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ants to the other translation ( $\mathbb{\sigma}^{4}$, ed. Romama); but it would be comparatively easy, if we possessed a few accurate collations of typical manuscripts, properly arranged.

Xone of these nitnesses exhibits a pre-Hexaplar state of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\text {; }}$ all show in differwith sll. In some the correction has generally supplanted the original rendering: in others the two stand side by side, with more or less stylistic accomodation. It is in the most systematically conflate recension that the most of the pre-I exaplar translation has been preserved. In Judges this is oflp, which the the $5^{\text {th }}$ cent., and which is doubtless of Syrian origin.

From the Greek translation represented by ( 6 ACsils $\mathrm{SiLLL}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{n}}$ are clerived the Old Latin ( $f$; fragments only), the Ethiopic, edited by Dillmann (E), and the Hexaplar syriac, edited by Rördast and by Latiarde (\$H); further the Arparatus.

The other Ancient Versions, the Latin of St. Jerome in its Vulgate form (3), the Syriac (§), and the Jewish Aramaic Targum , 『), are all based on the Palestinian Hebrew Standard Text of the ad cent. A. D., as are also the new Greck 20 translations of $A \Sigma O$, and the revision of $\mathfrak{G}$ after these, and in the main the translation found in ©vimis. The pre-llexaplar (f) alone represents a Hebrew text older than the official revision made in the school of R. Aqiba.

The text presented above, in accordance with the plan of the series, is the Masoretic Text, emended where it semed necessary by the aid of Heb. Mss, confronted by peculiar difficulties arising from the composite character of the narrative. Many of the faults which he finds in his text are not due to the errors of transmission which alone fall within the province of textual criticism, but to connect or harmonize his sources, or to subsequent editorial interference. The task of the textual critic is not to restore the text of the sources, nor even of some earlier state of the composite work, but only the form in which it left the hand of the last redactor. Cf. below, p. 50, 1. 10; p. 62, 1. 33.

In the present edition, the analysis, and the redactional changes which the higher criticism conjectures to have been made in the text, are explained in the Notes to the English Translation (1898), by which the Notes on the Hebrew Text are therefore to be supplemented. The exegetical grounds upon which emendations of the text by conjecture often rest will be found more fully set forth in the author's Commentary on Judises (1895).

The most glaring inconsistencies of the Wasoretic orthograply have also been emended in this edition; but without any attempt at strict consistency. The is of the inf. abs., the Qal active participle, and the fem. plur., is uniformly written plente: in other cases the prevailing spelling is made uniform. These departures from the Masoretic orthography are inclicated by $\because$.

The only systematic attempts to employ the Versions for the emendation of the Hebrew text of Judges are the dissertation of I. V. DOORNiNek, Bijibagre het




IN FOR․UINC, the present text, the following editions of fll have been chicfly used:-Jacon Kitarin (licnice, 1525 , - Vols. fol., with the Masorah) in the reprint of 1547 ; VAS 1 ER HOOGHT (imsterdans and l'trecht, 1705 , wheh has attained the character of a fixtus receptus); J. H. Mrchaer.ts (1lalle, 1720): RAMHAFt KimAYMM (Mantuat, 17t2, with the critical commentary of XORZI,
 Hasorah as edited by Jacon KHallon and by (ixsmore, and the IMasco-
 MSS and carly printed editions compiled by Kexnicotr 17\%6) and De RO44 iv (ionl. 2,17Sj).

Of $\left(5\right.$, besides the fragments of $A \Sigma \Theta$ collected by MoNTY AUCON and by $l^{\circ} \| E I \cap$, two translations have been preserved completésec Lacarwe, Septuginhr Sitwithe,
 I/us. Firit. 20,002, collated by LA(iARHE for cc. 1-5 ( $($ LI Lin), and a considerable group of minuscules ( 16.30 .52 .53 .58 .63 .77 .85 .131 .144 .209 .236 .237 of 110 Latrs and Parsonss, to which the text printed in the Catera Nicephori (Leiprig, 1753 belongs (oN). From this version is derived the Salidic, fragments of which have been published by Criscal (c).

The older Greck translation is contained in all the remaining MS. so far zo as known. Among these are the following uncial codices: Aleathirinus (bA),



Among the latter, three well-defined groups are easily separated, to two of which, at least, the character of recensions must be ascribed; eviz. codd. 19.108.118 25 of $H-\mathrm{P}$, whose text is exhibited by the Complutensian I'olyglot, and has been edited by l.AGARDE, 1853 ( $\left(56\right.$ ) ; 54.59 .75 .82 of $\mathrm{H} \mathrm{P}^{\prime}$, and the fragments of a Leipzig uncial palimpsest, incelied (J)pp; 120.121 of $11-1$, represented by the Ndine edition, Venice, 1518 (miVn). I fourth group, which stands internecliate between oflp and mL, is not cited in our apparatus.

[^0]$\square$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\square$
$-$

$\square$
$\square$
$\square$
$\qquad$ $\square$

A complete stemma, exhibiting the filiation of these $\ 5 S$ and recensions, cannot be made from the enllations in $11-1$, in which the internal variations of the representatives of this version are cehibited (in inemricable confusion as wari-

[^1]tried to express（DOORN゚．，BUDDE，GRÄTz，KAlttzscli）；fll here and in Jos． 15，18，1התEn．Ewall）conj．Wiont she took him into the secret．
 DOORN．，KAUTZSCH，al．）．The article is defended by Ewald．
masn：The rare word is variously rendered by the Versions from the context；
 mirt $16^{2}$ ）．Others have surmised that（f）read or guessed nisn，or misn．［ח：s may mean to fress，i．c．cindringen in 4,21 and in ihn dringen（Lat．instare）in 1，14；it may be identical with jox to importune（i）dule $13 \mid$ diver dالسؤ！．Transposition of liquids is not exceptional．－1＇．H．］
ーゴコ，so tll and the Versions；K゙ROC11atut and GRäTz conj．スミ゙ニ．
ב：הנ be lost before the following article（haplography）．
 Jos．has led to a false conformation of the adjectives．Canaanite names of places
 where $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{r}}$ is supposed to be explanatory；the plur，is preferred by BU．，Comm．］
 of Moses＇father－in－law is obviously requircd；（fiN oi vioil looop taû Keıvaiov；Josepls．
 （J）．The latter is supported by Jud．4，II，where the gless new jnin＝2n ソコニロ is derived from our passage．The sing．verbs in $4 \mathrm{Fl} 1.16^{\mathrm{b}}$ inake it probable that $\because=1$ is a corruption of the proper name；it is possible，however，that we should

 which is approved by k゙UENEN and 13U．（ $R-S$ ，p．9；lut cf．p．S6）．STCDER conj．השח name．
 of $\Omega$ s and $4 s$ is abundantly attested in lleb．IISS and the old Versions．
 $7 \%$ as amisplaced marginal correction of $n 83$ ， 1.17 ；but，even if this were other－ wise acceptable，it does not remore the difficulty．The warious recensions of 0
 （ $R-S$ ），and KAUTZSCH adope this reading；and for the rest，following ©AL al．els

 belong to the genuine text of $(5$ ；it is lacking in（ 5 LPVn ，asterisked in $\$ 15$ ，and stands in（GVN in a different place（ $£ v$ т ̣̂ vótu＇loủ১a）．［Cf．Bu．，Comm．］In our reconstruction it is supposed that $\Xi: 3$ בשׁ trusion of which in the wrong place uccasioned other changes；7ave in the Heb． text which lay before the（6 translators was a transcriptional error for 7 たロニ as in Jos．8，24．In Sll the obelus stands before lead，the corresponding met－ obelus is missing．RÖRDAM and LAG．Would correct this to the－Land ：il：Vidino，－whether righty，is questionable．ZiEGLER laad suspected that 45 TาIt：was an crroneous doublet to こココ．Another possible reconstruction，follow－
 the whole verse has suffered so greatly that it is impossible to feel much con－ fidence in any of these attempts．


 for the article in fll．GRÄT\％，rejecting this emendation，conjectures jyee 5 ．

[^2](1894); but many contributions to the correction of the text are scattered through the exegetical literature, in periodicals, and elsewhere. I have not essayed the impossible tisti of recording all these, nor does it lie in the plan of the present serics to do so; but 1 have thought it proper to note more fully the conjectures of earlier critics, such as llotetghit ( 1753 ), 1)athe ( $1 / 84$ ), Zielicek ( 1791 ), and Gendes (1797), who often anticipated corrections which are now generally accepted. The obvious emendations have been made over and over again, independently; claims of priority are nowhere more difincult to establish.


I 5) אדני בוק. The name is attested here by Al and all the Versions; ( 5 has Aduvi$\beta \in$ Zek in Jos. $10,1 \mathrm{ff}$. also, where fil and the other l'ersions read Wex. Well-
 in Jos. 10 is a harmonistic differentiation, imitating Fis $\begin{gathered}\text { © (King of Jerusatem) } \\ \text { ) }\end{gathered}$ in Gen. 14. But pI= `Ts is a wholly anomalous formation (pra, name of a place), white by the analogy of מללבי. It seems more probable, therefore, that the latter is the original form of the name, and that in Jucl., by accident or design, it has been changect to pI `ּx. Another variation is Adwvizeßek (Joseph., Steph. 20 13yz., Procop., 2 codd. ol (6) in Jos. 10, 1).
 mote on the Transtation ad loc.)*" gives roon for the suspicion that there is an error in this name also. An old commentator suggests that pre is identical with
 would be the scene, not of the batde, but of the capture of Adonizedec ; note
 $1 . j^{3}$ would be in place after $i \cdot 6^{3}$, and a different theory of the composition of li. $4-6$ would be neccessary. - BLDDE (R-S) conjectures that in the original
 be the original form of the name, $\boldsymbol{p}$, must be struck out; if right, קree inust remain; Bu., Comm.]
. DOorsinck regard; these words as a marginal gloss intended to follow in in t.
(7)
 (GMLpsil émopeúnaav, conformed to the beginning of $1: 10$ (DOorn., Hollevbe, (al.).

(13) (1)
(14)

* Budde's Richer (in Marti's Kiureer Bankl-Cimmenhar, 1897, was published after the text of the present volume was in type and the manuscript of the Critical Notes was in the Editor's hands. I have therefore been able to take account of the valuable contributions whiel Bunde has made in this work to the restoration of the text only in the form of supplementary notes. Bende's carlice work, hichter. unt Samuel (1890), in part previouly published in ZAT ('8;-'8S), is distinguilleed When necessary as be. ( $\mathcal{R}-\mathrm{S})$; the more recem volume, as lit. (Comm.). - The emendations in Kautzsen's AT are cited, not in the name of the translator of Judges (Kitfel), but in that of the editor (K WTRSCu), who assumes the responsibility for this apparatus (see Zaveites limwert); though, doubtless, most of them were proposed or adopted by the translator.
- Scmer (PEF, Qu. St. '9S, pp. 20-23 would find the site of Beret at Kürin, between Bethlehen and Hebron.



（33）V． $33^{\text {b }}$ is regarded by DOORN．as a gloss，dictated by national vanity：similar－ ly $35^{b}$ ．
（34）＇ this chapter the author uses the name Canaanites for the native population of the land，it is a natural surmise that in $1 \times .34 .35$＇has supplanted an origi－ nal＇ $3 y 23 \pi$ ，perhaps through a working back of the error in $\mathrm{v}, 36$ ．


 той ठрчииิvos（ $\mathbf{c}-\boldsymbol{\imath})$ ．
 genuine（BU．）；Jos，19，47 $\mathrm{Em}^{\prime}$ aủtoús（Kı．）．

 öplov toû Auoppaiou ó＇Ionuudios；a doublet in which the true and the false reading are combined，as often．The restoration of was suggested by Hollenb．，and is adopted by Bu．，Kı．，and Kau．Hollenb．himself preferred


$y^{2}=\pi$ ；Ill ybona，but the firminus ad quent is required；the of 11 is dittogram
 the context．
 kai $£ \pi i$ Bai日ŋ入 кai $£ \pi i$ тòv oikov lopan入；in SII the critical signs are confused，but

 tov oikov $l$ ．an erroneous doublet or gloss to the preceding words（cf．（ $f$ in


 if this were to be adopted，we should prefer to emond further，sev תi＝$\pi x$ as in 1,22 ．
 a clause has been accidentally omitted；the xpoe is perhaps evidence thit a lacuna was recognized by the Masoretic editors，as it was by the translators of

 3，16f．：Gen．50，24）；DOORN．adopts this，only putting for the last two words ，［so also BU．，Comm．］，which gives an unimpeachable sentence and sense．



 substance the rest；\＄11 oủbé ．．．ouvtpiycate sub obel．）．GEDDES，DOORN．，and Bu．think that this is the original text；All has been abridged or mutilated．Quite as probably 6 is the result of amplification（in Greek or Heb．）from the parallels in Ex．34，12．13；23，24．32；Deut．7，2－5．25，\＆C．［Before armizis in tll we should 50 doubtess have in good Heb．＂rather，as BL．suggests；whether the author of this patchwork of reminiscences must have written＂is not so clear．］
（3）आ（fNNBm

I（17）E．Mey．regards rey as a transcriptional crror for 7 g，the correction of which found its way into v． 16 ；see above，p． $25,1.32$ ．
 Michaelis，and adopted by Zieglefr，Gliddes，Doorn．，Grätz：DOORN．ex－
 lont and Ashdod，but we＇te not able to take Guza und Ekron（Ant．v，2，t；cf．V，3，1．．

 in the preceding instances，betrays a difterent hand，and makes it probable that the gloss is of relatively late date（DOORS．）．Cf．Josephus cited above（1．6）．

 not inability but unwillingness prevented the expulsion of the Canaanites；of．v． 21 ． \＆هe cf．v． 27 Sec．



（21）בゼリ．Al codd．＂ゴu，a Qere of the Oriental schools．
וּירוּ v． 19 above．Benjamin（Jos．），not Judah（Judl），is also original．
$\square$
$\qquad$
 THEAU，Kı．；see also on v .23 ．＇The change is not grammatically necessary，and the variation of $G$ is of little significance，$c f$ ．Jos，17，17；18，5．
לxn＝a，one worl．So Bïr（sece his note on Gen，12，8）；according to GiNsB． this is the orthography of the Uriental Jews．

 Bu．，Comm，argues that Joshua must have been named in this connection．The present text may，however，be the result of abridgment（if．v．19）；הירה（ for is an easy error，if． $2 \$ 1,12$, ill and 6 ．

