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11E present edition of the Sacred Fooks of the Old Teslament in Hebrew 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 cover.

Departures from the Received Text are indicated by critical marks: - . (i.e. $V=$ Versions) designate a reading adopted on the authority of the Ancient Versions $\left(a^{2}, \alpha, 3\right.$, \&ic. indicate that the respective glosses relegated to the foot of the page are omitted in the Versions, esp. (6) (cf. Ezek. 32, 20); - . (i.e. c $=$ conjecfure) are used for 10 Conjectural Emendations; and $:(i, e .2=7 p J$ ), for changes involving merely a departure from the Masorctic points, or a different division of the con-

 instead of the $د$ コク, and "for changes introduced by reason of Parallel Passages. 15 A small note of exclamation (e.g. 9,9 ) calls attention to readings deliberately preferred on the strength of some Heb. MSS or early printed editions of good authority. Doubtful Words or Passages are enclosed in notes of interrogation (1). Occasionally two critical marks are combined, c.g. *, i. $\epsilon$. Deviations from the Received Text suggested by the Versions as well as by Parallel Passages; 20 or es, i.e. Departures from the Masoretic points, supported by the Versions, \&ic. [ calls attention to transposed passages ( $c . g .34,12$ ), the traditional position of the words in the Received Text being marked by [] while the transposed words are enclosed in []. In cases where two or three consecutive words are transposed the traditional sequence is indicated by 123 Sc. respectively prefixed to the 25 individual words ( $c, g .19,9$ ). Transposition of consonants is indicated by figures above the respective letters (e. g. 19,10). Jassages corrupted beyond emendation are indicated by $\ldots$, while $* *$ point to Lacunce in the original. $C f$. English Translation of Ezekicl, p. v.

The Ancient Versions are referred to in the Nofes under the following 30
 $\mathfrak{\$ H}=$ Syro Hexapla; $\boldsymbol{A}=$ Saadya's Arabic Versinn; $\mathfrak{N}=$ lefus Latima $\boldsymbol{3}$ (i. e. St. Jerome $)=$ Vulgate ( ${ }^{\prime} A=$ Codex Amiatinus); $A=$ Aquila; $\theta=$ Theodotion; $\Sigma=$ Symmachos, su denotes the Samaritan recension of the l'entateuch. WA means Codex Alexandrinus (A), $(\mathbb{\sigma} \mathbf{C r}=$ Codex rescriptus Cryptoferratensis ( $\Gamma$ ), 35 $\sigma^{\mathrm{Du}}=$ Fragmenta rescripta Dublinensia $(\mathrm{O}), \sigma^{\mathrm{L}}=$ Lucianic recension $(\Lambda) ; \sigma^{3 t r}=$ Codex Marchalianus (Q), $\sigma^{S}=$ Sinaiticus $(\boldsymbol{K}), \boldsymbol{\sigma V}=$ Vaticanus (B).

The heavy-faced figures in the left margin of the Notes ( $1,2,3, \mathbb{S}$. .) refer to the chapters, the numbers in () to the verses of the licbrew text. The mark ${ }_{\wedge}$ means omit(s) or omilled by.
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12 ל 120

 וֹאַרא








 26 שה כמראה אב; טציר דמות כםא , בעליצ] ועל דמות הכםא דמות כמראה אדם [] $\longrightarrow 0453+5$


(r) 80 0.





(1) (1) 22 ( Erek.


24

בתובם: ולשונך אדב'ק אל חבך ונהלמת ולה תהזה להם לאיש מוביח כ' בית 26
מרי המה: וברברי אותך אשתח הת בּך ואמברת אליהם כה אמר אדני יהוהי 27 oו השטמ ישמע והחחדל יחדל בי בית מרי המה:
ואהתה ק


 15 לֹת




ב








 30 מטה לחם בירושלם ואכלו לחם במשקל ובדאָגה ומים במשוֹרה ובשממון ישתו:







 מאםו וחקוהי לא הלמו בהם: לכן כה אמר ארני יהוה עען הַמרת בם מץ הגוים 7


 בּה
 5 2,2.א

3 4
 6 6







 ותהי בפּ בדבשׁ למתוק:
ד.4.





 ום קח בלבבך ובאוניך שמע: ולך



 הנולה תל אביב







ח

*     *         * 

 טהומה，יעל התרים：ם

 לא







15

 והשבּתּ נאון

20
 ב־ אני יהוה：

״הּ בשנה הּ 25



 ：ジアコニ 30











> צ׳ אגי יהוה וטבְהּו:

ビ囚 8.2 （t） （防） לコロッジ
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6,2.א
3 4
 6 סביבות מזבחותיכם: בכל מושבותיבם הערים תחרבנה והבמות תישמבנה למעز 20




 הרעה הזאת:
 ב12 בית ישראלא אישׁר בחרב ברעב ובדָּבר יפלו: הרחוק בדבר ימות והקרוב בתרב



 מושבבותיהם וידע פי אני יהוה: 7,2.א צויהּ דבר יההה אלי לאמר: ואתה בן אהדם כה אמר אדני יהוה לאדמת 3

 יהוה:


 ם：ロתニン
 16 放
17 を的א
 ת

 10 22 רע ：12\％•＂มミ
 ודגם בּת 2 2 15 3 השב゙ּ

 8 8 80

－זרים ועיジּ 1 וב

 מת וֹאב על בל ב ：
וּ בלם ת






 ：ール゙ッゾバ

$\longrightarrow$ NBeros


 המל הראیה 13



 אל היכל יהוה ופניהם קָדמה והמה משתהזויים קדמה לשמשׁ：


 ולא ה＂ּשמע אותם：















 10，2





 ועח ויֵצה：
9




| ロ゙コアาゴ ภ1ゴゴ（1） | ＊ | ゴาジ 7 （9） | ＊ |  | － | ブがリ | 2 （G） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | コーナ゙年 |  |  |  |  |  |

13,त.4



8 8











נאם אדני יהוה:


 0
 אیּ



 אג׳ יהוה:

30

 וֹא゙ בלּ 35


 אגّ יהוה:
40

 23 24



3

 ד כבתך תֹא 7 ל ל בקיר
15 לאר



 20 ב 13 14

 ת
25 הึ ל 19 וֹּ閶
 -יה
 הル
 24






 5 מבנדיך ותעשי לך במות טלאות ותוני עליהםי: והקתי בלי תפארתך מזהבי 17




 נעיריך בהיוהך עירם ועריה מתבוסטת בדמך : 24.23


 לא שבעתה: ותרבי את תונותיך אל ארץ כנען בשדימה וגם בואת לא שבעתה: 29 צה אמללה לבתך נהם אדני יהוה בעשותך את בל אלה מעשה אשה זונה שללמת: ל



 לבן זונה שמעי דבר יהוה: בה אמר אדגי יהוה יען השטמך נחשטתך ותגלה לה. 36
















 והיו לי לעם ואני אהיה להם לאלהים נאם אדני יהוה:
 ידי עליה ושברתי לה מטה לחם והשלחתי בהּ רעב והברתי עמנה אדם ובהמה: 5




 האלה בתובה חי אני גאם אדני יהוה לא יצילו בעים ובנות בי הם לבדם יצצלו:
 ב אדם ובהמה: ונה דנאל ואיוב בתוכוּ חי אני נאם אדני יהוה אם בן אם בה ציצילו המה בצדקתם יצילו נפשםם

 הממוּאים בנים ובנית הנם יוצהאם אליכם וראיתם את דובם ואת עלילותם


 3

 וּיַחר ונעשׁה עוד למלאבה:
6



מגֹל נאם אדני יהוה:

 4






 12.11
 יבּרשו וידעתם בי אני יהוה דברתי:
22





ויהי דבר יההה אלי לאמר: מה לגם אתם משׁלים את המשל הזה על אדמת א. 18,









 0 התועבות האלה עשה מות יממת דמיו בו יהיה:


 25

 משצם וצדקה עשה את בל חקותי שמר ויעשה אתם חיה יחיה: הנםש החטאת ב






 ואמרתם לה יתבן דרך אדני שמעע נה בית ישׁראל הדוכי לא יהמן הלא דרביבם בה

 29






 5 53

 65 ובנותיך השצבינה לקדמתבן: ולוא היתה םדם אחותך לשמועה בפּך ביום גצוניך: 57 85 פלשתים השהאטות אותך מםביב: את ומתך והת תועבותיך את נשׂאתים נאם יהוה:
59 61.0 ברית: וזכרתי אני צת בריתי הותך בימי בעוריך והקימתי לך ברית עולם: וזכרת הת דרבֵך ונכלמת בקחתך הת התותיך הגדלות ממך אל הקטנוּת ממך ונתתי 15 62 התהּ לך לבנות ולא מבריתך: והקימתי אני הת בריתי אתך וידעת כי אני יהוה:
 אםשר עעשת נצם אדני יהוה:

א.א.27 ויהי דבר יהוה אלי לאמר: בן אדם חוד חידה ומשל משל אל בית ישראל: 20
 4







 רוח הקדים תיבשׁ יבשׁ על עִיָּת צמחהּ תיבש: 12.11 ויהי דבר יהוה אלי לאמר: אמר נא לבית המרי הלא ידעתם מה אלה אמב הנה בא מלך בבל ירושל




 רב יעטוֹה אותו פרעה במלחמה בשפּך טללה ובבנות דיק להכרית נהשטות רבות:

 ב ופרשתי עלי רִשתי ונתפש במצודתי והביאואיהו בבלה ונטםטתי אתו שם מעלו

 כלה במדבר: ואמר אל בניהם במדבר בהוקי אבותיכם אל תלבו ואת משבמיהם 18






 חללו ואחרי גלולי אבותם היו עיניהם: וגם אני נתתי להם חקים לא טובים בה ומשםטים לה יחי בהם: ואטמא הוהם במהנותם בהעביר כל צָּטר רחם למען 26 איִִמם למען אשׁר ידעו אשׁר צני יהוה: לבן דבר אל בית ישראל בן אדם ואמרת אליהם כה אמר אדגי יהוה עוד 27
 ידי לתח אותה להם ויראו כל גבעה רמה וכל עי עבות ויזבחו שם את ובחיהם

לבן אמר אל בית ישראל כה אמגר אדני יהוה הַבדרך אבותיכם אתם ל
 20






 מבם המרדים והפושעים בי מאריץ מנוריהם אוציה אותם ואל אדמת ישראל לא יבואלם וידעתם בי אני יהוה: ואתם בית ישראל בה אמשר אדני יהוה איש גלולים 39


 קדשיכם: בריח ניחח ארצה אתבם בהוֹצ"א אתבם מן העט״ם וקבּצתּ התכם מן 41



 למען שעי לה כדרכיכם הרעים ובעלילוחיכם הנשהחתות בית ישראל נאם אדגי יהוה:
 והנבא עעל יער השדה ננבהם: ואברת ליער הגנב שםע דבר יהוה בה אמר אדני 3

[^0]




20,א 3.2
 +


 ת 7

 9

 12

 14
 בטבּ













 515 לע־בי גוים וידעת בי אני יהוה:





 שגבתי חמתי עליכם:

 25 חתן 26





 בראטֵם נתתי נאם אדגי יהוה:


 אמֵּלה תחת





21 4
 7．6
 פר 9

 12




2 2I，16 ויתן אתחה ליטובחז
לתבּי בת
הוא הוחרדה והת והיא מרטטה לתת אותה ביד הורג：

הרב הרב
הוהרה וגם מרצהּה：

－


17 וע ועק והילֵ בן אן
 בוֹ
 21
 24．23
 26 מלך ברב



29



 35 33 34 לה לֹ 36 37 באט 37 ע゙ ערת לאכלה דמך יהיה בתוך הארין לא תוכרי כי אנגי יהוה דברתי：

| バエ 24 （\％） | ＊ | ニッก 20 （3） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ל－anל 33 （ $r_{1}$ ） | ＊ |  |

 ＊ 28 （z） 27 （c）



 בן אדם כתוב לך את שם האום קה הוה טמך מלך בבל יעל ירושלם בעצם היזם 2


 10 בתוכה:


 לבלתי הפטות: לבן בה אמר אדני יהוה אאי עיר הדמים גם אני אגדיל המדורה: 9





 ויהי דבר יהוה אלי לאמרר : בן אדם הגני לקח ממך את מחמד עיניך שוא
 תעצשה בארךך חבוש עליך וגעליך תשים ברגליך ולא תעטה על עָּםם ולחם 18 אֵ 18
 רבר יהוה ההה אלי לאמר : אמר לביה ישיראל כה אמר אדגי יההה הנני מחלל 2 אה מקדשי נאון ע, איבם מחמד עיניכם ומחמל נםשכם ובניבם ובגותיכם אישר

 30 תעשו בצּה וירעהם בי אגי אדגי יהוה: ואתה בן אדם הלוא ביום קחתי מהם את מִיֶּם משׁוֹש תפּארתם את מחמד בה עיניהם ואת משׂא גפשם בניהם ובנותיהם: ביום ההוא יבוא הפליט אליך 26 להשׁמעות אוניִם: ביום ההוא יפתח פּך אתת הפליט ותרִבר ולא תַאלם עוד והיית 27 35 להם למוםת וידעו בי אגי יהוה:


ויהי דבר יהוה אלי לאמר: בן אדם שים פגיך אל בני עמון והנבא עליהם: א. 25 40 ואמרת לבני עמון שמעו דבר אדני יהוה כה אמר אדגי יהוה 'ען אמבך האת 3

…axi30035

*     * 

 ת 24.12 (\%)


 12



 18



 22
 ק״





 29
 32



 36 3 ועב



 14
 אוֹת ： 44





באריץ חים: בלהות אתמנך ואינך ותבקשׁי ולא תמצצא עוד לעולם נאם אדני יהוה: 21
ויהּ דבר יהוה אלי לאמר: ואתה בן אהדם שׂא על צר קאנה: ואמרת לצור א-27.3







 בני ארוַדם על חומותיך סביב וגמדים במגדלתיך היו שלטיהם תלו על חiמותיך 15 תרשיׁי סתרתך מרב כל הון בכסף ברול בדיל ועיפרח נתנו עובוניך: יץ 13.12 תובל ומשׁך המה למליך בנפשׁ אהם וכלי נחשת נתנו מערבך: מבית תונרמה 14

 o ובוּן וראמות וכדצּ נתנו בעובוניך: יהודה וארץץ ישראל המה רכליך בחשי מנית 17




 במכללים בגלוּע׳ תבלת וריקמה ובננוי ברמים בחבלים חבּשים וארוים יבם רכלתך":


 о


 בגיהאהם קינה וקוננו עליך

בתיך הים:

השׂבעת עמים רבים
העשוּת מלבי ארין:
בּב゙ּ ת

34

 מערבך וכל קחהּך


27,18 (з) וחריך •




 וידעת בי אני יההה:
9.S כה אמבר אדני יהוה יען אמר מואבצקא הנה ככל הגוים בית יהודה: למן הנגי פתח את כתף מואב אג מערים מקצהו צבי אריץ בית הישימות בעל מעון

 12

 עעי ישראל ועישו באדום באבי ובחמתי וידעו את נקבתי נאם אדני יהוה: שו 15 61 למשחת איבת עולם: לבן כה אמר אדני יהוה הנגי גוטה ידי על פלשתים 77 והברתי הת ברֵתים והאבדתי את שארית חוּ הים : ועשיתי בם נקמות גדלות בתוכִחות חמה וידעו כי אני יהוה בתהי את נקמתי בם:

 3 החָרבה: לבן בה אמר אדני יהוה הנני עלִיך צר והעליתי עלִיך גוים רבּים בהעֶלות
 ה לצחיח סלע: מעטםח חרמים תהיה כתוך הים בי אני דברתי נאם אדני יהוה
 7 בי כה אמר ארני יהוה הנגי מביא מל צל צר נבובדראיאר מלך בבל מצפון
 9 יהרג ונתק עליך דיק וישםך עליך פללה והקים עליך צנה: ומחי קבלו יתן בחמוחיך

 12 בל חוצוהתך עמך בחרב יהרג ומצבות עיךך לארין תרד: ושלללו הילך ובוזו רבֵלתך
 44 המון שיריך וקול כנוריך לא יצממע עוד: ונתתיך לצחיח סלע משםח חרמים תהיה לא הבנה עוד בי אני יהוה דברתי נאם אדני יהוה:
 16 17 רקקמתם יפשעו חרדות ילבשו על האריץ ישבו וחרדו לרגעים ושממו עליך: ונשאוא עליך

קינה ואמרו לך

40





 ב
כי כה אמר אדני יהוה מקץ ארבעׁם שנה אקקבּן את מצרים מן העטםם 13

 על הנוים והשעשתים לבלתי רדות בגוים: ולא יהּה עוד לבבית ישראל למבצח 16 סו מזכיר עֶּן בתנותם אתריהם וידעו ב׳ אגי אדגי יהוה:
 בן אדם נבוכדראיצר מלך בבל העביד את החל עבזה נדולה יעל צר כל ראשו 18



 בים ההוא אצממח קרן לבית ישראל ולך המהן פִתחחון פה בתובם וידעו כי 21


ההּ ליום: בי קרוב יום וקרוב יעם ליהוה יום עען עח נוים יהיה: ובאה חרב 4.3 בשצרים והיתה חַלחתלה בכוּש בנםל חלל במצרים ולקחו המנגוּ ונהרםו יסודותיהֶ:


יהוה: ונשמאו בתוך ארצות נשמות ועריו בתוך ערים נתרבות תה״ינה: וידע כי 8.7




 ומלאה ב'ד ורים אני יהוה דברתי:





 19
 40 40 ויהי באתח עשרה שנה בראישון בשבעה לתדש היה דבר יהוה אלי לאמר: =



28,2.א
 4.3

6
 9.S


12.11




 אי אלהים ואבדך

 19 לעיצ בל ראֹך: בל יודעיך בעם ם שממו עליך בלהוח הית ואימך ער עולם:
22.ב

 בחרב עליה מסבּב וידעו כי אני יהוה:
25 24 24 אותם וידעו ב׳ אני אדני יהוה: בקו


 30

ארם מסביבותם וידעו כי אני יהוה אלהיהם:
29,2.\% 3



 6 7
 9


*     *         * 


 9 －






 תקונפה אותחה נאם אדני יהוה

 15 תחתיות את יורדי בור：



 20
 בור：








： 7 MT

## ＂an

ויהי דבר יהוה אלי לאמר：בן אדם דבר אל בני עמך ואמרת אליהם אריץ א． 33.3 בי אביאה עליה חרב ולקחו עם האריץ ציֵּ אחד מקציהם ונתגו אתו להם לצפּה： וראה את החרב באה על האריץ ותקע בשופר והאהתר את העם：ושמע השלמע 4.3 את קול השוּבר ולה נוהר ותבוא חרב ותקחהו דמו בראשוֹ יהיה：הת קול ה

30,22
 הת זרעעת מלך בבל ונתתי את חרבי בידו ושברתי את זרעות פרעה ונאק נאקות והחזקתי את זרעיעת מלך בבל ורעעות פרעה תפלנה

בה חלל לפניו:

26 31,0 ב 2 3 4





 לכן בה אמר אדעי יהוה יען אישר גבהי בקומה ויתן צםרתו אל בין עבותיםי:



 עבּתים בל ששתי מים בי כלֶם נתגו למות אל אריץ תחתית בתוך בני אדם אל

ירדי בור:





 בתוך ערלים השיבב את חללי חרב הוא פרעה ובל המוניקו נאם אדעי יהוה:
 32,*







 ועל כל גבעה רמה ועל כל פני הארץץ נפצוגזו ואין דורש ואין מבקש: לכן רעים 7

 וירעי הרעים אותב ואת צלאני לא רעעו: לכן הרעים שמעו דבר יהוה: כה אהבר 9.


ירעו עוד הרעים אותם והצלתי צאני מציהם ולא תהיץן להם לאבלה:


 והביאותים אל אדמתם ורעיתים עעל הרי ישראל באפיקים ובכל מושבי הארץ:

 15 יהוה: את האבדת אבקש ואת הנדחתת אשׁב ולנשברת אחבש ואת החהלה אחהק 16
 יהוה הנני שפע בין שׂה לשה לאילים ולעהתודים: הממעם מבם המרעה המוב 18


33.6
 דוא בעֵּנו נלקח ודמו מ״ד הצפה אדרשׁ: 7 S




 12

 14






21 21

 24 בה אברהם ציי־



 82 ובמעֶרות ברָּבר ימותו: ונתת
 2

 בעבוּ
 33

 3



והרבית התו ולה אהא עליכם רעב: והרביתי הת פרי העץ ותנובת השרה למען 36,





 בצורות ישׁׁב: ויזע הגוים אושר יאשארו סביבותיכם כי אני יהוהה בניתי הנהרסות 36 נםעתי הנשםה אני יהוה דברתי ועשׁת ית 0 10 כצהאן אדם: כצאן קדשים בצהּ ירושלם במועדיה קן תהזינה הערים החֵרבות 38 מלֵהות צאן אדם וידעו בי אמי יהוה:
 עצמות: והעבירני עליהם סביב סביב והנה רבות מהד על פני הבקעה והנה 2 5 ידעת: ויאמר אלי הנבא על העצמות האלה ואמרת אליהם העצמות היבשׁות 4 שטמע דבר יהוה: כה אמר אדני יהוה לעצמות האלה הנה אני מביא בכם רוח ה ז וח"תם: ונתתי עליבם גידים והעלתי עליבם בשר וקרמתי עליבם עור ונתתי 6
 00 וי"קרםם עליהם עור מלמעלה ורוח אין בהם: ויאמר אלי הנבא אל הרוח המבא אדם ואמרת אל הרוח כה אמו אדני יהוה מארבע רוחות באּ דרוח ופחי
 רנליהם חיל גדול מאד מאד: ויאמר אלי בן אדם העצמות האלה כל בית ישרואל 11
 אליהם כה אמר אדני יהוה הנה אני פתח את קברותיכם והעליתי אתכם
 את קברותיבם ובהעלותי אתכם מקברותיבם וסם: ונתהי רוחי בבם וחייתם והנחתת 14 אתבם על ארמתכם וידעתם כי אני יהוה דברתי ועשיתי נאם ידוה : 30

 אליך בני עמך לאמר הלוא תג:ד לנו מה אלה לך לד: דבר אלאיהם כה אמר אדני 19
 35





by 12 ( 7 )
[ 17 (\%)
71y (ג) * Tלロל $22(x)$
b 7 ( $\beta$ )


| * |  | (a) א א אוה |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ワy | 13 (6) |
| םกุ¢\% ( ${ }^{\text {( }}$ | - | את | 19 (r) |

 12


13 לגו נתנו לאבלה: ותגדילם עלי בפּךם והעתרתים עלי דבריךים אני שמעעהי: 14.14 14
 36, ב בה אמר אדגי יהוה יען אמר האויב עליכם האח -שמ־מות עללם למורשה האתה 3
 הרי ישרואל שמעו דבר אדני יהוה כה אמגר אדגי יהוה להרים ולגבעעת לאפּקים
 ה ה השר מסביב: לכן כה אמר אדני יהוה אם לא באש קגבהּ דברתי על שארית
 6 ולגבעה לאשּקים ולגאיות כה אמר אדני יהוה הגני בקנאתי ובחמתי דברחי 'ען 7 בלמת גוים נישאתם: לבן כה אמר אדני יהוה אגי נשׂאתי את ידי אב לא הגוים
 9 , וגורעתם: והרביהי עליכם אדם כל בית ישרואל בלֹה וגשִבו הערים והחחבות 20 וו תבינה: והרביהי עליכם אדם ובהמה ורבו ופרו והוֹשבת אתבם בקדמותיכם
 ישראל וירשוּך והי״ת להם לנחלה ולת תוסף, שו לשבּלם:







