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## .2



IIE present edition of the Sacred Books of the Old Testament in Helrew exhibits the reconstructed text on the basis of which our new Version in the Polychrome bible has been prepared by the learned contributors mentioned on the inside page of the back corer.

Departures from the Reccived Text are indicated by critical marks: - .. (i.e. $V=$ lersions) designate a reading adopted on the authority of the Ancient Versions $\left(x_{n}, x^{3}\right.$, , Sc. inclicate that the respective glosses relegated to the foot of the page are omitted in the V'crsions, esp. ( $\sqrt{6}$ (e.g. Neh. 9,24); - $\cdot$ (i.e. $c=$ conjechure) are used for 10 Conjectural Emendations; and $u(i, e .2=$ Mip $)$, for changes involving merely a departure from the Masoretic points, or a different division of the consonantal text. A pes 1 indicates transposition of the Masoretic pies sib; - a are used in cases where the $\operatorname{rp}$ has been adopted instead of the $\Xi \because \Omega=$, and $"$ for changes introduced by reason of Parallel Passages. A small note of cxclamation, ( (e.g. 1 Neh. 12,10 ) calls attention to readings deliberately preferred on the strength of some 11 cl . manuscripts or early printed editions of good authority: Doubtful W'ords or l'assages are enclosed in notes of interrogation ( 11 ). Occasionally two critical marks are combined, c. g. $\cdots, i$. e. Deviations from the Received Text suggested by the V'ersions as well as by l'arallel l'assages; or <z, i. c. I)cpar- 20 tures from the Masoretic points, supported by the Versions, Sc. - [] calls attention to transposed passages, the traditional position of the words in the Received Text being marked by [] white the transposed words are enclosed in []. In addition to these braclicts, [], braces, $\{3$, and parentluses, (), are used if there are two or threc transpositions on the same page. In cases where wo or threeconsecutive 25 words are transpoed the traditional sequence is indicated by $¥=3$ Sce. respec. tively prefixed to the individual words (Ezr. 7,22). Transposition of consonants is indicated by figures above the respective letters (Ezr. 8, 29). Passages corrupted beyond emendation are indicated by ...., white $\Rightarrow * *$ point to Lacure in the original. L'assages printed in smaller type (Ezr. $3,11: 9,11 ;$ Neh. 1,9;8,15) re- 30 present Quotations (cf. N゙um. 6,24;10,35;21,14; Jud. 14.14;15, 16; 1s.23,16).

The Ancient Versions are referred to in the 人botes under the following
 $i^{2}=$ V'ctus I.atina; 3 (i.e. Jerome) $=$ Vulgate; $A=$ Aquila; $\theta=$ Theodotion; $\Sigma=$ Symmachus. (GA means Codex Alexandrinus $(\Lambda), G^{L}=$ Lucianic recension ( $\Lambda$ ) : 35


The heavy-faced figures in the left margin of the Notes ( $1,2,3$, Sic.) refer In the ehapters, the numbers in () to the verses of the Hebrew text. The mark means omit(s) or amifted by; all. $=$ as an alfernative; $1^{\circ}, 2^{\circ}=$ first or second ocurtonie, respectively. $A V=$ Authorized $V$ 'ersion; $\mathrm{K} V=$ Revised $\backslash$ 'ersion.
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 ויעם


על ישיראל וכל העם הריעו תרועה גדולה בהלל ליהוה על הטם בית יהוה: 20
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 בית האלהים אלהי ישראל:

 ot טריות: ב
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 ואני החחוקת ביר יהוה אלהי סהשובהי עלי ואקבצה טישראל רהאשים לעלוח

 44


 16


 2 3





20 （

就 9 אר年
जתֵּ
 30 ם Nは，解的
 35 ．．．．．．．．．．．．．． 16




1919

 בני המולה הקריבו עלות לאלהי ישרואל פרים עגים עשׁר על כל ישרואל אילים

 האלהים:


 בעעי הארצות ויד השוים והסנים היהה במעל הוה ראשונה:
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 ובבשת פנים כהיום הזה: ועתה כםעם רגע ההתה תחִנה מצֵת יהוה אלהתימו

 ויט עלימו חםה לתבי םלבי פרם לתה לנו מחִיה לרומם אה בית אלהינו ולהעמיד



 למשן חתוקו ואבלהם את טוב האריץ והורשתם לבניבם ער עולם: ואחרי בל הבא עלינו
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 לא אבל ועים לה שתה בי מתאבל על מעל הנולה: ויעבירו קול ביהודה וירושלם לכל בני הגולה להקבבץ ירושלם: וכל אצישר
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 ונביק"ה שאלהינו על ואח ויעעתר לנו:
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 ומקדִּשים ללים והלוים מקדִּשים לבני אהרךן:
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## atro Eritical @lotes on Ezza-@lebemiah -stor

 Maras and 1 Esdr. 2, 1 ev oróцатı.
(2) אלה אלה is added, following I Esdr. 2,3. The context iff. v. 3) seems to require this addition.
 Hagg. 2,3; 1s. 43,22.
 This is corroborated by the fact that they change their place in (GL, here and 1 Esdr. 2,3.

 Commentar ibter dic Genesis, 1857, p. 251, n. I.
 Johns IHophins ('miecrsily Circulars, No. 114, July 1894, p. $107^{\text {b }}$. Sce also the 15 note on $\Psi 89$, 19; Dr. 1. M. Casanowicz's paper in the I'rec. of the Am. Or. Sec., April i895, and Cilsex.Kat'rescher, § 143 , e. - P. H.]






 Il $=1$



(8) The name of the prince here mentioned varies semarkably in the tradition (Ezr. $1,8.11=1$ Esdr. 2,11.14: Ezr. 5, 14.16=1 Esdr.6,17.19). Of the Greek 30
 the principal forms given by the Greek Versions, we get the impression of a continuous shortening or mutilation of this proper name: Eaoußajuoбápns,
 We have further Aßdooupos, Josephus, Antiq. xi, 1,3. (f. also the name of the 35
 bimple rctonstruit par Zorotuthel, reprinted from the . Iustom, 1888-89) and kiera
13.22 ת

ת 23 5 24
 26


 נבריוח:

 ৷ 15 صןְמגות ולבִּכורים זכרה לי אלהּ לםובה:


 5, \&, (f)V Pqouiou, (GL $\Delta \in \mu i o u$.
. Ifter this name "soñ should be supplied on authority of Neh.7,7; 1 Esdr. $5, S$, and $\mathbb{G L}$ in our passage.

For reve read nectu, following Neh. 7,7 and 1 Esclr. 5,8 .
At the close of the list of names, S.S Tûv mpoŋrounéveuv aủtûv.

3ff.) [For the names in the following list as well as in lezra $8 ; 10 ;$ Neh. $3 ; 7 ; 10$ if. En. Mtwlk, op, cif., pp. 1 f17., where the non-priestly families are given in alpha- 10 lical order. - 1'. 11.]
(5) The numbers are manifestly corrupt, as the sequence - hundreds, units, tens is contrary to the order used elsewhere. We should, therefore, emend at least
 traditionally given in sll have been left unaltered, although they differ both from 15 those given in Nelt. 7 and also from those in I Eisdr. 5, though mot so greatly from the latter. Only in the total number of the returning exiles is there agreement; if. v. G4. If we attempt to add up the data, we find that their total, taken individually, falls consillerably short of the traditional total. It makes no difference in this respect whether we reckon according to Jirr. 2, or Neh. 7, or 20 1 Fisclr. 5. This would seem to indicate: (1) that in the course of written transmission of the list a number of the individual data have been lost; (b) that the numbers of the individual data which still remain in the list are not textually certain. These conclusions are abundantly confirmed by a comparison of all authorities for the text. A few names can be conjecturally restored, as will 25 appear in the remarks subjoined. But no attempt has been made to correct the traditional numbers. [ED. Mrintr, of. cit., p. 136 thinks that the numbers were originally expressed in (Pheenician) figures; hence the corruption and confusion. - 1. H.]

(10) For $\because$ Neh. 7,15 has $\because: 2$; see on Neh. $7,15$.
(16) The names of two clans seem to have been omitted after this verse; for in : Esdr. 5, 15 f. we have the following additional data: vloi Acapou tetpakdótot
骨 contrast Neh. 3, 19. The proper name of the second clause cannot be transcribed into Hebrew with certainty. According to the variant 'Avvias in (5A, $\because: 3 \pi$ may be conjectured, of. Nich. 10,24; we should then have:

The clan whicl follows in 1 Eisdr. 5,16 , woi Apon, may correspond either to the

 2.32, the wioi Apou would seem to correspond to the exin "e.
 5,16 rads Apoeipoupei0, in (5.A Apoippoupet0; according to FRuTzSCHE, Apalpoupuo. This extraordinary form, it would secm, should be separated into the two +5
 names stood originally in juxtaporition in the list. 1. perbaps the name wi?n, Neh. 10, 19, concealed in $\pi 7$ ? The correctness of the numbers is cloubtful.
(29) V1. 2932 and 35 are inserted after v. 19: for the list was originally so arranged, as is still recognizable today, that, first, groups of families, or clans, were enu 50 merated; then, groups of dwellers in various districts. The clans were introduced by ${ }^{-9} 2$, the districts by preserved in Ň.h. 7 and 1 Eisclr. 5 than here; of. Ňch. 7,26fi; 1 Esdir. 5,17fi.
 that Sheshbazzar and shenazar were one and the same person；riohty，perhaps， according to the Clironicler＇s conception．

The following observations may serve to explain the peculiar name； 1 owe them to l＇rofessor II．ZInMt：8S，of Deipaig．
＂The second and third elements of the name＂ヨゴロ゙ alnost ertainly corre－ spond to a liabylonian alal＂fur＝protect the son（uhal，liabyl，pronunciation for afis／，as in Babylonian Merodachialadan as against A－uyrian Tiglathfilesar Sc．）；if．especially the Greek form Eaoaßahaoodipns，in which the／is still pre－


 （N゙ebo ןrotect the son）which became Naßorohaoouf．

As to the divine name，which must certainly be assumed as the first element， we might hesitate between Sirmers and Sing．＂The transliteration wem in \｜ebrew

 J．D．Prince，Ment Mine Tikel L＇pharsin，Baltimore，1893，p．118．－1＇．W． The $m$ of liamaš，a＇in the later pronunciation if．Kijlimu $\approx$ ibey，ienne $=$ aritl



On the other hand，the Greck forms इavaßuouup，इavauaoo seent to point to the name of the Moon－god Sin as constituting the first element of the name．liut against this assumption militates the fact that in the names
 instances，and not $\approx$ ．Consequently we should expect in the llebrew rendering of the name of this Assyro－liabylonian god a 2 for the ．Issyrian s．7swew secms to be execptional in this respect．However，it is still deloatable whether ame really con－


It should be added further that the lireck forms，such as Eavauadoap，Euuce－
 may have crept in thence，while it would be hard to explain whence the

［According to En．Mrver，Die Eintstehunt dis Juknthums，IIalle，1896，p．i7． n．I，VAN IlOON TCK：R＇s explanation，which has aho been adopted by WHLh．－ 35
 not impossible，but the Greck form clearly points to sin simbal with；O Noon－ grod，protect the son；＂i\％．／．c．72．77，and the name $73 \times 3{ }^{2}$ I Chr． 3,18 ，which is a shortened form of $-3 x_{i}:=$ ．It mighe be well to add that the relerences to En．M1：If：＇s new book were insertel after the Noten were in type．－P．II．
10）In the place where the context requires a number，tll has the unintelligible word extere，which is certainly due to an error．I liadr．2， 10 i2，read，in place of it doxiliol $==$ gis．If is hard 80 say whether this number may really have stood in the text，as the numbers in vr．9－11 of at in general vary from those in 1 Esdr．2，9ff．（12 if．＇．Instead of 30 in v．9， 1 Esdr．（fv has 1000 ；the total is in 4145 $44) 9$ ，in I Fisdr．（5W 5469 ，while in（f）$v$ it is missing altogetier．




2 （1）The spelling of the last syllable in the name רצมンジニ is remarkable for the fact
 mates to the lireek form of the name Nußouxodovooop．S？，too，in Jer． $47,28$.
 with this．





（61）For ビ， （f）has，before the names，the words ol ÉMmotoúpevol lepwounns kal oúx eúpé日 $\eta$－
 They who hud heken possessions of the priesthood，whe were not fount（in the list．

1 Esdr． 5,38 seems still to have read the woman＇s name：Aưriav $\mathfrak{G V}$ ，Aưreiav （5）

For ceet，at the end，read 1 ：ư，following 1 Esdr．


 of some importance．According to sll the persons referred to have no right to partake of the most holy offerings，$i, c$ ，they do not receise the full rights of 20 priesthood（l．ev．6，10f．21f．；7，6f．；22，1 16）．According to 1lisdr．5，40，on the wher hand，they are given no right at all to the sacred dues which fell to the priests．The latter agrees perfectly with Fizr．2，62；but the former secms to be a mitigation of the decision given in 1.62 ．Moreover，it is doubtful whether， at the time of composition of these lists，the distinction between holy and most 25 holy things had been established；fo Welutalesen，Composition des Hetufeuchs，


In the last clause it is better to read，with N゙ch． $7,6 \mathrm{f}, \mathrm{N} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { O }}$ instead of i ．
（64．65）1 Fsdr．5， 41 f．has apparently presersed the text in a form that comes nearest to







 change is also required by the parallel expressions．For ov． 66 f ．in general：see note on Neh． 7,66 f．
 manifestly in accord with the sensc．Ferr．2，68f．is worked over by the Chronicler． lic has omitted Neh． 7,70 ，expanded $\sqrt[6]{ } .71$ by the addition of＇us exter up to emize，and resumed the text of Xeh． 7,71 with $1: \%$ ．Neh． $7,72^{2}$ has here elropped out，apparently by owersight，the eye of the transcriber glancing from the end of $v .71$ to the end of $72^{a}$（ビミちか）．

The surprisingly larne number of cirachmas， 61,000 ，is not known to 1 liselr． 5, ft． but only 1000 （minut $=$ 万？$\%$ ．＂Wis statement of all is therefore subject to mani－ fold suspicion．See also on Xeh．7．71．As to drachmas and darics，see Eito．

 Es？at the beginning beside twene at the end．Hence the test of IEsdr．


 are now confused logether．The transposition effected in the text is intended to make it approximate again to the original order．

The ：$: 3$＇ $2=$ would seem to be a clin；if． $2: 3$ and $\because=$ Neh． 10,20 ，and the ex pression faro clans of this name．For this reason Xeh．7，33 is supplied after Ear．2， 29.
（30）（f．N゙ch． 10,21 世゙gresp（ 1 Fisdr．5，21 Neipeis）．
（35）The $-\mathbf{x}:=92$ according to 1 （Chr． 9,7 ，deh． 11,9 ），Nich． 3,3 ，are at clan；of Mishnal，Titan，4，5，where ix：e is mentioned as a clan of Benjamin．Contraxt ED．． 11111 R ，op．cil．，Pp．150；154；156，n．1；185．I＇．I1
（20）With v． 20 hegins the list of districes，introduced by＂Ex ol ek in I Fisdr．5，17 fi．； see on $1: 29$ ．Hence read in v＇20．21．24．25．26．33．34＇max for＇ 92 ，following in part Nelh． 7 and I lisdr． 5 ，in part conjecture．
 （5）A Batanp， 1 Chr，6，59（5）Bulamp，the often－mentioned licther of the revolt of 15 Harkocheba under Hadrian．sll is unintelligible；浔こ Neh，7，20 is not appropriate among the localities following；nor anywhere befure $\sqrt[V]{ } .25$


26 ．Ifter $-\cdots$ and rase there follow in 1 Eselr．5． 20 ol Xaßuiont kai Ausidut 20

 Atdoct the locality－ Cur Tipographic und lievehichte＇l＇ahastina＇s，1893，p．vi，＇Aunibou corresponds，
 he intends is called a？M！：in the lahmud．
（34）－
 Cf．Nelı，3，17f．：11， 30.

 in 1 Clir．24，12．Il - ：appears to be correct，but the continuation in 1 Esdr． 5,24 can hardly be a pure invention．



（42）The first $\because=$ should be struck out，following $\mathcal{C l h} 7,45$ and 1 Kisdr 5,28 ．
${ }^{\prime} 45$ ） 1 Fscdr $5, j$ fof has a number of names more than Ezer． 2 and Neh． 7 ．between w． 45 and 52 ．Some appear to be doublets；others，howetcr，genuine elements of the text．Unfortunately it is not possible to transcribe them with certainty to into Hebrew．In the following teat taken from（r）the names presumably genuine are printed in capitals：$u$ ．Akous，ú．OYTA s－：$\because$ ？if．Ezr．8，tif 1 （hr．9，4），u．


 Napelvel，ú．Aкоup，u．Axeipa，u．A soup，u．ФAPAKEM．
（46）The Qere ${ }^{2}$ ？


（57）I Esdr．5，34 furnishes eight additional names：$\dot{\text { u }}$ ．Eapweti，u．Meloulus，u．「us， 50 U．ADDous，и．इoußas，v．Ap€ppa，ن．Bapwdє15，u．इapur．＂they indicate a gap in fll，but cannot be referred back with ecrtainty to Hebrew names known to us．The last name in 1 Esdr． 5,34 U．$A \lambda \lambda \omega v=A M \Omega N=A M \Omega N$ corresponds to



 if．S． 10.
 HOONACKER（Zorolabel at li sicond limpli， 1892, p．104）proposes．Cf． K．lüzsch，Grammalik dis Biblisch－Aramitischen（I．eipzig，1884）§88．（G con－

 therefore，regard $\pi=0$ as a gloss，and explain $-!17 \%$ as in Jud 6， 14 ；Gen．24，8； Jos．2，14．20．Cf．Gisfnius KautzSCH ${ }^{26}, \$ 126,9$ ．

 1 Esdr．5，61 agree with $\operatorname{fl}$ But as the context is in favor of the reading of（ $5 \mathbb{H}, 1$ E：T should be struck out．

The Qerê it is sufficiently attested by the Versions．Cf．E．NESTLE，J／argi－ malien umd Ihatirialien，1893，p． 26.