[^3]


$\qquad$

$\square$

```
\(\square\)
```

$\square$30
 where the verb frequently occurs，it is found in Qal，with the accusative，and We should accordingly expect here bxn＝．．．ing（cf．©isn кai kateuxéqavto Bai日l $)$ ．SCMARFENRERG and STADE conjecture Mis？，which would probably be construed with 58 rather than $=$（if．however 2 Sam， 20,15 ）．（ 6 ，in all recen－
 Ahf． $1,2,6$ ．For gov n＇e（falvn al have oixos lopan入，（GLp ulol lopand，（GYN
 $\because 22$ ，and perhaps came in only by accident；of．© in 2,1 ．
（24）it Max\％．BU．（Comm．）suspects that before these words ia nexv or tink may fo have fallen out．

＇There is some lack of uniformity in this verse，＂בuev being insert－ ed before the last three names but not before the first wo：which may suggest the suspicion that the text has been glossed．
＂ゴリ（eré，as elsewhere in this verse and chapter；so many codd．in the text．
 bere，agetinst the Masorah．The orthography is confimed by Phenician（ClS i，1，3，1．19），Issyrian，and Egyptian inscriptions．Al here and in three other places ：$:$ า．

 appears to have abridged his source（BU．）．
 ישראל （DOORN．）；the alternative is to regard the whole clause as a gloss．

3 （1）All（GAALLp al．sll＂Inooús，conforınation to v． 21.

 dation would be למען רעת ב：י ישראל מלהת （so Grïtz），and モath as a gloss；for the construction of．Jos．4，24：so Monre， Comm，Bu．，Comm．EWaLD thinks it possible to retain all merely reading 10 auth（Qal）；so \＄．
 gender；but it is attested by $(G$ ，and in this gloss may be original，the author
 Clericus，Hoteb，al．emend הישי．Stu．suspects that the whole clause was 15 originally a marginal note．［Sec also luU．，Comm．］

 and most of the l＇ersions in Jos．11，3，where the correct reading is preserved in
 （Gien．34，2，cf． $30 ; 36,2 ; \mathrm{Jos} .9,7$, E．c．），white Cute－Syria and the Lebanon was the country of the littites（ $1 \mathrm{~K} 10,29 ; 2 \mathrm{~K} 7,6 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{c}$ ）．
（7）（This form of the plur，is late（ 2 Chron．19，3；33，3 $\because$ ），and probably a
 Bukentop defends，and Houb．，D．ithe，and others regard as the original $2_{5}$ reading here； $\boldsymbol{n}$ ，is found in one or two codd．of 411 ；$£$ ，which is also alleged， proves nothing．

מלך ארש suspects that the author wrote ct－s．Cushan is clsewhere the name of a tribe 30 connected with Midian；Num．12，1，of．Ex．2， 16 ffi ；Hab．3，7．
 the allies；but the change of number after $\bar{T}$ is harsh．\＆makes the preceding verbs also plur．
（16）（17）Many codd have ת ש false correction．
（17）At the end of this versc 11 and all the Versions have： $7 \times$ ロッニ ジx may be regarded as an anticipation．Dr．FURNESS makes the very probable suggestion that it is a misplaced gloss，originally meant to explain the words ． 22 י
 DOORN．suspects that עישאי is a gloss．
（19）E．bren．According to Htrz．，a false gloss which has displaced the original

 command as addressed to Eglon，render causatively；DOORN．，Bu．［but see 45 Comm．］，and Winckier would accordingly emend syיy．
（20）After $\boldsymbol{T}^{\text {hs }}$（ 5 adds $\beta$ coolleúu $=$ Then，which may have been accidentally omitted； if．v． 19 ［13U．，Comm．］．

 DOORN．and Bt＇，emend Kip：＇r．

For a gloss to $\mathrm{v} .22^{2}$ see note on r .17 ．
 airouis．This is apparently the translation of an interpolation in the Heb．ext used by（ 5 ，meant to bring out more clearly the fict that not all the peoples were left；DOORN．，

 23．13）；but it would be hazardous to enmend the text after these passages．（a）

 interpreted trups，smares；so Friedrich Dei．itzschi，comparing Assyr．Guddu to「initial s not certain；might be i］．Houn，renders echnfores，tacity reading＝＇is

（5）Alt ase．The true name of this place was probably exsen；of． 2 Sam．5， 23 f． w 84,7 ，where（ 5 renders as here，Kגaunutu．The place cannot，however，be the
 クルコ Gen． 35,8 ；llit\％connects it with the $\times$ エコス pey if 84,7 ，which he locates near Beth－cl．

 aủtoil sigh oóc\％．$\$ 11$.
 and a few codd．of 6 here．GEHnES，STL．，Fi：w，libRTh．，w\％regard onn as a transcriptional error；on the contrary，it is the true name，and no either an accidental corruption，or more probably in intentional transposition to remove a word which might suggest sun－worship（JUiNi：OLL；so also BU．，Comm．）：ef． 25 the variants in Is．19，iS 07n，07n and ann［sec Crit．Sotes on Isaiah，p．153，1．36］； a few codd．and the Soncino Dible of 1488 have onn in our verse，as in 1,35 above．
 This emendation is suggested by Jer．44，3；cf．Jer．7，9：11，13．17；Hos．11，2，\＆e．； 17シソソ is the result of unintentional conformation to x .11 ．
 the reader substituting aioxuvn，as in the $\| \mathrm{eb}$ ．text new sometimes takes the
 Fual mit dem aceiblichen Arfited in the Procecdings of the Berlin Academy， $188 \mathrm{i}, \mathrm{pp}$ ． 601 ff ．
$\square$
$\qquad$




Sisere also（unlike Jabin）secins to be non－Semitic；if．，however，לx：se on an Aramaic scal（Levv，Taf，1，3，in Driver＇s Samuil，p．xii），and Sassariél $=$ Salsavieil on an Assyrian－Aramaic bilingual（F．Jerfmas，in Sal＇ssaye＇s Religions． geschiohter 1，225）．N＇IEBUHR＇s hypothesis，that Siserat is an Egyptian name，is more ingenious than plausible．

 Versions，as far as can be judged from their renderings．But 1.5 is by a different hand；and the aththor of r .4 probably intended the preterit，$n=\frac{1}{2}$ ；see Trans－ lation．
を las a long account of Deborali＇s residence and possessions：ホーツアニ ホニボ
 א city Alaroth－Dehorah，being sutported by her possessions；for she had palme frees at Jericho，orchurds at liamuh，oit－bearing vives in the l＇alley，imigated fields 15 at Bethel，white earth on the King＇s．Moutht；artd the Istetites wiont up to her Ro judgment；of．Megillf $14^{2}$ ．Such idditions are infrequent in Jud．（except in c．5）．
（6）ill กニゼロ－




 （loublet）G13sLp（The；；mós ot is perhaps Hexaplar correction．
 ceding note．

 to exclude an unfavorable interpretation of Barak＇s refusal to go without De－ borah，and were naturally suggested by v． $14^{3}$ ．They are not part of the original 30 text（lloUb．，（irätz；more cautiously，STUDER）．In the other liant，the words
 we may infer that（5）here represents an old Heb．gloss．


הゼヤ；（ $5 L p+\tau \eta \varsigma ~ N \in \varphi \theta a \lambda 1$ ；$\Omega H$ sub ast．（should perhaps be a lemmisitus）．
（9．10）Some codd．and edd．less correctly in r． 10 ，Some
 emend：iby＂．
ares，as in $\because, G$ ，and according to rule；at＇פלא．
（11）Gifindes transposes $v .11$ ，putting it afeer v． 17.

 － 0 －


 connect the word with the name of a place Oime mentioned in Egyptian texts in the neighborhood of Megiddo，sce Bu．，Comm．，p． 37.
 Clericus suggested הםטלה．
 in wind the later orthagraphy 7 ．
 apparently rendering in the dark by a Greck word of somewhat similar sound)
 uévouç. The I'alestinian exegretical tradition connects niturg with eing contents

 sughested by the parallel construction of the clauses, and similar unusual form of the nouns, is that the two clauses are doublets from different sourece, W'inckter), one or both) of which is corrupt 'Gräty': or that one of them is
 duns or excriment, but fecal matler inside the budy, the contents of the intestines

 moaning. The water in the stomach of a camel is called, in the cuncifurm ace count of Issurbanipal's Irabian campaign, me firsiz; sce my note in Hebraía is 3. 110, n. 7 . The nriginal meaning of $\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{E}$ is not sipurations, sectetion, but rupture, that is, what comes out when an intestine is cut or perforated (i\% Syr. $1 ; 0$ ).
 but intentional, artificial assimilation to the following word rinezan, for the purpose of disguising the olyectionable word enes. as much as ponsible. 1. 11.] 20
(23) At the end of the verse sll adds לy a glosi - as the false tense shous suagested byribẏ, v: z\&.
 is more probable that the seribe who wrote -ion derived the participle from
 $70^{2}$; cf. also (G) $A O$ ), and Hexapla on $1 S 24.4$ Gkir\% conjectures in a similar

(25) ibray. Cf. Gen. 8, 10; purhaps we should rather read ban: lit., Comm,


$\qquad$

\begin{abstract}


#### Abstract

^[ $\qquad$ ]


\end{abstract}

תink companies of tazelers, so Biottcher (1849); all and V'ersions תirex zuays, roads; the same correction is reguired in Job 6,18.19. (osiCsEsLLp al.

 have been corrupt doublet to $\because$ に

 explicitness, from the preceding line (Ibraggs, LeEy, Grimate. For a more radical reconstruction sec MarQUart.
 is not improbably the true reading. [if ine be right, we should probably read

 Wimla مina!.
itn $2^{\circ}$. A subject, synonymots with $\mathfrak{H R}$, seems to have fallen out, either 15 before or after then, leaving this verb as the only remmant of a line. [BL. suspects traces of this subject in the following line, 7 - - יn? the verb over to the next stichos; bickerat omits it. Rumen rejects $4.7^{7}$ ats containing only fragments of 1 v .6 .1 , and transposes v. $7^{\mathrm{b}}$ after 1.8 .
 surgeret Debbora; so also in the next line. Il rnap is now generally explained as 2 sing. fem., with the old ending $i$ (Rödighr, Büttchek, (irätz, Welih., d. Mïller). This explimation is satisfactory, so far as $\mathbf{I l}$ is concerned; but it does not account for the 3 sing. in (f)? ; if these translators had read rapp, they would certainly have rendered in the first person. .Is Deboralh is elsewhere in $2 ;$ the poem spolen of only in the third person, it is more probable that the original
 formerly, Bickele - is also conccivable, but not probablel, which was altered to rap (first pers.', on the supposition that Deborah was the author and singer (ef. v. 1). lity. regards $x .7^{6}$ as a gloss (in which the $1^{\text {st }}$ person is natural); so 30 also Marquakt. Bickeli, omits rape $2^{\circ}$ for metrical reasons.
(8) The first two lines are corrupt.

 bella clegit Dominus; \& It: lad hate God chuse"t nezi thing, - all supporting 111. It is possible that a scribe may have tried to restore the partly illegible words of the aS before him by the help of 1)eut. 32,17 (COORE). The second



 $\pi=1$ ): cem are new-moons. The two lines describeal in some way the rarity of sacrifices (and thus of flesh to eat), and the rough fare to which the Israclites were reduced. Ristrasen conjectures that the original text may have
 (objected that ina, not arbs, is used througlaout the porm. The same objection
 Mayme Lammert (RliJ 30,115 ), dividing the words differently, reads unar is © עי , and thus obtains the lince:-
liy bohl thamspersitions and conjectures Miseltiskt reconetruct, in 7.8 thus: -

4 M，DOORN．strikes out the word．
 to at woman is anomalous．
（21）ヒלニ，as clsewhere：all בx．
תตท （ad lue．）；the current edd．have $\varepsilon$ gla．This difference is connected with a difier－
 （Wickes，Prose Alcents，p． $1+0$ ）．Neither of these is satisfartory，as the various interpretations of the words prove．The simplest remedy seems to be to pro－ nounce $\eta_{\mathrm{E}}^{2}$ ？（adj．），regarding the whole as a parenthetic circumstantial clause：







 Geddes emends：$-\cdots \cdot$

（2）（1）Sce Comm，ad loc．；Mayer Lamblert，REJ 24,140 symonym of ziana）；and on the fem．ny：e，Gruswald，Figemumin，p． $5, \mathrm{n}$ ． ヒyニアコース．Grimme conj．ニッコ（cf．v．9），on metrical grounds（ב lost by haplography）．
［Marglart rejects 1.2 as a marginal gloss to 1.9 intruded into the text in a wrong place．BU．（Comm．）notes that the diction of v ． 2.3 is late through－ 25 out；the poem begins with r．4．］
 gUART for metrical reasons．
 mill；BU．（R－S）accordingly conj．wes or ：ata．¿BU．，Comme，returns to all．］3o
 the next chause．
 in 1s．63， 19 ，from 4h）：if．O巳ミ 8 ．c．；so DOORN．would emend here．
הוהי
 Enuet toū Eiva（contamination from $\psi 68,9$ ，Scharfinblirg），©́lp Kupiou tou
 by mistake from the next line and canceled by the scribe himself．（According to Finlit RÖrdair nor LaG．mentions this correction．）！Montis comment sunt af ficic do－ mini Dei larad ex Sima the abridgement may be accidental－homarotelemtunt －is in（ $64+5 t$ ）．The worls $\because 0$ it are a gloss（ $\sum$ correctly，toutéoti tù Eiva）， as the form of expression shows［so now lbco，RUben］；if．similar glosses in 1x． 32,$1 ; 1$ K 14,$4 ; 1 \mathrm{~s}, 23,13$ ；it may be older than $\psi 68,9$ ．The rhythm of the verse also requires the omission of the words．Grimmi，who also finds the line
 interpretation of－i lareat，Kemink，Dooris．Gleddes restored the balance of the lines by omiting－inn $z^{\circ}$ ．WINCKLER sees in in the remairs of 1 H ，


 and GRAITZ conj．

```
    ーツルフ `!y \!y
```



```
    ックニ゙ア P!M
```



Here Deborah is not summoned to sing a song whether of batte or of wic tory－but to arouse the myriads of her conmerymen，which certainly agrees better with the words addressed to barak．The second line in sll，＂My
 restored；the uppnsite is not so probable．The imperative pis attested loy the domble tramslation of 11.4 .5 in the Cireck above；in 1.5 it was read as l＇i el 10 and the context supplied．Finally，the symmetry of the quatrain is restored，