 22

 24 התכם מן הגוים וקבּצתי אתכם מכל הארצות והבאתי אתכם אל אדמתהבם: בה וזרקתי עליכם מים טהורים וטהרתם מבל טממאותיכם ומכל גלוּליבם אטֵהר אתבם:




(8) שית 35 לנחלת בית ישראל
(仓) ( 36.9 לה

35 36.7 (\%)

 נתריך לאבלה: על פני השׂה תפול ב׳ אני דברתי גאם אדבי יהוה: ושלֹתתי ה. 6
 5


 יבבערו איש ושללו את שללליהם ובאו את בוזהם נאם אדני יהוה: 10 וקברו שםם את נוג ואת כל המזנה וקראו ניא המון גוג: וקברום בית ישראל 12 למען טַהר התה הארין שבעה חדשים: וקברו כל עם האריץ והיה להם לשם יום 13
 על פני הארץ לטהרה מקצה, שבעה חדשׁים יחקרו: ועברי העברים באריץ וראה טו


הארין:
ואתה בן אדד בה אמר אדגי יהוה אמר לצפור כל בגך ולכל חחת השרה 17

 20
 נאם אדני יהוה 21
 25
 : ETמ リコ

 30
 אותם אל הגוים וכנםתים אל אדמתם ולא הוהיר עוד מהם שםם: ולא אמתיר 29








 26 ובני בניהם ער עולם ורוד עבדי נשיא להם לעולם: וכרחּ להם ברית שלום ברית עולם יהיה אותם ונתהים והרביתי אותם ונתתי את מקדשי בתוכם ליצולם: 5 28.27 והיה מעבני עליהם והייהי להם לאלהים והמה יהי לי לעם: וידעו הגוים ב׳ אני


38,2.*
 4




 :

 12


 וצמדרה לגוג כה אמר אדני יהוה הלוא ביום ההוא בשָׁבת עם י ישראול לבטח



17
 19 בים בוא גונ על אדמת ישראל נאם אדגי יהוה תעלה חמתי באצּי: ובקנאתי 30

 ובל האדם אוּשר על פגי האדמה וגהרסו ההרים ונפלו המדרַגות וכל חומה לאריץ 21
 23 רבּם וּ
39,*

 (3)

האלה וחלוינות לו קלאלמאי סביב סביב צוֹך חממשים אמה ורחב חמש ועשרים 40
 מעל

שלחנות מפו ושנים שלחנות מפהּ לשחוט עעליהם העולה ודחטהת והאֶשם: ואל מ דבתתף מחוצהם לפתח השעור הצפונה שנים שלתנות ואל הכתף האחרת השור 41 לאללם השער שנים שלחנות: ארבעה שלחנות מצּה וארבעעה שלחנות מפה לכת


 סביב יאתל השלחנות ללםבשׂר הקרבן:

 וידבר אלי זה הלִשְׁבה אשׁר פניָּה דרך הדרום לבהנים שמרי משמִרת הבית: מה
 הקרֶבים מבני לוי אל יהוה לשֵׁרתו:
וימד את החצר אֹרך מאה אמה ורחב מאה אמה מרבּעת והמזבח לפני 47 הבית:
 20 ולחב השער >ארבע עשדוה אמה וכתפות השערז שלש אמות עפו ושלש אמות
 אליו ועעמרים אל האילים אחד מפלה ואחד מפה:


25 מפו וימר ארפו ארבעים אמהה ורחב עשׁרים אהמה:

הפתח שבע אמותח: וימד את ארטו עשרים אםה ורחב עשרים אמה אל פני 4 ההיכל ויאמר אלי זוה קדש הקדשם: וימד קיר הבית שש אמוֹת ורחב הנַלע ארבע אמוּת סביב סביב לבית סביב: ה 30

 וּעּ לבית גבּוֹ סביב סביב מגםסדות הצלעוה מלו הקנה שש אמות אמצילה:
 ב־״

הםגח חמשׁ אמות סביב סביב:

40 חמשׁ אמות רחב סביב סביב וארמו תשׁׂים אמה:
ומרד את הבית ארך מאה אמה והגְּרה והבּבִּיה וקירותיה ארך מאה אמה: 13
(y) (y)
(9) לחיכונה
(3) (\% \% על פן לחב לבית למעלה
(2) (90.0

 בל צשו אתה ראה לבית ישרדאל：

 6



 12.11

 טו
 האיליהםי לפגימה לשצור סביב סביב וכן לאלם אחלונות סביב סביב לפנימה 15


 91 הרצפה התחתונה：וימד רחב מלפני השעו התחתונה לפני החצר הפנימי מחוץ

ב ב ״ 21


 24 בה האלה：וחלונים לי ולא＂למו סביב סביב בהחלנות האלה חמשׁים אמה ארך

 －
2S

 ומעלוה שמונה מעלם
32

 ומצו ושלגנה מעלות מעלגם ו：




רוח הצבון חמשׁ מאות>x
 רוחות מרדים חומה לו סביב סביב ארך חמש מאות ורחב חמש מאות להבתיל בין הקדש לחלל :

 כמראה אֹビ

 0



 15 בתוכם לעולם:


 ואת כל חקקתי ועשׂו אות 20 תורת הבית:









 ונתיגו< על ארבע קרנת








4 4 אתכם נצם ארני יהוה:


4 41 ，ט．14

 デン
 ופּ 19


 22
 השלחן אישר לפני יהוה：


 15 כתפות האוּלםx：

42，א ב






 ברה



I2 13
 קדשׁ＂הקדשׁם והמנחה והחטאת והאיָּם כי המקים קדש：־



| －＊ | 5y מ\％ $\mathrm{y}_{7}$（\％）＊ | תוםב |  | ＊ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| － 24 （9） | ＊กilu 2x（ $\mathrm{r}_{1}$ ） | ＊（\％） | ＊ |  | ה |



 （ ）

－ק（
 הבהמה לא יאכלו הכהגים:
ובהפילבם את האריץ בגחלה תרימו תרומה ליההה קדש מן האריץ אֹרך א,


 מקום לבתים וילמנרם טים:

 סו חמשת אלפים רחב וארך חמשה ועצשרים אלך לעעמת תרומת הקדיש לכל בית



 כה אמר אדני יהוה רב לבם נשׂאי ישר






 לבפר עליהם גאם אדגי יהוה: כל העם קזם יהי אל התרומה האת לגשיא בישראלאל: 16 17
 בעד בית ישיראל:
כה אמר אדגי יהוה בראישון באחד לחדש תקח פר בן בקר תמים וחטאת 18
צת המקדש: ולקח הכהן מדם החשצאת ונתן על משוחת הבית ועיל ארבע פגוּת 19
 30

 התג יעשה עולה ליהוה שבעת פרים ושבעת הילים חמימים ליום שבעת הימים



 מחוץ ועמד על מחוחת השיער ועשו הכהגים את עולתי ואת שלמי והשהתחוה על
 ההוה בשׁבתות ובחדשים לתני יהוה: והעלה השר יקרב הנשׁה ליהוה בֵם 4

 3 והיה סנור: אדך הנשיאק הוא ישב בו לאבול לחם לפני יהוה מדרך אולם השער יבוא ומדרבו ״צּ
4

 למבוא הבית בבל מוצהי המקרש: 6 7 הועבתיבם בית ישראל: בהביאבם בגי נַבר ערלי לב וערלי בשר להיות במקדשי
 s.9 ולא שמרתם משמדת קדשי ותשימוים לשמרי משמרתי במקדשים לבּ ו כה א

 שעערי הבית ומשׁׂרתים את הבית המה ישחטו את העלה ואת הזבח לעם והמה




 ישרּאל מעלי המה יקרבו אלי לשרתתֵּ ועמרו לפני להקריב לי חלב ודם נאם 16 אדבי יההה: המה יבאו אל מקדשי והמה יקרב: אל שלאחי לשרתני וישמרו את 17 משׁמרתי: והיה בבואם אל שעׁרי החצר הפנימת בנדי פִּשתים ילבשו ולה יעלה


 = בנדים המרים ולא יקדישו את העם בבגדיהם: וראישם לה נללחו ופרע:ם לה
 2230




 לֹשִּרה בקדשׁ ,קיקיב חטאתו גאם אדני יהוה:
28
 ל וראשיׁת כל בבורי בל וכל תרומת כל מבל תרומותיבם לכהגים יהיה ורה השית


 ועלַהּ לתרוּה:

 הארין ההאות לבם בנחלה:


 10


תאת ת'מנה גנבח:



ישראל אתבם צִּםּלו בגחלה בתוך שבטי ישראל: והיה בשבט אושר גר הגר 23 אהּ שם תהנו נחלתו נאם אדני יהוה:

20




25 'יהודה אחד:
ועל גבול יהודה מבאת קדים יער פאת ימה תהּה התרומה אצוֹר תדימו 8




 בשׁמרח ה"
 הבהנים חמשה ועשרים אלק אורך ולחב עשרת אלפים קהבל ארך חמשה ועשרים 35 ההארין כי קדש ליהוה:
וחמשּת אלתים הגותר ברחב על פני חמשה ועשרים אלף חל הוא לעיר טו
 וארבעת אלפים וםאת נגב חמשׂל מאות וארבעה אלפים ומפאת קדים חמש מאות
04 וארבעת אלפים ופאת 'מה חמשי מאות וארבעת אלפים: והיה מגריש לעיר צפונה 17

 \% 15 (:)




 ：




ודגש゙











 19 19




 24




 4
 35 ל 35 ． 6
 הקדמוגה וירדו על הערע゙ 9


－ $5 \times 4$（3）

（\％） 7 （\％）
470（9）

47心（i）



## - Eritical @lotee on EzcRic\&

I (1-3) A double introduction, the history of which is uncertain. V. I has been regarded as a fragment (initial $ו$ ) olscure by reason of the loss of what once preceded it (Spinoza, Tract. Thicol:I'ol. 10, 12.13). It may be in a sense a fragment, but is not on that account necessarily spurious; of. Jer. I, 4 , in which the erefers not to w. 1-3, but to some fact in the writer's mind, or to some utterance not recorded. MIRRX (JPT 9,73) thinks that the verse is misplaced, belonging by its date ( $30^{\text {oth }}$ year) after $29,17: 27^{\text {th }}$ year). Cornilt rejects it on account of the supposed strangeness of the expression ואוּ (but this is the regular form of introduction of the subordinate explanatory claus( $\%$, the supposed incorrectness of to בתוך הגילה (but the bank of the river was among the captiates, 3,15), and the initial י. According to EWALD W. 2.3 interrupt the connection; but, as they give a necessary chronological datum, they must be regarded as an insertion by the I'rophet himself. The two v . (omitting $3^{\text {b }}$ ) have in fact the appearance of a gloss on $\times .1$. The expression on the fifth of the month (in which the month itself is 15 strangely omitted) seems to be quoted and explained, the name of the I'rophet is given, and the Chebar is described as being in Chaldea. Such a statement is usually (as in Jeremiah) prefixed to the prophecy; here it is inserted in the middle of a sentence, and is better taken out of the text and placed in the margin. See PrTLRS, Journ. Bibl. Lit., Vol. 2, Part 1, Pp. 38.40 and WiNckler, AT Cher 20 suihungeh, 1892, pp. 94 y6]. Peturs further, from (5 kai è'eveto, ac utely takes
 from r. 1. This, indeed, presupposes an insersion of the order of the glosses, and it may be simpler to take $\quad$ (which is ignored by $\mathbf{3 3}$ ) as doublet of follow. ing היהּ (so CORN.), but then the kui Ey'veto is not accounted for. CORN., though 25 he omits v.1, adopts from it and inserts ( v , 2) the number of the month ( $¥ ン=7$ ). Hau'r suggests that the ' same verse; this gives a natural conneetion between text and glens, but (if - or
 which more naturally -
In $113^{\text {b }}$,
 ful. 'The omission of $12.2 .3^{3}$ is strongly favored by the fact that elsewhere throughout the Book ( 24,24 is not really an exception) the I'roplet writes in the first person.
The number thirfy in verse 1 must be left as an unsolved problem. It is Erck.

 מכל שבטי ישׂראל:







27 ועל גבול ובולן מפאת קדִמה עד פאת ימה גד אחד: 28 נחלה עיד הים הגדול:
29 תהת האריץ אשר תפּלו יבנחלה לשבטי ישרהל ואלה מחלקתם גאם אדני יהוה:
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וארבעת אלבּים מִּה ושערים שלשה שער שמעון אחר שער ישׁושכר אחר שער
34
 יהוה שמה:


(9) The last three words of $\mathrm{v}$..8 and the whole of $v .9$ in fll consist of marginal annotations, and of phrases repeated from the following context (vv. 10-12). a it imilar title to var. il ; or, the last three words of $v .8$ form a title to $v v$. 1o. II. The text of © is simpler: kai $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \circ \dot{\sigma} \sigma \pi \alpha$
 тoû $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{\text { untou }}$ aủtûv Emapeúovto. But this also secms to be repctition from v.12, and here interrupts the description. See Corn., Winckiler, Altorient. Forsch., Bertholet.
(10) The verse is unsymmetrical and incomplete in form: we expect in connection 10 with each face the designation of direction, and the expression onszast. This last is lacking after the first face, and only two directions (right and left) are given. To supply another, Wellh. (in Smfni) changes inzuards, which, however, is hardly appropriate (מאחור would be more natural), and is not here in the right place. CORN., further, after the first face (aTא) inserts 15 . מקרם. It is better to leave Al as it is, or to make a complete conjectural reconstruction (so Siegfried in Kautzsch). Grätz inscrts מאחור after adia after נּ. Adopting these forms we may further insert לאוּ in the description of the first face; Siegfr., rendering freely, and Wincklier (see note on v. 6) omit the ' לאר לה throughout.
Al ופניהם, © , © is scribal repetition from v.9.
 tion in 8.9 ; the $e v$ of 1 Il, an easy corruption, is impossible.
(12) 111 insha, ^(J, perhaps scribal complement.

Al מראיהם is a change made to bring the expression into accord with Read的 with
 repetition of preceding $n$.
 torch-like coals of fire, introduced by the usual sin; sce l'rters, loc. cit. The fem. participle may agree with $\nsim \mathbb{\infty}$, and the note may have been intended for that word (but cf. Hirz.). The coals appear, however, from 10,2, not to have been in motion; the annotator perhaps had in mind the flashes of lightning. © $\mathbb{G}$ omits $x \because$, and makes the participle plural, as explanatory of areb, which is masc. (but 3 cf. Jud. 4, 4).
 אוצי, but the infs. abs. are difficult; בוּ is for Pe motion described is improbable.
 vision is the net the nem,
Similarly atl whon (though so found by (6) is to be corrected after 10,9 (and so 1,16 ), to ארבעה אופנים.
 and inappropriate; each wheel stood not by one of the faces, but by one of the 45 creatures. CORN. suggests that the error came from a form joniza (o corrected to b, but not deleted) to which the following I was attached; so from
(16) To prefix ו, with (6).
$111+$ (first occurrence), $\wedge^{(6,}$, scribal addition lacking in ro, 9 , out of keeping with the following clause.

4ll wn, masc.; read fem. 50
Al alm, ^(b, perhaps scribal complement, after preceding clanse; but of. 10, 10. It may have been omitted by from its similarity to the following word.


I not probable that the verse gives any other reckoning than that which is found everywhere else in the Book, that is, from the deportation of Jehoiachin. But the date thirtieth year is too late: c. 8, which presupposes the vision of c. I, falls in the $6^{\text {th }}$ year; the conclucling section, cc. $40-48$, in the $25^{\text {th }}$ year; and 29,17 ( $27^{\text {th }}$ year) is merely an added remark. May it be that V . I did not originally give the year, which was then supplied by a scribe in 1.2 , and later got into V. I in corrupt form? Possibly, also, an original $\boldsymbol{\pi},=5$, was changed into $b,=30$;
 The change to 30 may be the emendation of a scribe to bring the 70 years of Jer. 25,11 into accord with the qo years of Ezek. 4,6 (cf. Bertholet ad loc.). 10 If thiry be retained, it must be understood as referring to a Babylonian epoch rather than to the finding of the Book of the Law (2 K 22), e.c. 621 .
 The Gramd Camal. It occurs on a contrict tablet from Nippur (SE of Babylon), dated in the $41^{\text {th }}$ year of Artaxerves I., $4^{\text {th }}$ day of the $1^{\text {st }}$ month, i.e. March $+2+15$ B.C. It may have been the present Shet! en-Nत̂l, the large navigable canal (about 120 feet wide) which divides the mounds of Nippur into two approximately even halves. See Gesen.-Buhl ${ }^{13}$, p. xi and of. English Transtation of Ezekich, p. 93, 11. 16 ff. - 1'. H.]
(4) Before ע insert ; with (G. In the order of the details © differs from An, but 20 offers no adrantage over it.
 3 iniolzichs. On a possible stem prig gleam or burn see P. Rupen, Crit, Remarks (London, 1896), p. 15.



 sense: a general haman form was impressed on them. For defense of this sense see Hitzig and Cornill.
(6) All לa, (6, superfuous, and perhaps better omitted. © adds a computation of the whole number of faces (64) and sides (256). Winckiliz, Altorient. Forsch., 1,347-349, omits $r \cdot 6^{2}$ as gloss, on the ground that the creatures cannot have more than one face each; but why cannot this freedom be allowed a vision?
(7) : 411 שור (Winckler).

 Chald. I'B.); A, orpórruhov. It is doubtful, however, whether © and $A$ here rest on a Heb, text different from that of 117 ; they may give free renderings of $\{1$, or they may have taken exception (as does Corn., who reads $-\operatorname{b}_{2} y$ to the intro- 40 duction of an animal which was associated with idolatry (a sacrificial animal, however, Lev. 9,2 . Hirz. omits the clatuse as lacking in $\mathbb{G}^{2}$, doubtful in form, and interrapting the unity of vy. 6.7.

 reyards $\mathfrak{G}$ ail $\pi$ tépuyes aủrûv as representing asיsis, and adopts this reading (their wings were like shining bronze). But © here has part., as ill, and the
 be proved to be Hebrew.
Sll לhp, only here and Dan. 10,6, a word of doubtful origin; © apparently EEa- 50 otpimtuv, ¿2 shining; ? candentis. CORN, identifies it with the exappai
 that the verse is deating with.
 tion from the preceding and succeeding context.
(26) After weכ insert עליץ, with $\mathfrak{G}$, and omit the same word further on in the verse.

 Ill, perhaps scribal omission in ©. In any case the impossible | a must be |
| :---: | changed to $\begin{aligned} & \text { ajo, after the last clause of the verse; the fire is not within the }\end{aligned}$ ashmal, but encloses it ( $\cdot$. f). The $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. $\mathbf{Z}$ comes from an Aramaizing scribe. Grätz טביה.

2 (1) [For bin jof. Wellhausex, Shizzen und lobarbciten, part 6 (Berlin, 1809), 10 p. 196. - I'. 11.]
 the מרבר משו (6) found bp.

 whote, and the plur. occurs in Eizek. ( 35,$10 ; 37,22$, but not $36,13.14$ ) for the two branches of the nation; but the plur. is not used for the nation as a wholc. The word was inserted by an editor, perhaps on account of the following plur. part.
All mpir Corn. writes ins, unnecessarily.

(4) $41+2$ ל liy omitting a different set of words we might read the fathers rebelled against me, and the childrich are stubborn \&ic. The present text of stl seems to have arisen from a coalescence of two parallel readings.

(5) Instead of thl betcer, for after the statement thou art a prophet the in thicir midst would be unnecessary and unnatural.
 apparently assimilation to the form of the latter part of the verse.

 poses 'se ( 21,3 ; Prov, 16,27).

(7) Defore ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{p}$ insert $\boldsymbol{n} \beth$, here necessary. So $\mathbb{G}$ : $\mathbb{\mathbb { E }} \mathrm{\varepsilon} \%$.
(8) (! ! against the connection.
(9) Ill $\because$, referring to 7 , is strange, though 7 is masc. in one other place (Ex. 17, 12); we should probably read az.
(10) :31 היה. is introduced by 6 only in Jer. 30,$2 ; 36,2 ; 51,60$, and in these passages also we should write $6 y$. Before 7 oo the usual preposition is 2 , as in Ezek. 13, 9.
 (Orbtht), of which it is perhaps an imitation. © achat is sizen thee receiore, what is avituten in this rell, a paraphrase of All.
(2) At $+\boldsymbol{n} \pi$, , ( J , scribal repectition from preceding versc.
 verls as Qal and Nif., a good sense, though hardly preferable to sll.
The apparently Aramaizing should probably be pointed hzor.
 nally energic), ats in Ex.9,18; Num. 32,42; Jer. 44, 19; Job 31,22; the accents
divection of；the two prepositions appear to lawe been confused by seribes in the later language． 6 follows All ．
The こnコン2 of clause ${ }^{2}$ is omitted in $\mathfrak{f}$ ，perhaps by confusion with the second occur． rence of the cxpression；though not necessary，it is proper．
（18）The original reading of $v .18^{\text {a }}$ has been variously expanded by scribes here and

 ing גנב ； こnこม（an crroneous grammatical form）is repctition of jaコン；cf．J．P．PETERS，

 ＇ 1 ，a reading which does not take sufficient account of 10,12 ．
（20）Ill לy；write $5 \times$ ，as in V． 12.
 gible．
 which is better than 41 ，but has unnecessary repetition，the full description of the motion of the wheels being given in v．21；the concluding formula，however，may well be repeated．
For sing．- rin，here and vv．21．22，write plur．，as the connection suggests； 20 the sing．Was understood by the Versions to mean life；in $v .22$ they have plural．
（21）Ill axewn is lacking in（ 6 ，except（6Mr 88 ，and might be omitted，especially as it is inserted also after Ėாopev่ovto（cf． 1,30 ）in some（5 codd．（H－P 106．147．198）．
（22）The insertion of $=(5 \omega \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{i})$ before $\underset{\sim}{ } \boldsymbol{P}$ ？is required by the whole tone of the de－ 25 scription；the rendering of RV ，zias the likeness of a firmament，is syntactically impossible．The omission of the $=$ in $s l l$ is due to a realistic scribe who took the floor of the chariot to be the real（CORNILL）．
［The combination of $\pi$ np irystal with Assyr．Firau＇fortification＇is，of course，im－ possible；nor is it certain that the first stem－consonant of the Assyrian word is a 30 P ；in fact，it secms to be at ；if．DeL．HIV $353^{b}$ ．－P．H．］
$41+N \rightarrow 1, \wedge^{(5,}$ ，out of keeping with the tone of the context，addition by a scribe in the interests of mystery；perhaps after $\because I S$ ．
 on the heads of the תיד．
23）All nine，apparently constr：pragh $=$＇${ }^{\prime}$ ，
 after v．I1，תาדา

 in $\mathfrak{r} 11$ ）．Read $\varepsilon \pi$ ． changing שִּ might be regarded as explanatory gloss after 1.11 ．
24．Tis is to be inserted before＇$\because$ ，after 10,5 ．This and the following five words are omitted by 6 V ；whether they belong to the original，or are the insertion of a 45 scribe，is uncertain；cf． 3,13 ．
All -6 was read occurs elsewhere only Jer． 11,16 ，where（ 5 also（ $\pi \in \rho$ торйs）found it； 3 multi－ fudinis gives the early Rabbinical interpretation．It may be a scribal error for inn，or a collateral form of this latter．As the evidence stands，it seems safer 5 not to reject it；it is omitted by Merx，Jl＇T 9，69，Corn．，Siegrr．；but Corn． rutains it in Jer．11，16．© has katémauov $=$ Qal -3 ， 2 ，here the preferable read－ ing，since，as CORN．remarks，elsewhere（see v．17）the masc．verb is used with non．
 need to point as lolel（after Ezr．9，3－4）．
（16）Ill $\pi \Pi_{\text {；}}$ write $\pi n$ ，as in the Prophets generally，and everywhere else in Ezek．， 26,$1 ; 29,17 \mathrm{ct} \mathrm{al}$ ；the xpes in the middle of the verse perhaps led a scribe to make a new beginning（CORN．）．GRÄtz，taking the＇D as sign of a lacuna，would supply arme but this seems improbable．
（IS） 41 nan，for which（6）（日avatw日inn）seems to have had nbin，which is the legal plrase，and of．18，13；but the Prophet may have varied his phraseology．
41 ＋，ולא הזהרהו，tautologous，and，from comparison of 33,8 ，better omitted． Corn．（against（5）writes ולות ，that is，if he do not accept the divine ziarning； 10 but the point here and in c． 33 is manifestly the effect of the l＇rophet＇s warning． Before 41 רשׁ（first occurrence）insert article．
All
（19）הרשע ההוא 6，הרשעה הוא ，The verse should perlaps be emended after 33，9； it has the appearance of having been expanded by scribes．The עun of $\$ 1$ should 15 have the article．
（20），4ואא תוז＇צדק，Cokn．as being unsupported by the parallelism；but it seems to be in kecping with the context．
 to be a gloss，and the 1 should be retained（against（6）．