משתח is better written as one word，as in 2 Kings 19．37： 111 here，according to the common authoritics，divides it into two words．Cf．BÄr＇s edition，pp．Iotf．


（3）According to 1 Esdr． 5,67 ，nhe should be inserted before ：$: 3$ הלs．
All 7 万an is attested ncither by © nor by i F．sdr．5，68，and should，therefore，it would seem，be struck out．
 plural is meant，as appears from ごローム \＆ic．Read，therefore，＇

The Qere $\begin{gathered}\text { Chas should be preferred as in accordance with IIebrew usage } 30\end{gathered}$ elsewhere．
168 F．h．MbwR（if．cil．，1pp． 16 ff ．）calls attention to the fact that three actions are referred to，but only two letters as well as two addressees and two groups of addressers．He conjectures therefore that the original text of the document on Which the statement of the Clironicler was based ran as follows．＂0／n the reign of 35 ．Veraes，at the begimming of his retisn，there arote 7 lism，Wheradat，Tiabicl，and the rist of their compamions $h^{6}$ an accusation alsainst the inlurlitants of fudath and firusalion．${ }^{7}$ And in the days of Artatiracs，thire arote＂Richiom Sic．a lefter agranst firusalim， 7 to Artaterices，the kimg，as folloa＇s Sic．＂
［This wouk be in Hebiew：
לy






 n．2．The correct vacalization in Hebrew would be edaninx or perhaps wiveris． 50

As to ת．e．je，see the last remarti on 1．7．p．32，I．14．I＇．II．
7）The name of king Arthasastha（Artaxerxes）is spelled from lizr． 7 on and in Nech．with $e_{0}$ in lizr． 4 and 6 ，on the other hand，variably：sometimes with 6 ，
lopand Ev taş küughe aủtuv．Cf．1lisdr．9，37．Accordingly we shouht insert




Wherever $1.1^{6}$ appears in 1 lisdr．$(5,46 ; 9.38$ ，it has a more elefinite state ment of locality，like that in Neh．8，1．This must accordingly be regrareled as orisinal，and in place of afl chmo bwo should read：
 but in this there would seem to lie a well meant explanatory clatse，on the open mathe flace in from of the former gite on the cirst．The Chronicler，how ever，has shortened the docmment N eh． 8 ， 1 ，because he regarded the gate its not yet restored．

 N゙ch．8，t．
（3）V＇． 3 shoukl be restored on the basis of 1 Vistr． 5.49 ； 0 ．The text acendinge tw




 ning of the last clatuse：mity－xik Engi ritity．The second roty of th shoukt 25 be struck out．Cf．，however，Kiosilkninis，（risth．d．liokes／sr．，18y），Ilp．



（4）In the the seond half of $\mathrm{x} . \mathrm{f}$ is evidently overburdened．Following i listr． 5,30 jo


 Cf．$=$ Clır．2，3；8，13．
（S）In I Esdr． 5,55 we have an exact statement as to the day of the founding of the 35


 divergences from 211 in 10 sdr． 5.50 © 99 are connected with this．Still，it seems unadvisable to alter Ill to correspond．
（9）This serse in that manifestly fallen into disorter．The names which stand at the end of the verse should be connected，accordiner to 1 lisdr．5，56，with those at the beginning．Before the first $r: \%$ a 1 should be inserted，following 1 Fistr．


 as written should be observed．Iccording to lize． 2.40 we should expect here



（10） 1 İsdr． 5,56 begins kai texoidunotev＝：ここ＂，becaune the laying of the promer stone has already been mentioned in 1.55 ．Jut sll $\because$ seems to be suificiontly


 text in this sentence requires an imperfect, not a perfect.

The last word of the verse, wern, is doubtful; of. Nörıneke, Gofl. gcl. Anz., 188.4, p. 1019: Strack, Abriss des hibl. Arumaisch (189G), p. 2*. Sce also Kıutzscif, Grammatik, pp. 37.52.74.
(13) For all א

The word eres is traditionally uncertain. J3är, following good authoritics, requires onge, and regards it, as did the medicral Jewish commentators, as a 10 substantive with the meaning income. Ohers hold to the lectio auturatu anex, and regard the word as an adverb, to be rendered either, according to l'ersian, finally (IEWA.D, Jahirbucher der hibl. Wissensch., v, p. 156), or, according to Assyrian (Friedr. Detitzsch, Prolegomena cincs newen hebr.aram. W'orlerluchs, p. 152), in future. Andrlas in Marti's Grumm., p. $54^{*} \mathrm{cmends}$ to $\mathbf{z e}$ er $=15$ Middle and Modern l'ersian afsos 'detriment, injury.' The general sense of the clause is certain through comparison with vi. 15 and 22 .
 of Ezra, especially ce. 5.6 exhibit similar Helraisms in the case of the prono-
 [contrast Johus Hopkins L'nizersity Circulurs, No. 114, July 1894, p. $118^{\text {b }}$; sec also 1)river's Introductions, p. 472 (Nabat. En-:, 1'almyT. pir); German cdition, p. 5 fo. - I'. H.]


 5,17 it would seem to be better to read FEn: of. Marti, l. c., p. $41^{\circ}$. [Sce, however, Jrimer's note on Lev. 4, 12.24: 14,4 and Gis.-Kautzschire $5144, \mathrm{~d}$. l. H.]

Read the plural wase instead of the sing. following ©L and I Fsdr. 2, 18f. 30
 $\kappa_{\pi} \lambda$. These words give the subject of $\mathfrak{r y y}$, which in 4 tl is missing. It would seem, therefore, that מירחי Mas dropped out in 11 .
(1G) Insert, at the beginning of the verse, 1Y:, following 1 Esdr. 2,20 and some MSS of 15 .

For $\operatorname{ll}$ ון read, as in rv. 12 f.,

(22) The pronunciation of the imperative is here in the various editions given either as or or while in 6,6 in the exclusively attested form. In our


The pronunciation of the construct state of the infinitive, $\pi$, Marti, l. c., p. 46, thinks, we should read mprath.
(23) After en in $v .23$ the title $\begin{gathered}\text { enten has probably dropped out, as it elsewhere }\end{gathered}$ (v. 8f.17) invariably accompanies the name, and here also occurs after eref Only (f) has $B \in \in T \in \epsilon \mu$.

Bü̆R writes, following some codires, y:ise; several old editions, however, have ע: form, with long $\hat{i}_{1}$ would seem to be more correct; ©f. K゙auiz.
 the original text of the heginning of c . 5 , which continues 3,5 , seems to be preserved. Ezr. 4,24, =1 Fisdr. 2,25, is drawn from Ezr. 5, 1, not tive zersia. Hence

sometimes $=$ in the scond place. Ifire prefers the pelling with te (1. e., [1 102). In the or Ifrtikist we have the Ilctorew rendering of the babslonian form
 peculiar Ifebrew transposition of the consonantal group is (o) st. Gireck Apre-

 1:11. Mt.YFR, ap, cit, p. 15 below.


 popodóros rpapìv Eupıotl kal epunveuntéviv). It appears to be either an explanatory gloss on the preceding word, or added, as in 1).ın. 2,4 , 10 indicate the beginning of the Aramaic tevt. Fr. Movis l.c., pp. 18 fif. retains the wort, and
 This emendation, however, is not supperted by the Version-and is unneces-ary: 15 The Reccised Tevt is batel on the ithea that the Aramotr writing was not used in Canaan at that time, and that . Iramaic wia writen with (ancient Hebrew characters in about the same wat as the Jews in Arabiat nowatays write . Irabue with Itebrew characters.
(9-11) In w.9-11 the text is evitently faulty. . Tfer xase in 6.8 we expect the be- 20 ginning of the letter ; instead of this follows the narrative irx dic. . Nfer this xasz the words from -j7 $10 \cdots$ in $v .11$ are superfitious as a secund introduction of the wording of the letter. They are a gloss which has crept into the text from the margin, and which would stund better between w.S and y. $\mathfrak{j - x}$ in 8.9 of Ekpive, should be struck out. 11.9 It then contain the beginning of the letter 25

 instead of the singular -i.だ, 2King's 17,24. Howeler, 1 Eisclr, 2, 12 f. sungests a variant form of the text, particularly in the address $1: 11^{\text {b }}$. It remains a striking fact that the names of the writers of the lefter are given in $t x . g$. before the name of the addressee, s. If. I' $\mathrm{V} \cdot \mathrm{?}$ and to are, therefore, in all probability a

 v. It represent the beginning of at note of the registrar who dilet the document in the arehise of Jertastem, and that they wore orisinally conn cted with the
 the lefterew riters must have first been mentioned in the letter itself (we. 11 fif.), before they could be recorded in the note of the registrar, unlens we are reaty en believe that the registrat whotiled the letter knew more about it that is contained in both the letters and the answer given in $1.15^{\prime}$. Attempts to explain the names fo




 This emendation is certanly plasible: neverthelest we hase retancel in the sext the Wasoretic pronunciation of the names. The explanations suggeeted are to some extent still uncertain, and it is reasonable to suppone that the author beliesed that he was enumerating nation or tribes.
 $11,1,148 \mathrm{f}$. ( ( $1 / 14$ 14)
(12) According to the best authorities on the text we should read xomexzi for

but it is abso used with the meaning kinotilcelse, infurmation, news, report (Dt:LITZSCI, HWLS $297^{6}$, 4); and as orders on the part of the king and high dignitaries were, as a rule, sent in writing, femu may also mean order, command, decrec, messuge. A report sent to the king concerning the Arabs (femu ša Arabt) gives the king, as it were, a tusti of the drabs, and an orider from the king sent to a general, gives the general a tuste of the king vemu sa surri). So, it seems to me, the development of meanings is quite natural (against Ed, Mbeter, op, cit. p. 26, n. 1). The Babylonian worl \{cmut ( $=$ \{ cimu; cf. belu 'lord' $=$ bu'hu) has also

 connection with 广- - P. I1.]
(6.7) I Esdr. 6,7 has here a text which varies in a similar manner with that in Ezr. 4,9-11. While in tll the first two clauses of v. 7 appear evidently supertluous, 1 Esclr. 6,7 commends itself by the omission of these clauses. That the names in 1.6 are to be connected with the form of greeting in 1.7 at the beginning of 15 the letter, is then obvious. ED. Mayis, on the other hand, thinks that $\mathrm{v} . \mathrm{G}$ represents the note of the registrar who filed the document in the archives of Jerusallem; see op. cif., p. 26, and if. supria cul 4.9-11. I Esdr. 6.7 giL runs: duti-



 text would seem to justify the translator. Whether his translation be right, is a different question. $G$, on the contrary, regards the word as a proper name.

The close of 0.7 is certainly understood rightly by $\{l l$, whereas $x:=$ is connected by I Esdr. 6,8 with what follows (meivid yvuote éotw).
(8) The principal matter here, according to the context, is the announcement that the princes of the Jews have begun building the Temple. This is wanting in v. 8 IIt, but is plainly presupposed by the other data. The variant text I Esdr. 6, 8-10 contains the statement, but coupled with certain expansions which must be



 the course of the transmission of the Greek text; the close of v . 10 kai ev $\pi$ diun
 another doublet. Thus we reach the form of the text preferred above.

The lack of subject for $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ en, at the end of the verse, is a noticeable defici ency; 1 lísir. 5 , or has кai єủodoủuevov tó éprov év tuîs xepuiv aùtûv. Cf., howcwer, Kautzech, Gramm., p. 16t; M.aki, l. c., p. 19.

 or Ezr. 5, 11. Accordingly 7 neth has been supplied, and the clause in sll relegat ed to the foot of the page.


(10) All ane moun and the form of the suftix. In Aramaic it should be cither inew: or
 ever, is universally attested, [and we must remember that in Assyrian, - which is but an older local varicty of Aramaic of. Johins /lophins l'mizersity ('inculars, No. 114, July 189t, P. 118 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ) - the form ristio occurs alongside of risu; sce Hat'T,
-.x:3 should be struck out, following i lisdr. 6,1.
 /Vicronymi, 1874, p. 162.



 1. 32 .