 Fre，because they do not make a complete stichos．
Al Ti：
 Stam，Bu＇，Kautzsch，Mare．；of．Is．14．2．Grimme rejects this as unmetrical．

או：
ע ע ש
Two lines，perfect in form and parallelism，are thus conjecturally restored；of．zo
 as an apoc．impf．Pi．from arר，the context requires in both caties the perfect
 1Bertho，and most recent critics．In all Ey is wrongly joined to the first line；
 as do some Heb．codd．（De Rosst）；so WV．Greme，J．D．Mich．，Schatrrik， Stumer，（irärz，and many wthers．The aùtû of（iv（ib）is also preferable to ל of All （Kíhtitr，Grïrz）．－The second line being thus restored，it is a natural




 Winchler conj．© place of לאדירים
（14）The first two lines in $1 t$ are：－
in which only the names of the tribes can be made out．For pha゙ニ（ficstaphan



 Winckier writes：－

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { テロジニ }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { •药 }
\end{aligned}
$$

19＊is thought by Wincki．ER to be a synonỵm of See also on $\sqrt{1} .15$ ．Mars．adopts this reconstruction．

 a military official ser now Deissmann，libelsfadien，pp．106－108：I．OMBROSO，
 MH1，．Veue kirah，Yeitscheift，＇yo，p．Gg．





 GGA＇67，pp． $63 j$ f．，Wi：ilil．，Tert der Bitior Siamuilis，p．8，Field，ded loc．， LAGarDE，Sepfugintesitudien，p． 60 ．MARUUARI and RLEEN adopt the reading nx－x．

 and herc unnctrical．［So also 13 U゙．，Comm，proposing all．nin＇
 rendering of ニッフ， 1 S 2, ，



 $\pi \eta v$ wiv was erroncously connected with the preceding umozurious，and then in




 ávuкpououévuv àvà $\mu$ éoov eupparvouėvav gives a sense which agrees well with the following line，but at satisfactory restoration of the Hcb ．text which it represents



：an：－To remove the apparent Aramaism，K゙LOST．and M．ARU，with（5）Suovol， point ：ă：［Cf．below，p．57，1． 42.

 suspects that $v .11^{b}$ is a misplaced repectition of 1.13 ．
（12）The position of this invocation has been foumel difficult．Ew．made the beginning of a distimet pucm；CARL lifmelir，in his Reconstellation，transposes，to putting 1.12 in the place of $1: 2$ ．

The remarkable variations of 5 in this verse have not received the attention
 EEEf


 the selfervident corrections of che critical signs by RörDaM and l．．．！i．）： p W W ．

 may restore the Heb．text represented by the whlest（ireck version ats follons：－


all supporting stl; the corruption is therefore ancient. "The word' must contain the end of the preceding hemistich, 2-a the parallelism then requires a verb corresponding to in the first line; and in place of 19 'ש\& an (explicit) object corresponding to the pronoun theme in
 p. 36, 1. 50. Mare. transposes the line to the end of $\mathrm{v}, 27$.


 (?刃心): and this seems to be required ly in in the following line, which can hardly be taken otherwise than callsatively (fiom, in consequenic of); so Clemicus, tumc contusi sunt culcanti cquorme, firopter \&ec. BU. (Comm.) reads when and $=910$ ' 9 y, taking over the $a$ from the following nina, which removes the difficulty of construction. 13U, would also transpose i. 22 (or $21^{\text {b }} .22$ ) to stand before r. $21^{2}$, or (with Mares.) before r .20.
 sound of galloping hoofs. It is possible, however, that it is accidental; (fat al.



 The text has therefore been differently understond, and has varied considerably;

 (ive).
For ve. 22.21 CuEsNE, JQR, July' 98, p. 566, offers the following: -
או אלחמו קִ
קרשון בִּדימּ אביריו
צרף קדשדגי בחל ק"שוֹי צ?
 been conjectured that we is the mutilation of a better known name; ara, Jos. 11,5 'Pagninus, Cibricus [citing Euselit's' description of the situation of 35



 metrical grounds; as in many other places, the word is a later addition to avoid to anthropomorphism. Sec Bue, Comm.
AI ם לצים , supported, with numerous variations of translation, by

 lacking also in many codd. of nl .

 Grimane finds it sufficient to omit 'גי.
 fem. ') i' $^{\prime}$ defended by Holbann, Stider, Bachminn, and retained without 50 comment by Grimine.




 Which removes the difficulty; but we cannot be sure that we thus recover the
 and the other leersions may have had the same text. - For $2 y$ we may read
 can the primies of Issultur: Dithorati's tribe' so also Mare. Winckisk conjo inti sce on s. 14.

 קרב $\mathrm{i}_{2}$, a formally currect sentence but it complete anticlimax. (iknmate and
 It Ihtan
 teivev módus uitaū; $\Sigma$, émelingev toùs mintas aiton. The active is perhaps better A. Menere the passive certanly wrong); pussibly the same verb originally
 Sosyrimn sense, they desionded; Maks. Would read wha Cant. 4, 1).
 here $=$ ל
 have been erronemisly repeated from $8.15^{\text {b }}$, so TEILAR, REASA, A. Metbler, Make., al. - 1 il , on the contraty, strkes ull the werds in 1.15 and retains them here as containing the an-wer to the question of $\mathfrak{x} 16^{2}$. 1 is then necessary (1) 25 insert $\mathfrak{z e x}$ at the beginning of $\because, 16^{9}$.


 also suspects the text: neither in the Southwest ( $1,3+f$ f) nor in its later seats at 30 the headwaters of the Jordan was Dan a heat-faring tribe, nor did its territory eren adjoin the Phemician seaboard. But nese is supported by Gen. 49,13 (of Zebulun), which plainly appears to be dependent on Jud. 5,17 Batı. plau-ibly:

 -we cur luthitat nd mazes Aser:

家, unless nem be taken to mean mountain, is in Assyr. Wisckler). The reesc is transposed by Make, to stand after v. If.
(20) Ill divides the line wrongly:- sove which destroys the rhythm of both lines ,Clericus, Kümer, Hekder, Bickell, Grimme, and many others'. Make. reads $=:$ (elirect object,






 letters of arep the word exe?: this must have been preceded by a suitable verl),
 as a dittogram of the end of the preceding line.
quech（w 45，10；Nich．2，6，which is adtupted by Weli．h．，Stade，Doors．， KAUIZSCH，CRIMME，al．
Other conjectures are：＂asish for the meck of hime whe takes the spoil





－
BC．，Comm．，makes three symmetrical lines：－

של

Note the remarkable doublets to vx .29 .30 in（ 5 I．p．
＇31）E．Mentr regards this verse as a later addition to the Olke，on account of its 15 contents，and because it does not fil into his system of strophes；Wis te：also doubts its genuineness，on theological grounds（ZAT 9，223ff，and is followed by Be．（Comm．），Mare．，al．
 al．；Alge van．An alternative is to read $=$ אn in the preceding line．
all שェッー．Grimme wix，on metrical grounds．


ה．




 of the following バゴ\％
אראה
$77^{2}$ ）The first half of this verse，omitted in（fw？ $10 \mathrm{v} .6^{\mathrm{b}}$ ．The repetition in $\mathbf{I l}$ is not duc（6）transcriptional accident．
（9）Un：
 stances of this anomaly in stome cases expresty preseribed by the Masorah，in

11）Bv．（Comm．）surmises that the true order of the words is ליאוא
 Kи́pıos．


15）All 9 ： now recognized his visitor as ditine．

 StI；the author probalbly wrote simply

 article，which is necessiary to the sense，is omitted by haplographey：I or $\stackrel{\text { en }}{\text {（else．}}$ ＂hare before guturals ${ }^{\circ}$ it will be well the remember that the original form of


 risht humd smilis with srout cffurt．
 omission of the natme，which may have been added by a sctibe for areater ex plicitners．Some corld．of $1 l l$ nete，without the conjunction．


 be dittograplyy．SIUDfi尺 prefers in omit the conjunction．
（27）ここど
 attested in the other recemsions of（f．In mumerous coeld．of the the first line is

 interpretation has resulted in contamination in sereral recensions of $\boldsymbol{r}_{1}$ in 4，21； ©f．alsn 16，12．ओ．ake．strikes nut $=2 \because$ as gloss to hes．

 In place of $y=:$ we might expect ixy；accidental conformation to the preceding line is possible（lit＇．，Comm．）．

 peissible thitt，like diducüu），the verb could also be used of a loud cry of pain 2
 of this sense hawe not been produced．©，lowever，does not so understand the
 sil sub ast，катєudv＊avev，which we find elsewhore for verbs of secing，gazing．

 ond line of the distich，but contains apparently a variant transtation of the first



 and cancels＂上跑。
 NoRz1， 3 sing．fem，c．suff． 3 sing．fim．；$\%$ ？whe sapientior icteris uroribus，








The last two lines in 11 are：－

The words Exay bien are accidentally repeated foom the preceding line（RELVS， 5 ）
 these three Words（haplograply？）：ジS also is out of place REt SS，Mtimek．


payz．In our ignorance of the topograply，the emendation is very uncertain．
The cause of the corruption appears to be contamination from 1.8 ； 1 therefore omit it and Fロy＝；and for תyבse，which，if sound，would require a terminus ad quem（．．． according to 1.8 the camp was in the valley（Fロシュ）．BU．，conforming more
 ment that the camp of Midian was below him，which in $5 . S$ is preparatory 10 the following narrative，is in r .1 less relecant．
 Alıwpur（Aßup，Aßupur，\＆c．），${ }^{58}$ toû Auoppuiou；（f．1lexaplat here，and on Cien． 12，6；Deut．11，30．
 and doubtess corrupt．The verl），which is not found elsewhere，is rendered by the l＇ersions（probably guided merely by zer and $i$ in the context）dipurt，set 15
 interpretations，following etymological combinations，make a circuit，or leap， string，are hardly more satisfactory．（ікӓтz conj．Mey break through；or（later） －＝iv．A greater diffeculty lies in the words ent ince Gilead is remote from the scene of operations．J．D．Mich．conj．．an，flec quickly to Gileud； 20 but this conflicts with w．7．8．Clerfec＇s＇enendation，yane is adopted by houb，Gendes，Hitz．，berth．，Grit\％，Doorn．，Reuss，and others；but if，as these critics assume，Gideon was encamped on Mt．Gilboa（see r．1），the words are wholly superfluous（Datie，STUDER）．Ewald explains the words as an old Manassite saying，in which（iilead is proverbially used for the battle－ field，－a theory more ingenious than plausible．Ubserving that in the present text the execution of the divine command at the beginning of the verse is not narrated，while its consequences are（＇וּ ו

 thesis，as does R．Jesaia．Krochmal conj．מי ירא וחרי ישׁב路
 similarly 3s．The words are accidentally omitted in stl．

 cobviously false：in its place（ratipfe have the correct gloss ev tif rawoon aituov；contlation of the two has occurred in acobsinstl．The gloss in Ill was probably intended for the words av aise at end of 1.6 ，where it would righty express the sense（so Dooks．；BU．，Comm．）；not so likely genuine at the to end of $v, j$（ Bu ，$R$ R $S$ ；Kiautzsch），where we should expect the sing．is re．On the manner of drinking here described see Stade，Z．IT 16，183－186．
 reading（DOORN．，Grät\％），or（Jos．9．5．14）；and the text then has the support of all the Versions．But the verse is evidently a preparation for the to story of Gideon＇s stratagem in Ix． 16 ff ；it is essential the explain where he get so many jars as well as the horns，and quite irrelevant to comment on his supply． of provisions．Fimend therefore：＇TE：in the old alphabet the error might easily be made．l＇erhaps we should also read rp＇，in agree with the following－hew， and מידם［BC．，Comm．］．STUDER conjectures that the beginning of S .8 as far $j 0$ as arnatel should be joined to the preceding，reading inpl，jussive．
（12）$=$＝h $2^{\circ}$ ．（ikäT\％thinks the word erroneonly repeated from the end of ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ．
 Jud．

6 this pronoun is sid with long $\dot{a}_{;}$see fohns／lopkins（＂ntiersily Circulurs，No． 114 1． $111^{a} .-1$ ． 11 ．
 テา！

 of the divince names in c．13：Num． 22.
 represents an ingeniously perverse interpretation．Sec also Norzt ad loc．Houl． remarks that（Geipnivn Kupiou）and d，also，found the name of the attar a 10 stumbling－block．


 ロッジッジ（ sub ust．；the whole clause is lacking in（6N．Apparently ate and ain are doublets，and both corrupt；in 1.26 also＂ewn is not represented in focisintpin al．， while in 1.28 these codd，with（אMt and sil，translate olteutus．（iraphically， jet comes nearest to the doublet in 1 lt （cf． 1 S 15,9 ，on which sce Writht，ant

 acceptable，we shuuld prefer to emend：；湦－（the opposite error Cant．7，10，（f．（G）．


 seems impossible to do anything．

 loooks，some good codel．and old edd．of thave jyan，acrordinis to a marginal note in a llS the reading of the shool of Sora（see bỉk）．The word hy：seems
 （fi）takes the word as a proper name（with the doublet tou upous in meny corld．）； （反Lp toû öpous sinc adalit．




 is ニッツ
 （in warious forms and $\mathbf{3}^{3}$ ，which render though they probably did not read י゙h＝ッツ contind asainst（21，22：Jer．12，1：Jol）33，13），in which sense the athor
 suffix must be retlexive．This was misunderstood by the author of the gloss inzis ax ing $=$ ，if the words were originatly meant for this place；more probably， 45 bewever，the gloss was designed for the end of $1: 32$（where it also stands），and was introduced at the end of $1: 31$ ly at transeriptional accident（Cikitz）．





 Similarly in 5.22.

