^{cat}$ (= 249 3005) $cI^{-138\text{-}255\ 395\ 559\ 612\ 680}$ 474$^{cat}$ | τούτου] του 559; αυτου *C* (= 788-250) $C^{cat}$ (= 788-250) 139$^{cat}$; τουτων 555 | ἑταίρῳ] ετερως Ol$^{Y}$; ετερω (ἑτε(αι sup lin)ρῳ 788) $C^{cat}$ (= 249$^{1}$ 788-250) $cI^{-138\text{-}255\ 559\ 612\ 3006}$ 255$^{cat}$ 612$^{cat}$ 559$^{cat}$ 258$^{cat\rightarrow}$ 474$^{cat}$ | ἑαυτοῦ *C* (= 788-250) $cI^{-137\ 138\ 139\ 255\ 395\ 643\ 680\ 3006}$] αὐτοῦ $C^{cat}$ (= 249 788-250 3005) $cI^{-258\ 559\ 612\ 732\ 740}$ $cI^{cat-260}$ 754$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 258$^{cat}$ 505$^{cat}$ *cII* 161 555; > 260$^{cat\rightarrow}$

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܡܗܘܕܥ ܡܛܠ ܚܒܪܐ
ܕܝܠܗ

*Notes*: This fragment has three textual issues, which will be treated in order. Although ἀναγγελεῖ has good textual support, it should be considered secondary for three reasons: (1) ἀπαγγελεῖ also has good textual support since both 788-250 and 788-250$^{cat}$ have this reading and most of $cI^{cat}$ and *cI* testify to it. (2) Translation technique favors this lemma, since Sym only uses ἀπαγγέλλειν to render נגד Hi in the Psalter four times (29:10, 36:6[ο′], 91:3, 91:16) (Busto Saiz, 470, 684).[8] (3) It is easier to explain how a scribe could harmonize the reading of Sym to his bible text, than to change ἀναγγελεῖ to ἀπαγγέλλειν, which means ἀπαγγέλλειν is the *lectio difficilior*. These factors indicate that ἀπαγγέλλειν is probably the original text.

[8]Busto Saiz also lists one instance where ἀναγγέλλειν renders נגד Hi, but he underlines it, marking it as dubious, since the instance in Ps 63:10 is actually a retroversion from Syh; thus, Sym probably uses ἀπαγγέλλειν five times in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 684).

The variant ἑτέρῳ probably arose from ἑταίρῳ due to itacism (αι > ε), common in Greek mss (Wevers, 188; see the *sup lin* correction back to αι in 788). Translation technique indicates that Sym uses ἑταίρος for רֵעַ five times in the Psalter (27:3[α′], 34:14[α′], 37:12, 44:15[α′], 87:19) and חָבֵר once (44:18[α′]) (Busto Saiz, 513, 727).

Perhaps the most difficult textual decision is over whether to choose the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ or the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ, an interchange that is attested from Att. inscriptions from the 4th century BCE (Gignac, II 170, n. 5). The word under consideration is the third person pronoun αὐτοῦ, not the contracted reflexive pronoun αὑτοῦ, since the few instances of αὑτοῦ in comparison with αὐτοῦ warrant reading αυτου as αὐτοῦ in the Koine period (Gignac, II 170, esp. n. 4). Regarding Sym's usage of the reflexive pronoun, Busto Saiz says, "The pronominal suffix on a noun is translated by the Greek reflexive pronoun when the subject of the Greek verb which governs that noun, and the person represented by the pronominal suffix, are identical" (Busto Saiz, 83).[9] This fragment meets these criteria since the pronominal suffix and subject are identical; therefore, ἑαυτοῦ is preferred over αὐτοῦ.

The attribution to Olymp is established on the basis of *Kommentar*, *AGK*, and Nic (*Kommentar*, 316; *AGK*, vol III, 230; Nic, 326).

**Job 36 33b**

HT מִקְנֶה אַף עַל־עוֹלֶה׃

E κτῆσις καὶ περὶ ἀδικίας.

## ⟨α′⟩ κτήσεις καίπερ ἐπὶ παρανομίαις

*Wit1:* Syh

*Attr:* α′] > Syh

*Var:* κτήσεις *conj.*] κτίσεις cod

*NonGr*: Syh ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܒܪ ܛܒ ܥܠ ܥܒܘܪ̈ܝ
ܢܡܘܣܐ܀

*Notes*: Syr ܒܪ ܛܒ most probably should be retroverted as καίπερ since this seems to be common translation technique of Greek into Syriac (Field cites Pesh Heb 5:8 and 2 Pet 1:12; Sym Hex Eccl 4:14) and Aq translates אף with καίπερ (Lev 26:39; Hyvärinen, 89).

---

[9] I am grateful to Jason Parry for his help translating this sentence.

# σʹ ζῆλον καὶ περὶ ἀδικίας

*Wit1:* lemma] *C*[cat] (= 249 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] 754[cat] 474[cat] 258[cat] 505[cat] 3007[cat] ↓*cII* 555 161 252 Ol[Y] Syh | ζῆλον] ↓*C* (= 257 788-250) ↓*cI*[–137 260 732 3006]

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ζῆλον] ζηλος *C* (= 788-250) *cI* (= 395 559 680); και pr 703 | καί 252] > rel

*NonGr*: Syh ܠܛܢܢܐ ܡܛܠ
ܥܘܠܐ ❖

*Notes*: The καί in 252 could be explained as an assimilation to the bible text of the scribe, but Sym's usual practice is to translate אף with καί, which he does three out of six times in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 211). In one instance, Sym may have left this adverb untranslated, but Ps 67:9 may be an occurrence of where Sym used δέ to render אף (Busto Saiz, 211). The nominative form ζῆλος is explained as preserving the lexeme of Sym without concern for the original case of the word. The accusative is original since it functions as the direct object of ἀπαγγελεῖ in 36:33a (see *supra*).

The text of Syh has been divided between 33a and 33b here. The manuscript has one reading attributed to Sym.

The attribution to Olymp is established on the basis of *Kommentar*, *AGK*, and Nic (*Kommentar*, 317; *AGK*, vol III, 230; Nic, 326).

## Chapter 37

**Job 37 1a**

HT אַף־לְזֹאת (יֶחֱרַד לִבִּי)

E καὶ ταύτης (ἐταράχθη ἡ καρδία μου)

# α′ καίπερ εἰς τοῦτο

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr:* Syh ܐ. ܒܪ ܠܒ ܒܗܕܐ ܀

*Notes*: καίπερ is the probable retroversion (cf. 36:33b). The retroversion of the *Edition*, ἐν, is a problem, since it does not appear that Aquila uses ἐν to render ל but most often uses it to render ב (Hyvärinen, 48). Aq uses εἰς + acc. often to render ל (Hyvärinen, 46). There are three possible explanations: (1) Aq could have varied his technique and used ἐν for ל. (2) Syh rendered εἰς with ܒ. Job 37:13 is an interesting example of the technique of Syh. There are three instances of ל rendered with εἰς by Th, and Syh renders the first and third instances with the expected ܠ but the second with ܒ. In 37:6b and 12b Syh renders ἐν with ܒ; thus, one might suppose that Syh varied technique. (3) An inner Greek error of ἐν for εἰς occurred. These prepositions became confused in the Koine with εἰς + acc becoming used to indicate rest and ἐν + dat used occasionally to indicate motion towards (Browning, 42, 1969). Given the literal translation technique of Aq, it is best to posit he used εἰς + acc for ל, and to suggest that ܒ be retroverted with εἰς or perhaps an inner Greek error of ἐν for εἰς occurred in the transmission of the text.

# σ′ καὶ περὶ τούτου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI* (= 138-255 740) ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓252

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788) 138 252

*Var:* καί] > *C* (= 788 3005) 138-255 740 | τούτου] ταυτης 252; τουτο 740; τουτ() 138; τουτων *cII* 555 | fin] + πτήσσει ἡ καρδία μου *cII* 555 | πτήσσει] πτησση 555

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* calls attention to the following items: (1) 3005 is the first Γ′ (*C*) witness to this fragment, (2) the attribution to Aq in the *Edition* is erroneous due to a misprint, and therefore only Symmachus is possible, and (3) the longer reading in Nic is the result of later stylizing of the older catena tradition by a redactor (*Nachlese*, 407; *Kollationen*, 232).

Nic has the following reading: ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος· καὶ περὶ τούτων πτήσσει ἡ καρδία μου, while the older catena preserves only the prepositional phrase. The question, whence does the longer reading come, cannot yet be answered with certainty. The Hagedorns suggest that the longer reading arose due to the changing of the style of the older catena tradition by the redactor. They say, "Since it is not possible that the older recension of the catena is the source of N (because 3005 has the same text as Γ), we do not see, whence the redactor could have obtained the information, if it were not the case, that he himself transformed it so freely" (*Nachlese*, 407). This explanation is sound, though it should be noted that Symmachus does use πτήσσειν for חרד Qal with לִבִּי as subject in 1 Rgns 28:5 (H-R, 1238), which is similar to the structure in Job 37:1a. Either the redactor knew the tendency of Sym and added the correct verb, or perhaps the verb is original to Sym and *cII* preserves the right reading.

Since the fragment in 252 is anonymous and the readings of Th and Aq are established (see *supra*), the reading is best treated here. The fragment of 252 is as follows: καὶ περὶ ταυτῆς. This fragment preserves καὶ περί of Sym, but it probably received ταυτῆς from its bible text. Of the six times Sym translates אף in the Psalter, he uses καί three times (Busto Saiz, 211). This evidence is sufficient, given that Sym does not leave אף untranslated, except for one possible instance in Psalm 67:9, but rather than being untranslated, δέ probably translates it (Busto Saiz, 211); therefore, 252 probably preserves the original καί, even though the catena has not preserved it.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported in *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only in Nic (*Kommentar*, 317; *AGK* 3, 231; Nic, 527).

The apparatus of 4QJob[a] at 37:1 should be revised based on the new lemma, since this shorter lemma does not reveal whether Sym had the לא of that text or not (*DJD*, XVI, 177). The listing of σʹ should be removed.

**Job 37 1b**

HT — וְיִתַּר (מִמְּקוֹמוֹ׃)

E — καὶ ἀπερρύη (ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς.)

# αʹ καὶ ἐλύθη

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: According to Reider, this is the only occurrence of λύειν pass in Aq. The lexicon lists three roots for נתר. The first root means "to loose, remove" in Job 6:9, while the second means "to leap" in Job 37:1 (*HALOT*, 736-7). Aq used ἐπιβάλλειν in Job 6:9 (Woods, 143), and here he renders I נתר with λύειν pass.

# ⟨σʹ⟩ καὶ κατερείπει

*Wit1:* 252

*Attr:* σʹ *conj.*] θʹ 252 cod

*Var:* κατερείπει] κατεριπει cod (mend)

*Notes*: The *Edition* lists Symmachus as the author of the fragment, but the *Kollationen* has returned it to Th, which Field suggested on the basis of 252 (*Kollationen*, 233; Field, 66). This occurrence of κατερείπειν is the only one in the corpora of the LXX and Hexapla, so analysis of translation technique is not possible. Since Th is already the author of the bible text under the asterisk and the Aq reading is already established, Sym is probably the author of this fragment.

**Job 37 2a**

HT שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ בְּרֹגֶז קֹלוֹ

E ἄκουε ἀκοὴν ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ κυρίου,

# αʹ ἤκουσα ἀκοὴν ἐν κλονήσει φωνῆς αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: Job 3:17a provides another example of κλόνησις for רֹגֶז in Aq (Woods, 101). The first personal singular indicative verb (ἤκουσα) presuposses that Aq read a 1cs suffix (שִׁמעי).

**Job 37 2b**

HT וְהֶגֶה (מִפִּיו יֵצֵא׃)

E καὶ μελέτη (ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξελεύσεται.)

# αʹ καὶ φθογγή

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 161 ↓252 ↓Syh

*Attr:* αʹ] αʹ σʹ 139; > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* καί] > 252 260 Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܒܡܠܬܐ܀

*Notes*: Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Aq. The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 317-8; *AGK* 3, 231; Nic, 527).

HT (מִפִּיו יֵצֵא׃) וְהֶגֶה
E (καὶ) μελέτη (ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξελεύσεται.)

# σʹ ἦχος λόγου

*Wit1:* 252 ↓Syh

*Var:* ἦχος] ἴχνη Syh

*NonGr:* Syh ܗ. ܒܥܩܒܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ܀

*Notes*: Sym renders עָקֵב with ἴχνος in Psalms 48:6, 55:7, and 88:52 (Busto Saiz, 527), while he renders Hebrew words denoting sound with ἦχος (e.g. קוֹל in Job 39:24). The Hebrew word, הֶגֶה is used only three times in the Hebrew Bible, and there are no Sym fragments for Ps 90:9 and Ezek 2:2. Given this evidence, the reading in 252 is preferred over Syh.

**Job 37 3a**
HT (תַּחַת־כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם) יִשְׁרֵהוּ
E (ὑποκάτω παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ,

# αʹ ἐφοδεύσει αὐτό

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ ↓252

*Attr:* αʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐφοδεύσει *C* (= 788-250) 252] ἐφέδρευσις 138 255 740; ἐφέδρευσεις 612; ἐφεδρεύσεις 139 260 559 643 680 3006; ἐφεδρεύσει 395; ἐφαιδρεύσεις 137 | αὐτό *C* (= 788-250)] αὐτοῦ rel

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first *C* witness to confirm the attribution to Aq. The text of this fragment has two problems: (1) whether Aq used the verb ἐφοδεύω or the noun ἐφέδρευσις and (2) whether the acc. neut. sing. or the gen. masc./neut. pronoun should be considered original.

The HT consists of a verb from the root I שׁרה Qal impf 3ms + 3ms suffix. Probably, Aq has read the form as from I שׂרר "to rule, reign; to have oversight of," as Th also does in this verse (Gentry, 516). In Ps 5:9 and Ps 26(27):11, Aq renders שׁוֹרֵר "enemy" (cp. ἐχθρῶν LXX) with the participle of ἐφοδεύω, again reading I שׂרר for שׁרר. This understanding of HT makes ἐφοδεύω "to visit, inspect," "superintend, watch

over," the more probable reading over ἐφέδρευσις "lying in wait", which is otherwise unattested in the LXX and the Three (*Beiträge*, 41). La has *circuit*, which is also dependent on ἐφοδεύσει (*Beiträge*, 41).

Before the inclusion of 788, determination of the pronoun was problematic on textual and grammatical grounds. The text of 250 is difficult to read, but it appears to read αὐτό,[10] and Dieter Hagedorn has confirmed this conclusion. Although Ziegler's suggestion of an original αὐτοῦ, which was corrected to αὐτό, is possible, it was not confirmed by looking at the image (*Kollationen*, 234; *Beiträge*, 41). Ms 788 now affirms that this reading of 250 is correct. Second, there are no examples of ἐφοδεύω + genitive to analyze according to *TLG*. This conclusion renders the reading of 252 improbable, but probably 252 preserves an intermediate stage (correct verb form with incorrect genitive form), and this awkward reading may have caused the intentional scribal change from ἐφοδεύσει to ἐφέδρευσις.

**Job 37 3b**

HT (וְאוֹרוֹ עַל־)כַּנְפוֹת (הָאָרֶץ׃)

E (καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ) πτερύγων (τῆς γῆς.)

## σʹ ἄκρων

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*⁻⁷³²

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ 137; > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* ἄκρων] ακρον 138-255

*Notes*: Job 38:13a contains the same translation equivalent, where the attribution is attested by the *C* group (ἄκρων = כַּנְפוֹת).

**Job 37 4b**

HT (יַרְעֵם) בְּקוֹל גְּאוֹנוֹ

E (βροντήσει) ἐν φωνῇ ὕβρεως αὐτοῦ,

## αʹ ἐν φωνῇ ὑπερφερείας αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | ὑπερφερείας αὐτοῦ] *C*[cat] (= 249 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[cat] 754[cat] 474[cat] 258[cat] ↓505[cat] *cII* 555 ↓161ʹ ↓252 Ol[Y]

[10]The reading is as follows: ἐφοδεύσει αὐ-τό[supra linear]. The omicron is not perfectly shaped and so was probably formed from a blot. For this reason one might suggest an erasure occurred in the ms, but this is by no means an obvious conclusion. Given the spacing of the letters, it is best to conclude that the ms originally and only contained αὐτό.

*Wit2:* ἐν φωνῇ] εν βροντη *lI*; *in sonitu* La

*Var:* ὑπερφερείας] υπερηφανιας 505[cat] 680[cat] | αὐτοῦ] > 161′ 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܒܩܠܐ ܕܦܩܥ ܕܪܘܡܬܐ
ܕܝܠܗ܀

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* stands, since it is well attested by *Kommentar*, *AGK*, and Nic (*Kommentar*, 318; *AGK* 3, 232; Nic, 528). The full context of the catena is as follows: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὕβρεως αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἀκύλας "ὑπερφερείας αὐτοῦ" ἐκδέδωκεν.

## σ′ σὺν κτύπῳ (s ψόφῳ) ἐνδοξασμοῦ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܥܡ ܩܘܦܐ
ܕܡܫܒܚܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 67).

**Job 37 4c**
HT וְלֹא יְעַקְּבֵם כִּי־יִשָּׁמַע קוֹלוֹ׃
E καὶ οὐκ ἀνταλλάξει αὐτούς, ὅτι ἀκούσει φωνὴν αὐτοῦ.

## σ′ καὶ οὐκ ἐξιχνιασθήσεται ἀκουσθέντος τοῦ ψόφου αὐτῆς

*Wit1:* ↓*C*[cat] (= 249 257 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] 754[cat] 474[cat] 258[cat] 505[cat] ↓*cII* 555 161 ↓Ol[Y]

*Var:* καί] > 257 | οὐκ] + αν 251-703 | ἐξιχνιασθήσεται] εξιχνευθησεται Ol[Y]

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* stands, since it is well attested by *Kommentar*, *AGK*, and Nic (*Kommentar*, 319; *AGK* 3, 233; Nic, 528).

**Job 37 5b**
HT עֹשֶׂה גְדֹלוֹת וְלֹא נֵדָע׃
LXX ἐποίησεν γὰρ μεγάλα, ἃ οὐκ ᾔδειμεν,

# λʹ ποιῶν μεγάλα καὶ οὐ γνωσόμεθα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–137\ 139\ 260\ 559\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓Ol$^{Y}$

*Attr:* λʹ *C* (= 257 788-250) 255 395 612 740] σʹ *C* (= 3005) Ol$^{Y}$; > 138 680; Ἄλλος Field

*Notes*: The *Kollationen* reports that 3005 also preserves an attribution to Sym, which agrees with Ol$^{Y}$ (*Kollationen*, 235), but the *C* (= 257 788-250) group attests λοιποί and the best witnesses of *cI* agree. Furthermore, the version could be attributed to the Three since there are no idiosyncrasies in the translation.

**Job 37 6a**

HT (כִּי לַשֶּׁלַג) יֹאמַר (הֱוֵא אָרֶץ)

LXX συντάσσων (χιόνι Γίνου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς·)

# λʹ ἐρεῖ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{–137\ 139\ 260\ 395\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$

**Job 37 6b-7a**

HT וְגֶשֶׁם מָטָר וְגֶשֶׁם מִטְרוֹת עֻזּוֹ׃
בְּיַד־כָּל־אָדָם יַחְתּוֹם

E καὶ χειμὼν ὑετῶν δυναστείας αὐτοῦ.
ἐν χειρὶ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου κατασφραγίζει,

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI*$^{–138\ 680\ 732}$ 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* 6b init] pr (※ Syh) καὶ χειμὼν ὑετός B-S* *O*-253 = M; pr και χειμωνι (–να 637-644; χειμων Ol) ινα ῇ (> Iul) υετος A-637-644-Iul Ol: cf M | om 6b 336ʹ | om καὶ χειμὼν ὑετῶν Iul | χειμωνι V | υετου La C *c* 248$^{cʹ}$ 251 543 644 Aeth Ol; υετον *C*$^{p}$ 613 = Ald; υετος *lII* | δυναστειαις A-V-637 (pr-εν)-Iul 253; –στεια 249 La$^{\mu}$ (*potestas*) | αὐτοῦ] –των *lIII*

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 643(**6a**) 139(**6a**); ἐκ θεοδοτ() οἱ β̅ 260) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 6b-7a sub ※ 788 740 255(non **7a**) 612 559 395 137 3006 260 643 139 252 Arm(non **6b**) La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܘܣܬܘܐ ܕܡܛܪܐ ܘܣܬܘܐ ܕܡܛܪ̈ܐ
※ ܕܫܠܝܛܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܒܐܝܕܐ ܕܟܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܚܬܡ. ↘

La *et* (pr ※ β) *tempestas pluviae et tempestas* (*tem※pestas* β) *imbrium potestatis eius*
*in manu omnis hominis* (pr ※ β) *signat.*

Arm ※ Ի ձեռին ամենայն մարդոյ կնքէ

**Job 37 6b**

HT וְגֶשֶׁם מָטָר וְגֶשֶׁם מִטְרוֹת עֻזּוֹ׃

E καὶ χειμὼν ὑετῶν δυναστείας αὐτοῦ.

## α′ καὶ ὄμβροι ὑετοῦ, καὶ ὄμβροι ὑετῶν κράτους αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܐܪ̈ܣܣܐ ܕܡܛܪ̈ܐ.
ܘܐܪ̈ܣܣܐ ܕܡܛܪ̈ܐ
ܕܐܘܚܕܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 67).

## σ′ καὶ χειμῶνα ὑετοῖς χειμάσει ὄμβρος ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–137 139 260 643 732 3006] ↓*cII* 555 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* χειμῶνα *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[–138 395 559 680 740]] χειμων 395 559 680 740 Syh; χεμωνα 138 | χειμάσει] χειμαζει *C* (= 3005); χειμασιας 395 680 | ὄμβρος *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*[–680 740]] ομβροις 680 740 Syh; ομβρϊος 250; ομβρους 512-513

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܘܣܬܘܐ ܠܡܛܪ̈ܐ
ܣܬܐ ܠܐܪ̈ܣܣܐ

ܕܚܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ ❖

*Notes*: Ziegler chose the variants χειμών and ὄμβροις, but now that the manuscript stemma is established, it is clear that the lemma is supported by the best witnesses to the text. The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 320-1; *AGK* 3, 236; Nic, 529).

**Job 37 9a**

HT סוּפָה (מִן־הַחֶדֶר תָּבוֹא)

LXX (ἐκ ταμιείων ἐπέρχονται) δῖναι,

# α′ συσσεισμός

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006 248

*Var:* συσσεισμός 248] συγκλεισμος *C* (= 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Notes*: At present there is no evidence for συγκλεισμός in the corpus of Aq, but he uses συσσεισμός for סוּפָה in the following places: Job 21:18, Isa 5:28, and Prov 1:27 (Field = Nobil = 248). Ms 248, therefore, has the correct reading.

# σ′ θ′ καταιγίς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–732

*Attr:* σ′ θ′] θ′ 138

*Notes*: The index is at 9a in many of the catena mss, but it is over ψῦχος at 9b in 3005 (*Kollationen*, 236). For similar lexical equivalences with α′ and σ′ see Job 21:18b (Woods, 389).

**Job 37 9b**

HT וּמִמְּזָרִים (קָרָה׃)

LXX ἀπὸ δὲ ἀκρωτηρίων (ψῦχος.)

# α′ θ′ καὶ ἀπὸ Μαζορίμ

*Wit1:* ↓248 Syh

*Wit2:* ἀπὸ δέ] και απο La *lIII* Aeth Arm

*Attr:* α′ θ′] α′ 248

*Var:* Μαζορίμ] Μαζούρ 248

*NonGr*: Syh MAZOPIM
ܐ.ܬ. ܘܡܢ ܡܐܙܘܪ̈ܝܡ܀

*Notes*: Syh preserves the actual Greek reading above the Syriac as shown in the *NonGr* line. Ms 248 has a corrupt form of what is found in Syh and it does not preserve the complete attribution. Job 38:32a provides an example of Th transliterating this word; therefore, the double attribution is probably correct.

**Job 37 10a**

HT מִנִּשְׁמַת־אֵל יִתֶּן־קָרַח

E καὶ ἀπὸ πνοῆς ἰσχυροῦ δώσει πάγος,

## θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250) *cI*$^{-138\ 139\ 680\ 732}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̅ 250(**9b**) 740(**9b**) 255(**9b**) 612(**9b**) 559(**9b**) 395(**9b**) 137 3006(**9b**) 643(**9b**); ἐκ θεοδοτ() οἱ δύο 260(**9b**))] > rel

*Var:* 10a] om Sa | 10a sub ※ 740(+ **9b**) 255(+ **9b**) 612(+ **9b**) 559(+ **9b**) 395(+ **9b**) 137(+ **9b**) 3006(**9b**) 260(+ **9b**) 643(+ **9b**) 248(mend **10b**) 252 Arm La

*NonGr*: La ※ *et a spiritu dei dabitur glacies* ↙
Arm ※ Եւ ի շնչելոյ Հզաւրին տացէ սառամանիս

## σʹ ἀπὸ ἐμφυσήσεως θεοῦ δοθήσεται πάγος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161ʹ

*Wit2:* δώσει] *dabitur* La

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250) 139 643

*Var:* ἀπό] + δε 138-255 | ἐμφυσήσεως *C* (= 788-250 3005) 138-255 740] εμφυσιματος 612; εμφυσηματος 137 139 395 559 643 680 3006 *cII* 555 161ʹ | πάγος] ανθρωπος 137 139 395 643 680 3006

*Notes*: The best witnesses have ἐμφυσήσις, which is not attested in the LXX or the Hexapla. Furthermore, the word ἐμφύσημα is not attested elsewhere; therefore, the testimony of the oldest Greek catena should be considered genuine. Probably, Ziegler is correct to suggest that the *nomen sacrum* $\overline{\text{ανος}}$ is the cause of the variant (*Edition*, II App, 380).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 321-2; *AGK* 3, 237-8; Nic, 530).

**Job 37 11-12abc**

HT
אַף־בְּרִי יַטְרִיחַ עָב
יָפִיץ עֲנַן אוֹרוֹ׃
וְהוּא מְסִבּוֹת מִתְהַפֵּךְ
בְּתַחְבּוּלָתוֹ (Q בְּתַחְבּוּלֹתָיו) לְפָעֳלָם
כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יְצַוֵּם

E
καὶ ἐκλεκτὸν καταπλάσσει νεφέλη,
διασκορπιεῖ νέφος φῶς αὐτοῦ.
καὶ αὐτὸς κυκλώματα διαστρέψει
ἐν θεεβουλαθὼ εἰς ἔργα αὐτῶν·
πάντα, ὅσα ἂν ἐντείληται αὐτοῖς,

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*$^{-138\ 680\ 732}$ 248 252 706 Arm Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* ἐν θεεβουλαθώ Ra] εν –θων *lII*; εν –θωμ 339; εθετο βουλαθ S*; ενθα εβουλετο S$^{c1}$; εν θεεβουλαθ S$^{c2}$; εν θεεβουλαθωθ (θεβ. Bo) rel

*Attr:* θ′ (**11b-12ab**: ἐκ θ′ οἱ $\overline{\gamma}$ 740 255 612 559; **11b-12a**: ἐκ θ′ οἱ $\overline{\beta}$ 137 3006(**12a**) 643 139(*bis*); ἐκ θεοδοτ() οἱ $\overline{\beta}$ 260(**11b**)) 788 Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 11-12abc sub ※ 788 740(non **11a 12c**) 255(non **11a 12**) 612(non **11a 12c**) 559(non **11a 12**) 395(non **11 12ac**) 137(non **11a 12**) 260(non **11a 12bc**) 643(non **11a 12bc**) 139(non **11a 12**) 248(non **11b**; + **12d**) 252(non **11**) 706 Arm Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$
ܐܦ ※ ܘܟܠ ܓܒܝܐ ܡܛܠܠ ܥܢܢܐ.
※ ܡܒܕܪ ܠܥܢܢܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܗܘ ܒܟܘܪ̈ܟܐ ܢܗܦܘܟ.
※ ܒܬܐܒܠܘܬܘܬ ܒܥ̈ܒܕܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ.
※ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܢ ܢܦܩܕ ܐܢܘܢ. ↘

Arm
※ Եւ զընտիր ամպ ցանեսցէ
※ ցրուէ զմէգ լոյս նորա

※ Եւ ինքն դարձուցէ զշրջանակս
※ ուր կամեցաւ եղ զգործ նոցա
※ և զամենայն ինչ զոր հրամայեսցէ նոցա

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first catena ms to preserve all five lines under the asterisk and attribute them to Th. Syh preserves the Greek εν θεεβουλαθωθ for ܒܬܐܒܘܠܘܬܘܬ in the margin.

**Job 37 11a**

HT אַף־בְּרִי יַטְרִיחַ עָב

E καὶ ἐκλεκτὸν καταπλάσσει νεφέλη,

α′ καίπερ ἐκλεκτὸν ἐνοχλήσει (s παρενοχλήσει) πάχος

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܟܕ ܐܦ ܠܓܒܝܐ ܢܠܐ
ܥܘܒܝܐ ܀

*Notes*: παρηνώχλησε is the correct retroversion for ܠܐܝ Af according to the evidence of Judg 14:17, 16:16, Jer 46:27, and Dan 6:18, but ἐνόχλησις is the proper retroversion of ܠܐܝܘܬܐ based on α′ σ′ θ′ Isa 1:14, where the Hebrew has טֹרַח (Field, 68).

σ′ ἀλλὰ καὶ καρπῷ ἐπιβρίσει νεφέλη

*Wit1:* ↓*C*cat (= 249 257 788-250 3005) *cI*cat 754cat 258cat [505cat] 523cat 3007cat *cII* 555 ↓252 ↓OlY ↓Syh

*Attr:* σ′] α′ 252

*Var:* καί] > Syh | ἐπιβρίσει] επιβρυσι OlY; επιβρωσει 3005cat; δωσει Syh (*conj*. Ziegler)

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܐܠܐ ܠܦܐܪܐ
ܬܬܒ ܥܢܢܐ ܀

*Notes*: Regarding the second variant, Field notes: one retroverts the Syriac: Σ. ἀλλὰ καρπὸν δώσει νεφέλη, but only if it be transcribed soundly: ܣ. ܐܠܐ ܠܦܐܪܐ

⁘ܥܢܢܐ ܬܬܠ. Or must it be read ܬܬܒ, *inclinabit?* [“Codex ܬܬܒ, as the scholion has suggested: ܢܬܒܐ ܡܢ ܬܬܒ.” – Ceriani] (Field, 68, n 27). It appears Ziegler has followed Field’s suggestion of reading ܢܬܠ “to give” instead of ܢܬܒ “to draw, pull; fall down,” which is the meaning of the Greek fragment (*Edition*, II App, 380). Syh appears, however, to have ܒ not ܠ, and the scholion adds greater probability to this suggestion.

The evidence listed in the *Edition* is incomplete, since it only records the evidence of 252 138-251-732 *c* Ol[Y] Syh. In actuality, this fragment is preserved in all of the mss in the catena; therefore, the attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is confirmed by *Kommentar*, *AGK*, and Nic (*Kommentar,* 322; *AGK* 3, 238; *Kollationen*, 237; Nic, 530).

**Job 37 12a**

HT  וְהוּא מְסִבּוֹת מִתְהַפֵּךְ

E  καὶ αὐτὸς κυκλώματα διαστρέψει

# α′  καὶ αὐτὴ μεταστροφαῖς περιστρέψεται

*Wit1:*  252 Syh

*NonGr*:  Syh  ܐ. ܘܗܝ ܒܡܬܗܦܟܢܘܬܐ
ܬܬܗܦܟ⁘

*Notes*:  The *Edition* and more recently the *Kollationen* report the reading of 252 as περιστρέψετ[αι *pace* Field’s περιστρέφεται (*Kollationen*, 237; Field, 68).

# σ′  αὐτὸς δὲ κυκληδὸν ἀναστρέφεται

*Wit1:*  *C* (= 788-250) *cI*$^{-138\ 260\ 732}$ *cII* ↓555 ↓161′ 252 Ol[Y] Syh

*Attr:*  σ′ *C* (= 788) 255 559 612 *cII* 555 161′ 252 Ol[Y] Syh] > rel

*Var:*  αὐτὸς δέ] και αυτος 248; > 161 | δέ] > 555

*NonGr*:  Syh  ܣ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܚܕܪܘܢܐ
ܢܬܗܦܟ⁘

*Notes*:  The attribution is confirmed by 788. The fragment is next to 12c in 252 (*Kollationen*, 237). In Ol[Y], the Sym fragments of 12a and 12b are combined (*Kommentar*, 323; see *infra*).

**Job 37 12b**

HT בְּתַחְבּוּלָתוֹ (Q בְּתַחְבּוּלֹתָיו) לְפָעֳלָם

E ἐν θεεβουλαθὼ εἰς ἔργα αὐτῶν·

# α′ ἐν οἰακώσεσιν εἰς ἔργα αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* lemma] 252 | ἐν οἰακώσεσιν] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) $cI^{-732}$ Syh

*Attr:* α′] σ′ *C* (= 3005)

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܒܡܠܚܘܬܐ܀

*Notes*: The attribution is confirmed by 788. In 3005, the attribution to Sym is probably misplaced, since the Aq fragment and the Sym fragment are placed on top of each other. The attribution was intended for the second marginal note, which would then leave this note Anon. The apparatus for this problem and the one below reflect the situation in ms 3005.

# σ′ ἐν τῇ κυβερνήσει αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτά

*Wit1:* lemma] $C^{cat}$ (= 249 788-250 3005) $cI^{cat}$ $474^{cat}$ $505^{cat}$ $3007^{cat}$ *cII* 555 161′ ↓252 $Ol^{Y}$ | ἐν—αὐτοῦ] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-732}$ Syh

*Wit2:* lemma] + *in gubernaculis ad operanda* La PsVig

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 3005) 138-255

*Var:* αὐτά] > 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܒܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܗ܀

*Notes*: The longer reading is probably the original version of Sym. It agrees with the HT, since Sym renders פעל Qal with ἐργάζεσθαι (Busto Saiz, 511). The vocalization of the Hebrew noun with pronominal suffix and the Hebrew infinitive construct is identical. Sym translated the text as an infinitive construct with 3mp suffix, while Th and Aq translated it as a noun with 3mp suffix. In Job 7:2b, Aq and Th translate the same vocalized word with a singular noun, ἔργον (Woods, 151). In Job 24:5b, Sym uses a singular noun, ἐργασία, to render the word with the same vocalization.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is confirmed by *Kommentar*, *AGK*, and Nic (*Kommentar*, 323; *AGK* 3, 240; Nic, 531).

**Job 37 13**

HT אִם־לְשֵׁבֶט אִם־לְאַרְצוֹ
אִם־לְחֶסֶד יַמְצִאֵהוּ׃

E ἐὰν εἰς παιδείαν, ἐὰν εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ,
ἐὰν εἰς ἔλεος εὑρήσει αὐτόν.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 13 sub ※ 248 252(non **13a**) 706 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܘܐܢ ܠܡܪܕܘܬܐ ܘܐܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܐܢ ܠܪ̈ܚܡܐ ܢܫܟܚ ܐܢܘܢ ↘ ⁘

La *sive* (pr ※ β) *in tribu* (*tri※bu* β), *sive* (pr ※ μ) *in terra sua,*
*sive* (pr ※ μ) *in misericordia inveniri* (*inueni※ri* β) *voluerit eam*.

Arm ※ Եթե ի խրատ, և եթե յերկիր իւր
※ եթե յողորմութիւն գտցէ զնա

**Job 37 13a**

HT (אִם־)לְשֵׁבֶט (אִם־לְאַרְצוֹ)

E (ἐὰν) εἰς παιδείαν, (ἐὰν εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ,)

# σʹ εἰς φυλήν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 395\ 732}$

*Wit2:* εἰς παιδείαν] *in tribu* La = M

*Var:* εἰς *C* (= 788-250 3005)] > rel | φυλήν] φυλακην 740

*Notes*: The additional evidence of 788 and 3005 confirms that the oldest Greek catena preserves εἰς as part of the original Sym fragment, and therefore εἰς does not need to be placed in angle brackets as the *Edition* has it (*Edition*, 381; *Kollationen*, 238).

The variant φυλακή for original φυλή is well attested in the mss (*Beiträge*, 42).

**Job 37 14b**

HT (עֲמֹד) וְהִתְבּוֹנֵן (נִפְלְאוֹת אֵל׃)

LXX (στῆθι) νουθετοῦ (δύναμιν κυρίου.)

# α′ κατανόησον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 257 3005) *cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′] θ′ 161; > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: For general comments regarding this fragment see the Th entry below.

# σ′ ἐνθυμήθητι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 257 3005) *cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σ′] θ′ *C* (= 788) 3006; > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: For general comments regarding this fragment see the Th entry below.

# θ′ καὶ σύνες

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* θ′] α′ 161; σ′ *C* (= 788) 3006; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* καί] > 137 138 139 260 643 3006 *cII* 555 161 | σύνες] συνεσις 137 3006$^{inc}$

*Notes*: Ms 788 has confused the attributions of Sym and Th. At 38:18a, the ms has preserved the correct attributions for Sym and Th (see Job 38:18a). The presence of the copula καί in the oldest Greek catena has not been noted hitherto (*Nachlese*, 407). The καί most probably belongs to the original Th fragment since it translates Hebrew *waw*, and it is not borrowed from the LXX.

The fragments at 14b may be at 14a in 3005 since the readings appear without index (*Kollationen*, 238-9). The index over νουθετοῦ in 788-250, however, makes clear that these fragments are revisions of νουθετοῦ at 14b.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar*, *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 324; *AGK* 3, 241; Nic, 532).

**Job 37 15a**

HT הֲתֵדַע בְּשׂוּם־אֱלוֹהַּ עֲלֵיהֶם

LXX οἴδαμεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο ἔργα αὐτοῦ

# σʹ ἆρα γνώσῃ ὁπότε ἔταξεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 161 $Ol^{Y}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* γνώσῃ] > 137 139 260 395 643 680 3006 | ὁπότε *C* (= 788-250) $Ol^{Y}$] οτε 740; ποτε rel | αὐτῶν] αυτου 740

*Notes*: Translation technique confirms the reading of the oldest Greek catena and $Ol^{Y}$, since Sym does use ὁπότε/ὅτε + indicative for ב + infinitive construct in the Psalter and there are no instances of πότε + indicative (Busto Saiz, 244ff).

The attribution to Olymp is confirmed by *Kommentar* (*Kommentar*, 324; Nic, 532).

**Job 37 17a**

HT אֲשֶׁר־בְּגָדֶיךָ חַמִּים

LXX σοῦ δὲ ἡ στολὴ θερμή·

# αʹ οὗ ἱμάτιά σου θερμά

*Wit1:* ↓248 ↓252 Syh

*Var:* οὗ] οὐκ 248; ουχ 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܐܝܟܐ ܕܡܐ̈ܢܐ ܕܝܠܟ ܚܡܝܡܝܢ܀

# σʹ ὁπότε ἱμάτιά σου θερμά

*Wit1:* 248 252

**Job 37 17b**

HT בְּהַשְׁקִט אֶרֶץ (מִדָּרוֹם׃)

LXX ἡσυχάζεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

# αʹ ἐν τῷ ἡσυχάσαι γῆν

*Wit1:* 252

HT מִדָּרוֹם׃ (בְּהַשְׁקִט אֶרֶץ)
LXX (ἡσυχάζεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.) —

# θʹ ※ ἀπὸ νότου

*Wit1:* *cI*–138 680 La Syhtxt

*Wit2:* fin B-S* A-534-Chr Co] + (※ *O*) απο νοτου (νωτου 252 Iul) rel = M

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ 255 612 559 395; ἐκ θʹ τὸ ἡμιστίχ() 740)] > rel

*Var:* sub ※ 740 255 612 559(pr ἡσυχ.) 395(post νότου) 137(pr ἡσυχ.) 3006 643 732 139

*NonGr*: Syhtxt ※ ܡܢ ܬܝܡܢܐ. ↘
La ※ *ab austro.*

**Job 37 18**
HT תַּרְקִיעַ עִמּוֹ לִשְׁחָקִים
חֲזָקִים כִּרְאִי מוּצָק׃
E στερεώσεις μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ εἰς παλαιώματα,
ἰσχυραὶ ὡς ὅρασις ἐπιχύσεως.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *cI*–138 680 732 252 Arm La Sa Syhtxt

*Attr:* θʹ 740 Syhtxt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 18 sub ※ 740(non **18a**) 255(non **18a**) 612(non **18a**) 559(non **18a**) 395(non **18a**) 137(non **18a**) 3006(non **18a**) 643(non **18a**) 139(non **18a**) 252(non **18a**; **+ 19a**) Arm La(non **18b**) Syhtxt(non **18a**)

*NonGr*: Syhtxt ܬ ※ ܫܡܝ̈ܢܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܚܙܘܐ ܕܐܫܬܦܥܘܬܐ. ↘
La ※ *firmabis cum eo caelos*
Arm ※ Ի հարաւոյ հաստատեցես ընդ նմա ի հնութիւնս
※ զաւրացուցանել իբրեւ զտեսիլ եղեման ↙

*Notes*: The catena does not preserve 18a under the asterisk *pace* the *Edition*. The asterisk marking ἀπο νότου appears at the end of the 17b in some mss and therefore, 18a

seems to be under the asterisk according to those mss, but it is best to interpret this asterisk as marking ἀπο νότου at the end of 17b.

**Job 37 18a**

HT    לִשְׁחָקִים (תַּרְקִיעַ עִמּוֹ)

E    (στερεώσεις μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ) εἰς παλαιώματα,

# α′    εἰς ῥοπάς

*Wit1:* ↓*C*[1] (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[1–137 139 260 643 732 3006] ↓*C*[2] (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[2] ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 252 Syh

*Attr:* α′] θ′ 257 395[2]; σ′ 137 139 260 3006; > *C*[2] (= 788-250[1 2] 3005) 138[2] 255[2] 559[2] 612[2] 643[2] 680[2] 732[2] 740[2]

*Var:* ἐστερέωσε] –σαι 680 | εἰς ῥοπάς 252] εκτροπας 138[1] 255[1] 559[1]; εἰς τροπάς rel | init] αὐτὸς ἐστερέωσε τὸν οὐρανὸν *C*[2] (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*[2] *cII* 161 555

*NonGr:* Syh ܐ. ܒܬ̈ܩܠܐ.

*Notes*: The *Wit1* line represents the evidence for an actual fragment of Aq. Initially Ziegler considered the longer variant a longer Aq fragment, since the prepositional phrase, εἰς ῥοπάς, is from Aq, but later Ziegler concluded rightly in the *Beiträge* that αὐτός—οὐρανόν was a scholion to which the Aq fragment was added (*Beiträge*, 62; see also *AGK* 3, 244). A few mss wrongly attributed this fragment to Sym, while others wrongly attributed it to Th. The Nicetas catena must have been aware that at least part of the fragment belonged to Aq and therefore attributed the conflated reading to Aquila.

The variant τροπάς for original ῥοπάς in the catena mss is a problem attested elsewhere in Job (cf. 36:28a). The lemma is based on the following considerations: (1) Syh Aq uses ܬ̈ܩܠܐ "weight, load" (Job 37:21, 38:37; Ps 17(18):12 [Ps 36(37):6 has ܪܦܦܐ "moment," which is the attested meaning for ῥοπή]), which is retroverted to a form from ῥοπή. (2) In 37:18, ms 252 actually preserves original ῥοπή instead of τροπή, which is significant since the only other place where α′ ῥοπάς is preserved is in ms 248 (Prov 8:28a; Field's "Nobil" is confirmed, Field, II 327 n. 46). These external factors make the lemma most probable.

The relationship between ῥοπή "weight, scales; weight in scales" and שׁחק "dust, cloud" is not immediately apparent. The *Beiträge* provides the following considerations: (1) one expects Aq to use νεφέλη, but Aq uses this word to render ענן (Reider, 163). (2) The verb שׁחק means "to grind, crush," and the noun means "mote, dust"; therefore, the noun "dust" would be the result of the verb "to grind." (3) Most importantly the

translation equivalent is attested in the LXX at Isa 40:15 with the same sense (*Beiträge*, 42-3). Probably these observations allow one to reconstruct the technique of Aquila.

Ziegler listed Syh at 37:21b, but the reading is clearly beside 18a in the manuscript. I thank Jerome Lund for this observation.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 325-6; *AGK* 3, 243; Nic, 533).

HT מְדָרוֹם׃ תַּרְקִיעַ עִמּוֹ לִשְׁחָקִים
E (—) στερεώσεις μετ’ αὐτοῦ εἰς παλαιώματα,

# σ′ ἐξ ὕψους συνέσῃ αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ στερεώματι εἰς αἰθέρα

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓252 Syh | ἐν τῷ στερεώματι] ↓Arm | εἰς αἰθέρα] ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* σ′] α′ Arm; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* συνέσῃ αὐτῷ] συνεσει αυτου 252 | εἰς αἰθέρα] εκεθερα 559 | αἰθέρα] εθερα 395 612

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܡܢ ܪܘܡܐ ܬܗܘܐ
ܒܗ ܒܪܩܝܥܐ
ܕܐܬܝܪ ❖

Arm հաստատութիւն

*Notes*: The *Edition* notes that ἐξ ὕψους comes from reading ממרום “from the height” instead of מדרום “from the south,” which is at the end of HT 37:17b.

**Job 37 18b**

HT חֲזָקִים כִּרְאִי מוּצָק׃
E ἰσχυραὶ ὡς ὅρασις ἐπιχύσεως.

# α′ ἐνισχύουσαι ὡς ὅρασις συγχύσεως

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 732}$ *cII* 161 555

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ἐνισχύουσαι] ενισχυσαι *C* (= 3005); > *C* (= 257) | ὅρασις] ορασι *C* (= 788-250)

σʹ ἰσχυραὶ ὀφθῆναι ἐπιχύσεσιν

*Wit1:* 252

**Job 37 20b**

HT אִם־אָמַר אִישׁ כִּי יְבֻלָּע׃

LXX ἵνα ἄνθρωπον ἑστηκὼς κατασιωπήσω;

σʹ ἐὰν εἴπῃ· ἀνὴρ καταποθήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–260 732

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 3005)] > rel; Ἄλλος Field

*Var:* ἐάν] ινα *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* reports that 3005 is the first ms to designate an author to this fragment, and it preserves an attribution to Sym (*Nachlese*, 407). In the *Beiträge*, Ziegler argues that the translation technique indicates that Aquila is the author, but the *Nachlese* contradicts the premise that καταποθήσεται derives from καταποντίζω instead of καταπίνω. Aq uses καταποντίζω to translate בלע frequently, but primarily Sym uses καταπίνω to render בלע (*Nachlese*, 407; *Beiträge*, 43; Reider, 130; Busto Saiz, 533).

**Job 37 21b**

HT בָּהִיר הוּא בַּשְּׁחָקִים

E τηλαυγές ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς παλαιώμασιν,

θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI* (= 740 612 559) Sa

*Attr:* θʹ 788 740 612 559] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 21b sub ※ 788 740 612 559

σʹ συννεφήσει τὸν αἰθέρα

*Wit1:* ↓248 252 Syh

*Var:* συννεφήσει] συνεφησει 248 | αἰθέρα] αερα 248

*NonGr*: Syh ܗ. ܢܥܢܢ ܠܐܬܝܪ܀

HT בָּהִיר (הוּא בַּשְּׁחָקִים)
E τηλαυγές (ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς παλαιώμασιν,)

# α′ τηλαυγής

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*–138 260 395 559 680 732

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 788-250) 643 3006

**Job 37 21c**
HT וְרוּחַ עָבְרָה וַתְּטַהֲרֵם׃
LXX ὥσπερ τὸ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ νεφῶν.

# α′ καὶ πνεῦμα παρῆλθεν καὶ ἐκαθάρισεν αὐτάς

*Wit1:* ↓252 Syh

*Var:* ἐκαθάρισεν] -ησεν 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܪܘܚܐ ܥܒܪܬ݂
ܘܕܟܝܬ݂ ܐܢܝ̈ܢ܀

**Job 37 22a**
HT (מִצָּפוֹן) זָהָב יֶאֱתֶה
LXX (ἀπὸ βορρᾶ) νέφη χρυσαυγοῦντα·

# α′ θ′ χρυσίον ἥξει

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–260 732

*Attr:* α′ θ′] > *C* (= 250)

**Job 37 22b**

HT עַל־אֱלוֹהַּ נוֹרָא הוֹד׃
LXX ἐπὶ τούτοις μεγάλη ἡ δόξα καὶ τιμὴ παντοκράτορος.