All the statement that the righteous man，if he sin，shall die（kituss，CORN．）．Read
 correction to avoid the statement that a righteous man，though warned，might sin 25 and dic．The reading is old，being given by（ 5 ．
（22）ill + 咪，${ }^{\text {（ }}$（ $;$ a reference to the place inclicated in $v .15$ would here be too re－ motc．
 form of tll may be scribal change to avoid an unpleasant anthropomorphism． 30 Read in and jomos．（GI have pass．（סedovedul，data），which may be free render－ ing of all ；CORN．נת．

（1）CORN．arranges the verses of c． 4 in the following order： $4 \cdot 5 \cdot 6 \cdot[\wedge] \cdot 8 \cdot 9 \cdot 12 \cdot 13 \cdot 35$ 14．15．1．2．3．10．11．16．17，meaning to separate sharply the two symbolic acts （the siege of the city，and the bearing of the nation＇s sin）：but it sccms to be the l＇rophet＇s purpose to combine the two．In CoRN．＇s arrangement iv．IO．II are out of place，since they do not naturally connect themselves with $\mathfrak{r}$ ． 3 though they might well stand before $1: 16$ ），and in $v .4$ ，with which he begins，the 40 introductory 0 א $\mathfrak{j} \boldsymbol{j}$ is wanting．See note on $v .12$ ．
［ajab means here，of course，a clay fablet，not tile（Al＇）or Zieselslein（SunirRIED
in Kaut\％scII；of．BERTHOLET ad loc：and sec English Translation of lizekich， 1． 98, II． 37 ก1．－P．11．］
sll＋abelv s，gloss（though found in all Versions）．
（2）［099 has no connection with $=$ lamb；the babylonian battering engine had no ram＇s head like the Roman arietes；see English Translation of lizekity，p．103， 1．6．The stem scems to be 9 ＝Assyr．kanim＇o pull down，destroy＇Drit． HW $355^{\text {b }}$ ；contrast MEtSSNER＇s Supplement，p． $50^{\text {b }}$ ）or 92 may be $=$ Assyr．Kidmu ＇wall＇（I）Et．H1W＇ $349^{\text {b }}$ ）．－P．11．］
（3）B⿱̈r notes that התמביצ（with final $\pi$ ）occurs only here；the - is not original．
（4）Ill $\operatorname{rby}^{2} \ldots$ ．．．刀nt ；read，with CORN．，rxus，and $\quad y$ ，in accordance with $4^{b} \cdot 5 \cdot 6$ ；the attitude prescribed by ill is impossible．Whish，（in SMINH）reads rom and

3 in these places are some disjunctive some conjunctive. 'Cf. Beitr. z. Assyr. 1,10, - I'. H.]
 hardly insertion from Ex. 4, 10, rather it is a familiar expression.
 the whole context; it could be retained only by inserting before it $\mathrm{ck}^{\circ}$ ב.
 as repetition from $\because 5$; it is, however, a natural and probably original repetition.

$41+\mathbb{H}$ after A , which yields no satisfactory sense; neither the adversative (but) 10 nor the strong asseverative rendering is here in place. Better omit $\mathbf{K}^{2}$, with $\mathfrak{G}$ \& (SMEND); or, with Griitz, write 1h, $_{\text {, and take the clause as expressing unreal condi- }}^{\text {and }}$ tion; only the statement foreign peoples would hear brings out the contrast of v. 7. The apodosis here is without introductory 1; cf. Drivir, Tenses, c. 11. For defense of rendering but for st Ex, see Hirz. D. H. Mülle:R (Ezech..Stud., 15 p. 30) renders If $I$ (emphatic) had not semt thee to them, they would hear thec, i.e., they would receive the Prophet as friend, but not as divine messenger. But the text does not emphasize the pronoun, nor is this conception found elsewhere in prophetic writings. [ $\times$ b $=$ th forsooth; see p. 63, 1. 42. - 1'. H.]
(8) 11 prm , © кatioxúow, adopted by CORN. S has verbs for both adjectives of zo the verse.
(9) מהתּ מִצְחה , (6. It is a natural complementary expression, and so far suspicious; but it is in Ezekiel's manner.
(11) All אדג, , (6. On divine names in Ezekiel see Corn., Ezech. 172-5. The choice of names appears to be in general so arbitrary that 1 confine myself to noting 25 the differences between fl and $\mathbb{G}$.
(12) בּוּ inappropriate Al ביוך. Latter may be scribal corruption; MERX (JP'T 9,75) and Geiger (C'rschrift 318) regard it as intentional change to aroid an unworthy conception of JHvH, apb, according to Merx, being taken as =dioinity, and 30 the verse thus seeming to say that God put off His Godhead. But 'st is used in Rabbin. literature not for divinity, but as a paraphrase for God (see Shabb. $13^{\mathrm{b}}$, and the references in Buxt. Lex:), and such a usage is improbable for Ezekiel's time. D. H. Mưllev (Ezech.-Stued, p. I6) thinks that fll is sustained by the $\operatorname{mon}^{2}$ of Is. 6,3.4, and that Ezekiel below lays stress rather on $x=2 \pi$ than 35 on $\begin{aligned} & \text { ד. But this does not relieve the text of its difficulties, or recognize the bear- }\end{aligned}$ ing of 10,4 on it.
(13) (5) kai ïbov quvinv, where ibov seems to be for isoú (ff. 1,25) which is here possible, but unnecessary.

(14) Al ות ות וn it is, however, no less fitting than $x: y$, and of. 2,2;11,1.
II + מ, . $\mathscr{G}^{\mathrm{V} s, \text {, is inappropriate - the l'rophet is neither bitter nor sudd, only }}$ greatly moved; but might naturally be inserted by a scribe. Many (f) codd.
 from next verse.
 Aloone scribal complement; of. I, 1.
A
sil + שim
 ( 5 misreading several words). [The before is the Waw explicativum that is, where thicy were dwelling); see note on 15.17,8; Jud. 17,3 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ - 11. H.]
 formula of v .5 ，according to Ezekiel＇s constant usage at the beginning of an exhortation（cf． 6,$3 ; 13,2.3 .18 ; 14,4 ; 16,3 ; 17,3,20,3.27, a l$ ．）．The 2 s is suspicious， not occurring elsewhere；perhaps scribal insertion to secure accordance with





 force，and may be retained in spite of the break of symmetry which it pro－ duces．

Sll ajpin yields no sense，since a verb in，if it existed，could only mean to be
 Dayidsun，Orelli，Siggrr．，Bertholet；and sh apparently Reuss：trofzig）is easy and suitable，\＆makes it from nat，here unsuitable．Git ápopuil úuĩv your occusion（of $\sin$ ）；it is not clear what Hebrew，word this represents；for a sug－ gestion see Cornill．。Grätz השִּרבם משׁםu．
Ill +5 ，the presumable sense being that Israel had not even done according to 20 the just laws of the nations．Yet，after 11， 12 （though this is lacking in（ 5 ）it seems better，with §，Reuss，Ewald，Smind，to omit the negative；the antithesis is between the good laws of Juve and the evil practices of the nations．

 and）ame against you．
（9）All $\boldsymbol{y}^{\prime}$ ；（GAvMr katde，which Cornill follows；11－1＇ 23 al．סld．
（II）Al אוּ， 1 ©
 the plus may here be due to a scribe．
 Rr．uss，Orlifle RVM）is against the context，in which the point is that his cye is not withdrawn；diminish，take from（the people），after 1）cut．4，2（RV，Iläver－ Nick），is too fecble for the tone of the passage．The Versions also are unsatis－
 object，a simple and attractive reading，but not in accord with the usige of Ezckiel，who never employs this form of threat： $\mathfrak{Z}$ confingram，${ }^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{m}$ ，or perhaps， as ©（\％ap）and some NISS，湤 ctll off，similarly inappropriate．Ew．，following 24,14 ，emends to 2 上es w I zivll not forbear，go buck，which is appropriate and attractive；but the insertion of the negative is difficult，and the sense here is 40 somewhat different from that of 24,14 in which Juvi＇s resolution not to recede from Ilis threat is emphasized；Hriz．Nif．of a a aill give miself free rin， after Prov．29，IS，a doubtful expression，used in l＇rov：in bad sense；Corn．דוֹ $I$ aill bestir myself，onter the field，which gives in itself a grood sense，but is too military，and does not suit the following clause；a similar objection applies to 45
 TVy（ $1.8 ; 21,8$ ）is graphically easy，but from the connection we expect a verb here．From the formula in 8,18 （also referred to by D．sw）we get which seems best to meet the conditions，in spite of its length；if ana had fallen out，
On a（twice）in this verse see note on v． 8.



4 Thy, making Jurf lay the load; this removes the difficulty of posture, but the suggestion of the context is better.
(5) An (so all recent critics). The reading of al with arose from the desire (probably a teaching of the schoolsi to make the two terms of punishment represent the traditional alonde in Egypt ( $390+40=430$ ). The number 190 gives a possible chronology; the term. a quo is the capturc of Samaria, B.C. 722 , and the $t \mathrm{~cm}$. ad quem B.C. 557 ifo years from 997 ), which gives 165 years for the captivity of Israel; 390 is historically inpossible, and the l'rophet has an actual chronology in mind. In r. + ( $\sqrt{6}$ (except a few Cursives) has 150
 tracting to from 190 , which latter is held to include the captivity of Judali.
(6) $417+\pi \times{ }^{2}$, ( 5 Avs, scribal complement.
(7) Omitted by CORN. as presenting a physically impossible action ( 1.8 ); but this is scarcely a difficulty, since it is not probable that the acts of the wision were really performed by the Prophet, nor is it clear that the posture was impossible.
 The word, though somewhat stran:e, is intelligible.
(S) \& the phraseology of v .6 is not unnatural.
(9) Alt is hardly original (see 45,13 ) ; read $=$ ת

(10) Al : wis scribal expansion; read, with (G, לess.

 Ill rex̣, according to Gligek, Lirschr: fio, intentional softening of the objection- 25 able תצs.
(11) fll, passing over v. 11, refers to 1. 10; thou shath cut (read prepare it, that is, the food of v . 10 . The reference to water in $\mathrm{v}, 16$ makes it improbable that $\mathfrak{r} .11$ is scribal insertion; it is better to insert, with Hatrw, the order of w. 11.12. For Corxinsi's treatment of the passage see note on v . 1 .



$\qquad$

ye shall learn that I am Jfiof athen there shell be \＆ic．§ retains＇int，and omits בהיוה．
Ill antint the • is scribal miswriting．
（9）．ll
 simplest emendation is that of Wellit．in SMFN1，בשבּ י．
All + ワจ usage；of．Hos．9，1 \＆．c．
 however，in Ezekiel＇s manner．－Before ל放 we should，perhaps，insert 9 ．
 may be scribal insertion，though it is here not forced；of．Jer．35，17．

$11+\pi$ ， Pulurri，Stat．Constr．im Hebr．，pp． 8 f．）．Iabominationes malorum；$\$$ connects 15
 adj．，citing Is．28，1（on which of．Ew．289，l＇mliply，loc．cit．）；CORN．，SIEGFR．$\wedge_{\text {．}}$ ． ，Ill
（12）The order of $t l l$ in the first two clauses of $1: 12$ is inverted in（ 6 ．
All + ＋גָּut，（
（13）$\{1$ a to the people in Jerusalcm．Read יציףע．（G）has second person throughout this verse except in last clause．

All לx，scribal error for 5 \％．
Ill other two phrases of It as common expressions and therefore natural glosses． But the procedure of $(\mathbb{\sigma}$ is best accounted for by retaining all of 1 ll ，of which，we may suppose，the Hebrew text of $\mathbb{6}$ had lost a part，or which the（ $\sqrt{ }$ trinslator undertook to simplify；the fulness of 1 ll is not unnatural．
（14） 411 n－ the geographical requirements of the passage；the natural emendation is 30 （J．D．Michaelis）；see Jer． 52,10 ，in which passage（ 5 has the same miswriting， white Al is correct（Orelli）．
AI シา，（62 pers．plural．
 Siegfr，insert aft ； 39,17 has hater before it．
Ill

（3）In vi：3－9 the order of $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ differs from that of 41 ，the verses standing as follows： 6 （ 3 words）． $7.8 \cdot 9 \cdot 3 \cdot 4 \cdot 5$（ 4 words），that is，w． $3-5$ are put after $6-9$ ．The explana－fo tion of this diversity appears to be that $\mathbf{4 l}$ section 2－9 consists of two parallel parts， $2-4$ and $5-9$ ，and the copyists early introduced confusion by mingling the two． （ 5 omits parts of $\mathbf{w}$ ． 5.6 ；it is simpler to omit 8.9 ，which present a slightly expanded form of 3.4 ．W＇thus obtain a distinct form for $5-7$ ，and the section $2-13$ appears to consist of four similar dithyrambic utterances， $2-4,5-7,10.11,12.13$ ． 45 Hirz．sces two reconsions in $3-7$ and $5-11$ ．Cors．＾ $3 \cdot 4$ ，and arranges the rest： 6 （part）． 7 （part）．S．9．5．6（part）． 10.7 （part）．


M




5 fl צプ is somewhat better，in this connection，than © emrvouan；the address in 2 pers．begins in the next berse．
 each of which is possible，but the $\theta$ uratepas of（ 5 has not the same justification here as in 16,55 ．＇ול may be repetition of preceding word，or insertion from 5 V． 15 ．
（15）4ll and scribill crror for（0）．
Of the four initial terms of 11 only two are given by $(\sigma, \sigma$ ovaktin kai $\delta \eta \lambda a t \sigma t i n$ （which two are omitted is doubtful）；and CORN．accordingly emends to now המשin，after 6，14．In view of the impassioncd character of the discourse the so abridgment of $(5$ is at least doubtful；the min might lee changed to הum so as to get a common phrase，but the strangeness of＇ m is in its faror．Cf．J＇AUl RUBEN，
 appropriate，but hardly demonstrable；＇$y=$ lesson，w＇arning．The dismay of it is free rendering．
 retained．
fil＋｀クาゴ
（16）Ill ${ }^{3} \pi$ ，point $\because$ ，to agree with the following statement．
$4+=y, \pi$ ，insertion from next clause．The general declaration when $I$ semd my 20 evil arroa＇s is first madc，and the particulars are then given．

It בהם ；the connection requires the second person．
Ill＋ロコクグゼ

（17）All $+\boldsymbol{9}$ ， $\operatorname{yy}$ ，interruptive repetition，from preceding versc．
6 （t）With this chapter of．Lev． $26,25-40$ ；the resemblances between the two passages are so numerous as to suggest that they belong to the same period．
 ย $\pi^{\prime}$ ’ $\alpha$ ủt ．
（3）Al（bis），＾iv．
 in 35,8 ．


5） 11 ＋ cf．Lev．26，30．
 tion of the desolation of the land；but the תimpere also in the wיע， 159,12 ； 40 cf．Ezck．16， 24.

 เาコะม．
 and may have fallen out of $(5)$ by homurotileuton．
 v．13．－After min Grälz adds דבּ
 （followed by SMEND）writes פתבּד，which he attaches to v． 7 ：ye shall learn thot 50
 might easily have fallen ont owing to its similarity to the preceding $\quad$ min＇；but it is a question whether we should not simply omit min，and read（as in v．13）and
 old is shown by its presence in $\mathbb{G}$ ，and the difficulties seem not great enough to call for its deletion．The charge is that they have made their wealth their pride，which was shown in ritual display，of．v．24；24，21；30，6．Point itu．



 the following verbs as preterits，and refers the pollution of the Temple to the Israelites，rendering：and I turn my face from them，for they huve defled my 10 precious treasure（the Temple），and entered it，and profanced it，as in 23．39．This keeps the same reference for the pronouns throughout the verse，and gives in itself a good sense，offering a reason for the punishment in the idolatry of the people．Yet the reason is given in $v .23$ ，and the connection favors the reference of the profanation of v .22 to the invaders of the city．
The והסבתי פני מהם（ümaE $\lambda \in \mathrm{Y}$ ．）is to be understood of the Jews，the rest of the invaders．Point

Alt
 CORN．takes it to be interpretation of the（careless，irreverent entrance into the Temple）．
 ing of which is not clear；？fac conchusionem；Corn．．קוב raze and empty！ see Hirz．Some threat of punishment is involved，but the text is corrupt be－ 25 yond emendation．
 out of place；for the thought，of．22，25－27．Gr．i I\％Tiv．
（2t）All teleuton．The threat that their houses should be taken was not a small one．

（26）At $3 x$, scribal error for $4 y$.
After All מנְב：Cokn inserts something like which is necessary；the complete expression is best obtained by supplying $j^{\prime k}$ ，see end of $: 125$ ．
 and never of Zedekiah，who is here referred to．
all duce the instrument．

8 （1）At ジュ；© $\pi$ funtw．The date is uncertain．In © the interval between 1,2 and 40 8,1 is 384 days，in 413 days．Sminn thinks that the latter is correction intro－ duced（after the change in 4,5 from 190 to 390 ）to grain the time required by 3,16 and $4,5.6$（ $=397$ dity＇s）．But if the 40 of 4,6 be retained（as it is by S．31．），the time required is $7+390+40$ ，for which itl does not suffice $\%$ ．Davidsoni，unless （Ifirz．）we suppose an intercalated month in the $5^{\text {th }}$ year．See note on 4,6 ． 45 （f）$\pi \dot{\prime} \mu \pi \tau \notin$ may be accidental assimilation to following méutty．「Cf．Winckiler， 1．$c$ ．， 96 ．］
all
 censional clange）．
עמחוה stands in till before the first but not before the second．We may omit it here，with（ 5 ；or better，insert it before second＇n，after $\mathbf{1 , 2 7}$ ，and in accordance with Eqckiel＇s general manner of describing the vision．
 a slight change of the 11 ebrew; agrees with the context and with the tone of the whole passage. The clause was early corrupted: הד is not a Hel) word, and if we read 7 Thout (Is, 16,9.10), the resulting sense is here out of place. (5) out

 אירי in the strongholds of the mountains, where perhaps represents the same word in the Hebrew (see 33,27 ). The whole passage may be incomplete and corrupt; for other proposed readings sce HITz. and Corn.


 Omit these verscs (8.9) as doublet of 3.4 . The additions, consisting of familiar words and expressions, might easily be made by scribcs. In the improbable $\begin{aligned}-=0\end{aligned}$ at the end ( $(6 \delta$ rúmtwv) there is perhaps the tracc of a or a $\pi=$, (see be- 15 ginning of $v .5$, before which $v .9$, as doublet of $v .4$, seems to have stood). CORN. retains 8.9 , and rejects 3.4 ; but the latter are to be preferred on account of their relative curtness.
 repetition of the first, and the first scems to be a corruption of the last clause of 20
 oủdé $\mu \in T$ ù ubivuv. In any case All is unintelligible. CORN. וקמל הפַּה מה הם ומה and the sceptre shall wither: zohat are they and what their pomps. which is ingenious but introduces a conception foreign to the connection.
(12) An $6 \times$, scribal crror for 3 y.

All is old is shown by the corrupt repetition in next verse ; it appears to be a refrain; cf. 1.14
(13) Al 41 .nen , read The clause (three words) is omitted by (G, and is perhaps a gloss to the preceding clause. The sense of all (sustained generally by the 30 Versions) seems to be: the social life shall be broken up by exile; no exile shall return however long he live, and no one shall maintain his life in (or, by) his iniquity. Thought and wording are not clear, and CoRN. entirely changes the text in bo as to read and the buycr shatl not kiep ahat he has bought with his money. Siegrr. omits ${ }^{\text {b }}$. Cf. Brrtholet.
 011 Pinn, read the transitive $\operatorname{PMr}$, necessary from the connection.

 CORN., הקעו תקיע והבינו הן, two infs. abs.

 Hitz. וכלמלם המתם, and COR.א. But the meaning seems to be, not that the fugitives are slain, but that they wander homeless like stray doves; of. 1 S 26,20; 1s. 38,14 [and Paul Ruben's Crit. Remarts, p. 6, 1. 31. - 1'. H.]
(18) After \#1 ה
 of ${ }^{b}$.
 The immediate context here refers to the satisfaction of appetite; still a general affirmation of this sort is not out of place in the whole connection. The clause may have fallen out of $\mathbb{6}$ through similarity of יהוח [cf. Notes on lsaiah, p. 107, I. f2. - I'. H.]