（2）$E==$ ，sn tll and the Versions，rightly．Both here and in $\because \cdot j$ some codd．and ohd



 more probably，however， $3=y$ is a glasis added by a scribe who missed an explicit statement that Cideon crossed the river．


 jettured that the last translation represents the true tevt，ロンジタ ごジy［so Bu．，

 The words are not at all necessary in the consext；a bold critic might perhaps

（5）The names of the two kings are pronnunced in stl：＂：b
 ably recognize the name of a god Ebs；cf．alubss in an inscription of Tcimit （NÖLDEKE，I＇soc，Berlin Acad．＇S\＆，1＇．Stj）．With the second element of．\％as （I Chr．7，35）and yun（ien．36，40），the latter an Edomite name．
（6）tiexy，with all the Versions，as the grammatical concord requires；Al ：as＂，for Which some coeld．read $1+5 \times{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{i}$ ；while others note it as a conjecture（ $\because=0$ ，in the 25 margin，in accordance with the Nasoralı on Jud．11，15．
 cutting off the hand of a foe slain in battle as a proof of the warrior＇s prowess． In Eggyptian texts entries like the following are frequently found：／lere I cuffured and carrical off a hand，memtion of ahich rides made to the royal reporter，ame 30 there ares givens me the golden collar of i＇alor．There was fighting at second time at this place，and a second time $/$ citplutd and carried off a hand（FLiN－
 $\therefore 15$.
 sfirtis，but this is hardly a natural mode of expression：we should expect by ミて），or＝（ $(\mathbb{G} \mathrm{EV})$ as in v．16．I＇erhaps the words are a gluss from 8.16 ［so 1 Bt ．， Comm．］：see note there．


 E‘has．This wnuld not mean，however，the road used by the nomads in their annual forays（perhaps a trail which aroited the larger towns），as many inter pret，but the cietty to the decellers in fonts（さ
 a particular soute；more probably it proper name originally stood here．Jliu．， Comme，conj．
 EEETHEv）．As the panic in the camp seems（o）onme ton late in the story，after


 But ！ll may be defroded；see Ef 30，9；Zach 2，4：2S17，2 siunter）．
 acont cirding ahow the womp: of. 5,8. lirairz conj. te.


 place; the latter, for whirly (fixs, wh. have only кeti etrenev, is in at false tense.
14) $=\frac{1}{2}$ к-r; (rst and it few minuscule, Kuphus.
 לyse uf buth 'secr, lairveyant,' futhitu 'vision, \&c. DEI.. 11 W 182 If.; sce alsu

(8) (
 Bomaner, beors., Katrzach, at, would insert the word here.
 graply; the error seems whe old, it is faithfully reproduced in aratis. at
 R.S; Winckbek; af. v. iS; [or misplaced by a redactor; lice, Comme ].
 anticipates :EDY; and all the camp atooke, on the other hamd, adds an effective


 Gideon's men the subjert of both the laxt verbs, they reised she zeter ery, atht
 ( ВІктII: cf. 6, 11.





 KiteNen and BC, (Comme.) point appor, if. Am, 3, 6.






 \% the Matior, (wn Gen. 49,13) notes that would be comjectured ( $\because=2$ ); some to codth. have 7 in the text, wilhout note; this is preferred by BU, Comm.
 ped in common speech (Chisicts, Houbs, RFLANI), (iräl\%, wh); but there is



 introduced into the tex in this place, the comjunction wats necessarily pretixed. [So BU, Comm.] (iRitz would cortect תws to $5 \times=5$. connecting it with the words immediately proceding, ws for as liethathete, on the forden: the second go



 $9,+1$ ；sce Ms：7，libibel dis Josephurs，pp．13－15；liU．，Comm．
 by the slight emendation クーEyニ，as in 6，2f（STUDER，DOORN゚．，KAUTZSCH）；or by transposition，putting rージン after ワニアツ or at the end of the verse Killrysch， 5 formerly）．It is quite as probable，however，that＂ryロ｀ax is a gloss from 6，24．
 is the true name，which in the first two places has been changed；if．Dookn．



9 （5）Cf．We l＇anammu inscription，I． 3.



 with the same meaning as $\operatorname{Byg}$（STUDER，al．），it is safest to emend here： ［so Bt．，Comm．．The stone is the same the erection of which by Joshua is de－
 the old standing stones lad fallen under the ban of a more advanced religion， 20 the name $\pi$ aye became offensive，and was sometimes replaced by a harmless
 1.45 ；so also Jud． 9,6 in the Heb．text from which s was translated； $\mathfrak{i = x}$ u （5）Ex．24，4（all omits the verb），and probably in many other places．
 RIUS，ZAT 3，5j．
（9）าะボ；sonte codd．and cdd．Tะxงi．
 margin of the first two Bombers edd．，and in an Erfurt cod．；Olsit．，Sitade，al．；
 the most probable explanation is that the punctuation intends a Hof al with in interrogative and the elision of $\pi$ preformatise：shall I be compelled to gitere up \＆c．．Many recent scholars explain the form as Qal with $n$ interrogative（ so STUDER，BERTH．，К゙ィUTZSCH，a／．For this view it is urged that the Hif．and llof．of הare not found in OT；on the other side it is to be observed that in prose（Qal is construcd with in（cease freme somethingr），not with accus．


 lations of 1.13 ．The emendation iz GEIGER，CRÄTZ＇is necessary．For the Nif．to
 possible．On the motive for the change，see Gelaler，Lisihrift，p． 327.
 Bär．Most codd，and edd．have in v． 10 ミhe．

（12）$\because$ ロל Qere see on W． 8 and 10 ．



 mitigating the anthropomorphism；see also を．Cf．V．9．
16－19；DOORN．regards the whole of wr． $16^{6}-19^{4}$ as editorial amplification；similarly SMIND，l゙kANKRNDERG，TEz，IlotziNGER，and Blo，Comm．


 for AL（Jerome）．If this be right，we should emend：Fizes；the compound preposition admits only the interpretation of wis．Then a．man mot be the name







（14）（Coms and．（Comm．）suspects that ibs is erroneous explanation，the original subject of the verb was（ideon．
（15）ロミジア；cf．リ． 5 コンジタッ．




 Orod－ of the Cuthean amblassiddors in Alexander？，athed tied them to the taits of horse＇s athel kept dragring thems arer thoms and butpread till the brousht them to 1／1．Cerizint．For other references to this mode of torture sec Comm．wd loi．， and add Lescil：（hinese Clessios，3，1，p．39，n．Cierding is ery common in the 25 Icts of the Syrian martyrs，e．sr．CURETON，Anient Syriac locuntents，pp． 49 S．c．

The oldest（in translation，presersed（with doublets corresponding to sil）in
 ごメアニニー
 from r .14 （BU．）．
（18）NIEN © atho itere the ment as the context reyuires（if．（rip tiveç；sil Mens，（ot firhere．Since this does not seem to be a pertincont fucstion，nor to correspond to the answer，$f s$ and most recent commentators interpret guale＇s（sce also E．Köxig，Theol．Lithlatf＇96，No．5）．Houb，and Stumer，righty fecling that 35 we are not warranted in ascribing a ncw meaning to $-\boldsymbol{E} \times$ for this single passage， conj．הבッ DOORN．，a／f．）；but this particle is found only before verbs．Grït\％ therefore emends： 1 חה It is possible to explain All as a menacing question；sec Joore，Comm，［BU．，Comm． Mans．Mt．Tabor is somewhat remote from the scat of the clan Abiezer；per－ 40 haps the true name of the place is preserved in thinks rather of $\because 2 \pi, 9,50.1$
 take אחה distributively，zmusquisque，for which there is no warrant in usage．



（22）1าณพソ．See on 1 ． 1.
（24）For dll aid Bu．，Commo．，proposis｀eq：


 sugcrests パンクニジッ。

9 Ilebrew declaration of revolt；in 1.29 he challenges ．Wbimelech to come out from his capital，Shechem，to meet the Israclites in the field（see esp．IV．K．Smith＇

 is shechem（his city），thut w＇e should be subject to him：．Should not the sun of Jirublual and his lioutinatht libul subject the people of llemor，the futher of
 that in serritulenf egeront would suit the context，but is deterred by the Qal； he transposes：Bipe 9 biEnt．GEDDES renders，ffai＇c not a son of firwh－
 SMtru thinks，further，that $v, 28$ f．should stand immediately after $\therefore .22$（see against this theory STADE，（iesch．，1，p．194，n）；BU，woukl put iv． 28 f．after v． 25.


 hiJn，sic．

The assumption on which all these conjectures rest is at variance with the plain tenor of the narrative．The men whose confidence Gaal gains（ $1 . \dot{2} 0$ ），at whose vintage festival in the temple of their god he makes his incendiary specech （1v．27－29），and at whose head he goes out to battle against Abimelech（ 5.39 ）， 20
 fore，Gatal is not inciting the Israclites to rise against the Canaanite rule of Shechem；but is stirring up the native Shechemites to throw oftit the yoke of the half－l sraclite Abimelech，which they had unwisely taken upon them．In doing so，he appeals to their pride of race：Should Sheithom，should the Jhomoriti 25 ＂ristrirucy，be suthect to those atho hut bect their ou＇t subjects：With this understanding of the situation it is only necessary to read（with si）the perfect，
 see also lic．，Comm．）： 11 he is Abimilech：－And athed are the．Shechemites，that Tee showld be swbijut to him：Wire mot the son of Jerwhbeat and his liewtement 30 Tiloul subject to the Humorites：H\％y，then，should we he subject to him：－ Studer suggested i：ays，lit them（Abimelech and Zebul）sirate，dic；so OORI formerly．
E：ジミ．Gloss from Gen．34，6．
 GEDDISS，DOORN．，GRäTZ，KAUTZSCH，al；sll－x̌，narrative，Gaal sent this deftance to dbimelech；in contlict with the following verse．The contlict is not removed by making the subject of－ex＂indefinite（ 3 dictume ist），as Cleric $\log ^{\circ}$ Wotikl do．liU．（Comme，p．75）thinks that the difficulty is not to be disposed of by emending the text；the words which follow originally belonged to the message fo of \％ebul to Abimelech，before $1.33^{2}$ or ${ }^{b}$ ．
הe？，with some codd．and cedd．，the regular form；tll $\because \stackrel{\pi}{*}$ ，an anomaty of which no very satisfactory explanation has been given．
（3）הarse as in 1.41 ；Yebul sent mesnengers to Abimelech，who was at Irumah； STUDER，DOORN．，（iRäTz（as the name of a place，probably idemical with ．Iru－ 45

 the word with rexan，nupe．But the form of the noun is without analegy；secret Ir attributes 10 it a meaning for which there is no warrant：dicciffulls，frotudulent In，in the context coulel only mean，with intemt in deceive Abimelech．It would $; 0$
 arlopted in the lext is preferable．J．1）．Alech．，on the contraly，suspected that


 ミ．
 more alecisive is the harsh clathge of subject in Eimb Eat：．．ecn $x:=$ ．The



 one for whom $2 \boldsymbol{m}$ was not explicit enough； $\mathfrak{c}$ ：゙゙ was introduced by a scribe who wo missed the government of this noun．Cf．the result of successive thlosses in 3,2 ． Wixckler questions the whole verse，particularly ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ．
25） 5 リビ
 Isr．und jot？．（ieseh．${ }^{2}$ ，p．f4 regurds this as the true form of the name，dral）． 15 ل́جْ boclle，scurub［in Arab）．also applied 10 a black and ugly amb small man， or to a contentious one；LANE］；if．NEZ，Bibet de＇s foseplues，p．13；note also


 by the same confusion of $\wedge$ and $\Delta$ noted above in the case of liat is abo simply $7=1 \%$ ；sce $G_{1}$ in 1 Chr． 11,47 ，（GA a／．in 1 Chr．2，37：26，7：$=$ Clır． 231
 thought $ל=9$ ，an old Canatnite name，the more probable reading；many recent scholars K゙UENtN，DOORN．，STADE，KAtrzach，lir＂，KlTMEL，d／．suppose that 25 the name wats 6 gry，which being oftensive tor the scribes wats attered to $i=y$（sont of a starte）；it would follow that Gatal＂as of lsraclite extration．
some Heb．codd．have here and below マニサ ；ff．き．
 in which liat and his kinsman have taken up their residence in shechem；at 30 pregnant construction，fiessed weer fo Shechem athd dicell in it，is without parallel． The beginning of the story，which should have introduced Gaal to us，has been lust；perhips some abridgment in 1.26 is the catuse of the difitulty we find in the words under consideration．The l＇ersions（h）not appear to hawe had a dif－ ferent text，though some of them have tried to straishaten it out．
 if ebebn SCMARFFNBPRG，ZMEGLER）．




 p． 75.

Sof far its the consonant text groes，ill is stpported by the lersions with but




 In the absence uf external evidence，the textual critic can only be guded by go exegetical consithrations．Wost recent interpreters set out with the prenise that liatal，the son of lolatal see on $\sqrt[v]{ } .26$ ），Wis ans Ioraclite who incited the Sratelte part of the population to rebel against the king of shechems $1.2 S$ is a
 exceptions，collective．［BU．，Comm．，thinks $\mathbf{I l l}$ unobjectionable in $\mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{P}}$ ．］

 mation to the preceding ニングシ asses．（According to 13：̈r，p．106，the Uriental school
 Notes on Istiah，p．101，1． 4 ；and this form ニיףソ may have suggested the insertion of the E＇口y from $12,14 .-1$＇．H．］
דלy might well stand after ent $1^{\circ}$ ．［BU．，Comm，］
$\$_{1}$ in all three cases gives 32 for 30 ．So 70 is frequently ratised 1072 ：the reason is not obvious．
 ＝ix is found in S．
 sceond as original）．SCHARFENBERG suggests is7\％י．
חנש over to the following half－verse；（61）？omit the first；（frel translate evve kalpû
 －ixace．In 11， 26 these 18 years seem not to be included in the reckoning．
 junction，which is intolerable．
 Antwerp）．ed．，cod．Reuchl．ed．Lag．，cod．Mr．Xus．2210），（Vulgate：introduced by Clementine editors，apparently without any Latin attestation）；sporadic cor－ 25 rections evincing the feeling that the name is indispensable；of．E we hate leff Thece，our God；ill wish תx．


 construed with simple $\mathfrak{i n}$ ．（GACstislLplnslís $\$$ take the names of these peoples， like those in $\because 12^{2}$ ，as subj．of the verb $=9 \pi \times$ ， $2 \pi$ ，and 1 have emended accord－ ingly：The error probably originated with a scribe who began to transcribe the
 mistake boldly went on with it rather than mar his copy by a correction．The altemative is to suppose that the seribe or editor who introduced the string of
 cf．2，3．［BU．，Comm．］
11．12）The list of oppressors exhibits considerable variations，which are in part accidental， in part to be ascribed to the clesire for completeness．In the names of Joab ic．3．and Midian（cc．6－8 are conspicuously absent；in（5ACsBsll．plin（ミit sub obi\％）E ．Woab is introduced after the Ammonites，in \＆immediately after the ligupfians．

 first mentioned as enemics of Judill in the days of Jehoshaphat＇ 2 Chr．20， 1 ；see also 26．7； 1 Chr．4，41）；and as OT knows nothing of a Maonite invasion in the days of the Judges，we should probably emend： $\mathfrak{\square}=$ ，BERTH．，DOORN．，Gr．irz，
 howerer，that the late athor of this list wrote the name of a people of his own time， $1: \% \times$ ，instcad of that of Midian．Other variations in the l＇ersions need not 50 be discussed here．