# σʹ περὶ δὲ θεοῦ φοβερὸς αἶνος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–732] *cII*[–512-513] 555 ↓161ʹ

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 138-255 395 559 612 680 740 161

*Var:* περί] επι *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: Although Sym most frequently translates עַל with ἐπί (Busto Saiz, 195) and *C* (= 788-250) has ἐπί, it is easier to explain ἐπί as deriving either from the LXX or from the Th fragment (see *infra*); therefore, περί is probably the original text.

# θʹ ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ μεγάλη ἡ δόξα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI cII* 555 161

*Attr:* θʹ] σʹ 732; > *C* (= 250)

**Job 37 23a**
HT שַׁדַּי לֹא־מְצָאנֻהוּ שַׂגִּיא־כֹחַ
LXX καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκομεν ἄλλον ὅμοιον τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ·

# σʹ τὸν ἱκανὸν οὐκ ἐξευρίσκομεν

*Wit1:* 248

**Job 37 23b**
HT וּמִשְׁפָּט וְרֹב־צְדָקָה לֹא יְעַנֶּה׃
LXX ὁ τὰ δίκαια κρίνων, οὐκ οἴει ἐπακούειν αὐτόν;

# αʹ καὶ κρίσιν καὶ πλῆθος δικαιοσύνης οὐ κακουχήσει

*Wit1:* 248

## Chapter 38

**Job 38 1**

HT — (וַיַּעַן־יְהוָה אֶת־אִיּוֹב מִנהַסְּעָרָה—
(Q מִן הַסְּעָרָה) וַיֹּאמַר׃)

LXX — Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παύσασθαι Ἐλιοῦν τῆς λέξεως (εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ Ἰὼβ διὰ λαίλαπος καὶ νεφῶν)

# Sub ⟨÷⟩

*Wit1:* 252

*Attr:* οὐ κεῖται παρ' Ἑβραίοις 252

*Var:* ÷] > cod

*Notes*: There is no obelus in the text of 252, but the marginal note combined with the internal evidence indicates that there probably was one present in the original Hexapla. The *Edition* indicates that the note applies to all of verse one, but it should only apply to the first part as indicated by the punctuation of 252.

It is worth noting that Syh$^{txt}$ has κύριος (↘ ܡܪܝܐ ÷) under the obelus, which is an error, since the word is present in HT, but perhaps it may represent an error of the placement of the original obelus at the beginning of v. 1.

**Job 38 2a**

HT — (מִי זֶה) מַחְשִׁיךְ עֵצָה

LXX — (Τίς οὗτος) ὁ κρύπτων με βουλήν,

# σʹ σκοτεινὸς γνώμῃ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 260\ 732}$ *cII* 555 ↓248

*Var:* σκοτεινός] σκοτινος 680; pr ο 248 | γνώμῃ] γνωμην 138-255

**Job 38 2b**

HT — (בְמִלִּין בְּלִי־דָעַת׃)—

LXX — (συνέχων δὲ ῥήματα ἐν καρδίᾳ,) ἐμὲ δὲ οἴεται κρύπτειν;

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* 252 La Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* οὐ κεῖται παρ' Ἑβραίοις 252

*Var:* sub ÷ La Syh

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ÷ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܣܒܪ ܕܡܛܫܐ. ↘
La ÷ *et putat me latere?*

*Notes*: The *Edition* interprets 252 as having all of 2b under the obelus, i.e., not present in the HT, but only the latter part of the verse is absent from the HT.

**Job 38 5b**
HT (אוֹ מִי־נָטָה עָלֶיהָ) קָו׃
LXX (ἢ τίς ὁ ἐπαγαγὼν) σπαρτίον (ἐπ' αὐτῆς;)

# α′ κανόνα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^–137 139 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 ↓161′ ↓252

*Attr:* α′] σ′ 248 252 395; > 260

*Var:* κανόνα] pr τον 260

*Notes*: In 260, the hexaplaric fragments are accidentally included in the catena of Methodius in the following form: μέτρον ἤγουν τὸν κανόνα, τὸ σχοινίον (*Kollationen*, 244; *AGK* 3, 265). Ms 680 preserves the two fragments for verse 5b under an Aq attribution. Given the stemma of the Hagedorns, in which mss 137 139 643 are placed below ms 680, it is probable that the two fragments attributed to Aquila in 680 is the reason for the omission of this fragment in those three mss, since it makes little sense to have two fragments attributed to the same author.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 336-7; *AGK* 3, 264-5; Nic, 541).

# σ′ σχοινίον μέτρου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^–732 *cII* 555 ↓161′ ↓252

*Attr:* σ′] α′ 137 139 248 252 260 395 643 680; > *C* (= 250) 138 260 3006

*Var:* σχοινίον] pr το 260 | μέτρου] αὐτοῦ 252; αὐτῆς 248; > 260

*Notes*: The *Edition* treats the fragments in 248 252 and the catena as separate, but this proposal is probably not correct. Mss 248 and 252 already preserve the wrong attribution to Aq, which is present in many witnesses of the *cI* group, notably 395, which

contains the same confusion as 248 and 252, attributing to Sym the Aq fragment (see *supra*) and to Aq the Sym fragment. In 252, the reading αὐτοῦ seems to be a mistake for μέτρου and in 248 αὐτῆς is from the LXX.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 336-7; *AGK* 3, 264-5; Nic, 541).

**Job 38 6a**

HT (עַל־מָה) אֲדָנֶיהָ (הָטְבָּעוּ)

LXX (ἐπὶ τίνος) οἱ κρίκοι (αὐτῆς πεπήγασιν;)

# α′ θ′ αἱ βάσεις

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*−138 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′ θ′] α′ *C* (= 788); οἱ ἄλλοι *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* βάσεις] βασ[] 161

*Notes*: The *Edition* does not add the evidence of *cII* in this instance. Nic preserves the readings of the Three, but it groups them together without specific attribution. Ms 788 preserves an attribution to Aq, but the double attribution is probably correct.

# σ′ οἱ καταπῆγες

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*−137 139 260 559 643 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′ ↓252

*Attr:* σ′] α′ 248 252; οἱ ἄλλοι *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* καταπῆγες] καταπηγεις 252

**Job 38 7a**

HT (בְּרָן־)יַחַד (כּוֹכְבֵי בֹקֶר)

LXX (ὅτε ἐγενήθησαν)—(ἄστρα,)

# α′ θ′ ἅμα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788 3005) *cI*−137 138 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 Syh

*Wit2:* ἄστρα] pr αμα *lI* La$^{\beta\mu}$ Cass (co 8,9) = M

*Attr:* α′ θ′] α′ *C* (= 788); λ′ 161; οἱ ἄλλοι *cII* 555

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܬ. ܐܒܢܝ̈ܐ܀

*Notes*: This fragment is absent in 250, but 788 preserves it.

The Syh preserves the exact placement of this fragment before ἄστρα, since the index is between the two words ܗܘܘ ܟܘ̈ܟܒܐ, where the word appears in the HT. This fragment is at 38:7b in 255 559 612 680 (*Kollationen*, 245). In 395 the exact reading is ἐκ θ′ α′ υἱοὶ θεοῦ | ἅμα (*Kollationen*, 245). The placement of the two fragments together is the potential cause for the confusion (οἱ ἄλλοι) that obtained in Nic. The *Edition* does not list the evidence of *cII* for this fragment. This fragment and the following one are preserved together at 7a in the *cII* group: ἅμα υἱοὶ θεοῦ.

**Job 38 7b**

HT (וַיָּרִיעוּ כָּל־) בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים׃

LXX (ᾔνεσάν με φωνῇ μεγάλῃ πάντες) ἄγγελοί (μου.)

# α′ σ′ θ′ υἱοὶ θεοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓161 ↓555

*Attr:* α′ σ′ θ′ *C* (= 788-250 3005)] α′ θ′ 255 395 612 680 740; λ′ 161; οἱ ἄλλοι *cII* 555; > *C* (= 257) 559

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* corrects the *Edition* and the *Beiträge* by noting that 250 and 3005 count Sym as an author of this fragment also (*Nachlese*, 407; *Beiträge*, 12). Ms 788 may now be added as support for this attribution.

In 559 this fragment follows the one at 7a without separation (*Kollationen*, 245), which provides more evidence for the conflation of the two fragments that eventually obtained in the Nicetas catena.

**Job 38 8b**

HT בְּגִיחוֹ (מֵרֶחֶם יֵצֵא׃)

LXX ὅτε ἐμαίμασσεν (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτῆς ἐκπορευομένη·)

# α′ ἐν τῷ παλαίειν

*Wit1:* *C*cat (= 249 788-250 3005) *cI*cat–138 732 248 252

*Notes*: This fragment is embedded in the catena of an unattributed author (*AGK* 3, 270; *Kollationen*, 245). Mss 248 and 252 preserve the reading in the margin. The translation of ב + infinitive construct with ἐν τῷ + infinitive accords with the translation technique of Aquila (Hyvärinen, 74-5).

**Job 38 9a**

HT בְּשׂוּמִי עָנָן לְבֻשׁוֹ

LXX ἐθέμην δὲ αὐτῇ νέφος ἀμφίασιν,

# σʹ καὶ ὡς νεφέλην περιείλησα αὐτήν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 ↓161′ ↓252

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ 248 252; > *C* (= 788-250 257)

*Var:* καί—νεφέλην] > 248 252 | καί] > 680 | νεφέλην] νελεφέλην 740; νεφέλη 137 139 260 395 643 680 3006 | περιείλησα] –είλισα 740; –ήλησα 559 3006; –είλησσα 138; περιείλασα 137 | αὐτήν] αὐτῷ *C* (= 3005$^{inc}$) 138 255 559 612; αυτων *C* (= 788*); αυτον 740; αὐτ() 3006; > 248 252

*Notes*: The ending of the last word is not fully certain in 3005 (*Kollationen*, 246). The last letter could have the ligature for the -ην termination or for -ω, but it is too faint to decide. The reading of 788 was originally αὐτῶν, but it was corrected to αὐτήν. Although there is no *waw* in HT, which would correspond to καί, it appears that this may be a revision of δέ, since καί is in all the witnesses except 680.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 338; *AGK* 3, 271; Nic, 543).

**Job 38 9b**

HT וַעֲרָפֶל חֲתֻלָּתוֹ׃

LXX ὁμίχλῃ δὲ αὐτὴν ἐσπαργάνωσα·

# αʹ θʹ καὶ γνόφον πλάνησιν (s πλάνην) αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܬ. ܘܥܪܦܠܐ
ܡܛܥܝܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 70, n. 10).

HT (וַעֲרָפֶל) חֲתֻלָּתוֹ׃

LXX (ὁμίχλῃ δὲ) αὐτὴν ἐσπαργάνωσα·

# σʹ εἴλημα αὐτῷ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܘ. ܚܪ̈ܟܐ ܠܗ ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 70, n. 10).

**Job 38 11b**
HT וּפֹא־יָשִׁית בִּגְאוֹן גַּלֶּיךָ׃
LXX ἀλλ’ ἐν σεαυτῇ συντριβήσεταί σου τὰ κύματα.

# σʹ ἕως ὧδε τετάχθω τὸ ἔπαρμα τῶν κυμάτων σου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 732}$ *cII* 555 ↓161′ ↓Pitra

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 139 643

*Var:* τετάχθω] τεταραχθω 680; τεταραχθη Pitra *post corr* | τὸ ἔπαρμα] τα επαρματα 680 | τῶν κυμάτων] > 248

*Notes*: Pitra and 680 attest wrongly to a form from ταράσσειν "to stir, trouble," since the entire tradition attests to a form from τάσσειν "to order," which Sym uses to translate שׁית (*Beiträge*, 44; Busto Saiz, 590).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* and *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 338; *AGK* 3, 272; Nic, 544).

**Job 38 12a**
HT הֲמִיָּמֶיךָ (צִוִּיתָ בֹּקֶר)
LXX ἦ ἐπὶ σοῦ (συντέταχα φέγγος πρωινόν,)

# γʹ ἢ ἀφ’ ἡμερῶν σου

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* provides this new fragment from ms 257, which was hitherto unnoticed (*Nachlese*, 407; *Kollationen*, 246).

**Job 38 12b**

HT יַדַּעְתָּה שַׁחַר (Q יִדַּעְתָּ הַשַּׁחַר) מְקֹמוֹ׃
LXX ἑωσφόρος δὲ εἶδεν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τάξιν

# α′ θ′ ἐγνώρισας τῷ ὄρθρῳ τόπον αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*[–732] ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′ θ′] α′ *C* (= 788); λ′ *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐγνώρισας] -ρησας 139 | τόπον] ταξιν 395

**Job 38 13a**
HT (לֶאֱחֹז) בְּכַנְפוֹת (הָאָרֶץ)
LXX (ἐπιλαβέσθαι) πτερύγων (γῆς,)

# σ′ ἄκρων

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005)

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: Ms 3005 supports the author attribution in 257 (*Nachlese*, 407). Ms 788 also supports the attribution, adding to the probablility that the text and attribution are part of the oldest Greek catena. Symmachus uses ἄκρων for כַּנְפוֹת in Job 37:3b, where the attribution is well attested in *C* and *cI*.

**Job 38 15a**
HT וְיִמָּנַע (מֵרְשָׁעִים אוֹרָם)
LXX ἀφεῖλας (δὲ ἀπὸ ἀσεβῶν τὸ φῶς,)

# σ′ περιαιρεθήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 3005) ↓*cI*[–559 732]

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 3005) 139 260 643

*Var:* περιαιρεθήσεται] -ερεθήσεται 3006

**Job 38 15b**
HT (וּזְרוֹעַ רָמָה) תִּשָּׁבֵר׃

LXX (βραχίονα δὲ ὑπερηφάνων) συνέτριψας;

# α′ συντρίψεις

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* συντρίψεις] συντριψη 138

*Notes*: In mss 255 680, the following scholion is appended nearby: τὸν ἀδίκως ἐκτεινόμενον. In ms 138, it is completely appended (*Beiträge*, 62; *AGK* 3, 277; *Kollationen*, 247; Klostermann, 73). Klostermann mistook this longer reading for the complete Aq reading, but the oldest Greek catena confirms that originally these readings were separate, one a hexaplaric fragment, the other a scholion.

**Job 38 16a**
HT (הֲבָאתָ) עַד־נִבְכֵי(־יָם)
LXX (ἦλθες δὲ) ἐπὶ πηγὴν (θαλάσσης,)

# α′ ἕως φρουρημάτων

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250) 612 3006

*Var:* φρουρημάτων *C* (= 788-250 3005)] φορου ρηματων 137 138 139 255 260 559 612 643 680 740 3006; ψοφου ρηματων 395

*Notes*: Both *C* mss confirm the conjecture of Field for this fragment (*Nachlese*, 407; F-Auct, 10; *Beiträge*, 44). Ms 788 also confirms the conjecture of Field and the reading of the *Nachlese*.

# σ′ ἕως συνοχῆς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732

*Attr:* σ′] θ′ *C* (= 3005); > *C* (= 250) 138-255

*Notes*: Ms 3005 has an attribution to Th for this fragment (*Nachlese*, 407), but 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym is probably correct. Th uses συνοχή to render קפדה in Ezek 7:25, which may indicate that he would not use the word here for נִבְכֵי.

Sym uses συνοχή for עֹצֶר in Ps 106(107):39 and Prov 30:16 (only Nobil is cited by Field as evidence for each of these).

**Job 38 16b**

HT וּבְחֵקֶר (תְּהוֹם הִתְהַלָּכְתָּ׃)

LXX ἐν (δὲ) ἴχνεσιν (ἀβύσσου περιεπάτησας;)

# σʹ ἐν ἐξιχνιασμῷ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (=257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 257)] αʹ *cI*$^{-395\ 732}$; > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 395

*Var:* ἐν] > *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: To make a decision about the attribution of this fragment is difficult, since the external and internal evidences are divided. The *Nachlese* presents evidence from Judg 5:16 in which Sym uses ἐξιχνιασμός to render חֵקֶר, but there is also evidence of the translation equivalent in Aq at Job 11:7 (*Nachlese*, 407-8; Woods, 219-20). The weight of the earliest Greek catena plus evidence of the translation equivalent in Sym indicates that this fragment should be attributed to him.

**Job 38 17a**

HT (הֲנִגְלוּ לְךָ)—(שַׁעֲרֵי־מָוֶת)

LXX (ἀνοίγονται δέ σοι) φόβῳ (πύλαι θανάτου,)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *cI* (= 559 612) Syh$^{txt}$

*Var:* sub ÷ 559(pr ἀνοίγ.) 612 Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ÷ ܒܕܚܠܬܐ ↘

**Job 38 17b**

HT וְשַׁעֲרֵי (צַלְמָוֶת תִּרְאֶה׃)

LXX πυλωροὶ δὲ (ᾅδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν;)

# αʹ καὶ τὰ νέρτερα

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: There is reason to doubt that this reading comes from Aquila, since he always renders שׁער with πύλη (*Beiträge*, 44); however, the rendering of *waw* with καί is a trait of the translation technique of Aq (Hyvärinen, 52).

HT —(וְשַׁעֲרֵי צַלְמָוֶת תִּרְאֶה׃)
LXX (πυλωροὶ δὲ ᾅδου ἰδόντες σε) ἔπτηξαν;

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *cI* (= 559 612 740)

*Var:* sub ÷ 559(pr πυλωροι) 612 740

**Job 38 18a**
HT הִתְבֹּנַנְתָּ (עַד־רַחֲבֵי־אָרֶץ)
LXX νενουθέτησαι (δὲ τὸ εὖρος τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανόν;)

# α′ κατενόησας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$

*Attr:* α′] [] *C* (= 257)

*Var:* κατενόησας] α̈ κατενόησας 559

*Notes*: The variant in 559 may have arisen because of dittography of the attribution α.

# σ′ ἐνενόησας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* σ′] [] *C* (= 257); 138$^{inc}$; > *cII* 555

# θ′ συνῆκας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732\ 3006}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′$^{mg}$

*Attr:* θ′] α′ 248; σ′ 139; [] *C* (= 257); 138$^{inc}$; > *cII* 161$^{mg}$ 555

*Var:* συνῆκας] μη συνηκας 161′$^{mg}$; συνικας 612

**Job 38 19a**

HT (אֵי־זֶה הַדֶּרֶךְ) יִשְׁכָּן(־אוֹר)

LXX (ποίᾳ δὲ γῇ) αὐλίζεται (τὸ φῶς,)

# α′ θ′ σκηνοῖ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′$^{mg}$

*Attr:* α′ θ′] σ′ *C* (= 788-250); α′ 248; ἄλλοι *cII* 555; [] 257; > 161$^{mg}$

*Var:* σκηνοῖ] σκινοῖ 395

*Notes*: Probably, 788-250 confused the attributions of this fragment and the following one (see *infra*).

# σ′ ἠρεμεῖ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161$^{mg}$

*Attr:* σ′] α′ *C* (= 788-250); ἄλλοι *cII* 555; > 161$^{mg}$ 559

*Var:* ἠρεμεῖ] ἠρεμε⟨ι⟩ 612 740; ηγεμη 260

*Notes*: This fragment follows σκηνοῖ without a division in 559 (*Kollationen*, 249).

**Job 38 20b**

HT (וְכִי־תָבִין) נְתִיבוֹת בֵּיתוֹ׃

LXX (εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐπίστασαι) τρίβους αὐτῶν;

# σ′ ἀτραποὺς οἰκήσεως

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{–137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250)

**Job 38 22b**

HT (וְאֹצְרוֹת) בָּרָד (תִּרְאֶה׃)

LXX (θησαυροὺς δὲ) χαλάζης (ἑόρακας.)

## σ′ κρυστάλλου

*Wit1:* 248

*Notes*: There is no extant evidence to compare the use of this word by Sym.

**Job 38 24a**

HT (אֵי־זֶה הַדֶּרֶךְ יֵחָלֶק) אוֹר

LXX (πόθεν δὲ ἐκπορεύεται) πάχνη

## α′ σ′ θ′ φῶς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 680\ 732}$ ↓248

*Attr:* α′ σ′ θ′ *C* (= 788-250)] α′ θ′ *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-139\ 680\ 732}$; α′ 248

*Notes*: Since φῶς is a common equivalent for אור in the LXX and the Three, 788-250 probably preserves the original attribution to all three revisers. The evidence of 3005 shows that the attribution to Sym dropped first and 248 attests that Th was dropped last.

**Job 38 24b**

HT (יָפֵץ) קָדִים (עֲלֵי־אָרֶץ׃)

LXX (ἢ διασκεδάννυται) νότος (εἰς τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανόν;)

## σ′ ἄνεμος

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

**Job 38 25a**

HT מִי־פִלַּג לַשֶּׁטֶף תְּעָלָה

LXX τίς δὲ ἡτοίμασεν ὑετῷ λάβρῳ ῥύσιν,

## ⟨θ′⟩ τίς διέστειλεν τῷ κατακλυσμῷ ὑδραγωγόν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 260\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* θ′ *conj.*] α′ θ′ rel; οἱ ἄλλοι *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 788-250) 680

*Var:* διέστειλεν 137 139 256 395 643 680] δε εστειλεν *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 256\ 395\ 643\ 680}$ 161; κατεστειλα *cII* 555([]εστειλε)

*Notes*: The catena preserves this fragment under the double attribution of Aq and Th. This attribution is improbable, since the Aq reading is better preserved by 248 (see *infra*). Aq uses the noun διαίρεσις three times to render the noun פְּלַגָּה or פֶּלֶג (*Beiträge*, 44; Reider, 54). Symmachus should not be considered because he renders פִּלַּג with ἀσύμφωνον ποιεῖν in Ps 55(56):10 (*Beiträge*, 44).

HT (מִי־)פִלַּג (לַשֶּׁטֶף תְּעָלָה)
LXX (τίς δὲ) ἡτοίμασεν (ὑετῷ λάβρῳ ῥύσιν,)

# α′ διεῖλεν

*Wit1:* 248

**Job 38 25b**
HT וְדֶרֶךְ לַחֲזִיז קֹלוֹת׃
LXX ὁδὸν δὲ κυδοιμῶν

# α′ καὶ ὁδὸν εἰς κτύπον φωνῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′ 252 Syh

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* καὶ ὁδόν 248 252 Syh] > *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-138\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161 | κτύπον] κτυπων 255 740

*NonGr*: Syh .ܐ. ܘܐܘܪܚܐ ܒܩܘܦܦܠܐ
ܕܩ̈ܠܐ܀

*Notes*: The lemma appears as a revision of the OG in accordance with HT. The initial words appear to have dropped out of the catena tradition.

HT (וְדֶרֶךְ) לַחֲזִיז קֹלוֹת׃
LXX (ὁδὸν δὲ) κυδοιμῶν

# σ′ ψόφου βροντῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓*cII*$^{-512-513}$ ↓555 ↓161′

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ψόφου *C* (= 788-250) 248 255 395 559 612 740] ψοφους *C* (= 3005); ψοφον 138 680 | βροντῶν *C* (= 788-250 3005) 138-255 395 680] βροντῆς 559 612 740 $cII^{-512\text{-}513}$ 555 161ʹ

*Notes*: The variants for this fragment are interesting given the fragment in 28:26b:

σʹ ὄμβρων βροντάς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257) 252 Syh
*Var:* ὄμβρων] pr καὶ ὁδόν *C* (= 257) | ὄμβρων βροντάς] ομβρον φωνων Syh
*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܡܛܪܐ ܕܩ̈ܠܐ ❖

In 38:25b, the best evidence supports the gen. pl. βροντῶν, which agrees with the HT and LXX. Ms 740 has βροντῆς for the Sym fragment and in a scholion, which may account for its inclusion in the Sym fragment, and from 740 the genitive singular may have spread to other witnesses of *cI* (cf. *AGK* 3, 284). The *Beiträge* adds that ψόφος is part of the Sym lexicon on the basis of Job 37:4c (*Beiträge*, 38).

**Job 38 26-27**

HT
לְהַמְטִיר עַל־אֶרֶץ לֹא־אִישׁ
מִדְבָּר לֹא־אָדָם בּוֹ׃
לְהַשְׂבִּיעַ שֹׁאָה וּמְשֹׁאָה
וּלְהַצְמִיחַ מֹצָא דֶשֶׁא׃

E
τοῦ ὑετίσαι ἐπὶ γῆν, οὗ οὐκ ἀνήρ,
ἔρημον, οὗ οὐχ ὑπάρχει ἄνθρωπος ἐν αὐτῇ,
τοῦ χορτάσαι ἄβατον καὶ ἀοίκητον
καὶ τοῦ ἐκβλαστῆσαι ἔξοδον χλόης;

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) $cI^{-137\ 138\ 732}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa $Syh^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̄ 788-250 740(**26b**) 612 395 3006(**26b**) 643 139; ἐκ θεοδοτιωνος οἱ τέσσαρ() 260) $Syh^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 26-27 sub ※ 788 740(non **26a**) 255 612 559(non **26a**) 395 680(non **26a 27**; + **28b**) 3006(non **26a**) 260 643(non **27a**) 139(non **26a 27**) 248 252 Arm(non **26b 27**) La $Syh^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh^txt^ ܬ ※ ܠܡܡܛܪܘ ܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ ܐܝܟܐ
※ ܕܠܝܬ ܓܒܪܐ
※ ܡܕܒܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܒܗ
※ ܠܡܣܒܥܘ ܠܠܐ ܡܬܬܕܝܫܢܘܬܐ
※ ܘܠܠܐ ܡܬܥܡܪܢܘܬܐ
※ ܘܠܡܥܒܕܘ ܡܦܩܢܐ ܕܝܘܪܩܐ. ↘

La *ut* (pr ※ μ) *et pluat super terram ubi non est vir,*
※ *in deserto ubi non est homo,*
*ut* (pr ※ μ) *satiet invium et inhabitabile,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *ut germinet herbae viror?*

Arm ※ Տեղեալ յերկիր ուր ոչ գոյ մարդ

**Job 38 27b**

HT (וּֽלְהַצְמִיחַ) מֹצָא (דֶּשֶׁא׃)
E (καὶ τοῦ ἐκβλαστῆσαι) ἔξοδον (χλόης;)

# σʹ ἀνάφυσιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^−732^

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 3005) 139] > *C* (= 257 788-250) *cI*^−139 732^

*Var:* ἀνάφυσιν] ἀνάφυσις 260

*Notes*: The attribution to Sym is confirmed by 3005 (*Kollationen*, 252). The complete reading of 395 is ἔξοδον· ἀνάφυσιν (*Kollationen*, 252).

**Job 38 28a**

HT הֲיֵשׁ־לַמָּטָר אָב
LXX τίς ἐστιν ὑετοῦ πατήρ;

# αʹ μήτι ἐστὶν τῷ ὑετῷ πατήρ

*Wit1:* lemma] 248 252 Syh | μήτι] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^−139 260 643 732^

*Attr:* αʹ 248 252 Syh] αʹ θʹ rel

*Var:* ἐστίν] ἔνεστιν 248

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܕܠܡܛܪܐ ܐܝܬ

ܐܒܐ ܠܡܛܪܐ܀

*Notes*: Th does not translate הֲ with μήτι in Job (Gentry, 364-5); therefore, the attribution should be restricted to Aq, who uses μήτι for הֲ in numerous places in Job (4:2, 10:3 11:7, 14:14, 15:2, 15:8, 23:6, 26:5, and 40:31).

σʹ ἆρά ἐστιν ὑετῷ πατήρ

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓252 | ἆρα] *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ 252

*Notes*: The author attribution in 252 is a mistake, since the Aq fragment has been determined on internal and external evidence (see *supra*).

**Job 38 28b**

HT (אוֹ מִי־הוֹלִיד) אֶגְלֵי(־טָל׃)

LXX (τίς δέ ἐστιν ὁ τετοκὼς) βώλους (δρόσου;)

αʹ συστάδας

*Wit1:* 252

σʹ συστροφάς

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: Sym probably did not differentiate between אֵגֶל “drop” and עֵגֶל “young bull” (Ps 67(68):31) given that he translates both of these words with συστροφή (*Beiträge*, 44).

**Job 38 29a**

HT (מִבֶּטֶן מִי יָצָא) הַקָּרַח

LXX (ἐκ γαστρὸς δὲ τίνος ἐκπορεύεται ὁ) κρύσταλλος;

αʹ θʹ πάγος

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-260\ 732}$

**Job 38 30b**

HT וּפְנֵי תְהוֹם יִתְלַכָּדוּ׃

LXX πρόσωπον δὲ ἀβύσσου τίς ἔπηξεν;

# ἑβρʹ πρόσωπον δὲ ἀβύσσου πήγνυται

*Wit1:* Nobil (*apud* Field)

**Job 38 31a**

HT הַתְקַשֵּׁר מַעֲדַנּוֹת כִּימָה

LXX συνῆκας δὲ δεσμὸν Πλειάδος

# σʹ ἦ συνάψεις μόρια Πλειάδος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 732}$ 512-513 ↓555 ↓161′ ↓252 Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ 248 252; αʹ σʹ 139; > *C* (= 250) 643 3006

*Var:* ἦ *C* (= 3005) 248 512-513 Syh] ει *C* (= 788-250) *cI*$^{-260\ 732}$ 161 252 555 | συνάψεις] –ψῃς 395 | μόρια] μωρία 559 | Πλειάδος] Πειάδος 3006

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܐܘ ܡܠܘܬ ܐܢܬ
ܡܢ̈ܘܬܗ̇
ܕܟܝܡܐ܀

*Notes*: The decision over ἦ or εἰ is difficult, but perhaps Sym read the initial ה as the interrogative, which he renders with ἦ in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 265).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 342; *AGK* 3, 288; Nic, 551).

**Job 38 32**

HT הֲתֹצִיא מַזָּרוֹת בְּעִתּוֹ
וְעַיִשׁ עַל־בָּנֶיהָ תַנְחֵם׃

E ἦ διανοίξεις Μαζουρὼθ ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ
καὶ Ἕσπερον ἐπὶ κόμης αὐτοῦ ἄξεις αὐτά;

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* 248 252 La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 32 sub ※ 248(**31b-33a**) 252 La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܐܘ ܦܬܚ ܐܢܬ ܠܡܐܙܘܪܘܬܐ
※ ܒܙܒܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ
※ ܘܠܥܡܘܕܐ ܕܪܡܫܐ ܥܠ ܡܘܗܝ ܬܐ
※ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܕܒܪܬܐ ܐܢܬ ܠܗܘܢ. ↘

La ※ *an aperies Mazuroth in tempore suo*
*et Vesperum super aedificationem* (*aedi※ficationem* β) *eius*
*indices?*

*Notes*: In the margin Syh gives the Greek (Μαζορωθ) for ܡܐܙܘܪܘܬܐ. La has used Aq instead of Th in 32b (see *infra*).

**Job 38 32a**

HT הֲתֹצִיא מַזָּרוֹת בְּעִתּוֹ

E ἢ διανοίξεις Μαζουρὼθ ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ

# σʹ ἢ ἀναφύσεις τὰ σκορπισθέντα κατὰ καιρὸν αὐτῶν ἕκαστον

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] 732 ↓248 ↓252 ↓Syh | ἀναφύσεις τὰ σκορπισθέντα] ↓Arm

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ Arm Syh; > *C* (= 250) 559 612

*Var:* ἤ] pr Μαζουρωθ 3005 | ἀναφύσεις τὰ σκορπισθέντα] ἀναφύσει Ἀρκτοῦρος Arm | αὐτῶν *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–255 559] αυτω 559; αυτον 255; αυτου 248 252 Syh | ἕκαστον] ἓν ἕκαστον 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܐܘ ܡ̇ܦܩ ܐܢܬ
ܠܡܠܡ ܕܐܬܒ̇ܕܪܘ
ܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܒܙܒܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ❖

Arm ելանիցէ սայլն

*Notes*: The variant, αὐτοῦ, is probably from the bible text, while the lemma, αὐτῶν, is the reading of the best witnesses.

The Arm variant attempts to convey the reading in Greek which Cox presented in Latin: *exebit Arcturus* (Cox, 343-44). Given the Greek and Syriac traditions of this fragment, the authenticity of this Arm fragment is questionable, but until more is learned about the Armenian tradition, it should remain in the collection of hexaplaric fragments.

**Job 38 32b**

HT וְעַיִשׁ עַל־בָּנֶיהָ תַנְחֵם׃

E καὶ Ἕσπερον ἐπὶ κόμης αὐτοῦ ἄξεις αὐτά;

## α′ καὶ Ἕσπερον ἐπὶ οἰκοδομῆς αὐτοῦ καθοδηγήσεις αὐτούς

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | καθοδηγήσεις] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] 732

*Var:* καθοδηγήσεις] –γησης *C* (= 788-250) 137; οδηγησεις 395

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܠܟܘܟܒܐ ܕܪܡܫܐ
ܥܠ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ
ܬܗܕܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܀

*Notes*: Ziegler notes that Aq renders נחה Hi with καθοδηγεῖν here and in Ps 60(61):3, 77(78):53, 72 as well as Isa 57:18, which are in Reider (Reider, 121). Ziegler also notes the influence of Aq on La (see *supra*; *Beiträge*, 45).

**Job 38 33a**

HT (הֲיָדַעְתָּ) חֻקּוֹת (שָׁמָיִם)

LXX (ἐπίστασαι δὲ) τροπὰς (οὐρανοῦ)

## θ′ συντάγματα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI*–137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

*Var:* συντάγματα] συνταγμα *C* (= 788-250)

## σ′ διατάξεις

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

*Notes*: At 38:32b ἄξεις in 3005 (*Kollationen*, 254).

## α′ ἀκριβείας

*Wit1:* 248

**Job 38 34b**

HT וְשִׁפְעַת־מַיִם (תְּכַסֶּךָּ׃)
LXX καὶ τρόμῳ ὕδατος λάβρῳ (ὑπακούσεταί σου;)

# α′ θ′ καὶ ὁρμὴ ὑδάτων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*−[680] 732

*Notes*: Field attributed the fragment to α′ σ′ θ′, but Ziegler corrected Field on the basis of the *C* mss. Mss 780 and 3005 confirm this correction (*Beiträge*, 45; Field, 71 n 37).

**Job 38 35a**
HT (הַתְשַׁלַּח) בְּרָקִים (וְיֵלֵכוּ)
LXX (ἀποστελεῖς δὲ) κεραυνοὺς (καὶ πορεύσονται;)

# λ′ ἀστραπάς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*−[680] 732 740

*Attr:* λ′] > 138

**Job 38 35b**
HT (וְיֹאמְרוּ לְךָ) הִנֵּנוּ׃
LXX (ἐροῦσιν δέ σοι) Τί ἐστιν;

# α′ ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*−[680] 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓248

*Attr:* α′] > *cII* 555

*Var:* lemma] ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς πάρεσμεν *cII* 555 | ἡμεῖς] εσμεν 248

*Notes*: The *C* group (788-250 257 3005) and the *cI*−[680] 732 group have the correct version of Aq. Ziegler notes that Th may be read in place of Aq in 248, but the *Kollationen* still attributes the fragment to Aq in 248 (*Beiträge*, 45; *Kollationen*, 255). The *cII* group preserves an anonymous amalgam of the readings of Aq and Sym (see *infra*).

# σ′ πάρεσμεν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-[680]\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* σʹ] θʹ *C* (= 257 788-250); > *cII* 555

*Var:* lemma] ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς πάρεσμεν *cII* 555

*Notes*: Despite the strong external evidence for the attribution to Th, the evidence of 3005 and translation technique indicate that the attribution to Sym is correct. Sym uses πάρειμι for הִנְּנִי in I Rgns 3:4, 22:12; II Rgns 1:7 (*Beiträge*, 45). Th uses ἰδού or ἐστίν (Gentry, 365-6).

**Job 38 36b**

HT אוֹ מִי־נָתַן לַשֶּׂכְוִי בִינָה׃

LXX ἢ ποικιλτικὴν ἐπιστήμην;

σʹ ἢ τίς ἔδωκεν μεμωρωμένῳ ἔννοιαν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ἤ] > 161 | ἔδωκεν] εδωκε 137 139 257 260 643 732 3006 | μεμωρωμένῳ] -νον 138; -να 256; -ραμνων 259; -ραμ- 161 512-513 555 687-703

*Notes*: The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 344; *AGK* 3, 292; Nic, 553).

**Job 38 37a**

HT מִי־יְסַפֵּר שְׁחָקִים בְּחָכְמָה

LXX τίς δὲ ὁ ἀριθμῶν νέφη σοφίᾳ,

αʹ τίς ἐξηγήσεται (s διηγήσεται) ῥοπὰς ἐν σοφίᾳ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܡܢܘ ܢܫܬܥܐ
ܬ̈ܩܠܐ ܒܚܟܡܬܐ.

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 71). In Syh there are three distinct versions for 37-38, which have been divided into three sections in the *NonGr* apparatus. The *NonGr* line in the subsequent sections will be a continuation of the fragment which began in 37a and therefore the attribution to the Syriac attribution will not be repeated in the *NonGr* line.

## σʹ τίς ἀριθμήσει τὸν αἰθέρα ἐν σοφίᾳ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܡܢܘ ܢܡܢܐ ܠܐܬܪ ܒܚܟܡܬܐ.

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 71).

## θʹ τίς ἀριθμήσει παλαιώματα ἐν σοφίᾳ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܡܢܘ ܢܡܢܐ ܠܬܩ̈ܘܬܐ ܒܚܟܡܬܐ.

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 71).

**Job 38 37b**

HT וְנִבְלֵי שָׁמַיִם מִי יַשְׁכִּיב׃

LXX οὐρανὸν δὲ εἰς γῆν ἔκλινεν;

## αʹ καὶ ἀπορρέοντα οὐρανοῦ τίς κοιμήσει

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܘܢ̈ܦܠܐ ܕܫܡܝܐ ܡܢܘ ܢܕܡܟ.

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 71). According to Ziegler, Aq uses ἀπορρεῖν to translate I נבל in Isa 1:30, even though the source (Eus) attributes the fragment to Sym not Aq (cf. Ziegler's *Isaias Edition*). Aq also uses the noun ἀπόρρευσις to render נְבָלָה in Deut 22:21, where the critical text reads αʹ ἀπό<ρ>ρευσιν (cf. LSJ ἀπόρρευσις "flowing from"). Although HT means "to whither, decay" "folly," in these references, one may presuppose that Aq had I נֵבֶל "jar for

liquid” in mind, which is the meaning in Job 38:37. Aq must be employing etymological translation technique or stereotyping in these instances. Aq translates שׁכב Hi with κοιμάω in Hos 2:18.

# σ′ ἢ ὄργανα οὐρανοῦ τίς συνθήσει

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] Syh ↓Pitra

*Attr:* σ′ *C* (= 3005) Syh] σ′ θ′ 137 139 260 559 612 643 732 740 3006; α′ θ′ 395; θ′ 138-255 Pitra; > *C* (= 788-250)

*NonGr*: Syh ܐܘ ܠܐܘܪ̈ܓܢܐ
ܕܫܡܝܐ ܡܢܘ ܢܪܟܒ.

*Notes*: Ms 3005 joins Syh as testimony for the attribution to Sym.

# θ′ καὶ ὄργανα οὐρανοῦ τίς κοιμήσει

*Wit1:* ↓161′ ↓Syh

*Wit2:* οὐρανὸν δὲ] οργανα δε ουρανου *lI*; οργανα ουρανου δε *lIII*; pr οργανα V; ※ *et organa caeli* La[βμ] = M

*Attr:* θ′ Syh] σ′ 161′

*Var:* καί] ἤ (= ܘܠܐ) Syh | κοιμήσει] κοσμησει 161′

*NonGr*: Syh ܘܠܐܘܪ̈ܓܢܐ
ܕܫܡܝܐ ܡܢܘ ܢܫܟܢ.

*Notes*: The attribution to Sym in 161′ is an error for Th, and the verb κοσμησει is probably an error for κοιμησει, which is part of the corpus of Th (cf. Woods, 225; the fragment in 11:18ab belongs to Th not Aq *pace Edition*).

**Job 38 38**

HT בְּצֶקֶת עָפָר לַמּוּצָק
וּרְגָבִים יְדֻבָּקוּ׃

LXX κέχυται δὲ ὥσπερ γῆ κονία,
κεκόλληκα δὲ αὐτὸν ὥσπερ λίθῳ κύβον.

## α′ ἐν τῷ ἐκχεῖσθαι γῆν εἰς καταχύσιν καὶ χερμάδες (s χερμάδια) κολληθήσονται

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh

ܟܕ ܕܡܬܐܫܕ
ܥܦܪܐ ܒܡܐܫܘܕܘܬܐ.
ܘܒ̈ܢܬ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܡܬܕܒ̈ܩܢ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion here departs from Field and the *Edition* with respect to the ܒ of Syh. Ziegler retroverted it with ἐν and Field used the simple dative (Field, 72). Aq is rendering ל, which he renders usually with εἰς + accusative (Hyvärinen, 47) and, therefore, the retroversion reflects this tendency. Syh did use ܒ to translate εἰς (cf. *Notes* at Job 37:1a and 37:13).

## σ′ ὅταν κέχυται εἰς κόνιν γῆς ἐπίχυσις, ἵνα βῶλοι γένωνται συγκολληθεῖσαι

*Wit1:* lemma] Syh | γῆς—συγκ.] ↓252

*Attr:* σ′] α′ 252

*NonGr*: Syh

ܐܡܬܝ ܕܐܫܝܕܐ ܒܚܠܐ
ܕܥܦܪܐ ܐܫܘܕܘܬܐ.
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܦ̈ܘܠܟܐ
ܢܗܘܘܢ ܒܕܒܘܩܝܐ
ܕܐܚܝܕܐ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 72).

## θ′ ἐν τῷ ἐκχεῖσθαι γῆν καταχύσει καὶ βῶλοι συγκολληθήσονται

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh

ܟܕ ܕܡܬܐܫܕ
ܥܦܪܐ ܒܡܐܫܘܕܘܬܐ.

ܘܩ̈ܠܒܐ ܐܒܚܕܐ
ܢܬܕܟܘܢ

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 72).

**Job 38 39a**

HT (הֲתָצוּד לְלָבִיא) טָרֶף

LXX (θηρεύσεις δὲ λέουσιν) βοράν,

# α′ σ′ θήραν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 260 395 643 [680] 732 3006

*Attr:* α′ σ′] θ′ σ′ 559 612 740; > 255

*Notes*: 3005 is the first *C* ms to attest this fragment and attribution, and since Aq uses θήρα to render טָרֶף, it is plausible that 3005 has preserved the correct attribution (*Nachlese*, 408; see Job 4:11 in Woods).

**Job 38 40a**

HT כִּי־יָשֹׁחוּ (בַמְּעוֹנוֹת)

LXX δεδοίκασιν γὰρ (ἐν κοίταις αὐτῶν,)

# σ′ ὅτι φωλεύσουσιν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [680] 732

*Attr:* σ′ *C* (= 788 3005)] > rel; Ἄλλος Field

*Var:* φωλεύσουσιν *C* (= 788-250 3005) 395 612 740] -ευσουσι 559; -ευουσι 137 138-255 3006; φολευουσι 139; φολευουσιν 643

*Notes*: Ms 3005 is the first witness to name an author for this fragment (*Nachlese*, 408). Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym is part of the oldest Greek catena. The verb φωλεύω is otherwise unattested in the LXX and the Three, and the use of causal ὅτι for כִּי is a regular pattern for the LXX and the Three (Salvesen, 223ff); therefore, translation technique cannot determine the attribution. The external evidence is probably genuine.

## Chapter 39

**Job 39 1a**

HT הֲיָדַעְתָּ עֵת לֶדֶת יַעֲלֵי־סָלַע

E εἰ ἔγνως καιρὸν τοκετοῦ τραγελάφων πέτρας,

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *cI*–138 260 395 559 [680] 732 3006 248 La Sa Syh^txt

*Attr:* θʹ 740 255 Syh^txt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 1a sub ※ 740 255 612 137 643 139(*super* τραγ.) 248 La Syh^txt

*NonGr:* Syh^txt ܬ ※ ܐܢ ܐܝܕܥܬ ܥܕܢܐ ܕܡܘܠܕܐ ܕܝܥܠ
※ ܐܝ̈ܠܐ ܕܫܘܥܐ ↘

La *si* (pr ※ β) *cognovisti tempus pariendi tragelaforum petras* (*in petris* μ)

*Notes*: The asterisk and the attribution are well attested for this reading. The evidence of Syh 255 740 is sufficient to establish the attribution, since 740 and 255 are at the top of the stemma and are the best representatives of the *Vorlage* of *cI*; thus, a very important part of the catena tradition preserves the attribution to Th. The additional evidence of the attribution to Sym in 3005 for the following fragment also aids in determining that Th is the correct author.

HT (הֲיָדַעְתָּ עֵת לֶדֶת) יַעֲלֵי־סָלַע

E (εἰ ἔγνως καιρὸν τοκετοῦ) τραγελάφων πέτρας,

# σʹ νεβρῶν ἐν πέτρᾳ

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 | νεβρῶν] ↓Arm

*Wit2:* πέτρας] εν πετρα Iul; *in petris* La^μ = Vulg

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 788 3005)] θʹ 255 559 612 740; αʹ Arm; > *C* (= 250) 395

*NonGr:* Arm յայծքաղաց

*Notes*: In the *Edition*, II App presents this fragment as follows: θʹ (leg σʹ) νεβρῶν ἐν πέτρᾳ *C* on the basis of the external evidence available but, since the whole line is under the asterisk and attributed to Th, Ziegler rightly attributed this fragment to a different author, Sym. Now, the *Nachlese* reports that 3005 preserves the attribution to Sym (*Nachlese*, 408). In addition, 788 preserves the original attribution to Sym, and confirms that it was part of the oldest Greek catena. Internal evidence does show that Sym uses νεβρός in 1 Rgns 10:3 (Field 1, 502), and there is no evidence that Aq or Th uses this word.

**Job 39 2a**

HT תִּסְפֹּר יְרָחִים תְּמַלֶּאנָה

LXX ἠρίθμησας δὲ μῆνας αὐτῶν πλήρεις τοκετοῦ,

# σʹ ἠρίθμησας δὲ σελήνας πληρῶσαι αὐτάς

*Wit1:* 161ʹ

*Notes*: Ms 161ʹ preserves this fragment and the attribution. The first two words may be from the LXX, but the rest of the fragment is from Sym.

HT (תִּסְפֹּר) יְרָחִים (תְּמַלֶּאנָה)

LXX (ἠρίθμησας δὲ) μῆνας (αὐτῶν πλήρεις τοκετοῦ,)

# αʹ θʹ σελήνας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*$^{–137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ [680]\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* αʹ θʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* σελήνας *C* (= 788-250)] σεληνης 138-255 395 559 612 740

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first witness from the *C* group to attest the attribution and it also preserves the original text of the fragment. Ms 395 preserves the attribution in reverse order θʹ αʹ (*Kollationen*, 257). The *Edition* does not list the variant, which is preserved in the majority of the witnesses from the *cI* group (*Kollationen*, 257).

**Job 39 3a**

HT תִּכְרַעְנָה יַלְדֵיהֶן תְּפַלַּחְנָה

LXX ἐξέθρεψας δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ παιδία ἔξω φόβου;

# θʹ ἐνδώσουσι τὰ παιδία αὐτῶν διασώσεις αὐτά

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] 732 ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* θʹ *C* (= 788) *cI*–138 139 [680] 732 *cII* 555] σʹ *C* (= 3005) 138 139; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐνδώσουσι] εαν δωσουσι *cII* 555 | αὐτῶν] > 555 | διασώσεις] διαδωσεις 138 | αὐτά] αυτων 260

*Notes*: The fragment is divided into two parts in 139 as follows: σʹ ἐνδώσουσι τὰ παιδία αὐτῶν αʹ διασώσεις αὐτά (*Kollationen*, 257).

Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Th in the majority of the *cI* group is correct. Ms 3005 preserves an attribution to Sym, which is possibly correct according to internal evidence. Given that מלט or פלט is an error for פלח in this instance, both Th and Sym use διασώζω for מלט (cf. Dan 11:41 for Th; Job 20:20 for Sym, see also Busto Saiz, 708). Job 20:20 contains an instance in which Sym used διασώζω for מלט, while Th used σώζω (Woods, 369), but this instance cannot be considered conclusive. Given the state of the external evidence (the division of the *C* mss), it is possible, though not probable, that both attributions are genuine.

The patristic attribution to Chr in the *Edition* is not supported by the Chr-*Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 192; *AGK* 3, 298-9; Nic, 556).