8 （לシn）that is here meant，in contrast with the previously mentioned enclosure （ロッ）

On the spelling of see Böttchler，Neue Ährentese（on Ezek．40，16），Lag． Mithl． $\mathrm{I}, 100$ and Corn．＇s note here．The prevailing form in $\operatorname{lll}$ is E ， rarcly Q＇rê asc．But in Ezek．40，16－36 occur the forms and have aldan（see Fifld，Hexapla）．As the ctymology of the word is uncertain， and the Masoretic and Greco－Jewish traditions of the form of technical archi－ tectural terms cannot be confidently relied on，we have little to guide us in the deternination of the spelling．It is，however，to be observed that the flext in which the form or or occurs（found only in plur．）is specially corrupt，and the authority of（ 5 in such a case is not great；it secms better，therefore，to write 0 解 or 0 ．It is possible that the $\hat{\varepsilon}$ is a later pronunciation of $\hat{\pi}$ ．［Cf．also Havirf，The Assyrian E．vowel，Baltimore，1887，p．14，No．9；Delitzsch，HW 32； ZA II，35I，and for the change of $u$ and $c$ ，Notes on lsaiah，p．100，1．32．－1＇．11．］ Sll somewhat uncertain，and there is little ground here for choice；twenty may have been taken in $\mathbb{6}$ as round number，or twenty－five in sll may be in imitation of 11,1 ．
All ang ang ，scribal crror；omit the second $\pi$ ．
 and perhaps Ileb．gloss．
（17）All שי מלאו את הארץ חמש，deleted by Gunkel，Choos，p．142，n．，as incorrect gloss； onn is not before referred to in c．8，but is naturally suggested from c． 7 ．

all reacl $n$ ？！；the connection requires an expression of disgust or anger on Jrvirs part．A reference to a ritual act is out of the question．Cf．1Dcut．33，10；Am． 4,10 ．The Versions are discordant．© they sent（shame，xתiz，perhaps $\Rightarrow$ ）a stonch to their nostrils；\＆they snort（）with their nostrils，perhaps taking ＇ 1 as＝noise； $\mathfrak{z}$ follows $\mathfrak{A l}$ ． $\mathbb{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ autai ws huktppizovtes they are as scomers 30
［turn up their noses］，which secms to be a free translation of an expression not understood．l＇ossibly the Ilebrew text of（5 did not have arim．P．Pentirs）， and the translators supplied T：they put the hand to the nose．But it would then be hard to account for the＂of 1 ll ；even to late emending scribes the connec－ tion would not suggest a Cyprian or Persian ritual act，which，moreover，would
 obviousily a partial correction after A11．E，freely，kai ús d̀甲iєvtєऽ єioiv hixov
 of crepitus athtris，stench（Qam？i，Rashij）．If this seem improbable，we may read ורה，as in Num， 11,20 （1）．The change to＇As then becomes necessary．fo The coarseness of the expression is not an objection to it；but it is unnecessary to go to the length of the Jewish commentators translating it by crepitus aentris ［cf．Ilor．Sut．i，9，69．70 vin＇th curtis Judeis oppedere＝кatarépotiv］，or by mem－
 Ifel，on this verse，and Breithaurr＇s note in his translation of Rashi．Hetz， 45 takes＇t as＝sickle＂：the Juteans，as it were，cut off their own noses．Gunkle， 1．c．，they snort the snot（משמ丶）from froir noses．

 following verse．
 concrete noun，as the connection suggests．Corn．，Stespr．the cisitations of the


 regarded as a scribal variation, rare in UT, but probably not rare in the post-

 Wib), more probably scribal error for haen, the a coming from following \%.


 46, 1.
All ктuntevou, from קמה. See DE Rossit's note. The clause beyinning with רשׁs is bracketed by CORN. as prolepsis (see 5.5 ); it seems intended to indicate that the image had formerly stond here, but that the l'rophet did not expect to see 15 it still in its old place. Gunkil, Sihopf. . Chaos, p. 141, n., after $\psi 68.31$,
 Chaos-dragon (Tiimat).
 omits the last two words.


 with $Q^{e} r \hat{e}$, ,
 and ת
 suff. לרחקי.
( $7-9$ ) An obscure passage, sustained by all Versions, except that (5 omits in 6.7 from is to end (and I looked, amd lo, a hole in the ziall, and in 6.8 Ip twice. The 30 omission of the hole relieses the difficulty somewhat but not materially; CORN., further, by the deletion of v . 8 , gets rid of the att of digging, but does not account for the presence of v .8 in All. The process described, while obscure, is neither impossible nor improbable. Cf. Hitz, Smind, Blirtholit.
 time held sacred by the Israelitish people is probable from the old worship of bulls and serpents, and from ls.65,4;66,3. (Cf. S.mith, Rel. Scm. ${ }^{2}$, p. 357). GRÄтZ תבנית בל
 is syntactically hard.
 Elders. But the statement of II, that the Elders were standing before the pictures, is important for the situation, though the sense in $\mathbb{6}$ is good.
AI 政, ( 5 ; perhaps omitted by the Greek scribe as unnecessary.


 חדרי the sing. may be written as in (f) (though this is not necessary). Hir'z., CORN., Siegrr. omit the clause as scribal addition; it is, however, a natural and effec 50 tive touch.
Al אמרים, was in 9,9 , or else supply אמשרו
(16) Al המיה, CORN. תיב; but it is precisely the entrance to the building itself
intended to identify the Creatures of $\mathbf{C . I}$ with the Cherubs of the Temple, and are in general supported by the Versions, they must be retained (CORN. vw. 8-17). The order in c. 10 differs from that in $\mathbf{C . 1}: 10,1$ (throne) $=1,26 ; 10, \hat{8}($ hund $)=$ $1, S ; 10,9-13$ (wheels) $=1,15-18 ; 10,14(\not+$ faces $)=1,10 ; 10,16.17$ (motion) $=1,19-21$. C. I describes first Creatures, then wheels and throne (with divine form); c. Io 5 first throne (divine form in 8,2 ), then wheels, Cherubs - an exact reversal. D. H. Muller, Ezech., pp. 20 ff , explains this from the Prophet's different positions in the two cases: in c. 1 his attention is naturally, says MÜLLER, first attracted by the foundation of the vision, while in c. 10, the chariot being on the south of the Temple (v. 3), he could at first see only its top, since the corner 10 of the Temple-wall intervened. Nore probably the diversity arises from the fact that c.1 gives the formal description, while c. 10, presupposing c. 1, mentions only the points required by the writer's purpose. Thus, $\mathfrak{v} .8$ (which, however, is probably a scribal insertion) accounts for the hund of $\mathfrak{v} .7$; v. 9-22 state the main resemblances between Cherubs and Creatures. Each chapter may be used for 15 the criticism of the other, but absolute identity of the two cannot be assumed.
$V$. 1 seems doubly out of place: it separates 9 , 11 from 10,2 , is remote from its own context vv. 9-22, and is best bracketed, with CORN., Sifgrr. It might be regarded as a fragmentary introduction to a new section (we expect the man on the throne, as in 1,26 ) in this fragmentary chapter; it may somehow be connect- 20 ed with the change of position of the chariot (v. $\hat{3}$ ); but its connection with the context is so loose that it is here unintelligible as a part of the narration, nor can it well be placed after $1: 8$. Cf. Hitzig, Müller, Bertholiet.

All uncertain.
(2) Ill + תמוּ, scribal , after repetition.
all בivz, sing; © plur., here necessary.
 version of the last two letters of $\mathbf{x}$. Verses $3-5$ are a parenthetical explanation 30 of the situation, the narration of r .2 being resumed in v.6. Since $8,3.4$ the cherub-chariot has changed its place from north side to south side, but the moreinent has not been mentioned (see v.5).
 which he regards our passage as the repetition, rendering Nore the Glory of JUIVI 35 had risen up from the Cherub. This change simplifies the description; but, since there appear to be omissions in the Heb. text, it is perhaps better to retain sll, with the understanding that the cilory has changed position since 9,3 , though the fact is not mentioned.
Ill בill write plur., as in 1.2.
th אn, A CorN. on the ground that the obvious intention is to express the contrast that the cloud fills the court while the Glory of Juith fills the Temple, though the converse is said in the text. The cloud, however, may be supposed to accompany the divine person to the threshold of the house, while His brightness shines over the court.
(5) For

The soumb of the ziings is apparently an allusion to the morement assumed in $\because 3$; according to $\mathrm{H} 1 \mathrm{I} \%$ on $\mathrm{I}, 24$ ) it was produced by the flapping of the wings on the bodies when the chariot came to a stand.
 The werse is regarded ly Corn., Simifr, as a later aldition.
D. II. MÜıו,I:R (pp. 26 f .) holds that the Cherubs from which the rose chere and in 9,3 are those not of the chariot, but of the Temple, and that it is here 1:zeck.
cily are come near. This sense is intelligible and appropriate, but it is to be observed that ' $D$, when so used, is elsewhere sing, and is always preceded by br, or $\boldsymbol{n}$, or $\boldsymbol{5}$, except in Mic. 7,4, whare the text is doubtful (מצsecms to be gloss), and that $\times$ אֱ would be more appropriate than pan in this connection. קרב may be pointed cither as Qal or as licl.
fll on the ground that no culty disappears when $\boldsymbol{D}$ is taken as concrete. The difference between $\boldsymbol{G}$ 's renclerings of the clatse in $v \mathrm{v} .1$ and 2 is probably translator's variation.
3) All and and write plur, with $\mathbb{G}$ and in accordance with the general usage to in c. 10. [The name בna may be Babylonian; it does nut mean pozerful, however, but fropitious, syn. damqu; cf. sedu damqu, lumassu dumqu \&.c. - P. H.] ill peon nop; © Züvךv; CORN. rop,r, as in v. 1 .

Read Qerê winstead of Kethîl
All + \& All

(G) Al illata, omitted by CORN. as destroying the symmetry of the clause, and as
 51,22; Lam. I, 18; 2,21; Zech. 9,$17 ; 2$ Chr. 36,$17 ; \psi 148,12$. If any one of the five terms of al is to be omitted, it should be ip .
All arpin, omitted by CORN. as false gloss, on the ground that the reference must be to the men in 8,16, who are not called arpp; these latter, however, may have been Elders (in the l'rophet's view) as well as those in 8, ir.
 sense, and should be omited. The command is given here, the fulfiment in v. 11. CORN. fills out fll by inserting ist after isi

For ill nism write misin, with Corn., Stegrr., after © iboús; this accords better with the following statement, they aent forth, and smote in the citly.
 EWald ראֻֻ!. It is descriptively effective, yet not so obrious as to suggest a gloss. The order of words is strange; read (ans in 1s, 49,21), or, more
 was then inserted in the wrong place. On the MSS readings see B.ik and DE 35

 5ll



fll
 though the sense is doubeful. המשe is here not appropriate, and en is graphically too remote from
 freedom, ,oad ح لا لا which Cornith adopts.
 is unnecessary:

10 (1) This chapter presents serious difficultics: it has a fragmentary appearance, and it is not casy to explain the order of the verses. The chief difficulty lies in the parts relating to the Cherubs, vv. 1.8-22; but as these verses are obviously
 interrogative form, and CORN and Siegrr. the whole reading of $\mathbb{G}$, but the categorical rendering (HiTZ., Snifnd, DAyidson) agrees better with the context (expectation of war). The war-party says not Our houses (fortifications?) are just rebuilt, we are safe, but This is no time for the peaceful occupation of housebuilding (cf. Jer. 29,5), war is immincht, we are safoly enclosed in Jerusalem.
(6) All aribin; (6) vekpoùs úpûv, and Grätz גלוליבם.
 variation.
(7) (7ll

Ill šyir; read I p. 心יski, with 6.

(11) Verses in. 12 of 111, ( 5 , are an appendage (v. on ends with the formal concluding phrase), made from vv. $\mathbf{7}$. Io and $\mathbf{5 . 7}$, yet possibly added by the Prophet himself in a revision. They are regarded as spurious by Hitz., omitted by CORN., and 15 bracketed by Revss. A similar resumptive statement occurs in 13,15.



 in this connection.

4l simply describe the fact, as appears from the following clause.
\# margin. דוא הארץ and exclude each the other. הארץ is supported by $\mathbb{G}$, and is required by the connection, there being no antecedent to $\mathbb{N}$; ; the latter may be regarded as the insertion of an Aramaizing scribe. If the verse be a fragment, an antecedent to $\boldsymbol{N}$ ( may have fallen out; but this is a conjecture not to be employed except on strong grounds.

(17) All + לת (except that $\$$ omits 7 ). is better omitted as an interruption of the discourse, probably a copyist's repetition from the preceding verse. If it be retained, the form of $\$$ is better.
All

All ל3; read ant, after (6).
 36,26 (so Corn.). Ilitz., Smend, Orelli, and Siegfr., following © $\begin{aligned} & \text {, write } 7 \text { ns, } 40\end{aligned}$ which also gives a good sense. Cf. the similar passage, Jer. 32,39 , where $t l$ has
 אחמר began early.
Al בּקוּקוּ
(21) All 2 לss, and so $\mathbb{G}$, but the expression their heart gres to the heart of their 45 detestable things is intolerable. I quorum cor post offendicula . . ambulat; 厄 ותn .arm. These give the general sense, and so Hitz. But the Prophet passes in $\mathbf{v . 2 1}$ to a class of persons different from those of v. 20 , and the transition is better marked by CORN.'s emendation (adopted by Davidson and Siegrr.) (ואלה אמחו but as for these, their heart goes after their 50 idols. Hitz.'s reading is graphically easier, but leaves the sentence incomplete.
 dation. Grätz ואלה אל כל
and now (and not in c. I) that Jhvi leaves His sanctuary in Jerusalem. But on this supposition it is not easy to explain the vision of c. r. The Prophet is perhaps to be thought of as now standing in the outer court.

 ment that the man himself takes the fire, but in the second clause says that it was given him. As in the command of $v .2$, of which this is the fulfilment, no intermediate person is mentioned, it seems better to omit such references here.

 Corn., Siegfried). V. S, which accounts for the Cherub's hand, must then be deleted. The procedure in $v .7$ may have been suggested to a scribe by Is. 6,6, where, however, the circumstances are different.
Somewhere in this connection we should expect the man to return (as in 9, it) and report. His report is not mentioned, and seems to have fallen ont of the 15 text without leaving a trace behind. CORN. introduces an allusion to it by a transformation of 11,23 .
(9) The section rv. 9-17 is omitted by COrn. and Siegrr. as a scribal repetition out of c . 1 , induced by the remark in 20-22. The variations between this description and that of C . I rather seem to indicate that this is from the hand of the Prophet, 20 who is concerned to exhibit the identity of the Cherubs with the Creatures.
All 2192 ה; omit the article (twice in r.9).
(iI) 4 ll motion.
(12) See note on $\mathbf{r}, 18$. The original of $\{11$ is probably the same here as there, but 25 here it has been further expanded, with the purpose of supplying the chariot completely with eyes: before ומבל בְּנְ
 the bodies and wings of the Cherubs is out of place.
Al

 in $⿷_{\mathrm{V}} \mathrm{V}$, and the two verses interrupt the description of the wheels. The description of the cherub-faces is given below in vr. 21.22, and there is here besides the strange substitution of cherub-face for the bull-face of $\mathbf{I}, 10$. Ezekiel does 35 not identify the face of his Cherub with that of the bull either in c. I or in 41, 19, and the Assyro-Babylonian bull-deities and tion-deities are human-faced. Verses 14. 15 must be omitted here, nor is there any place in the chapter where they can be appropriately put; they are a scribal insertion, partly from c. $\mathbf{r}$, and partly from the context ( $15^{\mathrm{b}}$ from $20^{\mathrm{a}}$ ). In any case, המבוב should be changed to 40
 pointing of $\mathfrak{j}$ sis apparently scribal error). V. i4 is regarded as gloss by Hitz., Smend, Corn., Siegfr.
 חיה till his identification of and V . 20 (CORN.), as in c. I he makes no 45 mention of ברוב.

(19) an ansyy, omitted by Cornill as marring the parallelism. Al
(2I) Omit second
 v. 20.
ill + מקרֵּ marginal remark which has got into the text.
 ץרא
 Sing． $7 \boldsymbol{7} y$ in concrete sense，$=$ helper，is used in OT only of individuals，always of God except in Gen．2，18．20（Eve）；for Hos．13，9，see Nah．3，9．
解 $\mathfrak{k}$ ；write $ל y$ ，as in v．22，and with $\mathbb{G}$ ．

（23）Ill＇אา，©
 after Is．28，2I；CORN．ぶョฺ，after Ezek．7，7；22，4，and Siegfr．regards this as probable．The reading of $\mathbf{~} 1 \mathrm{ll}$ ，supported by $\boldsymbol{G}_{1}$ ，is intelligible；for the close rela－ tion between $7=1$ and $\min$ ，see Is．2，I．
（25）ifl + （
 （adopted by CORN．），which may be miswriting of $4 l$ ，or may have come from the text 9 าา $ํ า$ by repetition of the verb．The next two verbs © puts in i p． instead of 3 p. ；the difference is not important．

 $v \omega v=$ תמְרי，which may have arisen out of אםם．

AI רִּ pression at the end of v． 25 ．
 The two sections $v v, 2 I-25$ and $26-28$ are parallel predictions，probably written at different times．

13 （2）ill $ל x$ ，write $ל \boldsymbol{y} y$ ，with $(6$ ，the section being directed against the prophets．
 less repetition．The text has been not a little worked over by the scribes；thus S here adds לוֹן
stl
 gloss on and（after v．17），which expelled the latter from the text（cf．CORN．）． 35 Hitz．，Siegfr，retain fl ．

Afl סias aủtûv＝$=$ ， ed by the insertion of as gloss，and the substitution of the final clause 40 （Cornill）．
 mon； 6 simplifies．
For fill git read sing．，after（ 6 ，with Corn．，STADE，the being dittography from following word．
4ll

（6）Al oop．Read vcrb wopl，with（f $\mu \alpha v t \in \cup o ́ \mu \in v o u$ ．Or，two infs．abs．hin obp nay be read．
Al ロ ロตถ่，omit the article，as the clause is a simple circumstantial onc．
（7）Al Diak，omit I（circumstantial clause）．The whole clause is lacking in 6 ，and may be scribal repetition after 1.6 ．


II (22) After ant $\operatorname{yy}$ CORN. inserts

(23) ill the midst of the city, but in the sanctuary, and cmends (looking to $10,2 \mathrm{ff}$.) to (smoke of the burning city), transposing the words to the end of the verse. But the expression midst of the city is a general one, the contrast being between the city (in which stood the Temple) and the mountain to which JHVH, abandoning the city, now goes. CoRN.'s change of text is too violent, and does not offer the report of the man which we expect after 10,2 .
(24) $1 \mathrm{Ht}+\boldsymbol{\pi}$ (2, found in $(\mathbb{G}$, but producing an improbable tautology.
sll הארח but ill is more natural.

12 (2) Ill that occurs nowhere else in Ezek. (a similar expression is found in lev. 16, 16), 15 and does not accord with the following clause. HITz. המר, after Jer. 9:5; CORN. follows $\mathbb{G}$, holding that ת
המרי as in 2,8 .
Before ais insert 9 , with $\mathfrak{G}$.


 currence.

(6) CORN., changing the order of words, writes ground that ill exhibits an intolerable hysteron proteron; but the order in ilt seems not unnatural.



it $+7 \mathfrak{T}$, $6 \mathbf{s}$, explanatory gloss, or scribal corrupt repetition from preceding or succeeding word.
Ill
(io) ill ed in general by all the Versions, which, however, suggest no satisfactory emendation. For the first three words $\mathbb{G V V}^{\mathrm{V}}$ has $\delta$ üpxwv kai $\delta \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \eta$ roú $\mu \in v o \varsigma$, repetition

 a play upon words in swis (taken in its two senses of burden and prophicy) as in Jer. 23,33-40, especially v. 33 (as in (5) ye are the sum, and render The prince is 40 this burden (or massâ) Sc.; or by might be inserted before $\boldsymbol{N}$ (so $\Sigma$ ) and ל בית (in any case write for aza). See Davidson, Hitz. Otherwise the passage must be omitted as gloss (so CORN., SiEGFr.), though it seems to be a natural introduction to what follows. Cf. Bertholet.
(12) For $ל x$ write $b y$, as in $v, 6$.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

13 Aramaic-speaking scribe, who noted that the figure in the text contained an allusion to birds.
(22) הת attach 2 plur. suff.
Ill of the righteous must be false.

 ישדאל $8,11.12$, and omits it 20,1.3; 『fomits it here and 20,3. It seems to be a 10 matter of choice.
(3) لll yor for, see v. 4.


 readings may represent the same Hebrew text (and this text would contain more than ${ }^{2}$ ), in which case there is omission or addition in $4 l$ or ( $(5)$ in $v .4$ or in V .7.
 appear in $\mathbb{G}$, and that the clause is wanting in v.7. A difference between the readings of the Hebrew in rv. 4 and 7 would not be very strange. What Hebrew 20 text $\mathbb{G}$ is based on is not clear. The other Versions support $1 l l$
(5) All
(7) All 12 ; on the reading of 6 see on $v .4$ above.

All must be written sing.
All לולמש. Such familiar phrases are specially liable to scribal change.

 scriptio plena probably not original.
\{ll CORN. Piel occurs nowhere else in this sense, but, as it is found only three times (Ex. 3,22;12,36; 2 Chr, 20,25) the usage is hardly sufficient to cause its rejection here.
,
(15) To 11 CORN. objects that the distinctive sense of this particle is here inappropriate, and writes $1 \times$, after v. 17; but for the simple hypothetical force of ib see Gen. 50,15; Mic. 2,11. A strong (though perhaps not decisive) ground for writing is here is the construction in vi. 17.19. (6) seems to have had i. [For it (i. c. gl or $+J$ verily $)=2 \mathrm{Nee}$ Johns Hopkins University Circulars, Vol. 13, 40
 is not hypothetical but means simply: Joscph witl surcly prosecutc us (of. DElıTzsCH, Assyr. Handzü̈rterbuch, p. $373^{\text {b }}$ ). Ez. 14,12-20 must have been influenced by the Babylonian Account of the Flood, col. iv, 11. 12-20 (HaUPT, Nimerod-Epos, p. 142, Il. 180-194); cf. Deletzech, Parudies, 146; Jeremias, Izdu- 45 bar-Nimrod, p. 54, n. 92: Gunkel, Chaos, p. 428. - P. H.]
(16) Before Al n insert , (as in v.18), the condition being here continued. All
(18) All
(19) All לs, copyist's error for


(22) All
 here the probable reading.


(i1) fll 6 : ( 1 is unnecessary). Though לa stands in all the Versions, it is an unex- 5
 (so CORN.).
 GRÄTZ takes it as imperative.
All ing ye is improbable. If it be taken as verb, its object may be (63), or נְ ( $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ ); the latter construction is adopted by CORN., the former is favored by v. I3. If the construction of $\mathbb{6}$ be followed, is left suspended; it is hardly possible to take it as relative clause ( $\mathbf{3}$ lapides . . desuper irrucntes), and it must be omitted.
At


(15) All 7 ; write Nif al ${ }^{\prime}$,

42,7, \&.C., 命, Assyr. âme, Arab. Ass. ânu means both wehcere? and there is not; see Delitzsch, HW, p. $48^{\circ}$ below and p. $49^{a}$ above. 's $^{6} \hat{i n}$ is a later modification of ân; comp. rîsǔ, rêşu, \&c. - P. H.]
(16) V. 16 of 11 is explanation of the preceding figure, probably added by the Prophet,
since it seems too long and formal for a scribal gloss. It is bracketed by CORN., 25 but retained by Smend, Siegfr. as an exclamation.
All 6 ; read by, with $(6$.

All יד; omit the terminal ?, probably scribal miswriting from following 9 . $\quad$ י is sing. of class, like following שיא. We may also write ידי.

 Hou каi $\psi v \chi \alpha ̀ \varsigma ~ \pi \in p ı \pi o o v i v \tau o ; ~ \mathcal{Z ~ e t ~ c u m ~ c a p e r e n t ~ a n i m u s ~ p o p u l i ~ m e i ~ v i z i f i c a b a n t ~}$ animas corum (inb); \& the souls of my people yo hunt, and your ozen souts ye keep alize (so substantially $\mathbb{\mathbb { Q }}$, but paraphrasing). The idea given in $\$ 3$ is the only one that suits the connection (so Rashi, Hitz.); but the expression of the
 both these as glosses, and for 'yn writes (after v. 19); this change of verb is without Versional authority, and introduces prematurely the antithesis kill . . . saze of v. 19. The reading 'נפ' עם תמצ' מנם would give a good sense, but 40 has no other support. The expression is better omitted as in its present form unintelligible.
(19) 41 לעי ; ( $\sqrt{5} \lambda \alpha \tilde{u}$, adopted by Cornill.

 end of the verse.
Il and where the pronoun of the 2 p. makes a false reference; read
 clause in V .2 I .
111 את ם is to be adopted: I witl set free the souls \& $\mathbb{E}$ c.
 Aram. פרת; \& freely, Affel, wis w. The word is apparently a gloss by an
though, with CORN, and against (6, we omit the following ך- Hna. Halévy, Rev. des Et. Juives, Vol. 24, pp. 30 ff., 7 , flourishing. After the command to live (v.6) we expect a statement of what JHyH did for the rescued infant (so DAVIDSON); read Tירי $\boldsymbol{T}$, from which might easily come (the $i$ falling out by reason of the following ב) fil


 Gen. 18,12 in Ball's Genesis, p. 118, 1. 49); Halevy, of 41 is scribal change to avoid vox inhonesta.