The vacillation of 111 between noteworthy when we compare with it the freck texts. In E.zr. 5,3.6, as in 6,6, 10 t5 has of oúvioutol aútūv, but in Ear. 6, 13 oúviounol autoû. In 1 Esdr. 6.7 wc
 this is probably the form intended, which was read by 1 Eisdr. as shetus emftur ticus, but in 4 was mostlyaltered to however, the conditions are quite difierent. loor lizer. $4,9.17 .23$ the plural 15 sumix is well attested; of. 1 1isdr. 2, 12 15 ). 18, 21).21 ( 25 , llence in Ezr. 5,3:

 1. So. It would seem, however, to be a transcriptional error for x:y? v. 17.
 muvta; in (5) by tive xopyriav tauthv. The first word would secm to have the general sense of housc; the second expression is very obscure. Both $\ddagger$ and 3
 Kautzecit, l. 6,$562 ;$ Marti, l. 6, , p. $55^{*}$. The meaning is uncertain. 1 Esdr.




 old Aramaic word for pletie of worshif, stmithory. The expression used by the 30 beathen grovernor with reference to the Temple was, of course, oljectionable to the Jews, if only owing to the connection of the word with rise ; and it is possible that for this reason wisw was substituted for wask perhaps with reference to 5.16, where it is satid of Sheshbazzar that he laid the אew of the "lemple. Nölo
 the Assyr, plural ending cimi (cf. my remarks in The Assyr. F-acouch, p. 5 and in
 plural form ašithe alongside of ašre (asirift, es'cti) is unknown in Assyrinn, $\therefore$ and
 discussed in a special paper which will appear in the foumal of the American to Oriontal Socicty - I'. II.]
( $\$$ ) The first clause in the form giten it by 4 is totally unintelligible. (H) render eirooav or firov, thus removing, it is true, the greatest objection. It should be obsersed, howewer, that I Esdr. 6,4 has no knowledge at all of this clause, but continues with r. $f^{\text {b }}$ : kal tives elaiv ol alkodóuol ol taüta ( $2 \pi$ ) tedoüvtes. V'. $f^{3}$ ty is probably a gloss which was originally intended for v.9, and las here got into the wrong place. F.r. MFY:R of. cif, p. 26) thinks that this clause was taken by the author errhatim from the letter of Darius.
5) (The stcm of sמ⿰氵 means, like Latin suffer, to taste, to have sense, to know. Assyr. (cimu means, therefore, not only sense (šani (cmi insanity; of. 1 Sam. 21, 1f) 50
initial tinstead of the $\varepsilon$ in Aramaic is simply due to a partial assimilation of the sibilant to the following $=$ as in Ethiopic zubuif，＇to strike＇for sutuitu $=$ Assyr．
 is ath old causative of the two－consonant root ba jost as 放e is a Siafel of to． W＇e must，therefore，translate：The house of liod in fervsalem shatl be rehuitt whice they offer sacrifices，und bring His offerings made by fire，the softix refer－ ring to xitw．This rendering is also favored by I Esdr．6，23．It is true that the suffix in ine occasions some difficulty，and it would，therefore，perhaps be better to read the slatus cmplations withoue the suffix（in 4，12，on the other hand we have in tll
 Marti，§ 129 ）．The objection that an Aramaic equivalent of Hebr．הư woes not occur elsewhere is not valid．The passage is discussed in my paper on $\kappa$ אnen referred to in the note on 5，3．Cf．also ED．Mever，op．cil．，p．46，n． 2.
（4）For 7 דנ，see Marth，l．c．，p．72＊，Ed．Meyer，op，cit，p．46，n．3：1）elitzech， 15 HW13，p．210＂；Hactr，licier．z．Assyr．，i，pp．15，n．13：175 below．P．H．］
 read here a number，as against N an the preceding clause．GL，on the con－ trary，has（kal dónov ミóduv kaıvūv）Ëva，1 Esdr．6，24（25）kai bónou Eußivou
 Hut it would be unadrisable to infer from this an original in $\pi$ ，since new timber for the building would be a matter of course．
（5）Ill indoes not fit the construction of the sentence．＂Though expressed by $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{L}$ （ Do日jitw），it $^{2}$ is not found in 1 Esdr． 6,25 ．It seems to be a ditogram of the succeeding word．

（6）The transition in the address is very striking．llarsh as it is，it would scem necessary to let it stand．It is fully attested by（5）and by i Esdr． 26 （ 27 ）ffi，in so far as barius－see $\cdot 33(34)$－in v． 27 （28）speaks there also in the first per－ son．l＇rubably the form of the statement is to be explained by the fact that the writer reproduces his authority in abbereviation，retaining the mode of address， but omitting the transitions．

Read＇ 2 7nel＇，following 5，3．6 as well as（61．and I Esdr．6， 26 （27）．
（7）The construction：＇ש゙，＂ planations are unsatisfactory（ef．c．g．Kaurzachl，§ 68，p．127）．The double $\pi \times 35$ K wh strange，and we miss the name before＂For these reasons
 tǹs＇loùaias，kui toùs $\pi$ feaßutépous tûv ’loudaiuv tòv oìkov toù Kupiou Ékeivov oikuฎoucir commends itself to our attention．Is to $\pi$ ais $=72 \%$ ，of．I Esdr．6，12 （13）．Thus the restoration above attempted is explained．Vet，the express to mention of Zerubbabel along with the cherers of the Jones in this passage is sur－ prising．For it is a peculiarity of this account of the building of the Temple to regard the elders of the Jews as the builders $15,5.8 .9,6,8.14$ ．Thus is explain－ ed also the statement in 5，4．10，that the D＇ersian governor has to inquire for the names of the elders；in other words，does not know them．This ignorance would be surprising indeed if the l＇ersian sub－governor in Jerusatem，who must， of course，have been known to the governor of Syria，had been the leading builder of the Temple．Hence the words ；xירוּ regarded as an addition by the Chomicler，who sought thereby to harmonize the contents of the nartative with his own connecting clauses 5,1 and 2．［E．1），M1：S1：k， 50 1．i．，p．53，note 1，raises the question whether we shoukl not read here，as in



The Assyr. Evocuch, Baltimore, 1887, p. 22; 1):Livzscu, Assyr. Gr. § $32, \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{r}$. Cf. also the Nestorian Anei. - P. 11.]
 Alsew. In : Exdr. 6, 12 we scem to have a double translation of Ezr. 5, 10 .
(11) 1 Ésỉr. 6, 13 toù Kupiou toû ktioavtos tóv oùpavỏv kaì tìv rịv. The connection of x ? if. Jer. 10,11. Elsewhere we have only werner


For All



 1 Esdr. 5, 19.
16) (E.O. Mlevtr, l. c., p. ft, n. 2 thinks that the exact meaning of the phrase xes is not quite cetain; the verb $2 \pi$ the grote, he say's, does not suit the rendering
 if. קיר nadinu means even to matic, to creatci, just as Assyr. šztî̂nur means both to fiut, 20 to placie and to matie. - I. H.]
 according to 5,13.14. Wimbilasen (Gött. Nitherichen, 1895, p. 176) is of the opinion that the words jana wa k have dropped out before nen after 6,1;
 1896, pp. 552f.].
(GV and ©L agree with Al Kupiou toû év 'lep. as also 11 in v. 16. Th, therefore, would seem to be a scribal error for $\%$

6 (1) The statement of place ${ }^{2}$ does not agree well with the werse following, and would seem to be a later addition. See on 5,17 .
 instead of haza, at the end of the verse, rather W. II. Kosters, l.c.

(3) Following © and I Esdr. 6,23 we must insert here, just as in 5,17 , 9 before

 we should strike it out; it may be dittography of kyen.
 amd lit them be setting up its fonmattions (Poed part.) or be set up $=10$ be set up (l'oal part.); if. Kautzsch, l. c., $\$ 36$ and $\$ 76,3$ ). Wut he means carror, not set

 tion of the text. Sfer $\begin{array}{rl} \\ 3 & 3 \text { we expect a statement concerning the length of the }\end{array}$ new Temple. In the Solomonic Temple the length amounted to (oo cubits ( 1 K . 6,$2 ; 2$ Chr. 3,3). This number is now given for the height and width; so we must infer that the text of $\mathfrak{v} \cdot 3^{\mathrm{b}}$ in general is corrupt. I am inclinet to think that $\times$ = Ileb. הewn affrimg mudi by firce. In that case it would, of course, 50

 bring, to bring natr; just as Sosyr, zabillu (DeLitzscul, HWB 2jo) in which the
cal nuF2 probably means nore．It has been conjectured that the words consti－ tute a formula of abbreviation，by which the complete introduction of the ori－ ginal Ietter has been replaced．Cf．4，10．1J．17．

According to GiNSBLRGi xay？is the best－authenticated pronunciation． ANbREAS（in JART1）would prefer waz？，which is also attested by some ． 1 SS ．
 we insert the pronoun we must translate：as a mission（or delegation）is sent forth by the King amd his seven comenselors（ministers），－1＇．11．］
（il）The construct－state connection in sll chever rest of the letter，seems harsh and exceptional．传 has év lepouoadqu，and in 10 1 Esilr．8， 17 toû Ev lep．；©fl toû $\theta$ €oû lopand év lep．，and in 1 lisdr．8， 17 toû $\theta \in 0 u ̂ l o p u \eta \lambda$, with the misplaced addition toû ev $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{\rho}$ We must read，therefore，

（22）The peculiar arrangement of the words preceding clauses，nép should be placed after ǐ．Cf．©L каі eגaiou éus ßatūv is Eкatóv．K゙autzsch，Grammatili，p． 128.
 1 Eisdr．7，23 vóuov toū Otoû oou．

At the end of the verse，the singular should be restored，following I Estr．8，23 olodeets，perhaps with suffix of the 3．pers．sing，rean：


8 （2．3）According to IEsdr．8，29，w． 2 and 3 should be otherwise divided．The words ．


 Cf．Ear．2，10．BERTHEAL RISSLLL，p． 99.
（11）Al has $\because=$ twice．That is hardly probable．Truc，fly has Baßel，but（fL Bokx 30

 13ut this does not remove the difficulty of understanding the passage．We have in this word either a corruption of the text or an otherwise unknown technical term referring to the gencalogical registers．


 תөat каi Zakxoup，каi $\mu \in \tau^{\prime}$ aútüv．FFirst，the l＇ersions are preponderatingly in favor of the Qere $7: 3$ ．Then，only the name of a single person seems to have so been originally mentioned in the text（ $\mu \in T^{\prime}$ aútoû $=$＇$b, 50,100, B A R$ and（insis－ 1：t R1i），as in vv． 3 ff ．Under lotakdixou（lotaגкоúpou）there would seem to be concealed in ש゙x．Should we expect after it the name of a place？With this Ill＇s 7i＝l would not fit；besides，it is only partially attested by the form lotadkoú－ pou in（ $5 A$. lioth $K^{c}$ thib and $Q^{c} r e \hat{e}$ are unintelligible remnants of the original 45 text，which through their vocalization are made only apparently understandable．
15－20）The proceeding related in 1 v．15－20 of stl took a different course according to the text of 1 lisdr．8，$\downarrow 1 \cdot 48$ ．According to 1 Esclr．（kai katemaoov autous kai
 Levites；in Il r ． 15 ，on the wher hand，he finds only Levites lacking．However，a 50 careful examination of the context decides in fawor of Al．According to $\mathbf{A l}$ in $\mathbf{v} .2$ ， priests appear to hate attached themselves to Ezra from the outset；for the names ［hinchas and thamar are known to us in the OT only as names of priestly

 and the beginning of $\mathbf{v . 9} 9$ are rendered by 1 lisdr. 6 with noteworthy variations. Eis Oudiuv ( $(5)$ Oudias), - prase mighe be usect in w 9 , as a parallel to m?
13 Insert : befure -nt, following 5.3.6 and 1Esdr 7,1.




The last three worls refer back to 4, 5, 23, and thus betray thembelves ats : l.ater redactional iadelition.

Rual soternote as in 4,7.
 also Friedr. Dehitach, I'rolegomenk, pp. itof.

The date in tll is as in (f). I Fisdr. 7,5, on the other hand, hats twe tpitns kai tikabos=antan int This would secm to be correct, as it is inconceiv. 15 able that so important at date should be altered by the translator. Morcover, Josephus Antif, xi, 4,7 agrees with I Esdr. 7, $\begin{aligned} & \text {. }\end{aligned}$

The syncluronism at the end of the verse 13 : reckoning of the year, perhaps from the Recurn ( $3, S$; this nuth hate dropped


(17) For the Qere remen (for went), of. Kiverzscha, § $59, \mathrm{p} .109$.
(IS) At the end of the verse 1 Eisdr. 7.9 adds kai oi Oupupai Eq, Exdiotou munavas
 as they give a brief proof of the completion of the whole work of building. 25 Whether they are original is hard to say:
(19) The subject is given by 1 Esdr. 7, 10 as by 11 in v.21:
 leyond doubt purposely emphasized.
(21) After Il wesw the lack of resi is inconvenient; the gap is filted by 6 .
 not have it, nor do they read erts after ;-9.. The 1 in th is entirely justified; the Chronicler relates the fusion of the exiles with the native Jews as takin: place on this occasion, i. c. the formation of the community which, according to the older reports, was not accomplished till later by Nehemiah and Eara; 35

 fsrad's in die pissisthen Piriodi, Ileidelberg, 1895, p. 67]. Contrast A. K゙omblak, Pibblische (ieschichti, ii, 2, 510 If

 original text.

Before $x \times-$ a difiteremt reckoning of the year must have fallen out, ats in 6,15
 Bertheat Risita, pr. 8yf.

 with, as a cloublet before it, teteletumeve, referring to "Ë̈pu. t lindr. 8.9 han

 by irrounévors. The translator cannot possibly have read the same word in both cases, as we now do in 91. . In the second passage he read wex. When this word is inserted, we obtain the usual expression.

For $\operatorname{ll}$ n:
5
(30) In pure Hebrew the beginning of the serse would have to be the? If we do not wish to change the text, we must regard the form transmitted by 11 as a syntactical Aramaism. See a similar case in v. 36 , ixtu: ; so, 100, in 3,8, 10.
(34) The final words of $v .34, \ldots \times 2$, are connected in $\mathbb{C} v$ with $v .35$. Both form and content are in favor of this.

(35) Instead of the singular iby read the plural any, following $\mathbb{G}$ and I Estr. 8,63.
(36) The I'ersian expression for satrap (khishatrataa'rnt) stands here alongside of the
 ancient explanatory gloss on the first. Cf. Neh. 2,9. The double expression lay 15 even before the Greek translators. According to Eir, Misy.r, op. cit., p. 31, n. 3. however, the Assyro-Babylonian ing was the regular designation of the satraps even during the l'ersian perincl, but in the course of time it was gradually sup
 would be a gloss on ninta, and not vice aersa.

On wixy see note to $\mathfrak{x}$. 30 .
9 (1) In the enumeration of the various classes of the people from which mixed
 should really be included is proved by $9 l$ in $: 2^{\text {b }}$. In that case we should not, 2 of course, expect the same expression Extin in $\mathrm{s}^{\mathrm{a}}$. I Esdr. 8,65 has there of
区. The difference would seem to be original.

For Expzinz, of has
 finition.

In I Esdr. 8,66 64 and wanting from the list of alien peoples; in place of the latter, however, ? ? is given, which would seem to be correct.
(2) the sense, and the Chronicler, in fact, in Nell. $52,32.38$ (f. v. 40) replaces the 35
 Xóvtwv, while $\mathbb{G}^{L}$ and tisdr. 8,67 reproduce two expressions. l'resumably rajen is the original, which the Chronicler has actually superseded in v .1 by [imp
(4) : Esdr. 8,69 has as end of the first half of the verse 民 $\mu$ oú (aútoü) $\pi \in v \theta o u ̂ v t o s ~ d o$

 However, as 1 lisdr. 9,3 f. 15 is doubtless acquainted with the ehti in Ezr. 10, 7 f. 16, no critical inference can be drawn from the variation. The circumstantial clause from 1 Esdr. 8,6 , on the other hand, supplies a better sense: those faith- th ful to the Law, attracted by Eara's strange conduct, gather about him while he is sitting on the ground weeping; but not ajter he had sat upon the ground until the evening sacrifice. The tempural determinative, $=\sim$ ? change of attitude; in other words, $\sqrt{ }$. $\psi^{b}$ should be connected with $1: 5$. Thus the phus in I Estr. 8,69 is justificd. Further, 1Vstr. 8,70 should be followed in 50
 as $\mathrm{V} .4^{\mathrm{b}}$ is intimately connceted with r .5 , its supertluousness becomes apparent.
(6) Strike out the second Mron in M. Cf. : Esdr. 8,78.