**Job 39 3b-4**

HT חֶבְלֵיהֶם תְּשַׁלַּחְנָה׃
יַחְלְמוּ בְנֵיהֶם
יִרְבּוּ בַבָּר
יָצְאוּ וְלֹא־שָׁבוּ לָמוֹ׃

E ὠδῖνας αὐτῶν ἐξαποστελεῖς;
ἀπορρήξουσιν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν,
πληθυνθήσονται ἐν γενήματι,
ἐξελεύσονται καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀνακάμψουσιν αὐτοῖς.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI*–138 260 [680] 732 252 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ δ̄ 788-250 740 255 612 559 395(**4a**) 3006(**4b**) 643(**4a**) 139(**4b**); ἐκ θʹ Δ̄ 137(**4a**)) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 3b-4 sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 395(non **3b 4c**) 137(non **4bc**) 643(non **4bc**) 139(non **3b 4ac**) 252 Arm La Syh^txt^

*NonGr*: Syh^txt^ ܬܐ ※ ܚܒܠܐ ܕܝܠܕܗܘܢ ܡܫܕܪ ܐܢܬ.
※ ܢܫܪܘܢ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܝܠܕܗܘܢ.
※ ܢܣܓܘܢ ܒܥܒܘܪܐ.
※ ܢܦܩܘܢ. ܘܠܐ ܢܗܦܟܘܢ ܠܘܬܗܘܢ. ↙

La ※ *partus earum emittes*
*abrumpent filii* (pr ※ β) *earum*
*multiplicabuntur* (pr ※ μ) *in tritico*
*exibunt* (※ *et ibunt* μ; *et※ibunt* β)*, et non revertentur ad eas.*

Arm ※ մերժիցես ի նոցանէ զերկունս
※ Փրծանիցին որդիք նոցա
※ բազմանայցեն ի ծննդեան իւրեանց
※ ելանիցեն և անդրէն ոչ կրկնիցին↙

*Notes*: The asterisk and the attribution to Th are established sufficiently by the external evidence.

**Job 39 3b**

HT חֶבְלֵיהֶם תְּשַׁלַּחְנָה׃

E ὠδῖνας αὐτῶν ἐξαποστελεῖς;

## σ′ ἃ ὠδίνησαν ἀπολείπουσιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-559\ [680]\ 732}$ *cII* 555

*Attr:* σ′] σ′ α′ 395; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἃ] > 395 | ὠδίνησαν] ωδηνησαν 612 | ἀπολείπουσιν] καταλειπουσιν 137 139 260 643 3006

*Notes*: The attribution in 395 arose due to confusion between the relative pronoun ἃ and the attribution to Aq (*Kollationen*, 257). This fragment is followed by the Sym fragment in 4a, but since there is a divider between them, the fragments were viewed as two parts (*Kollationen*, 257; cf. Ms 250, 72v; cp. Ms 3005, 169v-170r where the two fragments are on two separate leafs with two distinct attributions to Sym).

The patristic attribution to Chr in the *Edition* is not supported by the Chr-*Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 192; *AGK* 3, 298-9; Nic, 556).

**Job 39 4a**

HT יַחְלְמוּ בְנֵיהֶם

E ἀπορρήξουσιν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν,

## σʹ ἀποβάλλονται τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]\ 732}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ἀποβάλλονται] αποβαλονται 137 | τά—αὐτῶν] > 138-255

**Job 39 4b**
HT יִרְבּוּ בַבָּר
E πληθυνθήσονται ἐν γενήματι,

## σʹ πληθύνειν ἐν ἀγριότητι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]\ 732}$

*Var:* ἐν] > 260 | ἀγριότητι *C* (= 3005)] αγροτητι 137 138 139 255 260 395 612 740 643 3006; αγρωτητι 559

*Notes*: Field and the *Edition* rightly conjectured ἀγρ<ι>ότητι (Field, 73; *Edition*, 391), but now 3005, the only witness for the *C* group, attests the correct text (*Nachlese*, 408).

**Job 39 4c**
HT יָצְאוּ וְלֹא־שָׁבוּ לָמוֹ׃
E ἐξελεύσονται καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀνακάμψουσιν αὐτοῖς.

## σʹ ἐξελθόντα οὐχ ὑποστρέψει πρὸς αὐτάς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]\ 732}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 137

*Var:* ἐξελθόντα] + και 139-256 | ὑποστρέψει] υποστρεψουσι 139; υποστρεψωσιν 256; υποστρεψ<ει> 260$^{inc}$ | αὐτάς] αυτους 137 139-256 260 643 3006

*Notes*: The reading in 260 arose from the layout of the manuscript, which contains very narrow columns that caused the scribe to use an abbreviated style periodically. Unfortunately, one cannot be certain whether the scribe is abbreviating -ει or -ουσι, but the importance of the stemma shifts the probability to the former termination, since 260 is below 3006 on the stemma.

**Job 39 6a**

HT (אֲשֶׁר־שַׂמְתִּי עֲרָבָה) בֵּיתוֹ

LXX (ἐθέμην δὲ τὴν) δίαιταν (αὐτοῦ ἔρημον)

# α′ θ′ οἶκον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

*Notes*: The fragments in 559 are composite presented as α′ θ′ σ′ οἶκον ἀοίκητον (*Kollationen*, 258).

HT (אֲשֶׁר־שַׂמְתִּי) עֲרָבָה (בֵּיתוֹ)

E (ἐθέμην δὲ τὴν δίαιταν αὐτοῦ) ἔρημον

# α′ ὁμαλήν

*Wit1:* 248 252

# σ′ ἀοίκητον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 [680] 732 3006 248 ↓252

*Attr:* σ′] [] 252; > 643

*Notes*: For the lemma and attribution of 559 see 6a *supra*.

# θ′ ἀραβά

*Wit1:* 248 ↓252

*Attr:* θ′] [] 252

*Notes*: The lemma and the attribution stand, even though Gentry questions whether this transliteration was produced by Th (Gentry, 312-3). Probably, it did not originate from Th since it is common in the LXX (e.g. Deut 1:7, 2:8, 3:17), but he

employs the transliteration here as he does elsewhere (cf. Isa 41:19, 51:3; Am 6:14; Jer 39(46):4 Syh).

**Job 39 6b**

HT וּמִשְׁכְּנוֹתָיו מְלֵחָה׃

E καὶ τὰ σκηνώματα αὐτοῦ ἁλμυρίδα·

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*$^{–138\ 260\ [680]\ 732\ 3006}$ 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θʹ 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 139(**6a**) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 6b sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 139(**6a**) 248 252 Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬܐ ※ ܘܡܫ̈ܟܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܠܚܬܐ. ↘
La ※ *et tabernacula eius salsuginem*
Arm ※ և բնակութիւն նմա զաղտաղտուկս

HT —(וּמִשְׁכְּנוֹתָיו מְלֵחָה׃)

E (καὶ τὰ σκηνώματα αὐτοῦ ἁλμυρίδα·)—

# σʹ ※ γῆν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) ↓*cI*$^{–[260\ 680]\ 732}$

*Var:* ※] > 138 559 3006

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first witness from the *C* group to preserve this fragment and it has two asterisks preceding it. Most of the *cI* group contains this fragment in the margin under an asterisk after ἁλμυρίδα. It is perhaps recorded in this way in the mss in order to indicate that this fragment is not a different version for מְלֵחָה, but rather this fragment is a complement to ἁλμυρίδα in the version of Sym. Although Ziegler does not list the asterisk, he comments that Field incorrectly understood the fragment to be for σκηνώματα αὐτοῦ, and he suggests that Sym had γῆν ⟨ἁλμυρίδος⟩ (*Beiträge*, 46).

**Job 39 7b**

HT (תְּשֻׁאוֹת) נוֹגֵשׂ (לֹא יִשְׁמָע׃)

LXX (μέμψιν δὲ) φορολόγου (οὐκ ἀκούων)

# α′ εἰσπράκτου

*Wit1:* ↓248 252

*Var:* εἰσπράκτου] εκπρακτου 248

*Notes*: The lemma and the attribution are secure based on external and internal grounds (*Beiträge*, 14). Probably the variant in 248 was caused by a lunar *sigma* next to an *iota* (ιϲ) without proper spacing (cp. Ms 252, 128r, which has the proper spacing between lunar *sigma* and *iota*), which then may have appeared as a *kappa* to the copyist.

**Job 39 8ab**

HT יְת֣וּר הָרִ֣ים מִרְעֵ֑הוּ
וְאַחַ֖ר כָּל־יָר֣וֹק יִדְרֽוֹשׁ׃

E κατασκέψεται ὄρη νομὴν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ὀπίσω παντὸς χλωροῦ ζητεῖ.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) 248 252 La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ β̅ 788) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 8 sub ※ 788 248 252 La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬܐ ※ ܢܣܟܘܪ ܠܛܘܪ̈ܐ ܕܪܥܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܒܬܪ ܟܠ ܝܘܪܩܐ ܒܥܐ. ↘

La ※ *consideravit montes pascuae suae,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *post omne viride quaerit.*

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first catena witness to attest the attribution and asterisked lines.

**Job 39 9a**

HT (הֲיֹ֥אבֶה) רֵּ֥ים (עָבְדֶ֑ךָ)

LXX (βουλήσεται δέ σοι) μονόκερως (δουλεῦσαι)

# α′ ῥινόκερως

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–559\ [612]\ [680]\ 732}$ ↓161$^{mg}$ 248 252 | ῥινοκέρωτα] ↓*C*$^{cat}$ (249 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{cat–[612]\ [680]}$ 351$^{cat}$ 754$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 258$^{cat}$ 560$^{cat}$ 765$^{cat}$ 3007$^{cat}$ 3008$^{cat}$ *cII* 161 555 ↓Ol$^{Y}$

*Attr:* α′] σ′ *C* (= 3005); ἕτερος τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν Ol$^{Y}$; [] 161$^{mg}$

*Var:* ῥινόκερως] ρινοκερος 139 395 643 3006; ρινοκερατον Ol$^{Y}$; ρινοκερατα *C*$^{cat}$ (= 249) *cI*$^{cat}$ (= 559)

*Notes*: The lemma is the fragment found in the margin of many mss, and in context it would be the proper grammatical form of Aq. The second fragment preserves the lexeme, but in the context of the catena the accusative singular was required in place of the nominative.

The new evidence of 788 attributes the fragment to Aq and thereby establishes Aq as the author, but the Sym attribution in 3005 could indicate that this version belongs to more revisers than Aq. Although Jerome rendered his hexaplaric source correctly with *monoceros* (La$^{μβ}$), *rinoceros* from the Hexapla appears in the Vulg.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is supported by *Kommentar*, *AGK* and Nic (*Kommentar*, 347-8; *AGK* 3, 302; Nic, 559).

**Job 39 10b**

HT אִם־יְשַׂדֵּד עֲמָקִים אַחֲרֶיךָ׃

LXX ἢ ἑλκύσει σου αὔλακας ἐν πεδίῳ;

σ′ ἢ ὁμαλίσει κοιλάδας ἀκολουθῶν σοι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–[612]\ [680]}$

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἤ] > *C* (= 257) | ὁμαλίσει] + σοι 137 260 395 643 732 3006 | κοιλάδας] κοιλαδα *C* (= 3005); κυλαδας 255 395 559 | ἀκολουθῶν σοι] > *C* (= 257)

**Job 39 11b**

HT וְתַעֲזֹב (אֵלָיו יְגִיעֶךָ׃)

LXX ἐπαφήσεις δὲ (αὐτῷ τὰ ἔργα σου;)

θ′ μὴ ἐγκαταλείψῃς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–139\ 395\ [612]\ [680]\ 732}$

*Attr:* θ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐγκαταλείψῃς] -ληψης 559; -λειψεις *C* (= 788-250); -ψης *super* -ψεις 137; -ληψις 3006

*Notes*: This occurrence is the only one in Gentry's study where Th renders *waw* with μή (Gentry, 368). Even though this instance goes against the normal technique of Th, sound external evidence attributes this fragment to him, and it should be considered authentic.

**Job 39 12a**

HT (הֲתַאֲמִין) בוֹ (כִּי־יָשׁוּב (Q יָשִׁיב))
E (πιστεύσεις δὲ)—(ὅτι ἀποδώσει σοι τὸν σπόρον,)

## π′ + ※ αὐτῷ

*Wit1:* La Syh

*Wit2:* πιστ. δέ] + αυτω S* La (※ *ei*) *L* = M

*Attr:* π′] > La

*NonGr*: Syh ❖ ܟܠܗܘܢ. ※ ܠܗ ❖
La *aut credes ei ※ quia reddet tibi sementem*

*Notes*: The asterisk may be misplaced in the mss of La, but the word is clearly in the La tradition.

HT (הֲתַאֲמִין בוֹ כִּי־) יָשׁוּב (Q יָשִׁיב)
LXX (πιστεύσεις δὲ ὅτι) ἀποδώσει (σοι τὸν σπόρον,)

## σ′ ἀποκαταστήσει

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [612] [680] 732

*Attr:* σ′] > 395

*Notes*: Sym translates the Qere, the Hi imperfect, since the context requires a transitive verb. Sym uses ἀποκαθιστάναι to render שׁוב Hi in Ps 34:17 (Busto Saiz, 472).

**Job 39 12b**

HT (זַרְעֶךָ וְגָרְנְךָ) יֶאֱסֹף׃

LXX εἰσοίσει (δέ σου τὸν ἅλωνα;)

# θ′ συνάξει

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$I^{-137\ 139\ 260\ [612]\ 643\ [680]\ 732\ 740\ 3006}$

*Var:* συνάξει] συναξαι 138-255 395 559

*Notes*: The variant is not mentioned in the Edition, but the *C* (= 788-250 3005) group preserves the original text, while *cI* (= 138 255 395 559) preserves the variant.

# α′ συλλέξει

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-137\ 139\ 260\ [612]\ 643\ [680]\ 732\ 740\ 3006}$

*Attr:* α′ *C* (= 788-250)] σ′ rel

*Var:* συλλέξει] συλλεξαι 395

*Notes*: Although the majority of the manuscript tradition favors the attribution to Sym, *C* (= 788-250) combined with the internal evidence indicates that the attribution to Aq is correct (Reider, 225-6; συλλέγειν as an equivalent for אסף is established for Aq). According to the evidence currently available, Sym does not use συλλέγειν to render אסף.

**Job 39 13-18**

HT

כְּנַף־רְנָנִים נֶעֱלָסָה
אִם־אֶבְרָה חֲסִידָה וְנֹצָה׃
כִּי־תַעֲזֹב לָאָרֶץ בֵּצֶיהָ
וְעַל־עָפָר תְּחַמֵּם׃
וַתִּשְׁכַּח כִּי־רֶגֶל תְּזוּרֶהָ
וְחַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה תְּדוּשֶׁהָ׃
הִקְשִׁיחַ בָּנֶיהָ לְּלֹא־לָהּ
לְרִיק יְגִיעָהּ בְּלִי־פָחַד׃
כִּי־הִשָּׁהּ אֱלוֹהַּ חָכְמָה
וְלֹא־חָלַק לָהּ בַּבִּינָה׃
כָּעֵת בַּמָּרוֹם תַּמְרִיא
תִּשְׂחַק לַסּוּס וּלְרֹכְבוֹ׃

E

πτέρυξ τερπομένων νεέλασα,
ἐὰν συλλάβῃ ἀσιδὰ καὶ νεσσά·

ὅτι ἀφήσει εἰς γῆν τὰ ᾠὰ αὐτῆς
καὶ ἐπὶ χοῦν θάλψει
καὶ ἐπελάθετο ὅτι ποὺς σκορπιεῖ
καὶ θηρία ἀγροῦ καταπατήσει·
ἀπεσκλήρυνεν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς ὥστε μὴ ἑαυτῇ,
εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασεν ἄνευ φόβου·
ὅτι κατεσιώπησεν αὐτῇ ὁ θεὸς σοφίαν
καὶ οὐκ ἐμέρισεν αὐτῇ ἐν τῇ συνέσει.
κατὰ καιρὸν ἐν ὕψει ὑψώσει,
καταγελάσεται ἵππου καὶ τοῦ ἐπιβάτου αὐτοῦ.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI*–137 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 248 252 Arm La Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ ιβ̄ 788-250 740 255(**13b**) 395; ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̄ 559) Syh[txt](**13b**)] > rel

*Var:* 13-18 sub ※ 788 740(non **14a**) 255(non **13a**) 612(non [**13-15]**) 559 395(non **17b 18b**) 248 252 Arm(non **15a**) La(non **15a**) Syh[txt](non **13a**)

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]

ܓܦܐ ܕܡܬܦܨ̈ܚ ܓܢܚܐ ܢܥܡܝܬܐ.
ܬ ※ ܐܝ ܠܓܠ ܐܣܝܕܐ ܐܘ ܢܨܐ.
※ ܡܛܠ ܕܫܒܩܬ ܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ ܒ̈ܥܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇.
※ ܘܥܠ ܥܦܪܐ ܬܫܚܢ.
※ ܘܛܥܬ ܕܪ ܪܓܠܐ ܡܒܕܪܐ ܠܗܝܢ.
※ ܘܚܝ̈ܘܬ ܚܩܠܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܬ̈ܕܝܫ.
※ ܩܫܝܬ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܗܘ̇ ܠܗ̇.
※ ܒܣܪܝܩܘܬܐ ܠܥܡܠܬ ܕܠܐ ܕܚܠܬܐ.
※ ܡܛܠ ܕܫܬܩ ܠܗ̇ ܐܠܗܐ ܚܟܡܬܐ.
※ ܘܠܐ ܦܠܓ ܠܗ̇ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܣܘܟܠܐ.
※ ܒܙܒܢܐ ܒܪܘܡܐ ܡܬܬܪܝܡܐ.
※ ܬܓܚܘܟ ܒܣܘܣܝܐ ܘܒܪ̈ܟܒܐ ܕܝܠܗ. ↘

La *penna* (pr ※ μ) *struthionum mixta* (*mix※ta* β) *est*
*alis herodionis et accipitris,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *relinquit* (*re※linquit* β) *in terra ova sua,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *in pulvere calefiunt* (*ca※lefiunt* β).
*et oblita est, quia pes dispergit ea,*
*et* (pr ※ β) *bestiae conculcabunt ea.*
*obduruit* (pr ※ μ; *Obduru※it* β) *contra filios suos, ne sint eius.*
*frustra* (pr ※ μ) *laboravit* (*labo※rauit* β; *laboravit* ※ μ)

*absque ullo timore,*
*quia* (pr ※ μ) *despexit eam* (pr ※ β) *dominus in sapientia,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *non distribuit ei intellectum* (*in※tellectum* β).
*cum* (pr ※ μ) *tempus fuerit, in altum se levabit,*
*et* (pr ※ μ) *deridebit equitem et ascensorem.* ↙

Arm ※ թեւք թռուցելոց նեեղաասաց
※ եթե յղաացի աահղն և նեեսայն
※ Զի արկցէ յերկիր զձուս իւր
※ և ջեռուսցէ ընդ հողով
Եւ մոռացաւ թե ուր ցրուիցէ
※ և գազանք անապատի կոխեսցեն
※ Ուծացաւ յորդւոց իւրոց իբրեւ ոչ յիւրմէ
※ ի զուր վաստակեցաւ առանց երկիւղի
※ Զի լռեցոյց ի նմանէ Աստուած զիմաստութիւն
※ և ոչ ետ նմա բաժին ի հանճարոյ
※ Ի ժամանակի բարձրասցի ի բարձունս
※ ծաղր արասցէ զերիվարաւ և զհեծելով նորա

*Notes*: There is a lacuna in 612, which contains verses 13-15, but 16-18 is under the asterisk. The attribution in 559 resulted from haplography of the iota.

**Job 39 13a**
HT כְּנַף־רְנָנִים נֶעֱלָסָה
E πτέρυξ τερπομένων νεέλασα,

# α′ πτερύγιον αἰνούντων συναναπλέκεται

*Wit1:* ↓161′ 252 Syh

*Var:* συναναπλέκεται] –πλεκει 161′

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܟܢܦܐ ܕܡܫ̈ܒܚܢܐ
ܐܚܝܕܐ ܡܬܓܕܠ ܀

# σ′ πτερὸν ἀγλαϊσμοῦ περιφύεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[612] [680] 732 *cII* 555 ↓161′ ↓252

*Attr:* σ′] α′ σ′ *C* (= 3005); > *C* (= 788-250) 139 643; [] 257

*Var:* πτερόν] πτερυγιον 252; πτερων 3006; περον 138; pr νεελασσα 248 | ἀγλαϊσμοῦ] ωραισμου 252; αγλαισμα 139 260 643 3006; αγλαισμενον 395 | περιφύεται] φυεται 395; + νεελασσα 161

*Notes*: The *Kollationen* is the first to list 248 as evidence for this fragment (*Kollationen*, 261). Ms 252 poses two significant variants: (1) πτερυγιον and (2) ὡραϊσμοῦ. The first is the lemma of Aq (see *supra*) and also a common translation of כָּנָף in the LXX (11x according to *Beiträge*, 46). Πτερόν is used infrequently in the LXX (4x; *Beiträge*, 46), but Sym does use this word to render "birds" as in Job 5:7 (עוף = πτερόν; Woods, 128) and to render "wings" as in Ezek 12:14. In that text, אגף in Heb means "troop," but in Aramaic the word means "wing" (Sokoloff, *Palestinian Aramaic*, 34). Sym, therefore, probably used πτερόν to render כנף.

The word ὡραϊσμός is used only two times, once in the LXX and once in Th. In contrast, Sym uses ἀγλάϊσμα (Ps 47:3, 88:18; Prov 19:11) and ἀγλαϊσμός (Ps 44:8). This internal evidence combined with the external evidence of *C* and *cI* make the lemma likely to be authentic.

**Job 39 13b**

HT אִם־אֶבְרָה חֲסִידָה וְנֹצָה׃
E ἐὰν συλλάβῃ ἀσιδὰ καὶ νεσσά·

# σʹ εἰ ἐναγκαλίσεται ὁ κύκνος πτίλους αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* 161ʹ ↓252

*Attr:* σʹ] > 252

*Var:* ἐναγκαλίσεται] εναγγκαλισεται 252 | πτίλους] πτιλοις 252

HT חֲסִידָה וְנֹצָה׃ (אִם־אֶבְרָה)
E (ἐὰν συλλάβῃ) ἀσιδὰ καὶ νεσσά·

# αʹ ἐρωδιοῦ καὶ ἱέρακος

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓*cII* ↓555 161ʹ 252 Syh Ol[Y] ↓Ol[Y2] | ὁ ἐρωδιός] *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat–[612] [680] 732] 351[cat] 474[cat] [505[cat]] [523[cat]] 560[cat] 765[cat] 3008[cat] *cII*[2] 555[2]

*Var:* ἐρωδιοῦ καὶ ἱέρακος] ο ερωδιος και ιεραξ Ol[Y2]; ερωδιον και ιερακα *cII* 555

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܕܗܪܘܕܐ ܘܕܒܙܐ ❖

*Notes*: The Aq fragment is more complex than appears in the *Edition*, since it appears in different places in some of the same sources but in a different form (*Edition*, 393; *AGK* 3, 303). Previously, the *Edition* presented the evidence for the first lemma, but it did not note that the fragment appears in two places in two different forms in Ol[Y] (*Kommentar*, 349, 12 and 350, 13). *AGK* notes that Ziegler did not use the second lemma, which is attributed to Aq in Nic and now more clearly in *AGK* (Nic, 559, 37-38; *AGK* 3, 303). Ms 395 preserves the second lemma in the margin, not in the catena.

The *Edition*'s attribution to Polychronius is supported only by Nic and not by *AGK* (Nic, 560; *AGK* 3, 303). The fragment should be attributed to Olymp probably, since it is found in his commentary (*Kommentar*, 349-50).

**Job 39 15a**

HT וַתִּשְׁכַּח כִּי־רֶגֶל תְּזוּרֶהָ

E καὶ ἐπελάθετο ὅτι ποὺς σκορπιεῖ

# α′ καὶ ἐπελάθετο ὅτι ποὺς λικμήσει αὐτά

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܘܛܥܬ ܕܪܓܠܐ
ܕܪܫܐ ܠܗܘܢ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 73).

# σ′ καὶ ἐπελάθετο ὅτι ποὺς λικμήσει αὐτό

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܘܛܥܬ ܕܪܓܠܐ
ܕܪܫܐ ܠܗ ❖

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 73).

**Job 39 17a**

HT (כִּי־)הִשָּׁהּ (אֱלוֹהַּ חָכְמָה)

E (ὅτι) κατεσιώπησεν (αὐτῇ ὁ θεὸς σοφίαν)

# σʹ παρεῖλεν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* παρεῖλεν] παρειδεν 395

**Job 39 17b**
HT וְלֹא־חָלַק לָהּ בַּבִּינָה׃
E καὶ οὐκ ἐμέρισεν αὐτῇ ἐν τῇ συνέσει.

# σʹ καὶ οὐκ ἔνειμεν αὐτῇ σύνεσιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] 732 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ἔνειμεν] ενιμεν 559 | σύνεσιν] συνέσει 137 139 260 395 559 612(σύνεσει) 643 3006

**Job 39 18a**
HT (כָּעֵת בַּמָּרוֹם) תַּמְרִיא
E (κατὰ καιρὸν ἐν ὕψει) ὑψώσει,

# σʹ πετομένη

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–[680] 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* πετομένη] πετωμενη *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: The evidence of ms 3005 increases the probability that this fragment belongs to Sym, and therefore it is not a scholion (*Nachlese*, 408; *pace Beiträge*, 47, and Field, 74 n. 31). Now 788 supports the attribution to Sym. The HT contains a *hapax legomenon* (תַּמְרִיא Hi impf 3fs from II מרא), and, therefore, it is not possible to compare this text with how Sym translates it in other contexts. Ziegler suggests, “If σʹ were the translator, then he would have written πέταται, see *volat* Targ. Also Ol p 350, 12s speaks of “to fly” and of “flight” (ἀφίπτανται...ἐν τῇ πτήσει) of the storks” (*Beiträge*, 47).

The edition of the Targum by Stec has the following text, כעדן דבמרומא טייסא מגחכא לסוסא ולרכביה, which is translated: at the time of rising in flight (flying), she laughs at the horse and its rider (Stec, 284*; *The Aramaic Bible*, 86). The word in question, טייסא, is parsed as a Peal present active participle fem. sing. from טוס "to fly," and is not a finite verb as Ziegler's Latin (*volat*) suggests; therefore, through polygenesis, not textual dependence, Sym and Targum probably translated the text in accordance with Jewish exegesis. The external evidence of the *C* (= 788 3005) group combined with the broader context of Jewish exegesis indicates that this fragment is probably from Sym.

**Job 39 19b**

HT (הֲתַלְבִּישׁ צַוָּארוֹ) רַעְמָה׃

LXX (ἐνέδυσας δὲ τραχήλῳ αὐτοῦ) φόβον;

# θʹ χρεμετισμόν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] 732 *cII* 555

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* χρεμετισμόν] χραιμετισμον 138-255; χρεματισμον *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The index is at πανοπλίαν in 20a in 3005 and the fragment is next to 19a in 250 (*Kollationen*, 263). Ms 788 actually preserves the original text, while its descendent, 250, has a minor variant.

The HT contains a *hapax*, for which there are two possible meanings: (1) "mane" (< III *רעם) and (2) "thunder" "uproar" (< I רעם). Th appears to have translated the noun in this verse as from the same verbal root as in 37:4 and 5, where he used βροντάω "to thunder."

# σʹ κλαγγήν

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] 732 | κραυγήν] *cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* κλαγγήν] κλαγην 139

*Notes*: The oldest Greek catena preserves the lemma, while Nic has κραυγή. The lemma is a *hapax legomenon* and is the original text, while κραυγή stands in Chr and Olymp in the Nicetas catena (*Beiträge*, 47).

**Job 39 20b**
HT (הוֹד נַחְרוֹ) אֵימָה׃
LXX (δόξαν δὲ στηθέων αὐτοῦ) τόλμῃ;

# σʹ θʹ φόβος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]\ 732}$

*Attr:* σʹ θʹ] αʹ θʹ *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* φόβος] φοβον 260

*Notes*: Aq does not translate אימה with φόβος but with εἴδωλον (Jer 27[50]:38) and he uses φόβος to translate מורא and פחד (Reider, 67; 250); therefore, the attribution in 788-250 is probably incorrect.

**Job 39 21a**
HT (יַחְפְּרוּ) בָעֵמֶק (וְיָשִׂישׂ)
LXX (ἀνορύσσων) ἐν πεδίῳ (γαυριᾷ,)

# αʹ σʹ θʹ ἐν κοιλάδι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 260\ 643\ [680]\ 732}$ Syh

*Attr:* αʹ σʹ θʹ Syh] αʹ θʹ *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-139\ 260\ 643\ [680]\ 732}$; αʹ σʹ *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* κοιλάδι] κυλαδι *C* (= 3005)

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ.ܣ.ܬ. ܒܥܘܡܩܐ܀

*Notes*: Since the Three use κοιλάς for עמק, it is probable that Syh preserves the correct attribution. The catena witnesses agree that the attribution to Aq is correct, while the majority of mss omit the attribution to Sym. Ms 788 attests the attribution to Sym, which indicates that it is probably part of the original attribution (cf. Job 39:10 for translation equivalent of Sym).

**Job 39 22a (HT 21b)**
HT (בְּכֹחַ יֵצֵא) לִקְרַאת־נָשֶׁק׃
LXX συναντῶν βέλει (καταγελᾷ)

# αʹ θʹ εἰς ἀπάντησιν ὅπλου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 ↓512-513

*Attr:* α′ θ′] λ′ 512-513; > *C* (= 250) 138-255

*Notes*: The versification in LXX and HT differs because the LXX retranslated בָּעֵמֶק (21a) in 21b, and, therefore, the LXX translates לִקְרַאת־נָשֶׁק of 21b in 22a (Dhorme, 608).

The groups, *C* and *cI*, preserve the hexaplaric fragment at 21b in the bible text. Ms 3005 has the index over εἰς πεδίον of 21b.

The *Edition* did not include Nic, which actually preserves this fragment and the following one.

## σ′ εἰς ἀπάντησιν καταφράκτων

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–[680] 732 ↓512-513 ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σ′] λ′ 161 512-513 555; > *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: For the discrepancy in versification between HT and LXX, see *supra*. The mss place this fragment at 21b and a few at 21a (138-255 740).

Mss 161 and 555 preserve only the Sym fragment attributed incorrectly to οἱ λοιποί. This instance is a case of the devolution of the catena of Job since the earliest tradition preserves both fragments under the correct attributions, while *cII* preserves the accurate readings but not the attributions.

**Job 39 22b**

HT (וְלֹא־יָשׁוּב) מִפְּנֵי־חָרֶב׃

LXX (καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀποστραφῇ) ἀπὸ σιδήρου·

## σ′ θ′ ἀπὸ μαχαίρας

*Wit1:* lemma] *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–139 [680] 732 | ἀπὸ ἡμιόνου] ↓161′ ↓252

*Attr:* σ′ θ′] α′ θ′ 395; θ′ θ′ 138-255; σ′ 161′ 252

*Var:* ἀπό *C* (= 3005) 161′ 260 643 3006] > 137 138 252 255 395 559 612 740

*Notes*: The attribution, σ′ θ′, is inverted in 740 (θ′ σ′). In 252, the fragment is at 21a, but the meaning “donkey” is not clear in this verse. Regarding the second lemma Field says, “I do not know what Codd. 161, 248, which convey: Σ. ἡμιόνου, wish for themselves,” (Field, 74 n. 37).

**Job 39 23-24a**

HT                    (עָלָיו תִּרְנֶה אַשְׁפָּה) לַהַב
LXX                    (ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γαυριᾷ τόξον) καὶ μάχαιρα,

# θ′          φλόξ

*Wit1:*    Syh

*NonGr*:    ܬ. ܫܠܗܒܝܬܐ܀

*Notes*:    In Syh the index is over ܘܣܝܦܐ, which indicates that the Th fragment is read in place of “καὶ μάχαιρα,” which accords with HT. Φλόξ is used in the LXX to describe a blade of a dagger or a spear in Judges 3:22 and α′ θ′ I Rgns 17:7 and renders לַהַב (Field, I 515).

HT                    (עָלָיו תִּרְנֶה אַשְׁפָּה לַהַב) חֲנִית וְכִידוֹן׃ בְּרַעַשׁ
LXX                    (ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γαυριᾷ τόξον καὶ μάχαιρα,)—καὶ ὀργῇ

# θ′ + ※          λόγχης καὶ ἀσπίδος σεισμῷ

*Wit1:*    Syh La

*Wit2:*    fin] + λογχη και ασπιδος σεισμος *lI* = M (23b)↓; + λογχης και ασπιδος σεισμω Iul; + ※ *lanceae hastaeque* (+ *cum*[β]) *tremore* La[βμ]; + *lancea hasta et tremore* La[P]; + *et tremor lanceae et hastae* Arm

*Attr:*    θ′] > La

*NonGr*:    Syh    ܬ. ※ ܒܙܘܥܐ ܕܠܘܒܟܬܐ
ܘܕܬܪܣܐ܀

*Notes*:    The retroversion is from Field, who explains that the Syriac has changed the order of the words for grammatical reasons, and he follows Jerome’s text, which accords well with HT. The *Edition* represents a literal rendering of the marginal note, since it is not clear whether the *beth* preposition renders ἐν or marks the dative. The *beth* in HT supports that Th would have had *beth*, but ἐν does not appear in the other sources with this addition.

Directly under this fragment and marked with an index in the Syh the following scholion appears: ܠܐ ܣܝܡ ܗܘܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܘܪܝܓܢܣ܀ (“it was not placed by Origen”). Perhaps this note explains the appearance of the Th fragment in the margin under the asterisk and why it is not in the bible text itself. The text is from Th, but Origen did not incorporate it into his hexaplaric revision. The scholion is probably not correct since this

fragment eventually entered La under the asterisk, and this version is probably the best witness to the hexaplaric version of Job.

**Job 39 24a**

HT בְּרַעַשׁ וְרֹגֶז יְגַמֶּא־אָרֶץ

LXX καὶ ὀργῇ ἀφανιεῖ τὴν γῆν

# σʹ ἐν σάλῳ καὶ ὀργῇ ὡς καταπίνων γῆν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] σʹ σχο() 395; > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* ὀργῇ] ωργη 3006 | γῆν] > 559 612 *cII* 555 161

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 351; *AGK* 3, 307; Nic, 562).

**Job 39 24b**

HT וְלֹא־יַאֲמִין כִּי־קוֹל שׁוֹפָר׃

LXX καὶ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσῃ, ἕως ἂν σημάνῃ σάλπιγξ·

# σʹ καὶ οὐ δειλωθήσεται ὑπὸ ἤχους σάλπιγγος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]\ 732}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 139 643

*Var:* δειλωθήσεται *C* (= 788-250) 260] δηλωθησεται *C* (= 3005) *cI*$^{-260\ [680]\ 732}$; δηλωνθησεται 395 | ὑπο] απο *C* (= 788-250) | ἤχους] ηχου *C* (= 788-250 3005) 137 139 260 395 643 3006

*Notes*: The *Edition* does not list the evidence of the variant spelling of 250 δειλω, now also attested in 788, and thus it presents all the mss as having δηλω. The *Nachlese* reports that 250 has δειλω., which would be from δειλόομαι "to be afraid," "to fear" (*Nachlese*, 408). This reading fits the context more sufficiently, and the phoneme /i/ was represented graphemically by both ει and η among other symbols (Wevers, 188). This confusion accounts for the variant, which entered the textual tradition quite early. The conjecture of Kreysigius, reported by Schleusner, has now found significant support

in mss 788-250, despite Schleusner’s own rejection of it (Schleusner, vol I, 540, s.v. δηλόω (1829)).

The Syriac Peshitta has ܘܠܐ ܕܚܠ ܡܢ ܩܠܐ ܕܫܝܦܘܪܐ. (“and he was not afraid of the sound of the trumpet”). Probably Sym is not dependent on Pesh and Pesh is not dependent on Sym but, since there is a reference to the horse’s scorn of fear in 39:22, each translator/reviser could have come to the same conclusion in verse 24 independently. Polygenesis probably accounts for this agreement.

**Job 39 25b**

HT וּמֵֽרָחוֹק יָרִיחַ מִלְחָמָה (רַעַם שָׂרִים וּתְרוּעָה׃)

LXX πόρρωθεν δὲ ὀσφραίνεται πολέμου (σὺν ἅλματι καὶ κραυγῇ.)

# σʹ καὶ πόρρωθεν ἀλαλάξει πολεμικόν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–559 [680] 732

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ σʹ 139-256; > *C* (= 250) 740

*Var:* ἀλαλάξει] αλλαξει 740; αλαλαζει 139 260 643 3006

**Job 39 27b (HT 28a)**

HT סֶלַע יִשְׁכֹּן (וְיִתְלֹנָן)

LXX (γὺψ δὲ ἐπὶ νοσσιᾶς αὐτοῦ)—καθεσθεὶς αὐλίζεται

# σʹ ἐν πέτρᾳ ἠρεμῶν αὐλισθήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓ *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 | ἐν πέτρᾳ] Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] σʹ σχολ() 395; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* αὐλισθήσεται] αυλιζεται *C* (= 788-250); αυλησθησεται 612

*Notes*: The Three have the first part of this fragment, but the last two words are attributed only to Sym (see *infra*). The LXX omits verse 28, and thus there is no mention of the “rock.” This fragment contains the reference to the “rock” in 28a, and the following fragment represents the text for HT 28b.

HT סֶלַע (יִשְׁכֹּן וְיִתְלֹנָן)

LXX (γὺψ δὲ ἐπὶ νοσσιᾶς αὐτοῦ)—(καθεσθεὶς αὐλίζεται)

# α′ θ′ ἐν πέτρᾳ

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* αὐτοῦ] + *in petra* La

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ.ܬ. ܒܟܐܦܐ܀

**Job 39 28 (HT 28b)**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | עַל־שֶׁן־סֶלַע וּמְצוּדָה׃ |
| E | ἐπ’ ἐξοχῇ πέτρας καὶ ἀποκρύφῳ; |

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*–137 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 248 La Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θ′ 788 740 255 612 559 395 Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* 28 sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 395 248 La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܥܠ ܫܢܐ ܕܟܐܦܐ ܘܒܡܛܫܝܘܬܐ. ↘
La ※ *in summitate petrae et in caverna*

*Notes*: Syh, *C* (= 788), and *cI* provide sufficient evidence for the attribution to Th to be correct.

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | (עַל־שֶׁן־סֶלַע וּ)מְצוּדָה׃ |
| E | (ἐπ’ ἐξοχῇ πέτρας καὶ) ἀποκρύφῳ; |

# α′ ὀχυρώματος

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 161′[mg]

*Attr:* α′] > 740

**Job 39 29a**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | (מִשָּׁם חָפַר־)אֹכֶל |
| LXX | (ἐκεῖσε ὢν ζητεῖ) τὰ σῖτα, |

# α′ βρῶμα

*Wit1:* 161′mg

**Job 39 29b**

HT לְמֵרָחוֹק עֵינָיו יַבִּיטוּ׃

E πόρρωθεν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ σκοπεύουσιν·

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*–137 138 139 260 559 643 [680] 732 3006 La Syhtxt

*Attr:* θ′ 788 740 255 612 395] > rel

*Var:* 29b sub ※ 788 740 255 612 395 La Syhtxt

*NonGr*: Syhtxt ※ ܡܢ ܪܘܚܩܐ ܥ̈ܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܝ̈ܩܢ. ↘

La ※ *longe oculi eius prospiciunt*

*Notes*: Ms 788 preserves the attribution to Th as well as the asterisk.

**Job 39 30a**

HT (וְאֶפְרֹחוֹ (Q וְאֶפְרֹחָיו)) יְעַלְעוּ(־דָם)

LXX (νεοσσοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ) φύρονται (ἐν αἵματι,)

# α′ ἐστομισμένοι

*Wit1:* 161′mg

HT (וְאֶפְרֹחוֹ (Q וְאֶפְרֹחָיו)) יְעַלְעוּ־דָם

LXX (νεοσσοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ) φύρονται ἐν αἵματι,

# σ′ καταρροφῶσιν αἷμα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] 732

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* καταρροφῶσιν] καταροφωσιν 137 139 260 395 559 643 3006

*Notes*: The Hagedorns were not able to find this fragment in their new collation of 249 (*pace Edition*; *Kollationen*, 266). The spelling with two *rho*'s is to be preferred over the spelling with one, since it is in the best witnesses.

**Job 39 30b**

HT וּבַאֲשֶׁר חֲלָלִים שָׁם הוּא׃

LXX οὗ δ’ ἂν ὦσιν τεθνεῶτες, παραχρῆμα εὑρίσκονται.

# σʹ ὅπου δὲ σάρκες τετρωμένων, πάρεστιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [680] 732

*Attr:* σʹ] θʹ *C* (= 3005); θʹ σʹ 139; > *C* (= 250) 137 643 3006; [] 138

*Var:* ὅπου δέ] οπου δ αν 395 | τετρωμένων] τετρωμεναι *C* (= 250); τετρωμέν() *C* (= 788) | πάρεστιν *C* (= 788-250 3005)] παρεισιν *cI*–260 [680] 732

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* treats the issues of attribution and text adequately. First, although 3005 preserves an attribution to Th, τιτρώσκω is a word that is used by Sym and not Th (*Nachlese*, 408; H-R, 1362). This observation is now confirmed by 788, which is the first *C* ms to preserve the correct attribution to Sym. Second, the evidence of *C* (= 788-250 3005) combined with the singular in HT shows that the correct text is πάρεστιν and that πάρεισιν arose due to revision as evidenced by its place in *cI* (*pace Edition*). The LXX and the Sym fragment, preserved in *cI*, refer to the bird's young, while, according to *C*, Sym preserves the HT, which refers only to the bird itself (*Nachlese*, 409).

## Chapter 40

**Job 40 1-2**

HT וַיַּ֖עַן יְהוָ֥ה אֶת־אִיּ֗וֹב וַיֹּאמַֽר׃
הֲ֭רֹב עִם־שַׁדַּ֣י יִסּ֑וֹר
מוֹכִ֖יחַ אֱל֣וֹהַּ יַעֲנֶֽנָּה׃

E Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἰὼβ καὶ εἶπεν
Μὴ κρίσιν μετὰ ἱκανοῦ ἐκκλινεῖ,
ἐλέγχων θεὸν ἀποκριθήσεται αὐτήν;

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* Arm La Syh$^{txt}$

*Wit2:* ὁ θεός] > *O* Bo Aeth Iul Syn = M

*Attr:* θʹ Syh$^{txt}$] > La

*Var:* 1-2 sub ※ Arm(non **2b**) La(non **1 2a**) Syh$^{txt}$(non **2b**)

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܘܥܢܐ ܡܪܝܐ ܠܐܝܘܒ ܘܐܡܪ.
ܕܠܡܐ ܕܝܢܐ ܥܡ ܗܘ ܕܣܦܩ ܢܨܠܐ. ↘

La *arguens* (pr ※ β) *deum respondebit ita*

Arm ※ Եւ պատասխանի ետ Տէր Աստուած Յովբայ և ասէ
※ Միթէ զդատաստան ոք Բաւականին թիւրեսցէ

**Job 40 2a**

HT הֲ֭רֹב עִם־שַׁדַּ֣י יִסּ֑וֹר

E Μὴ κρίσιν μετὰ ἱκανοῦ ἐκκλινεῖ,

# σʹ ἆρα ὁ δικαζόμενος πρὸς τὸν ἱκανὸν περιγενήσεται;

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]}$ *cII* 555 161ʹ ↓252 Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 138-255; [] 257

*Var:* πρός] μετα 732 | τόν] > 252 732

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܐܪܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܡܬܕܝܢ

ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܕܣܦܩ ܐܪܐ.܀

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* reports that the *Edition* II App contains an error, since no catena ms, which the Hagedorns collated, contained the variant μετά instead of πρός (*Nachlese*, 409). Ms 732 has μετά, but the ms is very low in the catena's stemma and it was not included in the final publication of the *Nachlese*.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 353; *AGK* 3, 312; Nic, 564).

HT (הֲרֹב עִם־שַׁדַּי) יִסּוֹר
E (Μὴ κρίσιν μετὰ ἱκανοῦ) ἐκκλινεῖ,

## α′ ἐκκλινεῖ

*Wit1:* 248

**Job 40 2b**

HT מוֹכִיחַ אֱלוֹהַּ יַעֲנֶנָּה׃
E ἐλέγχων θεὸν ἀποκριθήσεταί αὐτήν;

## σ′ διελεγχόμενος θεῷ ἀντιφθέγξεταί τι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] *cII* 555 ↓161′ ↓252 Syh

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250) 137 643 732 3006; [] 257

*Var:* διελεγχόμενος] ]ελεγχομενος 252 | θεῷ] θεος *C* (= 3005); προς θεον 3006; > 248 252 | ἀντιφθέγξεταί] –εγξηται 740; –εγγεται *C* (= 3005); -φθεγξαιται 643*; αντιφθεγξαι 260 | τι] > 248 252 395

*NonGr*: Syh ܗ. ܕܡܟܣ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ
ܠܐܠܗܐ: ܢܗܦܟ
ܦܬܓܡܐ ܡܕܡ.܀

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 353; *AGK* 3, 312; Nic, 564).

**Job 40 4abc**

HT —
LXX Τί ἔτι ἐγὼ κρίνομαι νουθετούμενος καὶ ἐλέγχων κύριον

ἀκούων τοιαῦτα οὐθὲν ὤν;
ἐγὼ δὲ τίνα ἀπόκρισιν δῶ πρὸς ταῦτα;

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*–138 [680] 252 La Syh[txt]

*Attr:* οὐ κεῖνται (κεῖται 559 395 137 3006 260 643 732 139(**3**)) ἐν τῷ (> 3006) Ἑβραϊκῷ 788 οἱ Γ̅(> 740 255 612); ]κεῖται παρ’ Ἑβραίοις 252

*Var:* sub ÷ 3005(non **4c**) 788(non **4c**) La(non **4c**) Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]

÷ ܡܢܐ ܬܘܒ ܐܢܐ ܐܬܬܕܝܢ ܟܕ
÷ ܡܬܟܘܣ݂ ܐܢܐ.
÷ ܘܡܬܟܣ ܐܢܐ ܠܡܪܝܐ.
÷ ܘܫܡܥ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ
÷ ܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܝ.
÷ ܐܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܢܐ ܦܘܢܝ ܡܠܬܐ
÷ ܐܬܠ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ. ↘

La ※ (pro ÷) *quid ergo iudicor,* ÷ *commonitus et increpatus a domino,*
*audiens* (pr ÷ β) *talia, cum nihil sim*
*quod responsum dabo*?

*Notes*: Ms 559 places the note after the text and there is an index at 4a; thus perhaps it has only 4a as not in the Hebrew. Ms 260 marks the proper beginning (4a), but with the singular κεῖται, only that line is not in the Hebrew. In 643, the note must mark the beginning of the text not in the Hebrew, again only 4a due to the singular κεῖται.

Mss 788 740 255 612 preserve the plural κεῖνται. Ms 788 is the only witness to attest the complete scholion: οὐ κεῖνται ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ οἱ Γ̅. Mss 740 255 612 preserve the plural but the subject has fallen out. After this stage, the verb was changed to the singular beginning at 559.

**Job 40 4b (HT 4a)**
HT (הֵן קַלֹּתִי (מָה אֲשִׁיבֶךָּ
LXX (ἀκούων τοιαῦτα) οὐθὲν ὤν;

# α′ ἰδοὺ ἠλαφρύνθην

*Wit1:* 248 252

*Notes*: This fragment strengthens the probability of the retroversion at 7:6a (Woods, 153).

# σʹ ἰδοὺ κοῦφος ἐποίησα

*Wit1:* 248 252

*Var:* κοῦφος] –φως 248

**Job 40 5**

HT (אַחַת דִּבַּרְתִּי) וְלֹא אֶעֱנֶה (וּשְׁתַּיִם וְלֹא אוֹסִיף׃)

LXX (ἅπαξ λελάληκα,)—(ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ οὐ προσθήσω.)

# σʹ ὃ μὴ ἀνεφθεγξάμην

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680]

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* μὴ ἀνεφθεγξάμην] μιαν εφθεγξαμην 138 3005 | ἀνεφθεγξάμην] ανεφθεξαμην 612; ανεφεγγξομην 395

*Notes*: The OG omitted this phrase, but Sym translated it and the catena has preserved his text. According to the *Beiträge*, the note in Pitra is incorrect since it read the scholion as part of the Sym fragment: οὐ μὴ ἀναφθεγξάμενος ἐτόλμησα ὑπὸ ἀκακίας, τὰ μὲν θέλω ὑπὲρ παιδείας (*Beiträge*, 47; Pitra, 557; Pitra does note: *scholia videntur,* which may indicate he thought they appeared as a scholia). *AGK* records this scholion, and notes that it appears without break with the Sym fragment in *cI* (*AGK* 3, 316). The proof that this is a scholion is found in 788-250 and 3005, the representatives of the earliest catena tradition. In 788-250, the fragment appears well above the scholion and is clearly marked as a marginal note distinct from the scholion. In 3005, the fragment appears in the margin, while the scholion is found in the text of the catena, clearly distant from the hexaplaric fragment. The marginal notes in the *Vorlage* of 250 must have become less and less distinct so that in *cI* they appear as one unified marginal note.