(9) On the use of the verbs 70 and of . H. Weinel in ZAT '98, p. 19.
(10) [The combination of unn with Assyr fax'šit 'sheep' is impossible. There is no
 and $705^{2}$ ), and this word does not mean sheep but inflated skin either of sheep 15 (Assyr. immeru) or of goats (Assyr. enzu). Gab̌̌ŝù is derived from grab̌̌u 'mass, fulness, inflation,' just as maxrht 'first' from maxru' 'front,' קדומ'א from Delitzsch, Ass. Gr. § 65, No. 37; Nöld., Syr. Gr. ${ }^{2}$ § $135 .-1$. H.]
(13) Kethîb שטׁ; read Qeerê ư.
$K^{c}$ chîb אבלת; read Q'rê be not an old form but a scribal error.
All + + , ${ }^{(5,}$, omit as gloss giving the political explanation of the preceding figure.

 be traced with certainty; Halévy in theover he be. See next note.
 S mat:
 perhaps the free rendering of the same text as that of We have here the 30
 these two words to v. 15, and reads there gible as a gloss, but should not be admitted into the text; the use of $\pi=$ of the female is at least doubtful (Davidson). Possibly the glossator wrote simply ל as a comment on, or expansion of, the concluding statement of v. 15 , and the words got into vv. 16 and 19 by error of copyists, and in mutilated form; in v. 16 , further, scribal miswriting inserted תis sit, which may have come from the preceding לך בשות.
(18) Kethîb נת ; write Qccê זת.

41 in omitted by Corn. as an insertion from v. 13, and 40
 was not a lawful offering (Lev. 2,1t), and that the verse division is here disturbed, $v .19$ being the only one in the indictnent ( $v .16-20$ ) which does not begin with npm!; by throwing vv. 18 and 19 into one he gains the desired symmetry, and the excessive length of the new verse he avoids by the omissions. So far 45 as regards the honey, Ezekiel is here speaking of unlawful cults; nor is it certain that the rule of Lev. 2,11 obtained in lis time. The mention of four and oil is to be expected; for a Greck libation of honey (instead of ruine) to the Sun-god see Ath. 15,48. [Honey was offered also to the gods of Babylonia; see Neb. Grot. i, 20; ii, 33; of. Scurader's Keilinschriftliche Zibliothek, 3,2 (Berlin, 50 1890), pp. 33.37: Delizascu, Hantaürterbuch, p. $280^{\text {b }}$ below s. v. rimeth. 1. 11.] Corn.'s criticism of the verse division is acute; but, in the absence of ofler sufficient grounds for his omissions, it is better to accept the irregularity; Etck.

14 preferred, for the supposition is not if some exiles should, like Woah, Dumiel, and Job, bring their children away (for the rescued remnant are not righteous), but even if (contrary to the statement of v. 16) some persons should be spared. For a different view, see Müller, Proph., pp. izzf.
CORN., to avoid the tautology, omits and inserts 5 before $n$ inn: but the repetition in 11 is not without force, and is found in $6 \$ 3$.
(23) Stl by homacoteleuton.

I5 (4.5) On the mistranslation of $\mathfrak{f r}$ see Schleusner, Corn.
(6) :lll
 v. 4. But the $-\mathbb{N}$ is also syntactically interruptive, and must be omitted; in the protasis $\operatorname{jan}$ belongs naturally to made by an early scribe who wished to express clearly the sovereignty of 15 Јнун.
(7) All 'si; Grätz suggests w? - \{ll =nver read with $\mathfrak{G}$, the reference being more naturally to the Jerusalemites than to the exiles.


All ith. Omit the article, with $\mathfrak{G}$, as in $v .45$; it is the indefinite categories $A m o-$ rite, Hittite that the description has in mind.
(4) Ill of All) see Cornill's note.
 by Smend, and omitted by Corn. and Siegfr. On the Assyrian mesit as = zuash, see Friedr. Delitzsch in Bär's Eaechiel; [Handwörterb. $419^{\text {b }}$; cf.
 -xpznsb) it must be an Assyrian loan-word, the final 'expressing the long final 30 rowel in Assyrian (ana mesî); it may have been a technical term. For the $\mathfrak{c}$ in Hebrew = Assyr. $=\left(\right.$ Uohns Hopkins Uniarersity Circulurs, Aug. 1887, p. 118 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ) com-
 assimilation of the initial sibilant to the final $\ddot{0}$; see Hebraica 1,$231 ;$ Am. Joum. of Phil. $8,267=$ Assyr. E-voưel, p. 3). For sûque 'street,' diminutive suquiqu $=35$ ق̈قز, see also Beitt: z. Assyr, 3,582, 1.27. The form فُقْبَ of Arabic diminutive forms is due to $\ddot{a}$ 故: way as modern Arabic lisun for lisân, \&c. In Assyrian an $\hat{a}$ is changed into $\hat{\varepsilon}$, not only under the influence of a preceding $i$ (sirriti for girratit), but also under the influence of a preceding $u$ (for instance, surminu 'cypress' for šurminu, to kurummêti for kurummâti icf. my remarks on zominut =ḷumẩu 'prayer' in the Critical Notes on Isaiah, p. 117, n. *); the $u$ in such cases may have been
 Field, Hex:

 here uncalled for.
 probably scribal miswriting for $=$.
 ed throughout the rest of the verse (CORN., DAViDSon); the sense of the term
 and favored by Reuss, but the connection hardly permits a command, even

Ill $\$$, and might be dispensed with; but it gives an effective ending to the sentence.
(36) (30)

Al to be retained, the word probably having an obscenc sense. © pranc, and so the old Jewish interpreters; see Geiger Crrschr. 391 . 392 and the notes of Hitz., Corn., Dayidson, Berth., and Friedr. Del. (in Bär). [Cf. post-Biblical uẹt under part, lower portion (Levy, NHCW, p. $374^{\text {b }}$ below). Assyr. suppilu sù sinnisti 'pudenda mulieris' is not derived from the stem לew but from supilu, a 10 Saf'el of the Piel of $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{K}} \mathrm{E}=\mathrm{S}$ ב to subdue (see Delitzsch's Handwörterbuch, p. 514). However, 'to make' is a Šaf'el of $\mathbf{u}$ to be. The $\Rightarrow$ in ušpthlu is due to partial assimilation of the $=$ to the preceding causative $s^{2}$; cf. Assyr. dispu 'honey' Mand. אuert (Nöld.,


 there seems to be no ground for throwing out the reference to child-sacrifice.
For 411 בדמי read (with (G) בדמי, as is required by the connection.
(37) \#ll ע ע y read with GräTz, Hal., as in $23,5 \mathrm{al}$; pleasant is here hardly 20 suitable.
al inn found in the Versions, is omitted by Cornill as a gloss, the first half being repetition, the second introducing the hand of enemies as means of punishment instead of the malicious joy of supposed friends, as the context has it. It seems to be rhetorical repetition with explana-
tory addition, =whethor thou art now on friendly or unfriendly terms with them, or, not only the cnemies (which was to be expected), but also these thy frionds.
(38) ifl ; omit the ; the plur. being uncalled for.

All at nesit, (b, but in accord with v. 36.
At + ונתתי בך חת וק' (see 23,25). The text has been in- 30



 rest of $v .41$ to $v .42$ after 7.
 ground that it contains a promise, which is out of place in this strain of denunciation. Davidson takes it to express the completion of punishment, the thought of the paragraph being then summed up in v. 43. It does not accord with the context, and should be omitted as a gloss, or changed into a threat.

觬
 introduced as something additional) has been the subject of the whole paragraph.

 by CORN. as meaningless, express religious faithlessness; they seem almost a necessary pendant to the preceding statements thou art the daughter of ther mother \&.C. - Ill

Al up, an unknown word. Scuultens, Ew., Hitz., Siegfr. = Arab. bä only; Friedr. Delitzsch (in Bär) = Assyr. qitf, 'a little'[?]: Orelli: a little, from ep

or to throw $v v .18$ and 19 together without regard to length, or even to insert והתקח at the beginning of $v .19$.
(19) $1 \mathrm{ll}+\mathrm{T} י \mathrm{r}$, gloss; see note on v . 16 above.


CORN omits as grammatically suspicious, and the whole of v. 21 as identical in meaning with, and a gloss on, v. $20^{\mathrm{b}}$. The passage omitted by him, however, is an appeal based on v. 20. In מתimp it is better, with $Q^{e} r e ̂$ ê, to insert ` before $\mathbf{7}$; see V. 15 .
 .מגותך.

\#




 This verse, though found in ( $\sigma$, is to be omitted as interrupting the list of infidelities (Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea), and as chronologically out of place. It is 20 an old gloss, added by a copyist who felt that the Philistine domination ought not to go unmentioned. The representation of the Philistines as ashamed of Israel's idolatry is strange. In any case int (here syntactically impossible) must be regarded as a gloss on שוּר. Halevy, l. c., defends the verse.
(29) All 17,4. CORN. omits ' 2 ; Halévy reads (here and in 17,4) ' 2 .
 on v. 30.



 circumcise, in the tropical sense (CoRnill); for similar readings of $\$ \mathrm{H}$ see Field. © had our text how great the wickedness of thy heart! (whence Grätz הhat for $\mathbf{N}$ ). The expression how weeck thy heart! fits not badly into the con- 35 nection; 7 放 may be old copyist's error for $\rceil=$, or possibly the feminine form was invented or adopted (it is $\dot{\pi} \pi \alpha=\lambda \in \mathrm{Y}$.) in allusion to the idea of weakness
 $\sqrt{ }(6)$ and the testamento two of the Coptic and Arabic Versions; but this hardly suits the connection. Halevy proposes the doubtful rab of Ex. 3,2.
 тaîc $\theta$ vүatpáoiv oov.
 All

 variations from 4l); a general observation, here out of place and an interruption of the sense.
 Ewald, Smend, Dayidson).
 obscure gloss; but, the correction of the preceding word being made, they are a necessary part of the antithesis.
difficulties．That it refers to the second cagle seems certain（so Rashi，Hitz， CORN．）from the interpretation（vv．12－21）of the allegory：vv．3－6 are explained in 12－14； 7 in 15： $8.9^{\text {a }}$ in 16 ； 10 in 18 ff ． $9^{\text {b }}$ must be explained in 17 ，and we expect it to say that he（the eagle）will not avail when it（the vine）is plucked up．As the text stands，it naturally refers to the first eagle，but in any case it is defective．Following $v .17$ we may insert $-\cdots y$ after $\Xi 7 \Sigma y$ and，in accor－
 a corrupt form，for（cf．Ols．$§ 199^{\circ}$ ），or in some way affected by following
 used of plucking up a tree．Hitz．takes as＝to clevute（to prosperity），a 10 sense that does not agree with the＇ש．Grärz＇n－is？．For prep．ל we must write $y_{\text {，}}$ after the $\begin{gathered}\text { I } \\ \mathrm{V} .17 \text { ：during the plu：king up．There still remains }\end{gathered}$ the difficulty that in part of this clause（コา $\square$ ）the figure of the allegory is abandoned，and these two words should perhaps be deleted．
 without materially affecting fll ．
（14．16）All



Al 7 רה，apparently from 7 ，though found clsewhere $(\psi \psi 33,10 ; 89,34)$ ，is pro－ bably scriptio plena for 9รก，from าะ．
 Zedekiah shall be taken to Babylon seems not out of place here，though it is not easy to account for its absence from $\boldsymbol{G}_{\text {；}}$ ；possibly the cyc of the $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ scribe
 Al
（21）fll possibly gloss on following rexi；it is omitted by CORN．

All ${ }^{\text {an }}$ ，（J，fits the parallelism，though it may be omitted without serious loss．The text of $\mathbb{G}$ in this verse shows some confusion．The construction of －⿰㇇⿰亅⿱丿丶丶⿱⿰㇒一乂，without cxpressed object（cf．following שתלח），is to be noted．Corn．follows （6．GRÄTZ ׳ונט．
（23）CORN．＇s emendation $\min$ is attractive，as the cedar is not properly a 35 fruit－bearing trec；but the text here appears to follow that of $v .8$ ，where the nouns are the same，and the verbs change places，and 9 may be uscd in the general sense of product；（丁 карпóv．
After tll
18 （2）At bcginning of the verse（6 inserts אדן an expression casily inscrted or omitted．
fll לxרש similar connection， $\mathbb{6}$ agrees with A ．


 crime，but not cating on the mountains；see W．Robertson Sumth，Religion of the Semites ${ }^{2}$ ，343；cf．English Translation of Leziticus，p．87，1． 10.
It ， （6）Yuvaîka év àpèdpu oũoav．
（7）At 2in；read בim（CORN．），which accords better with the construction in vv． 12. 16；בוn，morcover；is an Aramaic word，not found elscwhere in OT as noun（verb

16 expressed by (5AVs, and might be omitted; but, as the temporal sense of is here not appropriate, we may read $\pi$ rer for, which brings out the contrast
 does not exist. In the Charter of Nebuchadnezzar 1 , col. $i, 1$. in we must read saxxi; sce Hilprecht's cdition of the text, Leipzig, 1883, p. 2, n. 3 and Delitzsch's HW' 493. Sa.x.xu means perluaps pit, zuell (רצz); of. $s$ for $s^{2}$ as in xursainis \&c. Cf. also me saxatu, ASKT 114, It where suxatu is perhaps plur. of שֻׁn. The $n$ of the rerbal stem is sccondary (against De-
 (7x2). - I. H.]



A15 $52^{\text {b }}$ (beginning with $ת$ ) omitted by CORN. as repetition of $52^{\text {a }}$; it seems to be repetition by the $P_{\text {rophet }}$ for emphasis.


 and this would suit the statement of v .53 , while 11 is supported by the gencral context (vv. 51-53).


An The following words ות ( Before following דָּ insert :
(59) 411 , אד, (5)
 from the beginning of the verse; this is unnecessary if the verb be taken in present time.
 adopted by Corn., Grärz; but the rcading of agrees well with the context. On the readings of $\AA$ and $\Theta$ of. Field's note.

17 (3) All
(5) Ill $+\pi_{p, r} \wedge(5) ;$ error of copyist, perhaps from preceding $\pi p$. I ut firmaret ra-
 as is the he placed it of RV. No Hebrew word $n$ p is known.
 sec 31,5.6.8. On the true reading of 41 see notes of DE ROSSI, BÄr-DEL., and 40 Ginsburg.
(7) Al

(8) Al bx; write y, as in v. 5 .
 easily inserted than omitted.

## All

 (Hitzig).

 lated in form to the last clause of $v$. Io by inserting | n |
| :---: |
| before |
| $v ;$; but it is | better, with Corn., Siegfr., to omit the

ולוא בזרע גדולה ובעם דב לםשאות אותה משרשיה
mars the elegiac rhythm，but gives an unsatisfactory thought，and does not accord with v．Io．How was thy mother a lioness！is impossible both in Hebrew and in English or German；quare mater tua leana inter liones cubavit is out of the question．Read $\boldsymbol{T}$（cf．Cant．2，9），which gives an opening like that of v． 10, and prefix $ל$ to $\times \because=$ ．This change（the verse－division being made at restores the rhythm not unsatisfactorily；but rhythm and sense are improved by


 be changed to
 whether we render waited or delayed，but nothing better presents itself．Possibly we should read ibm，Nif．of nin sick（cf．34，4；1s．17，11），or אלn．he wius remor． ed（cf．Mic．4，7），or nis he was carried off．
Al
（7） 111 ， \＆he walked in his might，free rendering after（©．© he destroyed his castles（or，
 that 拥 may be used of breaking vessels but not palaces（for which is the word）seems to hold．Hirz．＇s own emendation ine carried off his 20 prey to his lair is somewhat remote，and so that of Corn．，who changes Hitz．＇s verb to $:=19$ ，he lay down in his lair，referring to $\psi \psi$ 104，22；139，3．Marti （cited by Siegrr．）reads $=1$ ind he multiplied his widows（suggested also by DAVIDSON），but the connection favors a reference to some physical destruction．
 to $\boldsymbol{y}$ above．It is perhaps impossible to restore the text with certainty．The connection seems to require for some parallel to $\begin{gathered}\text { encer } \\ \text { ，and for the verb }\end{gathered}$
 ravaged thetr dwellings iff．Jer． 31,28 where this verb occurs as synonym of various expressions of destruction）．
Ill may appropriately be said of a lion，and CORN：＇s emendation ニッグ

 ry，the appropriate object of the verb（לקp，cf．Neh．12，t2 with Josh．6，10）is 35 omitted，so here hip is omitted；render and the nations cried out against him： cf．Davidson．The Versions support ！ll，of which se give free renderings． Grätz ויחוּ
 led to labylon，and there kept in a cage．The words

 $11 \mathrm{eb} D=$ Assyr．$\check{s}$ ，see note on $\mathbf{1 6 , 4}$ ）．In the passages quoted by Lemy，Neuhebr．

 ManN s．o．）is，of course，derived from our passage．－For ann see notes on the English＇Translation of Ezekiel，p．132，1．53．－1＇．H．］ All $6 x$ ；write 38. －The $\quad$－jp－rhythm fails in $9^{\text {b }}$ ．
10）VV．10－14 form a second הן with not very well defined elegiac rhythm． All
 CORN．，SIf：Grk．omit．Rashi，wht，thou art like one whose mother whes a aine． C\％．Büтtch．in Stud．u．Krit．，18jo，pp．Cof If．
in Dan． $\mathbf{1}, 10$ ），and the collocation $2 \pi$ infan is difficult．－Halévi，RÉJ，Vol． 24.


（10） the unintelligible $\pi$ is probably repetition out of $\sin$ Davinsos）．（ 5 has for
 aủtoû toû dıкaiou oủk Є̇тopєúӨŋ，which gives a good sense，and is adopted by CORN．and SIEGIR．，but seems rather to be a paraphrase of the text of 1 l （SMEND）with the form of which it is not easily brought into relation．The omission of the last clause of $v$ ．io gives tolerable clearness to the text．This 10 clause possibly arosc from a miswriting of the words（as enmended）in v．11：
 represent תxim $\pi \in \mathscr{y}$ ，and the rest may be a gloss after v．If．

（13）For Bï＇s ת ת Ginsbưg writes תוュעゥ．
 with the context；cf．Ginsburg＇s notc．

（15）Al An הּ
（16）BÄR ロาע；GinsBURG ロาy．
（17）ill $3 y$ ；read $3 y$, as in v． 8 and in（ $\sigma$.
（18） 5 Il $+\pi s$ ，unintelligible gloss，or accidental insertion of a copyist．
（20）Kethîb シய゙า；insert article with Qerê．
（21）Kethîb insun；rcad Qerê umsun．


 Kethîb צמדקו；sead Qerê rg̨p．
 by v． 24 ，and is to be adopted．For arty GRÄTz reads אוה．
 insertion from $v .1$ ，appropriate there but not here．The contrast expressed in 1.14 is not found here，but the ascription of fear to the sinner is appropriatc． The word may have dropped out of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ by scribal accident．

（29）Ill $\overline{\square g}$ ：；read piur．＂נבת，to agree with the plur．subject．（G here has sing．sub－ ject and verb．


（31）All $\mathfrak{A}$ ；read ，with（5（HıTZ．），as the connection requires；0．，moreover，is 40 not an allowable complement to $\because 巛 \mathrm{~m}$ ；for the construction SIEGFR．compares Jer． $33,8$.

A1 scribe．

19 （1） 41 bs，scribal error for $5 y$.
 so Ew．，Hitz．，Corn．，Davidson，Orelli．［The plural in such cascs，however， may be amplificative；see note on 29,3 ：cf．$\psi \psi 24,2 ; 42,7 ; 105,15 ; 137,1$, \＆ic． 50 and Notes on Isaiah，p．IO9， 1.9 －P．H．］
（2）The rhythm of the verse is in disorder，and the word $i$ ，found in all the Versions， offers serious difficulties．The translation What was thy mother？not only

20 copyist's repetition of the following 'ובִּ (Lag., Prov., v; GGN 1882, pp. 168 ff . $=$ Mitth. 1,91). Corn. במוּסר. On Hitz.'s emendation pan of purify' ing sec Klost. (in Strack-Zöckler), Klttel (in Kautzsch), Budde (in Haupt), on 2 Sam. 13,9. To the reading (בטen Corn. objects that means not fale, count (Zihlung) but only number (Zahl), and that a synonym of $\mathbf{n}$ ew is here demanded. But in 1 Chr. 9,28 we have they brought them in by tale ('ra), and both 0 and ( v .38 ) refer to a process of numbering.


 your idols through the fire), SIEGFr. burn your idols; but 'y does not mean burn, and to prass idols through fire (i. $\epsilon$. offer them up) would be an unexampled procedure (according to Corn it is suggested by iv .26 .31 ). All is favored by the antithesis $=$ but afterwards, not and then.
Al clause; HıTz., CORN., $=$ Ew ix. fll ironically bids them serve idols now, declaring that hereafter they shall serve JHVH alone; (6) seriously commands the destruction of idols. The harder reading seems preferable. As to the possibility (denied by Hitz.) of participle instead of imperf. in future negative conditional clause, cf. Ew. $\$ 335^{\text {b }}$; Ges. Kautzsch ${ }^{26}$, § $159, v$.
,

19 （11）Instead of nith and of write sing．，with $\mathbb{G}$ ，and as in v．14；and make the predicates sing．here and in $v .12$ ，and，in accordance with these changes，omit
 amplificative；see above，p．70，1．50．－I．H．］．
For til an⿰y thick branches（so Cornill）read תゴ；clouds．
 text is not clear：the vine is cast down，the branch is burned（ $v .12$ ），the vine is transplanted（v．13）；whence，then，the fire of v．14？If the verse be retained as a concluding resumptive statement，then，since the purpose seems to be to say that the destruction of the nation comes from the royal house，and since the 10 ＇ and（with CORN．）insert article before הu．

20 （1）Al לארッツ；（ f ol̂kou lopan入，and so CORN．；see note on 14，3．

（5）ת
 as glosses；Hitz．thinks the second an insertion that interrupts the connection． ＇They are found in（ $\sigma$（the first，however，as E＇rvopionnv），and may be only 20 redundancies of style．
 only of reconnoitering or spying out（Deut．1，33）．

，7）אלהיהם（1）write
（9）Al byil；CORN．（after §）not so well：Disi．The general term is here needed．－ 31 ñ in point as infinitive．

retains the former，and omits the latter as marring the parallelism and here
inappropriate．It is a redundancy which appears to belong to the style of the inappropriate．It is a redundancy which appears to belong to the style of the 30 chapter．
（13）Bär cתis；Ginsburg אהם．
（14）At newn；Corn．noms，as in r．9．－ 111 han；point as infinitive，as in v．g．
（15）After the sense requires the insertion of arit，as in $\mathbb{G}$ ． Before וְ וnsert with © © of．v． 6.