Ezra

8 clans or indisiduals．liurther，the men sent by ldelo are plainly indicated as Levites，since in w． 18 f．they are reckoned with the levite）clans Mathli and Merari．The guestion recurs in 5.24 ；eee note there．
（10）The text is here loaded with doublets；nor the the Versions give it in a pure state．In the first half of the verse all has 9 names；so， 100 ，（fyl（file omits iand 1 Esdr． 8,43 ，according to（5N，gives to names：according to（5t， 7 names．bet lupelß（lwpiß），which is wanting in（the，would seem to belong to the original text． Hence we should strike out 1 pheste，In the secont hatf of the werse the proper names shond loe struck out；they are repeated from what precedes．©f

The difference between $K^{-c}$ hill and Q＇re is here retiected in the l＇ersions．The
 The $\mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{e}}$ thib should be read neyser，and interpreted in the sense of dismiss，sent watey，following lien．19，5；Jer．38，23．In both catses 7 － sense of $1-x^{-} \div x$ ．The Qrê，taken in the sense specified，deserwes the prefer 15 ence．

The words exana ware，after Iddo，totally unintelligible．Read rax， following 1 E．sctr．кai toīs didedpoîs aủtoū，and strike out ニンaine Iddo＇s brethren were not the Nechimim．But it may be that＇ת has crept into the text

（18）Strike out 9 before $-:=3$ ，both because the sense requires it，and because $\mathbb{t}_{5}$ and 1 lisdr．8， $4^{6}$ ，in spite of all disagreements，are at one in reading no $i$ in this passage．




For $\$ 11 \mathrm{sm}$ ，at the ent of the verse，read e－ras，as required by the continua．

（22）The final clause is wanting in 1 Estr． 8,52 ．As it is not required by the context it would seem to be an expansion of the original text．let it appears in（f）．
（24）The varying construction of w ．15－20（sec above）is connected with the uncer－ tainty of the text of 8.24 ．Ill on the first impression，seems to mean that two of the chief priests were Sherebiah and Ilashabiah，the names of the other ten not being mentioned．This text of Al is exactly confirmed by Gुv tệ Eupati， Aoußui，somewhat more freely by（5l tóv Eupußiav xul töv Aoußiav（ -1 Esilt． 35 $8,5+$（62）．Nevertheless，it cannot be correct：for，according to w，18f．，Sherebiah and llashabiah are not of priestly but of Levite origin．Accordingly，their brethren
 be a wery needless remark．Hence t Eisdr． 8,54 Wr probably gives the best
 herum．
 ư่тाīv．


 in stl are removed．

 i．$e^{\text {a }}$ a correction after sll．The ntwer numbers in $w$ ： 26 f．are remarkably high：so Eve，therefore，can harilly be right．
 มローズ

Io contained what was formerly the heading of the list vv． 18 ff ．（＇נוּ
（19）For 11 cuexw read，with KUENEN， handlungen， 1894, P． 245 ．
 addition．The glossator was probably under the impression that mip was an error for Kelita who is known as a Levite from Neh．8，7；10，11，while היל？does not occur anywhere else．
 Zakxoup，evidently＝71！！！．As the name cannot be explained as dittography of another near it，we must regard it，apparently，as an original element of the text． 10 Cf．t Chr．25，2．10；Neh．12，35．
（25）It seems strange to meet the name $\quad$ age twice． 1 Esdr．9， 26 GL substitutes in the second instance，（f）here in the first，Mixaias＝nッ゙ロ；perhaps correctly．
（28）The clan Bebai is well known from Ezr．2，11 and Neh．7，16．But it should be
 pears thus to have varied here just as in Ear．8， 11.
（29）All bug is a surprising name．I lisdr．9，30（6V has kai Aodindos，ofl Aooan $=$


 1 Esdr．9，32（ $\sigma^{\mathrm{V}}$ ）．
 （6I）Iounh，is more correct．As to ${ }^{2} 2$ ，sce on $r .38$ ．
（35）The end of $v .35$ and beginning of $v .36$ are hopelessly corrupt．（6）$X \in h \times \in \in a$ ，
 Al has
 v． 36 Al）．

 ＇Eגtuøtis；GL Ma日日avia．The end of the verse，too，is unintelligible．
（38）According to $\mathbb{6}$ and 1 Esdr． $9,34,1.38$ begins a new clan；hence，according to the usual opening，＂コ२p；strike out the ；that follows，and pronounce，like 4 ，or
 $\because: ะ$ are to be distributed between $י x .29 .34$ and 38 ．
（40）Again，the beginning of the verse would seem to be badly corrupted．WV Mu－

 tion of the tradition one may perhaps be permitted to build on this tlimsy foundation．
（44）The end of the verse in $A 1$ is unintelligible．GV kal E＇Yévnoav $\mathfrak{E E}$ aủtûv vloús；

 ent text may be doubted（cf．Kostrers，l．c．，pp．122f．；German edition，p．102）． However，a comparison of these words with all leads to the conjecture：+5 ．

9 （7）According to the Greek authorities a 1 should be inserted before 1 ， צ，likewise lefore
 ting the word at which the reader stumbles．I Fisdr．8，76（kai）toú davukedúprat
 itself to be the true reading by taking up the awkward ing into the flow of the discourse．
 not the original reading；for＇ $\mathbf{6}$＇here means the exiles as in 8,25 ．

（3）The indefinite expression aturn in $\{11$ is evidently incorrect．Not mercly the article is required，but some closer determination of what women are meant．

 －年
 corrupt．The very mode in which the motives for action are set side by side
 ReUss，Rawlisson）litle improvement is made；we should surely expect the 20 Law to come first，and afterwards the opinion of the devout，not rice tersat．（GL



 ，But to follow the reading of（ $\mathfrak{F} \mathbf{y}$ is unadvisable，in view of v．4．\＆Esdr．would yickl：ローhin鿊．V． 4 ． 4 thus obtains a suitable introduction．
 Entirely suitable．
5）For then read a！boi，following 1 Estr． 8,92 and 6 L．
（G）The second $\bar{T}$ exei and $\$$（sec Bertheau who follows Cifricus）．

 rid in（fle would seem to be a doublet．See also the note on 9,4 ．
 name of the month（chislew）may have dropped out before sti in the same way as in 6,15 and 7,8 ．

 $\pi \rho d \boldsymbol{r} \mu \boldsymbol{\tau}$
（16）The connection with $\because .15$ is bad；presumably in consecfuence of an abbreviation by the Chronicler of the original account．

The form thyen is translated by ob＇only，kai sieutidnouv，but with the variant 45
 agent．With that agrees（jil kai stéotel zato aùtû＂Eopus＝iל ל

At the end of the verse read Ent？for the monstrosity wind
 tois adopous．But the original text perhaps read otherwise：1 Esdr．9，if kai
 and Kosters，l．c．，p． 123 （icrman edtition，p．103）conjecture that in $v .17$ is


(10) Strike out the , before $\ddagger$
 0оирє!и.


 comparison of $\mathrm{v}: 15$ (5L, we should read:

 oversight.
 Ezr. 3,9; Nch. 10, 10.
 both passages fl's text seems to have had the same word. But $\begin{aligned} \text { y } \\ \text { alongside of }\end{aligned}$ pes is unintelligible, while shy can be rendered, as in x . 31 f., upper chamber, room in a tower. Yet we should then be obliged to regard pusio also as a short expression for
20) - is ditlography of the preceding word. The Versions have no knowledge 20 of it. It should be struck out.

The K'chitb $\because 1$, as against the $Q^{\text {ere }}$ ' $\because$, is supported by the V'crsions and Ezr. $10,28$.
(25) Pun seems to be wanting at the beginning of this verse, and Fun after The in the second half of the verse.
(26) The first half of this verse evidently gives a passing remark upon Ophel (cf. 11,21). But as Ophel is not mentioned before v.27, the remark should not come until after that. The improper place of the notice confirms the impression made by its contents, that it was not a part of the original text. The second half of the verse, on the other hand, is the continuation of $\mathrm{v} \cdot 25^{\mathrm{b}}$. The division 30 of the verses should be altered accordingly.
(30) The Q*et in w. 30.31 יאns (for
 can either be taken as referring to $i==$ the sixht descondant, or connected with new ent the sixth a se ond portion, i. c., 11, was the sixth, and undertook not 35 one portion for building, but two. The latter, however, does not agree with the narrative in Neh. 3, inasnuch as in V. 30 it mentions for the seventh time some one as having restored a second building section. As the first possibility also woutd be an entirely unparalieled and exceptional remark in this connection, the suspicion forecs itself upon us that under the consonants 'wien lies a state- to ment concerning the native place of this man.
 smith, nor belonging to the guild of the goldsmiths" (BünMe, l. c.). © has tou £upurel ( $\Sigma \in \rho a \varphi \in 1)$. The article forbids the ideal that it is a proper name, but perhaps Siant, § 303, c; ̈̈, Besides Sarepta referred to in $1 \mathrm{~K} 17,9$ f. of the place of the same name not far from Jebna in Southern l'alestine called to-day Nionterçarafiand. The context, to be sure, points to a goldsmith.





## ＠lefeming．

I（5）Ill $-\pi$ without the article is impossible．Read 7nñ，following Neh． 9,32 Deut．7，9．
（6）In the first double clause it is remarkable that first the singular and then the plural is employed．We expect uniformity in parallel clauses．In favor of the plural in the first clause we have（GL тí witi oou $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ exovta，and similarly， 2 Chr．
 the singular，and 1.11 uses it also．The tradition of the text varied even in an 10 cient tines：lut，originally，the plural would seem to have been used in both members，presumably in $v, 11$ also．
（7）Al $12=\pi$ 位；the Masoretic pronunciation of these two words is obscure． Nothing can be made of the sense pledse，plederes，Ezek，18，12．16．To construe or render $b=\frac{\pi}{7}$ as infin absol．would be ungrammatical．The most probable 1 assumption seems to be that the vocalization depends on some Aramaism un－ known to us．So far as we know，the Pi＇el（I＇acel，of ban in Hebrew and Bibli－ cal Aramaic means act coilly（Job 34， 31 ？），like nñe；hence W．A．Tri．Bönme has suggested the pronunciation $3=\frac{1}{6}$ ．Con．Cf his paper $\langle$ bor den Fext dis buches Nehemiah，first half，（Programme of the Jarionsfifls－Grmmesium，zo Stettin，1871）．iln Eccl．5，5，on the other hand，we must read $5=\pi$ instead of



（11）Compare the note on $v .6$ ．
 similar construction $\mathrm{I}_{1}, 1 \ldots$ commends itself．


 reixeory）．The latter，the only construction which makes sense，requires the pronunciation 9 ，as read by Bir and GINSBtRG．

 Ex？： precedes．（ $W^{2}$ seems to confirm the passive construction of sll with tois reixeouv
 of the sentence，of．GESENIUSKiUTZSCu ${ }^{25}, \$ 13 \delta, b$ ．The use of the participle reminds us of Aramaic（cf．KiU゙TzSCH，Aram．Gramm， $\int 76$ ；for the pronoun， § 87,3 ，and，perhaps，the masculine can be understood as being due to the writer＇s having in mind the Aramaic word for ${ }^{\text {I＇dll，which，according to Ezr．}}$
 poses to read E＇y．



（8）The name - non awakens suspicion both through its consonants and its rowels． （TL Bupaxiou，ミL：u，Arajo．The original form of the name cannot be restor－ 30 ecl．As the following word ereis positively requires the article，the final in of this uncertain name has been connected with that word．

A proper name seems to have dropped out after the second $i \frac{1}{7}$ ，for cerpen is
clause following, and conceive it as an addition to the subject contained in izen. The meaning woukl then be: Of whaferer place ye may be. But this addition, couched thus in general terms, dues not correspond to the definite ex-




 nect.
(7) The difficulties of $v .7$ are not small. Bertheau misses the object of the first 10 $7 \times \mathrm{y}$,
 utp defensite ensines in the flace behind the arth, in frotected spots. But, apart from the arbitrary conjecture, it cannot well be said that the sentence is intelli-
 mean proints situated bencath another place, lower than it. In our view, according to well-known usage, ip signifies simply the flace at (or upon) which something is. liy the plural with? following, which on its part is connected with the singular, the expression is given a distributive sense: at foints which acre cath fime loziter thun the spot in question (that on which they were to work?), behind 20 the wall, $i$. c. $\begin{gathered}\text { nnjun. This word seems intended to determine more exactly }\end{gathered}$ the preceding general statement; every reader at the time must have known at once what was meant by it. Today we can no longer tell; perhaps, also, the text has not been correctly transmitted. © has in place of it $\in v$ tois $\sigma \kappa \in \pi \in i v o i s$ $=$ in shelfiral flaces (such as cavelike hiding places). (GL kai Eornoav úmokd- 25
 should, perhaps, read 0 'hִ? ? $=$, Jud. 9,49 ; I S.13,6, of. Euting, Nabat. Inscher. (1885), pp. 54 f. (No. 15, 11. 4.5).


 Leginning of the verse $=$ an'utwif of. 5,12 .


(9) For the K゙ethîb בixdi read the Qere zư! ! !
(10) The : before 0 ? attestation in (6. On the other hand, a 1 is wanting before ouper, where $\mathfrak{G}$ also translates one.

The end of the verse should extend wer the first two words of 8.11 , which in $\mathbf{( G )}$ are still rightly included within it. Cf. BÖnMe, l. c., pp. 17 f .
 lar as explicative of noxy.

(17) The end of the verse in tll is unintellistible. Instead of discussing the various conjectures ( $17 \div$ or

 also conjecture the participle arne used in Aramaizing fashon.
 13ӧнме, /. c., pp. 19 f.
 20 f , has called attention to the fact that according to v .5 the fictds and vine-








 versions to one another and to $1 l l$ is very instructive for the character of the Lucianic text. 'The underlying identity of the Creek is plainly recognizable, but so also, at the same time, is the working over which $\mathfrak{G l}$ l has undergone, by means of alterations and additions based on the llebrew text. The opening in $\mathbb{G L L}^{2}$ has been changed on the basis of 1 ll . Nevertheless, the double Trevin ill is very awkward, and certainly not original.

Other doubts suggest themselves. The first sentence of Sanballat in all sounds very empty; moreover, can one, in strictness, speak before the pate bre? According to (6V, on the other hand, we get the significam semtence:
 it is therefore repeated by (5L in its proper position. Kui cimuv (eimov) $\pi \rho \circ \mathrm{s} 20$
 translated a second time in ©L by $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ кatadeípouev autois. Bejond question, All has here preserved the original text; the change of art to eroxt should be


 Cint, are variants. The sentence which follows in all occurs only in © L r. 4 . but


(35) The opening should stand as in $A t=(5, L \cdot 5$. Tobiah's speech is fully preserved
 confirm one another. It becomes at the same time apparent that Tobiah, while taking up the words of Sanballat, means to outdo them by a stroke of wit.