 Jud．
 in $v .41$ ．］


 and his，fullowers were in pussension of the city，not besieging it；and ins besiege is constrned with לy，not with the accus．The context requires a word signifying，
 sense，hut against usage．Stade suggests eryse，part．Hif．of－ris，they matie the cify hustile to thece．It is an ubjection，though not a decisive one，to the emenda
 tively late Ez．23，22；1s．13，17；Jer．50，9：51，1；Dan．；see however abowe，un
 41,2 emend in $H$ lif？
 Bouvoù oú oí mowéves，doublet．Sce Mez，libibel de＇s Josephus，p．1ł，n．
（41）- － － The reading in siLp may be only a © doublet，accidentally recovering the original

（fi）：$\because$ ザ
 accident，from the next halforse；（rABsisll ai upxul；（fiN attempts to remowe the difficulty by translating of dexnyoi，stidik conj．，less probably，Eemja．
（f0）mas．See Commt，and esp．G．Hormann，$\%$＇＇go，pp． 322 It． ！li nッ ב
 sruplyy）perhaps represents an intermediate stage in the history of the cor－ ruption．

 Heb．）is not found in（9T．Doors．reads $\pi$ ；ew but in this distributive phrase the suff．is usual，if not indispensable（Bertr．）；if．St．
 as 11 ehe＂erplicutive（if．Crit．Notes on Ezek．，p． $46,1.52$ ），thut is，wll the cittizens， 35 dic．In the present instance the conjunction may hatse been inserted by some
 ＂hole clause is lacking．
53）iron；tll uni，an anomalous form，whether we regard it as Hif．iwhich is not found elsewhere）or，with BARtH，as an $i$ impf．Qal．
（57）Denk；two of the oldest edd．
（1） putruus．The name Didu occurs frequently in the Amarma dispatches（see K13 5．Nos． $44.45 .52,15$ ）；in the inscription of Meshat，1．12，הin seems to be tj the name of a goll：of．Dido ion which name sec Wincklis，Altoricnt．Forsch．，


 berg conj．that in st and the lersions a name has fallen out，and would restore，jo

 of this word．
 Num．2I，13fi．）：while fatazer and the fordtr，which are not suggested by any－ thing in the context，are original．［BU．，Comss，thinks，on the contrary，that the latter names are due to the attempt to give the story－which originally dealt with Moab－a relation to Amınon．］
 II Eñis．．The sing．has been used throughout in the address to the king；the mase．suff．for the fem．＇referring to the cities＇is not uncommon＇cf．below， p． $65,1.36$ ）．The other recensions of（ 5 have ti ütl oùk Eppúoavto（al．Eppúouto） aùtaús，（GLp ठi山̀ ti oủk EEEiスavto aủtás．
（27）E）

 preferred by DE Rossi），？transicns ad filios Ammon；dll pay＂コ
（31）кצッウ，＾（GLp al．£，ミll sub ast．



 シant masc，an error for which the following i＝is perhaps responsible．The 20 Masorah notes this as onc of six places where aias would be conjectured for リロッ（



 of these rersions makes it probable that none of them had our Heb．text：



 Ths（GV＇n a\％．otapdeas）．The concurrence of $\because \because=$ and $ワ シ \%$ in $1 l l$ is of itself sus－ picious．HOUB．suspects that the original text had 7 Fig in all three places；


 reliese the awkwardness of the expression）；it was a gloss meant for the end of



（．39．40）The division of the verses is wrong（Clerticus，DOORN．）the custom which be－ came established in Isracl was the women＇s mourning described in 8.40 ；not the sacrifice of daughters，v．39．The reason for the Masoretic division，as ciakter＇s


 in order that no man should affer his son or his daughter for aburnt effirins．as the Giliodite Jephthath didt bcause he did＇not conswlt the pricst Dhinehas；for had
 malous（ $\mathrm{F} \pi$ is masc．）：the false division of the verses perlapes led some seribe 50 to take Jephthah＇s daughter as the subject．I＇robably it should be emended T－！，BU．，Comtm．］
（40）rimb．Klosticrmans conjectures nizy to sing：13v．（Comm．）suspects that



 we should read $\cdots=$ ，the order would still betra！tie glons．



BUBult：＇s recemeruction of wi．i－3 concerns the source of the verses，not the to actual text；cf．above，p．23，1． 37.
 b． $5^{3}$ ．obscrse low ？rondenses in translation）；ZneGiok and STloER question
 Dorone regards $v . f$ as by the author of w． $1-3$ ，makins connection with 1.5 ． 15
 subject is the ごさ戸か。
 Ill jass，which could only refer to the cities in this region，if． 15.33.

 ing at link in the narrative．


（18），ニx： which the translation wats made，perhaps in Eitself．



 the introduction of the negative and correction of the tense；na，GRätz，which is perhaps not indispensable）maty have been hist before $-x$ or supplanted bỵ it．With th arree miNe ；？mon dimisit cum fransire，de．
הisne．In the inscription of Meslat（1．19，as in Ts． 15,4 J Jer．48，34，the name is $\mathfrak{H} \pi$ ；the locative in $\bar{\pi}$（Num．21，23；1）eut．2，32）seems in this，as in numerous 35 other instances，to be mistaken lie later writers for a feminine；see also on 14， 1.
 only repeat in another form what has been satid in v： $21^{\mathrm{b}}$ ；ZntGRER suspected that they were it gloss．

 words are omitted in（6l－1；in licilbsin all all after toul laßok is lacking．

 sense，and destroys the symmery of the paralle．The eiror is an old one；it is found in all the licraions．

 repetition，which gives us a construction without parallel，is probalbly accidentad，so



troduced into the $\|(\mathrm{l})$ ．text reppesented by（6l．p from 11.3 f ；in that case we
 EW＇ALD：if．the city of（iilead in lios． 6,8 ，perhaps the modern Jat＇ud，three miles south of the Zerqâ Jablook＇；see Butil，Geegr：，p．262．J．1）．Micur．suspects that the city bilead is the same as Mispeh．

11．12）in $\dot{j} 11$ 11． 11.12 are sub ast．，and a marginal note in cod． 85 （ ）bserves that from Kai ÉKplve（ $1: 11$ ）to the end of V .12 is not in（ 5 ．
 thus distinguishes the name of the Judge from that of the town is areificial（cf． 1 （5）；both should be read lillin，（ien．46，14 NöLDEke）．In the speiling of this word there is much diversity，not only in codd．and cdel．，but apparently among the Masoretic schools．bäk writes the name of the judge in 19.11 .12 אן as also in 4,11 ，appcaling to Massora fimalis $\aleph^{22}$ ；but on this rubric see FRENSD．， ．Masser．IV intirt．，P．265，n．G，and cf．Ginsisukg，Massorn ．Magha，1，p．47． 15


 Pirathon is to loc looked for，not at Fig atid NW of lifbulus，but further south 1 Macc：9，50，Joseph．Ant．xiii，1，3）；Abdun oceurs in the genealogical lists in lien－ 20 jamin， 1 Chr． $8,23: 8,30=9,36$ ．This agrees well with the situation of the dis－ trict of Shaalim in Samuel．The mountrin of the Amalekites of ill is commonly
 irremediably corrupt．

13 （4）＇תゼด เxi；many codd．Nלை；similarly in $\because .14$.
（5）B7ẹ，consec．perf．；nt n7ey as in $1: 7$ ，Gen． 16,11 ，in intentionally ambiguous punctuation，holding the mean between the perf．and the part．ryb：Sec K゙öざ！G，1，404－406．
（6）In and Versions＝ーnixn－xta；so also in v．9．Elsewhere in this chapter alnays 30 Rar． $7 \times 2$（11．3．13．15．16．17．20．21）．Perhaps the variation in 15.6 and 9 is accidental，occasioned by the proximity of Entriter．Sece note on 6,20 ．It may be reasonably suspected that＝－itx exx note the article，was alered by


 （15t．）．


（10）Ill Eva．The expression has no exact parallel；if the teat be sound，we must 40
 oa sub whel．），similarly $\xi_{\text {，and even ef probably only from the fecling that the }}$


 plur．（sec Nolkzi．In 1.17 ，where the same phrase occurs，the plur is corrected Ly the（）eré．


 This is not at reason for the Messeng＇r＇s reply in 8.16 ，but an explatiation of something which Manoah said or did．Hočis．（following an observation of Cilsicus and lBomme accordingly transpuse $v .16^{a}$ and b，so that the words
the word is a late stabstute for ${ }^{3} \boldsymbol{P}$ ？，to remove the last plain trace of the human sacrifice．
 Josefinus，p． 17.

 after iny（Dors．，liU．，al．，－not before it，（ikirz）．The origin of the error was perceived by Sember．
ここ゚タs F゙ixt，with（f）（except（f）\＆ struction of Fö c．acc．Nelı． 9,28 is rare，and confusion of ax and he common．




 274．，and J．H．Mtcteamets ad loc．
 In sll the entire halfererse from $\because=1$ is asterisked ats a llexaplar addition to（6） （he asterisk has been placed by mistake before Efthorme $1^{\circ}$ i sce Rönvsa $=0$
 ［108 n．b．］128．134）omit from 1 ？${ }^{2}$（1）the end of the verse，from which it is to be inferred that the asterisk in llexaplar MSS originally stood after Efhram
 sentence completed by the insertion of ank．KaU＇Z．SCH thinks it possible that 25 this clause originally stood att the end of $\mathfrak{\forall} \cdot 6^{3}$ ．The following words， 7 ．

 codd．，as in Versions generally），－seems to be a marginal correction made by a scribe who naturally did not see how the（iileadites could be said to be in the mitst of Efturaim．In this state of the text，we need not go afield for parallels to the supposed taunting speech of the Ephraimites，with which Jacor：（Sifulient zu din altarah．Dichtern，3，37）compares Maç undi，．Marj，6，i45，where the Taiy are reviled as zusammensichatfone Nabataer．－On this verse see Wetilit．in

（6） $\operatorname{size゙.~(f)~understands~that~the~word~was~a~pitssword~or~countersign;~so~most~}$
 púQuvav tuú Ace入noal oütuc．
 stance of the idiom $=\mathfrak{y} \mathfrak{\circ}$ ：the impf．must then be taken as frequentative．But 40 the meaning，he did not give hecel，take pains，to suy it risht，is hardly natural；the ellipsis is not attested by old examples；and in the sequence of narrative tenses a perfect is expected．The error may be ascribed to the intluence of the follow－ ing $i=$ ．Some codd．and old edd．have $i=\cdots$


 reading of GLp probably represents REs＝in a Heb．copy in which 9 had been accidentally lost；and as Jephthah＇s home was at Mizpelı（11，34），we may with some confidence restore the name here，with STUDER，J）OORN．，BUDDE：MEZ jo
 ing $\mathfrak{v i} 1$（where he would read $\operatorname{Has}$（ for nises $\sum \in \varphi \in t v a$ ），thus inverting DOORN．s explanation of the variant of $\mathbb{G L p}$ ．It is，of course，conceivable that ress was in

14 （2） $1 \approx x$ b．The word is a comparatively late addition to the text．External evidence of this fact is perhaps preserved in SH，where we read，，－ael U，olo aloo ：$\infty$ olo ※aly axolo．The asterisk is manifestly misplaced，the verb kui eime is indispensable；and it is a very probable conjecture that the signs should be corrected：－：olo tal， perlaps by homacoteleutor．
（3）itw vax h inxy．The verl was not conformed when the second subject was interpolated，cf．v． $5^{3}$ ；some recensions of（ 5 with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ ，：ind even d，correct to the plural．On the editorial changes in this chapter see notes to the English Trans－ lation，pp． 83 ff．；DOORN゙．，and esp．STADE，ZAT 4 （＇S4） 250 ff ；13U．，R－S 130 f．
 al．［BU．，Comm．would follow \＆a step farther，and emend：

（4）Dooks．regards this verse as a late gloss．


 author wrote אニ゙（DOORN．）．
 chez lis Greets，p． 73.
＇18 \％
 to suspect the text，as some scholars have done．See Comm．－The consider－ able variations in some recensions of $₫$ are apparently derived from a Heb． cupy in which irsz had been corrupted to vo（ 5 AlW゙n eis tò otónce uùtou； 25

 Xepoiv cutoû，i．$\subset$ ．ソミュン）．This crror has worked back into $\because$ ．S，where the original
 utit in all recensions of $\left(5\right.$, and has been perpetuated from $\mathfrak{f}$ in $\mathbf{3}$ ，while in $\mathbf{v} \cdot 9^{b} 30$
 ＝23）．

 think the words original；to them the following note，for so the yournse men wed 35 to do，refers．＂The seach days may，however，very casily have been introluced from vi． 12.




inpi．Dookn．（Thiol．Tïdschrift＇94，p．21）would supply the subject，aseme；
 lic．，Commo．，who makes it probable that it was the Timnathites who chose these groomsmen；ath that the later（not Samson）provided the feast；of．WerzsTEN， 45








immediately follow Manoalis invitation to meat. They are, however, an even more apposite comment on $1: 17$, where Manoal asks his visitor's name and is told that it is a mysery. The evident displacement of the sentence is most easily explained if it is a gloss meant for 1.17.
(17) :11 \% uncommon; but Al may be right, of. Deut. 4,7; . Mic. 1, 5; Gen. 33,8.
Tom, so Qere (fes; many codd. and edd. of sll have the sing. in the text without further note (Oriental text); Kethill כיבּ plur.; see on $\mathfrak{r i}$ 12. The other places where the same correction is made are 1 K 8,$26 ; 18,36 ; 22,13 ;$ Jer. 15, 16;廿 119, 147. 161; Ezra 10, 12.
 of. $\psi$ 139,6.