（22）细
All



（29）V． 29 of th， ancient insertion，also found in $\mathfrak{G}$ ，an etymological gloss，improbable for Ezekiel， who nowhere else gives an etymology；of．Field＇s note；Lag．，Mitth．1，213．

The interrog．－before and probably repetition of preceding i．The interrogative form is，however， natural and vigorous．


 tion；it is better taken as rhetorical repetition．
Ill ๆコン：（（G）èv toútols，Hitz．，Corn．，Sifgfr．ant（that is，on aciount of your sins）． For Ill，cf．29，7．
（30）Al घשר ר by atickedness；Sh：GFR．（in Kautzsch omits＇ M ．Better profoned，wicked（cf． $\because 34$ ，and $\psi 75,5$ ．

 reading in next verse．The same expression in the next verse Cors．emends to so
 seems to be，however，that the crown shall vanish till the future king comes．

All לanc，which affords no sense，must be changed to hand and transposed so as to stand before P ？ 3 ，as in v． 15.
（34）Al 7 nix；read，with HrTz．，CORN．，mins，the reference being to the sword．
For following 6 x read 4 ．


（37）All ；תהּיה；read ，the predicates elsewhere in the paragraph being feminine．

（3）lefore $\boldsymbol{7}$（5）inserts $\mathbb{W}$ ，as in 24,6 ．
All
 the parallelism with the next versc．Grä＇ry transposes למת לn to end of verse． 11 yields a good sense．
（4）All ETưv oov； 3 agrees with $(\mathfrak{G} ; \mathbb{\$}$ thy days are near；and the time of thy years is at hand；『 the day of thy destrution is near，and the time of thy discrace is at 33 hand．The Oriental Jews also read ny instead of y（and so 2 MSS of De Rossi）． The verbs should be either both Qal or both Hif．；the latter form is favor－ ed by V． 3 and the whole connection：Jerusalem has so acted as to bring on its punishment．In the first clause we must read sing．thyy（it is the day of judgment that is meant，cf．v．3）and in the second clause we then expect time．
Ill mine must be omitted（with Corx．）as gloss，and written as parallel to
 instead of $\overline{7}$－ 7 ，which ，has stands immediately beneath on the page［evidently misunderstanding of a correction in final revise．－P．H．］．
（5）An
（7）Ill pyy＝wi；cf．All and（6）in w．12．29；18，18．
（8）This verse（found in $639 \mathbb{Z}$ ）is omitted by CORN．as the inscrtion of a ritualistic cditor；but Ezekicl in this section freely mingles ritual and moral offenses．（f） has the verbs in 3 plur．，and this is perhaps the true reading；the direct address to the city is found also in fll 8.12 ，where $(5$ again has 3 pers．


（14）Al םreb；read arba，with（5）$\varepsilon^{\prime} v$ ．
 for the idea，of． 13,$19 ; 20,9 ; 36,20$ ，and v． 26 below．The form in 11 is perhaps 50 meant to get rid of the mention of the profanation of JHVH；© $\mathbb{E}$ ．Instead
 I have been profunted，which does not agree with the time of $1: 15$ ．Stigrk．

21 （17）Al 6 for for
（18）All equally unintelligible．Cf．the לema
（19）位（1）The text is meaningless，but stands in all the Versions．

 but not natural；aישhemeans not herocs but afficers（here not appropriate），and the sword in the text is described by its relation to the slain，not to the slayers．
 （omitting inewh as gloss），taking the verb in the sense（not elsewhere found 10 to seize with the hand．These are both graphically attractive；but，according to the context，the sword cannot be in the Prophet＇s hand．

All

 see Fried．Inelitzsch in Zcilschrift fiir Keilschriftforschumg，2，395；［if．Her． Langu．29；Prol．75；AlV 27．The Assyr．stem nas＝nav，however，does not exist．Dilitzsch does not give it in his HWP，p． $5^{\text {b }}$ ，and ibid．p． $299^{2}$ he admits that the synonym of maqaçu＇rack＇ $11 \mathrm{~K} 23,9 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{b}$ is naţbaru，not nabburu $=20$
 below）．Instead of abûıu＇torture＇Prol．75．3；AW 27 （cf．Zimmern，Fusppsalmern， 93）Delitzsch reads now apurat（see HWB，112）．－P．H．］

The doubtful a $\pi \alpha E \lambda \in \Upsilon$ ． SMEND，Corn．，Grätz．
（21）It gives four terms，of which two are right and left，for the directions of the sword．It seems better，with BötTCHER，to get the other two directions by
 ing it from（ 6 O which the scribe forgot to cancel．（I）gives only the two directions right and left．

 For 4ll לis write לy，as in VV．17．19．

$41+$ Nig after

After following דרד insert $7 \because$ ，to make the phrase complete，at the head of the rad to each city（cf．SMEND）．


（27） $\mathrm{Al}+\mathrm{an}$ nity here out of place，copyist＇s repetition of same phrase in this verse below．［For ans，see above，p．47，1．46．］CORNILL，בישר，to appoint captains．
 IlOUBIGANT cited by ROsINMUQLLER！，a noun which may probably be assumed 45
 and Zeph．1，14，© $\sigma k \lambda \eta \rho \alpha$（SMEND）．CORN．holding this noun to be doubtful，

（28） $1 \mathrm{ll}+\mathrm{a}$（ b ，unnecessary alongside of anיגפ．
 think they hare weveks upon atecks（nシуニサ）．
（29）All


23 is possible，but so general an expression is here not unnatural．It is better to point |  |
| :---: |
| $: ~ a s ~ e l s e w h e r e ~ i n ~ t h e ~ l i o o k . ~$ |

（12）Ill לx；read לy．
Ill ニ゙ニ゙p；read コンフา，as in v．5；［contrast above，p．76，1．48］．
 is appropriate here，JuvH speaking as an observer．（5 follows Al．

（15）Al＇912
 reading of $\mathbb{\leftarrow} \pi \alpha \rho \beta \beta \pi \tau \dot{\alpha}$ ，see Holmes－P．irsons．



Ill אpuml ；read y＝unt，after a suggestion of CORNilL＇s；auas saled fits the con－ nection much better than was defiled；cf．16，28．29．
OTט ה
（IS）Alt Min written，as containing a doublet，and as interrupting the sense．It may be equally well understood as fulness of expression．

（20）Ill mitt GRÄTz nimb as＝memb．zir．，with（G aiboía，but this scems to be the sense of ายะ．

 a softencd expression for＇$n=$ ，and 0 ロッs．as agent，and so this last term is taken 25 by Reuss，DAv．，SilgFR．；but in v． 3 ＇ b is name of place．Point תimyar as in v． 3. Cf．Geiger，Urschor．397．Grät\％E゙リンy2．

（23）GRäTz deletes 321 ，comparing v． 15 ；it may be sufficient 10 cancel the t
All จxip；read コ’ニ9；see above，p．76，I． 43 ．

 ל．［In his Alhorient．Forsch．，second series， 2,254 （ 1899 ）Winckler proposes to
 all the Chuldeans，Pikod，the Sutcans and Kir，with the gloss all Assyiuns；of． Arrian iii，8，5 and Crit．Notes on Isaiah，p．197，1．37．－P．H．］
 26,7 ，adopted by CORN．，GRÄTz；but the geographical notice，appropriate in the historical statement of c． 26 （whence it was perhaps inserted by a Greek
 KV ，but the weapons are mentioned farther on in the verse．For later Jewish renderings，see Rashi，ed．Breithauli．The connection favors the sense multitude，and it is better cither so to understand $; s$ ，or，with BÖTTCHER， SMEND（who refer to 26,10 ），to read yat（cf．Illt\％）．FRIEDR．DELITzSCll（in 13．ik）finds the stem in Assyr．çinsi（Flood－tablet 1,43 ），which he takes as $=45$ heap together，collect．［The stem of eginsï，however，is $\mathfrak{i x s =}=$ Eb，Aram． $\mathfrak{i}=$ （sec（jen．45，17，E）lude；cf．ZIMMLRN，Busspsalmen 9S，2；FRIINR．DIELITZSCII， Jrokegomena 176；J1．xsw，Ḱosmol．+13.77 ；and especially BFLsi：R in Beitr，zur Assyr．2，142．In his IIWI 556a DeLirzsCH takes the stem jws to lade to be iden－ tical with jws to fill；of．Meissner，Supplement，p． $80^{2}$ ．－P．H．］In the un 50 certainty as to the meaning and existence of $;$ is it may be allowed to remain in the text（aken as $=$ muttitucle，and the preposition $~=~$ should be inserted before it．It is omitted by ReUss and Sieqr ried．
retains $\operatorname{All}$ ，only omitting 7 ；but the nation is never the object of 约 elsewhere in Ezekiel．$\Sigma$ ，кататри́wow $\sigma \epsilon$ ；$\AA$ O（in St．Jerome）contaminabo tc．Ew．，Crätz ונחמתי．


 AI Mi：Grätz
（19）ארגי（15）
（20）Before קep the particle $\Sigma$ is required by following $i=$ ．
 at the beginning of v．21． 6 is simpler，ill more vivid．
（24）Sil when；（5 Bpexouevn；read Pual perf．of（Hitz．，CORN．），or better， with Smend，Orelli，part．מpa．
The following בְ בְ may be pointed，against Masorah，as Pual perf．
 quires．
（26）Omit article in ill אמש．
（27）All ת Mer 29 ，on the ground that the people（ $\mathrm{v}, 29$ ）should be contrasted with the frinces （27），and that the man of $v .30$ stands naturally in connection with the frophets 20 （28）．The order of 4 ll ，however，princes，prophots，peoplc，is also a natural onc．



23 （2）At in in placed by 6 after but this is hardly ground for changing the order

Al may be free translation，while the insertion of 9 in 4 is not easily accounted for．We should rather expect its omission as vor inhonesta．
 found in all the Versions（so Haupt）．
（5）Al 4 x for לy；sec proceding clause．
Al asinp，an ancient miswriting（found in all the Versions），not appropriate for 35 the Assyrians．Ew．zeurlike，from Aram．＝ip aure，but this is highly improbable for Ezekiel，even if there were such an adj．；Smann zearriors；llimz．red $(=\underbrace{}_{\text {ق to turn red，used of ripening dates！）explained by following clothed int }}$ purple；CORN．Drım，as in $v .23$ ，in sense of famous（cf．Num．1，16；26，9），but this sense is not proved；ReUsS，Siegfr．，Stade regard the word as probably to unrecognizablc corruption．Read だュา（Jer．39，13），which suits the connection， is an Assyrian title，and is graphically not hard．The p，having got into v． 5 （perhaps from preceding 7）would be repeated in vv．12， 23.
 ＇battle，war＇are also found in Assyrian，but the common Assyrian word for $t$ zuarrior is quridu，which is also used as an epithet（queridu Bel，\＆c．）；if． SCHRADER，K゙ $1 \mathrm{~T}^{2} ; 16$ below．EMTp（also asmp， $.23^{\prime}$ may be a corruption of ם：רירק＝Assyr．qurade＇warriors＇or＇the warlike＇（Delitzsch，Hundwörterbuch，
 been Inoked upon as a part of the proper name．－P．11．］

（10）At it in areyt，omitted by CORN．as marring the parallelism，and on account of the divergencies of the Versions；he holds it to be a gloss after 16,41 ．This

23 [For iv. $\ddagger 0-44$ of. Paul Ruben's Crit. Remarks, p. 22. P. H.]
(45) In ${ }^{\text {a }}$ make the suffix fem., in (cf. Diehl Pron. pers. suff., Giessen, 189j).
(46) fill yליהם; read [see, however, note on Jud. 19,24. - P. H.]
(47) fill ; read inf. abs. in accordance with preceding and following constructions, and with ( 5 .
Alt + + hp, found in all Versions; omit, with CORN., as inappropriate after the change of the preccding verb; perhaps scribal repetition from preceding verse.
Make the suff. in All

 place. - A1 לא, crror for $\%$ y.
(3) Aln
 emphasis.

All
 Hisz.).

V. $6^{\text {b }}$ of ill, beginning with למתֶñ, is better, with Corn., transposed to follow v. IO, where it agrees with the empty of $\boldsymbol{v}$.II, while in $6^{2}$ there is no mention of picees. With this omission the connection between the rust of $6^{2}$ and the blood of 7 becomes clear.
(7) [צחיח lias no connection with Assyr. çusin; cuşi means mursh, fon-lund or an 25 artificial islumd in the midst of a lake. - 1 . H.]
 thus lost.
(9) Al
 of the description, it stands not inappropriately at the beginning of this fresh address.
(10) All (in all Versions) lirew the broth; so $\Sigma 3$ (probably also AO) and
 sce Hitz., Sm., Corn.; Sifgfr. omits it as uncertain in meaning. According 35 to Rashi the meaning of the stem, both here and in Ex. $30,25.33$ (the anointing ail), is to make a mixture.
All +1 יָּ strangeness of the expression; the bones are not burned but boiled; sce 1.5 .
 on (6), 1.2 r .
 written and meaningless; but is not this mention of the purpose to remove the impurity presupposed by the interpretation given in v. 13? טמאתח in our verse might be considered interpretation of $\min$ (though it should then stand second 45 instead of first, but the two may naturally be mentioned.
 less. The sense she lus swearied herself (or me. witht toil, if it could be got from the words, is here out of place.
Before the next following clause CORNALL, inserts 9 , omitting \%

 gloss. The words break the connection betwcen 1r. 12 and 13 .

23 Al シュア；（ $\mathfrak{5}$ quגakịv；CORN．（but not after（5）ロワワ，which suits the connection； but 1 ll also yields a good sense．
（25．26）All，v． $25^{\text {b }}$ ，beginning with nin，and v． 26 are omitted by CORN．as interpolation； the passage has somewhat the appearance of an explanation，but is in place． It is given in all the Versions．
（28）All nאני＂；Ew．，holding this to be not in keeping with the connection，or ，iי CORN．omits it．It is a bit of realism；cf．16，37．
（29）All following עיע．
 For 411 （fun has kaí．


 interjected plarase in 1.32 （cxplanatory gloss），but this is not clearly the case． 15 Sifert．brackets as glosses the words addressed to Jerusalem in both verses
 clear sentence．CORN，omits 3 בלולו
 interjected exclamations，may be retained，except that innein，$^{(5)}$ ，should probably 20 be omitted as gloss；of．above，note on $\psi^{b}$（sn HAUPT）．
（34） $41+$＋ doubtful verb（HiTz．suggests 7מנ）．ミ，followed in part by Grältz，has the im－ probable reading thou shatt shaare thy hair．At must be rendered its sherts thou shalt crush（Num．24，8），an inappropriate conception．For 111 ＇$\pi$ HıTL．， 25
 its dregs，an attractive conjecture but for the rare verb sed．De Werte，Reuss lick for＇נ．The expression is better omitted，with Sibgir．
Ill
（ $3+35$ ）（twice），A（5．

（40）The mixture of persons and numbers in 1v． $40-42$ ，bizarre to modern taste，is sustained in general by all the texts．（5 omits has



Assyr, stem sęifu (impf. isǐt), a synonym of qulluhu iff. King, Magic, No. 11, 10, Di:..) seems to mean to slight, to neglect; the synonym nigu, on the other hand, which may be identical with Heb. ixj (cf. Del. HW 646 ), does not occur in any connected text. - P. H.]

(17) (II)

26 (1) The month, fallen out of $\{11$, is not supplied by the Versions, but, as the destruction of the city is here assumed, the date must be later than the fifth month (Jer. 52, 12).

 The fulness seems to be more naturally said of Tyre, as in 11 l ( $6 f .27,25$ ), and the curt antithesis in in innen without expression of subjects, is appropriate in this exclamatory sentence.
(3) 41 M
 might be scribal imitation of preceding העלִית (CORN.); yet the construction of Qal with לגבְלָ is difficult; the $ל$ is hardly distributive (Hirz.), or original Aramaizing sign of acc. (Smind). For ל, Se have Z; marc flucturns. If we write 20 Qal inf., $ל$ should be changed to 3 ; it is perhaps better to retain Hif, and omit 3 as the insertion of an Aramaizing scribe. Cf. v. 19.
(4) Bär

 Wislly. (in Sm.) $=1 \mathrm{y}$ y , but the reference appears to be to a number of peoples, not as in $\mathbf{1 7}, 15$, but as in 32,3 .
There is no ground for referring ve. 7-15 to the siege of Tyre by Antigonus, B.C. 315-313 (Manchot, JPl', 14: pp. 423ff.).
 There seems to be no reason for departing from 111 .
 terms is after Ezekiel's manner. CORN. omits לגלמל, to preserve symmetry:
(11) 纤
(12) (6) puts all the verbs in $v .12$ in the sing., continuing Nebuchadnezzar as subject; 35 here also it is hard to decide between $(5$ and At . The sing. seems more natural, but might for that very reason be written by a Hebrew or Greek scribe.
ת

 of 4 Al
(17) [The plur. Dיפ is amplificative; of. Gen. 1, 10; \% 24,2; and above, p.70, 1.51.-l'.11.]
(17.18) The clegy in (5 reads thus:-



This commends itself by its simplicity and symmetry, and is to be adopted instead of the longer form in 1 ll ; a comparison of the two texts will make it evident how the additions in st have arisen.

Between ve. 19-21 destruction by the seat) and vy, 1-6 (lestruction by the nations' there: is no diserepancy (M1.3nC10t, JPT, 14.446 ; the former is made posible by the latter, or is poctical statement of the later. The two descriptions are Frek.


(16) MI Try
 silence.
 it is against the order in the Versions; of. Hitz.'s note.
 the sense bread of mouning; for the custom of the funeral-meal Davidson compares Jer. 16,7. cibos lugentium, and so e. Read Edre, after Hos.9,4, 10

(18) On the text of $(6 \mathrm{sec}$ Corn.'s note.






D. 11. Müller (Proph.) omits the last clause of the verse on strophic grounds.
(4) All 12 Pi., only here; (5s read Qal.

At

 expressions have infs., and it is lacking in (5 (followed by §) kui éréxapac é 25
 pears from the translation by ( 5 of the similar phrase in $v .15$, and from $£(\mathrm{~cd}$. RANKE) here, at insultasti in anima tua (malicious joy". Instead of $=$ ו we
 omit it, since, if it were original, it would bc hard to account for its absence 30 from ( 5 ; it appears to have been introduced into 11 from 36,5 . CORN. retains this expression, and omits $=5=2$, holding the latter to be lacking in $\mathbb{G}$. Grätz
 requires.
(7) Kethîb :ב, crror of transcription for $Q^{e}$ rê iz.

Al Truss; (厅) ammitieq; CORN. omits it as destroying the parallelism. D. 11. MüllisR assumes, after ' $x$, a long lacuna as necessary to completc the stanza.

Al + י": Lefore $-\cdots$ © $(\mathbb{T}$ inserts $\operatorname{lopan\lambda }$, addition for completeness.
 モיר: from the connection.
 $\int 119, Y$; the whole cxpression is difficult. The V'crsions, except ( $\sqrt{5}$, follow It. t5





(14 16). Ill
 of their soul; ewith crultution rie's of soul. See note on x .6 above. The
(Onom. ${ }^{2}$ 367, from the Armenian name for Cappadocia) anta; ? Prgmati: CORN. E'm, Licn, 10, 18. Cappadocia scems too remote. \%imar; occurring in Gen. 10, if along with Arvad, is more probable, but still an uncertain name. The word seems to be the name of a people, and, till a satisfactory enendation is reached, must stand as in Il. Cf. Bertholer.
(12) After foy (f) has kai xpuoiov, here improbable; sold is nowhere else in OT mentioned in connection with Tarshish (Smbnd).
 IIW $35^{2}$, from ezibu 'to let;' if. Mrisswir, Supplement, p. $4^{\text {bl }}$ is some stipula-
 tion. We must prefix the = protii Grs.Kat'rzsC1126 \$ 119 , p' throughout to iary and delete it before the objects sold. In $1: 13$ c. sr. we must read.... 902 ?

 p. 132. - I' 11.]
14) 期 + ロung , corrupt doublet of following ox ceding E'oie. It is found in ( 6 , which renders it i $\pi \pi \in i ̂$; but it must here mean horses; ( 6 omits $\left.\begin{array}{c} \\ \hline 192\end{array}\right)$ which, however, it is better, with CORN., to retain as natural accompaniment of axib, and to suppose that it has fallen out of $(\mathbb{J}$ by

(15) Al 17 ; read 17 , with $\mathfrak{G}$, , coming below, $\mathfrak{1}$, 20.

Instead of tll
 im (iricth., pp. 35 f.
 south to north, and Syria coming in v.I\&. The details of the products of Edom are
 which CORN. suggests (a precious stonc), as in 28,13. After הן (6)

 of textile stuffs between precious stones as improbable, would omit these three words; Corn. gets rid of them by emendations and omissions. In sll and (o) we have two different texts, and our ignorance of the Edonite commerce makes it difficult to decide between them. Possibly III presents a mixture of two verses, one (with precious stones) relating to Edom, the other (with stuffis relating to Syria.
 of Tyre, vi. 1225.
(17) Ill תִּ second word may be the name of a product. CORN. Asze enura aitheat amt spicery, see (ien. 43,1t, an attractive emendation; CRiiz 7rbiouna. \& riex to
 the name of a plice [ $f f$. Jud. 11,33$]$, nt may be doubtfully retained.
 Heb. "?p. rusted gruin; ? halsumum, It appears to be here meant as a sort of

(18) all

4tl 1 !! ! ili (


 emendation has the advantage of accounting for fll in is miswriting of a text-word, and is ingenious and attractive; but see next note. רms may signify some color (if. 3 coloris optimi, and Jud. 5,10 ), or may be the name of a

26 obviously rhetorical variations of one theme, and may well be from the same. hand.
(20) Ill Alt (B.̈ß) בתוּ , from the connection.
 (Orelli).
(21) All and for following לוּ writes wh.

27 (2) Though this discourse is called a $\pi$ הp, the elegy proper is contained in w. so 32-36. [Sce also Wincelwe, AT C'ntersuchunern, p. 115.]

Ill יאני Well which seems unpoetically explanatory.
(4) All בנביל; Corn. but ditelling pluce seems less appropriate than domain: GRÄTZ נבולּ

 note on Ez. 31, 3 .
(7) All atanding in (f) in corrupt form, is omitted by Corn. as gloss, on the ground mainly that os here can only mean flug, and that ancient ships had $=0$ no flags; see his excellent note. On the other hand, 0 is used of a sail in ls. 33,23 , whence it may probably be inferred that sails (which were often colored) served as distinguishing signs for ships, which is the statement of All ; sce also Davidsox's note. [Dٍ may be an Assyrian loan-word, $=$ hisu 'elcvation' or 'something raised up,' stem xim (see Delutzsch, HW $485^{\text {b }}$ and of. © Jer. 6, 1), 25 and this is identical with niš" 'signal, mark (cf. תNé, Lev. I3,2 \&c.), symbol' (1)el. HW $488^{b}$ ). - For the $D=$ Assyr. we see above, p. $6 \neq 1.32$. P. H.]