4 (1) Strike out An entern, following (5y. They are mentioned nowhere else in this connection. The words a'dhel E‘? are also presumably an addition, cither by the Chronicler, or as a later gloss; for Nehemiah nowhere clse expresses himself in this way.




 wanting in (by.
$\qquad$

20
$\qquad$
$\square$

7 （3）For the meaningless Nethib－ex read the Qerê 7 nex：
The imperative irse：refuses to adjust itelf th the other clauses of the command．
 sonants could also be pronounced ：nse or ins\％．In $11 I_{a}$ a seems to have dropped out．The meaning here，according to I K．6，10，would be to bolt the doners，fustion them with burs．
 Circuhars，Vol．xiii，No．114，July 1894，p．108．－I＇．H．］
（5）The words המת Hebrew．The same meaning is differently expressed in Far．8，1．的 corre 10
 hand，smoothes out the objectionable element：Bıß入iov tîs reventorias tûv divaßcivtuv ev depxin．Wie must leave sll in its present condition，and regard the words awx：e Chronicler，who has inserted here the list which follows in w． 6 ff．
（6）Insert Lery $^{2}$ ，following Ezr． 2,1 and 1 lisctr，5，\％．
（7）Fint all aint read eirr，following Farr．2，2 and I Esctr．5， 8 Poetmou；and after the

（8）The remarks made on Ezr． 2,5 apply to the numbers in w． Sff ．
（15）Whether $1: 2$ or，as in Exr．2， $10, \cdots$ be the true reading，must remain doubtul．I Estr． 20 5．12 Buvet and Buvala．Still，Bavou and Bovoul occur also in（f＇A Ear． $2,10$.
（21）As to the addition after v．21，see on Eizr．2， 16 f ．
 Ezr．2， 16.
（24ff）Insert after v． 24 ： 2，18．Then let w．33－35 and v． 38 follow，－because these still speak of clans， but not of districts，－together with the expansions afforded by the paraltel texts．Sce alsut the note on F．zr．2，19ff．
 of Ex in I Esdr．5， 17 ft ．Insert，accordingly，for All ？ ime also is incorrect；for，according to its situation，this locality is not in place here，but at ix：29f．According to I lisdr．5， 17 we should read－ñ\％of．Jos．15，59； 1 Chr．6，59 6．Sce note on lizr．2，zo．
（26）Two districts are combined，which are separate in Far．2，21f．，but without pro－ ducing agreement in the ental．
（29）For the gap after $\mathbf{v}$ ： 29 ，see note on Fizr． 2,25 f．
（3i）As to the addition after this verse，see note on lizr．2，34f．
（39）Sce note on Fizr．2， 36.
（43）The terse has been altered on the basis of I Esdr．5，26，uloi＇Incoú eis Kobon̉ou kai Bavvou kai इoubiou＇and Eizr．2，40）．
（ 760 fi．）In w． $46-56$ Neh． 7 has three names less than Ear．2；as these are also attested ly．t lisdr． 5,30 ．they are here supplied．For the gaps noted besiles these，see note on Ezzr．2， 44 fi．
 fuestion can be as on the interchange of o and the the double designation of 45
 Bha1．k．Wtelninusen，Fimkitung ${ }^{6}$ ，p． 585 ．The name of this family is preserved （1）Its on an ancient seal in the British Maseum in the form Mifisi or Nefisi

57）The name nese on the authority of lior．2，55 and I lisdr．5，33（Aodupeliwe 50 h．心 licen given as n＂s．en．
 2.57.

5 yards no longer belong to the persons in question, and that, consequently, they are certainly no longer in condition to borrow money on these their lust posses sions; the lot which threatened them was nothing eloe then slavery. He there fore proposes, reasonably as it would seem, to strike out the two words.
 is against these that Nechemiah brings reproathes in 1.7.
(7) Strike out the $x$ in all exex. The word in question is the verl) neta, and the
 p. 21.
(9) Strike out the • in 9 nex, and read 7 ,kh, as the (eere requires.
(11) For A1 rexp read תxwel Deut. 24, 10 (Gminim, Zoitschr. fiur jud. Thicol, viii, 227).


 following gla kai exoutov. But gives a better interpretation in quetidic; read 15 accordingly
(18) Kivil attempts to retain A's expression $1 \cdots-\frac{\square}{2}$ by the rendering of all sorts of aine. But has not a word fatlen out after $\frac{2}{}$, which designated the place or the mode of distribution? Or is (GL right with kui dua Séka ǹuepuv oivov mavti tẹ
 $=\mathrm{Chr} .30,18$.
 At the end of the verse strike out הִ and lreat the thread of the letter.

 of a 1 before 5 . The 1 in thould be struck out, and the first sentence ended
 Nehemiah is in the halit of placing ath at the end of the sentence. Cf. Neh. 30 2,12.13.15.
(11) l'oint wron, not wron (VAN DER llowgit). The in is the interrogative particle. So bik and Gixsberk.
(13) The beginning of the verse defies all interpretation, and is evidently corrupt. berthlau and kill, it is true, assert that the first iget means on this ritionht, 35 but neither has given any proof. It is not hard to recognize in the present words位 graphy based upon the group of letters 淑 accordingly, אin $n=\mathfrak{M}$, at the beginning of $: 13$. It is another question, of course, whether, with that, we have obtained the original text. Gf kai Tupius to
 wording as that above restored; or, on the other hand, has kei Twßue kui

(19) The last clause of the verse should be connected by 1 with what precedes: $n$ nim:;



7 (1) The gatekeepers (evel are quite in place, but it is impossible to see why the singers and Levites should have been appointed by Nehemiah just after the $j^{\circ}$ completion of the building of the wall. The words Enh a later addition to the original text, based on the ideat that it is the Temple which is here being spoken of.
quite foreign to his Bouk; it must be assumed that he had no other reading in his original than that reproduced in his translation. We should, therefore, regard אin הipmp as an explanatory gloss (cf. O. F. Firitzschei, llandbuch zu dint Apocryphen, Vol. i, 1851,1 . 7). The other variants in 1 Esclr. 9,49 f. are sliown to be errors by the end of $v .10$ and $v .11$ in $\{1$.


(13) Read ajozit following GL; strike out, on the other hand, the before byent, following ©.

9 (4) The names in iv. 4 and 5 are only partially correct in the tradition. st has

 would add some further variants. Probably the round number seich was originally intended here as in 8,7.
(5) For it $\quad \underset{\sim}{-1}$ © of the next clause by means of 1 consccutivum is certainly to be preferred, of. 1 Chr. 29,20; strike out the suffix of the second person in $\overline{7}$ ? 2 , and for anta


(6) Before $v .6$ inscrt ארִ


 1uURG, ad loc.

 trat the original text ran $-\underset{y}{2}$ ל

(24) The first half-verse is relegated to the foot of the page as a gloss; the words 30 were intended to bring out the fulfilment of the divine promise in $v .23$, but they needlessly, anticipate the contents of $v: .2 f$., and are wanting in Grsa.



 $10-5 \mathrm{~V}$.
 and in agreement with the context.
(32) meems to have dropped out befure 3 ? Otós ṅ $\mu \hat{\omega}$ v $k \tau \lambda$.


(37) The end of the prayer seems to be wanting. The petition begins indeed in v. 32 , but does not reach complete expression. We should expect Ezza to finish 15 with supplication for the restoration of tsracl. Cf. Kostirs, /fit /ferastill i'. /sracl, 1894, p. 77: German edtition, 1895, p. 65.

10 (2) To all appearance the word אnat has been added later, as it separates the proper name and the patronymic; it is also wanting in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{v}$, but hr has ob kui $\mathbf{j} 0$
 p. 105 ff , assumes a more catensive comruption of the text.

The new introductory formula inclicates that the list has been taken from a

7 （61）For the changes here，see note on Ezzr． $2,59$.
（63）See note on Ezry 2，61．

 Fizr．2，63．
（66－69）For the restoration of vv．66－69，sce nutes on Fzr，2，64－67．V． 68 is omitted by good authorities on the text，and was not counted in the Masorah anong the verses of the llook．See BäR＇s edition，pp．1t\＆f．（5 also varies in the trans－ mission of this verse．Both Ezr．2， 6,6 and 1 Eisclr．5，42 bear witness that it be－ longs to their list．Thus the closer relation of I Esdr．to Ezr．is here brought into 10 strong relief．The verse certainly does not belong to the original contents of the list；probably the same is true of the similarly constructed v．Gg．
（70－72）VV．70－72 have an independent form of text as against Fzr．2，68f．and I Esclr． 5,43 f．As the edtorial manipulation of the Chronicler is clearly apparent in Ezr．2，68f．，Neh．7，70－72 must be regarded as the older form．Here，again， 15 1 Esclr．ranges itsclf with Ear 2，not with Neh． 7

At the end of $v .70$ the text is corrupt．As $n: x$ eune on account of its posi tion，cannot refer $10=$ Many，the designation of the object which was in be enumerated would scem to have dropped out；according to BERTHEAU，it was


The first half of v .72 is wanting in（ 5 y ，but that text can hardly be correct； the total in Ear． 2 ，GSf．certainly seems to presuppose this third item．
（73）The text is altered in accordance with the note on E．zr．2，70．The second half of the verse is intimately connected with c． 8 ，and should be attached to it．See also Fezr．3．1．

8 （If．）Esdr． 9,39 has tụ Iepei kai dvarviooty＝ wavers，calling Eara now－セn，now inan．Comparing Ezr．7，it appears altogether probable that here，in the beginning of the narrative，Eara should be introduced with lis full title．Whether he was generally mentioned by this full titce can no 30 longer be made out with certainty．Cf．Iv．2．4ff．9；12，2．6；1 Esdr．5，40．42．49．
（－1）The number of those who stood beside Ezra at the reading of the taw varies in the tratition．Al has 6 on the right， 7 on the left；ofv 6 on the right， 4 on left；GL 7 on the right and 7 on the left； 1 Esdr． 9,43 6y 7 on the right， 6 on the left；${ }^{5} \mathrm{~L} .7$ on the right，and 7 on the left．Evidently， 7 on each side are in－ 3 tended．Hence add arys．following ©L．The last lwo names should be con－ nected by 1.


（7）Strike out the 1 before E！ha，following I Esclr．9，48．

 ーココン 勺ゴど。
 regard the words 5 Tofon wir as a gloss．They can appeal for support of this 45 view to of which las not these words，but in I Estr． 9,49 we have，nevertheless，
 interpolated gloss（somewhat as in Gen． 9,22 ＂צx original form of the text？Since it is altogether improbable that the author of 1 Esdr．would have omitted the proper name，but taken up the title；further， 50 since he lias regarded the wrol soy？as a proper nance both in 9,47 and also in 5.40 （Nefuius kai Attaplus），and since historical considerations，for the sake of which he might have avoiled speaking of Nehemiah，are elsewhere

11（7．8）These verses also，when compared with the parallel text 1 Chr． $9,7-9$ ，show gaps and errors．Some clans are missing after v．7．The beginning of $: .8$ is
 9.13 and N゙ch．11，12．13．14．According to $\because 14, \%$ is a corruption of＂だった $\div \cdot$

 The same name occors in in two different pronunciations which are still un known to 0.
（10）Serike out $\boldsymbol{1 l} \boldsymbol{7}=$ before $=9 \%$ ，and insert 1 in its place，following I Chr． 9,10 ．On 10 the same authority，insert i also before $\mathfrak{\imath =}$ ：
11）Begin the verse with i，following I Chr．9，i1．
For 11 Min Chr，reads（cf．Ezr．2，2 and Neh．7，7），but it would scem incorrectly；sec Bratheau on 1 Chr．9，11．
（13）The same remark as that mate on Neh．7，52 applies to the monstrosity＂everi 15 of Al ．


 We expect a proper name，bot Jhegrecidutime means only the srout onts，and is 20 no proper name．
 Cf．ISERTHAAURVSSEL，1． 320 ．


（19）Completed on the bisis of 1 Chr．9，17．Cf．V．zr．2，42；Neh．7，＋5．
（20）Certainly intended is at transition to w．25－36，and lience to be plated between


（35）Keald 1 before stl arenne

 ；oxazi．It seems preferable，however，to leave it in its present form．
$12(1-6)$ The names in w． $1-6$ are intimately related to those in Neh，10，3－9．On this 35


 1 Clir．9，12．GI．＇Soovius $=-7$ nin，which is unknown as the name of a priesty clan．
 cf． 1 Chr． $25,3$.
 vaver autwv év tais épquepiass：it would seen to be an explanatory wloss teriv－ ed from 11，17．In GL laval is il doublet of dékpoúuvtu＝ごンク，Accordingly restore in v．g：＇x c’u’！．
（10）The third－יhst is wanting in good MSS and arcording to the Masorall．
（11）For 1rỵ of sll and all the Versions we should probably read jent．For，in v．22， we lind i：！̣＂（cf．‥23），and Josephus Antig．xi，7，i calls him＇lwivvns．but doubts have been expressed as to the line of high－priests also．


 cortling to v． 2 ，E゙心 would seem licere to have dropped utt．
speciat source. It applies to the document the plural designation exenene, whale


 Cill.i.v. on ls. 37.14. ''. 11. W'ith v. 29 the account of $\mathfrak{r} .1$ is resumed, but it is remarkable that in $v$ : I the Levites stand befure the priests, white the list itself places the priesis before the leestes. I'rohaps the list wats enlareded atho by the editor. Cf. KOSIERS, Het Hirst I/, 1P. 78; German edition, p. G6. St 11 . (icishl, ii, 179, would -cparate onl! iv. 3-14.
 correct.
 in his tevt.
 and is there universally attested.

 I.cvite clan Judult is meant, Neh. 12,8.
(15) It is natural to compare the fif names in we $15-28$ with the names of the clans in E.er. 2 (Neh. 7, E.zr. 8, 2గ1., and Neh. 3,5-32. ()ur attention is thus drawn to 20 certain noteworthy phenomenat, without our being able, however, to reach ponitive
 curs only as a Levitical name, Neh. 9,4 , in ill, where, however, $9: 2$ is more probable. The vaciltation between liani and Benui oceurs also in Eier. 2, 10 and Noch. 7,15. It must remain undetermined whether we hase a mere was ering of the tradition, 25 or actually two elims of diverse name. The latter is puite possible.
 it is true that the Versions do not confirm this conjecture.


 Manta lo i., p. $1+5$ proposes to read . Veh and Nobad.



 -

i5) Insert: before Enf: ( 5 kai ol ^eultul.
( $3(1)$ lietween 5.36 and 37 the division of verses has been attered to tit the sense. $i^{\prime}$
11 (12) Verses 1.2 are a fragment from some other connection.
 KT $\lambda$.
(6) This verse should go with s. ti the number of the I'erezites with l'ere\%. It has fis therefore been transposed.
 enou:h, the same reading of the consonants is found also in 1 Clir. $9,5$.
 expect: ifrst, the number of the Shelanites, corresponding to the number whe to descendants of l'erez; then, the third Jude.m clan Zerah which ats', dwelt, atcording to 1 Chr. 9.6 in post Fisilic Jerusalem. These gaps are indicated in the text, ind in part supplied by the use of a Chr. 9,6.