**Job 40 8a**

HT הַאַף תָּפֵר מִשְׁפָּטִי

LXX μὴ ἀποποιοῦ μου τὸ κρίμα.

# ⟨αʹ⟩ μήτι καίπερ ἀκυρώσεις κρίσιν μου

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓248 252 | ἀκυρώσεις] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-138\ 260\ [680]\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* α′ *conj.*] α′ σ′ *C* (= 788 3005); σ′ 137 139 248 252 255 395 559 612$^{vid}$ 643 740; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* καίπερ ἀκυρώσεις] και παρακυρωσης 248

*Notes*: Ms 3005 preserves a double attribution to Aq and Sym, while the rest of the witnesses preserve an attribution to Sym (*Nachlese*, 409). Ms 788 also attests the double attribution, indicating that the attribution to Aq is part of the historical memory of the text. Already, Ziegler noted that the vocabulary in this fragment shows the attribution to Aq as correct and he favored him as the author in the *Edition* (*Beiträge*, 47; *Edition*, 397).

Based upon the vocabulary and translation technique (e.g. μήτι καίπερ), Aq is probably the author of this fragment, but already in the *Vorlagen* of 3005 and 788, the attribution to Sym was added to the attribution to Aq. After this intermediate stage, the rest of the catena lost the attribution to Aq and only the one to Sym remained.

**Job 40 8b**

HT תַּרְשִׁיעֵנִי לְמַעַן תִּצְדָּק׃

LXX οἴει δέ με ἄλλως σοι κεχρηματικέναι ἢ ἵνα ἀναφανῇς δίκαιος;

# σ′ μὴ ἄδικον ποιήσεις με, ἵνα δικαιωθῇς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{-[680]}$ ↓248 ↓252

*Attr:* σ′ *C* (= 788 3005) 248] α′ 252; > *C* (= 250) $cI^{-[680]}$

*Var:* μή] > 248 252 | ποιήσεις 248 252] -σης *C* (= 788-250 3005) $cI^{-3006}$; ποιησις 3006 | με *C* (= 788-250 3005) 248 252] > $cI^{-[680]}$

*Notes*: Ms 3005 confirms that 248 preserved the correct attribution to Sym against 252, which has Aq (*Nachlese*, 409). Ms 788 also supports this attribution. The *Edition* already favored Sym as the author based on 248, but it considered this lemma different than the one preserved in the catena (*Edition*, 397). Since the fragment is now identified in the catena, it is clear that these fragments are from the same source.

**Job 40 9a**

HT (וְאִם־זְרוֹעַ) כָּאֵל לָךְ

LXX (ἢ βραχίων) σοί ἐστιν κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου,

σʹ ὡς θεοῦ ὑπάρχει σοι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ὑπάρχει] υπαρχεις 612 740; -χης 559; -χει 395; υπαρχ() 255 | σοι] > *cI*–137 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

*Notes*: Only *C* (= 788-250) has the correct the text, since in the *cI* group ὑπάρχει σοι has become ὑπάρχεις οἶον, due to a following scholion (ἀντὶ τοῦ· δειχθῇς), to which οἶον does not originally belong but was added to *cI* secondarily (*AGK* 3, 325; *Kollationen*, 269; Chr-*Kommentar*, 226ff). The sigma of σοι became the ending of the verb υπαρχεις and the οι of σοι as the first word of the scholion became οἶον. This scholion does not interfere with the hexaplaric fragment in 788-250 and thus 788-250 preserves the correct text.

**Job 40 10a**
HT עֲדֵה נָא גָאוֹן וָגֹבַהּ
LXX ἀνάλαβε δὴ ὕψος καὶ δύναμιν,

αʹ κόσμησαι δὴ ὑπερφερείᾳ καὶ μετεωρότητι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–138 139 260 395 643 [680] 732

*Attr:* αʹ *C* (= 788 3005)] > *C* (= 250) *cI*–138 139 260 395 643 [680] 732

*Var:* κόσμησαι] κοσμισαι 255 559 740; ⟨κ⟩οσμισαι 612 | δή] δε δι 559; δη και 3006 | ὑπερφερείᾳ καί] υπερφερειαις 255 740 | μετεωρότητι] μεωροτητι 740

*Notes*: The *Nachlese* reports that 3005 preserves the attribution to Aq, which confirms Field's conjecture that he made in the *Auctarium* (*Nachlese*, 409; F-Auct, 11 n. 1). Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Aq was part of the oldest Greek catena.

**Job 40 10b**
HT וְהוֹד וְהָדָר (תִּלְבָּשׁ׃)
LXX δόξαν δὲ καὶ τιμὴν (ἀμφίεσαι·)

# θʹ εὐπρέπειαν καὶ ὕψος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–[680]\ 732}$

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 250) 138-255 3006

*Var:* καί] > *C* (= 3005) | ὕψος] δοξαν 137 139 260 643 3006

*Notes*: Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Th. Ms 139 has an additional θʹ εὐπρέπειαν in the line above this lemma; therefore, it has the attribution and this word twice (*Kollationen*, 269).

**Job 40 12a**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | רְאֵה כָל(־גֵּאֶה הַכְנִיעֵהוּ) |
| LXX | —(ὑπερήφανον δὲ σβέσον,) |

# αʹ θʹ ἰδοὺ πάντα

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ.ܬ. ܗܐ ܠܟܠ ❖

*Notes*: In Syh, the index occurs after ܡܟܟܘ. "to abase, humble," which translates ταπείνωσον in v. 11b; therefore, the fragment comes before LXX 12a and corresponds to the HT.

**Job 40 12b**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | וַהֲדֹךְ (רְשָׁעִים תַּחְתָּם׃) |
| LXX | σῆψον δὲ (ἀσεβεῖς παραχρῆμα) |

# αʹ καὶ ἐπίρριψον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–260\ [680]\ 732}$

*Wit2:* 12b] ασεβεις δε παραχρημα κρυψον (κρ. παραχ. 157 Bo) *lI*ʹ*C*ʹ-296 *b*$^{-248}$ *d* 55 253ʹ 644 706 795 Bo Aeth Ol | 13a κρύψον B-S *O L*ʹ-534ʹ 248ʹ Arm Pris Spec] σηψον rel

*Attr:* αʹ *C* (= 788) 138-255 395 559 612 740 3006$^{2}$ 248 252] σʹ 137 139 643 3006; > *C* (= 250 3005)

*Var:* ἐπίρριψον] απορριψον 559 612; επιστρεψον 3006$^{2}$ 248 252

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first *C* ms to attest the attribution to Aq. Ms 3006 contains the traditional fragment of the catena, but it also contains a marginal note from a different hand and a different source as follows: ἐν ἑτέρῳ σῆψον. Ἀκύλας, ἐπίστρεψον | Σύμμαχος, καταχώνευσον αὐτοὺς εἰς κενὸν (*Kollationen*, 270). Ms 3006, therefore, has agreements with the catena on the one hand and 248 and 252 on the other. The second part of this note will be treated below. Nic also seems to be influenced by the variant, ἀπόρριψον αὐτοὺς μακράν (Nic, 571)

As *Wit2* shows, the catena has a different text for 12b than the OG, and it is not clear how this reading arose; although, it seems to be the result of an error of sight due to homoioteleuton of the –ψον of the verbs κρύψον and σηψον, which then gave rise to the other variants (see 13a *infra*). As the catena stands, σῆψον is in verse 13a and the hexaplaric fragment is also marked at 13a or next to it. Ms 248 is representative of the OG and has its note at σῆψον at 12b. Ms 252 has its note at 14, which is incorrect.

Since the situation in the catena is difficult to discern and the HT at 12b has a *hapax leg*. (II הדך "to tread down," *HALOT*), this edition has based its text on the HT and not the difficulties in the catena witnesses (cf. Field, 75 n. 5). The HT has *waw* + verb at 12b, which corresponds to Aq's καί in the note itself. The HT does not have *waw* at 13a, even though the OG has δέ. The hexaplaric fragment, therefore, corresponds to 12b, despite the catena tradition placing it 13a. In this case the actual phrase that is marked in the catena (σῆψον δέ = והדך) takes priority over the differing stichometries.

The reading of 248 and 252 must be a variant of this fragment. Perhaps it is plausible to posit that ἐπίστρεψον derives from ἐπίρριψον, since the two words begin and end the same and the first *rho* may have been read as a *stigma*.

HT וַהֲדֹ֖ךְ רְשָׁעִ֣ים תַּחְתָּֽם׃
LXX σῆψον δὲ ἀσεβεῖς παραχρῆμα

# σʹ καταθλῶν ἀσεβεῖς ἥττησον αὐτούς

*Wit1:* 252

**Job 40 13a**

HT טָמְנֵ֣ם בֶּעָפָ֣ר (יָ֑חַד)
LXX κρύψον δὲ εἰς γῆν (ἔξω ὁμοθυμαδόν,)

# σʹ κατάχωσον αὐτοὺς εἰς κόνιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] ↓*cI* (= 3006[2]) ↓248

*Wit2:* 13b ἔμπλησον] + κρυψον δε εις γην εξω (> 336′ = M) ομοθυμαδον (ομοθ. εξω *d* Aeth) *lI*-336′ *C*-296 55 253′ 542 543 706 795 Bo Aeth Ol = M (13a); superadd καταχωσον αυτους εις κονιν *lI* = M

*Attr:* σ′] α′ 248; α′ σ′ 139; > *C* (= 250 3005) 732

*Var:* κατάχωσον] καταχωνευσον *cI* (= 3006$^{2}$) 248 | αὐτούς] > 732 | κόνιν] κονην 139 612; κενον 248

*Notes*: Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym in 257 is part of the oldest Greek catena. The catena has added the equivalent of OG 13a to the end of 13b, which created 13c. The hexaplaric fragment is at 13c in the catena, while it is at 13a in 248. The first Lucianic sub group has incorporated the Sym fragment at the end of 13c.

**Job 40 15a**

HT (הִנֵּה־נָא) בְהֵמוֹת (אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי עִמָּךְ)
LXX (ἀλλὰ δὴ ἰδοὺ) θηρία (παρὰ σοί·)

# α′ θ′ κτήνη

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 3005)

*Attr:* α′ θ′] > *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: Ms 3005 is the second witness to this fragment after 257, which Field knew from Holmes-Parsons' collation (*Nachlese*, 409; Field, 76).

HT (הִנֵּה־נָא בְהֵמוֹת) אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי (עִמָּךְ)
LXX (ἀλλὰ δὴ ἰδοὺ θηρία)—(παρὰ σοί·)

# α′ θ′ ※ ἃ ἐποίησα

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* θηρια α εποιησα π. σοι *lI* = M

*NonGr*: Syh ※ ܐ.ܬ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܒܕܬ ÷

*Notes*: The index is over ܠܘܬܟ ("with you"), and was inserted before this word under the asterisk in the Hexapla.

HT (הִנֵּה־נָא בְהֵמוֹת אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי) עִמָּךְ

LXX (ἀλλὰ δὴ ἰδοὺ θηρία) παρὰ σοί·

# α′ μετὰ σοῦ

*Wit1:* 252

**Job 40 16a**

HT (הִנֵּה־נָא כֹחוֹ) בְמָתְנָיו

LXX (ἰδοὺ δὴ ἰσχὺς αὐτοῦ) ἐπ’ ὀσφύι,

# α′ ἐν νώτῳ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 612\ [680]}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 252

*Var:* ἐν 252] επι *C* (= 3005); > rel | νώτῳ 252] νωτου (νοτου 3005) rel; ο νωτος *cII* 555 161 | αὐτοῦ 252] > rel

*Notes*: Ms 252 preserves the correct reading, for it is a translation of the HT. Usually, Aq translates ב with ἐν and he does not use ἐπί (Hyvärinen, 48-9). Hyvärinen lists two places where Aq appears to have ἐπί for ב, but he posits that these texts (Gen 6:7(6), Job 40:11(16)) have been adjusted to the LXX. The ἐπί of 3005 probably comes from the LXX and the genitive ending (νωτου) and omission of αὐτοῦ in the rest of the catena tradition may have arisen by parablepsis from the νώτῳ αὐτοῦ, from which νωτοῦ arose.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 360; *AGK* 3, 331; Nic, 573).

# σ′ ἐπὶ λαγόσιν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 612\ [680]}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σ′] θ′ 559

*Var:* ἐπί] > *cII* 555 161 | λαγόσιν *C* (= 3005)] λαγονο() 138; λαγος 137 139 559 643 740 3006; λαγο() 255 732; η λαγων *cII* 555 161

*Notes*: Ms 3005 is the only witness which clearly preserves the plural and probably represents the correct version, since also there is a plural in the Hebrew (*Nachlese*, 409). Additionally, Symmachus uses this word in the plural in Job 12:18b (Woods, 236; *Nachlese*, 409). The Hagedorns posit that this original form became the shortened form λαγόσ(ιν), which soon was no longer dispersed correctly (*Nachlese*, 409).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar,* 360; *AGK* 3, 331; Nic, 573).

HT (הִנֵּה־נָא כֹחוֹ) בְמָתְנָיו
LXX (ἰδοὺ δὴ ἰσχὺς αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ ὀσφύι,)—

## π′ ※ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh La

*Wit2:* ἐπ’ ὀσφύι] + (※ La) αυτου *O L′* Co Aeth Arm Bas^ap Pris Quod^ap Cass^ap = M

*Attr:* π′] > La

*NonGr*: Syh ※ ܚܠܨܘܗܝ. ܕܝܠܗ܀
La ※ *eius* ( + ↙ β)

*Notes*: The index comes after ܒܚܨܬܗ (the final *hē* is the anticipatory suffix) “loin,” showing that the pronoun was under the asterisk in the Hexapla.

**Job 40 16b**
HT וְאֹנוֹ (בִּשְׁרִירֵי בִטְנוֹ׃)
LXX (ἡ δὲ δύναμις)—(ἐπ’ ὀμφαλοῦ γαστρός·)

## γ′ ※ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh La

*Wit2:* δύναμις] + (※ La) αυτου (-τω Syn) rel = M

*Attr:* γ′] > La

*NonGr*: Syh ※ ܟܝ ܕܝܠܗ܀
La *eius* (pr ※ μ)

*Notes*: The index is after ܕܝܢ “but, now” and it marks where the pronoun was in the Hexapla.

**Job 40 17a**
HT יַחְפֹּץ (זְנָבוֹ כְמוֹ־אָרֶז)
LXX ἔστησεν (οὐρὰν ὡς κυπάρισσον,)

σʹ τονώσει

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: This rendering for יַחְפֹּץ was not known until now (*Nachlese*, 409). This lexeme is new to the LXX corpus.

HT (יַחְפֹּץ זְנָבוֹ כְמוֹ־)אָרֶז
LXX (ἔστησεν οὐρὰν ὡς) κυπάρισσον,

λʹ κέδρον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–138 260 [680] 740 ↓248

*Var:* κέδρον] ως νεδρον (oder νεδρος) 248

*Notes*: The reading in 248 is difficult to discern. The ligature for ος appears over the ρ, but κεδρον would suggest the ending –ον. This word does not occur in *TLG* database.[11]

**Job 40 18a**
HT (עֲצָמָיו) אֲפִיקֵי נְחוּשָׁה
LXX (αἱ πλευραὶ αὐτοῦ) πλευραὶ χάλκειαι,

σʹ ὡς σωλῆνες χαλκοῖ

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: The reading of the last word of the ms is actually χαλκ[.

**Job 40 18b**
HT (גְּרָמָיו) כִּמְטִיל בַּרְזֶל׃
LXX (ἡ δὲ ῥάχις αὐτοῦ) σίδηρος χυτός.

σʹ ὡς συμβλήματα σιδηρᾶ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [680] ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

[11]*TLG* [online]; accessed 26 July 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet.

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ὡς] ω 3006 | συμβλήματα] συμβεβλημενα 740; συμβληματος 555; συμβλητα 748 | σιδηρᾶ] σιδηρου *cII* 555 161

*Notes*: Ms 788 preserves the attribution to Sym.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 362-3; *AGK* 3, 334; Nic, 575).

**Job 40 19a**

HT (הוּא) רֵאשִׁית (דַּרְכֵי־אֵל)

LXX (τοῦτʼ ἔστιν) ἀρχὴ (πλάσματος κυρίου,)

# αʹ κεφάλαιον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* αʹ] οἱ ἄλλοι *cII* 555 161

*Var:* κεφάλαιον] κεφαλη 559; και φαλαιον 612; + οδων ισχυρου *cII* 555 161

*Notes*: The *cII* group has a general attribution, which is not of much value, since the oldest Greek catena preserves the reading and attribution correctly (*Beiträge*, 63). Nic also combines this fragment with the following one into one reading.

HT (הוּא רֵאשִׁית) דַּרְכֵי־אֵל

LXX (τοῦτʼ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ) πλάσματος κυρίου,

# σʹ θʹ ὁδῶν ἰσχυροῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257) *cI*–260 [680] 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 ↓252

*Attr:* σʹ θʹ] σʹ *C* (= 257); αʹ 252; οἱ ἄλλοι *cII* 555 161

*Var:* ὁδων ἰσχυροῦ] pr κεφαλαιον *cII* 555 161

*Notes*: Translation equivalents do not help isolate the author of this fragment, since all three revisers use these words as equivalents for the Hebrew words in this text; therefore, it is possible to attribute the fragment to the Three (Reider, 119; Gentry, 145; for Sym see Job 41:17).

**Job 40 19b**

HT הָעֹשׂוֹ יַגֵּשׁ חַרְבּוֹ׃

LXX πεποιημένον ἐγκαταπαίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ.

# σʹ ποιηθὲν προσαχθῆναι τῇ μαχαίρᾳ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ [680]\ 732}$ *cII* 555 248 ↓252

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 788) *cII* 555 248 252] > rel

*Var:* προσαχθῆναι] προσταχθηναι 3006 | αὐτοῦ] μου 252

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first ms of the oldest Greek catena to attest the attribution to Sym.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar,* 364; *AGK* 3, 335-6; Nic, 575).

**Job 40 21b**

HT (בְּסֵתֶר קָנֶה) וּבִצָּה׃

LXX (παρὰ πάπυρον καὶ κάλαμον καὶ) βούτομον·

# λʹ κάθυγρον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* λʹ] > 680

*Var:* κάθυγρον] καθαρον 256

*Notes*: The index is at βούτομον in 3005 (*Kollationen,* 273), and now preserved also in 788.

**Job 40 22a**

HT יְסֻכֻּהוּ צֶאֱלִים צִלְלוֹ

LXX σκιάζονται δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ δένδρα μεγάλα

# αʹ σκεπάσουσιν αὐτὸν σκιαὶ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܒܚܘ̈ܫܒܝܗܝ ܛܠܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ܀

*Notes*: The δένδρα μεγάλα of OG renders צֶאֱלִים, not צִלֲלוֹ. The OG renders צִלֲלוֹ with σὺν ῥαδάμνοις, which is in 22b. Aq reads צֶאֱלִים צִלֲלוֹ together; thus, he has σκιαὶ αὐτοῦ for both words in the HT.

# σʹ (ἐν) σκιᾷ σκιάζονται

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܒܛܠܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܛܠܠܝܢ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Ziegler, and the ἐν in parentheses represents the uncertainty of the retroversion of *beth*. Field understood the dative case to be the proper retroversion, not ἐν + dative (Field, 76).

# θʹ σκιαὶ σκιῶν αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܛܠܠܝܬܐ ܕܛ̈ܠܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ܀

**Job 40 22b(22a HT)**

HT צִלֲלוֹ (יְסֻבֻּהוּ עַרְבֵי־נָחַל׃)

LXX σὺν ῥαδάμνοις (καὶ κλῶνες ἄγνου.)

# σʹ σὺν ταῖς παραφυάσιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260}$ *cII* 555 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] θʹ 395; > *C* (= 250) 138 559

*Var:* παραφυάσιν] + αυτων Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܥܡ ܢܨ̈ܒܝܗܘܢ܀

*Notes*: This fragment corresponds to OG 22b (σὺν ῥαδάμνοις), which seems to be the OG equivalent to צִלֲלוֹ in HT 22a (cf. Field, 76). The *Edition* omitted the evidence of Syh for this fragment, even though Field listed it (Field, 76). The possessive pronoun

in Syh perhaps corresponds to HT, but its omission from all the other witnesses probably indicates that it is secondary.

In 138 and 559 this fragment follows ϊεται χειμάρρους without division (see *infra*). In 395 the notes are composed as follows: α′ ἰτέαι, σ′ χειμάρρους, θ′ σὺν ταῖς παραφυάσιν (*Kollationen*, 274).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 365; *AGK* 3, 339; Nic, 577).

HT (יְסֻבּוּהוּ) עַרְבֵי־נָחַל׃
LXX (σὺν ῥαδάμνοις καὶ) κλῶνες ἄγνου.

# α′ ἰτέαι χειμάρρου

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–260 *cII* 555 161′ 252

*Wit2:* ἄγνου] *torrentis* La = Vulg

*Var:* ἰτέαι] ϊεται 138 740; ϊ[ε]τ‛ε′αι 255 | χειμάρρου 3005 *cII* 555 161′ 252] χειμαρρους *cI*–260 3006inc

*Notes*: In 395 the notes are composed as follows: α′ ἰτέαι, σ′ χειμάρρους, θ′ σὺν ταῖς παραφυάσιν (*Kollationen*, 274).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 365; *AGK* 3, 339-40; Nic, 577).

HT (יְסֻבּוּהוּ) עַרְבֵי־(נָחַל׃)
LXX (σὺν ῥαδάμνοις καὶ) κλῶνες (ἄγνου.)

# λ′ ἰτέαι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓*cI*–137 138 139 260 395 643 732 3006

*Attr:* λ′] > 680

*Var:* ἰτέαι] ϊεται 255 559 612 740

*Notes*: This fragment was not listed in the *Edition* or *Beiträge*, but ἰτέαι was also identified as the version of Symmachus and Theodotion (*Nachlese*, 409).

**Job 40 23a**
HT (הֵן יַעֲשֹׁק נָהָר) לֹא יַחְפּוֹז
LXX (ἐὰν γένηται πλήμμυρα,) οὐ μὴ αἰσθηθῇ,

# σʹ οὐ καταπλαγήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 365; *AGK* 3, 340; Nic, 578).

**Job 40 23b-24**

HT
יִבְטַח כִּי־יָגִיחַ יַרְדֵּן אֶל־פִּיהוּ׃
בְּעֵינָיו יִקָּחֶנּוּ
בְּמוֹקְשִׁים יִנְקָב־אָף׃

E
πέποιθεν ὅτι προσκρούσει ὁ Ιορδάνης εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.
ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ αὐτοῦ δέξεται αὐτόν,
ἐνσκολιευόμενος τρήσει ῥῖνα;

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*–138 260 559 732 3006 248 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ (> 137) γ̅ 740 255 612 395 137 643 139; ἐκ θʹ οἱ τρεῖς 680) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 23b-24 sub ※ 788 740 255 612 395(non **24b**) 137(non **24b**) 643 248 Arm La(+ **23a**) Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]
ܬ. ※ ܬܬܟܠ ܕܢܦܩ ܝܘܪܕܢ ܒܦܘܡܗ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܒܥܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܩܒܠܝܘܗܝ.
※ ܟܕ ܡܬܥܩܡ ܢܩܘܒ ܢܚܝܪܗ. ↘

La
*securus* (pr ※ μ) *est,* ※*cum illisus fuerit Iordanis in os eius*↙
*in oculo suo suscipiet* (pr ※ β) *eum.*
*torto vertice, pertundit nares* (+ ↙ β).

Arm
※ յանձնապաստան է զի թե Յորդանան դիմեսցէ ի բերան նորա
※ Յակնակապիճս իւր ընկալցի զնա
※ ի խուսափել նորա ծակիցես զռնգունս նորա

*Notes*: The asterisks and attribution are well attested for these lines.

**Job 40 23b**
HT (יִבְטַח) כִּי(־יָגִיחַ יַרְדֵּן אֶל־פִּיהוּ׃)
E (πέποιθεν) ὅτι (προσκρούσει ὁ Ἰορδάνης εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.)

# α′ ὅταν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* α′] σ′ 395 680 740; > *C* (= 250) 138

*Notes*: The index is at ὅτι in 3005 (*Kollationen*, 275) and in 788.

Aq distinguished the demonstrative and temporal meanings of the כי by using ὅτε (+ ἄν = ὅταν) sometimes and ὅτι other times (Hyvärinen, 53).

La has *cum*, “when,” which shows that Jerome may be dependent on Aq, not Th. The Vulgate adopted *quod* “because” (see *supra*).

**Job 40 24a**
HT (בְּעֵינָיו) יִקָּחֶנּוּ
E (ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ αὐτοῦ) δέξεται (αὐτόν,)

# α′ λήψεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-260\ 732}$

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The fragment occurs two times in 740, once here and once at 24b (*Kollationen*, 275).

**Job 40 24b**
HT בְּמוֹקְשִׁים יִנְקָב־אָף׃
E ἐνσκολιευόμενος τρήσει ῥῖνα;

# σ′ ἐν περόνῃ τρυπηθήσεται τὴν ῥῖνα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138^{inc}\ 260\ 732}$ ↓*cII* 555 ↓161′

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250) 3006

*Var:* περόνῃ] περωνη 161 559; περονι 255 | τήν] > 703

*Notes*: In 138, only σʹ and τρ[ are able to be read (*Kollationen*, 275).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar,* 366; *AGK* 3, 340; Nic, 578).

**Job 40 25a**

HT (תִּמְשֹׁךְ) לִוְיָתָן (בְּחַכָּה)

LXX (ἄξεις δὲ) δράκοντα (ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ,)

# αʹ σʹ Λευϊαθάν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257 3005) ↓*cI*–732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* αʹ σʹ] > 138 395; λʹ *cII* 555 161

*Var:* Λευϊαθάν 740 *cII* 161] Λευϊαθάμ *C* (= 3005); Λευϊθάν *C* (= 257) *cI*–740; Λευϊσθάν 259ʹ 555

*Notes*: Although only a few catena mss preserve the correct orthography in this place, Job 3:8 makes clear that the original orthography according to the catena tradition was Λευϊαθάν (Woods, 97-8).

Originally the Aq and Sym fragments were probably preserved separately and in their longer form as they appear in the Syh (see *infra*). The evidence of the catena shows that from a very early time the fragments were combined under a double attribution and only the most relevant part of the fragment, Λευϊαθάν, was preserved, since this is the point of contrast with the LXX. The readings of 248 and 252 preserve part of the longer reading, but they have erroneously preserved the attribution, each omitting one of the original authors (252 omits Sym, while 248 omits Aq; see *infra*). The general attribution to λοιποί in the *cII* group is not correct, since Syh has a different reading for Th (see *infra*).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 366; *AGK* 3, 342; Nic, 579). *AGK* contains the following comment by Evagrius: οἶμαι τὸ προειρημενόν *κῆτος* καὶ τὸν ἐνταῦθα *δράκοντα* ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, ἐπεὶ τὸ Ἑβραϊκὸν ἐν ἀμφοτέροις Λευϊαθὰν περιέχει οὐχ οὕτως τῶν ἄλλων δρακόντων παρʼ Ἑβραίοις ὀνομαζομένων, ἀλλʼ ἐχόντων τὸ οἰκεῖον ὄνομα τοῦ γένους αὐτῶν· τοῦ γε μὴν εἰς τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν ἀντικειμένων δυνάμεων ἀναφερομένου δράκοντος ἰδίως ὄνομα Λευϊαθαν κέκληται ὥσπερ κυρίαν ταύτην κεκτημένου προσηγορίαν (*AGK* 3, 342-3).

HT תִּמְשֹׁךְ לִוְיָתָן בְּחַכָּה

LXX ἄξεις δὲ δράκοντα ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ,

## α′ ἑλκύσεις Λευϊαθάν ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ

*Wit1:* ↓252 Syh ↓Hi (Ezek 32,10)

*Var:* ἑλκύσεις] *extrahens* Hi | ἐν ἀγκ.] > 252

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ. ܢܓܕ ܐܢܬ ܠܠܘܝܬܢ ܒܚܠܘܒܐ܀

Hi *extrahens Leuiathan in hamo*

*Notes*: *Extrahes* is a variant in the Hi commentary on Ezekiel (450).

## σ′ ἑλκύσεις Λευϊαθάν ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ

*Wit1:* ↓248 ↓Syh

*Var:* ἑλκύσεις] –σει Syh; + δε 248 | Λευϊαθάν] + δρακοντα Syh | ἐν ἀγκ.] > 248

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܢܓܕ ܠܠܘܝܬܢ ܬܢܝܢܐ ܒܚܠܘܒܐ܀

## θ′ ἑλκύσει δράκοντα ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܬ. ܢܓܕ ܬܢܝܢܐ ܒܚܠܘܒܐ܀

**Job 40 25b**
HT וּבְחֶבֶל תַּשְׁקִיעַ לְשֹׁנוֹ׃
LXX περιθήσεις δὲ φορβεὰν περὶ ῥῖνα αὐτοῦ;

## α′ *et funibus colligabis linguam eius*

*Wit1:* Hi (Ezek 32,10)

*Notes*: Jerome does not include an equivalent for *beth* (ἐν), which probably Aq would have had (Hyvärinen, 48-9).

**Job 40 26a**

HT הֲתָשִׂים אַגְמוֹן בְּאַפּוֹ
E εἰ δήσεις κρίκον ἐν τῷ μυκτῆρι αὐτοῦ,

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *cI*–137 138 260 559 643 680 732 3006 Arm La Sa Syh^txt^

*Wit2:* 26a] om *C*1–705 Sa Eus (Ps 88,9-11) Pris

*Attr:* θʹ Syh^txt^] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om 139 Sa Pris | 26a sub ※ 740 255 612 395 Arm La Syh^txt^

*NonGr*: Syh^txt^ ܬܠ ※ ܐܘ ܦܠܛ ܐܢܬ ܕܡܟܐ ܒܢܘܢ
※ ܚܢܝܩܐ ܕܠܘܗ. ↘
La ※ *si* (+ ↙ β; ※ *sigillabis* μ) *ligabis circulum in ore eius*
Arm ※ Եթէ կապիցես անուր ի քիթս նորա

**Job 40 26b**
HT וּבְחוֹחַ תִּקּוֹב לֶחֱיוֹ׃
LXX ψελίῳ δὲ τρυπήσεις τὸ χεῖλος αὐτοῦ;

# θʹ καὶ χαλινῷ τρήσεις σιαγόνα αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* θʹ] σʹ *C* (= 257); > *C* (= 788-250) 395

*Var:* τρήσεις *C* (= 257) *cII* 555 161] τρυπήσεις *C* (= 3005); τρίσῃς *C* (= 788-250); τρίσεις 395 740; τρίσει 137 139 559 612 643 680 3006; τρήσει 138 255 260 | σιαγόνα] σιαγωνα 255 395 559

*Notes*: Translation technique indicates that Th is both the author and that τρήσεις (from τετραίνω) (for נקב) is the correct lemma (cf. Th Job 40:24b *supra*). The reading τρυπήσεις in 3005 is from the LXX. The rest of the variants derive from τρήσεις through the phonological error of η-ι, which is a common scribal error in Greek mss (Wevers, 189).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 367; *AGK* 3, 343; Nic, 579).

**Job 40 27**

HT הֲיַרְבֶּה אֵלֶיךָ תַּחֲנוּנִים
אִם־יְדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ רַכּוֹת׃

LXX λαλήσει δέ σοι δεήσει,
ἱκετηρίᾳ μαλακῶς;

# ἑβρ′ ἆρα πληθυνεῖ πρὸς σὲ δεήσεις (s ἱκετηρίας); ἆρα λαλήσει πρὸς σε μαλακά

*Wit1:* Nobil (apud Field)

**Job 40 27b**

HT (אִם־יְדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ) רַכּוֹת׃

LXX (ἱκετηρίᾳ) μαλακῶς;

# α′ θ′ ἁπαλά

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-680\ 732}$ Syh

*Attr:* α′ θ′] α′ σ′ *C* (= 3005); > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ἁπαλά] απλα 612

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ.ܬ. ܪ̈ܟܝܟܬܐ ❖

# σ′ πολλά

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* μαλακῶς] + πολλα V-*lII*-Iul[lem]

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܣ̈ܓܝܐܬܐ ❖

*Notes*: The *Vorlage* of Sym must have had רַבּוֹת instead of רַכּוֹת or he misread his *Vorlage*. This fragment may be the cause of the doublet found in part of the Lucianic tradition, including the lemma of the commentary of Iul.

**Job 40 28a**

HT הֲיִכְרֹת (בְּרִית עִמָּךְ)

LXX θήσεται δὲ (διαθήκην μετὰ σοῦ,)

θʹ μὴ διαθήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*–139 732

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 250 3005)

*Notes*: Ms 788 joins 257 as the second *C* ms to attest the attribution to Th.

**Job 40 29a**
HT הַתְשַׂחֶק(־בּוֹ כַּצִּפּוֹר)
LXX παίξῃ δὲ (ἐν αὐτῷ ὥσπερ ὀρνέῳ)

σʹ μὴ ἐμπαίξῃς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > 643

*Var:* ἐμπαίξῃς] –εις 559 740; εμπεξης 138

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the second *C* ms to attest the attribution and text of this fragment.

**Job 40 30a**
HT יִכְרוּ עָלָיו חַבָּרִים
LXX ἐνσιτοῦνται δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔθνη,

σʹ ἐνδιαγωγίσαιντο αὐτὸν κοινωνοί

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓252

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250 257)

*Var:* ἐνδιαγωγίσαιντο] ἐνδιαγνώσαιντο *C* (= 3005); ἐνδιαγωγήσαιντο *C* (= 788-250); ἐ]ν̣διαγωγίσονται 252

*Notes*: The fragments for 30a and 30b are combined in 252 as follows: διαμερισθήσονται μεταξὺ μεταβόλων ἐνδιαγωγίσονται κοινωνοί under α′ σ′ and next to 40:30b (*Kollationen*, 277).

The *Nachlese* provides a significant update of the evidence for this fragment, since the reading in 257 and 3005 was still unknown to Ziegler (*Nachlese*, 409-10; *Beiträge*, 48). Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Sym. The the issues of root to which the verb is traced, the meaning which Sym assigned to the word (not documented elsewhere), and the determination of the form (future or optative) must remain unsettled (*Nachlese*, 410).[12]

# θ′ ἀγοράσωσιν αὐτὸν μέτοχοι

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓248 ↓252

*Attr:* θ′] > *C* (= 250) 252

*Var:* αὐτὸν μέτοχοι] > 252 | μέτοχοι] > 248

*Notes*: Ziegler was unaware of the fragment in 257 and 3005, which confirm the whole reading known before only in 250. These two witnesses confirm the authorship preserved only in 248 until now (*Nachlese*, 409-10). Ms 788 also confirms the attribution to Sym and the full lemma. The form ἀγοράσουσιν is a typographical error in the *Beiträge*, but the correct form, ἀγοράσωσιν, is in the *Edition* (*Nachlese*, 410; *Beiträge*, 48).

**Job 40 30b**

HT יֶחֱצוּהוּ בֵּין כְּנַעֲנִים׃

LXX μεριτεύονται δὲ αὐτὸν Φοινίκων γένη;

# α′ ἡμισεύσουσιν αὐτὸν μεταξὺ Χαναναίων

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-559\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* ἡμισεύσουσιν] ημισεουσιν 3006 | μεταξύ] μεταξοι 3006

---

[12]The word still does not occur in *TLG* [on-line], accessed 28 July 2011 http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet. It is also not listed in *Ἐπιτομὴ Λεξικοῦ Κριαρά* [on-line], accessed 18 February 2012 http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/medieval_greek/kriaras/index.html; Internet.

σʹ διαμερισθήσονται μεταξὺ μεταβόλων

*Wit1:* ↓248 ↓252 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ 248 252

*Var:* διαμερισθήσονται] -σεται Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܡܬܦܠܓ ܒܝܢܬ ܬܓܪ̈ܐ܀

*Notes*: Sym uses διαμερίζω for חלק in Isa 53:12, and there are no instances of this verb listed for Aq (H-R, 305-6). This observation combined with the attribution to Sym in Syh makes it probable that this fragment should be attributed to him and not Aq.

**Job 40 31a**

HT הַתְמַלֵּא בְשֻׂכּוֹת עוֹרוֹ

LXX πᾶν δὲ πλωτὸν συνελθὸν οὐ μὴ ἐνέγκωσιν βύρσαν μίαν οὐρᾶς αὐτοῦ

αʹ μήτι πληρώσῃς ἐν ἀναφορεῦσιν δέρμα αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* 252

σʹ μὴ πληρώσῃς ἐν σκηναῖς τὸ δέρμα αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓248 252

*Var:* ἐν] > 248

**Job 40 31b**

HT וּבְצִלְצַל דָּגִים רֹאשׁוֹ׃

E καὶ ἐν πλοίοις ἁλιέων κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI* (= 740 612) Arm La Sa

*Attr:* θʹ *C* (= 788)] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 31b sub ※ 788 740 612 Arm La

*NonGr*: La ※ *et in navibus piscatorum caput eius.*
Arm ※ և ի նաւս ձկնորսաց խալամ նորա

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first witness to preserve the attribution to Th.

HT וּבְצִלְצַל דָּגִים (רֹאשׁוֹ׃)
E καὶ ἐν πλοίοις ἁλιέων (κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.)

# σʹ καὶ ἐν ἰχθυοφόροις

*Wit1:* 248 ↓252

*Var:* καί] > 252 | ἰχθυοφόροις] –φορα 252; + κεφαλην αυτου 252

*Notes*: The addition in 252 comes from the LXX.

**Job 40 32bc**
HT זְכֹר מִלְחָמָה
אַל־תּוֹסַף׃
LXX μνησθεὶς πόλεμον τὸν γινόμενον ἐν σώματι αὐτοῦ,
καὶ μηκέτι γινέσθω.

# αʹ μνήσθητι πολέμου, μὴ προσθῇς

*Wit1:* 248 ↓252

*Attr:* αʹ] σʹ 252

## Chapter 41

**Job 41 1a**

HT הֵן־תֹּחַלְתּוֹ נִכְזָבָה

LXX οὐχ ἑόρακας αὐτὸν

# θʹ ἰδοὺ ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ διεψεύσατο

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555 ↓252

*Attr:* θʹ *C* (= 788) *cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555] σʹ 252; > *C* (= 250 3005)

*Var:* διεψεύσατο] > 252

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first *C* ms to preserve the correct attribution to Th. The *Edition* has two fragments, one for Sym based on 252, and the other for Th based on the catena. The *Kollationen* viewed these two fragments as one, since it is the same fragment with a confusion of attribution (*Kollationen*, 278).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 370; *AGK* 3, 351; Nic, 583).

# αʹ ἰδοὺ ἡ προσδοκία αὐτοῦ διαψεύσεται

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: Ziegler notes that προσδοκία for תֹּחֶלֶת is suspect, since Aq typically uses καραδοκία and derivatives for translation equivalents (*Beiträge*, 63). Sym, however, has a preference for προσδοκία (5x) and προσδοκεῖν (18x) and the lemma may very well have come from him, but it is also possible that προσδοκία was written for καραδοκία (*Beiträge*, 63).

**Job 41 1b**

HT הֲגַם אֶל־מַרְאָיו יֻטָל׃

LXX οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις τεθαύμακας;

# σʹ ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἰδέαν αὐτοῦ καταβαλεῖ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἰδέαν] ειδεαν 740

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 370; *AGK* 3, 351; Nic, 583-4).

**Job 41 2a**

HT לֹא־אַכְזָר כִּי יְעוּרֶנּוּ

LXX οὐ δέδοικας ὅτι ἡτοίμασταί μοι;

# αʹ θʹ οὐ μὴ ἀσπλαγχνίσω, ὅταν ἐξεγείρω αὐτόν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732 ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* αʹ θʹ] αʹ θʹ σʹ 139; λʹ 512-513 555; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* οὐ *C* (= 788-250 3005)] ουδε 255 559 612 740 512-513 555; ουδ’ ου 137 139 260 395 643 680 3006 | ἀσπλαγχνίσω] –νησω *C* (= 788-250) 137 139 260 643 3006 | ἐξεγ. / αὐ.] tr *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: The agreement of 250 and 3005 shows that οὐ rather than οὐδέ (and accordingly οὐδ’ οὐ) is the original text for the catena (*Nachlese*, 410). Ms 788 confirms that this reading is part of the oldest Greek catena. The variant, οὐδέ, represents a corruption from the LXX (οὐ δέδοι.). The root of the first verb, which is attested only here, must have been ἀσπλαγχνίζομαι, not ἀσπλαγχνέομαι because of the parallel formation εὐσπλαγχνίζομαι (*Nachlese*, 410; cf. Lampe s.v. εὐσπλαγχνίζομαι).

**Job 41 4**

HT לֹא (Q לוֹ)־אַחֲרִישׁ בַּדָּיו
וּדְבַר־גְּבוּרוֹת וְחִין עֶרְכּוֹ׃

E οὐ σιωπήσομαι δι’ αὐτόν,
καὶ λόγον δυνάμεως ἐλεήσει τὸν ἴσον αὐτοῦ.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*–138 680 732 3006 248 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̄ 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 139; ἐκ Θεοδοτιωνος οἱ δύο οἱ τοὺς ἀστερίσκους ἔχοντες 260) Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 4 sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 395(non **4b**) 137 260 643(non **4b**) 139(non **4b**) 248 Arm(non **4b**) La Syh$^{txt}$(non **4b**)

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܠܐ ܐܫܬܘܩ ܡܛܠܬܗ. ↘

La ※ *non tacebo propter eum*

*et* (pr ※ μ) *sermo virtutum miseretur aequalis sui* (+ ↙ β)

Arm ※ Ոչ լռեցից վասն նորա

**Job 41 4a**

HT (לֹא Q) לוֹ־אַחֲרִישׁ בַּדָּיו

E (οὐ σιωπήσομαι) δι’ αὐτόν,

## α′ περὶ αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ *cII* 555

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250) 559

*Notes*: Nic has absorbed this fragment into its commentary (Nic, 584).

**Job 41 4b**

HT וּדְבַר־גְּבוּרוֹת וְחִין עֶרְכּוֹ׃

E καὶ λόγον δυνάμεως ἐλεήσει τὸν ἴσον αὐτοῦ.

## σ′ λόγος δὲ κἂν ὁ δυνατώτατος οὐκ ἀντιτεθήσεταί μοι

*Wit1:* lemma] ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) Syh | λόγος δὲ ἱκανοῦ ἀδιάπτωτος] 252

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*NonGr*: Syh

ܣ. ܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܦ
ܐܢܕܐ ܕܗܘ ܚܝܠܬܢܐ
ܠܐ ܬܬܩܘܡ
ܠܘܩܒܠܝ ❖

*Notes*: The Greek wording for this fragment was cited for the first time in Ziegler’s *Beiträge*, and therefore Field’s retroversion of Syh was shown to be invalid (*Nachlese*, 410; *Beiträge*, 48; Field, 78). Ms 788 confirms the Greek wording, but it does

not preserve the attribution. The reading of 252 does not align with HT, and it is doubtful whether it belongs to Sym, given the evidence of *C* and Syh.

HT (וּדְבַר־גְּבוּרוֹת) וְחִין עֶרְכּוֹ׃
E (καὶ λόγον δυνάμεως) ἐλεήσει τὸν ἴσον αὐτοῦ.

# α′ δωρήσεται τάξει αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$

*Attr:* α′] σ′ 559; > *C* (= 250) 740

*Var:* αὐτοῦ] εαυτου 680

*Notes*: Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Aq, while is absent from 250.

**Job 41 5a**
HT מִי־גִלָּה פְּנֵי לְבוּשׁוֹ
LXX τίς ἀποκαλύψει πρόσωπον ἐνδύσεως αὐτοῦ;

# σ′ τίς ἀπελέπισεν ἐπιφάνειαν ἐνδύματος αὐτοῦ;

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἀπελέπισεν] απελπισεν *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: The Symmachus version has been overlooked until now, since in 250 it has no author attribution (*Nachlese*, 410). Ms 788 confirms the attribution to Sym. The rare word, ἀπολεπίζω “to peel,” is found in the LXX only twice in the Book of Tobit (11:8,13) (*Nachlese,* 410).

**Job 41 5b**
HT בְּכֶפֶל רִסְנוֹ מִי יָבוֹא׃
LXX εἰς δὲ πτύξιν θώρακος αὐτοῦ τίς ἂν εἰσέλθοι;

# σ′ εἰς ὑποδίπλωσιν φολίδος αὐτοῦ τίς ὑποδύσει

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-732}$ *cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ὑποδίπλωσιν] -δηπλωσιν 680; -διπλοσιν 161 | φολίδος] φιλιδος 559; φωλιδος *C* (= 3005) 137 138 255 395 643 680 | ὑποδύσει] –λυσει 559; -δυσεται 555

*Notes*: The word φολίς is difficult to explain and probably indicates that Sym read סִרְינוֹ "his coat of armor," which is a deviation from the HT (רִסְנוֹ), due to metathesis of ס and ר and confusion of sibilants (*Beiträge*, 48-9; *HALOT*, s.v. *סִרְיוֹן and שִׁרְיוֹן). The Three translate רֶסֶן with χαλίνος, and שִׁרְיוֹן is always rendered with θώραξ in the LXX (10x; *Beiträge*, 48-9).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 371; *AGK* 3, 354-5; Nic, 586).

**Job 41 6a**

HT דַּלְתֵי (פָנָיו מִי פִתֵּחַ)

LXX πύλας (προσώπου αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνοίξει;)

## λʹ θύρας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-612\ 680\ 732}$

*Attr:* λʹ] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* θύρας] οὐρᾶς 137 139 260(οὐράς) 395 643 3006

*Notes*: The variant arose probably because of graphemic similarity between O and Θ (*Edition*, 404).

**Job 41 6b**

HT סְבִיבוֹת שִׁנָּיו (אֵימָה׃)

LXX κύκλῳ ὀδόντων (αὐτοῦ φόβος.)

## θʹ περὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI cII* 555 161

*Attr:* θʹ] σʹ 260; > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 371-2; *AGK* 3, 356-7; Nic, 587).

**Job 41 7a**

HT גַּאֲוָה אֲפִיקֵי מָגִנִּים

LXX τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ ἀσπίδες χάλκειαι,

# α′ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ὑπερέκχυσις θυρεῶν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI cII* 555 ↓161′

*Attr:* α′] σ′ 395; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* σῶμα] pr το 395 | αὐτοῦ] αυτων 248 | ὑπερέκχυσις] -χυσεις 248 395 | θυρεῶν] θυραιων *C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Notes*: The variant ὑπερεκχύσεις in 248 395 agrees with the HT in the plural number. Cant. 5:12 preserves an Aq fragment for אֲפִיקֵי, and there Aq has the plural ἐκχύσεις on the testimony of 161-248 (Ceulemans, 440; see also Aq Isa 8:7 for the same Greek lemma for a plural in the HT). Although these factors are important, they are not conclusive. Ms 395 shows that -εις is a variant of the original version -ις and this variant has influenced 248. The translation data is not conclusive because the contexts are different. In Cant 5:12 the word in question occurs as the object of a preposition. In Job 41:7a the word in question is the predicate nominative of a singular subject.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 372; *AGK* 3, 357; Nic, 587). Perhaps Aq has influenced the exegesis of 7b in the commentary of Olymp: σύνδεσμος ὅλον τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (*Kommentar*, 372; *AGK* 3, 358).

# σ′ ὑπερφρονεῖ προερχόμενος ἐν θυρεοῖς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–732 *cII* ↓555 161

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Var:* ὑπερφρονεῖ] αφρονειν 555 | θυρεοῖς] θυραιοις *C* (= 788-250 3005) 255 559 612

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 372; *AGK* 3, 357; Nic, 587).

**Job 41 7b**

HT סָגוּר חוֹתָם צָר׃

LXX σύνδεσμος δὲ αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ σμιρίτης λίθος·

# ⟨α′⟩ ἀποκλειίστου σφ⟨ρ⟩αγὶς στενῇ

*Wit1:* 248

*Attr:* α′] > 248 cod

*Var:* σφ⟨ρ⟩αγίς] σφαγῖς cod

*Notes*: Aq uses ἀποκλειίστον for סְגוּר in Job 28:15. He uses σφραγίς for חוֹתָם in Gen 38:18 and Ezek 28:12. He uses στενός for צַר in Isa 59:19. The attribution must remain plausible in the absence of explicit witness to the attribution.