(9) The description of the commerce of Tyre, w. $9^{b}-25^{a}$, is regarded by Mavehot
 being complete and unitary without it. let the geographical details are in Eyekiel's manner, and he is probably the author of the commercial description; it either belongs to the original form, or was inserted by the lrophet. Such 35 detailed descriptions, with recurring formulas, are not out of accord with Ezekid's style; cf. cc. 16.17.19.20.23. Nor is there an observable transition, in $3^{b-}-y^{a} \cdot y^{b}-25^{a}$, from poctry to prose; proper poetical rlythn we do not find till we come to the lament, 1 : 32-36. Although, thercfore, the supposition of an interpolation is attractive, it may be better to retain the present form of the chapter.
 und Euturopa, pp. 115 f . As the territory intended is Egyptian, it is better to conform this list to that of 30,5 , and read (so Grätz), $\boldsymbol{\sim}$, טוe; see note on $30,5$.
 more natural herc. Halevy (Milenges d"ćsigraphie, 69) reads -לmו Cilicit, and Cors. emends to the relations between Tyre and these places being uncertain. Failing a satisfactory geographical mame, the word must be omitted, perhaps (Grälz) as dittogram from $v$. 10 . [See also Wiscklir (AT (ntersuch. ISO), who suggests 50 Chulkis, west of Damascus.]





A nothing better, and CORN.'s emendation הye glorious, commends itself as being graphically deducible from the word in the text and as offering an appropriate contrast to the destruction described in v. 34. D. II. Mülurk juq. like a
 MSS have the perf. (De ROSSi).


 unsatisfactory, but nothing better suggests itself. For ade read oria.


28 (1) W'inckler (AT C'mersuch., pp. 114f.) holds that c. 28 was not written by Forckiel, his grounds being that the section rv. $11-19$ is a weak imitation of c. 27, that $1-10$ (in which Tyre is destroyed by JHYH) is parallel to c. 26 in which the destroyer is Nebuchadnezzar), and that the reference to Daniel and the $\quad$ (v. $3^{\text {) }} 20$ points to a late post-Exilic datc. These considerations do not appear to be decisive. We have here a series of denunciations of 'Tyre, like those against Egypt in cc. 29-32, with natural resemblances and differences. In v. 3 the reference is to sages who might easily belong to the 6th century B.C.
(2) \#\#l

 an argument (see above, l. 21): ' h is a term of F ', and might have been used by Eackiel. Cf. 31,8.
The stem eny has here not the sense hide or dect, obscure, but $=$ reach 10, 30

 probably late scribal addition.
 here desirable.


 (so Rashi, who renders it poninting). [תינコת (if. 43, 10) seems to be $=$ Assyr. tulinitu 'carcful preparation, model' (Del. HW' $338^{2} ;$ for 0 cf. Hag. 2, 23; Jer. 22,24; Cant. 8,6; the expression means ane retho is under special care and to protection, a stociat protígé or furorite ( $(6$ àmoopparioule órowbews, i. c., ant impression of the same scal, is practically equivatent to whse יtev, i. c. cast in sume mold; of. note on Gen. 1,26). The description in the following verse presupposes this metaphor of the model signct-ring. 日n is Il cbrew, not Issyrian; Assyriology can shed no light on this problem contrast Corvile and liertholric 45 ad loc.), though we may find same day the corresponding Assyrian term kumik: (or quntîq; DEL. IIW 580) tuknîli. - J'. 11.]

(13) In the number of precious stones given in $V .13$ the Versions vary ( $(\mathbb{1} 12,39$, \$S), and in so uncertain a detail there seems no reason for departing from 9 ll .50 BÄR ה Venice ectition of $1524-25$.


 or ledrn ( KV ) is out of the question, and Dedren (Ew., SmeND) is introduced in the next verse. But also $\boldsymbol{M}$ ( $(6$ kai oivov), standing here without connection, is to be regarded as corruption of preceding $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$; the rendering Jazun is precluded by the occurrence of that name in $\mathrm{v}, 13$. The order of words in st has been greatly changed by scribes.
 (so ( 6 ), in order that the Damascus-verse may end with the regular formula [cf. above, p. 83, 1. 8], the verse-division being made after 's; v. 19 is thus devoted to Uzal, as $\because .18$ to Damascus.

(22) All + This. This word is out of keeping with the norm of Ezekicl's sentence throughout the list of countries. It is either a very old scribal repetition (it is 15 found in ( () , or the corruption of the name of a place; CORN. writes (Gen. 10,7 ) which, he thinks, could not well be wanting here. The connection between Ezekiel and Gen. Io is close; there are, however, many names in that chapter that he does not mention.
 it in its Hebrew text.
 (which expression is supported by Ezekiel's usage, vi. 13.17.21.22), and the concluding word of the verse. Mez, Gesch. d. Stadt Harran, 1892 (cited by


 gives a proper end to the sentence, which in 4 is incomplete.
[For aniby cf. note on lsaiah 3,23 , ibid. p. S2, 1. I3. - P. H.]
(25) Al
 All weems to have arisen from the $\boldsymbol{y}$ of and corruption of תור. The preposition is after the construction in vx. 17.22.24. A, Eגєitoúpyel $\sigma 01$,
 thee is not natural. © in shits of the sea they rowed (יטיט), andbrought thee wedres, 35 whence Smind suggests ב omits 'ש as unintelligible, and CORN. 'y as gloss.
(27) Al מערֶך (first occurrence), omitted by Hirz., Cors., (inärz (?), as gloss which destroys the symmetry of the sentence.
Ill ובקָ; omit 2 , scribal crror.

 and reading some word = qóß in place of At A Ahe connection supports the general form of Ill: the pilots of the sinking ship cry out, their cry shakes the earth (cf. Jer. 49,21). But 41 'an common land is inappropriate; Rex'ss, Sm. take
 ( 5 qóßu), a word that docs not elsewhere occur in OT; Siegrr. omits; Reves attaches 31, 16; 32, 10. But these passages and Jer. 49,21 indicate here a word for land


[^1]$\qquad$
$\qquad$50
(31) (HMp, not snap (HAHN), is the form given in BÄR and GNosburg. V. 31 is lacking in $\mathfrak{G}$, and is omitted by Corx. as expansion of the preceding verse; the omission in $\mathbb{G}$ may be scribal oversight.

29 （2）th לy；write bx，according to Ezekiel＇s usage 6,$2 ; 28,21$（sc．）．

III＇ix；write רא，as in v．g．［The plural in mine may be amplificatize；of．notes on 19,$1 ; 26,17$ ．－P．H．］


 but perhaps for that very reason to be retained．
 up a corpse preparatory to burying it（Hos．9，6，and cf．Ew），yet the expressions so in Jer．8，2：16，4； 25,33 make it highly probable that we should write 1 Pp，with Hitz．，Corr．（and of．Dayidson，Orelli，Shegrr．）．
 ing word．

All is here metathesis（מעד $\boldsymbol{\square}$ ），see Qamhi，Rashi，Hitzig．



 though all also is pertinent and vigorous．
Lefore one insert prefix $h$ ，which has probably fallen out through preceding $ל$ ל．





 riches（so $\$$ ，Hirz．，Ruuss，Orlili，Siegir．），since the verse is concerned with 30 spoliation．But Ezekicl nowhere clse uses in in this sense（see 30，4．10．15；31，2． 18 al. ），and it is better，with CORN．，DAl：，to omit the words．
（20） 11 ＋$+\boldsymbol{\square}$ ל a forcign king，a sort of explanation that Fexeiel nowhere（lse thinks it necessary to make；omit，with Corn．，Siliorr．If it be retained， $\boldsymbol{m}$ ，should be changed 35 to $\begin{gathered}\text { ה゙リ，with？} \\ \text { ？}\end{gathered}$

30 （2）和（
 $1111332^{6}$ ．－1＇．II．］An imp．，like that of 1 ，is here natural，and se further 40 inscrt the imp．of
（3）All
 היר＇ 2 ；it is doubtful，however，whether simplicity should here be the decisive consideration．
（t）（1II（I）．See on 29，19；the reference to captivity is here，however， appropriate；sce $\mathbf{N : 1 5 . 1 8 . 2 6 . ~ S ~ r e a d ~}$
5）The list of gentilic names is corrupt．©

 ful whether there was an Egyptian ith；if．MölomR，As．It．Fur．，p．115，n．．3；in


 coris tui ef formminu tur. No satisfactory explanation has yet been proposed.
 who thought a verb necessary to must be placed after 7 , so as to read in the diry when thou ziert created I placed thee with the Cherub. Cf. Datinson.
 vision - a fuller picture than is given in cien. 2.3.
liefore בוּ insert the article, with ( $\sqrt{5}$, and in accordance with the context.
 bring this figure into connection with the Cherub of the Temple. הסובT is taken from I K8,7, and משמ (which cannot have anything to do with anointing) is probably a corruption of some other term. It does not occur in v. 16 . 3 exten-
 which, according to Jensen in Brockelmans's Lex: Sy/:, is a babylonian 15 loan-word, the genuine Aramaic stem being udo (with $L=\dot{E}, s_{1}$ );cf. جس ج

 the proteclor, the swurdian deity (Assyr. itu mušallimu or lammassu demqu); see Det. HW, P. $38 \mathrm{r}^{\text {b }}$ and English Translation of Esckicl, p. 155,1 6. - P. H.] Cf. also 20


All + ת゙̣ゥ. Either this word or must fall out, the two saying the same
 Ans in both places. The presence of $\boldsymbol{O}^{\circ}$ in 4 is more easily accounted for, as 25 scribal insertion or as doublet from preceding
 from following h.utpac. CORN. omits.
(16) All מלְ; read may be the right reading, or the final $n$ may have been added by a seribe from $3^{\circ}$ following 7 תות.



After Theg : the same expression from the beginning of $\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{I} 8$, where also it is found in $(6$. The position of the words in 41 is not unsuitable.

 1s. 46,8 . - 1'. 11.]
(22) A11

A1 19: © TVuan; in w. 23.24 both 41 and 6 have 3 pers. plur.
(23) \{ll omission of the Greek scribe by homooteleuton. (t) had $7=$ instead of 4 ma , and the 2 pers. pron. throughout the section, w. 22.23; this is casier for us, but the change of pronoun is frequent in Hebrew, and $₫$ probably here writes frecly in Ill לeser, read לem.
[Creek style.



29 (1) All gives roth $y$ ear, $10^{\text {th }}$ month, $12^{\text {th }}$ day; (6 $12^{\text {th }}$ year, $10^{\text {th }}$ month, $1^{\text {st }}$ day: The dates in 30,$20 ; 31,1$ make all more probable.
affirmation of v .21 is, however, identical with that of vv .22 .26 ; the two paragraphs, independent predictions, declare the ruin of Egypt. The verb in v. 21, 'שיחבי, is to be taken as general assertion, and as expressing the same fact as the future ly rendered, no rendering except that of (GACr (ouvtplßoutvous) representing Al ; § omits the second.
(23) Y. 23 of 1 ll is omitted by Corn. as being identical with $26^{a}$, and here interrupting the parallelism of $v: 22$ and 24 . It appears, however, to occupy the same position in the subsection $22-24$ as $26^{3}$ in the subsection 25.26 . It is found in all the Versions.

 to have here not two recensions of one original text, but two texts, both of which have claims to acceptance: $\mathbb{6}$ has the standing expression, 111 is more picturesque. Possibly, however, Ill and (G) give each a part of a longer original. In regard to the Endéel autiv it is to be obscrved that the expression (Hif. of with expect the I pers. here.
(25) All לא; read לy.

31 (3) All +3 , an old gloss, found in $(6 ;$ made by a scribe who saw here an allusion to Assyria. J. 1). Michi, Ew., Smend, Orelli read ment and take it as in construct relation with following 1 ®ֶ; but this is syntactically hard. Reuss sug-
 as $\mathbb{6}$ renders $17 \times$ in 27,5 by кumaptoons, and has the same word here, it is simpler 2 to omit אשוֹ. It is omitted by Siegrr. Cf. note on 27,6.
All לxִutin, ^ G, and a shady forest, an improbable description of a tree; the Versions, except ( 5 , take it freely as = with thich folioge. Grätz changes $\boldsymbol{i}$ to $=$ but this also gives an improbable comparison. The context suggests adj. + noun. The expression appears to be a gloss. [Cf. Whllit. on $\psi 72,16$.]


All על על עי הצים is to be omitted as inappropriate; the canals carry water to the soil, not to the other trees, which do not here come into consideration. The word was introduced from the expression in the next verse. It seems better also to write instead of שזהוה, in which the article probably comes from 'un in v. 5 ; the suffix is needed here as in 'מטע.
( 5 For siap write הas; the Aramaizing form in $\mathbb{N}$ is probably due to a scribe.

V. 5 should end with $\begin{aligned} & \text { arap } \\ & \text {; see next note. }\end{aligned}$
-1 branches) forth, is here forced and unnatural, though the verb is properly employed in $\mathbf{1 7}, 6$. The two terms, 'ש2 and (only one of which is given in (6) appear to be parallel, one an explanation of the other. Hutz. (ancl so apparently Rb:USS) omits בשלחו; but CORN. pertinently observes that the commoner word (here 'as) is more likely to be the gloss, and it secms better, with him, to

 contradictory combination of לa and a $=$ ( $=$ many, not grat, as in RV) is found only here and in $\Psi 89,51$, and in the latter passage the text is corrupt (sce notes 50
 and Is. 17,12), notwithstanding the suggestion of $h=$ from the context. Ret's. omits בל
 ^ißue૬, which may be for here or for preceding טis; we may read bs, and
 unintelligible וfll may be read ( 25,16 ), with Cokn., Sifgrik.; the may be gloss.
 insertion or omission.
 of a paragraph ; yet of. the equally difficule v : 10 , where ( $\sqrt{5}$ has the formula. Corn. omits, with $(\sqrt[G]{ }$, and inserts the $\pi=$ of $\mathscr{G}(v, j)$ at beginning of this verse.

 שיצ or or ixt the latter was read by some Greek codd. ( $\epsilon \sigma \sigma \mu$ ), and is adopted by Cornili. . מל might be omitted as doublet of the preceding word, מלאים, and the reading suift messengers (מלאים) is simple and satisfactory (if. 15 Is. 18,2, מלי phe . On the other hand, the text of all is good (messengers sent by JHVH, and ships, as in 1s. 18,2), and from it that of © may be derived without difficulty; itl may be retained as the harder.
Atl neph, ( 5 , syntactically not easy, but its absence is more easily accounted for than its presence, and see Jud. 8, If.

(11) All inc, $\mathbb{G}$, perhaps fallen out by similarity to preceding word. (5) wrongly connects הואו with preceding 7 יואי
 tion or onission is doubtful.
 the political relations only.

 Ětl, omitting the rest of the verse, from which (MËupews being corrupt repcti- 30 tion) we have ונשיאים מארץ מצרים; between this and fill there is little ground of choice.

 iws, Jer. 46,25 ; of. Nah. 3,8.


 favored by SMEND, but not natural. The connection suggests the storming of a city; and CORN:'s emendation commends itself: its atalls (shall be 40 broken through. Reuss, seine Mratern (sollen) durhbrochen (werden!. Subgr. omits.

 which '2 refers to cities.

 hinn; yet this last is repetition of first $\boldsymbol{\pi}=\pi$, and an addlitional repetition does not seem out of place in this excited utterance.
(22) Ill לx; read $3 \%$

All + א. These words are a scribal insertion intended to harmonize the sing. yin of 1.21 with the plur. תy of $v .22$; it is explained that not only the already broken arn ( $\mathrm{r} \cdot 21$ ) but also the sound one is to be broken. The
is contrary to the opening words of the ginchs in $31,2.18$ ，and does not do
 take the words as expressing a comparison（so the Versions）and reacl＇ g ＇ g ת＇מт，לs may have fallen out by reason of preceding lis，and a have been in serted from preceding $a$ ：thou art like a lion $\mathbb{S} \mathrm{c}$ ，but thou art S．c．，the first clause being sarcastic；but the connection suggests a rellexive form（llithp．Nibna），
 （Nebuchadnezzar；ff．31，12）is ufon thee！hone wht thon whdone！This helps the halting rlyythm，but the allusion to $N$ ．is not natural here．GuNkis，l．c．，


Sl กศ心，introducing a contrasted comparison；$(G$ ，not so well，attaches הת to preceding clause，and puts the 1 before $a \times \Omega=$ ．
 Ill，secing here an allusion to the mythical dragon $=$ sed．For further proposed 15 cmenclations of v．2，see CORNuL．

 dikтua $\lambda \alpha \hat{\omega} v$ mo入入ūv，but this also introduces alien matter．
 ロ＂מシ．
（4）All sion from $\mathfrak{v} .6$ ．The phrase of $n l$ is omitted by Cokn．as destroying the rhythm； it seems，however，to be an allowable parallelism．
Sll better to transpose $\pi$ n and $6=$ cf． 34,28 ．
（5）stl गriny height here gives no sense；$\Sigma$（and perhaps s）The？ihy futresebuce，

 CilRN．rejects V． 5 as inept since the beast is devourcd in the preceding verse； 30 but such rhetorical cumulation is permissible．
 fluze，and＇ $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ Ls，here ont of place，is copyist＇s insertion from precedintr verse．
 tion，in itself attractive，there are serious objections：it is not captivity but 35 destruction with which the chapter is dealing；the effect is to terrify the peoples （llitz．）；the expression bring thy caftives amoner the mations is unexampled and improbable（Num．31， 12 is different）；and the parallel $v$ ， 10 calls for a reference to destruction here（ DAv＇IDSON pertinently compares aikhen I bromdish mu suonrl）． It is better to retain $エ エ$ ，and as 10 N゚ュn，either to take it in the sense of spread to ing news（so Ifllz．，keuss；but this is hard），or change it against all the Ver－
 Ifebrew script is nearly identical with バニージSHGFR，retains 1ll，rendering ruins，zureck，a doubtful sense．
All לy；read לx．

（13）BLDon：finds the rhythm of $1: 13$ faulty，and CORN゙．，to secure symmetry，omits
 in $V .2$ ．It is doubtful whether rhythmical perfection should be insisted on in such a discourse．

 dation｀ゴ of v．9．
 rection should probably be made in Is. 11,$5 ;$ Jer, 41,12 , al.

 inappropriate in this purely descriptive piece.

 be omitted as goss; the ' mars the well-maintained allegory.
 tree; though found in the Versions (except (6), it must be regarded as a gloss 10 (like the paraphrase of e) pointing to the King of Egypt. (f) кai Emoinoe tivv umùtuav aútoú, the Heb. of which is uncertain (only in is omitted). CORN.


 change of text seems hardly necessary.
$41+1,0.9$ (second occurrence), an old gloss, found in (6, but an inappropriate remark and an interruption of the sense, due to the same feeling that prompted the insertion in v. 11, or repetition of same word above. (f) kai ìdópıoav aùtóv; CORN. wepu and were dismaved.

(14) All + + these words (found in (5) appear to be a gloss, perhaps after $10^{\mathrm{b}}$; the sentence becomes symmetrical by their omission. CORX.
 But in vy. 3.5. Io only two points are given in the description of the tree, that 25 it is exalled in stature, and that its top is in the clouds; even when the suspicious 'א K is omitted,


All + תיrnn, (if; the reference is to the rival earthly kingdoms, as in $1: 9$.


All ayn here gives no satisfactory sense, whether as arm, might (SMEND, REv'ss), or seed = underaiond (CORN.) or aftergroath (Orbill). Read Mmy (so also GRÄtz), as in 30,$8 ; 32,21$. Davidson, arm=heifers.

 here improbable; the verb is appropriate, and we may insert Tas". The preceding is to be pointed as impf.
 ported by 31,2 , and by $(6$ here; yet one expects a reflexive form, as in $(6$ 3I, 2.
 or perhaps for s.


 of fll $\begin{gathered}\text { ה2; see } 32,19 .\end{gathered}$


contrasting the burial of Meshech－Tubal with that of the warriors of the olden time．Of these，as of the others，it is said that they were a terror while they were alive，but the difference is that the gibborim are buried in their armor．

Instead of ロ＇by CORN．writes ■hes，and refers to Gen．6，4－a possible but

 warrior＇s outfit，and getting rid of the iniquity；the latter term is hardly possible， and CorN．＇s emendation is appropriate；write plur．，to correspond with anene HiJz．םצורוּ（cf． $37,6.8$ ）．

 doublet of following ニゴゥ．GrÄrz 72ph，which gives a good sense，but this verb does not occur elsewhere in the paragraph．

This verse，with its 2 ．pers．sing．，corresponds to $v .19$ ，and forms a natural ending to the discourse．In the next two verses the style of address is different from that of $\mathrm{v} .22-27$ ，and vv． 31.32 form a second ending（with 3．pers．sing．） to the discourse．We must either take 5.28 as an interpolation，or regard リ．29－32 as a paragraph added by the Prophet or by a scribe．Cf．Brertholer and English Translation of Ezchiel，p．166，1．S．

 no obvious reason for mentioning both $\boldsymbol{T}^{\boldsymbol{b}}$ and $\mathbf{x}$ שי゙s，the two terms being syn－ onymous in Ezekiel（Hitz．refers to＇ts and Dיpitw used of Edom in Gen．36， 31. 40），but it is not clear that＇p should be deleted．


$111+$ aיva，（ $\sigma_{\text {，meaningless for the text，a gloss of uncertain origin．}}$
 ［cf．DRIWIR＇s note on Lev． 15,18 ］；in the preceding vv．it is omited after 77． 30 Though the usage is not clear，here（v．30）תw before abל should probably lee omitted，with（ 5 ．
On the etymology of Toj（Assyr．nasâku＇to appoint＇）ef．Dristzesch，IIV＇ 472 ， and W＇kiNEL，ZA＇9S，p． 17.








33 （5） 111 ר！ ring to the watchman．
（8）Ill $y \dot{y}$（first occurrence），（ $\mathbb{G}_{1}$ probably copyist＇s repetition，ill 3 ，iS；the follow： ing（after אטוּ）also is betler onitted as gloss；see note on 3,18 ．


 which is not parallel in form to the preceding clause，and furnishes no anteced－ cnt for $\pi$ ． 6 omits $\pi$ and the wo following words；？justus non poterit
 following תבוn. The reference to the Brophet seems less likely than the indefinite 3 pers. plur. Some Heb. codd. have 3 plur. imperf.
(17) The month has fallen out in fil, but is given in (5; after insert במה (cf. v.1).
 son addressed in the following description; the l'rophet, however, does not distinguish between King and people.