 1s. 29, 4 ; 2 Chr. 26,15; Jocl 2,26. This reading, which Cuericus had suggested, 15


 with © and is probably from $A_{i}$ \& with the utmost frecdom, Lisal loa mzeoo. all defies atl attempts th construc it grammatically: Matrer conj. s'hes xini 20 תיצ:ל, but this, as STuiner observes, only gives us at second circumstantial clause to dispose of. Houb., better, to connect the words with the following clause, after the latter had accidentally: intruded; see the nest note below. [13U., Comm. (if. BerTh.), hinks the words,

At the end of this verse 81 and the Versions add axin nexs mim; copied out of place from the next verse, \& connects the words with 1. 20, making the repetition even more intolerable.
(a) במלוה; many codd. and old cdd. תלוה.

חבוan ayb. ミLole interpreting as docs Josephus; cf. 6,21.


 and Bu. cancel $\% .21^{\text {b }}$, as superfluous afer $\because, 20^{\mathrm{b}}$.]
(23) :מידינ, with many codd, and edd. of sll; the Received Text has

Alfowze

 etymological association with ins. The words its he then refer to the instructions for the bringing up of the child, from which it wats a very strong inference to that JHyll meant something else than their destruction. It is an attractive conjecture that this is the true reading; the error which made of it led then to the addition of the rather awkward last clause, since a mention of what Juwn had said to them wats now lacking.



 הajan). The Itebraized form הasa also octurs, but not in Jud. The same correce 50 tion is mate in $w .2 .5$ below; see also note on 11,20 . At the end of the verse
 from 1. 7.

15 (10) All :



 infinitive absolute and its serl) (ef. I telerit eos); so Houb., J. D. Mich., Geddes, Doorn., Matmes, Budde, Kautzsch, Gissuurg, Buhl, al., all making the
 disturbazi, as 7 nen in Aram.; Cismdes, I haeic completely routed them; J. D. Alicu., Ich hete sie dicke wher einander gethuft; \&c.). J. D. Мıce. referred in explana- 10 tion of ti EEu入eipu to the Arab. pare, pecl, skim (s!n. . with this verb DOORN. and numerous recent scholars connect the Heb. verb. There is, however, no other trace of such a meaning in Heb); and it therefore seems safer to regard the verb as from the same root with -ph heop, measure; perhaps a casual denominative, invented for the paronomasia; if this be the case, 15 we should probably regard the finite verb as Piel.
(17) (רם לחז לח. In spite of the etymological explanation of the origin of the name (הธา throxit, slloz correctly derive the word from an.
(19) All extw; 3 Dominus, © [BU., Comm., suspects that the word is redactional; if we pronounce yPs?: the 20 subj. is unnecessary; of. also notes on $1 \mathrm{~K} 2,19$; 1s. 16, 10; Err. 4, 15, \&c.]

 have been omitted by accilent after imbe; or intentionally, because after 15,20 2; it had lost its connection.
 stupplied in all the Versions (Clericus, Houb, \%hegler, Studfr, Doorn., Kautzech, Grätz).
= to $^{\circ}$; STuDer and DOorvinch strike out the words as a gloss.

 might compare iS $\mathbf{t}, 22$.
(3) Al


 loniki, van mer Hooght
5) All 1 , well to note, however, that the present of Assyr. nadinu ( $=$ ins; see Hacpt, to Sumor. Pimiliongisetze, p. 43, n. 2) is not only imidin, indimdin but also iddun (see op. cil. P. 53) or even iltan, with $n$ (Delirzsch, Assy: Handaworterbuch, pp. $450^{\mathrm{a}} .488^{\mathrm{a}}$; As.syr. Gramm, § 100 ; if. also alowe, p. 34, I. 33.]
 Comm.
( 13.14 ) In $111(\S \mathbb{C}$ ) the end of what Samson said and the beginning of what Deliath did
 17-19. Wie have two (1) translations of the passage: (11) (51.p (cf. (ill) eaiv draou




 Jwl.

14 howewer，no obtious reatson why they should be supposed to sive up the riddte in the middte of the week：more probably the error ties in the ower number，「 makes this sugkertion，without confidently alopting it．Neither the actual mor the emended sext is in harmony with $1: 17$ ，acoording to which Samson＇s bride teases him the whole week through to tell her the riddle．If we may assume consistency in the author＇s own representation，the notes of time in $1 \times .14^{\text {b }} \cdot 15^{-1}$ must be regarded at glosses（STADLE，Duorsi．，IBe：）．The thilistines speedily convineed themselves that the only way to get the answer to the riddle was to worm it out of S：umson，and with，ut delay set his wife on him．For six day＇s she badgered him with tears and reproaches，until，worn out at last，he betratyed his secret．
 Th is only an early attempe to remose the difficuly＇which these critics unnecessa－

： the I＇iel，for which some take the form with Metheg，occurs only in 1eut．28，t2，
 connecting the verb with ※？．Contamination of signification is probable；of．


 wl．According to marginal notes in some MSS，the schools of Sora and Nehartea
 Ill wh，but the alternative or not is expressed in Jleb．by xise，not by xta； 25 and is not in place here at all．§（which mistranslates）and（f）dis not represent






 servet．If the author had meant before sunst，he woutd have satd $x=n$ Ere ยッジッ
＇zo＇This verse is regarded by DOORNINCK as a gloss，suggented by 15,2 ；without sufficient reason．

 have a contlite text．




 $\therefore \because$ after $\pi \mathrm{x}$ ．


 ground for the sappicion that tors has ariven from the variant ans which appears in ti；but 1 de not wenture to reconstrust the text in accordance with（fi，whish is ite li hardly premencel in its original forme．

Friw，as in the preceding halferese and in v．27；\｛ll pasv．Except Ez．23，32 prys is found only in the l＇entatcuch．The different spelling is perhaps not without critical significance．The older Creek Version has кai évémuĭov aủtû， ats if $\because$ ，bלyar $(19,25)$ ，which may hase been altered in conformity with $1.25^{3}$ ；

 pas is due to partial assimilation of the initial sibilant to the final p；cf．Beitr．z． Assyr．I，2．In Ex．23， 32 payb is canceled by Cornilt．，following © ；sec Toy ad loc．］

 side of שum in the same sense，or that there was contamination in these forms （Köntg，＇t＂y analogy＇）；but more probable that＂e゙ュa is to be set to the account of the scribes，who may have been influenced by dramaic，or have meant to lint at a double sense，let me fiel（ש゙世n），and let me remoce（ビリ：Mic．2，3，sec Qamhi）the columins．
（27）ם＇אור．If the preceding clauses，from itel，were part of the original text，the participle would have to be indefinite，and the article should be struck out as an accidental repetition of the final $\boldsymbol{n}$ in $\boldsymbol{\pi} \mathbf{x}$ ；cf．（ $G$ ACsSrLiph＇n．The removal of the words orerlined in our text，which seem to contain two successive additions to the original narrative，leaves $\mathbf{E} \mathbf{2}$

 Theodoret，three thousand men and many times more atomen．
（2S）exen，idiomatic，as in 6,$39 ; 15,3 ; 16,18 ; 111+\pi i n$ ；but as $0 y$ is uniformly fem． （2 $\mathrm{S} 23,8$ is corrected by the $Q^{e} r e \hat{)}$ ，the demonstrative is probably a late gloss． 25
 an ill－fitting restoration（BU．，Comtm．）；cf．notc on $\psi 45,7$ and Crit．Notes on Ezekicl，p．52，1．52．］


 ulciscar me de hostibus meis，ct pro amissione diverum｜utminum wham ultionem recipiant；GRÄTZ accorclingly ensends：אחר
 quires 5 ．On internal grounds also we should probably prefer An．\＆youll： Wherin！IAan，without the numeral one．DOORN．would omit nns；but the same objection from the preposition would lie against this；we should have to
 difficulty；but is too violent a remedy 10 commend itself．
 conj．that they read a＇s！．



 and all the Versions（including these recensions of（6）in 3，31．Differences in the translation show that it was not brought over to this place from 3.31 in the （f）text，but was found here by these translators or revisers in their copies of sll． In \＄lt there are no critical signs；but in $\mathbb{6}^{1+3}$ the whole is sub whe Beyond question，the Platistine fighter comes more appropriately after Samson than at 50 the beginning of the period of the Judges：anel it is perlaps not too bold to conjecture that this is the original position of the brief account of his exploit． 1）n other ground it is doubeful whether the name of the bero was originally



 mity here be disregarded，（f）ㅇ the other recensions show the results of conllation or contamination；if．also 3）．Neither of these transtations is entirely free from glosses；but by comparing them with each other and with the corresponding pissages in the account of the other trials the Heb．original may be restored as in our text．The lacuna is supplicel from（ 6 by IIOUb．，J．D．Micu．，Cibntes，



 ically sounder．
 removes the grammatical difficulty by emending： $\mathrm{in}^{-9}$ ，as older scholars hatd done．
 correction for ：－x，by a scribe who understood that the pin in w． $13^{6} .1 f^{2}$ was used to fasten the web to the watl（ $\sqrt{6}$ ）or ground（ 3 ），and thought that the verb yey liere described the pulling out of this pin or natil．The Tin＇was a pointed piece of wood with which the woof was beaten up，corresponding to the orden employed by the Cirecks in the upright loom（llkAUN）；naee is the web itself； 27x，the loom．（On these and other technicall tems connected with weaving see I＇AOS citcd abose（1．11）．
 （turoü，which would be sutable at this point（Bu），but may，for that reason，have lseen borrowed from $\sqrt{ } .15$.

 $\mathbb{K}^{\circ}$ thib $\pi^{2}$ ，accident．1l repetition of $\quad$ ab in the same platase just above．



 specific word may have been suggested by the context．
Kלa，as the context seems to require；what else was the man called in for？
 formation to the preceding and following verbs；filare ambiguous．The alter－


 The passive scems to agree beter with the meaning of ais（cf．w． 5.6 above） and the context；his humiliation began，and his strength departed from him． tl may hate arisen through ditography of 9 ，but the error was perhaps fator－ ed by a diferent interpretation of $\mathrm{a}: 3$（ forment）．
 plural，not of 7 nex，which would be at variance with the principle of the correc－ tion in Gen．39，20，but of ies，15，14，\％\％7exn $2=$ Jer．37，15．
 ッニン
 not recognizing this form，unnecessatrily substitutes the inf．（In the variations of codd．and cold．sec tた：Rossi．

W＇āk explicafiazun before glosses see Crit．Notes on Ezekiel，p．46，1．53．－ I＇．H．］
 an original -Ba he builh．
 MICH．，Dsthe，ZiEGLER，GEDDES，and，among recent critics，STUDFR and KUENEN reject the words as a gloss；but the last thing a glossator would do is to represent a Levite as of Judean exeraction，BC．（R－S）regards the words
 rejects the same words in $v .8^{\mathbf{a}}$ as a ditogram from r． $7^{\text {a }}$ ．［BU．，Comm．，thinks 1 that rina must have displaced another name，either $\because$ bin or more probably －（守
（10）The last words of this resie in stl are 15 －-3 ，which the lersions also found here；beyond doubt a corrupt doublet to the following＂ba לxy，STUDER，BERTH．， KiUTZSCH，GRATZ，al．（ITTLI would read ib！？which is not suitable in this 15 context．

18 （1）Ald nhme．Sut DER uould supply before this worl：$\gamma-5$ ，ats in alk simitar cases （Ez．47，17．22；45， 1 ；Ňum．34，2；26，53：Jos．13，6；23，4，SC．）；（535 render only הbri．If the words came from the old source，we should without hesitation emend：－ibns，which correction is found in a few codd．of 811 ；in a gloss，perhaps of late date，we have to admit that the writer，having in mind the phrase men－ tioned above，mity have written incorrectly - bora．


 some confusion in the critical signs of a 11 exaplar cops；of． $\mathbb{F}_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{r}} \mathbf{\Sigma 1 1}$ ．
 Èv oľkẹ $M$ ．

 ChEN：ad loc．），in which case the subject－ind must be supplied，and the verb
 probable（STADE）．Jos． 1,8 たーツ idiom（ribun 2 sing uasc．）

กニニン กニゼッ．The fem．part．dues not agree with the natural antecedent，＝y， ＂hich has moreover its oun complement in חesel ニpie below；and can only by a very forced construction be taken with the suff．in הコロッ（SEB．SCHMAD，al．）． If，with Clobrices and llotio，we shombl remose the grammaticat discord by emending：$=\because \because$ ，the tautology would remain（Srenek）．In our text it is supposed that the worels come from at second source，and have been imperfectly adapted （1）their new surroundings；originally they were preceded by some such ex－
 It must be confesed，howeter，that sueh imperfeet assimilation of his materials 45 by a redactor has grave improbabilities．




 whole into（6t al．\＆Otherwise the Versions reprenent $\$ 1 \mathrm{t}$ as well as they can：

 the name wats corrupted to $-5(5,6)$, the verse would almost of necersity be transposed to a place before c. 4. Observe, further, that in the of wext guoted abose (p. 59, l. 42) Shamgar is introducet lxe the regular formala for the . Winor

 rans, to which there is no parallel in Jud. The suspicion that in 5,6 Shamgar ben-Anath, with his foreign and heathenish natue, wats not a deliverer but an oppressor of Isracl (Comsm., p. 43) thus gain. in serength. Sec now 13 C ., Comme, on 3,31; and MOORE, foums. Amer. (riche. Nini, 19,159 f.j