**Job 41 8a**

HT אֶחָד בְּאֶחָד יִגַּשׁוּ

E εἷς τοῦ ἑνὸς κολλῶνται,

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*$^{–138\ 680}$ 248 La Sa Syh$^{txt}$ Pris

*Attr:* θ′ (θ′ 788 740 612 559 395 3006 137 643 139; ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ δύο 260) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa Pris | 8a sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 260(+ **8b**) 643 732 139 248(+ **8b**) La(+ **8b**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܠܐ ※ ܚܕܐ ܒܚܕܐ ܡܬܕܒܩܝܢ. ↘

La *unus uni ※ adhaeret,*

*et spiritus non pertransibit eum* ↙

# α′ εἷς τῷ ἑνὶ προσεγγίσουσιν

*Wit1:* 252

*Var:* τῷ] το cod

*Notes*: In 252 this lemma and Sym's lemma at 8b are next to v. 8 and are under α′ σ′ as follows: εἷς τῷ ἑνὶ προσεγγίσουσιν. καὶ διάστημα οὐκ ἔσται. The readings are clearly divided by the point and a wider space between προσεγγίσουσιν and καί in the ms.

**Job 41 8b**

HT וְרוּחַ לֹא־יָבוֹא בֵינֵיהֶם׃

LXX πνεῦμα δὲ οὐ μὴ διέλθῃ αὐτόν·

# σ′ καὶ διάστημα οὐκ ἔσται

*Wit1:* 252

HT וְרוּחַ (לֹא־יָבוֹא בֵינֵיהֶם׃)

LXX πνεῦμα (δὲ οὐ μὴ διέλθῃ αὐτόν·)

# α′ ἀνάπνοια

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250) 138-255

*Var:* ἀνάπνοια] αναπνοης 559

*Notes*: Ziegler believes that Aq read רֶוַח "width," space," for he would have used πνεῦμα as the LXX, if he had read רוּחַ (*Beiträge*, 49). This occurrence is the only usage of ἀνάπνοια in Aq, but this suggestion is probably correct. Sym read the consonants with the same vocalization as Aq, since Gen 32:17 shows that διάστημα renders רֶוַח in the LXX (*Beiträge*, 49).

**Job 41 9**

HT אִישׁ־בְּאָחִיהוּ יְדֻבָּקוּ
יִתְלַכְּדוּ וְלֹא יִתְפָּרָדוּ׃

E ἀνὴρ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ προσκολληθήσεται,
συνέχονται καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀποσπασθῶσιν.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *cI*–138 260 Arm La Sa Syh$^{txt}$ Pris

*Attr:* θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β̄ 255 612 395 3006 137 643 139) Syh^txt] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa Pris | 9 sub ※ 740(non **9a**) 255 612 559(non **9a**) 395(non **9a**) 137 3006 643 732 Arm La Syh^txt

*NonGr:* Syh^txt ܬ ※ ܓܒܪܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܚܘܗܝ ܢܕܒܩܘܢ.
※ ܐܚܝܕܝܢ ܐܚܝܕܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ. ↘

La *vir*(pr ※ μ) *fratri suo adglutinabitur*↙
*continebuntur*(pr ※ μ), *et non divellentur* (+ ↙ β)

Arm ※ Այր զեղբաւր զհետ երթիցէ
※ զմիմեանց կալցին և մի մեկնեսցին

**Job 41 9a**

HT אִישׁ־בְּאָחִיהוּ יְדֻבָּקוּ

E ἀνὴρ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ προσκολληθήσεται,

# ⟨σʹ⟩ ἕκαστος τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ προσκολληθήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓161ʹ ↓252

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ 161ʹ 252

*Notes*: Ziegler notes that the fragment is probably not from Aq, since he would have translated the ב with ἐν and אָח with ἀδελφός as is consistent with Aq's treatment of the reciprocal construction in Hebrew (*Beiträge*, 63; cf. Hyvärinen, 40 with regard to Aq and the reciprocal constructions in Hebrew). Unfortunately, there is no evidence that Sym translated אָח with πλησίον. Since the Th reading is established, and it is least probable that the reading comes from Aq, one may posit that the reading is from Sym.

**Job 41 10a**

HT עֲטִישֹׁתָיו תָּהֶל אוֹר

LXX ἐν πταρμῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπιφαύσκεται φέγγος,

# αʹ πταρμὸς αὐτοῦ φέγγος πυρός

*Wit1:* lemma] 248 | φέγγος πυρός] *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*^–260 732 ↓*cII* ↓555

*Attr:* αʹ *C* (= 788 3005) 248] ⟨σʹ⟩ *Edition*; > rel

*Notes*: The full lemma in 248 has been considered to be the original text, since it follows the HT or at least Aq's Hebrew *Vorlage* closely (עֲטִישָׁתוֹ; cp. the singular pronoun in LXX, Vulg. Targ.; see Dhorme, 635).

The *Nachlese* says, "that 3005 assigns to Aquila the fixed words φέγγος πυρός, which were otherwise anonymous in the catena, raises the certainty that it is a relevant component of the same designation, which we also detect in 248" (*Nachlese*, 410). The *Nachlese* suggests that one reexamine once more Ziegler's argument that the version belongs to Sym (*Nachlese*, 410). Now, we add the evidence of ms 788 to support the attribution to Aq, which means that the oldest Greek catena probably had the attribution to Aq.

At the beginning of his argument Ziegler says that πταρμός could be authentic, but then he writes that the version cannot come from Aq for the following reasons: (1) Aq has never translated *tahael 'or* with φέγγος πυρός and (2) Aq would have certainly rendered *'or* with φῶς (*Beiträge*, 63-4). In light of these considerations, he posits Sym as the probable author of the fragment (*Beiträge*, 64). There are two problems with Ziegler's reconstruction: (1) the verb I הלל Hi occurs only three times in the HT (Isa 13:10; Job 29:3, 41:10) and has אוֹר as its subject in Isa 13:10 and Job 41:10. There are no instances of a noun derived from this root (see *HALOT* ?II תְּהִלָּה, which concludes that the word in Hab 3:3 is I תְּהִלָּה "praise"). No hexaplaric evidence for the words in question is available for Isa 13:10; although, there is relevant evidence at Job 29:3 (Sym renders I הלל with λάμπειν); therefore, at present there is no evidence to show that Aq has translated *tahael 'or* with φέγγος πυρός, since there are no relevant analogues. (2) Although it is correct that Aq usually translates אוֹר with φῶς, perhaps the rare Hebrew word combined with אוֹר has caused him to alter his usual approach. Ziegler's proposal for Sym is not satisfactory because it does not account for Job 29:3, where Sym uses λάμπειν to render I הלל Hi. This piece of evidence stands contrary to Ziegler's proposal. In the final analysis, the evidence of *C* (= 788 3005) 248 is sufficient to establish the attribution to Aq.

Ziegler treated this fragment as an anonymous scholion (*Edition*, II App 404; *Beiträge*, 81), but now it should be considered as part of the hexaplaric tradition which is in the catena of Job.

**Job 41 10b**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | (וְעֵינָיו) כְּעַפְעַפֵּי(־שָׁחַר׃) |
| LXX | (οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ)—(εἶδος ἑωσφόρου.) |

# λʹ ὡς

*Wit1*: *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-137\ 138\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$

*Notes*: In ms 3005 the index is over εἶδος, which does not necessarily indicate a substitution for the LXX lemma, but it shows the reading of λʹ belongs close to this word. Ms 788 has the index between αὐτοῦ and εἶδος, which perhaps shows that the marginal

note is not intended to supply a substitution for the LXX lemma. Comparison with the HT and the index in 3005 and 788 provide sufficient evidence to place this fragment in its proper place.

Ziegler clarifies that the full lemma in Field (ὡς εἶδος ἑωσφόρου) is incorrect, since the mss have noted only λʹ ὡς (= M), and εἶδος ἑωσφόρου is the LXX text and has nothing to do with the Three (*Beiträge*, 64).

**Job 41 11a**
HT (יַהֲלֹכוּ)—(מִפִּיו לַפִּידִים)
LXX (ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύονται λαμπάδες) καιόμεναι

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ÷ ܕܝܩܕܢ ↘

*Notes*: The Syh marked the participle with an obelus since it was absent in the HT.

**Job 41 11b**
HT כִּידוֹדֵי (אֵשׁ יִתְמַלָּטוּ׃)
LXX (καὶ διαρριπτοῦνται) ἐσχάραι (πυρός·)

# λʹ δαλοί

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–138 260 680 732 740 ↓248

*Attr:* λʹ] αʹ 248

**Job 41 13a**
HT (נַפְשׁוֹ גֶּחָלִים) תְּלַהֵט
LXX (ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἄνθρακες,)—

# σʹ θʹ φλέξει

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* ἄνθρακες] ανθρακες(-κες V) φλεξει La V-637-Iul Dam II 1405 = M

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܬ. ܬܫܠܗܒ ❖

*Notes*: The index is at the end of the line after ܠܓܘܡܖ̈ܐ. “coals.” The index marks where the verb appears in the HT, showing where Sym and Th add it. This fragment has influenced La and some witnesses of the Lucianic text.

**Job 41 14b**
HT וּלְפָנָיו תָּדוּץ) דְּאָבָה׃)
LXX (ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ τρέχει) ἀπώλεια.

# α′ ἐκλιμία

*Wit1:* 248

*Notes*: Aq translates the verb דאבון with ἐκλιμώσσειν in Deut 28:65.

**Job 41 15b**
HT יָצוּק עָלָיו בַּל־יִמּוֹט׃
E καταχέει ἐπ’ αὐτόν, οὐ σαλευθήσεται.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *cI* (= 740 255 612) 248 Arm La Sa Syh[txt]

*Attr:* θ′ 740 Syh[txt]] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 15b sub ※ 740 255 612 248 Arm La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ܬ ※ ܐܫܝ̈ܕܢ ܥܠܘܗܝ؛ ܠܐ ܬܬܙܝܥܢ. ↘
La *circumfusae* (pr ※ β) *ei et immobiles*
Arm ※ եթէ զեղցի ի վերայ նորա ոչ խլրտասցէ

# σ′ περικεχυμέναι αὐτῷ ἀκλινεῖς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*−[680] 732 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* αὐτῷ] αυτων 255 | ἀκλινεῖς] ακληνης 3006

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar,* 376; *AGK* 3, 364-5; Nic, 592).

**Job 41 17a**

HT מִשֵּׂתוֹ יָגוּרוּ אֵלִים

LXX στραφέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ φόβος θηρίοις τετράποσιν ἐπὶ γῆς ἁλλομένοις.

# σʹ ὑπὸ τῆς κινήσεως αὐτοῦ εὐλαβηθήσονται ἰσχυροί

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[680] 732 ↓*cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ὑπό] απο 512-513 | κινήσεως] σκηνεως 138; κηνισεως 3006

*Notes*: Ziegler notes that Aq translates אֵלִים with ἰσχυροί at Isa 1:29 and the Three do the same at Isa 6:13 (*Beiträge*, 49; see *infra*).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 376; *AGK* 3, 365; Nic, 593).

HT (מִשֵּׂתוֹ) יָגוּרוּ אֵלִים

LXX (στραφέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ) φόβος θηρίοις τετράποσιν ἐπὶ γῆς ἁλλομένοις.

# αʹ ὑποσταλήσονται ἰσχυροί

*Wit1:* 248

**Job 41 18a**

HT מַשִּׂיגֵהוּ חֶרֶב בְּלִי תָקוּם

LXX ἐὰν συναντήσωσιν αὐτῷ λόγχαι, οὐδὲν μὴ ποιήσωσιν

# σʹ καταβαλοῦσα αὐτὸν μάχαιρα οὐχ ὑποστήσεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[612] [680] 732 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* καταβαλοῦσα] καταλαβουσα 512-513 555 161 | αὐτόν] αυτων 138 | οὐχ ὑποστήσεται] > 138 | ὑποστήσεται] υπεστησεται *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 376-7; *AGK* 3, 366-7; Nic, 594). Perhaps there is detection of Sym's influence on the exegesis of Olymp, since he uses the phrase καταβάλωσιν αὐτόν in his explanation of verse 18a (*Kommentar*, 376-7; *AGK* 3, 366-7).

**Job 41 18b**

HT חֲנִית מַסָּע וְשִׁרְיָה׃

E δόρυ ἐπηρμένον καὶ θώρακα·

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*–138 260 [612] [680] [732] 248 Arm La Sa

*Attr:* θʹ 788 740] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 18b sub ※ 788 740 255 559(mend **18b-19**) 395 3006 137 643 139 248 Arm La

*NonGr*: La ※ *hastae elatio et thoracis* (+ ↙ β)
Arm ※ զէնք և նիզակք

*Notes*: Ms 788 confirms that the attribution and asterisk were part of the oldest Greek catena.

# σʹ οὐδὲ λόγχης ἄρσις καὶ θώρακος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[612] [680] 732 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250) 395

*Var:* λόγχης] ολογχης 139 | ἄρσις] αρσεις 559; αρσης 3006

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 376-7; *AGK* 3, 366-7; Nic, 594).

**Job 41 19a**

HT (יַחְשֹׁב) לְתֶבֶן (בַּרְזֶל)

LXX (ἥγηται μὲν γὰρ σίδηρον)—(ἄχυρα,)

# α′ θ′ εἰς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 138 139 260 [612] 643 [680] 732 3006

*Var:* εἰς] + αχυρα *C* (= 3005); pr ※ 788 740 255

# σ′ ὡς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–138 260 [612] [680]

*Var:* ὡς] + αχυρα *C* (= 3005) 139; pr ※ 788 740 255

**Job 41 20a**
HT לֹא־יַבְרִיחֶנּוּ בֶן־קָשֶׁת
LXX οὐ μὴ τρώσῃ αὐτὸν τόξον χάλκειον,

# σ′ οὐ φυγαδεύσει αὐτὸν ἀνὴρ τοξότης

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [612] [680] 732 161

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 788-250 3005) 139 395 643

*Var:* οὐ] > 139 643 3006 | φυγαδεύσει] -δευση *C* (= 788-250); -δευει 740

*Notes*: Ms 161 has this fragment and attribution also.

**Job 41 20b**
HT (לְקַשׁ נֶהְפְּכוּ־לוֹ) אַבְנֵי־קָלַע׃
LXX (ἥγηται μὲν) πετροβόλον (χόρτον·)

# λ′ λίθους σφενδόνης

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 [612] 643 [680] 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* λ′] > 395

*Var:* λίθους] λιθου 138-255 740

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 376-7; *AGK* 3, 366-7; Nic, 594). Perhaps, the Three have influenced the exegesis of Olymp, since he uses σφενδόνη to explain πετροβόλον in verse 20b (*Kommentar*, 376-7; *AGK* 3, 366-7).

**Job 41 21a**

HT כְּקַשׁ נֶחְשְׁבוּ תוֹתָח

E ὡς καλάμη ἐλογίσθησαν σφῦραι,

# α′ θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*–260 [612] [680] 732 3006 Arm Sa Pris

*Attr:* α′ θ′ 788 740 255 559 395 137 643] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa Pris | 21a sub ※ 788 740 255 559 395 137 643 Arm

*NonGr*: Arm ※ Եւ իբրեւ զեղէգն համարեցան նմա ուռունք

*Notes*: The *Edition* lists the fragment: καλάμη] α′ θ′ χόρτος 255. This entry has been added erroneously due to misreading 255. The double attribution to Aq and Th is in the left margin to the left of the asterisk, which is also to the left of the word in the bible text χόρτον. In 255, the asterisk and attribution are often placed above the first letter of the line that is under the asterisk, and this instance is not an exception to the pattern. Ms 255 has 21a under the asterisk; therefore, this entry should be taken out of the hexaplaric corpus. The *Beiträge* analyzes this fragment as if it is genuinely a hexaplaric fragment (*Beiträge*, 64). The *Kollationen*, however, sees that χόρτον is in a completely normal place in v. 20b (only on a separate line), and that the attribution applies to the whole of verse 21a (*Kollationen*, 286).

# σ′ ὡς καλάμη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ σφῦρα

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh

ܣ. ܐܝܟ ܩܢܝܐ
ܚܫܝܒܐ ܠܗ
ܐܪܙܦܬܐ܀

*Notes*: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 79, n. 34).

**Job 41 21b**

HT (וְיִשְׂחַק) לְרַעַשׁ כִּידוֹן׃

LXX (καταγελᾷ δὲ) σεισμοῦ πυρφόρου.

## σ′ σειομένου θυρεοῦ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-138\ 260\ [612]\ [680]\ 732}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′

*Attr:* σ′ *C* (= 788-250 3005) 248] > rel

*Var:* θυρεοῦ] θυραιου *C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Notes*: Both *C* mss (thus 250 as well, which was not previously listed) agree with 248 in the attribution to Symmachus (*Nachlese*, 410). Ms 788 also supports the attribution to Sym.

HT (וְיִשְׂחַק לְרַעַשׁ) כִּידוֹן׃
LXX (καταγελᾷ δὲ σεισμοῦ) πυρφόρου.

## α′ ἀσπίδος

*Wit1:* 248

**Job 41 22a**
HT (תַּחְתָּיו) חַדּוּדֵי חָרֶשׂ
LXX (ἡ στρωμνὴ αὐτοῦ) ὀβελίσκοι ὀξεῖς,

## θ′ σιδήρια τέκτονος

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[612]\ [680]\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* θ′ *C* (= 788) 138-255 740 *cII* 555 161] α′ *C* (= 3005); σ′ 137 139 260 643 559; > *C* (= 250) 395 3006

*Var:* σιδήρια] σιδηρα *C* (= 3005) 139 | τέκτονος] τεγυτονος 138; τεκτονας 643

*Notes*: The authorship of this fragment is difficult to determine because the manuscript evidence is divided and the HT contains a *hapax legomenon* (חַדּוּדֵי); therefore, translation equivalents cannot decide the question. Each of the Three uses τέκτων to render חָרָשׁ "worker." Aq favors ὄστρακον for חֶרֶשׂ, but Aq, Th, and Sym use this word in Ezek 23:34 (see *infra*). The new evidence of 788 favors the correctness of the attribution to Th, since now it and the best witnesses of the *cI* group have the Th attribution.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar,* 377; *AGK* 3, 367; Nic, 595).

# α′ ὀξυντῆρες ὀστράκων

*Wit1:* *cII*$^{-555}$ 248

*Notes*: Given that 788 attributes the above fragment to Th, this fragment can now be more probably attributed to Aq on the basis of 248.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 377; *AGK* 3, 367; Nic, 595).

**Job 41 23a**

HT יַרְתִּיחַ (כַּסִּיר מְצוּלָה)

LXX ἀναζεῖ (τὴν ἄβυσσον ὥσπερ χαλκίον,)

# α′ καχλάσει

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[612]\,[680]}$ ↓*cII* 555 161

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* καχλάσει *C* (= 788-250) 137 138-255 395 559 740 3006 *cII* 555 161] καχλαζει *C* (= 3005) 139 260 643 512-513; ανακαχλαζει 732

*Notes*: The *C* witnesses are divided between the future and present tense, while the best *cI* mss favor the future tense over the present. In addition, Aq translates the Hebrew prefix forms with the Greek future frequently, but if the prefix form has a frequentative or gnomic sense, he does use the Greek present to translate it (Hyvärinen, 65). With the new evidence of 788, the external evidence and the probability of translation technique favor the lemma. Furthermore, the present tense could be considered a harmonization to LXX.

**Job 41 23b**

HT (יָם יָשִׂים) כַּמֶּרְקָחָה׃

LXX (ἥγηται δὲ τὴν θάλασσαν) ὥσπερ ἐξάλειπτρον,

# α′ ὡς μυρεψητήριον

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[612][680]\,732}$ ↓*cII*$^{-512-513}$ ↓555 ↓161′

*Attr:* α′] > *C* (= 250) 138

*Var:* ὡ̔ς 248] > rel

*Notes*: The word, ὡ̔ς, is an equivalent to כ in HT, and therefore should be considered original.

# σʹ ὡ̔ς ἀναβρασσομένην ἄρτυσιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{–139\ [612]\ [680]\ 732}$ *cII*$^{–512\text{-}513}$ 555 161′

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ὡ̔ς] > *C* (= 3005) | ἀναβρασσομένην] -μενων 643

**Job 41 24b**
HT יַחְשֹׁב תְּהוֹם לְשֵׂיבָה׃
E ἐλογίσατο ἄβυσσον εἰς περίπατον.

# θʹ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*$^{–138\ 260\ 395\ [680]\ 3006}$ La Sa Syh$^{txt}$ Pris

*Attr:* θʹ 788 740 255 612 559 643 732] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa Pris | 24b sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 643 732 La Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ※ ܚܫܒܗ ܠܬܗܘܡܐ ܠܡܫܬ ܗܠܟܐ. ↘
La ※ *computavit abyssum quasi in deambulacrum* ↙

**Job 41 25a**
HT אֵין־עַל־עָפָר מָשְׁלוֹ
LXX οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὅμοιον αὐτῷ

# σʹ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπὶ χοὸς ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{–139\ [680]\ 732}$ *cII* 555

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 378; *AGK* 3, 369; Nic, 596).

**Job 41 25b**
HT —(הֶעָשׂוּ לִבְלִי־חָת׃)
E (πεποιημένον ἐγκαταπαίζεσθαι) ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων μου·

## Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *cI* (= 740 612 559 395) Syh$^{txt}$

*Var:* 25b sub ÷ 740 612 559(θ′ ※ pro ÷) 395 Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܕܥܒܝܕ ܠܡܬܒܙܚܘ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐܟܐ ÷ ܕܝܠܝ. ↘

*Notes*: The evidence of Syh preserves a variant of the original, which the *cI* group preserves.

**Job 41 26a**
HT אֵת־כָּל־גָּבֹהַּ יִרְאֶה
LXX πᾶν ὑψηλὸν ὁρᾷ,

## θ′ πάντα ὑπερήφανον ἐμβλέψεται

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]}$ *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* θ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ὑπερήφανον] υπεριφανον 138 | ἐμβλέψεται] ορα 3006

*Notes*: The longer reading in Klostermann (ὅλος γάρ ἐστιν ὑπερηφανίας μηδὲν ταπεινὸν λογιζόμενος; Nic, 596) is not part of Th, but is a scholion from the commentary of Olymp (see Klostermann, 74; *Kommentar*, 379; *AGK* 3, 370; Nic, 596; *Beiträge*, 49).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 379; *AGK* 3, 370; Nic, 596).

**Job 41 26b**
HT (הוּא מֶלֶךְ) עַל־כָּל־בְּנֵי־שָׁחַץ׃
LXX (αὐτὸς δὲ βασιλεὺς) πάντων τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν.

## α′ ἐπὶ πάντας υἱοὺς βαναυσίας

*Wit1:* lemma] 248 | ἐπί] Syh

*Attr:* α′] α′ θ′ Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ.ܬ. ܥܠ ⁘

*Notes*: There is no variant for the attribution, since both Aq and Th use this preposition (see Th *infra*). Syh places the index after ܡܠܟܐ "king," which indicates that the preposition should be inserted after this word. Furthermore, this word order also accords with HT.

## θ′ ἐπὶ πάντων υἱῶν βαναυσίας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [680] ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161 | ἐπί] Syh

*Attr:* θ′] α′ θ′ Syh; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐπί Syh] > rel | πάντων *C* (= 3005)] > rel | υἱῶν] υιον 137 139 643 732 3006 | βαναυσίας] βανασιας 250; ναυσιας 137 139 395 643 732 3006

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ.ܬ. ܥܠ ⁘

*Notes*: This fragment has been reconstructed from Syh and 3005. The *Edition* has πάντων in angle brackets, indicating that there is no textual witness for this word, but 3005 actually contains it (*Kollationen*, 288).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 379-80; *AGK* 3, 370-1; Nic, 596).

## σ′ παντὸς βρωμώδους

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–260 [680] ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* βρωμώδους *C* (= 788-250) (βρομωδους *cII* 161) 555 (βρωμωδους)] δρομωδους (δρωμοδους 3006; δρομοδους 395) rel

*Notes*: The majority of the tradition favors the variant δρομωδους, but this word is unattested in Greek.[13] The word would be derived from the root *δρομ- "race,"

[13]*TLG* [on-line]; 9 August 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch;

“speed” and has the –ωδες derivational morpheme, which is usually added to nouns to form adjectives which denote “fullness” or “similarity” (Smyth, § 858.16). If this analysis is correct, then the term may denote a quick-like or rapid-like object. With the addition of 788 to the evidence, the lemma is now more firmly established. LSJ notes that βρομώδης is frequently read for βρωμώδης (s.v. βρομώδης), and thus both orthographies are attested.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 379-80; *AGK* 3, 370-1; Nic, 596).

---

Internet. It is also not listed in *Ἐπιτομὴ Λεξικοῦ Κριαρά* [on-line]; accessed 18 February 2012; available from http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/medieval_greek/kriaras/index.html; Internet.

## Chapter 42

**Job 42 2b**

HT	וְלֹא־יִבָּצֵר מִמְּךָ מְזִמָּה׃

LXX	ἀδυνατεῖ δέ σοι οὐθέν.

# θʹ	καὶ οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐνθύμημα

*Wit1:*	↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-139\ 260\ [680]}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:*	θʹ *C* (= 788 3005)] λʹ 161; οἱ ἄλλοι *cII* 555; > *C* (= 250) *cI*$^{-139\ 260\ [680]}$

*Var:*	ἐνθύμημα] ενθυμιμα 138

*Notes*:	Ms 3005 is the first witness to provide an author for this fragment (*Nachlese*, 410). Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Th is part of the oldest Greek catena.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 382; *AGK* 3, 374-5; Nic, 598).

**Job 42 3b**

HT	(בְּלִי) דָעַת לָכֵן הִגַּדְתִּי וְלֹא אָבִין

LXX	φειδόμενος δὲ ῥημάτων καὶ σὲ οἴεται κρύπτειν;

# σʹ	ἔγνων, διὰ τοῦτο ἐλάλησα ἀνοήτως

*Wit1:*	248

*Notes*:	There is most probably an ellipsis of οὐκ at the beginning of this fragment, given the lemma of the HT (Field cites Montef, 80 n.2). Field suggests that ἀνοήτως may render בְּלִי דָעַת, based on the evidence of Job 35:16b, but I have established that ἀνοήτος is a variant for ἀναίσθητος in that verse. Furthermore, Field recognized that this suggestion would result in the reading: ἀνοήτως; διὰ τ. ἐλάλησα ἃ οὐκ ἔγνων (Field, 80 n.2), which is not a probable solution. Montef most probably arrived at the correct solution to this problem.

**Job 42 3d**

HT	—

LXX	μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ ἃ οὐκ ἠπιστάμην;

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*–139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 La Syh[txt]

*Var:* 3d sub ÷ 3005(※ pro ÷) 740 138-255 612 559 395 []137 La Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ÷ ܪ̈ܘܪܒܬܐ ܘܬܡܝ̈ܗܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ
÷ ܕܠܐ ܡܦܣ ܗܘܝܬ. ↘

La *magna* (pr ÷ β) *et mirifica quae non noveram*

*Notes*: This line is in the HT (מִמֶּנִּי וְלֹא אֵדָע׃ נִפְלָאוֹת), but the LXX contains a very dynamic translation of it, which probably prompted Origen to place it under the obelus.

**Job 42 4a**
HT (שְׁמַע־נָא וְאָנֹכִי אֲדַבֵּר)—
LXX (ἄκουσον) δέ (μου, κύριε, ἵνα κἀγὼ λαλήσω·)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ÷ ܕܝܢ ↘

*Notes*: The *Edition* did not note this instance of the obelus in Syh.

**Job 42 5a**
HT (לְשֵׁמַע־אֹזֶן) שְׁמַעְתִּיךָ
LXX (ἀκοὴν μὲν ὠτὸς ἤκουόν) σου (τὸ πρότερον,)

# λʹ σε

*Wit1:* *cI*–[680](= 255 612) ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161[mg]

*Attr:* λʹ] > 161[mg]

*Var:* σε] pr ηκουον *cII* 555

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar,* 383; *AGK* 3, 376-7; Nic, 599).

**Job 42 6a**
HT עַל־כֵּן אֶמְאַס (וְנִחַמְתִּי)
LXX διὸ ἐφαύλισα ἐμαυτὸν (καὶ ἐτάκην,)

# σʹ διὰ τοῦτο κατέγνων ἐμαυτοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 559\ [680]}$

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* κατέγνων] κατεγνω 732 | ἐμαυτοῦ] εμαυτον 732

**Job 42 6b**
HT וְנִחַמְתִּי עַל־עָפָר וָאֵפֶר׃
LXX ἥγημαι δὲ ἐμαυτὸν γῆν καὶ σποδόν.

# αʹ καὶ παρεκλήθην ἐπὶ χοΐ καὶ σποδῷ

*Wit1:* 248

**Job 42 7b**
HT חָרָה אַפִּי בְךָ וּבִשְׁנֵי רֵעֶיךָ
LXX Ἥμαρτες σὺ καὶ οἱ δύο φίλοι σου·

# σʹ ὠργίσθη ἡ θυμός μου σοὶ καὶ τοῖς δυσὶν ἑταίροις σου

*Wit1:* 248

# θʹ ἐθυμώθη ἡ ὀργή μου ἐν σοὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς δυσὶ φίλοις σου

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-[680]\ 732}$ *cII*$^{-[555]}$ 161

*Attr:* θʹ *C* (= 788) *cI*$^{-138\ [680]\ 732}$ *cII*$^{-[555]}$ 161] σʹ 138; > *C* (= 250 3005)

*Var:* ἡ] > 137 139 260 395 643 3006 | ἐν] επι 138 | δυσί] δυσιν 612; > 740

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first *C* ms to preserve the attribution to Th. In 139 the complete fragment cannot be seen due to a crease at the edge of the folio (255v; *Kollationen*, 290). The μου appears as μ[ at the end of the first line. The τοῖς is clearly seen at the end of the second line, and φι[ appears below τοῖς. Unless δυσί was written after τοῖς, there may not be space for it, but this conclusion remains speculative. The definite article was omitted due to haplography of the η of the verb termination.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 385-6; *AGK* 3, 382-3; Nic, 601).

**Job 42 7c**

HT —(כִּי לֹא דִבַּרְתֶּם אֵלַי נְכוֹנָה)

LXX (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε ἐνώπιόν μου ἀληθὲς) οὐδὲν

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh[txt]

*Wit2:* οὐδέν] > Iul

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ÷ ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ. ↘

HT נְכוֹנָה (כִּי לֹא דִבַּרְתֶּם אֵלַי)

LXX (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε ἐνώπιόν μου) ἀληθὲς (οὐδὲν)

# θʹ εὐθύτητα

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 ↓*cII*–[555] ↓161

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* εὐθύτητα] pr οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε *cII*–[555] 161

*Notes*: The words οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε, which precede εὐθύτητα only in *cII* 161 and which were read as the text of all the catena in Field and Ziegler, are taken from the LXX by *cII* only for the purpose of clarifying the position of the relevant word in the phrase. They have no place in an edition of the minor translator (*Nachlese*, 411).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 385-6; *AGK* 3, 382-3; Nic, 601).

# σʹ ὀρθῶς

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–139 260 [680] 732 *cII*–[555] ↓161

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ὀρθῶς] ορθωσιν 161

*Notes*: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 385-6; *AGK* 3, 382-3; Nic, 601).

**Job 42 8a**
HT (וְעַתָּה קְחוּ־)לָכֶם (שִׁבְעָה־פָרִים וְשִׁבְעָה אֵילִים)
LXX (νῦν δὲ λάβετε)–(ἑπτὰ μόσχους καὶ ἑπτὰ κριοὺς)

# σ′ θ′ ※ ἑαυτοῖς

*Wit1:* Syh La

*Wit2:* λάβετε] + εαυτοις Iul = M; + (※ La) *vobis* La Co

*Attr:* σ′ θ′] > La

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܬ. ※ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܟܘܢ ܀
La ※ *vobis*

*Notes*: The *Edition* presents the fragment as from Aq and Th erroneously, since Syh preserves the attributions for Sym and Th.

**Job 42 8c**
HT וְהַעֲלִיתֶם עוֹלָה (בַּעַדְכֶם)
LXX (καὶ) ποιήσει καρπώσεις (περὶ ὑμῶν·)

# α′ ἀναβιβάσετε ὁλοκαύτωσιν

*Wit1:* ↓248

*Var:* ὁλοκαύτωσιν] ὁλοκαυτώματα 248

*Notes*: Aq uses ἀναβιβάζειν for עלה Hi (Reider, 16). Although Aq uses both ὁλοκαύτωμα and ὁλοκαύτωσις for עלה (Reider, 171), probably the catena has preserved the correct direct object for both Aq and Th (see *infra*), since the form is singular, which agrees with HT.

HT (וְהַעֲלִיתֶם) עוֹלָה (בַּעַדְכֶם)
LXX (καὶ ποιήσει) καρπώσεις (περὶ ὑμῶν·)

# α′ θ′ ὁλοκαύτωσιν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 395 643 [680] 732 3006 *cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* α′ θ′] α′ 161

*Var:* ὁλοκαύτωσιν] ολοκαυτωματα 555

*Notes*: Ms 161 has confused the attributions by only preserving the attribution to Aq here and then assigning ἀναφοράν to Th (see *infra*). The variant in 555 agrees with 248, and therefore suggests that 248 had contact with *cII* (see *supra*).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 386; *AGK* 3, 384-5; Nic, 602).

# σ′ ἀναφοράν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 395 643 [680] 732 3006 *cII* 555 ↓161

*Attr:* σ′] θ′ 161; *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: Klostermann had access to 161, and, therefore, he incorrectly attributed this fragment to Th. Ziegler has shown that Sym always renders עוֹלָה with ἀναφορά (*Beiträge*, 49; Klostermann, 74).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 386; *AGK* 3, 384-5; Nic, 602).

**Job 42 8e**
HT כִּי אִם־פָּנָיו אֶשָּׂא
E ὅτι εἰ μὴ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ λήμψομαι·

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788) *cI*–138 260 559 [680] 3006 Arm Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θ′ 788 740 255 612 395(**8d**) 137 643 139] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 8e sub ※ 788 740 255 612 395(**8d**) 3006(**8f**) 137 643 732 139 Arm Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ※ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܢ ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܠܐ
※ ܢܣܒ ܐܢܐ. ↘

Arm ※ Զի եթե ոչ նմա ակն առեալ էր

# σʹ πρόσωπον γὰρ αὐτοῦ παραδέξομαι

*Wit1:* lemma] *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\,[680]\,732}$ | παραδέξομαι] ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 788-250 3005) 139] λʹ 161; οἱ ἄλλοι *cII* 555; > *cI*$^{-139}$

*Var:* πρόσωπον] > 139 643 3006 | γάρ *C* (= 788-250 3005)] > rel | αὐτοῦ] > 137 139 643 3006 | παραδέξομαι] -ξωμαι 137 139 643 161

*Notes*: Ms 3005 supports the attribution which was only known from 250 (*Nachlese*, 411). Ms 788 also supports the attribution to Sym. Regarding the internal evidence for the attribution to Sym, the comments of Ziegler are also worth noting. One must mistrust the attribution οἱ ἄλλοι, since Aq normally translates נשׂא with αἴρειν (*Beiträge*, 64).

The Hagedorns draw attention to this fragment because the text history illustrates well how in the course of time more and more information is lost from the catena. In the transfer from *C* to *cI*, the author attribution and the conjunction γάρ were already lost. Later the αὐτοῦ disappeared first and in a later stage πρόσωπον also (*Nachlese*, 411). The Hagedorns' comment regarding the remnant of the fragment in the Nicetas catena may now be updated moderately based on the evidence of 161 (*Nachlese*, 411). The evidence of 161 appears in the catena (not the bible text) with the index at 8e as follows: οἱ λοιποὶ· παραδέξωμαι. It appears, therefore, that this remnant was part of the catena with the hexaplaric attribution to the λοιποί before it was taken from the catena and placed into the lemma with the attribution οἱ ἄλλοι.

The Hagedorns are correct that this fragment has no relevance for Olympiodorus, since there is no evidence for it in *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only in Nic (*Nachlese*, 410; *Kommentar*, 386; *AGK* 3, 384-5; Nic, 602).

**Job 42 8g**

HT (כִּי לֹא דִבַּרְתֶּם) אֵלַי (נְכוֹנָה כְּעַבְדִּי אִיּוֹב׃)

LXX (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε)—(ἀληθὲς κατὰ τοῦ θεράποντός μου Ἰώβ.)

# αʹ θʹ πρός με

*Wit1:* Syh

*Wit2:* ἐλαλήσατε] + προς με La (※ *ad me*) *lI*-Iul = M

*NonGr*: Syh ܐ.ܬ. ܠܘܬܝ܀

## σʹ ἐπ’ ἐμοῦ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*−395 [680] 732 Syh

*Attr:* σʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* lemma] εμοι 740

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܩܕܡܝ܀

*Notes*: There is no variant in Syh since Job 38:12 shows that ܩܕܡܝܟ renders ἐπὶ σοῦ (Field, 80 n. 16).

HT (כִּי לֹא דִבַּרְתֶּם אֵלַי נְכוֹנָה) כְּעַבְדִּי אִיּוֹב׃
LXX (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε ἀληθὲς) κατὰ τοῦ θεράποντός μου ’Ιώβ.

## αʹ ὡς ὁ δοῦλός μου ’Ιώβ

*Wit1:* 248

HT (כִּי לֹא דִבַּרְתֶּם אֵלַי נְכוֹנָה) כְּעַבְדִּי (אִיּוֹב׃)
LXX (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε ἀληθὲς) κατὰ τοῦ θεράποντός μου (’Ιώβ.)

## θʹ καθὼς ὁ δοῦλός μου

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*−[680] 732

*Var:* καθώς] καθος 255 612

**Job 42 9a**
HT (וַיֵּלְכוּ אֱלִיפַז הַתֵּימָנִי וּבִלְדַּד) הַשּׁוּחִי (צֹפַר הַנַּעֲמָתִי)
LXX (ἐπορεύθη δὲ ’Ελιφὰς ὁ Θαιμανίτης καὶ Βαλδὰδ) ὁ Σαυχίτης (καὶ Σωφὰρ ὁ Μιναῖος)

## σʹ ὁ Σωΐ́

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{–138\ 139\ [612]\ [680]\ 732}$

*Var:* lemma] ο εωιτης 260

# θ′ ὁ Σωΐτης

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{–[612]\ [680]\ 732}$

*Attr:* θ′] σ′ 138

HT (וַיֵּלְכוּ אֱלִיפַז הַתֵּימָנִי וּבִלְדַּד הַשּׁוּחִי צֹפַר) הַנַּעֲמָתִי
LXX (ἐπορεύθη δὲ Ἐλιφὰς ὁ Θαιμανίτης καὶ Βαλδὰδ ὁ Σαυχίτης καὶ Σωφὰρ ὁ) Μιναῖος

# σ′ Ναμαθίτης

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{–260\ [612]\ [680]\ 732}$

*Attr:* σ′] θ′ 137; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* lemma] -θήτης 559 3006

*Notes*: The spellings *Naamathites*: *movens mortem* and *Naamathi*: *decor*, appear in the *Onomastica Sacra* (de Lagarde, 59).

# θ′ Νωμαθίτης

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{–139\ 260\ [612]\ [680]\ 732}$

*Attr:* θ′] σ′ 137

*Var:* lemma] -θήτης *C* (= 788) 559 3006; Νομαθιτης 395

**Job 42 9c**
HT וַיִּשָּׂא יְהוָה אֶת־פְּנֵי אִיּוֹב׃
LXX καὶ ἔλυσεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῖς διὰ Ἰώβ.

# σ′ καὶ προσήκατο ὁ θεὸς τὸ πρόσωπον Ἰώβ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓$cI^{–139\ [612]\ [680]\ 732}$ *cII* 555 161

*Var:* προσήκατο] προσικατο 138

*Notes*: Sym translates נשׂא פנים with προσίημι here and in Ps 81(82):2, and he uses the verb in Jer 6:10 for חפץ. This verb is not found in the LXX; therefore, Schenker, cited in Ziegler, has designated it “an exclusive Symmachian word” (*Beiträge*, 49-50).

**Job 42 10abα**

HT וַיהוָה שָׁב אֶת־שְׁבִית (Q שְׁבוּת) אִיּוֹב בְּהִתְפַּלְלוֹ בְּעַד רֵעֵהוּ

LXX ὁ δὲ κύριος ηὔξησεν τὸν Ἰώβ· εὐξαμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν φίλων

## σ′ καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐπέστρεψεν τὴν ἀποστροφὴν τοῦ Ἰὼβ ἐν τῷ προσεύξασθαι αὐτὸν περὶ τῶν ἑταίρων αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܗ. ܘܡܪܝܐ ܐܗܦܟ
ܠܡܬܗܦܟܢܘܬܗ
ܕܐܝܘܒ. ܟܕ ܨܠܝ
ܡܛܠ ܚܒܪܐ ܕܝܠܗ.

*Notes*: The question of authorship of these fragments is problematic for two reasons: (1) Syh contains two fragments, both attributed to Sym, which is an error. (2) The best witnesses of the catena do not attribute 10bα to Sym but only to Aq and Th (see *infra*). The best way forward separates the authors of the catena fragment from the Syh fragments, since it is improbable that Aq is the author of the first or second fragments in Syh, for he uses αἰχμαλωσία to render שׁבית/שׁבות (Reider, 8; see esp. Jer 37[30]:16), and this word is the retroversion of Syh ܫܒܝܬܐ, not ܡܬܗܦܟܢܘܬܐ (e.g. Syh Am 1:6, 9).

Although the catena does not support Sym as the author of the infinitive clause, the Greek fragment still controls the wording of the Sym fragment. The Syriac temporal construction of the first fragment is used in the second also; therefore, the same retroversion is required for both. Sym, then, has used ἐν τῷ + the inf to render ב + inf construct, a strategy he does not employ in the Pentateuch but that he uses in the Psalter occasionally (Salvesen, 229; Busto Saiz, 244ff).

## ⟨θ′⟩ κύριος ἐπεστράφη πρὸς μετάνοιαν τὴν

# διὰ τοῦ Ἰὼβ ἐν τῷ προσεύξασθαι αὐτὸν περὶ τῶν ἑταίρων αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* Syh

*Attr:* ⟨θʹ⟩] σʹ cod

*NonGr*: Syh

ܗ. ܡܪܝܐ ܐܬܦܢܝ
ܠܘܬ ܡܬܬܘܣܦܢܘܬܐ
ܗܘ̣ ܕܒܥܐ ܐܝܘܒ.
ܟܕ ܨ̱ܠܝ ܡܛܠ
ܚܒܪ̈ܐ ܕܝܠܗ ❖

*Notes*: This fragment is attributed to Th on the basis of the catena tradition and the fact Aq probably did not author it (see *supra*).

HT (וַיהוָה שָׁב אֶת־שְׁבִית (Q שְׁבוּת) אִיּוֹב)
בְּהִתְפַּלְלוֹ (בְּעַד רֵעֵהוּ)
LXX (ὁ δὲ κύριος ηὔξησεν τὸν Ἰώβ·)
εὐξαμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ (καὶ περὶ τῶν φίλων)

# αʹ θʹ ἐν τῷ προσεύξασθαι αὐτὸν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 [612] [680] 732

*Attr:* αʹ θʹ *C* (= 788 3005) 138-255 559 740] σʹ 395; αʹ *C* (= 250); σʹ θʹ 137 260 643 3006

*Notes*: The *Edition* chose σʹ θʹ as the original attribution, but the best witnesses have the correct αʹ θʹ. Furthermore, 788 shows that its *Vorlage* had the double attribution to Aq and Th, and therefore, the single attribution to Aq in 250 arose from miscopying.

**Job 42 10c**
HT (וַיֹּסֶף יְהוָה)—(אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר לְאִיּוֹב לְמִשְׁנֶה׃)
LXX (ἔδωκεν δὲ ὁ κύριος) διπλᾶ (ὅσα ἦν ἔμπροσθεν Ἰὼβ εἰς διπλασιασμόν.)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh[txt]

*NonGr*:  Syh[txt]  ÷ ܒܥܐܦܐ ↘

HT  (וַיֹּסֶף יְהוָה)—(אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר לְאִיּוֹב לְמִשְׁנֶה׃)
LXX  (ἔδωκεν δὲ ὁ κύριος) διπλᾶ (ὅσα ἦν ἔμπροσθεν Ἰὼβ εἰς διπλασιασμόν.)

# ⟨?⟩  προσθήκην

*Wit1:*  248

*Notes*:  The index is over διπλᾶ in the ms. The word προσθήκη does not occur in the LXX. Aq uses προσθήκη in Prov 1:9 for לִוְיַת "wreath" (Field = Nobil = 248). Sym uses this word in Ezek 27:33 to render עִזָּבוֹן "merchandise." Although there is not a corresponding word in HT, it is probable that 248 has preserved a hexaplaric fragment for διπλᾶ.

**Job 42 10c**

HT  (וַיֹּסֶף יְהוָה אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר לְאִיּוֹב) לְמִשְׁנֶה׃
E  (ἔδωκεν δὲ ὁ κύριος διπλᾶ ὅσα ἦν ἔμπροσθεν Ἰὼβ) εἰς διπλασιασμόν.

# σʹ θʹ  Sub ※

*Wit1:*  *C* (= 788) ↓248

*Wit2:*  lemma] > La

*Attr:*  σʹ θʹ] > 248

*Notes*:  The *Edition* places these words under the asterisk *sine nomine* in 255 and 248. Ziegler has incorrectly listed 255 as evidence for the asterisk, since the scribe of this ms used decorative asterisks to bracket the last line of a κεφαλαιον (255, 176v, 177v, 179r, 179v et al.). In 248, there is a clear asterisk at the beginning of the line at ὅσα, and there may be a faint asterisk before εἰς in the same line. Ms 788 confirms that there is an asterisk before εἰς, and these words are hexaplaric, taken from Sym and Th, and therefore are not part of the OG as Ziegler proposed. Syh has an obelus before διπλᾶ, indicating that the Hexapla considered this word to be absent from the Hebrew but present in the OG; therefore, the hexaplaric fragment, εἰς διπλασιασμόν, has corrupted the transmission of the Greek text. The omission of the words in La suggests that they were not part of the hexaplaric version but, in this case, La may actually attest the OG and not the hexaplaric version of Origen.

# α′ εἰς δευτέρωσιν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005)

*Attr:* α′ *C* (= 788)] > *C* (= 250 3005); ⟨α′⟩ *Edition*

*Notes*: Ms 788 is the first manuscript to attest the attribution to Aq for this fragment. The fragment was previously *sine nomine* in the *C* mss (*Nachlese*, 411). The *Edition* originally posited an attribution to Aq, but the *Beiträge* posited that perhaps Sym should be accepted as the translator on the basis of 2 Suppl 34:22, where Sym renders בַּמִּשְׁנֶה with ἐν τῇ δευτερώσει (*Beiträge*, 50). It also suggested the possibility of attribution to Aq, given that he renders the root שׁנה with δεύτερος, δευτεροῦν, and δευτέρωσις (for שְׁנִינָה in Deut 28:37; *Beiträge*, 50; Reider, 52).

**Job 42 11bc**
HT —
LXX πάντα τὰ συμβεβηκότα αὐτῷ
καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ÷ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܓܕ̈ܫ ܠܗ ܘܐܬܘ ܠܘܬܗ. ↘

*Notes*: These lines are not present in the HT, and probably they should have been included under the obelus in the *Edition* and Field.

**Job 42 11d**
HT (וְכָל־יֹדְעָיו) לְפָנִים
LXX (καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ᾔδεισαν αὐτὸν) ἐκ πρώτου·

# α′ εἰς πρόσωπον

*Wit1:* 248

# σ′ πρίν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{-139\ 260\ 559\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250)

# θʹ ἔμπροσθεν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 139 260 559 643 732 3006

*Attr:* θʹ] > *C* (= 250)

*Notes*: Th uses ἔμπροσθεν for לִפְנֵי only one other time (cf. Job 21:33; Gentry, 350).

**Job 42 11e**
HT (וַיֹּאכְלוּ)—(עִמּוֹ לֶחֶם בְּבֵיתוֹ וַיָּנֻדוּ לוֹ)
LXX (φαγόντες δὲ) καὶ πιόντες (παρ’ αὐτῷ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτόν,)

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* Syh[txt]

*NonGr*: Syh[txt] ÷ ܘܐܒܝܘܗ ↘

HT (וַיֹּאכְלוּ עִמּוֹ לֶחֶם בְּבֵיתוֹ) וַיָּנֻדוּ (לוֹ) וַיְנַחֲמוּ (אֹתוֹ)
LXX (φαγόντες δὲ καὶ πιόντες παρ’ αὐτῷ) παρεκάλεσαν (αὐτόν,)

# σʹ παρεμυθήσαντο

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 559 643 732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ *C* (= 788 3005)] > *C* (= 250) *cI*–139 260 559 643 732 3006

*Notes*: The *Edition* assigned the fragment to Sym in the absence of external evidence, but ms 3005 confirmed this conjecture (*Kollationen*, 295). Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym is part of the oldest Greek catena. Ms 3005 has the index over παρεκάλεσαν, which is what Sym revised. In actuality, the OG has translated two Hebrew verbs for “show sympathy” (נוד) and “to comfort” (נחם) with one verb. Sym usually translates נחם with παραμυθεῖν or παρηγορεῖν, while Aq uses παρακαλεῖν (*Beiträge*, 13). The internal evidence combined with the attribution in 788 and 3005 makes Sym the probable author of this fragment.