12（40）A statement as to what Nehemiah and his half of the officers did，has fallen out at the end of the verse．
 strike out the thefore on the same authority．
 As this expression is the rule in cc． 8 ff ．，it is adopted here also．
 Oúaavto h＝tury．
（3）［Et．MivFR，op．cif．，p．130，n．2，remarks that we must point $=-5$ Fidouins in 10

下゙ニut？Cf．EWald，Geschichte des Volkes Jsrael3，iii， 207.
．

 cordingly．
 is confirmed by the context（ $v .8$ ）．

（15）The word nowhere else appears in the sense merchandise it is questionable whether，in this passage，it is not corrupted out of nane．l＇et the connection of the words in $\mathbb{G}_{6}$ is different．

For the $K^{\text {e }}$ thib $\boldsymbol{2 k}$ ，the $Q^{e} r e \hat{e}$ i has been adopted，giving the usual spelling． 25

 the context favors it．
（19）The first arek disturbs the course of the acldress，and is also wanting in（51． $1 t$ is a mistaken anticipation of the second -7.56 ，and should be struck out．As 30 to the custom，of．Neh．7，3．

Before Kロッ： ш̈бтє $\mu \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．

（29）Al mana nina，beside the ©v has the same，but Gl tỉv diaßn̉кŋv tûv lepéwv kui tûv へevitûv．＂This re－ presents unquestionably the original text a！？
（30）For All hax

 to ill תi＝y？．
 see v． 21.
（17）After jeiget the name of the head of a clan loas dropped ous，and，for anjer， we should read nitot（v．5）．In Gt．Tệ Mıuelv Maout，тü Maouı Apedn0ı the reiterated Muout，＝

（20）For atl ？
For tll ： E GL have $A \beta \in \delta=シ シ$ ；it is hard to say which form is right．
 （5L．$\tau \bar{\varphi}$＇Sbouiq＝$=$ as in $v .7$ ．Kead here，as in $V .7$, ．
（22）Instead of the indefinite expression in th nix wix．，the definite
til would seent to be a transcriptional crror for 7 ．Cf．lBERTHEAU－KiSSLEL， pp． 330 f．


 comparison with $v . S$ and 10，10．Cf．also 8，7：9，4．
（25）Connect the first threc names of $v .25$ with $v .24$ on authority of Neh．11，17：ff． 20 also $v . y$ ．The three names which follow，on the other hand，are to be taken as subject．The words orete and orget should be transposed，so that orate may stand directly alongside its object ope．

 Ill thus agrees with $\sqrt{ } .29^{\text {b }}$ in regarding Levites and singers as identical．Still， tll would seem to be contracted from Eaneen こクาener，and has dropped out．

For All＂
（31）For 41 nıלהת zun／srati，iS94，p．59；German edition，p． 50.
（ 33 fl ．）In the first half of $v .35$ the priest＇s names are wanting．According to v．It we expect here also 7 priests；their names at present make up wr． 33 and 34 ，and should be taken up into $v .35^{\circ}$ ．The division of the verses is to be altered ae－ cordingly．
 ㅅch．11，17（if．（G）．
 If bio be omitted，and lizra not counted，the number of persons named in v． 35 and 36 agrees with that in $1 . \not+2(S)$ ．
（37）A verb of motion and a statement of place seen to have dropped out at the beginning of the verse．

 according to v． 32 it should run： 0 ． miss after $\operatorname{men}$ the a statement of the point on the wall where the second com－ pany that give thanks took its station，and at verb of motion on which the pre－ positions following may depend，such is 12 ！！．
 It has been ohserved by Stath．，Gesch．，ii，175，that these words do not suit the 5 ？ context；for according to that statement the second choir would hate extended southward beyond the Temple．We are therefore inclined to consider the words

stated as follows．He denies that we lave any genuine Memoirs of Ezra at all； lie concedes to Neliemiah：Ňilı． $1,1-2,6 ; 2,9^{6}-20 ; 3,33 ; 3,34^{2,3}-5,13^{3} ; 5,13^{b, 3}$ ． 6，19．The sections Ezra $4,9^{2} ; 4,10-23 ; 5,1-6,8 ; 6,31-14^{b 3}$ he regards as ex cerpts from an Aramaic source composed in the closing part of the fourth cen－ tury B．C．All the rest he assigns to the Chronicler．
llis conclusions as to the historical value of the l：ook，which are more rad－ ical than those of most other recont critics，will be discussed in the Notes to the Fnglish Jranslation．［Cf．also JOnAN．NES GEISSLER，Die fitcrarischen Beziehungen der Ezrantmoirn，inshesondere zur Chronik und den heratewchischen Ouchen． sihziflien．Clemnitz， 1899 ＇Jahreshericht dies statlisillent licalgynmasiums and 10 Jullaniles Nikel，Die ll iederherstellung des jüdischen Gemeinatesens nach dem batylonischen Exzil，Freiburg i．13．，1900．The last three pages of the introduction to this work（ Pp ）xiii－xv）contain a theful biblingraphy of recent publications dealing with the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah．See also Klosthrmans＇s article
 Biblica， $1478-149+$ 1901；；cf．below，p．58，1． 37.

In the following Adderlda the figures in the first column refer to the pages and lines of the Critical Notes in the present volume，while the numbers in parentheses（ $1,3 \mathbb{N}$.

$25,7(1,3)$ NikEL，op．cit．，p． 37 remarks that the words icy vink יa bear a genuine Babyonian tinge and read as though they were quoted from a Babylonian incantation or penitential psalm．－P．H．］
II（4）See also W．J．Noultow＇s paper Lber die Lherliefernng und den lixthritischen 11 crith des drillen Esrabuchs in STADE＇s Zat， 30 1899，pp）． 230 f． 24.4 f ．
20
21
6）．Sec also MOU1．TON，l．c．，pp． 23 I． 245.
［ש゙ミッ probably refers especially to the carmels $\quad 2,67$ ；of．Neh．7，69） white - anc includes horses，asses，and mulis 2，66．67）；（f．Neh． 2，12．14 and below；p．60，1． 21 （it is not likuly that הan2 in Neh． 35 2，12．14 refers to a horsi；contrast Niktit，of，cil．，p．is8，1．9， In the cunciform account of Assurbanipal＇s Arabian campaign（k゙13 2，224，1．36）the camels of the Arabs are called rukînsisumu；see Hebraica 3，110．－I＇．I1．］
29 （ S）There is an ellipsis in Ill which is supplied in I Esdr 2，10：EEvety－дo
 Sec MuUliloN，l．c．，p．245．In Fzr．8，26．33 Tapébukev stands


 names mentioned in the lBooks of Ezara and Nehemiah have been found on cunciform tablets，especially on the labylonian contract－ tablets disinterred during the American excatsations at Nippur， Sit of Habylon，toward the end of May，1893．All of the 730 business－dncuments discovered are dated in the reign of Artaxer－；o xes 1．＇B3．C． 164 f24＇and Darius 11．（13．C．423－405）．Cf．Hie notes on the English translation of Exthiel，in The Pilgchrome Bible， p．93，I．34．The names have been selected from the fiusiness


## addenda.

11E CRITICAL NOTES on the Hebrew teat of Ezra Nehemiah (pp. 25-55) as well as the Hebrew text (pp. 1-2f) were printed in the autumn of $1896^{\prime}$ if. $1,2(6,1.40$ ), but unforeseen circum. stances beyond the control of the editor and publisher made it necessary to reprint the Hebrew text. This delayed the publication of the volume. l'rofessor (ivithe having found it imposesible to make any additions, owing to the pressure of other work, the Rev. L. IV. BATtEN, PH. D., Rector of St. Mark's Church, New York, formerly l'rofessor of Hebrew in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia, who is preparing a commentary on the looks of Ezra and Nehemiah for The International Critical Commentary; kindly consented to append, with l'rofessor Cu'the:'s approval, a number of Addenda, especially references to the recent works on Ezra-Nehemiah, which appeared after l'rofessor Gl'tue's Notes were in type. A few copies of the first edition were distributed in 1890 so that l'rofessor 13UHL was able to refer to the work in the $13^{\text {th }}$ edition of Cestsiles 11 brew Lexicon issued at the beginning of

 references in the notes to his translation of 1 Esdras in Kaurzsch's Apo 20 kyphen and Psendepigraften dis AT (Freiburg i. B., 1900), P. 6, note a: P. It, note c . I '. H .

WITHIN the last few years there has been a great deal of discussion about the looks of lira and Nehemiah, and some important contributons have been made; but, for the most part, these deal very little with the text, being chiefly concerned with the structure and the value of the l books as a historical source.

With regard to these points Professor Charles C. MORRIs, of liable U'niversty, New Haven, has published his conclusions in a pamplatet entitled The Com-
 Keifschrifs fur die Alfieshtmentliche |l isschsidath, edited by I'rofessor STADt Biessen, 1Sg6. Torres's emendations of the teat will be found in the Notes 3 below. His conclusions in regard to the composition of the look may be briefly

fll $\because \mathfrak{i}$ ? in Neh. 7.15 ; cf. above, p. 49, J. 20.

(12) The second element of the name Tive is the deity Gad (Is. 65,11,
thus showing the worship of this god during the Captivity (Gray, 5
op. cit., p. 145; cf. above, p. 58, 1. 44).

51 (29) [Cf. NikLL, op. cit., p. 54, n. 1. - 1..11.]
28,10 ( $35^{\circ}$ The number here (1ll 3.630) is too large; it varies in every text.
(6) in Neh. 7,38 reads 930 . This place (Scnadh) is otherwise un- 10
known, and it is very unlikely that more people would be settled
there ( $1 / 12$ of the whole numberl) than at any other place.
$33(36-39)$ Verses $36-39$ contain the list of priests. It is noteworthy that here the Fara and Neh. lists agree exactly in names and numbers, and the several (f) texts show little variation. These facts excite sus- 15 picion. The passage is probably much later than the text to which it is attached.
36 ( 40 ) Gray (op. cit., p. 287) thinks 11 H . (Nel. 7,43 (P) but is not sure which is the original form.
37. 42) There are six lists of porters: - Ezr. 2,42; Neh. 7,45; 11, 19; 20 12,25 ; 1 Chr. 9,$17 ; 26,1-14$. The only names which are constant are abue, jbis, and ニiv. The other names are corrupt, and it is impossible to determine the original forms. Gray (op. cit., p. 90) from Aram. obe to oppress; $=$ Ipy = Babyl. Aqûbu, also Iqubu [i. c. Equibu, with c for a after initial y; see 25 Haupt, The Assyrian Eroatel (Baltimore, 1887), p. 26, 10; cf. Delitzsch's Assyr. Gr. § $34, \mathrm{r}$. Babyl. Iqubu, however, might
 Hal'pt, Sumer. Fomiliengesetze (Leipzig, 1879) p. 67; E-vowel, p. 26, 9 ; cf. 1)R.L. § $32, Y ; \int 103$. For names like ニpin alongside 30

 2gï. - P. H.]
 sec Deitr: z. Assyry: 1, 255 ; cf. below, p. 62, 1. 50; p. 64, 1. 51, de.).

fs ( ;3) af oip = is according to Hilirecht and CiAs, op. cit., p. 27,
 Epigraphische Denkmaler aus Arabicn, Vienna '89, p. 51] and the Assyrian Barquisu. The second element of this name is the god to op ( $\epsilon$. liäthgen, beitr. zur semit. Rel., p. II. The first elenent is possibly not the Aramean word for son (CRsl, of. cit., p. 68, n. 2), but the god Bir: [cf. Assyr. Bir-1)adta (Hchraiia 1, 224; KB

 generally written kim̂hb (cf. kirib $=29 p, 11 W 59 t^{b}$; see JENSEN's Kosmologie, p. 517. - P. 11.]
1\% (Nels. 7,61 jhx), Babyl. Addinu, which is the name of a place in laabylonia, but probably named after a person. [Cf. Nikel, of. cit., p. 10, n. 2. - 1. H.]

11 (61) [ ( 6 L's rendering means those atho latid claim to the friesthout, who clamed to belong to the priests. - P. II.] been indicated in the lists given in that volume. The name is, of course, not Babytonian. but l'ersian. TY: is righty explained as a l'ersian word. Its prototype appears in Babylonian contracts as gunsuburu; of. l'EISFR, LATT 17,347.
26,21 [Even if we had ew in Bablonian we might expecter in Hebrew;

to Maspero in his Passing of the Empires (p. 6r33, note) accepts
 also Nowack's Commentary on the Alinor Prophets Goittingen, 1897) p. 302; SillLiv, 2, 35. n. 1 ; ©f. 1,239 .279], while WiN( Kleer Alfor. Forschungren, second series, wol. 2, part I (whole number 11, Leipzig, 1899) p. 223, n. 1 endorses ED. Mevtr's identitication of
 p. fo says that, from the philological point of view, it is preferable


 paper cited above, p. $25,1.15$ and Crit. Noter on Numbers, p. 63, 1. \&. Nikel, op. cit., P. 43 says that the number 5400 should be corrected to 5469 following I Esdr. 2, 14; ©f. OOrT, Emend. - 1'. 11.]

27, 1 (2,2) 5: is explained by van Hoonacker in his Nouvelles titudes sur la Restauration Juive (1896, p. 9f), as meaning Donen with 25 Babylon! Ile gets this sense (which kostles rejects) from the
 Delitzscil, $11 W 263^{b}$. - P. H.]. The name would then carry an imprecation against Babylon. Latakdt: (lominalbitd., p. j3), on the other hand, thinks that may be a liabytonian name. 30 [According to Nikel, ç. cit., p. 46, n. 2, Zerubbabel is a genuine Babylonian name, $=$ zer-Bibili 'offspring of Babylon.' He endorses the view that Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel are two different persons. For Selliv's hypothesis concerning Zerubbabel see Crit. Notes on lsaiah, p. 199, II. 17ff.; cf. NikeL, op. cil., p. 142. Sec now also Sellin's Studien zur- Entstehungsgest hiche der jüdischien Gemeinde nach deme babylon. Exil, especially vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1901.
For the $e$ of $\because: 4.0$ instead of the 0 in surs: see Crit. Notes on Chronicles, p. So, 1. 45 ; contrast above, 1. 7.

 dukea [i, í, probably, 1/ardukid]. GRN (Expes. Times, Fel), ISog. holds that this name is connected with Marluk, and shows that foreign gods were worshiped during the Exile.
6 For All 2 gen see below, p. 69, 1. I3.
 is rightly rejected by Gral (Hik. Proper Nimmes, p. 24, note).
29 ( 5) [Cf. Nttel, op, cit., p. 80. -- P. 11.]
30 ( 6) That the text is in disorder is plain; whether the slight emendation adopted above, p. I, 1. 28 is sufficient is not certain. The best $\mathbb{6}$ texts (๘VS) : before $=\mathbf{N}$ in Neh. 7,11. Either a number has dropped out after must be an early one as if testifies to the present text.

Aives 111
1＇P．IL，CC．VY：
 grapht：－1．H．］

VAN HOONACKLR（Restaur．，p．144，thinks the corruption
 passage becomes clear as soon as we perecive that it is an Aramaic word，equisalent to lleb．－r：－：the meaning is then：－ they established the alhar on its base＇s：for a bantah seas found aboce，crectid by the cure of the people of the lands．［Aramaic




fo（ 8）＇Tokris＇holds that I Esdr．5，jff．has preserved the true reading both here and in $v, 6$ ，and that it would be better to alter ？ 4 correspond．
31，12（12）［Not only Nンズ but also the preceding it may be a gloss；cf．Crit． Cotes on Judges，p．32，1． 45 ．

20 （4，2）For the $K^{e}$ thib $x^{6}$ instead of the（Qere it cf．Crit．Notes on Iror verbs，$p .62,1.5$ ．The Kethib represents，of course，an intentional 20 alteration；cf．Crit．Notes on Istiah，p．S8，I． 53.
$24 \quad$ For Esarhadden in this connection if．Nikel，p．100．－1＇．H．j
47 （ 6）．Iceording to Torrey op．cif．，p．5，n．1i i． 6 is simply a historic－ al patch inserted by the Chronicler to make the history con－ tinuous，and aloo to account for the inactivity of the Jews．But 25 would the Chronicler leave his work so di－jointed？sce the article in Hasiligs＇Bible Dictionary，vol．1，1．S＇23）．ป＂．7，says Torkr：s， was originally an introduction to the Rehum－Shimshai correspon－ dence；as it now reads it is＇uf no possible use to anybody：＇ w．8－it present at＇scene of the wildest confusion．＇TORREY ep． 30 cil．，p．6；sce also p．49，n．1；contrast SELAIN，2，27．15S propose＇s on solve the problem by transposition，reading thus：－


 า


 19：אニלמ
H1N゙CKLER（Allor．Fiorsch，second series，vol．2，part i，whole number is．P． 217 holds that Ahasucrus V． 6 and Artaxerxes －1．7－23 stand for Cambyses．He says also that this passage shows its late origin，belonging to the time when the bostility between Jews and Samaritans was so pronounced that the latter were the natural opponents of the rebuilding of the Temple．
 an acceptable conjecture．Cf．also KaUrzactis Terthibel．Con－

32，19（ 8）The evowel in eve
19！9）According to Marot＇art fiundamente isr．w．jud．Gesch．，Cott．＇97，



29．12（ 2,61 BROWN：DRIVER－BRIGGS derive the name bre from biy and give it the meaning man of iron，but this derivation is rejected by Sistill，in the Am．Journal of Sem．Largg．and Lit．，vol． 13 Ipril， 1897 P． 173 ．NESTLE says，the Semitic languages do not like to form adjectives from nouns denoting material．In Gilead Arameans and Jews met together in early umes；$=$ therefore is ＂priori probably the Aramaic word for son，and the name of a person，place，or god．The stem 施 is rave in llebrell ？
 28，7），but frequent in Iramaic，meaning luxturious，in a good or 10
 Leipzig 1900 p 238.
2S（63）For the l＇ersian title אrwin and the Babylonian term nrion see N1k1：L，op．cit．，p． 81.
For axent a＇ais of．notes $52-61$ of the paper cited below；p．07， 15 ת．${ }^{2}$ and Helmaica 16，224（July 1900）．－1．11．］
 animals enumerated，has been a trouble to many interpreters．Gis．－ Butit ${ }^{13}$ rightly calls the passage obseure．Some scholats hate
 1890，p．533）says that bulls and conus cannot be right because these animats could not be maintained on the journey across the desert．On the other hand，the levitical singers E＇ク̆？
 be meant for the reason that women were excluded from the 25 ritual of the Temple．＂The words refer to a class of slawes kipt by the rich to satisfy their taste for music．Tlise $\sin$ gete in the and usually became concubines．Aramaic $\begin{gathered}\text { ande } \\ \text { enncubinc（Dan．}\end{gathered}$
 ｜lch．