 Jacob Kihasvost and Norzt) have nise in the text without any note. The batter

(2-f) Ill "


 sions, is manifestly in disorder. The atuthor cannot late made Dicalh return the silver to his mother twice ( $1 \times 3^{3} \cdot 4^{2}$ ). lid. followed ly Kiaurzech, conjectures that the last words of $r, j$ ( $\boldsymbol{F}_{\text {b }}$ namb); when they had been accidentally displaced, the substance of $v . f^{2}$ was restored in $5.3^{\text {at }}$, not exactly in the right place. There remains, however, an-

 the mother said; 130. supposes that the worls were suppressed through a scruple such ats led to the atteration of the teat in $1 \$ 25,22$ dic: but in the present instance this does not seem very likely. On the other hand, v. $3^{\text {ba }}$ stands in 41 in an unsuitable place. In the restoration in our text it is therefore assumed that the words " $\because$ : -ancor "มixン $\operatorname{Bas}$ v. 2: the mother had not only pronounced at curse upon the unknown thicf, but had, in the hearing of her son, consecrated the silver to Jowt for a specified purpose, so that it could not withou sacrilege be used for any wher (if. the effect of the $=-\mathbf{p},=\dot{3} \dot{P}$, dic. in the Jewish law) By the fear of the curse and the taboo, the son was mosed to inake restitution. So the passage is under-
 ioni her argentum Iomino, Sic.: if. also CIERICL'S and Zagutar. The displacement of the words was perhaps not altogether accidental; a scribe may have thought that the consecration was meant in avert or nullify the curse, and must naturally come after the son's confession. If this conjecture be sound, the other transpositions in our teat follow of themselven; $b 3^{3}$ is omitted ats doublet in v. $f^{2}$. No other nperation of ievtual criticism is an precarious as such trampositions on purely internal grounds; and the present attempt is subject to all the reserve which in due in such eases. For a dhtierent reworation of the text 45 sce 13U., Comm., p. 113.]
 cattion in the consecration, which could not the satistied by the thicf, taking
 Comm, arguc. forcibly against this emendation.]
 by the retiection that the ithol wat made of sitver by the $\mathrm{s}-\mathrm{B}$; the ting E'Ess, on the contrary, come from the ather version of the stary. Fior the
thither, seize the idols, \&ic. (so also IBU.). It seems to me more probable that the whole verse is a late addition, originating in a doublet to 1.18 ; and that the perf. tenses came from the latter serse, where they are grammatically sound.



 as an abridginent; KAU'TZSCII and Grätz, on the contrary, regard it as original, and reconstruct the $1 / \mathrm{cb}$. text accordingly: But comparison with ors, the other accessible representative of the same translation with $\mathscr{G}^{V}$, proves conclusively that the shorter text of $\mathbb{6}^{2}$ is merely the result of at common transcriptional accident, probably in the copy which was the immediate ancestor of $\mathbf{F}^{\prime}$ : the seribe
 discovering his mistake, he satw that nothing essential had been omitted, except the statement that the priest was standing by the door (kui of Ifpeus éotnduntévos
 the exigencies of space dictated, on the margin, whence it found its way into (o) in the wrong place (xai \& Iepeùs éozús). The case forcibly illustrates the peril of using (6vy for critical purposes without controlling it by (6N. In ( 62 also the shorter text is the result of a simple homatoterton, - the scribe having skipped from tò xwveutóv $1^{\circ}$ to tó xuveutóv $2^{\circ}$, - as the oher representatives of this version ( (6ACsisLpVnslté) attest.
(18) All (cf. 3 ( ) TEx, hee תx; Gs supply the conjunction, and the Ephod; Sturler inserts Fאi, which necessitates the further correction tean (Kautzscit). The glossing is more awkward than usual.

[^5][^6][^7]$$
20
$$
(19) is, introducing the second member of a disjunctive guestion, is unusual; ox would ${ }^{2}$ be regular. Sce König, Syntar; § 353 , n.
 right.
All bean תki; ( 5 + кai to xuveutóv, as in other places, completing the inventory; 30 Kautzscht and Grätz accordingly, ה=מת תאו.
 of the women has accidentally dropped out; read: וישימו את הנש:


 l'ossibly the original word was erone (v. 24), in which case there would be a stronger motive for the suppression.
ש゙ל ל


 -avovo loa lase: (asterisks in the codex also before cenies: and oa in the middle of a line; metobelus only after oa), and l3ar Hebreeus (yuoted in Fintui).
 Tosephta, Sunhedrin, 14,8 (p. +37 ed. Zueckermandel). After explaining the
路
 the son of Manassch. Wias he, then, the sen of Manassch: Wias he not the 50 son of lloses: Why, then, is the thing fustimed an Ihanasseh: It teathes that


 be noted；s ac＞oo Jlif

Ilの以Nる $\because$ ： 9 ；otherwise in 1.28 ．The reading 0 ． should probably have been received into the text；sce I3U．，Comm．The confusion of ニัא，ごx，ニา is very common．

 this question secmed to be appropriate only in the mouths of the explorers，
 liv．（R．S）conj．that kdi日no日e represents éens $\because \cdot 9^{\text {b }}$（accidentally misplaced there），and would emend accordingly：E＂ent enk in；so K゙at＇TzSCn．But in vi． $\mathrm{g}^{\text {b }}$

 represents a corruption of ごごmb Ens；after the loss of aby haplography the 15 word was read E‘？ see l＇U．，Comm．］
（9）ip9，with codd．（Qere of the Oriental school）and old edd．of all，and all the lersions，including を；llot＇b．，STUDFR，al．；Al המש．［The sing．may be defended by the analogy of $\pi$ ？





 first part of this，at least from elori $\Delta 0 \alpha \mu \in v$ to Natoa，has the prestmption of originality；in Ill the place to which the exploring party proposed to lead their
 such information．［13U．is led by this observation to suspect the word ariby，the 30 remosal of which would relieve this ditficulty．j What folluws may be merely repeated from $\sqrt{ } .7$ ．Unskilful combination of the sources has given rise to other difficulties in these verses for which textual criticism has no remedy．
 Figh תnge，construed with p；here perhaps originally with une of the following 35 infinitives（nath，wab）；the absolute use is also prossible：you are deving mothing whout it！［For another restoration of these verses sce BU．，Comm．］
（1．4－18）A ratical reconstruction of the text was attempted by Writhe in IbtEEK4，p．199； withdrawn，Composition，p． 356.



（15）（בים Marmonistic note，identifying the residence of the Levite with that of his master．


 ש＇x אוּ
（17）＂מּ prose．Wel．th．formerly（see above，1．38）proposed to read the terbs as impera－ 50
 haps accidental，after 6 ；the two other instances are both late and dubious）．



 which would require us to read orizs；［cfo，however，Ges－K．lu＇12SC1126,$\$ 128$ ，w］．
 codd．of 11 （a correction，but a sound one）and some recensions of ©（Bomberg 1518,1525 ，Antwerp．，\＆．C．），GRÄ12 ，

 we should hardly emend accordingly：
Ill il ．As the continuation of the preceding，we should expect the usual adsersative after a negative， $\mathrm{Ex}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ ，or ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ ；simple $:$ is as unusual as the kut of（ 5 in place of $\dot{A} \lambda \lambda \dot{u}^{\text {．}}$ ．l＇erhaps in the source from which the words were taken they read $ル=y$ so they passed on to Gibeah．
 2 Chr．25，17；see the Masorah on the latter verse．

（18）（

 following ת＝： abbreviation of הin ת 1． $26 ;$ p．167，1．11）；the scribe would naturally think of Shiloh．I et nume endimus dd domumt $D_{e i}$ might suggest $h_{x} \pi^{2}=$ ，but this would not accord with the context．


（22）（2אנ，best described as suspended annexation，Drtvir，Sirm．，p．166；cf．ニוּ תivン תex，\＆c．

 Hommel，ibid．July＇97，p． 472.


（so some codd．and old edd．），grammatical correction；if．（jen． 19，8；Ez．16，50，Sc．；Jut．15，13：th ；wher cases of the same correction in 21，22； 35 Al $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{x}$ ， ar ．Instances of masc．sulf．，especially in the plural，referring to fem． nouns are numerous；and it would be rasid to lay them all at the door of the
 scarcely to be believed that a case like the present was possible in wdd Ileb． Copyists，under the influence of Mishnic lleb．，in which the suff．of both genders to was in，i－，would be less observant of the distinction．
［The promouns of the $3^{11}$ pers．plural in Semitic were originally $\sin ^{\prime \prime}+m a=$ he and sumtone，fem．$s i+m a=$ she and someome；the masc．suma（ the＇y）became， with vocalic assimilation of the final vowel，sumu，just as we have the suffix
 fulther of thec and someone；compare the sumerian didazuneme；what is，futher of the and them．Intervocatic $m$ is often changed into $n$（ef．the particle $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{s}}$－which is identical with the enclitic emphatic－ma；the plural endings in Syriac ©ic． instead of the original－m in Hebrew）．en So there must have been a time when
\＃－20．e8po－
 Kiltarente S 105，1，note 3.

Jud．

18 Closses to the same cffect are found in the margin of a number of MSS of $\mathrm{Al}_{\text {, }}$; the Jewish tratition was perfectly aware that the name wats really $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ee. As might be expected, however, $n$ atb is found in many codd. and old edd. of att; so (fAVLYin viou Muvaoon, S lawo but Ephr. Syr. I, p. 327 La00). Sce further Comme, pp. 400 If.; Ginsburc, Introductiont to the Hetrazu Bible, pp. 335 tif.

 for which D.ttine proposetl inen (cf Nch. 2.19); J. D. Mich., Schtrissi.k,


 $r, 2,8$ f.): \& suio. The verb it is not elsewhere construed with by; and the seguel of the story toes not imply that the woman was the offender. Another not improbable conjecture would be Fjxit this was corrupted to :xam for an cxample I of the confusion of the two verhs see $K / 4 u / l i n 63^{n}$, and then, as the woman wats no wedded wife, atan sulsstituted as more appropriate to the relation see Rabl). comm.). So Mnore, Comm, approsed by BU., Comm.



 corruption הim in r .2 , and of the rentection that the man was the injured party who needed to be reconciled.
 :NEni she conducted him into her father's house; for the reasons explained in the last note. All contlicts with i: 4 .
(4) All : Expaitnoe tìs xetpós autou kai eiantrurev autóv o raußpòs aùtoû ó rutip tîs vedividas mpós uútóv (sill alol sub ast. - should probably be a temnistus, 30
 connected with the erroneous :-xンnt in $1: 3$.
(8) $\cdots$ - Entatorial summation of the days in the composite text.

 in uncial writing ( $T$ for $\Gamma$, and iwith grammatical correction' (6) orpatevoov; ' $A$,

 -nyng, Scharblamberi. This has a genuine look: peataps the original text
 a singular.


 minor varations which do not affect the reconstruction, GCs.ALSH (GAL doublet 45

 EיThas any support in usage. Apart from (5, we might conj. Tis Jer. 6, f); so
 Thest Many colll. Thent.

(11) ( к+кАкмік.
in the mouth of his messengers（if．Saul， $1 S 11,7$ ）；hence $B U$ ．proposes to read merely $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ ，for when they assembled at the summons，only knew that a bloody crime had been committed，but not what，or how．I infer，therefore，that the passage belonged to the original text，and was probably dropped from ill by homaroteluton（ 7 in the words of the messengers and in the response of those who saw the bloody sight）．The text is restored accordingly：［So also Bu．，Comm．］

 1727，whicl leaves wey without an object，and gives us in are verb（Is． 10 8, so）．The cases of the ellipsis of $\begin{gathered}\text { bafter } \\ \text { are late or doubtful；if we retain }\end{gathered}$ 1sy，it would be better to insert $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ ，or read ezab for $\boldsymbol{e}$ ל（Hour．，Stunek，Кroch－ mat，Stade，Bu．，Comme；of．©）．It is not impossible that the text was early
 ext．The words stand in At in a somewhat unnatural connection；they are more appropriate in the mouth of the messengers than of the spectators．Following （f）A ald．they are consequently transposed from the end of the verse．［The original
 suggested by Is．8，to．－P．11．］
 cf．also ©LP．
 insertion of the conjunction is the simplest relief of the difficulty，but is on that very account suspicinus；Grärz conj．bae．The words may be a gloss not accommodated to the structure of the sentence．
（3）A better division of the verses would put the pies go after הפצמ．V． $3^{\text {a }}$ has nothing to do with $3^{\text {b }}$ ，and is altogether out of place；But thinks that it originally stood（in the older source）immediately before $v .14$ ；the negotiations with Ben－ jamin begin in v． 12.



 be adopted．


 The rendering $Z \epsilon \mu \mu \alpha_{\text {，}}$ a mere transliteration of $\mathbf{I l}$ ，is doubtless from $\theta_{\text {；}}$ L＇uu may be an attempt to understand it as Creck（SCHARFENBERG）．［ne？has no connec－
 originally zaniaco ；the $m$ instead of $n$ represents a partial assimilation of the
 meaning of this stem zamizea scems to be to be full；of．Assyr．zamimu，Dr：LtTzsch， Assyr．Handworterbuch，p． $260^{3}$ and the remarks ihid．p． $324^{\mathrm{b}}, \mathrm{s}$ ．v．kuzhu．－I＇．H．］

 other instances in whith the sing．occurs it is corrected by the Qere．
（9）ל－נコニー・ケy הלy，so \％IEGLER，STUDPR，following（5）dvaß
 for．The reference is perhaps to v．IS，if．I，t．The fact that ace will go uf is the readiest way of filling the lacuna leaves it possible that $\boldsymbol{h}_{5}$ is only an old conjecture；even then it is probably right．＂The other l＇ersions difierently：\＆

19 šumu, šmu and šunu, šmu or (with $h$ instead of $s^{\prime}$ ) humu, himu and humu, himu were used promiscuously.

In the course of time the original $m$ disibpeared entirely in Assyrian and Aramaic, just as in the plural ending of the noun; so we hatee in Assyr. surnh 'they,' fem. Šhu, Aram. an arbitrary adaptation took plate, the forms with the original $m$ being reserved for the masculine, and the byforms with the secondary $n$, for the feminine; so
 nantal differentiation was established it was no longer necessary to observe the vocalic differentiation as we find it in Assyrian and in . Iramaic: /um, fem. /bum, 10 or him, fem. him, were just as distinct as hum, fem. him, or hun, fem. hin, In Arabic the vowel of the masculine form prevaled: we find hume, fem. hunha instead of the original humtu, fem. hemu or humu, fem. hina; in llebrew, on the other hand, the masculine vowel " was entirely superseded by the feminine vowel $i$; therefore we have hem, ken.* The evowel of these forms represents the $i$ of $\mathbb{N}$ in the same way as the $u$-vowel in Arab. /umm, /ummu is connected
 of the original $u$-wowel (Gris.Kistzschas $\int 27, v$ ) is untenable. In Arabic we find a trace of this e-vowel in cases like to sity, -hum has been changed into-him, but the form -him, which could at one time be used in all cases, ceren when there was no frowel in the preceding syllable, has been preserved in this case under the intluence of the preceding $i$-vowel. There is a difference between the survival of a byform and a modification of the standard form. The $\cdot h i$ in d $l \ddot{S}$ corresponds to the $-h i$ in -aeal S.e. $(\sim 0)=$ hifilibilhi).