**Job 42 11f**
HT (וַיְנַחֲמוּ אֹתוֹ) עַל כָּל־הָרָעָה (אֲשֶׁר־הֵבִיא יְהוָה עָלָיו)
LXX (καὶ ἐθαύμασαν) ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, (οἷς ἐπήγαγεν αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος·)

## ⟨α′ θ′⟩ περὶ πάσης τῆς κακίας

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–139 260 559 643 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* ⟨α′ θ′⟩] σ′ θ′ *C* (= 788); α′ *C* (= 3005); σ′ 138-255 612 680 740 *cII* 555 161; > *C* (= 250) 137 395

*Var:* περί] ἐπί *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: Ms 788 has updated the evidence for this fragment, since now there is an attribution to Th in the oldest Greek catena. From the external evidence, it appears that the original attribution was to Aq and Th. Ms 788 attests an original double attribution and also the early intrusion of the attribution to Sym in place of Aq, which became the only attribution preserved in the catena. Ms 3005 preserves the attribution to Aq, but its *Vorlage* had already lost the attribution to Th. Also, its text was already corrupted by the LXX, since it has ἐπί instead of περί.

The internal evidence confirms this conclusion. The translation of the noun רעה with κακία is important. Aq is careful to distinguish the adjective רַע (= κακός) from the noun רָעָה (= κακία; Reider, 123). In Job, Th translates רעה with κακία one time and רע with κακία one time. He also translates רע with πονηρός one time. There are no examples of κακός for רע in Th Job (Gentry, 137). Th translates על with περί three times in Job (Gentry, 347). There are no other instances of περί for על in Aq at present (Hyvärinen, 50-1).

There are now two fragments for this verse. This fragment is attributed to Aq and Th, and the one below is best attributed to Sym on the evidence of 248 and translation equivalents.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 390; *AGK* 3, 394-5; Nic, 606).

## σ′ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς κακοῖς

*Wit1:* 248

*Wit2:* ἐπὶ πᾶσιν] + τοις κακοις (αγαθοις Iul) *L′*–A 575 = M; *in omnibus malis* La: cf M

*Notes*: In 248, the marginal note σ′ τοῖς κακοῖς is placed above πᾶσιν of the bible text and is intended to be read as an addition, as one observes from La and the Lucianic text group in *Wit2*.

Sym renders the noun רָעָה with the Greek adjective κακός very consistently in the Psalter (20(21):12, 40(41):8, 89(90):15, 90(91):10 [contrast with Aq who has κακία], and 106(107):39; Busto Saiz, 529), and only once is Sym listed as using κακία (140(141):5),

but in this place there is evidence that Sym may have had κακῶν instead of κακιῶν (Field, 297 n. 13). H-R lists several instances of Sym's use of κακία, and it is worth listing the evidence in full. Job 17:5 is erroneous and should be dismissed from the evidence, since the lemma is κακοῖς (from κακός not κακία) for רֵעִים (Woods, 320). Prov 26:26 is based on Nobil, and is therefore set aside until confirmed. I Rgns 24:10, Prov 6:18, 11:19, and Zach 8:17 have attributions to the Three not specifically Sym. In Isa 57:1, Sym is coupled with Th. Sym uses κακία for רָעָה in four instances in Jeremiah (9:3(2) 2x, 17:16, and 28(51):24), but nowhere else does he employ this translation equivalent.

Before the evidence of 3005 and 788 became available, Ziegler concluded that *C′* passed down the correct Sym version, while 248 attested to the Lucianic recension (*Beiträge*, 50). This conclusion is no longer tenable for two reasons: (1) 3005 and 788 have introduced a hexaplaric fragment attributed to Aq and Th, which do not conflict with the fragment in 248. (2) The Lucianic recension used a hexaplaric base text, to which La attests. Ms 248 provides an attribution to Sym as the hexaplaric source in this instance. One cannot dismiss a hexaplaric fragment on the basis of its relationship to the Lucianic text group but, rather, this relationship is probably the reason it should be considered genuinely hexaplaric.[14]

**Job 42 11g**

HT (וַיִּתְּנוּ־לוֹ אִישׁ) קְשִׂיטָה אֶחָת (וְאִישׁ נֶזֶם זָהָב אֶחָד׃)

LXX (ἔδωκεν δὲ αὐτῷ ἕκαστος) ἀμνάδα μίαν (καὶ τετράδραχμον χρυσοῦν ἄσημον.)

## ⟨σ′⟩ νόμισμα ἕν

*Wit1:* ↓*C*$^{cat}$ (= 249 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{cat}$ ↓754$^{cat}$ ↓474$^{cat}$ ↓258$^{cat}$ ↓3007$^{cat}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161′

*Attr:* ⟨σ′⟩] ἕτερος τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν *C*$^{cat}$ (= 249 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{cat}$ 754$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 258$^{cat}$ 3007$^{cat}$ *cII* 555; > 161′

*Notes*: Although there is no direct evidence for Sym as the author of this fragment, there are two reasons for assigning this fragment to Sym: (1) Sym is the only one of the Three to use the term νόμισμα (Num 3:47; Burris, 124). (2) Ursula and Dieter Hagedorn make the case that νόμισμα ἕν must have been written in place of ἀμνάδα μίαν by a minor translator. After the identification of the hexaplaric marginal notes, the catena has Aq Th ἐνώτιον in place of τετράδραχμον and Sym ἐπιρρίνιον (see *infra*).

[14]For a recent treatment of the Lucianic recension of Job and Lucian's use of a hexaplaric base text, see Claude Cox, "The Nature of Lucian's Revision of the Text of Greek Job," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta (Leiden: Brill: 2008), 423-42.

From the information of ms 248 we may infer that Sym is the sought after translator, although the name (*pace* Ziegler) is not mentioned there. The line in 248 reads: ὃς μὲν νόμισμα ἕν, δὲ πυρίνιον (read ἐπιρρίνιον) ἓν χρυσοῦν (*AGK* 3, 398). The Hagedorns have interpreted the evidence correctly. The catena preserves the second fragment with an attribution to Sym (ἐπιρρίνιον ἓν χρυσοῦν), and 248 preserves the same fragment (incorrectly) and the version for ἀμνάδα μίαν; therefore, 248 preserves the first Sym fragment as well and, on this basis, one can attribute the fragment to him tentatively.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is confirmed, since it is confirmed by *AGK* (*AGK* 3, 398; Nic, 607).

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | (וַיִּתְּנוּ־לוֹ אִישׁ קְשִׂיטָה אֶחָת וְאִישׁ) נֶזֶם זָהָב אֶחָד׃ |
| LXX | (ἔδωκεν δὲ αὐτῷ ἕκαστος ἀμνάδα μίαν καὶ) τετράδραχμον χρυσοῦν ἄσημον. |

## α′ θ′ ἐνώτιον χρυσοῦν ἕν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 680\ 3006}$ *cII* 555 ↓248

*Attr:* α′ θ′] α′ 248; > *C* (= 250)

*Var:* ἐνώτιον] ενωπιον 255; ενοτιον 138 | χρυσοῦν] χρυσον *C* (= 250) | ἕν 248] > rel

*Notes*: Ms 248 preserves the full lemma, which corresponds to HT. The catena preserves the correct double attribution. It is very difficult to determine the reading of 250, but it should be read according to Ziegler (*Kollationen*, 297). The word in the ms is χρυσο, and there is no space for χρυσοῦν since the divider is clearly seen after the omicron and the ligature for -ουν is not visible below the word. Ms 788, the ancestor of 250, preserves χρυσοῦν clearly and it has the double attribution. Ms 788 is the first member of the *C* group to attest the double attribution.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 390; *AGK* 3, 398; Nic, 607).

## σ′ ἐπίρρινιον ἕν χρυσοῦν

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓248

*Attr:* σ′] > *C* (= 250) 248

*Var:* ἐπιρρίνιον *C* (= 788-250)] επιρρινον 138; επιρινον *cI*$^{-137\ 138\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ *cII* 555; πυρινιον 248 | ἕν χρυσοῦν] > *C* (= 788-250) *cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 680\ 732\ 3006}$ *cII* 555

*Notes*: Ms 248 preserves the full lemma, which corresponds to HT. Ms 788-250 preserves the correct spelling of ἐπίρρινιον for two reasons: (1) the ending of the incorrect πυρινιον in 248 suggests it, and (2) most important is the unique σʹ ἐπιρρίνιον in Ezek 16:12, where LXX Aq Th have ἐνώτιον for נֶזֶם (*Beiträge*, 50). Ms 788 confirms the attribution and the orthography.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 390; *AGK* 3, 398; Nic, 607).

**Job 42 12a**

HT (וַיהוָה בֵּרַךְ אֶת־אַחֲרִית אִיּוֹב) מֵרֵאשִׁתוֹ

LXX (ὁ δὲ κύριος εὐλόγησεν τὰ ἔσχατα Ἰὼβ) ἢ (τὰ ἔμπροσθεν·)

# σʹ θʹ ὑπέρ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-137\ 139\ 260\ 643\ 732\ 3006}$ ↓Syh

*Attr:* σʹ θʹ] αʹ σʹ 395 680; > *C* (= 250) 138 Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܐܘ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ
ܝܬܝܪ ܡܢ.

*Notes*: The scholion in Syh is *sine nomine*, but the catena tradition provides its source.

**Job 42 14a**

HT (וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם־הָאַחַת) יְמִימָה

LXX (καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὴν μὲν πρώτην) Ἡμέραν,

# αʹ Ἰ̈εμιμα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260}$ ↓248 ↓252 Syh

*Attr:* αʹ] αʹ σʹ 248 252 732; > 612$^{inc}$

*Var:* Ἰ̈εμιμα *C* (= 788-250 3005) 248] υεμημα 137 138 139 255 395 559 612 643 680 740 3006; υεμηνα 732; > 252

*NonGr*: Syh .ܐ. ܝܡܝܡܐ ❖
Syh$^{txt}$ ܐܝܡܝܡܐ

*Notes*: The spelling of the name in 248 is confirmed by *C* (= 788-250 3005). Ms 252 has the double attribution like 248 but no text after it (*Kollationen*, 297). The attribution in 612 appears to be in a breach or gap in the manuscript (*Kollationen*, 297). According to Field, Syh was accustomed to imitate the Pesh with respect to proper names (Field, 81). The reading in the margin, attributed to Aq, agrees with the text of the OG, while the reading in the text is closer to what Aq has according to the catena.

# σʹ ‘Ϋμιμα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260\ 680}$

*Attr:* σʹ] αʹ σʹ 732

*Var:* ‘Ϋμιμα *C* (= 788-250 3005) 559] υμημα 137 138 139 255 395 612 643 740; υμηνα 732; συμημα 3006

*Notes*: Ms 788 confirms that the oldest Greek catena had ‘Ϋμιμα, which agrees with HT.

**Job 42 14b**
HT (וְשֵׁם הַשֵּׁנִית) קְצִיעָה
LXX (τὴν δὲ δευτέραν) Κασίαν,

# σʹ Κισίαν

*Wit1:* 248 252

**Job 42 14c**
HT (וְשֵׁם הַשְּׁלִישִׁית) קֶרֶן הַפּוּךְ׃
LXX (τὴν δὲ τρίτην) Ἀμαλθείας Κέρας·

# αʹ σʹ Καρναφφούκ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 406 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*$^{-260}$ ↓248 ↓252 ↓Syh

*Attr:* αʹ σʹ] αʹ 252; σʹ Syh; > *C* (= 250 406) 559 248

*Var:* Καρναφφούκ *conj.*] Καρναβουθ *C* (= 3005); Καρναφφουθ *C* (= 788-250) 395 612 740; Καρναφιφουθ 559; Καρναφ’φουθ 138-255; Καρναφουα 248 252; Καρναφουθ *C* (= 406) 137 139 643 680 732 3006; Ναφουκ Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ܣ. ܢܦܘܟ❖
Syh^txt ܩܪܢܦܘܟ

*Notes*: The reading in 740 is on two lines as follows: α′ Καρναφ σ′ Φουθ (*Kollationen*, 297). Ms 612 preserves the correct attribution but, like 740 its reading is also on two lines. Given the number of variants, no witness has the correct spelling of the proper name *pace* Ziegler, who read 248 as Καρναφουκ incorrectly, and Field, who depended on Drusius and Nobilius (Morinus, see chapter 2), who have Schol. Καρναφουκ; Field, 81 n. 33). By conjecture the name can be reconstructed according to the sources in comparison with the HT. The dagesh forte in the פּ is represented by the double φ (as 788-250 and the best mss of *cI*) and Syh provides the correct ending of the word.

**Job 42 16a**
HT (וַיְחִי אִיּוֹב אַחֲרֵי־זֹאת מֵאָה) וְאַרְבָּעִים (שָׁנָה)
LXX (ἔζησεν δὲ Ἰὼβ μετὰ τὴν πληγὴν ἔτη ἑκατὸν) ἑβδομήκοντα,

# α′ τεσσαράκοντα

*Wit1:* 248

**Job 42 16b**
HT —
LXX τὰ δὲ πάντα ἔζησεν ἔτη διακόσια τεσσαράκοντα ὀκτώ·

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*^–138 139 260 395 680 3006 La Syh^txt

*Attr:* οὐ κεῖται παρὰ (πε() 250) τοῖς λοιποῖς(λοιπ] 643) 3005 788 250 740 255 612 559 395 137 643

*Var:* 16b sub ÷ 3005 788-250 740 612 732(※ pro ÷) La Syh^txt

*NonGr*: Syh^txt ÷ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܫ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܚܝܐ ܡܐܬܝܢ
÷ ܘܐܪܒܥܝܢ ܘܬܡܢܐ. ↘
La *et* (pr ÷ β) *omnes anni vitae eius fuerunt CCXLVIII.*

*Notes*: There is a stain over the beginning of this scholion in 788. Therefore, one cannot determine the initial part of the reading. There is no visible οὐ or obelus, but 250 preserves both of these elements, so it is probable that 788 had them also.

**Job 42 16cd-17**

HT וַיַּרְא (Q וַיִּרְאֶה) אֶת־בָּנָיו
וְאֶת־בְּנֵי בָנָיו אַרְבָּעָה דֹּרוֹת׃
וַיָּמָת אִיּוֹב זָקֵן וּשְׂבַע יָמִים׃

E καὶ εἶδεν Ἰὼβ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ
καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ τετάρτην γενεάν·
καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰὼβ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πλήρης ἡμερῶν.

# θ′ Sub ※

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) $cI^{-138\ 139\ 260\ [612]\ 643\ 680\ 732}$ 252 La Sa Syh$^{txt}$

*Attr:* θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ γ̅ 740 255 395 137) Syh$^{txt}$] > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 16cd-17 sub ※ 3005(non **17**) 788 740 255 559 137 3006(non **17**) 643(※ **16b** pro **16c**) 732(non **16c 17**) 252(non **17**) La(non **17**) Syh$^{txt}$

*NonGr*: Syh$^{txt}$ ܬ ※ ܘܚܙܐ ܐܝܘܒ ܠܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
※ ܘܠܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܘܗܝ ܕܪܐ ܐܪܒܥܝܐ.
※ ܘܫܠܡ ܐܝܘܒ ܡܫܝܢܐ ܘܣܒܥ ܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ. ↘

La *et* (pr ※ μ) *vidit Iob filios suos*
※ *et filios filiorum suorum quarta generatione* (+ ↙ β)

*Notes*: In 643, the asterisk for 16c is at 16b.

**Job 42 17**

HT (וַיָּמָת אִיּוֹב זָקֵן) וּשְׂבַע (יָמִים׃)

E (καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰὼβ πρεσβύτερος καὶ) πλήρης (ἡμερῶν.)

# ⟨?⟩ ἐμπεπλησμένος

*Wit1:* 248

*Notes*: Although the fragment is *sine nomine*, it corresponds to HT and both Aq and Sym use ἐμπιπλᾶν to render שׂבע Qal (Reider, 79; Bust Saiz, 503; cf. Isa 1:11). It is, therefore, probably hexaplaric.

**Job 42 fin**

HT —(וַיָּמָת אִיּוֹב זָקֵן וּשְׂבַע יָמִים׃)

E (καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰὼβ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πλήρης ἡμερῶν.)—

# τοῦτο τὸ τέλος τοῦ Ἑβραϊκοῦ

*Wit1:* 248 252

*Var:* τό] > 248

*Notes*: This scholion appears here in 248 252.

**Job 42 17a**α γέγραπται**—fin** (βασιλεύς **17e**δ)

HT —

LXX

17a γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι μεθ’ ὧν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν.

17b Οὗτος ἑρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου
ἐν μὲν γῇ κατοικῶν τῇ Αὐσίτιδι ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁρίοις τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ ’Αραβίας,
προϋπῆρχεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὄνομα Ἰωβάβ·

17c λαβὼν δὲ γυναῖκα ’Αράβισσαν γεννᾷ υἱόν, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἐννών, ἦν δὲ αὐτὸς πατρὸς μὲν Ζάρε, τῶν Ἠσαὺ υἱῶν υἱός, μητρὸς δὲ Βοσόρρας,
ὥστε εἶναι αὐτὸν πέμπτον ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ.

17d καὶ οὗτοι οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ βασιλεύσαντες ἐν Ἐδώμ, ἧς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦρξεν χώρας·
πρῶτος Βαλὰκ ὁ τοῦ Βεώρ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ πόλει αὐτοῦ Δεννάβα·
μετὰ δὲ Βαλὰκ Ἰωβὰβ ὁ καλούμενος Ἰώβ·
μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἀσὸμ ὁ ὑπάρχων ἡγεμὼν ἐκ τῆς Θαιμανίτιδος χώρας·
μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἀδὰδ υἱὸς Βαρὰδ ὁ ἐκκόψας Μαδιὰμ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Μωάβ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ πόλει αὐτοῦ Γεθθάιμ.

17e οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες πρὸς αὐτὸν φίλοι·
Ἐλιφὰς τῶν Ἠσαὺ υἱῶν Θαιμανῶν βασιλεύς,
Βαλδὰδ ὁ Σαυχαίων τύραννος,
Σωφὰρ ὁ Μιναίων βασιλεύς.

# Sub ÷

*Wit1:* *O*

*NonGr*: Syh[txt]

÷ ܟܬܝܒ ܕܝܢ ܕܬܘܒ ܢܩܘܡ.
÷ ܥܡ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܡܩܝܡ.

÷ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܦܫܩ.
÷ ܡܢ ܟܬܒܐ ܣܘܪܝܝܐ.
÷ ܒܗ̇ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܥܡܪ ܕܥܘܨ.
÷ ܠܘܬ ܬܚܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܕܘܡ ܘܕܐܪܒܝܐ.
÷ ܩܕܡ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܫܡܐ
÷ ܝܘܒܒ.
÷ ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܢܣܒ ܐܢܬܬܐ ܐܪܒܝܬܐ
÷ ܝܠܕ ܒܪܐ.
÷ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܫܡܗ ܐܢܘܢ.
÷ ܐܒܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܗܘ ܕܐܒܐ
÷ ܡܢ ܙܪܚ.
÷ ܡܢ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܥܣܘ.
÷ ܕܐܡܗ ܕܝܢ ܒܐܨܘܪܐ.
÷ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ.
÷ ܚܡܝܫܝܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܪܗܡ. ↘
ܘܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܟܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܠܟܘ ܒܐܕܘܡ.
ܒܐܬܪܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܦ ܗ̣ܘ ܗܘܐ
ܒܗ ܕܫܠܛ.
÷ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܒܠܩ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܥܘܪ.
÷ ܘܫܡܐ ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܢܗܒܐ.
÷ ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܩ.
÷ ܝܘܒܒ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܬܩܪܐ ܐܝܘܒ.
÷ ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢ ܗܢܐ.
÷ ܚܫܘܡ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗ ܡܢ ܬܝܡܢܐ.
÷ ܡܢ ܐܬܪܐ ܬܝܡܢܝܐ.
÷ ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢ ܗܢܐ ܗܕܕ ܒܪܗ ܕܒܪܕ.
÷ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܩܛܠ ܠܡܕܝܢ ܒܦܠܓܬܐ ܕܡܘܐܒ.
÷ ܘܫܡܐ ܠܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܓܬܝܡ.
÷ ܪ̈ܚܡܘܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܘ ܠܘܬܗ.
÷ ܐܠܝܦܙ.
÷ ܡܢ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܥܣܘ.
÷ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܬܝܡ̈ܢܝܐ.
÷ ܒܠܕܕ.
÷ ܛܘܪܢܐ ܕܫܘ̈ܚܝܐ.
÷ ܨܘܦܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܢܝܬܝܐ.

La ÷ *scriptum est autem resurrecturum eum cum his quos dominus suscitabit.*
*Hic*(pr ÷ μ) *interpretatur de syraico libro,*
*in*(pr ÷ β) *terra quidem habitasse Ausitide*(pr ÷ μ) *in finibus*(pr

÷ β) *Idumaeae et Arabiae,*
*et erat ei antea*(pr ÷ μ) *nomen*(pr ÷ β) *Iobab.*
*et accepit uxorem Arabissam* ↙ *genuitque*(pr ÷ β; (*ge÷nuitque* μ) *filium cui nomen erat Ennon.*
*erat autem*(pr ÷ β) *ipse*(pr ÷ μ) *filius quidem Zare, de Esau*
*filiis filius*(pr ÷ β), *de matre*(pr ÷ μ) *vetro Bosram* ↙
*ita ut sit quintus ab*(pr ÷ β) *Abraham.*
*et*(pr ÷ μ) *hi sunt reges qui regnaverunt in*(pr ÷ β) *Edom, in qua et ipse regnavit*(pr ÷ μ) *regione.*
*prius*(pr ÷ β) *Balaac filius Beor, et*(pr ÷ μ) *nomen civitatis eius*(pr ÷ β) *Dennaba.*
*post Balaac autem Iobab*(pr ÷ μ), *qui vocatur*(pr ÷ β) *Iob.*
*post hunc Asum, qui erat ÷ dux ex Themanorum regione.*
*post hunc Adad*(pr ÷ β) *filius*(pr ÷ μ) *Barad, qui excidit Madian in campo*(pr ÷ β) *Moab* ↙ *et*(pr ÷ μ) *nomen civitatius eius Gethem.*
*qui*(pr ÷ β) *autem venerunt ad eum amici*(pr ÷ μ), *Eliphaz*(pr ÷ β) *ex filiis Esau Themanorum rex,*
÷ *Baldad Saucheorum tyrannus,*
*Sophar*(pr ÷ β) *Minaeorum rex.*

*Notes*: The *O* group supplies sufficient evidence for placing these lines under the obelus. In addition to this evidence there is evidence from the catena (Olymp), a scholion from 248, and a comment by Origen, which indicates that these lines were in the LXX and Th but not in the HT, Aq, and Sym.

The evidence for the comment by Olymp is as follows: *C*$^{cat}$ (= 249 250 3005) *cI*$^{cat-[612]}$ 474$^{cat}$ [505$^{cat}$ 523$^{cat}$] 560$^{cat}$ 3007$^{cat}$ 3008$^{cat}$ *cII* 555 161. The note reads: μέχρι τοῦ *πρεσβύτερος καὶ πλήρης ἡμερῶν* Ἀκύλας καὶ Σύμμαχος ἐλθόντες συνεπέραναν τὸ βιβλίον ὡς δὴ τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ ἀκολουθοῦντες. ὁ δὲ Θεοδοτίων συμπεραίνει (συμπαραινει 560 3008 559 754 258) τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα (Ō 250 740 754 137 3006 643 139) (*AGK* 3, 405). The note in 161, derived from the former note, reads: μέχρι τούτου Ἀκύλας καὶ Σύμμαχος τὸ βιβλίον συνεπέραναν· ἀκολουθοῦντες ἴσως τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ · θεοδοτίων δὲ τοῖς ο′ ἐξηκολούθησεν.

In 248, a scholion reads: ἐντεῦθεν οὐ κεῖται ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ ὡς Ἀκύλας καὶ Σύμμαχος· παρὰ Θεοδοτίων κεῖται.

Concerning the last verse in the Hebrew text in his letter to Africanus Origen says: οὐ κεῖται παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις· διόπερ οὐδὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἀκύλᾳ· παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ Θεοδοτίωνι τὰ ἰσοδυναμοῦντα ἀλλήλοις (Origen, II.6, 528 *La Lettre à Africanus*, de Lange, 1983).

**Job 42 17aα**
HT —

LXX (γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι) μεθ’ ὧν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν.

# θ′ μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὅτι θεὸς ἀναστήσει

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) ↓*cI*–137 139 260 [612] 643 732 3006

*Attr:* θ′ *C* (= 3005)] > *cI*

*Var:* ὅτι] + ΠΙΠΙ 138-255 395 740 | θεὸς / ἀναστήσει] tr 559; + ΠΙΠΙ 559 | ἀναστήσει] αναστισει 255

*Notes*: For the first time, ms 3005 has made clear that these words belong to Th, the only reviser to follow the LXX past the Hebrew *Vorlage* (*Nachlese*, 411). The mark of the Tetragrammaton, which corresponds to κύριος in the LXX, is clearly separated from the Th fragment in 3005, since it is passed down in the line above it. This mark is inside the Th fragment in the *cI* mss but, in 137 and the subsequent mss of the Hagedorns’ stemma, it is found erroneously at 42:17Ba βίβλου and the Th fragment is absent altogether (*Nachlese*, 411). It is clear, then, that ΠΙΠΙ has nothing to do with the Th fragment, but it has been included in the variant line because it is in the *cI* mss.

Previously, Ziegler treated this fragment as an anonymous scholion, even in 3005, but this assessment was incorrect. This new evidence demonstrates it is hexaplaric and therefore should be removed from Ziegler’s chapter on scholia in the *Beiträge* (cf. *Beiträge*, 81).

**Job 42 17eβ**
HT —
LXX Ἐλιφὰς τῶν Ἠσαὺ υἱῶν (Θαιμανῶν βασιλεύς,)

# θ′ υἱὸς Ἰωσαφατ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[137] 139 260 [395] [559] 643 732 3006 *cII* 555 161

*Attr:* θ′] > 138

*Var:* υἱός] υιοι 138

**Job 42 17eγ**
HT —
LXX Βαλδὰδ (ὁ Σαυχαίων τύραννος,)

# θʹ υἱὸς Ἀμμῶν τοῦ Χοβόρ

*Wit1:* ↓*C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[137] 139 260 [395] [559] 643 732 3006 ↓*cII* ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* θʹ] > 138 680

*Var:* Χοβόρ *C* (= 3005) 740 555] Χωβορ 138-255 612 *cII*; Χοβωρ *C* (= 788-250) 161; Χωβωρ 680

**Job 42 17eδ**
HT —
LXX (Σωφὰρ) ὁ Μιναίων (βασιλεύς.)

# θʹ ὁ Ἰ̈εμιναίων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) ↓*cI*–[137] 138 139 260 [395] [559] 643 732 3006

*Attr:* θʹ *C* (= 788 3005)] > rel

*Notes*: This fragment has been uncatalogued until now, since before 3005 became available, it was anonymous (*Nachlese*, 411). Ms 788 supports the attribution to Th. It is observed, however, that Th renders the corresponding word Μιναῖος (הנעמתי) with Νωμαθίτης, where he translates from the Hebrew (Job 2:11e, 42:9a; *Nachlese*, 411). Since there is no HT for this text, perhaps Th varied his approach for factors not yet known. The fragment should be included in an edition of hexaplaric fragments of Job due to the evidence of 3005 and 788.

CHAPTER 4

# FRAGMENTS OF DUBIOUS HEXAPLARIC SIGNIFICANCE

In the course of compiling a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Job 22-42, there were a number of anonymous fragments from various sources which could not be traced back to the Hexapla or any other source with reasonable probability. These readings are listed in this chapter with the anticipation that they might become the object of future study, in order that their relationship to the Hexapla or other sources might be more acutely defined as more critical editions of the Hexapla and translation technique studies of the Three are produced and more about the Lucianic recension is known.

Ziegler's *Beiträge* was the source for the majority of these marginal notes (*Beiträge*, see especially 75-81, 84-87). The following selection includes those fragments to which Ziegler did not assign an attribution, unless there was reason to doubt this attribution. Additional fragments were added from *AGK*, if there was a manuscript which preserved a hexaplaric attribution, and from Ziegler's II App, if these fragments could be shown to be non-hexaplaric. In all cases, the specific manuscript evidence is from *AGK*. Initially Field listed twenty-four instances of Ἄλλος. Of these instances, seven have received hexaplaric attributions in the critical edition,[1] two are associated with the Lucianic recension,[2] one is influenced by Olympiodorus,[3] four are part of the text history

[1]In chapter three, see 22:4, 24:3, 30:8, 30:17, 37:5, 37:20, and 38:40.

[2]24:24 and 31:16 (see *Beiträge*, 91-92).

[3]39:16 (see *Beiträge*, 91).

of LXX Job,[4] three are unconfirmed from later collations of these materials,[5] and seven are *sine nomine* with varying significance.[6] Five of the final seven are reproduced in this chapter with Field's attribution Ἄλλος.

**Job 22 6b**
HT וּבִגְדֵי עֲרוּמִּים תַּפְשִׁיט׃
LXX ἀμφίασιν δὲ γυμνῶν ἀφείλου·

## ⟨?⟩ ἐπιτείνων αὐτοῖς τὴν πενίαν

*Wit1:* *C* (= $257^{cat}$ 3005) *cI*$^{cat}$ (= $740^{mg}$ $255^{mg}$-$138^{mg}$ 612 3006 559 (474) 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139)

**Job 22 12a**
HT (הֲלֹא־) אֱלוֹהַּ (גֹּבַהּ שָׁמָיִם)
LXX (μὴ οὐχὶ ὁ τὰ ὑψηλὰ) ναίων (ἐφορᾷ)

## ⟨?⟩ οἰκῶν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680) 252 Iul Syh

*Wit2:* ναίων] αιων C; νεων B*-S Syh A-575*-754* $255^{txt}$-$612^{txt}$-$740^{txt}$-765 797 (νεον); + οικων Iul↓: cf praef p 164; ανιων 795; ορων 637; pr και S*

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] Ἄλλος Field

*NonGr*: Syh ܠܐܦ̈. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܪ̈ܘܡܐ ❖

*Notes*: There is no clear connection to the Hexapla. Translation data do not establish a link to the Hexapla. Aq uses οἰκεῖν (οἰκουμένη) to translate תֵּבֵל in Ps 89(90):2 and Isa 14:21 and אֶרֶץ in Hab 3:3. According to Busto Saiz, in the Psalter Sym uses οἰκεῖν to render ישׁב Qal (60:8; 126:2), οἰκεῖσθαι to render ישׁב Qal (124:1), and

[4]In Field and *Edition* (I App), see 26:8, 26:9, 36:16, and 36:26.

[5]See Field at 22:20, 38:27, and 42:13.

[6]In this chapter see 22:12, 27:21, 28:16, 29:5, and 37:7. For the probable hexaplaric value of 42:17, see chap. 3. For a discussion of the exegetical fragment of 31:31, see the hexaplaric fragment for 31:31 in chap. 3.

οἰκουμένη to render תֵּבֵל (32:8, 89:2, 95:10, and 97:7; Busto Saiz, 555). Outside of the Psalter Sym uses οἰκεῖν to render ישׁב Qal (Ex 2:21, 4 Rgns 15:5, Isa 6:5, 8:14, Jer 29:9(49:8), 35(42):7, and 51(44):14), οἰκεῖσθαι to render ישׁב Qal (Isa 58:12), οἰκουμένη to render תֵּבֵל (Isa 14:21, ) Th uses οἰκουμένη to render תֵּבֵל in Isa 14:21 and אֶרֶץ in Hab 3:3. Ziegler shows the relationship between ναίων and οἰκῶν, and how one can be substituted for the other, but there is no connection to the Hexapla in his comments (*Edition*, 164-5).

The Hagedorns are correct to list the text as an exegetical fragment in *AGK* (*AGK* 2, 382).

**Job 22 14b**
HT וְחוּג שָׁמַיִם יִתְהַלָּךְ׃
E καὶ γῦρον οὐρανοῦ διαπορεύσεται.

⟨?⟩ ἐκπεριέρχεται ἡ πρόνοια τοῦ θεοῦ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI*[cat] (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139[mg]) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 139[mg]

*Notes*: In 139, the attribution to Sym is probably incorrect, since there is a well attested Sym fragment in the catena for this verse both in *C* and Syh.

**Job 22 20a**
HT אִם־לֹא נִכְחַד קִימָנוּ
E (εἰ μὴ ἠφανίσθη) ἡ ὑπόστασις αὐτῶν,

⟨?⟩ τίνων αὐτῶν; τῶν ἀσεβῶν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 680 137 643 732)

*Notes*: This scholion influenced the exegesis of Nic (*AGK* 2, 387; *Beiträge*, 75).

**Job 22 21a**
HT הַסְכֶּן־נָא עִמּוֹ וּשְׁלָם
LXX (γενοῦ δὴ σκληρός,) ἐὰν ὑπομείνῃς·

⟨?⟩ εἰ ὑπέστησαν ἐκεῖνοι, πείρασον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612)

*Notes*: This scholion appears to be an exegetical fragment, which also influenced Nic (*AGK* 2, 388; *Beiträge*, 75).

**Job 22 25b**

HT וְכֶסֶף (תּוֹעָפוֹת לָךְ׃)

LXX καθαρὸν (δὲ ἀποδώσει σε ὥσπερ ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον.)

## ⟨?⟩ τῷ σώματι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680)

*Notes*: At present, there is no wider context to interpret the significance of this fragment (*AGK* 2, 391; *Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 22 29b**

HT וְשַׁח (עֵינַיִם יוֹשִׁעַ׃)

LXX (καὶ) κύφοντα (ὀφθαλμοῖς σώσει·)

## ⟨?⟩ τουτέστι τὸν ταπεινόφρονα

*Wit1:* $C^{cat}$ (= 249 250 257 3005) $cI^{cat}$ (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 754 474 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) 512-513 [505] 523

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] α′ $C^{cat}$ (= 249) 643 732

*Notes*: The reading is as follows: κύφοντα ὀφθαλμοῖς, τουτέστι τὸν ταπεινόφρονα (*AGK*, II 394). Ms 3005 attributes the fragment to Olymp, where Ziegler attributed it to Or on the basis of Nic, since Or = τοῦ αὐτοῦ (*Beiträge*, 86, 99; Nic, 387). Ms 3005 preserves the correct attribution. There is an attribution to Ἀκύλα in 249 643 732, though this attribution may have been caused by a misunderstanding of the catena sign Ā (*AGK*, 394). The exegetical fragment has influenced the exegesis of Nic, which connects this fragment to the tax collector in the Gospels (cf. *Beiträge*, 86).

At present, there is no evidence to determine whether Aq used ταπεινόφρων to render שחח. He uses the word to render the Psalm title מִכְתָּם in 16:1. Sym and Th use κύφοντες for שחח in Isa 60:14 (Field, 552).

**Job 23 7b**

HT (וַאֲפַלְּטָה) לָנֶצַח (מִשֹּׁפְטִי׃)

LXX (ἐξαγάγοι δὲ) εἰς τέλος (τὸ κρίμα μου.)

⟨?⟩ παρ᾽ Ἑβραίοις τὸ τέλος καὶ ἡ νίκη διὰ μιᾶς σημαίνεται λέξεως

*Wit1:* C$^{cat}$ (= 249 250$^{mg}$ 257 3005$^{mg}$) *cI*$^{cat}$ (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) [505] 523

*Notes*: This fragment is included here because *AGK* posits that this fragment is possibly from Polychronius, due to the relative frequency with which he cites ὁ Ἑβραῖος (*AGK*, III, 5; I, 105), while Ziegler posited incorrectly that it was from Chrysostom (see Chr-*Kommentar*, 141). Ziegler adds that, although the LXX and the Three use εἰς τέλος and εἰς νῖκος to render לָנֶצַח, neither the LXX nor the Three use εἰς νίκην to render לָנֶצַח (*Beiträge*, 76). The note is probably not hexaplaric, but it remains in this list since its source is not known.

**Job 23 10a**

HT כִּי־יָדַע דֶּרֶךְ עִמָּדִי

LXX οἶδεν γὰρ ἤδη ὁδόν μου,

⟨?⟩ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ θέλω κριθῆναι

*Wit1:* C (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612$^{cat}$ 3006 3006$^{cat}$ 559 559$^{cat}$ 258 395 395$^{cat}$ 680 680$^{cat}$ 137 643 732 139) 505

*Notes*: Although 505 attributes this fragment to Olympiodorus, *AGK* maintains that the fragment is *sine nomine* (*AGK* 3, 7). It has also influenced the exegesis of Nic (*Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 23 11a**

HT (בַּאֲשֻׁרוֹ) אָחֲזָה רַגְלִי

LXX ἐξελεύσομαι (δὲ ἐν ἐντάλμασιν αὐτοῦ)

⟨?⟩ ὥδευσα

*Wit1*: 523

*Notes*: This fragment is listed in *Edition* II App, as 253 (*O* ms), but the *Beiträge* corrects this to read 523 (*Beiträge*, 99).

There are no instances of this word in the corpus of Aq. In the Psalter, Sym uses ὁδεύειν to render הלך Qal (25:1, 25:11, 31:8, 80:13, 83:8, 12, 88:31, 90:6), Pi (85:11), Hitp (55:14), and דֶּרֶךְ (49:23) (Busto Saiz, 554). Outside of the Psalter, Sym uses ὁδεύειν to render הלך Qal (Ex 13:21, Eccl 6:9), דֶּרֶךְ (Job 29:25a), and עבר Qal (Ezek 5:17). Th uses ὁδεύειν to render הלך Qal (Ex 13:21).

The word, ὥδευσα, appears in *Kommentar* as exegesis of this verse (*Kommentar*, 204; *Beiträge*, 99).

**Job 23 12a**

HT —(מִצְוַת שְׂפָתָיו וְלֹא אָמִישׁ)

LXX (ἀπὸ ἐνταλμάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ μὴ παρέλθω,)—

## Sub ∽ ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνω ↙

*Wit1:* Syh[txt]

*Wit2:* fin] + ινα μη αποθανω *L′*-644[c] Syh (sub ∽) Arm Dam

*NonGr:* Syh[txt] ∽ܐܝܟܢܐ↙ ܕܠܐ ܐܡܘܬ

*Notes*: This instance of the lemnisk in Syh has been identified with the Lucianic recension; therefore, it is not an indicator of a Hexaplaric reading (*Edition*, 113). Syh has misplaced the metobelus.

**Job 23 12b**

HT מֵחֻקִּי (צָפַנְתִּי אִמְרֵי־פִיו׃)

LXX ἐν δὲ κόλπῳ μου (ἔκρυψα ῥήματα αὐτοῦ.)

## ⟨?⟩ ἐν τῷ διανοητικῷ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 [137] 260 643 732 139) [505]

*Notes*: This fragment does not appear to be hexaplaric but it has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*AGK*, III, 8; *Beiträge*, 76). Although Ziegler cites Ol as the source, the verbal parallel is too narrow to make such a claim (Ol = ἐν τῷ βάθει τῆς διανοίας; *Kommentar*, 204)

**Job 23 13a**

HT וְהוּא בְאֶחָד (וּמִי יְשִׁיבֶנּוּ)

LXX εἰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔκρινεν οὕτως, (τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἀντειπὼν αὐτῷ;)

## ⟨?⟩ εἰ δὲ καὶ δικαιοπραγοῦντα κατέκρινεν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612cat 3006cat 559cat 474cat 258cat 395cat 680cat [137] 643 139) [505] 523

*Var:* δικαιοπραγοῦντα] δικαιοπραγιαν 395

*Notes*: Ms 395 attributes this fragment to Olymp (*AGK*, III, 8). Ziegler attributes this fragment to Chr, but this attribution is probably not genuine (*Beiträge*, 76; cp. Chr-*Kommentar*, 141).

HT (וְהוּא בְאֶחָד) וּמִי (יְשִׁיבֶנּוּ)
LXX (εἰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔκρινεν οὕτως,) τίς (ἐστιν ὁ ἀντειπὼν αὐτῷ;)

## ⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· οὐδείς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 [137]) [505]

*Notes*: This fragment has no context here, but the *Beiträge* directs the reader to 36:23a, where this same fragment appears in Nic and it influences the exegesis of that catena (*AGK*, III, 8; *Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 23 13b**
HT וְנַפְשׁוֹ אִוְּתָה וַיָּעַשׂ׃
LXX ὃ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἠθέλησεν, καὶ ἐποίησεν.

## ⟨?⟩ συντρέχουσαν ἔχει τῇ θελήσει τὴν δύναμιν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 257cat 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612cat 3006cat 559cat 258cat 395cat 680cat [137] 260cat 643cat 732cat 139cat) [505] 523

*Notes*: The oldest Greek catena does not attribute this fragment to an author (*AGK*, III, 8). On the basis of Nic, the *Beiträge* attributes the fragment to Chrysostom (*Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 23 16b[1]**
HT (וְשַׁדַּי) הִבְהִילָנִי׃
LXX (παντοκράτωρ) ἐσπούδασέν με.

## ⟨?⟩ ἐθρόησέ με

*Wit1:* 157

*Notes*: See notes on the fragment below.

**Job 23 16b[2]**
HT (וְשַׁדַּי) הִבְהִילָנִי׃
LXX (παντοκράτωρ) ἐσπούδασέν με.

## ⟨?⟩ ἐτάραξέ με

*Wit1:* 157

*Notes*: In the *Edition*, these fragments were listed as unattributed scholia in II App. Dieter Hagedorn has informed me that 157 (a witness of Ziegler's *d* group) has many marginal notes, which are excerpts from a Nicetas catena and which the scribe has shortened and manipulated for his purposes. These fragments are examples of this phenomenon. In personal correspondence, Dieter Hagedorn presented the following suggestion. The fragments were originally at 23:15a as evidenced in 161 and 248. The reading in 161 is as follows: ἐσπούδακα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐθροήθην, ἐταράχθην τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς ἀγνοῶν, and the reading in 248 is as follows: ἐθροήθην καὶ ἐταράχθην ἀγνοῶν τῆς πληγῆς τὴν αἰτίαν. These readings have been influenced by Nic, which in the same verse according to Young's edition reads as follows: ἐσπούδακα, τουτέστιν, ἐταράχθην, οὐκ εἰδὼς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς, but in the Hagedorns' collation of 259, ἐθροήθην is read instead of ἐταράχθην. All of this material appears to come from Olympiodorus who, in his commentary has the following: διὰ τοῦτο, φησίν, ἐθροήθην οὐκ εἰδὼς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς (*Kommentar*, 205, 5). It appears these fragments are exegetical fragments and they are not hexaplaric. The scribe of 157 adapted exegetical fragments from 15a and applied them to 16b.

**Job 23 17a**
HT כִּי־לֹא נִצְמַתִּי מִפְּנֵי־חֹשֶׁךְ
LXX οὐ γὰρ ᾔδειν ὅτι ἐπελεύσεταί μοι σκότος,

## ⟨?⟩ τὸ τῶν μαστίγων ἄδηλον ἢ ἀδιεξόδευτον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI*$^{cat}$ (= 740 255$^{mg}$-138$^{mg}$ 612 3006 559 258 395 680 [137] 260 643 732 139) [505] 523 512-513

*Var:* μαστίγων] συμφορων 512-513

*Notes*: There is no attribution for this fragment in the oldest Greek catena (*AGK*, III, 10). Nic attributes the comment to Olymp, but it is not possible to discern the authenticity of this attribution (Nic, 393).

**Job 24 1**

HT (מַדּוּעַ מִשַּׁדַּי לֹא־נִצְפְּנוּ) עִתִּים

LXX (διὰ τί δὲ κύριον ἔλαθον) ὧραι,

⟨?⟩ ὧραι οἱ καιροὶ τῆς κρίσεως τῶν ἀσεβῶν. «διὰ τί οὐκ αὔθωρὸν ἀνταποδίδωσιν, εἴπατε.»

*Wit1:* *C* (= 249^cat 250 3005) *cI*^cat (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 754 474 258 395 680 [137] 260 643 732 139) [505] 523 3007

*Notes*: Ms 395 attributes this fragment to Olymp, while 139 attributes it to Polychronius and 523 attributes it to Chrysostom (*AGK*, III, 11). The word, καιροί, belongs to Aq and Th, but the whole fragment is probably from patristic sources. This exegesis has influenced Nic (*Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 24 2a**

HT גְּבֻלוֹת יַשִּׂיגוּ

LXX (ἀσεβεῖς δὲ) ὅριον ὑπερέβησαν

⟨?⟩ τὸ δίκαιον ἐπάτησαν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI*^cat (= 740 138-255 612 3006 395 680 [137] 643 732 139) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 395

*Notes*: Ms 395 attributes the fragment to Sym, but there are no extant examples of Sym using πατέω to render נשׂג or סוג. The fragment has either influenced Iulian's comments or has come from them: πῶς ἀσεβεῖς πατήσαντες τὸ δίκαιον ποίμνιον σὺν ποιμένι ἥρπασαν καὶ κτήνη ὀρφανῶν καὶ βοΐδιον χήρας; (*AGK*, III, 11; Iul-*Kommentar*, 149; *Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 24 5a**

HT (הֵן פְּרָאִים בַּמִּדְבָּר) יָצְאוּ (בְּפָעֳלָם)
LXX ἀπέβησαν (δὲ ὥσπερ ὄνοι ἐν ἀγρῷ)

## ⟨?⟩ ἀδεῶς καταπατοῦντες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 138-255 612 3006 559 754 395 680 [137] 260 643) [505]

*Notes*: The note appears without separation from a hexaplaric note in 260 643 (*AGK*, III, 13). Otherwise there is no apparent connection to the Hexapla. Ziegler notes that the comment has been absorbed by Nic (*Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 24 6a**
HT בַּשָּׂדֶה בְּלִילוֹ יַקְצִירוּ (Q יִקְצוֹרוּ)
LXX (ἀγρὸν πρὸ ὥρας οὐκ αὐτῶν ὄντα) ἐθέρισαν·

## ⟨?⟩ λῃστρικῶς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680)

*Wit2:* fin] + λῃστρικως *lI* $C^{3\ mg}$

*Notes*: This fragment appears to be an adaptation of the exegesis of *Kommentar* (*Kommentar*, 207; *AGK*, III, 15), and it has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*Beiträge*, 76). The lemma actually appears in the first Lucianic group. Whether this reading is an original part of the Lucianic tradition or was accidentally added to the text from the marginal gloss is not clear at present.

**Job 24 6b**
HT (וְכֶרֶם רָשָׁע) יְלַקֵּשׁוּ׃
LXX (ἀδύνατοι δὲ ἀμπελῶνας ἀσεβῶν ἀμισθὶ καὶ ἀσιτὶ) ἠργάσαντο.

## ⟨?⟩ τῇ καταδυναστείᾳ εἴκοντες

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 137 643 732) [505]

*Notes*: This fragment has influenced the exegesis of Nic, but it has no apparent connection with the Hexapla (*AGK*, III, 15; *Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 24 9a**

HT יִגְזְלוּ (מִשֹּׁד) יָתוֹם

LXX ἥρπασαν ὀρφανὸν (ἀπὸ μαστοῦ,)

# ⟨?⟩ ἐπὶ τῷ πωλῆσαι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] α′ 3006

*Notes*: Ms 3006 has an attribution to Aq (*AGK*, III, 17). Ziegler notes a parallel with *Kommentar*, which may indicate that this fragment has come from Olympiodorus, although it has been modified by the scholiast (*Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 24 9b**

HT וְעַל־עָנִי יַחְבֹּלוּ׃

LXX ἐκπεπτωκότα δὲ ἐταπείνωσαν.

# ⟨?⟩ ἐκπεσεῖν ποιήσαντες τῶν ὑπαρχόντων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 249cat 250 3005) *cI*cat (= 740mg 255mg-138mg 612 3006 559 754 474 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) [505] 523

*Notes*: This exegesis may be adapted from the commentary of Olympiodorus and is probably not related to the Hexapla (*Kommentar*, 208; *AGK*, III, 17; *Beiträge*, 76).