39168 ）Iecording to DRIWIR，introt．${ }^{\circ}, 5+6^{9}$ ，there is，in $v 5.68 .69^{3}$ ，an insertion in the text of the parallel passage Neh．7，71，which shows

ti）（（G）］［Cf．NikEL，of．cil．p．76．－P．II．］

30，2）3．3 TorkE of cif．，p．12，n． 2 has proposed a reconstruction differ－ ing considerably from the text adopted above，p．fill．fff．He to
 N放 suthered themselaes tegether asainst themt and athent they fier． ceized that they acere conne abith hestile purpose；they withestod them，and bmill the alfar in its phace，and affered burntolferings is theron．Ite hold，that most of the corruption arose from the confusion of $\because コ=9$ ，a favorite word of the Chronicler，and $\because \because=9$ ； ［ef．Crit．Notes an Proverbs，p． $54.1 .27 .-\mathrm{P}$ ．H．］This recon－ struction puts the clatse they buith the alfar in its place where it belongs．The Jews did not build the altar because the people 90 eame agaimet them；the meaning must be that their coming did not stop the restoration of the altar．If we adopt this reconstruc tion of the text it would be better to read 5 －


( 1) reper occurs cosewhere only w. 11.17 (nysi) and 7,12. It is usually rendered and so forth see ED. MLAER, op, cit, Pp. 8f). TORRES says, however, in vol. 16 of the Jeurmal of Dibliad Literalure (lioston, 1897) 1. 196, that there is no feat of modern lexical jugglery by which rezel can be made the equivatent of and so forth. Iccording to lorres riya in this verse is plainly due to the blunder of a copyist, caund by the fact that the last clause of the verse is exactly like the last clause of 5 . 11 . Torkey holds, with Sherrma-S rade, that this word is only a variation of $i=2$, and that it must mean and hozl; it must be connected with what follows, and not with what precedes. He compares it to ments of a formal character. The word should be isolated, thus: - 15 Artaxervis, king of kings, to Rehume and Shimshat and their comphantons, grecting! And note: - Vour report has been carc. fully retad \&c. Torria compares a similar usage of - -nio in 2 K 5,6; 10,2: ©f. also kui vüv 2 Mace. 1,6. Cf. above, P. 39, I. I. alson Assyr. eninnarma ( $111 \mathrm{~W} 103^{\mathrm{b}}$ ) 'and now;' lit. at this time (erme 20 'time, נnase. of 5 , and anni 'this,' of. הen, with enclitic -mu; see Crit, Notes on Numbers.p. $48,1.44$, and for annit, - ne, Crit. Notes on Pronerb:, 1. 33, 1. 36). Cf. alion Hebratial 1,251 .
it (12) For the form N (3) sec Hibriticu 2,249; 13. 122; cf. Beitr. z. Assyr. 1,17, n. 20, and SrRack's (irammar of Bibl. Aramaic, 1897, $5=3$, K. 25 - P. H.]
i3., Noldthe says correctly that actills are neifher seteed nor dug. Fränkl $7.11^{\circ} 19,180$ suggests the Assyr. stem er fiven in Delitaschis 11 W $27 t^{a}$ below to throut down, with the derivative ra' cifu which seems to denote a man who removes obstructions. clears away rubbish. The meaning would then be that the walls were newly built up from the foundation after the old foundations had been removed. ['חיחw is correctly translated in Kautzscris Texthibel: und dic Finntumente graben sie bereits aus: wore is impf.
 regular form nould be par: with virtually doubled r. Cf. Datama's Grammar, p. 276. Contrast ShLLiN, 2,20 .
 cf. SLLLIN, 2, 25 n. 1.

37 ( $21^{\prime}$ Iramaic firms like Eun correspond to the Assyr. Ittafal, i.e. the retlexive-passive stem of the Xifal (Lecill): cj. 1)EL. i 84. The Iramaic Ettafal is not based on the Afel; contrast Nö́meke, Syr. (ir. © Si $159: 17$ it, E; 177, 13. - 1'. 11.]
4. 24) Vi 2t is weribed by Torkiv (op. cit., p. 9) to the Chronicler; the t; reference in $w: S-23$ is to the building of the walls. The verse is a lurmonistic puth to make the Aramaic narrative fit the Chronicler's story. Vax Hoosicker Rest, p. 21, n. 2) says, i. 24 follows i. $\bar{j}$ directly, but the second member is from the Redactor.