If we find in ()ld Hebrew texts as feminine suffix instead of in ( $\%$. Ges.K゙AU'ZSC126, $\int 135,0$ ) there may have been originally (not in all cases, but in somej a vocalic differentiation, size, the masculine sufix an may have been pronounced hom, while the feminine sumix $\operatorname{ar}$ was suunded as hern. If hom became hom, and hem, hém, there was practically no difference so that the 30 eonsonantal ditierentiation became necessary. ( $f$. also Crit. Notes on Fzra-Neh., p. 33, 1. 22. - 1'. II.]


 the Masoridh on Num, 17,23 and Deut. 4, 20.
 hatue nby in the text without note.


 lopand, explatining the disposition of the forete pieces.
 EEantootel

 cod. 121, S11 (the viriations are without significance); so also Jusephus read the story (Ahf. $v, 2,8$ ). This is not at free addition or doublet in ( 5 , but is manifestly: translated from lleb. We should expect that the Levite would put some word

## 

[^8]Un grounds mercly of transeriptional probability, we might be inclined to think that the clause had falien out by hommoteleuton (Clorict's): but the intrinsic probability is here strongly in favor of the sloorter reading. llotib. takes the other alternative the seven hundred are not the Gibeathites, whone number is not given bectuse they were not in the fiedd, but the eorps of slingers), and

 (they are found in all the lersions) derived from 3,15 : lhud's tribesmen of jo'se had the same peculiarity as he.
 only, but to all the Benjamites, whose skill in shooting was famous; see I Chr. 12,2.
 (nomen rnitatis).

15
 the Jewish interpretation, of which $\boldsymbol{?}$ is here a reprenentative (in domum $\rho_{e} \boldsymbol{i}_{\text {, }}$ hoc est, in Silo, shows that it was so written.
 ellipsis is not usual.
§ omits $1: 20^{\mathrm{a}}$, and incorporates the substance of $\because .20^{\mathrm{b}}$ in v .21 .

 substituted in sll for greater definiteness.
(22.23) GEDDES trinsposes the two verscs; by which a rational connection is made. So 25 also STtDER.




 and rex. In v. 24 also vious is asterisked in (5)r, and there it is lacking in (GAME; but if. w. 28.30.
 doublet, accommodated by the insertion of the conjunction; cf. $\because .22$ and above, 35 p. 67, 1. 24.


(27) EMBs. הּ

 $\therefore 28$ are a late gloss (Weti.lI., Grodrs transposes the passage. placing it after ‥ 26 , and loringing $5.27^{3}$ immediately before $-2 x^{6}$ ( $\because: 28$ ), by which a better connection is secured. Doubtess this is the place for which the gloss was intended.
 The abyodetie perfect show, that this clause is not part of the sentence in which it now stands; it comes, morenver, ton carly in the narrative. and secms 10 be
 have here at long passage which is not found in Al or the other liersions: after 50



 تite "ull asp lots erete it, in which way Clitkict' also would complate the senee,
 matkes the words the beginning of $1: 10$.
 is eelferident; with $\overrightarrow{\text { ech }}$ they had nothing on do. The confusion of the two
 read exat tois fiotopewouevors). We might perhatss retain the word in the text



A simple, but radical, remedy for the diticulty in 1 . 10 would be to transpose
 E. ל , secured on both sides. It appears that the eatraordinary disorder in this chapter hat been in part occ:asioned by accidental misplacement of patsitges; see bulow 15 on $\operatorname{wr} 35 \cdot 3^{16^{a}}$.


 (if. $\because .15$ ), perhaps better than Ill The verse would not be any less superflunus 20 and disturbings if this reading were alopued.

 14.3.]

 occasinned by a preceding $\because=\cdots$. That the archaic form of the construct, " $\because=$. is intended, is less probable.
 (haplographis).






 reading of At nor of ( 6 exactly tallics with the summary of the lienjamite lonses
 so Weltim. and others.






 isked formed no part of the oldeet of Ver-ion; in other $1 /$ SS of thi I Crion they are not found at all. Nor are thẹ reprenented in आix Éktis tuv oikoúvtuv




movement is narrated in due order．Examples of an infinitive construction con－ tinued，with change of subject，by tinite tense，lien．18，25；Ex．33，16； 2 S 13， 28. The consec，impf．in 4 is a consequence of misinterpretation，under the in－ fluence of $\mathrm{r}, \mathrm{t}$ ．［The alternative is to reject the whole verse as a repetitious interpolation，with Bu．，Commr．］
（11）מע．Many coald．
t2）The verse was perhaps originally preceled by $35.36^{2}$ ；see above $\rho$ ． $70,11.23 \mathrm{~A}$ ． This accounts for the plur．＂גEy，for which，in the present surroundings，we should expect ${ }^{\text {P }}$（BU．，Comm．）．
プロニ half－verse seems to be that the ambush，after firing the city；sallied from it and attacked the retreating Bejamites in the rear；of．Jos．8，22 ואלוא ．So I interprets，sed et hi qui urbem

 erroneously alleging $\mathcal{S}$ ，whose tanone，if not a corruption of $\mathbb{A}$ ，
 have arisen by ditography of the initial b of the following worl．The half．werse， with v． 43 ，is the work of a late writer，who probably had Jos． 8,22 in mind； that the meaning is not very clearly expressed does not militate against the 20 soundness of the restoration．
（43）（4）A perhaps overbold attempt to re－ construct the corrupt text．The verse describes the pursuit and slaughter of the
 ceased at a point opposite Gibeat on the east，while Geba lies in the line of 2 flight toward Kimmon，and the difficult passage of the ravine between Gela and Nichmath may well have checked the pursuit．For this tirminus ad queth we require at tominus a quo，and can find it only in the word which（5）N at． also take as a proper name，amò Noua（so Mlebciek，Houe，STUWiR）；if． ת 1 Chr．8，2，son of Benjamin，i．e．Benjamite clan or village（with which －mia Jos． 16,6 ，on the border of Epliatim，is scarcety to be combined）．For the verb has of ill，（5）have kutékottov，katékowav，Ekowav which subgests irse， or $\quad$（Zhither）．D＇ossibly the author maty have written ing in the sense grate no respite to then，kept at them（Aram．，Syr．）．＇The two other verls in sll，：הִoper ane？on，are doublets，both corrupt，and perhaps originally a gloss．［On this 35 verse see Bl＇，Comme．］
 explanation fails．
（45）（4）．The words are out of place here；they have been accidentally repeated from $\because .47^{3}$ ，where they belong，the error being occasioned to

「uluud，uncial corruption of 「ubuap（corld．and $\$(t)$ ，poves！Genses and Grärz，would emend：fies；but Gibton is in the wrong direction；Ill which may be an infinitive．

（48）（4）ans in Deut．2，3ł：3，6：Job 24，12；so many codd，and some odd edd．

 on Isaiah，p．110，I． 38 ；p．197，I．6．］
פמצ הana is singular；lit．，Comm，supects that something hais Irepped out．，


 marginal comment，derived in substance from w． 3 Sff．the author righty felt that some explanation was necessary．

 in 以5． 32.45 （cf．21，19）；but the words，which manifestly intrude，are probably
 emendation is necessary：the road by which the lienjamites were advancing from Gibeah woukd not be described as leading tu（Bibeah；＂：lias been suggested ©f． $\mathfrak{r} .43$ ）；others，jwas［so IB6．，Comms］．

 expression cannot be forced to mean，thel mate is stand where they ex ere，hat ij reformed their limes．＇lilo．，（imme，coni．āipes．］
－5：



 IIOUP．would adopt．
（ $35.36^{3}$ ）Torkr．i conjectures with much probatility that these verses，which are mani
 regard is a late addition，originally stood after $\sqrt{ } f 1$ ，and were accidentally mine

 connects very well with $\sqrt[i]{ }, j 6^{2}$ ．The analysis of the passage is not affected by this transposition．


（3S）＇ 1 （

 evedpow suth ast．；doubtless the signs are misplaced，and belong to uixupa， 35

 ニーn a correction which at least gave a real word．
 suff．is necessary if $ニ ー-$ be retained（ SHLOLRR ）；but if $=-\pi$ be dropped the sufi．to is quite right．
 dation I have proposed in the next clause be accepted，the article would not be objectionable．
 furn about in the haflic，and confront their purvucrs；continuing the account of the plan agreed upon betwen the main body and the division in ambush，r． 38 ； of．the execution of this stratagem in $\mathbf{v}$ ．fo $\mathbf{~} 1$ ．The verse－division should then
 with ©A a／．dvéotpequtv，\＆．C．，and has led in（5）N to the introduction of a narra－ 50
 cotnoav ev tin $\pi$ ugutaizet，k．t．E．This leaves the statement of the plan incom－ plete，and，on the other hand，anticipates $\because f f$ ，where the execution of the
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I（S．9．12）どご，the prevailing orthography；gl ש゙ゴ in v．S，ビコン in vv．9．12．
（11）The instructions in 1 Il（ 0 M．きe）seem to be defective in the most important particular，namely，the direction to preserve the virgins alive．Gr．p ruouv de
 obclus erroncously after vecividu），（



 can be preserved from utter destruction．secing that atl the women had been io killed（v． $10^{\text {b }}$ ，and that they cannot give wises to the surviving men．So（fipp


 הove，but the assertion is somewhat superfluous，and the following clause，sis 15 －na；seems to require a question or ath expression of purpose．Gkïlz［Bu，
 ．


（20）แצי，with Qerê and atl the Versions，the plural is necessary；ドethib iי9．
（21）－
binh．We should expect，according to usage，，binis，of．v． 23 （13U．）．



 enough virsins were found to give a wife to the 600 Benjamites（Silvore）．This
 àvip ruvaiku uv́toû evv rụ̂ modeuw；so（ $\sigma \mathrm{LL} \mathrm{p}$ ，but with the omission of the negative． The same text is represented in a slighty different translation by ow ex $\lambda$ oos
 ，

 atic did not tukic，\＆c．，supported only by（f）and d．waph is a correction，prompt－ ed by the retlection that it wats the speakers，and not the six hundred benjamites who made the attatek on Jabesh；this led subsequently to the change of 玉ns ： to ：isn．The whole clatuse seems to me to be secondary：see below．lik．emends
 ＂eighs hearity against it，and the rape of the Shitonite maidens wouk hardly be described as הanima．
MENn zoould be sruilty（scil．of breaking your oath）．The words connect immediately

 Gritz，conj．ib or whe the confusion of this particle with the negative is frecpuent
 tion of the apodusis after iל．The impf．mems is an objection to this construction of the clatuses，but perhaps not a conclusive one．

Date Due


## - Explanation of Eopors tom

DIRK IURPLE (e.g. 10,1) represents the composite document JE (about $640 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$.), that is, those parts of the Prophetionl Namative of the Hexateuch, in which the Judaic Documbent (J, B. C. 850 fit.) and the Ephraimitic Document (E, B. C. 750 ff .) are so intimately fused that they cannot be separated by 45 literary analysis, - Light PURPLE (e.g. 7,2) indicates additions of the redactor of JE (RJE) who interwove the two documents with one another. - Dark blue (e.g. 4.6) is used for Older Strata of $E(E$, about 750 B.C.), while Light elue (e.g. 2,6) is employed for Liter Additions to E ( $\mathrm{F}^{3}$, about 650 B. C.) l'arts derived from J are printed on a white background without any additional 5 coloring (e. g. 1,5-7). - Liglt grekin (e. g. 2,7) indicates Deuteronomistio E.xpansions (RD, about $570-540 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$.) which in many cases overlic RJE. - Yelioll (e.g. 1,4 ) is used for additions of post.Exilic authors or editors.

Overlising indicates the latest strata of the respective documents, especially Redutional Changes or Adititions, made in the process of uniting and harmonizing 5 different sources, or in adjusting the narrative to the point of siew of the editor or glossator, or under the influence of a parallel passage. Cf. the English Translation of Judges in The Polychrome Bible (1.ondon, New York, Stuttgart, 1898), p. tó.

## esse Eist of Contributore

Genesis: C. J. Ball (London).
Exodus: 1I. E. Ryle (Cambridge).
l.eviticus: S. R. Driver and H. A. Wimes a (Oxford).
Numbers: J.A. Patersos (Edinburgh).
5 Deuteronomy: G. A. Smith (Clasgow).
Joshua: W. H. Bewnett (London).
Judges: Geo. F. Moore (Andover).
Samuel: K. BUDDE (Strasshurg).
Kings: Berwilard Stade (Giessen) and F. Schwally (Strassburg).
10 Isaiah: T. K. Cheyse (Oxford).
Jeremiah: C. H. Cornill (Breslau).
Fzckiel: C. H. Tor (Cambridge, Mass.).
Hosea: Alhert Socin (Leipzig) and Karl Marti (Bern).
Joel: Francis Brown (New York).
15 Amos: Jolin Tailor (Winchcombe).
Obadiah: A. Harper (Melbourne).
Jonah: Friedrich Dflitzsch (Berlin).
Nicali: J. F. McCurdy (Toronto).

Nahum: Alfred Jeremias (Leipzig. Habakkuk: W. II. Ward (New York). 20 Zeplaniah: E. L. Curtis (New Haven). llaggai: G. A. Cuoke (Oxford).
Zechariah: II: R. Harpfre (Chicago). Malachi: Claude G. Mon refiore and I. Abrimhas (London,
Psalms: J. Weldathusin (Göttingen). $=5$ I'roverbs: Auglst Mülleir $Y$ and Emil kiutzsch (Halle.)
Job: C. Siegfrien (Jena).
Song of Songs: R. Martinfau ${ }^{2}$ (Lon. don) and J. P. Peters (New York).
Ruth: C. A. Briggs (New York).
Lamentations: Morris Jastrow, Jr. 30 (Philadelphia).
Ecclesiastes: Paul Haupt (13altimore).
Esther: T. K. Abbott (Dublin).
Danicl: A. Kamphaysen (Bonn).
Ezra-Nohemiah: H. Guthe (Leipzig).
Chronicles: R. Kittel (Leipzig).
+6-40-5t+0
a Died viij $30^{\prime} 9 \mathrm{~S}$. - S Died vi,24'99. - Y Died ix/12'92. © Died xiij14'98.

- Professor Abraltam Kuenen who had agreed to do the Look died xii/10'91
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[^8]:    - We must remember that Assyrian is but an older local variety of Aramaic; sec Johins flintums Circulurs, No. 114, p. 118b, 1. 23.
    