**Job 24 10b**

HT (וּרְעֵבִים) נָשְׂאוּ עֹמֶר׃

LXX (πεινώντων δὲ) τὸν ψωμὸν ἀφείλαντο.

# ⟨?⟩ ἐπίτασις πονηρίας

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 137 643 732 139)

*Var:* ἐπίτασις] επιτασει 3005

*Notes*: This scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic, but it has no clear correspondence to HT or the Hexapla (*AGK*, III, 17; *Beiträge*, 77).

**Job 24 12b**

HT וְנֶֽפֶשׁ־חֲלָלִים תְּשַׁוֵּעַ
LXX ψυχὴ δὲ νηπίων ἐστέναξεν μέγα,

## ⟨?⟩ ἐξ ἀτροφίας

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 754 395 680 137 260^cat 643 139) [505]

*Notes*: This exegesis either influenced Olympiodorus or it is a summary of his exegesis in *Kommentar* (*AGK*, III, 19; *Beiträge*, 77). It has no clear correspondence to HT or the Hexapla.

**Job 24 13b**
HT לֹֽא־הִכִּירוּ דְרָכָיו
LXX ὁδὸν δὲ δικαιοσύνης οὐκ ᾔδεισαν

## ⟨?⟩ οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ

*Wit1:* *cI* (= 732)

*Notes*: This note corresponds to Matthew 5:8 and Psalm 23:4 (*AGK* 3, 20; *Beiträge*, 77). It is a secondary addition to the catena since it is not present in 643.

**Job 24 20ab**
HT יִשְׁכָּחֵהוּ רֶחֶם
מְתָקוֹ רִמָּה
LXX εἶτ ἀνεμνήσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ ἁμαρτία,
ὥσπερ δὲ ὁμίχλη δρόσου ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο·

## ⟨?⟩ εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὁ πτωχὸς περὶ τῶν ἰδίων, εὐθὺς ἀφανίζεται

*Wit1:* *C* (= 249^cat 250 3005) *cI*^cat (= 740 255^mg-138^mg 612 3006 559 474 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Var:* ὑπομνήσει] υπομνηση 249 250 395

*Notes*: Ms 474 contains an attribution to ἄλλως, while 395 has an attribution to τοῦ αὐτοῦ (= Olympiodorus) (*AGK* 3, 23; *Beiträge*, 77). There is no parallel to this scholion in any other source.

**Job 24 20d**

HT וַתִּשָּׁבֵר כָּעֵץ עַוְלָה׃

LXX συντριβείη δὲ πᾶς ἄδικος ἴσα ξύλῳ ἀνιάτῳ.

⟨?⟩ ἀχρήστῳ γενομένῳ μετὰ τὴν συντριβήν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005*) *cI*$^{cat}$ (= 740$^{mg}$ 255$^{mg}$-138$^{mg}$ 612 3006 559 754 474 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Var:* γενομένῳ] γινομενω 740 138-255 612 3006 559 258 395 680

*Notes*: The asterisk after 3005 indicates that the ms has not been completely collated in *AGK*. The only variant from the lemma is that the ms preserves the fragment in the accusative case (-ον) instead of the dative case. Ziegler notes that this note has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*Beiträge*, 77).

**Job 24 23**

HT יִתֶּן־לוֹ לָבֶטַח וְיִשָּׁעֵן (וְעֵינֵיהוּ עַל־דַּרְכֵיהֶם׃)

LXX (μαλακισθεὶς) μὴ ἐλπιζέτω (ὑγιασθῆναι, ἀλλὰ πεσεῖται νόσῳ.)

⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· οὐκ ἐλπίζει

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 137 643 139) [505 523]

*Notes*: There is no wider context in which to interpret the significance of this fragment (*AGK* 3, 25; *Beiträge*, 84).

**Job 24 24b[1]**

HT (וְהֻמְּכוּ) כַּכֹּל (יִקָּפְצוּן)

LXX (ἐμαράνθη δὲ) ὥσπερ μολόχη (ἐν καύματι)

⟨?⟩ ὥσπερ χλόη

*Wit1:* Montef

*Wit2:* μολόχη] χλοη *L* Glos (*herba*) Ol (ἕτερα ἀντίγραφα)

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] Ἄλλος Field

*Notes*: Since the reading of the Three is established for this line, this reading cannot be hexaplaric. Even before the new evidence of the *Nachlese*, Ziegler had already identified this reading with the Lucianic recension (*Beitrage*, 92).

**Job 24 24b²**

HT וְהֻמְּכוּ (כַּכֹּל יִקָּפְצוּן)

LXX ἐμαράνθη (δὲ ὥσπερ μολόχη ἐν καύματι)

## ⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· μαρανθείη

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 137 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 395

*Notes*: *AGK* contains a catena fragment which contains this scholion at the beginning of a comment which has correspondences to the Olympiodorus Kommentar (*AGK* 3, 25 §§73-74; *Beiträge*, 84).

**Job 25 2b**

HT (עֹשֶׂה שָׁלוֹם) בִּמְרוֹמָיו׃

LXX (ὁ ποιῶν τὴν σύμπασαν) ἐν ὑψίστῳ;

## ⟨?⟩ ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ, μετ᾽ οὐδενὸς συσκοπήσας

*Wit1:* $C^{cat}$ (= 249 257 3005) $cI^{cat}$ (= $740^{mg}$ $255^{mg}$-$138^{mg}$ 612 3006 559 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) [505 523] $3007^{cat}$

*Notes*: Ms 732 preserves an attribution to Olympiodorus, while 139 has an attribution to Polychronius. These witnesses are not the best representatives of the oldest Greek catena and therefore these attributions are probably not genuine. The scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*Beiträge*, 77).

**Job 25 3a**

HT (הֲיֵשׁ) מִסְפָּר לִגְדוּדָיו

LXX (μὴ γάρ τις ὑπολάβοι ὅτι ἔστιν) παρέλκυσις πειραταῖς;

## ⟨?⟩ παράτασις ζωῆς ἡ ὑπέρθεσις τιμωρίας

*Wit1:* *C*cat (= 3005) *cI*cat (= 740mg 255mg-138mg 612 3006 559 258 395 680 137 260* 643 732) [505 523]

*Var:* παράτασις] παραθεσις 3005

*Notes*: Ms 395 attributes the scholion to Evagrius (*AGK* 3, 31). Ziegler notes that a form of the scholion is in Olympiodorus (*Beiträge*, 77).

**Job 25 3b**

HT וְעַל־מִי לֹא־יָקוּם אוֹרֵהוּ׃

LXX ἐπὶ τίνας δὲ οὐκ ἐπελεύσεται ἔνεδρα παρ’ αὐτοῦ;

## ⟨?⟩ ἐπὶ τίνας δέ, τῶν πειρατῶν εὔδηλόν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 137 260* 643 139) [505 523]

*Var:* ἐπὶ τίνας δέ] > *C* (= 3005) 137 643 139 | εὔδηλόν] ευδηλονοτι 250; δηλονοτι 137→

*Notes*: The scholion answers the question about whether it is the πειραταί, which are mentioned in 25:3a (*Beiträge*, 86; *AGK* 3, 31).

**Job 25 5a**

HT הֵן עַד־יָרֵחַ וְלֹא יַאֲהִיל

LXX εἰ σελήνῃ συντάσσει, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιφαύσκει·

## ⟨?⟩ ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ προστάσσει αὐτῇ μὴ φᾶναι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 137 260cat 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] α′ 395

*Var:* φᾶναι] φαινειν 3006; φαινει 559

*Notes*: Ms 395 attributes the fragment to Aq but, since the Aq fragment is established for this verse, this scholion arose probably due to the scholiast combining a comment of Olympiodorus and Isa 13:10 (cp. Matt 24:29; Mark 13:24) (*AGK* 3, 33; *Kommentar*, 217,6-7; *Beiträge*, 77). It also influenced Nic.

**Job 26 7a**

HT נֹטֶה צָפוֹן) עַל־תֹּהוּ)

E (ἐκτείνων βορέαν) ἐπ' οὐδέν,

⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· εἰς ἀπέραντον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 260^cat 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Var:* ἀπέραντον] απερατον *C* (= 3005)

*Notes*: The word, ἀπέροντος, occurs 4x in the LXX and the Three. Th uses it in Job 36:26 and it occurs in 3 Makk 2:9. Since the Th and Aq fragments are established for this verse, is it possible that this one belongs to Symmachus? He uses εἰς ἀπέραντον for עוֹלָם וָעֶד in Ps 20(21):7 and ἀπέραντος for סוּף (LXX: ἐσχάτη) in Jon 2:6. Although at present it is not probable that Sym is the author of this fragment, perhaps more evidence from translation technique will reveal that it is from him, since he is the author to use this term most frequently. ἀπέραντος also occurs in the Job catena in two other places, used by both Polychronius (*AGK* 2, 78 §25) and Olympiodorus (*AGK* 3, 130 §156).

**Job 26 13a**

HT בְּרוּחוֹ שָׁמַיִם (שִׁפְרָה)

LXX κλεῖθρα δὲ οὐρανοῦ (δεδοίκασιν αὐτόν,)

⟨?⟩ αἱ ὑπερκόσμιοι δυνάμεις

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 257^cat 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Var:* ὑπερκόσμιοι] υπερκοσμιαι 740 3005

*Notes*: This fragment is separate from the following one in the oldest Greek catena. Nic has been influenced by this fragment (*Beiträge*, 77; *AGK* 3, 43).

**Job 26 13a²**

HT בְּרוּחוֹ שָׁמַיִם (שִׁפְרָה)

LXX κλεῖθρα δὲ οὐρανοῦ (δεδοίκασιν αὐτόν,)

## ⟨?⟩ συνάγει γὰρ τὸν ἀέρα καὶ πάλιν διαλύει ὡς ἂν ἐθέλῃ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 250 3005) $cI^{cat}$ (= $740^{mg}$ $255^{mg}$-$138^{mg}$ 612 559 754 474 258 395 [680]) [505 523]

*Var:* ἐθέλῃ] εθελει 740 3005; εθελοι 138-255 395; θελει 474

*Notes*: This fragment is separate from the one above in the oldest Greek catena. Nic has been influenced by this fragment (*Beiträge*, 77; *AGK* 3, 43).

**Job 27 7a**
HT יְהִי כְרָשָׁע אֹיְבִי
LXX οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ εἴησαν οἱ ἐχθροί μου ὥσπερ ἡ καταστροφὴ τῶν ἀσεβῶν,

## ⟨?⟩ ἀπόλοιντό φησιν οἱ ἐχθροί μου· συκοφαντοῦσι γάρ με

*Wit1:* $cI^{cat}$ (= 740 138-255 612 559 754 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Notes*: This scholion is attributed to Chrysostom and is from Chr-*Kommentar*, and therefore is not hexaplaric (*AGK* 3, 51; *Beiträge*, 77; Chr-*Kommentar*, 146).

**Job 27 15a**
HT שְׂרִידוֹ (שְׂרִידָיו Q) בַּמָּוֶת יִקָּבֵרוּ
LXX οἱ δὲ περιόντες αὐτοῦ ἐν θανάτῳ τελευτήσουσιν,

## ⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· πρόωροι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 $3006^{cat}$ $260^{cat}$ $643^{cat}$ 732 $139^{cat}$) [505 523]

*Notes*: πρόωρος is not listed in the LXX concordance (H-R, 1234), and it is only used here in the Job catena (*AGK* 4, 319). This fragment appears to have influenced the exegesis of Nic (*AGK* 3, 54; *Beiträge*, 84).

**Job 27 19a**

HT                    עָשִׁיר יִשְׁכַּב (וְלֹא יֵאָסֵף)
LXX                   πλούσιος κοιμηθεὶς (καὶ οὐ προσθήσει,)

# ⟨?⟩ κοιμηθεὶς ἀνέστη πένης

*Wit1:* *C* (= 249cat 257cat 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612cat 559 559cat 754 474 258 395 680 680cat 137 3006 260cat 643cat 732 139) [505 523]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ *C*cat (= 249 257)

*Notes*: Two important mss have an attribution to Sym, but the rest of the tradition preserves the note *sine nomine* (*AGK* 3, 55; *Beiträge*, 77). There is no correspondence to the HT and, therefore, it is probably not hexaplaric.

**Job 27 20b**
HT                    (לַיְלָה) גְּנָבַתּוּ סוּפָה׃
LXX                   (νυκτὶ δὲ) ὑφείλατο αὐτὸν γνόφος·

# ⟨?⟩ ἐν περιστάσει μὴ ἐκφύγοι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Notes*: This scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*AGK* 3, 56; *Beiträge*, 78). Ziegler notes that this scholion was incorrectly attached to the hexaplaric fragment for this verse (*Beiträge*, 37).

**Job 27 21b**
HT                    וִישָׂעֲרֵהוּ (מִמְּקֹמוֹ׃)
LXX                   καὶ λικμήσει (αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ.)

# ⟨?⟩ ὡς κόνιν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395)

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] Ἄλλος Field

*Var:* κόνιν] κόνις 138-255; κόνι 612; κονιορτός 559 395

*Notes*: The *C* group and 740 preserve the original text of the fragment (*AGK* 3, 57). Ziegler notes that the variant κονιορτός is secondary and perhaps it was influenced by LXX Job 21:18 (ὥσπερ κονιορτός, ὃν ὑφείλατο λαῖλαψ). He also notes that

κονιορτός is used 19x in the LXX, while κόνις is used 2x in the LXX and 4x in Symmachus (*Beiträge*, 91; Field, 48).

**Job 28 7b**

HT (וְלֹא שְׁזָפַתּוּ עֵין) אַיָּה׃

E (καὶ οὐ παρέβλεψεν αὐτὴν ὀφθαλμὸς) γυπός·

# ⟨α′⟩ ἰκτῖνος

*Wit1:* T-S NS 309.9

*NonGr*: CG איכטינש

*Notes*: De Lange has the following note on the reading in the Cairo Geniza: xxviii 7 *'yh*. There is another word following, which is illegible. Aq., Sym. and Th. use ἰκτῖνες for דַּיָּה at Isa 24:15 (Reider, 117). His transliteration of the Hebrew letters into Greek is ἰχτῖνας, which Ziegler emended to ἰκτῖνος (De Lange, 292, 294). The Th fragment is under the asterisk, so hypothetically this lemma could belong either to Aq or Sym on the assumption of De Lange that these CG fragments are from the Three.

The LXX also uses ἰκτίν for אַיָּה in Lev 11:14 and Deut 14:13 (H-R, 684), which means that the word cannot be limited to the Three. Perhaps with more evidence this fragment will be shown to belong to the Three, but at present this fragment is best treated as a Byzantine version of Job, which had contact with the LXX translation tradition of using ἰκτίν for אַיָּה.

**Job 28 16b**

HT בְּשֹׁהַם (יָקָר וְסַפִּיר׃)

LXX (ἐν) ὄνυχι (τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφείρῳ·)

# ⟨?⟩ σαρδονυχίῳ

*Wit1:* 248 512-513 555

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] Ἄλλος Field

*Var:* lemma] -δων 248; σαρδονυχι 512-513 555

*Notes*: The word does not occur in the LXX and in the Job catena it occurs only here in a comment attributed to Olympiodorus (*AGK* 3, 68). It is probable that the note came from Olympiodorus and is, therefore, not hexaplaric.

Field notes that Drusius suspects that Aq is the author on the basis of Gen 2:12 et al. (Field, 50 n. 21), but the evidence there and in other places points to ὄνυξ as the reading of the Three.

**Job 28 17a**

HT וּזְכוֹכִית (לֹא־יַעַרְכֶנָּה זָהָב)

E (οὐκ ἰσωθήσεται αὐτῇ χρυσίον καὶ) ὕαλος

⟨?⟩ κρύσταλλος διαφανής

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 680) [505]

*Notes*: This scholion was probably influenced by the exegesis Olympiodorus (*AGK* 3, 69; *Beiträge*, 78; see especially the comment by Olympiodorus in *AGK* 3, 68 §85).

**Job 28 19a**

HT פִּטְדַת־כּוּשׁ (לֹא־יַעַרְכֶנָּה)

E (οὐκ ἰσωθήσεται αὐτῇ) τοπάζιον Αἰθιοπίας,

⟨?⟩ τοὺς θησαυρούς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Notes*: *AGK* lists this fragment at 28:18b on the basis of 3005, noting that *cI* (= Γ) has it at 19a (= *Beiträge*, 78; *AGK* 3, 71). Ms 788 is the second *C* ms to preserve this fragment and it preserves it at 19a; therefore, we place it at 19a here. This fragment appears to be an exegetical comment on the text and is not related to the Hexapla.

**Job 29 5b**

HT (סְבִיבוֹתַי) נְעָרָי׃

LXX (κύκλῳ δέ μου) οἱ παῖδες·

⟨?⟩ ἀγόμενοι ὑπ᾽ ἐμοῦ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 255 612 559 395 680) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] Ἄλλος Field

*Notes*: Field listed this fragment with the hexaplaric fragments, but in a footnote he comments that it is a scholion from Olymp (Field, 51 n. 6; *Beiträge*, 91). This note entered Nic and was attributed to Olymp, but the oldest Greek catena preserves it separate from the catena and therefore it is a scholion, which remains *sine nomine* (*AGK* 3, 82).

**Job 29 10a**

HT קוֹל־נְגִידִים נֶחְבָּאוּ

LXX οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐμακάρισάν με,

# ⟨?⟩ τῶν ἀκουόντων μου καὶ μακαριζόντων με, ἐφ’ οἷς ἔλεγον, *ἡ γλῶσσα τῷ λάρυγγι ἐκολλήθη*

*Wit1:* *cI*[cat] (= 740 138-255 612 [559] 3004 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505] 523

*Var:* ἔλεγον] ελεγεν 3004 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139

*Notes*: Ms 523 attributes this fragment to Chrysostom, while there is no attribution in 474. The majority of the tradition attributes this fragment to Origen and *AGK* accepts this attribution as authentic (*AGK* 3, 86). The text in italics is from the bible text of 29:10b.

**Job 29 20a**

HT כְּבוֹדִי חָדָשׁ עִמָּדִי

E ἡ δόξα μου καινὴ μετ’ ἐμοῦ,

# ⟨?⟩ ἀεί μου ἀνακαινίζεται ἡ δόξα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] (= 740[mg] 255[mg]-138[mg] 612 [559] 3004 754[mg] 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139[mg]) [505] 523

*Var:* ἀνακαινίζεται 138 3004] ανακενιζετε 250; ανεκαινιζετ() 788; ανεκαινιζετο 3005 *cI*[−138 3004] 523

*Notes*: *AGK* comments on this fragment as follows: Ziegler has not considered that it could be treated as a hexaplaric note; however, compare the version of the Vulgate: *gloria mea semper innovabitur* (*AGK* 3, 96). The readings for Th and Sym are established for this verse and, therefore, Aq is the only eligible reviser. According to Reider and H-R, there are no instances of ἀνακαινίζειν for Aq (Reider, 17; H-R, 78). More evidence will need to come to light before we can assign this fragment to the Hexapla.

**Job 29 20b**

HT וְקַשְׁתִּי (בְּיָדִי תַחֲלִיף׃)

E καὶ τὸ τόξον μου (ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ πορεύσεται.)

⟨?⟩ ὁ σκοπός μου πρὸς αὐτόν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{cat}$ (= 740$^{mg}$ 255$^{mg}$-138$^{mg}$ 612 [559] 3004 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139$^{mg}$) [505] 523

*Notes*: This fragment is related to the exegesis of Olympiodorus, and is probably not hexaplaric (*AGK* 3, 96; *Beiträge*, 78; *Kommentar*, 248).

**Job 29 21b**

HT (וְיִדְּמוּ לְמוֹ) עֲצָתִי׃

LXX (ἐσιώπησαν δὲ) ἐπὶ τῇ ἐμῇ βουλῇ·

⟨?⟩ νόμον αὐτὴν ὁριζόμενοι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255)

*Notes*: This fragment is best treated as *sine nomine*, even though a version of it appears after a comment from Olympiodorus in *C* (= 3005) and *cI* (*AGK* 3, 97; *Beiträge*, 78). In *C* (= 788-250) this scholion is distinct from the comment of Olympiodorus, but it appears to have been influenced by Olympiodorus and therefore it is probably not hexaplaric.

**Job 29 24b**

HT וְאוֹר פָּנַי (לֹא יַפִּילוּן׃)

E καὶ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου μου (οὐκ ἀπέπιπτεν·)

⟨?⟩ ἡ δόξα τῆς διδασκαλίας μου

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{cat}$ (= 740 255$^{mg}$-138$^{mg}$ 612 [559] 3004 754 474 258 395 680 137 3006$^{mg}$ 260 643 732 139$^{mg}$) [505] 523$^{mg}$

*Var:* ἡ] > 258 612

*Notes*: Ms 395 attributes this fragment to τοῦ αὐτοῦ (= Olympiodorus), but the fragment is probably not from him. This fragment is partially parallel to Olympiodorus, and therefore it is probably not hexaplaric (*AGK* 3, 98; *Beiträge*, 78; *Kommentar*, 249).

**Job 29 25a**

HT אֶבֲחַר דַּרְכָּם) וְאֵשֵׁב רֹאשׁ)

E (ἐξελεξάμην ὁδὸν αὐτῶν καὶ) ἐκάθισα ἄρχων

⟨?⟩ ἐγὼ μὲν εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἤθελον δοκεῖν, οἱ δὲ ἄρχοντα με ᾑροῦντο

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] (= 740 255[mg]-138[mg] 612 [559] 3004 754 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139) [505] 523 3007

*Notes*: Mss 740 and 139 preserve an attribution to Olympiodorus. This scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*AGK* 3, 99; *Beiträge*, 78).

**Job 30 3a**

HT בְּחֶסֶר וּבְכָפָן) גַּלְמוּד)

E (ἐν ἐνδείᾳ καὶ λιμῷ) ἄγονος·

⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· ἄγονοι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 [559] 3004 395 680 137 3006[cat] 643[cat]) [505]

*Wit2:* ἄγονος] -νοι La (*instabiles*) *lIII* 620 644 Co Aeth

*Notes*: The *Edition* contained this fragment in App II, but Ziegler then reassigned it to marginal scholia in the *Beiträge* (*Beiträge*, 84). The reading is witnessed in La and the third Lucianic group. The plural number may indicate that it is not hexaplaric, since Th translated HT with a singular number. Th has influenced this version, but its source is not known beyond this point.

**Job 30 3b**

HT הַעֹרְקִים (צִיָּה אֶמֶשׁ שׁוֹאָה וּמְשֹׁאָה׃)

E οἱ φεύγοντες (ἄνυδρον ἐχθὲς συνοχὴν καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν,)

⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· μὴ φέροντες

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 [559] 3004 395 680 137 3006 260 643) [505]

**Job 30 16a**

HT (וְעַתָּה עָלַי) תִּשְׁתַּפֵּךְ (נַפְשִׁי)
E (καὶ νῦν ἐπ' ἐμὲ) ἐκχυθήσεται (ἡ ψυχή μου,)

## ⟨?⟩ συγχεῖται

*Wit1:* 248

*Notes*: A catena fragment has the following: ἐκχυθήσεται ἀντὶ τοῦ συγχεῖται..., which is partly from Olympiodorus (*AGK* 3, 107 §90; Nic, 457). This portion is not from *Kommentar*, and therefore the source is not clear. The fragment in 248 is probably not from Olympiodorus and there is no demonstrable connection to the Hexapla.

**Job 30 18a**
HT (בְּרָב־כֹּחַ יִתְחַפֵּשׂ) לְבוּשִׁי
LXX (ἐν πολλῇ ἰσχύι ἐπελάβετό μου) τῆς στολῆς,

## ⟨?⟩ τοῦ σώματος

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 257[cat] 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 [559] 3004 395 680 137 3006 643) [505]

*Notes*: There is no wider context in which to interpret the significance of this fragment (*AGK* 3, 108; *Beiträge*, 78).

**Job 30 25a**
HT (אִם־לֹא) בָכִיתִי (לִקְשֵׁה־יוֹם)
LXX (ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ παντὶ ἀδυνάτῳ) ἔκλαυσα,

## ⟨?⟩ «καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκω», φησίν, «τὴν ὁμοίαν συμπάθειαν»

*Wit1:* *C* (= 249[cat] 788-250) *cI*[cat] (= 740[mg] 255[mg]-138[mg] 612 [559] 3004 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505] 523

*Notes*: Mss 137 523 680 attribute this fragment to Chrysostom, but this is probably an error for the well-attested fragment of Chrysostom for the same verse. This scholion was absorbed by Nic and attributed to Olympiodorus incorrectly (*Beiträge*, 78; *AGK* 3, 111). There is no correspondence with HT and therefore this fragment is probably not hexaplaric.

**Job 30 28b**

HT קַמְתִּי בַקָּהָל אֲשַׁוֵּעַ׃
LXX ἕστηκα δὲ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κεκραγώς.

⟨?⟩ διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῶν δεινῶν οὐδὲ πλῆθος συνόδου αἰσχυνόμενος

*Wit1:* *C* (=257cat 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 [559] 3004 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139) [505] 523

*Var:* ὑπερβολὴν τῶν δεινῶν] αγαν οδυνην 3005 | πλῆθος συνόδου] πληθους συνοδον 137→

*Notes*: Ziegler lists this fragment at 30:28a, but this edition is based on *AGK*, which has it at 28b. *AGK* attributes this fragment to Chrysostom since it is approximately equal to the Chr-*Kommentar* (Chr-*Kommentar*, 157; *AGK* 3, 113). This scholion is no longer Anon and therefore it cannot be hexaplaric. This scholion also influenced Nic, which attributed it to Olympiodorus (*Beiträge*, 78).

**Job 31 4a**
HT (הֲלֹא־הוּא) יִרְאֶה (דְרָכָי)
E (οὐχὶ αὐτὸς) ὄψεται (ὁδόν μου)

⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· εἶδεν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 [559] 3004 395 680 137 3006cat 643cat) [505]

*Var:* εἶδεν] ιδεν 788

*Notes*: For the specific manuscript data see *AGK* (*AGK* 3, 117).

**Job 31 4b**
HT וְכָל־צְעָדַי (יִסְפּוֹר׃)
E καὶ πάντα τὰ διαβήματά μου (ἐξαριθμήσεται;)

⟨?⟩ «ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὑμεῖς», φησίν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 257cat* 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 [559] 3004 395 680) [505]

*Notes*: There is no wider context in which to evaluate this scholion, since it does not appear in any of the patristic sources or Nic (*AGK* 3, 117; *Beiträge*, 79).

**Job 31 7b**
HT וְאַחַר עֵינַי הָלַךְ (לִבִּי)
LXX εἰ δὲ καὶ τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ ἐπηκολούθησεν (ἡ καρδία μου,)

# ⟨?⟩ εἰ ἐπεθύμουν ὧν ἔβλεπον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 249cat 257cat 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 [258] 395cat 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 139

*Notes*: Ms 395 attributes the fragment to Evagrius. The scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*AGK* 3, 121; *Beiträge*, 78).

**Job 31 8a**
HT אֶזְרְעָה (וְאַחֵר יֹאכֵל)
LXX σπείραιμι (ἄρα καὶ ἄλλοι φάγοισαν,)

# ⟨?⟩ ταῦτα ἔλεγον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 [258] 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Notes*: Concerning this note *AGK* concludes that it is based on a misunderstanding, which also intruded into the text of an Olympiodorus fragment of the catena (*AGK* 3, 122; see also page 121; *Beiträge*, 78). It is not from the Hexapla.

**Job 31 12b**
HT וּבְכָל־תְּבוּאָתִי תְשָׁרֵשׁ׃
LXX οὗ δʼ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ, ἐκ ῥιζῶν ἀπώλεσεν.

# ⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· περιστατικόν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 [258] 395 680 137 3006 260 643) [505]

*Notes*: The *Beiträge* places this fragment at 12a, but *AGK* and the mss place it at 12b. For the specific manuscript evidence, see *AGK* (*AGK* 3, 124; *Beiträge*, 84). This word is not a clear substitute for any word in 12a or 12b.

**Job 31 16b**

HT וְעֵינֵי אַלְמָנָה) אֲכַלֶּה׃)

LXX (χήρας δὲ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν) οὐκ ἐξέτηξα.

⟨?⟩ τοῖς δάκρυσιν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 612 559 [258] 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Wit2:* fin] + τοις δακρυσιν *lI* 620 $C^{3\ mg}$

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] Ἄλλος Field

*Notes*: This fragment occurs in the margin in the catena tradition, but it is also at the end of the bible text in *lI* 620 (*AGK* 3, 127; *Beiträge*, 91; Field, 55 n. 13). It is probably not hexaplaric

**Job 31 26a**

HT אִם־אֶרְאֶה אוֹר כִּי יָהֵל

LXX (ἢ οὐχ ὁρῶ μὲν ἥλιον τὸν ἐπιφαύσκοντα) ἐκλείποντα,

⟨?⟩ σημείωσαι, ὅτι ἐζητήθη

*Wit1:* *cI* (= 740 138-255 612)

*Var:* σημείωσαι] σημιο() 612; ση 740 138-255

*Notes*: The abbreviations could stand for σημείωσαι or σημειωτέον (*AGK* 3, 132; *Beiträge*, 87).

**Job 31 26b**

HT וְיָרֵחַ יָקָר הֹלֵךְ׃)—)

LXX (σελήνην δὲ φθίνουσαν;) οὐ γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἐστιν.

⟨?⟩ ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ ἐπιτάξαντι

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σ′ 740

*Notes*: This fragment has no corresponding phrase in HT but, theoretically, this fragment could be a revision of OG. There are no known hexaplaric fragments at this verse so that it might be possible for this fragment to be one. This fragment has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*AGK* 3, 132; *Beiträge*, 79).

**Job 31 35b**

HT הֶן־תָּוִי שַׁדַּי (יַעֲנֵנִי)

LXX χεῖρα δὲ κυρίου (εἰ μὴ ἐδεδοίκειν,)

## ⟨?⟩ μὴ ἐκτεῖναι αὐτὴν κατά τινος

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 754 395^cat 680 137 3006 643 139) [505] 523

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 139

*Var:* ἐκτεῖναι] εκτεινειν 3005 | αὐτήν] αυτον 559 680→ 523

*Notes*: There is no wider context in order to interpret the significance of this fragment (*AGK* 3, 138; *Beiträge*, 79). It has no discernable connection to patristic sources and it does not appear to have formal correspondence with HT. It is probably an explanatory gloss on the Greek text.

**Job 31 36**

HT (אִם־לֹא עַל־שִׁכְמִי אֶשָּׂאֶנּוּ) אֶעֶנְדֶנּוּ עֲטָרוֹת (לִי׃)

LXX (ἐπ’ ὤμοις ἂν) περιθέμενος στέφανον (ἀνεγίνωσκον,)

## ⟨?⟩ ἐν ἰσχύϊ νικᾶν ἐλπίζων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643) [505]

*Var:* ἐλπίζων] ελπιζω 250

*Notes*: The scholion is at 37a in 788-250 and 740. There is no formal equivalent to HT or connection to patristic sources and it appears to be an exegetical comment on the Greek text.

**Job 31 37a**

HT מִסְפַּר צְעָדַי אַגִּידֶנּוּ

LXX καὶ εἰ μὴ (ῥήξας αὐτὴν ἀπέδωκα)

## ⟨?⟩ κατὰ κοινοῦ δὲ τὸ εἰ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Notes*: There is no equivalent to HT for this fragment. This scholion appears to be a guide to the reading of this verse, even though there is no textual evidence for this reading according to *Edition* I App (*AGK* 3, 139; *Beiträge*, 79).

**Job 32 13**

HT פֶּן־תֹּאמְרוּ (מָצָאנוּ חָכְמָה אֵל יִדְּפֶנּוּ לֹא־אִישׁ׃)

LXX ἵνα μὴ εἴπητε (Εὕρομεν σοφίαν κυρίῳ προσθέμενοι·)

⟨?⟩ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ ἐρῶ γὰρ ὑμῶν ἀκουόντων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{\text{cat}}$ (= 740$^{\text{mg}}$ 255$^{\text{mg}}$-138$^{\text{mg}}$ 612 559 474 258 395$^{\text{mg}}$ 680 137 3006 260 643) 505

*Notes*: Ms 395 attributes this scholion to Chrysostom. Job 32:11b is the source of this scholion (*AGK* 3, 154; *Beiträge*, 79).

**Job 32 19b**

HT (כְּאֹבוֹת חֲדָשִׁים) יִבָּקֵעַ׃

LXX (ἢ ὥσπερ φυσητὴρ χαλκέως) ἐρρηγώς.

⟨?⟩ διάπνευστος

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257)

*Notes*: The *Kollationen* contains this fragment and comments that the index is at ἐρρηγώς (*Kollationen*, 207). This fragment could be an error for the established fragment, ἀδιάπνευστος, at Job 32:19a.

**Job 32 22b**

HT כִּמְעַט יִשָּׂאֵנִי עֹשֵׂנִי׃

LXX (εἰ δὲ μή,) καὶ ἐμὲ σῆτες ἔδονται.

⟨?⟩ ὡς τὸν ’Ιὼβ οἱ σκώληκες

*Wit1:* *C* (= 249$^{\text{cat}}$ 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 260 643) 505

*Notes*: In 249[cat], the scholion was incorporated into a directly named comment from Chrysostom, but this evidence does not connect the fragment to him. Also, Nic incorporated this exegesis and attributed it to Olympiodorus (*AGK* 3, 162; *Beiträge*, 79). There is no formal correspondence to the HT and it is doubtful whether this fragment has hexaplaric significance.

**Job 33 3a**

HT (יֹשֶׁר־לִבִּי) אֲמָרָי

LXX (καθαρά μου ἡ καρδία) ῥήμασιν,

⟨?⟩ μηδὲν κατὰ πρόκριμα λέγουσα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 249[cat] 257[cat] 788-250) *cI* (= 740 255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 260 643)

*Wit2:* ῥήμασιν] + μηδὲν κατὰ πρόκριμα λέγουσα *lI*

*Notes*: This scholion is an addition in the first group of the Lucianic recension (*AGK* 3, 162; *Beiträge*, 79). Also, it entered into the exegesis of Nic (*Beiträge*, 79). Since there is no correspondence to HT or OG, it is probably not hexaplaric.

**Job 33 12b**

HT כִּי־יִרְבֶּה אֱלוֹהַ מֵאֱנוֹשׁ׃

LXX αἰώνιος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐπάνω βροτῶν.

⟨?⟩ τουτέστι· οὐκ ἐπὶ σοὶ πρῶτον δοκιμασθήσεται

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] (= 740 255[mg]-138[mg] 612 559 754 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505] 523

*Notes*: Mss 559 395 attribute the fragment to Chrysostom (*AGK* 3, 167). This fragment has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*Beiträge*, 86).

**Job 33 13**

HT (מַדּוּעַ אֵלָיו רִיבוֹתָ כִּי) כָל־דְּבָרָיו לֹא־יַעֲנֶה׃

LXX (λέγεις δέ Διὰ τί τῆς δίκης μου) οὐκ ἐπακήκοεν πᾶν ῥῆμα;

⟨?⟩ ὁποία ποτ’ ἂν ἡ αἴτησις ᾖ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680) [505]

*Notes*: This fragment cannot be hexaplaric since the readings of the Three are already established for this verse.

**Job 33 16a**

HT (אָז) יִגְלֶה אֹזֶן אֲנָשִׁים

LXX (τότε) ἀνακαλύπτει νοῦν ἀνθρώπων,

⟨?⟩ ἕκαστον ὡς δυνατὸν ἐπιστρέφων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] (= 740[mg] 255[mg]-138[mg] 612 559 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505] 523

*Notes*: There is an attribution to Chrysostom in 395. There may be an imprecise parallel to Olympiodorus (*Beiträge*, 79; *AGK* 3, 169), from which this scholion may have come.

**Job 33 17b**

HT וְגֵוָה מִגֶּבֶר יְכַסֶּה׃

LXX τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πτώματος ἐρρύσατο.

⟨?⟩ ἐπιστρέφων πρὸ τῆς τιμωρίας

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 754 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] α′ σ′ 139

*Notes*: This fragment has entered into the exegesis of Nic. Ziegler notes that *Kommentar* uses τιμωρία 3x and ἐπιστρέφειν 2x (*Beiträge*, 79; *AGK* 3, 169).

**Job 33 26b**

HT (וַיַּרְא פָּנָיו) בִּתְרוּעָה

LXX (εἰσελεύσεται δὲ προσώπῳ καθαρῷ) σὺν ἐξηγορίᾳ·

⟨?⟩ μετὰ ἐξομολογήσεως

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*–137 138 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] *Edition* ⟨θ′⟩

*Notes*: This note follows διγρ() ἱλαρῷ in 559 (*Kollationen*, 213). In 788, the hexaplaric fragments of Aq, Th, and Sym are on the left side of the bible text and this fragment appears on the right side. In this early witness these fragments were intended to be separate. Furthermore, the hexaplaric fragments for this verse are established (see chapter 3 "Hexaplaric Fragments."), but whence does this scholion come? The commentary of Olympiodorus has the following reading and it is similar in *AGK*: τότε ὁ διασωθεὶς εὐχαριστήριον ᾠδὴν καὶ ἐξομολόγησιν εὐπρόσδεκτον ἀνοίσει θεῷ, προσώπῳ δὲ καθαρῷ, τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς δηλονότι· καθαίρεται γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ διὰ παιδείας καὶ ἐξομολογήσεως (*Kommentar*, 285; *AGK* 3, 172). There are two possibilities: (1) either this fragment has influenced the catena or (2) the catena has influenced this fragment. Certainty on this question is elusive, but it appears that this is an exegetical fragment and not hexaplaric in this verse (cp Chapter 3, 22:22a Sym for the possible hexaplaric influence on patristic exegesis).

**Job 34 10b**

HT חָלִלָה לָאֵל מֵרֶשַׁע

LXX Μή μοι εἴη ἔναντι κυρίου ἀσεβῆσαι

⟨?⟩ μὴ εἴπομαι αὐτὸν ἀκρίτως τι ποιεῖν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788 3005) *cI*[cat] (= 740[mg] 255[mg]-138[mg] 612[mg] 559 258 395[mg] 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 395

*Notes*: The attribution to Sym in 395 is incorrect, since there is a well established Sym fragment for this verse. The fragment has entered Nic with one change (τὸν θεὸν for αὐτόν) (*AGK* 3, 182; *Beiträge*, 79).

**Job 34 11b**

HT וּכְאֹרַח אִישׁ יַמְצִאֶנּוּ׃

E καὶ ἐν τρίβῳ ἀνδρὸς εὑρήσει αὐτόν.

⟨?⟩ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοφώρῳ ἐλέγξει αὐτόν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680) [505]

*Notes*: The readings of Th and Sym are established for this verse and this fragment is not from Aq. This scholion entered Nic (*AGK* 3, 182; *Beiträge*, 41, 79).

**Job 34 13a**

HT מִי־פָקַד (עָלָיו אָרְצָה)
LXX ὃς ἐποίησεν (τὴν γῆν·)

⟨?⟩ ὑπ’ οὐδενὸς ἀναγκασθεὶς εἰ μὴ δι’ ἀγαθότητα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612$^{cat}$ 559$^{cat}$ 474$^{cat}$ 754 258$^{cat}$ 395 680$^{cat}$ 137$^{cat}$ 3006$^{cat}$ 260$^{cat}$ 643$^{cat}$ 139$^{cat}$) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 395

*Notes*: This scholion is at 13b in the *cI* group. This scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (*AGK* 3, 182; *Beiträge*, 79).

**Job 34 19b**
HT (וְלֹא נִכַּר־שׁוֹעַ לִפְנֵי־)דָל
LXX (οὐδὲ οἶδεν τιμὴν θέσθαι) ἁδροῖς

⟨?⟩ πλουσίοις

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 680) [505] 523$^{mg}$ Pitra

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 680 Pitra

*Notes*: There is some question over the provenance of πλουσίοις at 34:19b. The *Edition* has Sym as the author, but the *Beiträge* notes that there is too narrow a base for this claim, and it concludes that this scholion is probably not a Sym reading but an explanatory gloss. Ziegler lists the traditions of Hesychius and Suda to show that πλούσιον is usually juxtaposed to ἁδρόν in order to further explain its meaning (*Beiträge*, 38-9). This juxtaposition is also present in Olympiodorus at 29:9: ἁδροὺς τοὺς πλουσίους (*Kommentar*, 245; *AGK* 3, 185).

**Job 34 23a**
HT כִּי לֹא עַל־אִישׁ יָשִׂים עוֹד
E ὅτι οὐκ ἐπ’ ἄνδρα θήσει ἔτι·

⟨?⟩ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καθ’ ἕνα ὄψεται τὸ δίκαιον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Var:* ἕνα] εν 395 680 137 3006 643 139

*Notes*: This fragment entered Nic, but the source is unknown (*AGK* 3, 187; *Beiträge*, 79).

**Job 35 7a**

HT אִם־צָדַקְתָּ מַה־תִּתֶּן־לוֹ

LXX ἐπεὶ δὲ οὖν δίκαιος εἶ, τί δώσεις αὐτῷ;

⟨?⟩ εἰ δὲ καὶ ὡς λέγεις δίκαιος εἶ, τί προσθήσεις αὐτῷ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] (= 740 255[mg]-138[mg] 612 559 754 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139) 505

*Notes*: The scholion is attributed to ἄλλο in 137 3006 260 643 139. The source of this fragment is not known, but it does appear to have verbal correspondences with HT (προστιθέναι = נתן in LXX Ps 68(69):27) (*AGK* 3, 201; *Beiträge*, 79).

**Job 36 18a**

HT (כִּי־)חֵמָה (פֶּן־יְסִיתְךָ)

LXX θυμὸς (δὲ ἐπ' ἀσεβεῖς ἔσται)

⟨?⟩ τὸ τιμωρητικὸν τοῦ θεοῦ

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139)

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σ′ 139

*Notes*: The word τιμωρητικός is used only here in the Job catena (*AGK* 4, 338; *AGK* 3, 220), and at present it is not listed for the Three (H-R, 1354). Ziegler draws a parallel to this scholion and the comment in *Kommentar*, but it is not a clear parallel (θυμὸν...ὁ θεὸς...τιμωρεῖται; *Kommentar*, 311; *Beiträge*, 80).

**Job 36 22a**

HT (הֶן־אֵל) יַשְׂגִּיב בְּכֹחוֹ

E (ἰδοὺ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς) κραταιώσει ἐν ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ·

⟨?⟩ τοὺς ὀρθὰ κρίνοντας

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 754 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505]

*Notes*: This scholion has no correspondence with HT or E. It appears to be a direct object supplied for the verb κραταιώσει. The form ὀρθά is used in two other places in the Job catena: one of those is attributed to Olympiodorus (*AGK* 3, 212) and the other comes from a fragment which is closely parallel to Olympiodorus (*AGK* 1, 346; *AGK* 4, 280).

**Job 36 23a**

HT מִי(־פָקַד עָלָיו דַּרְכּוֹ)

LXX τίς (δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἐτάζων αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα;)

## ⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· οὐδείς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Var:* ἀντὶ τοῦ] > 137 3006 643 139

*Notes*: This same fragment appears at 23:13a (*Beiträge*, 84). For specific manuscript data, see *AGK* (*AGK* 3, 222).

**Job 36 24a**

HT (זְכֹר כִּי־)תַשְׂגִּיא (פָעֳלוֹ)

LXX (μνήσθητι ὅτι) μεγάλα (ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα,)

## ⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· θαυμαστά

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Var:* ἀντὶ τοῦ] > 137 3006 643 139

*Notes*: Ziegler shows that the works of God often called “wonderful” in the OT (cf. Ex 34:10, Job 12:22, 42:3, and Sir 11:4; *Beiträge*, 85; *AGK* 3, 223).

**Job 36 26b**

HT (מִסְפַּר שָׁנָיו) וְלֹא־חֵקֶר׃

E (ἀριθμὸς ἐτῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ) ἀπέραντος.

## ⟨?⟩ τουτέστιν· ἀΐδιος

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Notes*: This word is used 6x in the Job catena, and most significantly it is connected with ἀπέραντον (ἀπέραντον καὶ ἀΐδιον) in a comment by Polychronius at Job 11:7a (*AGK* 2, 78; *AGK* 3, 224). The word is not listed for the Three, and in the LXX it appears at WisSal 7:26 and 4 Makk 10:25.

**Job 36 28c**

HT (מִסְפַּר שָׁנָיו) וְלֹא־חֵקֶר׃
LXX ὥραν (ἔθετο κτήνεσιν,)

## ⟨?⟩ μέτρα καὶ ὅρους

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 139

*Notes*: These words belong to Olympiodorus in the Job catena at ΚΕ 64 (*AGK* 3, 234) and this comment is from *Kommentar* (320; *Beiträge*, 80). The scholion, therefore, belongs to Olympiodorus and has no connection to the Hexapla.

**Job 37 7a**

HT בְּיַד־כָּל־אָדָם (יַחְתּוֹם)
E ἐν χειρὶ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου (κατασφραγίζει,)

## ⟨?⟩ τὰ πάντα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 137 3006 643 139)

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ *C* (= 3005); Ἄλλος Field

*Var:* ἀνθρώπου] ουρανου 139 643

*Notes*: There is no corresponding phrase to the HT, and a fragment from the Three would resemble the Th reading under the asterisk. This scholion is probably a marginal gloss without connection to the Hexapla (*AGK* 3, 236; *Beiträge*, 80).

**Job 37 16b-17a**

HT מִפְלְאוֹת תְּמִים דֵּעִים׃
אֲשֶׁר־בְּגָדֶיךָ חַמִּים
LXX ἐξαίσια δὲ πτώματα πονηρῶν.
σοῦ δὲ ἡ στολὴ θερμή·

⟨?⟩ καὶ πῶς ἐξαισίως ἐπιπίτουσι τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς ἐν θέρμῃ ὄντων τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 249cat 257 788-250 3005) *cI*cat (= 740mg 255mg-138mg 612 559 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) 505

*Var:* ἐν θέρμῃ] ενθεν μη 137 3006 260 643 139

*Notes*: This scholion does not appear to be a version of HT but it is a comment on the LXX (*AGK* 3, 242; *Beiträge*, 80).

**Job 37 21b**

HT (בָּהִיר הוּא) בַּשְּׁחָקִים

E (τηλαυγές ἐστιν) ἐν τοῖς παλαιώμασιν

⟨?⟩ τουτέστιν· ἐξ ἀναριθμήτων χρόνων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] α′ 395

*Var:* τουτέστιν] > *C* (= 788-250)

*Notes*: The attribution to Aq in 395 is an error. There is an Aq fragment at this verse, but it has fallen out of 395; therefore, the attribution is for the missing hexaplaric fragment not the exegetical fragment (*AGK* 3, 246). The scholion has been included in Nic (*Beiträge*, 86).

**Job 37 24b**

HT (לֹא־יִרְאֶה כָּל־)חַכְמֵי־לֵב׃

LXX (φοβηθήσονται δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ) οἱ σοφοὶ καρδίᾳ.

⟨?⟩ οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ τὸ τέλειον κατειληφότες

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 260cat 643 139) [505]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 395

*Var:* αὐτοί] αυτο 260; > 139

*Notes*: *AGK* and *Beiträge* draw a parallel between this scholion and *Kommentar* (οὐδὲ...κατέλαβον τὸ τέλειον) (*Kommentar*, 328; *AGK* 3, 248; *Beiträge*, 80). It appears that this scholion is influenced by Olympiodorus and is not hexaplaric.

**Job 38 6b**

HT (אוֹ מִי־יָרָה) אֶבֶן (פִּנָּתָהּ׃)

LXX (τίς δέ ἐστιν ὁ βαλὼν) λίθον (γωνιαῖον ἐπ’ αὐτῆς;)

⟨?⟩ ἐν ᾧ τείνεται τὸ σπαρτίον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505]

*Notes*: *AGK* places the fragment correctly at 6b, while *Beiträge* had it at 5b (*AGK* 3, 267; *Beiträge*, 80). The scholion appears to have come from Olympiodorus (*Beiträge*, 80; *AGK* 3, 267), and it has no overt connection to the Hexapla.

**Job 38 13b**

HT (וְיִנָּעֲרוּ) רְשָׁעִים (מִמֶּנָּה׃)

LXX (ἐκτινάξαι) ἀσεβεῖς (ἐξ αὐτῆς;)

⟨?⟩ τοὺς ἐν σκότῳ λῃστάς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 260 643 139) [505]

*Notes*: There is verbal correspondence between this fragment and Chr-Kommentar for this verse (...τῶν λῃστῶν...) (Chr-*Kommentar*, 187; *AGK* 3, 275; *Beiträge*, 80).