$3+13$ ( 3 ) zont Darius. . .os. 27.82) we have ('stinu pixat Babili ut ibir . Viri.

```
6
```



```
    Nives Al
p1&.CC.N
```



```
rol. 1, p. }10\mathrm{ and p. 167, & 9. -- P'. 11.]
```



```
        haps we should read cfri (with r); cf. DEL., HW 2S.4E. - I'. 11.]
```



```
        an explanatory gloss, and notes that the relative.e occurs nowhere
```



```
        piler.
```




```
        fiove; of. below; p. 70, 1.17. Nikel, however, believes that the
        0.2&7%שוא may have been superior officers controlling the admini-
        stration of the תחת.
    33(9, 1) For '\P% cf. Crit. Notes on 1saiah, p. 98, 1. 8; p. 102, 1. 25; p. 116, 15
                1. 2. See also W`iNCKlER's Geschichte Isracls, part 2 (Leiprig,
                1900) p. S8. - P. H.]
    53: 6) Torres (op. cit, p. 19) says that the Chronicler is fond of using
        #
        here. The present construction is difficult, and the conjecture is 20
        tempting that exv originated in a misreading of the first three
        letters of the following word ו.⿱⿰㇒一丶⿴囗丨⿱二小
```



```
43, 1 ( 18) {ll ה,:+1, Babyl. Gaduliama (pronounced Gadaliazra; see ZA 2, 25
                265). Cf. below, l. }32\mathrm{ and p. 68, 1. 12.
```



```
    22) All ל,\mp@code{wa, Babyl. Natan'iki.}
```



```
    13: 25) {ll n:%%, cf. Babyl. B'ama'ili.
    26 al \, Mabyl. Abdiaia.
```



```
        It =! is certainly the same as ?!, Ezr. 2,9; but which name is
        right it is not possible to say: The latter has a certain probability in its favor．
        The name E
        not as Gi:S. formerly did, zhom JHV/I afllicied, but as coming
        from the Assyrian ctcllu, detected by Paul Rlibes in Nah. 2,7,
        and meaning greal, cxalfcd, or as a subst. lord(cf. DeL,, IIW 157 b).
```






```
        1. 232) says that the (f) forms ending in ov suggest l as final con-
        sonamt. ©VV has Maxaivaßot=1בנ2%, the last part being the god 45
        Neloo: of. Y. 43. ©S reads Axadvaßou, having the same ending.
        (f) Maxvada\beta\betaou and ©L kai Nabaßou show transposition. Gras
        holds that }7\mathrm{ and ; are liere, as often elsewhere, confused, and that
        we should read :בmen possession of licho. In 2R 63,4 we find
        a name \iamkitr:A'sur' 'possession of Ashur.' The corruption may 50
        be intentiunal to get rid}\mathrm{ of Niche, just as Abci/ Nebe has been cor-
        rupted to Alcamego (%, 4,4). (For Issyr. makkirm and mamkiuru
        "property, possession' see 1m:L., HN" 40S. - 1'. II.]
\(3^{3}(6)\) DRIVER Introd．\({ }^{6}\) ，p． 549 ），on the other hand，assigns vi．10－18 （1）the Chronicler，who intended these ver－es as the conclusion of the Aramaic portion of the building narrative，and so wrote thein in the same languige．Winctibre Altor．lorsch，second－eries， vol．2．p．227；see alsn Drivir，off．（if，p．jtj）holds that only


29 （11）［nEs－pušsuru＇appeasement of the divine wrath；of．note 60 of the paper cited below，\(p\) ． \(6-\) ，note ．
fu ．22）lor the etymolngy of nise see up．itt．，note So．－I＇．K1．j


H（7．1）TORRI：（op．cif．，pp．it if．，regards cc．7－10 as wholly the work of the Chronicler，there being no senuine Nemoirs of Eara at all if．above，p． 57,1 ．1）．He gives a long list of words from this passage which he considers as characteristic of the Chron－ icler．Masplro（op，cit．，p． 888 ，note says the dates are not part of Eara＇s work；but he holds that the Memoirs are authentic． WiNCRLl：R（Altur，Fursih．，second series，vol．2，p．244）thinks 20 that Artaxeraes in \(v\) ．I stands for lotriues
 crbs，p． 55 ，1． \(37 .-1\) ．11．］
 to be the \(7^{\text {th }}\) year of Artaxerxes 1．（B．C． \(46 j-42 \psi^{\prime} i, c .458\) B．C．， 25 the date of Earas mission is placed by Maslero（op，cit，p．787） in 369 B．L．VAN HOONACKJ．R（Le Sircirduce Léritique， 1890. 1 ． 51 satys it 11 as the \(7^{\text {th }}\) year of Artanerxes \(11 .\), i．i． 398 B．C．；
 GGN1 1975.1 ． 186 thinks ＂ c should read factuly－serenth ye tr，the 3 number tienty having been omitted by a copyist．This would make Earas date \(\downarrow 27 \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{C}\) ．Marot art（op．cit．，D．34）declares that this verne belongs to the Redactor，and has suffered in trans－ mission，the correct date being 365 t ．C．or \(36 ; \mathrm{B}\) ．C．See also WiNCK1，ER，Alfur．Fousch．，second series，vol．2，p．242，who says ij Fira came to Jerusalem in the \(7^{\text {th }}\) year of Darius 11．，i．c．is．C．\(f 16\) ； cf．below，p．66，1．27：N゙ィkı，op．cil．，p．148．－1＇． 11.
 the writer meant that lizra was the atuhor of th ：law book；there would be no object in giving him such a title if it only meant to coprist．Contrast Nithl，of．cif．，p．162，n． 2 ；sec alho ibid．，p．23．］ 12，According lo Torrfit ép．cit．，p．58，n．1：see also Jourmal of liblical Litinature，vol．16，l3oston 1897，p．16\％，note 1j che has

 zur buth\％Re\％，p． 93 and fi．above，p．co．1．24 and p． 36 of the paper cited below，p． 67, n．\({ }^{2}\) ．11．H．］
 Lidmlunt，which，aceordnes to NumにE，correspond to lleb．jo

8） 11 היT？！，Babyl．Zubaticu．
46 （14）A1 K゙ゃhib تにi，Baby゙．Zubhidu．［Sce，however，OURT，Em．］


Jehoiakin, Ezck. 19:9: sce Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 71, 1. 42. The change of the original 7 to \(b\) in (cfe. Crit. Notes on Proverbs, p. 53, 1. 31. 2 maty, of course, have been influenced by the verb לנe, but, as stated above, there is no original connection between the noun and the verb circumstantial clause (so \(\omega^{\prime}\) and Kaurzscn's Textbibce); it is not necessary in prefix the article to ישבו (so Luther following ©?), nor is it likely that the Queen addressed the same question to Nehemial. But if Nehemiah served wine in the presence of the Queen be was probably a eunuch; of. 1s. 56,3; \(\psi\) 127, and see 10 Hebraica 11, 14t, also Chevne's Introduction to the Book of Isaiah,

30 ( 10) ) bey is called a lloronite, but the name is Babylonian, its right form being, not Sin-uhallit, but Sin-muballit, as the finite verb would require an object between subject and predicate; see Winck- 15 Ler, Allorient. Forschungen, second series, 2.228, n. 3. [1t is well known that the B in Babytonian was often silent, muš̌ur was pronounced u'šsur ©ic. (see ZA 2,270; JAOS 16, p. cvi); cf. however Hllprecht and Clay, op. cit., p. 21. - I'. 11.] Al is, according to vas Hoonacker (Sac. Lés, p. 375), the 20

 Nikel, op. cit., p. 189. - P. H.]
 he reads 1 int. "This he bases confidently on 3,6. (5 inflaoave וּש without suffix. Consecrating a gate or wall is against Heb. usage.
( 4) [The first element of fll watue is the Babylonian part. museaib, the causative of \(\mathbf{y}\). The correct explanation of the verb 2 wit was \(3^{\circ}\) first given by Pognon in his L'inscription de Barian (1aris, 1879) p. 183; see Beitr. z. Assyr: 1, 13. - 1'. 11.]
( 7) Al nieht, if. Babyil. Bahatia. [For the interchange between \(b\) and \(m\) see \(2 i\) 2, 268 ; cf. above, p. 63, 1. 11.

52 ( 8) Sce on r. 19, below, 1. 49.

19 (19) For Al ouvaitovoons tîs ruviac đ múprou suggests for hat ixan:

 pent and the ascent of the turning of the weall hefore the armory'; this agrecing with \(\because: 20\). 作 has a doublet with a marginal gloss, tis to ópos \(=\) inn- which has been wedged in between oflow
 ( \({ }^{(r y y A s}\) ). The glons semse to have worked its way into a second passage, i. 8 , due to the verses having stood opponite to each other in parallel columns.

At has in v. 8: Uzzich, son of Havhaiah, goldsmiths. \(\quad\) arng

*. F3-E:1.
a SSec also note 99 of my paper on Finhlu nian Elements in the lecure Rittand in


\section*{Sives 111}
13. 1.1. CC. V'


40 ( \(4+\) TORRI.Y (op. cil., p. 32, thinks that Neh. 9.10 are the direct contimuation of this abruptly ending chapter, and that they are alsus the product of the Cluronicler's pen. .tee also Cintixit, fereish Nelig. Sife, p. 62.

Citfixise (l.c.) emends the text at the close of this verse after 'the true Septuagint text: - and thiy dismissed thens with their children. CHEiNi's true Septuctgint dixt is found in 1 Eistr.



This passagge has been much discussed by VAN I OOONACKER and Kostliks. The former (hestumr:, p. 282) accepts \(\sigma\), and



\section*{Adocinda to @loter on @ligemiaß.}

 passage 13 ith Eara 4,2t and 6.14.

27. 2, 1) According to WisickLl:R (sec above, 1. 21) Artaverves here and

All variuus explanations which have been given fail lamemably. ©
 Nehemiah waited for the oppurtunity to speak to the King when no one else was present, \(i\). \(e\). no other courtier: the Queen wats certainly present \(\because 6\) ). See the article . Vibembith in Hasitags. lible l)ictionary. V.J. 1100 NACkler (hestaur., p. 172) accepts (5, Which he supposes to have come from [The [This 35 reading would seem to be correct; in simply a synonym of -ns; cf. Crit. Notes on Iroverbs, p. 35, 1. 38; p. 39, 1. 28; p. 50, 1. 24. The crroncous punctuation \(\geqslant .\), which entailed the change
 verse. - 11. 11.]

\section*{in \(5,14: 13,6\) means Darius. [Cf. (11./ 3,373, n. 1.- I'. 11.]}

\footnotetext{

}
30

\footnotetext{

}

\(\qquad\)
40

29 ( 6) If we take bexte, the rogal spouse in a strict sense, it would mean here the principal auife of Artaxerxes, Dambaspia, and not Anestris, the Queen Mother (was lfoosiacklik, Resturi, p. 1yo, note). [לִּe (cf. \(\psi 45,10\) ) has, of course, no etymological connection with the obscene verl) (1)eut. 28,30; 1s. 13, 16; Jer. 3,2; 2ech. 1t, 2 : 45 it is identical with Assyr. sierviti 'ladies of the harem;' of. DeLtizscir's IIW, pp). \(256^{2} .641^{2}\) and Nos. 171.226 (pp. 21.28) of the Sihriftufel in the fourth edition of Delitzsch's Cuneiform Chrestomathy (rol. 16 of the Assyriologisiche Bibliothek edited ly
 as though it were a feminine form of zikuru 'male, but it secms to be connected with šigiru 'lock, cage, which has passed into 11 ebrew as \(2: 2\), miswriten \(:: 10\) in the Elegy on Jehoalatz and

48 (6) above, p. \(65,1.11\). Kautzsch's Textbibel Iranslates correcly: und zuther aucrden sie des. Vachts kommen (AV, yea in the night will they come to slay thice). - P. 11.]
45 i 19) For "? Chevse (op. cil, p. 49, note) would read evil reports of me [ǎi? of. Num, 13,32; 14,37; see also above, p. 35, 1. 10.]

53 (7, 2) Torrex (op. cit., p. f2, n. 1) ventures the conjecture that 'עy should be inserted between in chenrib, and thinks that the ex. 10 pression refers to the officer in charge of the gate service mentioned in the Talmud (ef. Schëreer's Gesiht. d. jud. I'olkics, 2,274).
 poses \(n\) aspadat, a Persian name; cf. Wellhausen, Is\%. u. jüd. Gcsch.3, p. 163. [Contrast Nikel, op. cit., p. 77. - Fur 15
 - P. H1.]
jo, 4 ( 65 ) Kosters identifies the Tirshatha with Nech.; hence he concludes that this passage cannot be earlier than his time. Mever, in a recent article (Exp. Times, 9,67) refers the title to Sheshbazzar, 20 who is mentioned, Merer thinks, also in I Chr. 3, 18 as Shenazzar; cf. above, p. 26, 1. 38 and p. 58, 1. 14.
20 ( 70) A more probable reading than All's is suggested by Ezra 2,60 , wiz. fire hundred mina of

 Rybe, Cambridge Bible, on Ezra 2,69.
25( 73) Wellhausen proposes to strike out the last three words, \({ }^{2}\) שישראל בעִיםים , as a needless repctition. But Torrey (op. cit, pp. 26f.) says, the testimony of Al and all the Versions is unanimous in their 30 favor. The awkwart repetition is explained easily enough by Torrey as being due to the Chronicler.

 l'iel, cf. Babyl. piris'tu); see Crit. Notes on Numbers, p. 5t, 1. 12. Nikel, of. cit, p. 23 silys that the Levites gave not merely a paraphrase of the nh: but added some comments. - 1 . 11.]
51, 5 ( 9) Maspero (op. cit., p. 789, notc) says, there is an interpolation to identify Nehemiah with the representative of the l'ersian Court; to he agrees apparently with the view stated above, p. 51, 1.3, that Il what is to be struck out. Vax Hoovackitr also accepts this emendation (Sat. Lée, p. jo and note). Marequart regards the mention of Nehemiah in the Ezra document, as well as the mention of Ezra in the Nehemiall document (Neh. 12, (0), as additions by the Chronicler. [According to Niken, op. cit., p. 200, n. 1 the name if. above, P. 50, 1. 45 . I'. 11.]
Van Hoonicklar (op. cit, pp. jof.) regards stl byeun the lerites atho instract the frople as a title indicating a habitual office. 50 [Niklus, op. cit., p. 22 translates teachers (ef. ibid., p. 171), adding that this term points to professional instruction in the Law (if. the

ts（3）Similarly we have，in the same verse，Hananiah，one of the apo－ thecarics．Wor this use of 12 of．Assys．miru in mir umminni（HII
 p．87）．－P．H．］

Cheve Expos．Times，Ip．1899，p．331）say＇s that if armory were the sense， yyph，which may have been of＇s reading．＂At any rate the break－
 not prudent to adopt it here，where certainly nothing in the con－ text suggests it．＂ All הi：？，Babỵ．Padimu；see above，p． \(6_{5}\) ，11．25．32：p．70，1． 15. ［Padima might be explained as a contraction of Padadithma contrast
 §4t，b），and iimar might represent an（so PiNehes in PS13．1 15，15i of．Hommat，Auf sutze wnd Abhundlungen，Munich，IS90， 15 p．2，n．4）；see，however，Jinier in Beilr．zur Assyriol．1， 470 （cf． ibid．2，137 and Crit．Notes on Jeremiah，p．44，1．25）and Ja，trow in Journal of Dithlical Literature，13，14．123；／．1T 16，1；Z．10，231； of．Hilprecitt and Clas，of．cil．，p，f8，n． 7 ；Kitthe in Herzog－
 Ancient Heb．Tradition，p．101）see JIOS 14 ，xcix，n．＊．Heb．－its？： is an intran－itive impf．\(u_{1}=\)＇？
46,29 （ 34 ）Torres（op．cit．，p．38，thinks the clause may be an interpolation on account of the mention of Samaria． sanballat was not a Samaritan．Torrey regards Sanballat as the 25 prince of a stronghold near Jerusalem．Cf．above，p．67，1． 13 ．
In place of Al mane yal Hoonacker（Restuur．，p．175，nute）
 cd as pleonastic．He suggrests as an atternative：ー－n hary
（ 38 ）According to WiNCKler，Alturient．Forsih．，second series， 3 ， 10530 ＇sn means here not hulf but entirety，completeness；so，too，in I． 8 of the Inscription of Mesha．－P．H．］

47， \(9(4,6)\) All is obscure and confused．The emendation adopted above， p．13，1． 28 helps very much，but perhaps the text of © pure and 35
 oiкoûvtes exóneva aùtūv，kai єĭmoaav n̆Miv，Avaßaivouбiv हk \(\pi\) div－

 tisgs＇Bible Dictionary，p．1991，note．
43 i 1 4 ＇［As the preceding word ends in 1 the omission of the ：before Wrisk is evidently due to haplogruph19．－1．11．］
 10（cf．above，p．47，I．45）as in 2 Chr． 25,10 ．He says it is cass）．


4S， \(9(5.8)\) For in cf．Crit．Notes on I＇roverbs，p．60，1．51．－I．11．］
13（ If Cherve（Jetuish Refig．Life，p． \(50^{\circ}\) says，the text of this verse can searcely be accurate；but he docs not attempt a correction．
\(26(6,10)\)［For 1 my fut under troo see IV．R．Smitst，Semitis²，p． 456. 28 The ，before הhb may be correct；the whole clause ごN2－－bit テール！may be a gloss introduced by the IIta explicatize；see
If ( 12 , abte and the before asisn. Thus we get: - At the time of
                Eliashib, muder the reign of Darius of l'irsia, there wre monatid
                as heads of priestly families: Joirda, Johenan and Jaditul. Cf.
                \(\therefore\) 12. for 7 instead of Cf. note on Nunl. 23,18; Crit. Notes
                    on Ezekicl, p. 1141153 ; p. 115 1. 17. - P. H.]

                grebu, and בipy are here associated by an error of the copyist who puts in names familiar to him．
5j， \(2(\mathrm{ft})\)［For תツאา see above，p．70，1，24．－1＇．11．］
3 （ 55 ）For the name ה上to of．Babyl．Šullumá．
6 （13，1）MarQuart（op．cit．，p．36）regards c． 13 as connected with Ezra \(9,1=10,44\) ．
15 （ 6）MARQUART reads＂p̣：at the chd of his duys for Al a＇b＂．＂This verse does not seem to be in its right place here；see the article \(1 ;\) in Hastings＇Bible Dictionary，vol．1，p．S22．
20 （ 14）［411 ת p． \(67,1.22\).
21 （ 15 ） 11 E＇s．g should be pointed a＇ang；cf．Crit．Notes on Numbers，p．49， 1．23；p．53，I．\＆8；Crit．Notes on Proverbs，p．64，1． 11.
33 （21）for the original meaning of הา⿰丬夕（cf．above，p．6y，1．1）see ibrid． p． 45 ，l． 46 ．
 omission of the first \(\pi\) is due to haplograplyy jusi as we often find
 does not mean \(I\) a＇isiled（besmihte in Kautzsch＇s Texthibel：of． BERTHEAU－RVSSEL ad loc．）but I saw（AV，correctly，In those day＇s also sazu \(I\) Jea＇s that had marriad \＆ \(\mathbb{C}\) ．）．The it prefixed to

 32，23：1 K 5，17（cf．GeS．KaUtzSC1f 5117,1 ）；contrast construc－ tions like I＇rov． \(23,22^{\text {b }}\) ．For the use of the article as a relative pronoun（cf．also Eara 8，25；10，14．17）see note 38 of the paper cited above，p．67，note \({ }^{2}\) ．P．H．］
（24）Torrey（op．cit．，p．51）regards 411 c！！！ 1 ！util as an addition of 35 the Chronicler＇s．
\(38(29)\) CulliNe（Jerwish lielig．Life，p．6S）renders；－Remember，it is to them，and not to me，that I hare atterined friestly dignities． I here phrged the pricsthond from all strangers，and mambined cuch of the offices of the friests，and of the leciotis．

\section*{Corriginda．}

 the ごロロー expounded and supplemented it．－I＇．I1．］
 an interpolation．
 possibly＇be restured from（o．［Cf．（）okr，Emend．
 so AN：in Kautrsch＇s Teatbibel：wahlten cinen Anfuher；of． Fi：．18，25；Delle．1，15）nor they turned their hend（so Bertiliau 10




 p． 65, I．6．If we read \(1=5\) ，the 1 is the 1 Hate explicative：of an \＆nEx：9，16 and Crit．Notes on Numbers，p．53，1．12．
 the sacrificial table，see C＇rit．Notes on Numbers，p．44，I． 9.
The primitive meaning of 9 ge is not to couer but to ruipe off（פחמ）； if． \(\mathrm{KB} 6,78,20\) and Crit．Xotes on Xiumbers，p．43，I．＋2．

fo（ 38）Fior הion yen the first hiead buthed of some dough，which was
 bread，see Crit．Notes on Numbers，p．50，I．50．Nikill，op．cit．， p．202，n． 2 translates Ehex Ehenfortion，which is certainly more enrrect than Fersting des Schrotmehts in Kisurzsch＇s Tentbibel， Num． \(15,20,-\) P．H．］

53，25 11 17）A11 א
 1＇roverbs，p．34，1．47．
29 （ 32）This town in Benjamin may be the place intended in 15 ． 10，30（At－3y），and ChisNe（Exp．Times，Sept．1899）proposes \(3 ;\) to correct the text of Isaiah accordingly．Cf．Crit．Nutes on Isaiah， p． \(26,1.41\) ．
 ICKER（Mishtur，p． \(253^{\prime}\) to Mattaniah，and his name and this nutice must have originally stood apart from the preceding names．
fis（ \(\quad\)（ink Hoonickir（h，i）thinks that beyond a doubt must be read instead of Al ：3 ．Q＇rè \(\because ⿰ 丬 夕\) ）．
 Babyl．Vinizmini．－P．H．］

 says we must therefore suppose that \(A 1\) in in in in 11 is a mistake for gues from Joscphus（ - tut．，，i，7，1）who calls him＇lwavvins．
14 Winck li：k（Forsch．，sec．ser，2，2：1）thinks that the usual emenda－ tion of this passage \(\geqslant\) instead of \(A\) 施 as adopted above，p．22， 1．19，is yute insufficient．It is better，he says，to strike out al
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\section*{Eist of Clames}

Wirit their Babulonian Eguivalesers and I'arablals
I)ISCUSSHD IN ADDENDA.


\section*{－Explanation of Eopore}

THE LNCOLORFI）passages and words are from the pen of the Chronibler （about jon B．C．）．（ WERliNiNt；calls attention to modifications of the older sources at the hands of the compiler（Ezr．2，68：7，11－20）．Subsequent additions to the work of the Chronicler（inserted during the \(3^{d}\) cent．）are printed in DARK ciREEN（Ezar．3，5 and 4， 3.24 ，LHGHT GREEN（F．zr．4，9．10）being used for pasages +5 still later than the dark green sections．

The Memoirs of lizra（composed about \(42 j\) B．C．）are printed in DARK
 modifications of the original document．

In the same way the Memoirs of likemakh（composed about \(425 \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{C}\) ．） 50 are printed in DARE RED（Neh．1，1－7，5；13，f－31），while LIGIIT RED（Neh．11， \(1-2 f ; 12,27-44)\) is used for passages of the work modified by the compiler．

Dakk rerple indicates Dockments of the fimes of E゙zra an．dihemiah （componed about \(430-f 10 \mathrm{Br}\) C．）．Modified sections are marked by overinsing （Neh．9，1－3；12，12－26）．The section printed in Llifly Purpl：（ハeh．10，2－2S）is 35 a later aldition to the same ducument．The source of this insertion is unknown．

1Est．OW distinguishes the Aramaic Document（composed about 450 B．C．） relating the completion of the Temple（F．zr． \(5,3-6,5\) ）．A section of it，modified at the hands of the compiler，E2r．6，6－15）is distinguished by OrerkiNiNG．

Latter glosses and interpolations within the several sections are relegated 60 from the text to the foot of the pages．

The atguments for these distinctions are given in the introductory remarks prefixed to the Explanatory Notes on the English Translation of the Bonk．
\(x\) Eist of Contributors ex

Genesis：C．J．B．hti（1）xforl）．
Exodus：II．E．Rvif（Cambridge）．
levitions：S．K．Drwtre and H．A． W＇IIEE \({ }^{2}\)（Oxford）．
Numbers：J．A．P＇ATFRSON（Edinburgh）．
5 Deuternomy：GEORGE ADAM Sumif （Clasgow）．
Joshua：W！．H．Bexixbly（london）．
Judges：Ceo．F．MOORE：（Andover）．
Simuel：K．BudDE（Marburg）．
Kings：Br：RNHARD Sram：（Giessen） and \(\mathscr{F}\) ．Schwaliv（Strassburg）．
to lsaiah：T．K．Cnevxe Oxford）．
Jermiah：C．11．CORN：1s．1．（13remau）． Fackiel：C．II．Tor Cambridge，Mass．）． Hosca：dbil：RT SOCIS \({ }^{3}\)（Lciprig）

Joel：Francis lrow．（New lork）．
15 Amos：Jois Tivink（Winclicombe）， （Hadiah：A．H．arber（Melbourne）．
 Micah：J．F．McCtravy（Toronto）．

Nahum：Alr re：D JFrimbas（Leipzig）．
Habakkuk：W．II．Warn（New lork）．2o
Zephaniah：F．L．CURIIs（New Haven）．
Haggai：G．A．COORE Oxford）．
Zechariah：W゚．R．HaRbFR Chicago）．
Malachi：Chatene G．Montifform： and I．Abrallines London：．
Psalms：J．W＇ellinat＇sin（Güttingen）．2j
Proverbs：AUGUST MC＇sLiR \(\gamma\) and Emil K゙．lutzscil（halle．）
Job）：C．Sifafried（Jena）．
Songr of Songs：R，Minktinfiu \({ }^{3}\)（Lon－ don）and J．1＇．l＇tothe（Nicw look）．
Kuth：C．A．Brtcos（New lork）．
Lamentations：Morrds Jastrow，Jr． 30 （lhiladelphia）．
Feclesiantes：l＇ati．Itaust（Baltimore）． Esllaer：T．K．Dsbott（I）ublin）．
Danicl：A．Kinmplution（Bonn）．
Ezara－Nehemiah：II．Gl＇THE：（teciprig） and L．W＇．liattan New lork）． Chronicles：R．Kırtle（Leipzig＇）．

\section*{P－4 \(10+6\)}

－Professor Abrinins Ǩrenes，who had agreed to do the Book，died xii， 10 ＇01．```
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