**Job 38 30a**

HT כָּאֶבֶן מַיִם יִתְחַבָּאוּ

LXX ἣ καταβαίνει ὥσπερ ὕδωρ ῥέον;

⟨?⟩ ἡ πάχνη κατιοῦσα κρυσταλλοῖ τοὺς ποταμοὺς ὡς ὀπὸς γάλα

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{cat}$ (= 740$^{mg}$ 255$^{mg}$-138$^{mg}$ 612 559 754 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139$^{mg}$) [505 523]

*Var:* ἡ] > 258 474 754

*Notes*: Ms 395 attributes the fragment to Chrysostom. The comment entered the tradition and influenced Nic (*AGK* 3, 287; *Beiträge*, 80).

**Job 38 36a**

HT מִי־שָׁת בַּטֻּחוֹת חָכְמָה

LXX τίς δὲ ἔδωκεν γυναιξὶν ὑφάσματος σοφίαν

## ⟨?⟩ καίτοι τὰ ἄλλα ἀσθενέσιν οὔσαις

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 [680] 137 3006 643 139) [505 523]

*Notes*: This fragment entered Nic and was attributed to Olymp (*AGK* 3, 293; *Beiträge*, 80).

**Job 39 7b**

HT (תְּשֻׁאוֹת נוֹגֵשׂ) לֹא יִשְׁמָע׃

LXX (μέμψιν δὲ φορολόγου) οὐκ ἀκούων

## ⟨?⟩ ἀπολαύει γὰρ ἀφθόνως τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 257$^{cat}$ 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 139) [505 523]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 139

*Var:* ἀπολαύει γάρ *C* (= 257$^{cat}$ 788-250 3005)] απολαυειν *cI*

*Notes*: Sym does use the verb ἀπολαύειν in Eccl 5:18 and 9:9 for נשׂא and ראה respectively, but the presence of γάρ in the fragment may indicate that this is an explanation of the verse (*AGK* 3, 301; *Beiträge*, 80).

**Job 39 21a**

HT יַחְפְּרוּ בָעֵמֶק וְיָשִׂישׂ

LXX ἀνορύσσων ἐν πεδίῳ γαυριᾷ,

⟨?⟩ τῷ δὲ ποδὶ κατακροαίνων τὴν γῆν γαυριᾷ καὶ φρυάττεται

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 139) [505 523]

*Notes*: This fragment is from Olympiodorus and is not hexaplaric (*AGK* 3, 306; *Beiträge*, 80).

**Job 39 27a**

HT אִם־עַל־פִּיךָ יַגְבִּיהַּ נָשֶׁר

LXX ἐπὶ δὲ σῷ προστάγματι ὑψοῦται ἀετός,

⟨?⟩ τὴν δὲ ὑψιπετῆ πτῆσιν σὺ τῷ ἀετῷ προσέταξας ἔχειν;

*Wit1:* *C*$^{cat}$ (= 249 788-250 3005) *cI*$^{cat}$ (= 740 138-255 612 559 754 474 258 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Var:* ὑψιπετῆ πτῆσιν *C*$^{cat}$ (= 249 788-250 3005)] υψηπετη κτισιν Ol$^{Y}$; υψιπετησιν *cI*

*Notes*: This fragment is from *Kommentar* (*AGK* 3, 310; *Kommentar*, 352; *Beiträge*, 80), and it is probably not hexaplaric.

**Job 39 30a**

HT וְאֶפְרֹחוֹ (וְאֶפְרֹחָיו Q) יְעַלְעוּ־דָם

LXX νεοσσοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ φύρονται ἐν αἵματι,

⟨?⟩ φασὶ τὸν γύπα λάπτειν

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006$^{cat}$ 260 643 139) [505 523]

*Var:* φασί] + γαρ 3006$^{cat}$ 260 643 139

*Notes*: There is no wider context in order to interpret the significance of this fragment. The word λάπτειν occurs only here in the Job catena (*AGK* 4, 256). The scholion appears to be an explanatory gloss on the Greek text.

**Job 40 4a**

HT —

LXX Τί ἔτι ἐγὼ κρίνομαι νουθετούμενος (καὶ ἐλέγχων κύριον)

⟨?⟩ μετὰ τὰ πάθη τοῖς λόγοις

*Wit1:* *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 139) [505 523]

HT —

LXX (Τί ἔτι ἐγὼ κρίνομαι νουθετούμενος) καὶ ἐλέγχων κύριον

⟨?⟩ λείπει τὸ «ὡς», ἵν᾽ ᾖ· ὡς ἐλέγχων κύριον νουθετοῦμαι ὁ ἄθλιος.

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] (= 740[mg] 255[mg]-138[mg] 612 559 754 474 258 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Var:* νουθετοῦμαι *C* (= 788-250 3005)] νουθετουμενος *cI*

**Job 40 7**

HT אֱזָר־נָא כְגֶבֶר (חֲלָצֶיךָ) אֶשְׁאָלְךָ וְהוֹדִיעֵנִי׃

LXX Μή, ἀλλὰ ζῶσαι ὥσπερ ἀνὴρ (τὴν ὀσφύν σου,) ἐρωτήσω δέ σε, σὺ δέ μοι ἀποκρίθητι·

⟨?⟩ «μὴ σιώπα», φησίν, «ἀλλὰ ἀνδρίζου πρὸς τὰς ἐρωτήσεις.»

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395[cat] [680] 137 260 643 732 139) [505 523] 3007*

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σʹ 139

*Var:* ἀλλά] ἀλλ᾽ *C* (= 788-250) 740

*Notes*: The fragment is at 7a in the catena. Ziegler’s evidence for drawing a parallel to Origen for this fragment is only one Nicetas manuscript (*Beiträge*, 81; *AGK* 3,

320-1), which indicates that this fragment is probably not from Origen. This scholion was absorbed by Nic and attributed to Origen, but its prehistory is still unknown.

**Job 40 8b**

HT (תַּרְשִׁיעֵנִי לְמַעַן) תִּצְדָּק׃

LXX (οἴει δέ με ἄλλως σοι κεχρηματικέναι ἢ ἵνα) ἀναφανῇς δίκαιος;

⟨?⟩ ἀντὶ τοῦ· δειχθῇς

*Wit1:* *C* (= 3005) *cI* (= 740 255 612 559 395 [680]) [505 523]

*Notes*: For comments regarding the οἷον in Zeigler's *Beiträge*, see *AGK* (*AGK* 3, 325 §15; *Beiträge*, 87). It is not part of this scholion or the related hexaplaric fragment.

**Job 40 11b**

HT (וּרְאֵה) כָל־גֵּאֶה (וְהַשְׁפִּילֵהוּ׃)

LXX πᾶν δὲ ὑβριστὴν (ταπείνωσον,)

⟨?⟩ τοὺς δαίμονας

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137) [505 523]

*Notes*: *AGK* lists this fragment at 11a, since this phrase may be exegesis of ἀγγέλους in that line. Ms 788 has the index over ὑβριστήν in addition to 3005 and the *cI* group; therefore, this edition maintains the placement at 11b, which also the *Beiträge* had (*AGK* 3, 327; *Beiträge*, 81).The fragment does not appear to have any contact with HT or the Hexapla.

**Job 40 12a**

HT (רְאֵה כָל־)גֵּאֶה (הַכְנִיעֵהוּ)

LXX ὑπερήφανον (δὲ σβέσον,)

⟨?⟩ τὸν ἀρχέκακον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137) [505 523]

*Notes*: *AGK* places this fragment at 40:11b, but the manuscripts and the *Beiträge* have it at 12a (*AGK* 3, 327; *Beiträge*, 81).

**Job 40 13b**

HT (פְּנֵיהֶם) חֲבֹשׁ בַּטָּמוּן׃

LXX (τὰ δὲ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν) ἀτιμίας ἔμπλησον·

⟨?⟩ διὰ τῶν ἐλέγχων

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 643 732 139) [505 523]

*Attr:* ⟨?⟩] σ′ 139

*Notes*: There appears to be no connection to HT or Hexapla (*AGK* 3, 328; *Beiträge*, 81).

**Job 40 20a**
HT כִּֽי־ב֣וּל הָרִ֣ים יִשְׂאוּ־ל֑וֹ
LXX (ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπ’ ὄρος) ἀκρότομον

⟨?⟩ ἀκρότομον· τὸ δύσβατον

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI* (= 740 138-255 612 559 754 395 [680] 137 3006 643 732 139) [505 523] Suidas A 1021 (I S. 94 Adler)

*Var:* ἀκρότομον] > 3005 | δύσβατον *C* (= 788-250 3005)] δυνατον *cI*

*Notes*: The Suidas reads as follows: ἀκρότομον δὲ ὄρος τὸ δυνατὸν παρὰ τῷ Ἰώβ, and it is dependent on the *cI* group (*AGK* 3, 337; *Beiträge*, 81). There is no discernable correspondence to HT or the Hexapla.

**Job 41 13a**
HT נַ֭פְשׁוֹ גֶּחָלִ֣ים תְּלַהֵ֑ט
LXX ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἄνθρακες,

⟨?⟩ ἀφ’ ἧς ἐξέρχονται *τὰ πεπυρωμένα βέλη*

*Wit1:* *C* (= 788-250 3005) *cI*[cat] (= 740 255[I] 255[IIm]-138[I] 138[IIm] 612 559 474 258 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 139) [505 523]

*Notes*: This fragment is unattributed in *Beiträge*, but *AGK* attributes it to Evagrius (*AGK* 3, 362). Mss 255[II]-138[II] 474 do not have an attribution, but ms 788 has a

clear attribution to Evagrius. The words in italics allude to Ephesians 6:16. There is no connection to the Hexapla.

**Job 42 17bγ**

| | |
|---|---|
| HT | — |
| LXX | (προυπῆρχεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὄνομα) Ἰωβάβ· |

# ⟨?⟩ πατὴρ ἐν αὐτοῖς

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes*: This fragment was not listed in the *Edition* but in the *Kollationen* (298). It does not appear to be hexaplaric but rather an explanation of the name Ἰωβάβ (*Kollationen*, 298). There is no onomasticum sacrum for Ἰωβάβ in de Lagarde's work (de Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra*, Gottingae: 1870, 59).

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY

## Introduction

The primary goal of this project was to produce a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Job 22-42, which would not only gather data from previous editions but also update those editions by incorporating new findings and sources. There were two types of updates: (1) newly added materials and revised materials and (2) placing the already known fragments on a surer textual foundation through the use of the manuscript stemma of the Hagedorns and translation technique studies. This summary lists relevant preliminary findings of the first type of update and demonstrates where this edition moves beyond Ziegler's *Edition* II App. The material is arranged as follows: (1) newly identified hexaplaric fragments and attributions, (2) revision of attribution and lemma, (3) revision of attribution only, (4) revision of lemma only, (5) unattributed scholia, and (6) removed readings.

## Preliminary Findings

### Newly Identified Hexaplaric Fragments and Attributions

This project lists twenty-two newly identified hexaplaric fragments. Of these fragments, fourteen have an attribution preserved in the witnesses, while eight were assigned an attribution through considerations of translation technique. The following fragments are not listed in Ziegler's II App and all of them except one have not been listed until now. Field listed Job 39:18a σʹ πετομένη, but in a footnote he considered it to be a scholion, and Ziegler did not list it in his II App. Initially, only the *cI* group

preserved this fragment and attribution to Sym, and therefore it could have been interpreted as a scholion. The *C* (= 788 3005) group now confirms that this fragment and attribution belong to the oldest Greek catena, and therefore it should be listed among the hexaplaric materials of Job. The newly identified fragments are as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 23:3b | ⟨θ′⟩ | ἕως ἑτοιμασίας αὐτοῦ |
| 23:14a | α′ θ′ | ὅτι ἀπαρτίσει ἀκριβασμόν |
| 24:1b-2a | ⟨σ′⟩ | καὶ γινώσκοντες αὐτὸν οὐκ οἴδασι τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ |
| 24:10a | γ′ | ἄνευ ἐνδύματος |
| 24:24ab | γ′ | ὀλίγον καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει, καὶ ταπεινώσει αὐτὸν καθὼς πάντα τὰ συγκλασθησόμενα |
| 27:12b | σ′ | ματαιολογεῖτε |
| 27:14b | ⟨σ′⟩ | οἱ ἀπόγονοι |
| 30:21a | α′ θ′ | ἐστράφης εἰς ἀνελεήμονά μοι |
| 31:9a | σ′ | ὥρμησεν |
| 31:11ab | σ′ | ὅπερ ἐστὶ μύσος καὶ τοῦτο ὑπερβάλλουσα ἀδικία |
| 31:12a | σ′ | πῦρ δὲ τὸ ἕως συντελείας ἀναλίσκον |
| 34:18a | ⟨α′⟩ | ἀποστάτα |
| 34:18a | ⟨σ′⟩ | ἀπαίδευτε |
| 34:18a | ⟨θ′⟩ | ἄδικε |
| 36:2b | ⟨σ′⟩ | [ἔτ]ι γὰρ περὶ θεοῦ [εἰ]σὶ λόγοι |
| 36:28a | ⟨α′⟩ | ⟨ῥοπαί⟩ |
| 38:12a | γ′ | ἢ ἀφ’ ἡμερῶν σου |
| 39:18a | σ′ | πετομένη |
| 40:17a | σ′ | τονώσει |
| 40:22b | λ′ | ἰτέαι |
| 42:17aα | θ′ | μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὅτι θεὸς ἀναστήσει |
| 42:17eδ | θ′ | ὁ ’Ϊεμιναίων |

**Revision of Attribution and Lemma**

This category covers two types of revision: (1) six actual fragments which required revision of attribution and lemma of identified hexaplaric fragments, and (2) twenty-six places in the *Edition*, where Ziegler listed multiple attributions and lemmata,

which have been reassessed in order to ascertain the original attribution and lemma.[1]

There were six instances of the first type, and two of these instances require further explanation. The attribution to Aq in Job 37:1a was a typographical error in the *Edition*, which has been corrected here. Job 30:7a α′ appears as a variant in the *Edition* II App, but this edition has clarified that there are two fragments for that verse; thus, the Aq fragment appears as a new fragment here. The six instances of this type are listed as follows with the attribution of the *Edition* in parentheses:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 23:8 | α′ (⟨α′⟩) | ἰδοὺ ἀρχῆθεν πορεύσομαι καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει, καὶ ὀπίσω καὶ οὐ συνήσω αὐτόν |
| 23:9a | σ′ () | οὐκ ἐπιλήψομαι |
| 28:16a | ⟨σ′⟩ (α′) | οὐκ ἀναβληθήσεται |
| 30:7a | α′ (σ′) | φυτῶν |
| 31:13a | σ′ (⟨σ′⟩) | εἰ ὑπερεφρόνησα |
| 37:1a | σ′ (α′) | καὶ περὶ τούτου |

Two examples of the second type should be sufficient for this summary. At 31:31a, Ziegler lists two fragments as follows: α′ εἰ μὴ εἶπον and σ′ θ′ οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς σκηνῆς μου, but there is no manuscript which attests these readings and attributions. The *C* (= 788 3005) group attests one fragment with an original triple attribution. From this starting point, it is easier to see how the longer fragment was divided and the attributions were placed the way they were in the *cI* group.

At 41:1a, Ziegler lists the following two fragments: σ′ ἰδοὺ ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ ⟨διαψεύσεται⟩ 252; θ′ ἰδοὺ ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ διεψεύσατο *C′*. The fragments are the same (252 omits the verb), but the attributions are different. The new evidence of 788 shows that the attribution to Th is part of the oldest Greek catena and, therefore, the attribution to Sym for the same fragment in 252 is incorrect.

---

[1]They are listed as follows: 22:18a α′ θ′, 24:2a α′, 27:20a α′ σ′, 28:1b λ′, 28:15a σ′, 29:25b σ′, 30:12c α′, 31:21a σ′, 31:31a α′ σ′ θ′, 31:40a θ′, 32:11c σ′, 34:5b, 37:3a α′, 37:9a α′, 37:9b α′ θ′, 38:25a ⟨θ′⟩, 38:25a α′, 38:35b α′, 39:13a σ′, 39:19b σ′, 40:8b σ′, 41:1a θ′, 41:10a α′, 42:11g σ′, 42:14a α′, 42:14c α′ σ′.

## Revision of Attribution

This project revised the attributions of twenty-four previously established hexaplaric fragments. Of these fragments, twenty-two have attributions which are attested in manuscript evidence, while two are conjectures based on other considerations. In fourteen cases, there is a revision of an existing attribution (e.g. 29:2b). In six cases, old conjectures are confirmed by new manuscript evidence (e.g. 22:16b). In two cases, a new attribution was assigned on the basis of manuscript evidence (e.g. 38:40a).

Job 42:11f is a good example of a new attribution assigned by conjecture through new manuscript evidence and translation technique. Previously, Ziegler listed two fragments attributed to Sym, one on the basis of 248 and the other on the basis of the catena. The new evidence of 788 and 3005 brings this conclusion into question. Ms 3005 has an attribution to Aq and 788 preserves a double attribution to Sym and Th. Ms 788 preserves the original double attribution, but it has already been corrupted by the insertion of Sym and the omission of Aq, which 3005 confirms as genuine. These two mss preserve the attributions to Aq and Th, and translation equivalents confirmed this textual reconstruction, since Sym usually translates רעה with κακός as the fragment in 248 attests, and Aq and Th (to a lesser degree) render רעה with κακία, as the oldest Greek catena attests. The revised attributions are as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 22:16b | σʹ (⟨σʹ⟩) | ποταμὸς παρασύρει τὸν θεμέλιον αὐτῶν |
| 22:22a | αʹ θʹ (αʹ) | νόμον |
| 29:2a | σʹ (αʹ σʹ) | τίς δῴη μοι κατὰ τοὺς μῆνας τοὺς πρώτους |
| 29:2b | θʹ (αʹ σʹ) | κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἃς ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλασσέν με |
| 29:11b | αʹ σʹ ([αʹ] σʹ) | ἐμαρτύρησεν περὶ ἐμοῦ |
| 30:1d | αʹ θʹ σʹ (λʹ) | μετὰ τῶν κυνῶν τῶν προβάτων μου |
| 31:9b | λʹ (αʹ σʹ) | ἐνήδρευσα |
| 33:7a | σʹ (αʹ) | ἐκθαμβήσει |
| 33:26b | αʹ θʹ (αʹ) | ἐν ἀλαλαγμῷ |
| 37:20b | σʹ (⟨σʹ⟩) | ἐὰν εἴπῃ· ἀνὴρ καταποθήσεται |
| 38:7b | αʹ σʹ θʹ (αʹ θʹ) | υἱοὶ θεοῦ |
| 38:16b | σʹ (αʹ) | ἐν ἐξιχνιασμῷ |
| 38:24a | αʹ σʹ θʹ (αʹ θʹ) | φῶς |
| 38:28a | σʹ (⟨σʹ⟩) | ἆρά ἐστιν ὑετῷ πατήρ |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 38:39a | α′ σ′ (σ′ θ′) | θήραν |
| 38:40a | σ′ () | ὅτι φωλεύσουσιν |
| 39:1a | σ′ (θ′ (leg σ′)) | νεβρῶν ἐν πέτρᾳ |
| 39:21a | α′ σ′ θ′ (α′ θ′) | ἐν κοιλάδι |
| 40:8a | ⟨α′⟩ (σ′ (leg α′) | μήτι καίπερ ἀκυρώσεις κρίσιν μου |
| 40:10a | α′ (⟨α′⟩) | κόσμησαι δὴ ὑπερφερείᾳ καὶ μετεωρότητι |
| 42:2b | θ′ (οἱ ἄλλοι) | καὶ οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐνθύμημα |
| 42:10c | σ′ θ′ () | ※ εἰς διπλασιασμόν |
| 42:10c | α′ (⟨α′⟩) | εἰς δευτέρωσιν |
| 42:11f | ⟨α′ θ′⟩ (σ′) | περὶ πάσης τῆς κακίας |

**Revision of Lemma**

There were sixty-six places where the lemma of II App was revised, but the attribution was confirmed.[2] Not all of these revisions are equally significant: some consist of minor changes, while others consist of more substantive ones.

Job 23:6a σ′ furnishes an example of minor change. Ziegler's II App had: διαδικάζεταί μοι, while this edition has δικάζεταί μοι on the basis of 3005 and consideration of translation equivalents.

Job 26:5a σ′ is an example of two separate lemmata in Ziegler's *Edition*, which were able to be combined into one here. The lemma is comprised of three different fragments, and the integrity of these witnesses is still intact in the *Wit1* line.

Job 27:9a λ′ was not revised with regard to the wording of the lemma, but the placement of the fragment itself. The *Edition* listed it at 9b, but the evidence of 3005 and considerations of translation technique show that it should be listed at 9a.

Some revisions were more substantive. At 28:25-26a α′, the *Edition* has the

---

[2]They are listed as follows: 22:3b σ′, 22:16a σ′, 22:17b θ′, 23:6a σ′, 23:8 σ′, 24:5b σ′, 24:12c σ′, 24:15c σ′, 24:22b σ′, 24:23 σ′, 24:25b σ′, 25:2a α′ θ′, 25:3b σ′, 25:5a α′, 26:5 α′, 26:5 σ′, 26:14ab σ′, 27:1 α′, 27:9a λ′, 27:23a α′, 28:18a σ′, 28:19b σ′, 28:25-26a α′, 28:26b σ′, 29:4a σ′, 29:4b σ′, 29:25c σ′, 30:2b-3a α′, 30:2b-3a σ′, 30:4a α′, 30:7a σ′, 30:17a λ′, 30:27a σ′, 30:30a λ′, 31:6a α′, 31:29b σ′, 32:1b σ′, 33:13 σ′, 34:11b σ′, 34:17a σ′, 34:33 σ′, 35:6a σ′, 35:16b σ′, 36:5b-6a α′, 36:33a σ′, 37:6b σ′, 37:10a σ′, 37:13a σ′, 37:14b θ′, 37:15a σ′, 37:18a α′, 38:9a σ′, 38:25b σ′, 38:32a σ′, 38:38 α′, 39:4b σ′, 39:24b σ′, 39:30b σ′, 40:16a σ′, 40:30a σ′, 41:2a α′ θ′, 41:4b σ′, 42:5a λ′, 42:7c θ′, 42:8c α′.

following: καὶ ὕδωρ ἐσταθμίσατο ἐν καταμετρήσει, while this edition based on the new evidence of 257 as presented in the *Nachlese* has: καὶ ὕδωρ ἐσταθμίσατο ἐν καταμετρήσει ἐν τῷ ποιῆσαι αὐτὸν ὑετῷ ἀκριβασμόν. The expanded lemma agrees with HT and is found in a reliable witness. At 30:17a λʹ, the *Edition* has the following lemma: νυκτός, while this edition, based on the new evidence of 257 as presented in the *Nachlese*, has the following: συγκέκοπται νυκτός. The expansion agrees with HT and is preserved in a reliable witness. At 34:33 σʹ, the *Edition* has the following lemmata attributed to Sym: ἀποδοκιμάσεις *C*; ἀπεδοκίμασας 249, while this edition based on the new evidence of 249 as presented in the *Nachlese*, has the following: ὅτι ἀπεδοκίμασας· σὺ γὰρ ἐπελέξω καὶ οὐκ ἐγώ. The longer reading agrees with HT and is found in a reliable witness.

**Unattributed Scholia**

In the *Edition*, there were eleven unattributed scholia.[3] Of these instances 23:9a and 38:40a were found to be hexaplaric (see Revision of Attribution and Revision of Attribution and Lemma above). In ms 157 Job 23:16b (2x) contains two fragments, which are probably related to the Nicetas catena (see discussion in chapter four). When the Hagedorns recollated ms 523, they found that the ms supported the lemma in 23:15c. Job 26:13b probably records a hexaplaric reading, but there is no way to determine the author. The rest of the instances are listed in chapter four.

**Removed Readings**

There were also four readings in II App that needed to be removed from the corpus for various reasons. Job 24:13b σʹ is not hexaplaric (see the relevant discussion in chapter three). The fragment of Job 31:2a αʹ was caused by misreading the attribution to

[3]The references are as follows: 22:12a, 22:29b, 23:9a, 23:15c, 23:16b (2x), 26:13b, 28:16b, 30:3a, 30:16a, 38:40a.

Aq (see chapter three). Job 38:27b was not found in any manuscript which the Hagedorns collated. Job 41:21a χόρτος α′ θ′ arose from a misreading of manuscript 255 (see discussion in chapter three).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary Sources

Ceriani, A. M., ed. *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolitographice editus.* Monumenta sacra et profana, 7. Milan: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874.

Chrysostom, John. *Johannes Chrysostomos Kommentar zu Hiob*. Edited by Ursula Hagedorn and Dieter Hagedorn. Patristische Texte und Studien 35. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.

Cox, Claude. *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 42. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

________. *Armenian Job: Reconstructed Greek Text, Critical Edition of the Armenian with English Translation.* Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

________. *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 21. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Lagarde, Paul de. *Onomastica sacra*. Gottingae: prostant in aedibus Dieterichianis Luederi Horstmann, 1887.

Lange, Nicholas R. M. de. "Some New Fragments of Aquila on Malachi and Job?" *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1980): 291-94.

Didymus. *Kommentar zu Hiob: (Tura-Papyrus)*. Edited by Albert Henrichs, Ursula Hagedorn, Dieter Hagedorn, and Ludwig Koenen. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, Bd. 1-3, 33. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1968.

Elliger, L., and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967/77, 1997.

Field, Frederick. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1875.

Hagedorn, Ursula, and Dieter Hagedorn, eds. *Die Älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob: Band I Einleitung, Prologue und Epilogue, Fragmente zu Hiob 1,1-8,22.* Patristische Texte und Studien 40. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.

________. *Die Älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob: Band II* Fragmente zu Hiob 9,1-22,30. Patristische Texte und Studien 48. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

________. *Die Älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob: Band III Fragmente zu Hiob 23,1-42,17*. Patristische Texte und Studien 53. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000.

________. *Die Älteren Griechishen Katenen zum Buch Hiob: Band IV Register. Nachträge und Anhänge.* Patristische Texte und Studien 59. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

________. *Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1 Philologisch-Historische Klasse, no. 10 (1991). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

Jerome. Epistle 57 to Pammachius: "On the Best Method of Translating." *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiaticorum Latinorum*, vol. 54, ed. Isidorus Hilberg, 503-26. Vindobonae: Österreichischen Akadamie der Wissenschaften, 1996.

________. Epistle 112 to Augustine. *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiaticorum Latinorum*, vol. 55, ed. Isidorus Hilberg, 367-93. Vindobonae: Österreichischen Akadamie der Wissenschaften, 1996.

________. *Liber Job Altera Versio*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Patrologia Latina 29. Paris: Apud Garnier fratres, 1846.

________. *Praefatio Hieronymi in librum Job.* Edited by J. P. Migne. Patrologia Latina 29. Paris: Apud Garnier fratres, 1846.

________. *Praefatio in librum Paralipomenon*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Patrologia Latina 28. Paris: Apud Garnier fratres, 1845.

________. *Commentariorum in Hiezechielem*. Edited by Francisci Glorie. Corpus Christianorum 75. Turnholt: Brepols, 1964.

Julian of Eclanum. *Iuliani Aeclanensis Expositio Libri Iob. Tratatus Prophetarum Osee, Iohel, et Amos*. Edited by L. de Coninck. Corpus Christianorum 88. Turnholt: Brepols, 1977.

Julian the Arian. *Der Hiob Kommentar des Arianers Julian*. Edited by Dieter Hagedorn Patristische Texte und Studien 14. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973.

Klostermann, E. *Analecta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik*. Leipzig: A. Deichert Georg Böhme, 1895.

Montfaucon, Bernard de. *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt: multis partibus auctiora*.

2 vols. Paris: Ludovicus Guerin, 1713.

Müller-Kessler, Christa, and Michael Sokoloff, eds. *The Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament and Apocrypha Version from the Early Period*. A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic, vol. 1. Groningen: STYX Publications, 1997.

Nicetas. *Catena Græcorum Patrum in beatum Iob: collectore Niceta Heracleæ metropolita ex duobus mss. Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ codicibus, Græcè nunc primùm in lucem edita, & Latinè versa*. Edited by Patrick Young. London: Ex typographio Regio, 1637.

Olympiodorus. *Kommentar zu Hiob*. Edited by Ursula Hagedorn and Dieter Hagedorn. Patristische Texte und Studien, Bd. 24. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.

Origen. *Origenis Werke: Commentary in Matthew*. 2 vols. Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1935.

________. *Sur les Ecritures: Philocalie, 1-20 et La Lettre à Africanus*. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Notes by N. R. M. de Lange. Sources Chrétiennes 302. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1983.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpres.* 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004.

Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace, eds. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. 6, *Jerome: Letters and Select Works.* Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1890. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishing, 1994.

________. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. 1, *Eusebius: The Life of Constantine.* Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1890. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishing, 1994.

Schulthess, F. "Christlich-palästinische Fragmente. Fragment IV." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (*ZDMG*) 56 (1902): 253f: 16:9b ἐπ' ἐμέ–19.

Sokoloff, Michael. *The Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI*. Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University, 1974.

Treu, K. "Neue Berliner Septuagintafragmente." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 20 (1970): 43-65.

Ulrich, Eugene, Frank Moore Cross, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Peter W. Flint, Sarianna Metso, Catherine, M. Murphy, Curt Niccum, Patrick W. Skehan, Emanuel Tov, and Julio Trebolle Barrera. *Qumran Cave 4 XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Discoveries in the Judean Desert 16. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

Van der Ploeg, J. P. M., and A. S. van der Woude. *Le targum de Job de la grotte XI de Qumrân*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Weber, R., B. Fischer, J. Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, and W. Thiele, eds. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Iob*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum, vol. 11.4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

## Secondary Sources

### Reference Works

Allenbach, J., ed. *Biblia patristica: index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la literature patristique*. 6 vols. plus supplement. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975-1995.

Barthélemy, D. *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project.* 5 vols. New York: United Bible Societies, 1979.

Bauer, W. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Revised by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Baumgartner, W., ed. *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament.* 3rd ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Bedrossian, Matthias. *New Dictionary: Armenian-English*. Venice: S. Lazarus Armenian Academy, 1875. Reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009.

Bergsträsser, G. *Hebräische Grammatik*. 2 vols. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1918-1929. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1986.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Edited and translated by R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Brenton, Lancelot C. L. *The Septuaginta With Aprocrypha: Greek and English.* London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, n.d.

Brock, Sebastian, Charles T. Fritsch, and Sidney Jellicoe, eds. *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint.* Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 6. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Brockelmann, C. *Lexikon Syriacum*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1928. Reprint, Hildesham: Georg Olms, 1982.

Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. Briggs, eds. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907; reprint, 1955.

Browning, Robert. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. London: Hutchinson, 1969.

Buck, C. D. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.

Conybeare, F. C., and George Stock. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Coxe, A. Cleveland, ed. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 4, *Tertullian, Part Fourth; Minucius Felix; Commodian; Origen, Parts First and Second*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1867-1872. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976.

De Vaux, R., and J. T. Milik. *Qumran Grotte 4: II (Archeologie et 4Q128-4Q157),* vol. 6. Discoveries in the Judean Desert. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

Dogniez, Cécile, ed. *A Bibliography of the Septuagint: 1970-1973.* Vetus Testamentum Supplement 69. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Dorival, G., M. Harl, and O. Munnich, eds. *La Bible Grecque des Septante.* Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1988.

Dos Santos, E. C. *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint*. Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, Baptist House, n.d.

Even-Shoshan, Abraham, ed. *A New Concordance of the Bible*. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sefer Publishing House, 1993.

Gesenius, W., and E. Kautsch. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 28th German ed.; 2nd English ed. Translated by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Gignac, F. T. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. 1. *Phonology*. Testi e documenti per lo Studio dell; Antichità 55. Milan: Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1976.

________. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. 2. *Morphology*. Testi e documenti per lo Studio dell; Antichità 55. Milan: Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1981.

Gryson, Roger, and Hermann Josef Frede. *Altlateinische Handschriften: = Manuscrits vieux latins : répertoire descriptif. Première partie. Mss 1-275*. Freiburg: Herder, 1999.

Hatch, E., and H. A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. 2nd ed. Grand

Rapids: Baker, 1998.

Helbing, Robert. *Grammatik der Septuaginta Laut- und Wortlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907. Reprint, 1979.

Jastrow, M. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 vols. London: Luzac, 1903. Reprint, New York: Pardes, 1950.

Joüon, P. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Subsidia Biblical 14. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1991; reprint with corrections, 1993.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. Revised by W. Baumgartner and Johann Jakob Stamm. Translated and edited by M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994-2000.

Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Land, J. P. N. *Anecdota syriaca IV*. Lugdini Batavorum, 1875; Neudruck Jerusalem, 1971.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexion, with a Revised Supplement*. 9th ed. Revised by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Frederick McKenzie. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Lisowsky, G. *Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.

Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.

Lütkemann, Leonhard, and Alfred Rahlfs. *Hexaplarische Randnoten zu Isaias 1-16 aus einer Sinai-handschrift*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, Bd. 1, Heft 6. Berlin: Weidmann, 1915.

Mayser, E. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. 2 vols. in 6 parts. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1906-1934.

Mills, Watson E., and Thomas F. Dailey. *Bibliographies for Biblical Research. Old Testament Series*, vol. 13, *The Book of Job.* Lewiston, NY: Mellen Biblical Press, 1997.

Moulton, J. H. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906-1976.

Müller-Kessler, Christa. *Grammatik des Christlich-Palästinisch-Aramäischen*. Teil 1:

Schiftlehre, Lautlehre, Formenlehre. New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1991.

Nöldeke, Theodor. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. Translated by James A. Crichton. London: Williams and Norgate, 1904. Reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003.

Payne Smith, J., ed. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902. Reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1999.

Payne Smith, R., ed. *Thesaurus syriacus*. Oxonii: e typographeo Clarendoniano, 1879.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Qimron, E. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Harvard Semitic Studies, no. 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Rahlfs, Alfred. *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments. Bd I, 1. Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert.* Translated by Detlef Fraenkel. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Supplementum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

Reider, J. *An Index to Aquila. Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew-Greek, Latin-Hebrew, with the Syriac and Armenian Evidence*. Completed and revised by N. Turner. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 12. Leiden: Brill, 1966.

Rengstorf, K. H., ed. *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1973-1983.

Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research.* Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.

Rosenthal, F. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Porta Linguarum Orientalium, N.S. 5. Wiedbaden: Otto Harrasowitz, 1983.

Schleusner, Joh. Fried. *Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus. Lexicon in LXX et Reliquos Interpretes Graecos, ac Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti.* 3 volumes. London: 1829.

Schulthess, F. *Lexicon syropalaestinum.* Berolini: Georgii Reimer, 1903.

Schwyzer, E. *Griechische Grammatik*. 4 vols. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, II.1.1-4. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1950-53, 1971; reprint, 1977.

Segal, J. B. *The Diacritical Point and the Accents in Syriac*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953. Reprint, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2003.

Segal, M. H. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.

Smith Lewis, A. *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary: Studia sinaitica VI.* London, 1897.

Smyth, H. W. *Greek Grammar.* Revised by G. M. Messing. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920, 1956. Reprint, 1963.

Sokoloff, Michael. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2009.

________. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period.* Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1990.

Stec, David M. *The Text of the Targum of Job: An Introduction and Critical Edition*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 20. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Stevenson, Wm. B. *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

Strack, H. L., and P. Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*. 6 vols. in 7. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922-1961.

Swete, Henry Barclay. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902. Reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Vol. 1, *Introduction, Orthography and Accidence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Thomson, Robert W. *An Introduction to Classical Armenian*. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1998.

Tov, Emanuel. *A Classified Bibliography of Lexical and Grammatical Studies on the Language of the Septuagint.* Jerusalem: Academon, 1980. Rev. and enlarged, 1982.

Walters (Katz), Peter. *The Text of the Septuagint*. Edited by David W. Gooding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Williams, R. J. *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Ziegler, J. *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der

Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3rd ser., 147. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, no. 18. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.

________. *Randnoten aus der Vetus Latina des Buches Iob in spanischen Vulgatabibeln: Sitzungsberichte der Bayer*. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Kl., Jahrgang 1980, vol. 2.

**Books and Monographs**

Baars, W. *New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts: Edited, Commented Upon and Compared with the Septuagint.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

Barthélemy, Dominique. *Les Devanciers d'Aquila: Première Publication Intégrale du Texte des Fragments du Dodécaprophéton*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 10. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.

Daniel, S. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire de culte dans le Septante*. Études et Commentaires 61. Paris, 1966.

Dorival, G. *Les Nombres: Traduction du text grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes*. La Bible d' Alexexandrie 5. Paris: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

Gentry, P. J. *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Grafton, A., and M. Williams. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Hyvärinen, K. *Die Übersetzung von Aquila*. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 10. Uppsala: G. W. K. Gleerup, 1977.

Kamesar, Adam. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones hebraicae in Genesim*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Middeldorpf, H., ed. *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Liber Quartus Regum e Codice Parisiensi Iesaias Duodecim prophetai Minores Proverbia Iobus Canticum Threni Ecclesiasticus e Codice Mediolanensi*. 2 vols. Berlin: Enslin, 1835.

Orlinsky, H. M., ed. *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

Salvesen, Alison. *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*. JSS Monograph 15. Manchester: Victoria University of Manchester, 1991.

ter Haar Romeny, R. B. *A Syrian in Greek Dress. The Use of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis*. Traditio Exegetica Graeca 6. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.

**Articles**

Barr, J. "Review of An Index to Aquila. Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew Greek, Latin-Hebrew, with the Syriac and Armenian Evidence, by J. Reider, comp. and rev. N. Turner." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 12 (1967): 296-304.

Brock, S. P. "Origen's aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament." In *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*, ed. H. M. Orlinsky, 343-46. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

________. "To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation." In *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, eds. G. J. Brooke and B. Linkars, 301-38. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Burkitt, F. C. "Aquila." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 10 (1898): 207-16.

Cox, C. E. "Traveling with Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia." In *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 302-16. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Dines, Jennifer M. "Jerome and the Hexapla: The Witness of the Commentary on Amos." In *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 421-36. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Dorival, Gilles. "Remargues sur l'Originalité du Livre Grec des Nombres." In *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992*, ed. L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich, 89-107. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Emerton, J. A. "The Purpose of the Second Column of the Hexapla." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1956): 79-87.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. "The Textual Context of the Hexapla: Lucianic Texts and Vetus Latina." In *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 408-20. Texte und Studien zum Antiken

Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Fritsch, C. T. "The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Hexaplar of Proverbs." In *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*, ed. H. M. Orlinsky, 356-68. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

Gentry, Peter J. "Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Rôle of the Syro-Hexapla." *Aramaic Studies* 1 (2003): 5-28.

________. "The Place of Theodotion-Job in the Textual History of the Septuagint." In *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 199-230. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

________. "The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes of the Syro-Hexapla." *Aramaic Studies* 2, no. 1 (2004): 63-84.

Gehman, Henry S. "Ἐπισκέπομαι, ἐπίσκεψις, ἐπίδκοπος, and ἐπισκοπή in the Septuagint in Relation to פקד and other Hebrew Roots – a Case of Semantic Development to that of Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 22, no. 2 (1972): 197-207.

Grabbe, L. L. "Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982): 527-36.

________. "The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?" In *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Linkars, 505-56. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Harl, Marguerite. "Le Renouvellement du Lexique des 'Septante' d'Apres le Temoignage des Recensions, Revisions et Commentaires Grecs Anciens." In *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989*, ed. C. E. Cox, 239-59. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Jarick, J. "Aquila's Koheleth." *Textus* 15 (1990): 131-39.

Jellicoe, Sidney. "Aquila and his Version." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 59 (1968-1969): 326-32.

Jenkins, R. G. "Colophons of the Syrohexapla and the Textgeschichte of the Recensions of Origen." In *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989*, ed. C. E. Cox, 261-77. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

________. “The First Column of the Hexapla: The Evidence of the Milan Codex (Rahlfs 1098) and the Cairo Genizah Fragment (Rahlfs 2005).” In *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, 88-102. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

________. “Sunia and Fretela Revisited: Reflections on the Hexaplaric Psalter.” In *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992*, eds. L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich, 219-32. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Kahle, P. E. “The Greek Bible Manuscripts Used by Origen.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960): 111-18.

Katz, Peter. “Notes on the Septuagint.” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 57 (1946): 30-33.

Katz, Peter, and J. Ziegler. “Ein Aquila-Index in Vorbereitung.” *Vetus Testamentum* 8 (1958): 264-85.

Law, T. Michael. “A History of Research on Origen’s Hexapla: From Masius to The Hexapla Project.” *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 40 (2007): 30-48.

________. “Origen’s Parallel Bible: Textual Criticism, Apologetics, or Exegesis?” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 59 (2008): 1-21.

Liebreich, Leon J. “Notes on the Greek Version of Symmachus.” The *Journal of Biblical Literarure* 63 (1944): 397-403.

Lust, J. “The Greek Version of Balaam’s Third and Fourth Oracles. The ανθρωπος in Num 24:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography. In *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992*, ed. L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich, 233-57. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

________. “A Lexicon of the Three and the Transliterations in Ezekiel.” In *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 274-301. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Margolis, M. L. “Hexapla and Hexaplaric.” *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 32: (1915-1916): 126-40.

Marquis, Galen. “The Text-Critical Relevance of the Three in the Book of Jeremiah: An Examination of the Critical Apparatus of the Hebrew University Bible Project Edition.” In *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd*

*August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 255-73. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Martin, M. J. "Origen's Theory of Language and the First Two Columns of the Hexapla." *Harvard Theological Review* 97 (2004): 99-106.

Munnich, Olivier. "Les Hexaples d'Origène à la lumière de la tradition manuscrite de la Bible grecque." In *Origeniana Sexta: Origene et la Bible*, ed. Giles Dorival et Alain Le Boulluec, 167-85. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995.

Nestle, Eberhard. "Symmachus, not Aquila." *The Expository Times* 22 (1910-1911): 377.

Norton, Gerard J. "Cautionary Reflection on a Re-edition of Fragments of Hexaplaric Material." In *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, 129-155. Orbis Biblicus et orientalis 109. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1991.

________. "Collecting Data for a New Edition of the Fragments of the Hexapla." In *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995*, ed. B. A. Taylor, 251-62. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

________. "Observations on the First Two Columns of the Hexapla." In *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 103-24. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Orlinsky, H. M. "The Columnar order of the Hexapla." In *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*, ed. H. M. Orlinsky, 369-81. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

________. "Origen's Tetrapla – A Scholarly Fiction?" In *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*, ed. H. M. Orlinsky, 382-91. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

Rahlfs, Alfred. "Quis sit ὁ Σύρος?" In *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*, ed. H. M. Orlinsky, 292-300. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

Salvesen, Alison. "The Relationship of the LXX and the Three in Exodus 1-24 to the readings of $F^b$." In *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions: Studies in Their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Nicholas de Lange, et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

________. “Symmachus Readings in the Pentateuch.” In *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994,* ed. Alison Salvesen, 177-98. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Scanlin, Harold P. “A New Edition of Origen’s Hexapla: How It Might Be Done.” In *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 439-49. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Schaper, Joachim. “The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla.” In *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 3-15. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Snaith, N. H. “Numbers XXVIII 9, 11, 13 in the Ancient Versions.” *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (1969): 374.

ter Haar Romeny, Bas. “‘Quis Sit ὁ Σύρος’ Revisited.” In *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 360-98. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

ter Haar Romeny, B. and P. J. Gentry. “Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Material for the Book of Genesis.” In *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998*, ed. B. A. Taylor, 285-99. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

Treat, Jay Curry. “Aquila, Field, and the Song of Songs.” In *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 135-76. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Ulrich, Eugene. “The Relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for Hexaplaric Studies.” In *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 401-07. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Voitila, Anssi. “The Translator of the Greek Numbers.” In *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1995*, ed. B. A. Taylor, 109-21. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Weitzman, Micheal. "The Reliability of Retroversion of the Three from the Syrohexapla: A Pilot Study in Hosea." In *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th – 3rd August 1994*, ed. Alison Salvesen, 317-59. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Wevers, J. W. "The Göttingen Pentateuch: Some Post-Partem Reflections." In *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989*, ed. C. E. Cox, 51-60. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

________. "Proto-Septuagint Studies." In *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*, ed. H. M. Orlinsky, 138-57. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

________. "A Note on Scribal Error." *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 17:2 (1972): 185-90.

Zuntz, G. "Aristeas Studies II: Aristeas on the Translation of the Torah." In *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*, ed. H. M. Orlinsky, 208-25. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

**Theses and Dissertations**

Burris, Kevin. "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Numbers 1-18." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009.

Busto Saiz, José Ramón. "La Traduccion de Simaco en el Libro de los Salmos." Ph.D. diss., La Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1978.

Ceulemans, Reinhart. "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles, with Emphasis on their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis." Ph.D. diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2009.

Marshall, Phillip S. "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Ecclesiastes." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2007.

McClurg, Andrew H., "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Numbers 19-36." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011.

Reider, J. "Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Theodotion." Ph.D. diss., The Dropsie College, 1916.

Woods, Nancy. "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job: Chapters 1-21." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009.

## Internet Materials

Hagedorn, Ursula and Dieter. "Die Epitome einer Hiobkatene unter dem Namen des Leo Magister in der Handschrift Vaticanus gr. 709." Köln, 2009 [on-line]. Accessed 28. Available from December 2010, http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/volltexte/2009/10160/pdf/Leo_Magister.pdf; Internet.

Lust, Johan. Selective Bibliography of the Septuagint [on-line]. Accessed 5 April 2010. Available from http://www.bible-researcher.com/lxx-bibliography.html; Internet.

## Unpublished Materials

Cox, Claude E. Greek Job Commentary for SBLCS Iob, n.d.

Gentry, Peter J. "The Greek Genizah Fragment of Ecclesiastes and its Relation to Earlier Greek Versions."

Hagedorn, Ursula, and Dieter Hagedorn. Kollationen der hexaplarischen Fragmente des Buchs Hiob, n.d.

________. Partial Collation of Ra 161 for Job (folios 91v-105v), 2008-2009 (?).

Ter Haar Romeny, Bas. "The Early Syriac Bible and Its Development: The Peshitta Project." Sound recording of a lecture presented at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY, 13 November 2000.

________. "Editing the Hebrew Bible from BHS to Editio Quinta; The Greek Versions and the Hexapla: Collecting Fragments of Origen's Comparative Edition." Sound recording of a lecture presented at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY, 13 November 2000.

________. "The Position of the Hebrew Bible in Early Christian Exegesis." Sound recording of a lecture presented at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY, 13 November 2000

ABSTRACT

A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE HEXAPLARIC
FRAGMENTS OF JOB 22-42

John Daniel Meade, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012
Chair: Dr. Peter J. Gentry

Primarily, this dissertation provides a critical text of the hexaplaric fragments of Job 22-42, which updates the previous editions of Field (1875) and Ziegler (1982), and which may serve as the fascicle for the second half of Job for The Hexapla Project. The critical text includes (1) extant readings of the Three, (2) Aristarchian signs' material, and (3) other materials usually related to the Hexapla. The project includes all relevant and available evidence from Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Armenian sources.

Chapter 1 provides a summary of the history of the Hexapla and hexaplaric research. This chapter also presents the methodology for the project and an introduction to interpreting the apparatuses.

Chapter 2 gives a full listing and description of the textual witnesses used for the project. These witnesses include the text groups of Ziegler's *Edition*, but, regarding the catena tradition of Job, this chapter provides an update to the *status questionis* by providing a brief history of the catena of Job in past hexaplaric editions and a new way forward.

Chapter 3 provides the critical text. The Hebrew and Greek lemmas are listed first, followed by the hexaplaric attribution and lemma. All variants to the attribution and lemma are listed in the appartuses underneath along with editorial notes.

Chapter 4 contains the readings that are of dubious significance for the Hexapla of Job. These readings are anonymous in the margins of manuscripts, which

preserve hexaplaric readings, and therefore, they are included in this separate chapter.

Chapter 5 gives a summary of the preliminary results of the project. This chapter focuses on those instances where Ziegler's *Edition* has been updated with regard to (1) new fragments and attributions, (2) revision of attribution and lemma, (3) revised attributions, (4) revised lemma, and (5) removed readings.

# VITA

John Daniel Meade

PERSONAL

Parents: John Charles and Phyllis Jean Meade
Married: Anne Elizabeth Bogert, married July 5, 2003
Children: Charis Elisabeth, born April 3, 2009
Magdalena LeGrand, born January 15, 2011

EDUCATIONAL

B.A., Columbia International University, 2003
M.Div., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2006

ACADEMIC

Garrett Fellow, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008
Adjunct Instructor, New Testament, Campbellsville University, 2009
Adjunct Instructor, Old Testament, Campbellsville University, 2011

ORGANIZATIONAL

Evangelical Theological Society
International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Society of Biblical Literature