(19) In vv. 19-25 fll and (5 differ both in wording and in order, and neither offers a 10 satisfactory text. Especially in w. 19-22 the emendations of tit must be largely conjectural; see Hitz., Ew., Smend, Corn., Siegfr., and Bertholet. V. ig, with the first three words of v. 20 , is placed by ( 6 in $v .21$, after one? (a brief phrase being interposed), and constitutes the address of the warriors to the King; (6) omits $21^{\text {b }}$, which is the address in Ill, and is nearly identical with $19.20^{3} 15$ of til. © is simpler, but the repetition of 41 is in keeping with the style of the section. [For w. 19 ff. compare the description of Hades in a fragment of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic (ed. Haupt, pp. 17. 19); sec Beitr. z. Assyr. 1,318f.; A. Jeremias, Isdubar-Nimrod (Leipzig, iSoi) p. 43; Geo. Smitil, Chuldean Account of Genesis ed. Savce (London, 1880) p. 237 (German edition, 1p. 197) 20 and cf. English Translation of Ezckicl, p. 165, 1. 7. - P. H.]
 be omitted as affording no sense, and the omission of the first helps to intro-




 20 are thus retained as address of the l'rophet, as in 31,$18 ; 32,2$.
(21) The abrupt transition of from 2 pers. to 3 pers. makes a difficulty, and $\sqrt{6} 30$ similarly passes from 3 pers. to 2 pers.
 texts are wholly different, and both are hard; Ai's combination of Egypt and its helpers is, however, in accordance with Ezekiel's usage (sce 30,$8 ; 31,17$ ).
The verbs in $25^{\text {b }}$ must be made imperatives, and the form made parallel to 35 $19^{\mathrm{b}} .20^{\mathrm{a}}$. Instead of 1 ,

(22) The same order should be observed, as far as possible, in the descriptions of the various nations. Instead of os as in $24^{a}$ of 411 and in 22 of $\mathfrak{6}$.
Al arsin; read abs, but the word is suspicious, cutting in two a familiar expression, and ought perhaps to be omitted.
 All ת ת
(24) Al a $\begin{gathered}\text { (2nen; read abs, as in } 22 .\end{gathered}$
(25) Of $\mathbf{v . 2 5}$ ( 6 has only the two words near the end: absin $\boldsymbol{T}$. The verse consists of repetitions out of the preceding description, and even the words found in © are better omitted, after the nom of $v .30$ (at end).

 preceding word.
 Hitz., Smend, Corai., Siegfr., Skinner (Expos. Bible), the verse apparently

34 （6）解 + ソN゙s（second occurrence），（ 5 ，insertion of subject，or gloss．

 CORN．omits as an improbable redundancy．
（9）All
（10）$\pm 118 \%$ write $ל \mathrm{~b}$ ．



12）V． 12 is in disorder in 16 and in（ 6 ．First，for in mead man，as in（ 6 ，and then 10 omit $\boldsymbol{T}^{102}$ ，which，though found in $\mathbb{G}$ ，appears to have been added as a neces－ sary connective，after the suffix had been attached to $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ．The significant fact about the day is that on it the sheep are scattered，not that the shepherd is then with the sheep．Further，the expression at the end of the werse，
 for the scattering of the flock．In © it occurs at the end of the verse，and alio， with the order of the two synonyms reversed，after min，giving an intoleralle sense，and being probably scribal displacement；its occurrence at the end of the verse may also be explained as the repetition of a Hebrew copyist，followed by（ $f$ ，which thus adopts the errors of Al，and adds its own．CoRx．，following S， 20 writes at the begiming isio（referring to Ain．1，14），omits the following four words，and in the rest of the verse adopts the text of $4 l$ ． $3 \mathbb{E}$ reproduce $\{t$ ；
 first to second an（in the emended text）．
（13）Al לx，miswriting for 3 y．
（14） 11138 ；write 24.25

（16）Ill（5，（5，perhaps scribal insertion．




 may be scribal expansion．


（25）㲘 ח



All
all $+10 .$, （ $\sigma$ ，complementary insertion．
 CORN． tation for renown（so RV），but the expression is hard．

（31）All＋ ruption of following יצs．The omission of pest gives the proper emplasis to the sentence．
$\mathrm{Al}+\mathrm{aT}, \mathrm{A}^{\text {（ }}$（，perhaps corruption of following Ens ，or（COKN．）insertion from 36，37；it is here maningless．（irät\％（Zech．13．5＂．
ljeforc ‘x insert ），with（6．


33 zizuce in justith sum in quatumgte dic poctarerif，giving the sense by supply－ ing in justitur stur．A proper form is secured by writing me？is in place of the initial 1 ；s maty easily have fallen out through following מich．Coks．omits from pis to the end of the verse；the clause is possibly a gloss．
（13）Ill

 referring to（ien．6，15；Ex．29，38；but these contain instructions，and are differ－ ent from our passage．The Ileb．text of $\mathbb{6}$ may have contained $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ in the sense of licituse，and iit may have been copyist＇s repetition from preceding 10 $\cdots \cdots$
 ง תעy，with $£$ ，which would be about six months after the fall of the city，ample time for a fugitive to reach Babylonia（1）Avinsow．
（22）ill
At insertion．－ 11 ：
（25）All ant is to be retained；sce note on 18,6 ．（G）omits vv .25 （except first three words）and 26 and the first three words of 27 ，perhaps by copyist＇s error（see similar beginnings of $v: 25$ and 27）；but the plus of 41 is possibly gloss after 20 c． 18 （W．6．11． 12 （S．C．）．
Write（\％



Al
（31）All + ソシ，gloss（cxplicitum）．
Ill no satisfactory sense）is miswriting from following verse．


（33）Before $\boldsymbol{\text { Mis in in inserts Epoûotv，but the exclamation more naturally belongs }}$ to the I＇rophet．
 and retains b．
 The reading of 6 is parallel to the following clause，and that of 11 l also is appropriate；the difference between the two may be due，on either side，to scribal fancy．

（4）Ill an min in omited by Cors．as not occurring in the parallel v．16， the חibns，further，being scarcely distinguishable from המומ；variations of this sort，however，cannot be called improbable，and a（ireek scribe might easily onnit such a clause．
After 1.16 Cors．writes enpin instead of 41 Ense？．（6 is here identical with 141.45 ［The clanse ニn＂アニ x hemen nx suggests the proper explanation for Eccl．

All ing verlb，and of．l．ev． 25,53 ．We must then，following（ $G$ ，omit $\mid$ așe，which was inserted because apine was taken as adverbial．

Ill＋ of the verse．
(1) 1 ll $b s$; write $b y$, with $G$.
 Deut. 32, 13; Nic. 3,12 hardly support ' 9 , which term Ezekiel uses elsewhere only of idolatrous shrines; CORN. תimew.

Il תiดư; read aש่ snort, as in 1s. 42,14 (HITZ.), the initial g having fallen out through the preceding ; CORN. טk
(4) 1ll 9 (twice), 6.

 ings of $25,6.15$ (on which see notes).
For ill aコל לֹ

CORN, regards ( 5 toû dxpavioul as rendering not of מנדשה (which he takes to be


 fluence of הumb. For in we may write nim, so that the expression will mean to possess it and to plunder it; cf. S مl olaso wi anes: GRÄTz, nבלו v. 4), omitting ' 2 , - simpler and perhaps preferable.
(6) 111 •มาא, ๙





(12) In 1 ll $12-15$ and $\mathbb{1} 13.14$ the passage fron plur. to sing. pron. may be rhetorical variation from momatains to land, or scribal inadvertence.
 Kethîb 'תא; write Q ${ }^{\text {crê }}$ תx.

 is perhaps scribal repetition from preceding verse.
Al 7 אלא; write 7 - as in 19,$4 ; 27,30$, and with ( 5 .
 tion of following word.



(22) Al ©
(23) Ill הוּ (5, perlaps inscrtion of Hebrew scribe, perhaps omission of Greck copyist by homevoteleuton.
(27) 抽

37 (1) Al + , $\operatorname{An}$, after $\pi$, explicitum; $\mathfrak{G V}$ takes it as subject of preceding verb. The expression " 4 occurs elsewhere in Ezek. only in 11,5 where it is appropriate;
 llere the '9 might be talien as subject of the verbs after ידי.

(5) fll
 tion.
 איאירם איבים , scems to represent all

Il
 first ' $u$ is not a possible form.
Il 14,13: 36,11, al.
8) All יֵֶ improbable order, since after she thing filled regularly precedes that with to which it is filled. Corn.'s objection, that its mountains is improbable since it is .Yount Seir that is addressed, is not valid; the Prophet has in mind the land, which contained both mountains and valleys. Variation of pers., as in wr. 7.8 , is not unconmmon in OT. - All whin; Grätz abin.


(10) All
(11) : Al

Al

 itself by its simplicity, but its minus may be due to homicotelenton ( $\pi$ תיצy and กセン

At $=\Sigma$ (first occurrence), $\wedge$ ( 6, perhaps scribal complement.
At Ez (second), ( 6 oot; read 72 , with the sense that JHVH is to be made known through them, rather than to them; (f) oot may be an interpretation after v. 12.
(12) Ill לכ; ( $\mathfrak{G}$ quvn̂s = bip, not improbable.



 CORN. points out, doubtful the stem has not this sense in $\operatorname{Pr} .27,6$, and the text of Jer. 33,6 is not certain); and what is here demanded by the connection is 35 a verb of quality rather than of quantity. No satisfactory emendation offers itself: : המתיק is not unsuitable in meaning, but is not supported by the Versions. ©, eßoñate; Ierogustis; st s:o. Hirz. is no doubt right in regarding this עת as the Aramaic form of lleb. רע. The expression is omitted by Corvill but symmetry seems to re- 40 quire a clause here, and the text may be retained, with change of plur. endings to singular. Its form, however, is probably due not to Ezekich, but to an Aramaizing scribe.
(14.15) Verses 14.15 contain a doublet, 14 and (6) being both corrupt. בשמח בל הארּ yields no sense; it cannot be rendered to the joy of the whole carth (Orelli). 45 The following emendation, proposed by CORN., brings out the malicious joy of Edom, and its occasion, namely, the desolation of the lsraelitish territory. The shorter and more original form is found in I4, where is, after the norm of $15^{2}$, to be read ארצ" or הארין
(14) (15 omits the
(15) Instead of על Corn. writes $\because$.


38 (1) Winckitir in Part 4 of the Second Series of his Altorientalische Forschungen) regards this Section as an appendix, composed in the time of Alexander the Great, between the battles of the Granicus and lssus (B. C. 334-333). Israel, he remarks, has lons since returned from exile not in Babylonia lout) amons the nations $38,8.12 .17$ ). The chief 38,2 is Alexander, who has become prince of Meshech (Plorggia) and Tubal (Cappadocia); the is/es or cousts 39,6, are the (irecian lands; 38,5 (mention of P'aras, Cush, Phut, that is, l'ersia and the country south of Egypt) is a later insertion. The basis of this section is the contest, described in the Habylonian cosmogonic poem, betneen Tiânat and the celestial gods (cf. Guxime, Schötffuger und Chuos), here applied, with explanatory remarks, to the situation of Israel at a definite time; and a third hand has added the closing exhortation, from 39,22 or, 23 ) to the end.

To this ingenious exposition there are at least two serious objections: Alexander would have been called King of Grecec; and he would have been regarded not as an enemy, but as a savior.
(2) Whether 11 ש̌x is the same with the of Gen. 10,2 , and, if so, which is the right spelling, is uncertain. [A land ש゙ำ does not exist contrast Crit. Notes on
 chicef priest $2 \mathrm{K} 25,$.18 ; Ezr. 7,5: 2 Chr. 19,11. Several chiefs ruled over the tribes of לan , משׁi, but above them all was a According to Winckler zo (1. C. p. 160) (משׁׂ is an explanatory gloss on שut if it were a gloss it would probably not have been repeated in $\sqrt{\prime} 3$. In $\psi$ ito, 6 , which was writeen at the
 guru ruprestur in the Akhxmenian inscriptions (if. Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 199,
 interpolation (not found in 1.3 and 39,1 ) which is derived from (ien. 50,2 , and in that passage מעe seems to be a corruption of due to the influence of the following 'an (see HOLzNGGR ad loc.) I Chr. I, t naturally depends on the
「wr seems to be used there ats a collective name for tribes ( $\because, 15 ; 30$ 39,2 ). may originally be not a proper name but an appellative; note the gentilicium Gagiäa (=Northern barbarian) in the first letter of Wiscruer's translation of the Amarna tablets $(\mathbb{K} 135, \mathrm{p}, 5,1.38 ; \mathrm{cf}$. the excursus on the Amarna tablets in the English Translation of foshua, p. 51, l. 29.) גומ maty therefore be a term like our Great Mosul or the German Grosstïrke $\doteq$ EEnglish Grand 35 Tiwk, Groml Seignior). Several appellatives have for a long time been looked
 'echo' of the Lydian Gyges; nor can it have any connection with the Greek "Ryuros (Winckler, l. c., 1. 16.1. n. 2). - 1'. 11.]
(3) עליך : אליך ; write
(4) For all (6) has simply kai ouvdew $\sigma \epsilon$; the other V'ersions follow All ; ouvdew may be rendering of (\$s.49,5) or of 'שוב ' ( $2 S 10,16$ ). '2 2 , however, must here mean turn butk, and is then out of position; it should stand after ' $\mathrm{a}^{\prime}$ ' 2 (Sm!.ND, of. 29,4; Is. 37,29). This last expression is suspicious, since it implies coercion, while Ciog is Juhn's willing Alinister (v.7). It seems better to omit, with Cors., the whole phrase before ssir. The verb $e$ is variously rendered by the Versions: 3 civamagant; $\$$ asol; $O, \pi \in \rho 1-$

 should be trinsposed to the beginning of v.f. - 1'. 11.]

37 (6) omits תiniv, and takes preceding verls as causative 3 sing.; scribal omission or insertion.
 $\beta$ aivev.

(⿺) :1ll Hithp. only in 13,17 , and there in a special sense. As Hithp, and Nif. are used elsewhere interchangeably, it is doubtful whether this point can be pressed.
(II) Ill הנְ: write ala, the following part. requiring an expressed subject. (6) attaches


AT My, ( 5 S, both here and at end of $: 13$ (where it is found in ( 5 but is lacking in S) a gloss. In any case the reading of ( 5 in v. 13 ( toû divarareiv ... tòv $\lambda \alpha o \delta v o u$ ), not according in form with preceding clause, is less probable than that of fll. It is not necessary to regard y y as original in $v .13$ (CoRN.) in order 15 to explain its presence as gloss in v. I2.
(16) Kecthîb חבֵּ; write Qeerê חברֶי

Ill two אות
 priate, since the connection requires that only the tribal name be given, and it is Josefh that is contrasted with Juduh. Grätz 'Ex א





 Sin $\sigma \alpha$.

30

All



 write 1 ², the substantive being, as more explicit, less probable than the suffix.

 Bär ank ; Gnsburg אלחם
sll $+\boldsymbol{i}$ - למל, scribal repetition introducing a tautology.






 \$), in absolute sense, makes a difficulty, and in 17,22 , where it occurs in 111 , it is lacking in ${ }^{6}$; still, such a sense cannot be called improbable.
 scribe.
 for omitting Al（so CORN．），which occurs below in the verse，especially as there is little or no difference of meaning between בער and ．It would be better if we could here have a word meaning to collect，corresponding to we： and $w, y$ ：in $v .10$ ，of which，however，there is no trace，except in さ $\mathfrak{Y}$ frovitle or load themselaes with（arms \＆c．）；if this is not corrupt，it may possibly represent a form of $x=3$ in Al ，from which might come our $\boldsymbol{p}$ ； nyel might be retained，or rejected as scribal insertion．

（ii）Sll 10 All expyn；write ara，taking the word as proper name，Abarim，cast of the Dead Sea，with J．D．Mich．，Eichi．，Hitz．，Corn．，Sirgrir．（and with the approval of ReUSS）．Though Abarim is elsewhere the name of a mountain range， a valley might well be so called．In the translation the l＇alley of the l＇ussers－lyy the $\begin{aligned} \text { an } \\ \text { y must refer to the Scythians，while in } 1 \mathrm{v} .14 .15 \text { it is the designation of } 15\end{aligned}$ those who traverse the land in search of dead bodies．
In 6 modudvopiov we have the word ${ }^{\prime}$ in，which is a copyist＇s insertion．
$1 \mathrm{~A}+\mathrm{a}$＋ zersers，not the inzaders（who are dead），nor（Davidson）tratelers in general （which is against the use of a $\begin{gathered}\text { and in this section，and in itself not probable）but }\end{gathered}$ the searelhers（who，however，are not to be stopped）．© каi $\pi$ epionoסouñovar
 Ni，ns：but can（occurring elsewhere only in Dcut．25，4，of the muzzling of an $0 \times$ ）is a strange term for shutting off access to a valley；nor docs it appear why the mouth of the valley should be closed．We should rather expect some such statement as the traversers shall prepare it，but the words（perhaps a gloss）are

（14） $111+\boldsymbol{a}$ sible，since it means the searchers and not the invaders．
Ill מקברים；faduat；Hitz．，CORN． 10 search．
 read by $\mathscr{G}$ in its Ilebrew text；the sense seems irrecoverable：no city has been
 with his multitude．We might write，after 1.11 ，ומבוֹ
 7世゙ב，which preserves the combination flesh and blood，as in $\mathfrak{r} \cdot 17$ ，but this harmoniz－ ing is suspicious．
 Ill gives a good sense，I will manifest my glory among the nations．

（26）All imp rad wid，with 111 Tz ．A marginal note in HAHN and GiNstiURG not in BÄr）gives the reading（ $Q^{c} r \hat{e}$ ） 1 ． of is out of place．


（27） 4 ＋$+\mathfrak{ロ} \geq$ ？， $\mathbb{G}_{1}$ omitted in accordance with the phrascology of the chapter．
 the second clause is necessary．BйR


38 of particulirs there are chances of errors both in ith and in $\mathbb{G}$, and the shorter text is not necessarily the better.
(5) Dis is strange in this enumeration of Northern peoples; we should perhaps read לוד, which is added in (6.4 and many other (fir codd. (H-1' 87.88 .22 .26, al.) and S $^{11}$.
(7) III להם; read ${ }^{\text {b }}$, with $(\mathbb{G}$, as the context reguires.
 properly belong only to $[y$, and there is an abrupt transition from 3 sing. fem.
 the preceding clauses; it cannot be taken ( $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, Siecirk.) as dependent on what goes before (a land . . gathered . . . to the mountains [ $\mathbb{\sigma}$ rivv] of Isract). § 10 transposes: thou shalt come against the mountuins . . and agrainst a lumut. Order is partly restored by the omission of על הרי . . הלוּ (so CORX.), which appears to be composed of two glosses. Whe should perhaps also insert $\mathrm{c} \boldsymbol{y}$ by

 Instead of מחחקב we must, from the parallelism, read מחרבּ
 which is syntactically hard; better omit $n$, with Reuss, Corn., Shagrk.


 next clause, as stylistically improbable.

(12) If $6 \times$; write $5 \%$
( 13 ) :ll lions by Ezekiel; read $\pi$ rליִ, a common word in c. 27, and sufficiently like a to account for the corruption; CORN.
For the sake of the symmetry, which is suggested by the form of the sentence,
 せ kings.

(16) $41 \mathrm{ll}+\boldsymbol{1 1}$, , $_{\text {© }}$, gloss.
 fusion with the preceding verse.
The interrog. $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is better onitted, with $\mathbb{G}$, before $\boldsymbol{n}$. s ; there is no propriety here 35 in a çuestion; the statement is meant to be positive.

Ill a may be retained as = for years, but the construction is suspicious; © © connect it by, with a's; ? in diebus illorum temporum.
 subject of For the construction $\operatorname{Fi}$ ב. Fi, of. $\psi$ 18,9.
(21) AH חֵּ ORellit);
 the plus is in the Greek. CORN, thinks it in favor of that its text offers two 45 Hithpacels and two Nif'als, but the symmetry may be contro as well as fro. 'גבבות may be doublet of mave have fallen out through resemblance to it.

(2) Then is regarded by Grïtz as corrupt repetition of preceding word [cf. above, p. 99, 1. 42].
all
(5) All (6)

40 which, however, departs too far from sll and (f), and is unnecessary. Grïtz suggests a combination of $\mathbf{t l l}$ and ( 6 : את ה ה The beam. Siligrr. omits $13^{\text {b }} \cdot 14.15$ as unintelligible.


 inserts, not with great probability, the חad
sll
 the court did not, properly speaking, adjoin the guard-rooms. SMENA throws 10 out hs, rendering: and adjoining the court atas the gaterity. DAvidSON: and adjoining the forch (as) was the court round rebout the gate. The clause is omit-
 z'estibule of the gatecuay', that is, one passed from the vestibule into the court, a statement that explains the position of the vestibule. The transposition of $9{ }^{3} \mathrm{~m}$. 15

(15) All byl read לyb, as this gives one terminus of the measurement; the other terminus is griven further on by "asb by, which must be read " $⿲$ ge 7 (CORNilh omits by).



 is not improbable.
(16) 111 המִּ-
 to each gateway.

At end of $v .16(6$ has $\epsilon v \theta \in v$ kal $\epsilon v \theta \in v$ (of the palm-trees), $=$ तפמ nem, a natural and not improbable reading.
 by $\pi \epsilon \rho i \sigma \tau u \lambda \%$, as in 1.17 ; it probably had a text different from that of 1 ll . CORN. brachets המחת as suspicious, since it seems to have no place in the structure.
(19) liefore v. 19 CorNill, inserts 35 the detailed statement in $\mathbf{v} .19$ compared with that in these verses does not favor the insertion.
After anา (f) has tins aùnns, a proper explanation, but perhaps unnecessary.
 scrious difference.

 in which the first word is a corruption of anp, while the gissi may be the word of our text, (displaced in fll. It is simpler, howeser, to reacl, at the beginning of 1.20, ,

(20) Before insert the connective :

 : write (twice in this verse).




 sary here. The New lear's Day of 41 is probably a later scribal corruption or paraphrase; al year could not begin on the tenth day of the month, except possibly for jubilec (Iev. 25,9), and that is improbable (cf. Rosh he Shandih, $8^{\text {b }}$ ). 5 In support of all see notes of HiM\%, Smexd. lossibly sll read axẹn exise, of. Ex. 12,2.3.


 cessary. - 11 慈: write ל
 than on the south.
 copyist's repectition from the following letters.



 the number (in the other gates) is introduced in a more formal manner, and it is 20 perliaps here inserted by the Greek scribe for the salke of completencss.
All + ancin meaningless.
 here certainly to be supplied in thought, though the original text may say simply 2 the space bituech. [xn has no connection with Assyr. hî. The Assyr. word does not mean chamber but intantation. In the passage II R 23, $4^{\text {a }}$ we must read a-rat-fi-i instead of amar ti; see Delitzsch, HW $1+1^{\mathrm{b}}$; 7OIb; of. MelssNer's Supplement, p. 18. S P. H.] $^{\text {P }}$
In ve. $7^{\mathrm{b}} .8 \mathbb{G}$ gives the dimensions of the second and third $\approx$ (guartrooms) at 30 length (the numbers are the same as for the first), while 1 ll in $7^{\text {b }}$ gives the inner po or aestibuli. The two texts are entirely different, and show the hands of revisers; but both are probable, and we have no clear grounds for choosing between them. - On afix or 8 see note on 8,16 .
(8) int + (il tence.


 latter hats Eīpoş for $\bar{\eta}$; but even with this clange the statement contradicts fo $11^{2}$, and for the number thirteen there seens to be no place in the description. CORNILL transposes $11^{3}$ after 12 , thus gaining unity in the arrangement of the details; but whether the original had this unity is doubtful.
(12) Before the inscrtion of is syntactically necessary.

V. $12^{\mathrm{b}}$, from sim to end, is omitted by Cors, as superfluous. The sing. sn is strange, and should, perhaps, be changed to plural, though the word may be used for the whole structure on both sides of the passage-way.
(13) Instead of 纤 1 l (wice) (6) has roixos, which Cokx. adopts as relieving the obscurity of the measurement. As we are ignorant of the architectural methods and expressions of Ezekiel's time, it is perhaps better to keep the harder phrase of $\mathrm{Ill}_{\mathrm{l}}$, and understand $\sqrt{6}$ as an interpretation; the measurensent from roof to roof


(40) $111+\frac{2}{3}$, probally gloss; the description of the side-wall as being outside a person soing up to the door instead of outside the door is unnatural.
$(5$ póukos (in some $11 s$ S púakos), apparently the rendering of a derivative of $\pi 19$, read instead of 41 ,
 sidewall of the drain, and two by the vestibule.

 the $\pi$ חar after vone might be adopted.
(42) $\sqrt{6}$ is identical with 111 .
$111+$ heres scribal repetition from below where it is said, both in 41 and in (II,
 Ill
 בר?nbi; coverings for the tables are not improbable, though why they should be protected from dryness is not clear.
The $t$ in $ל{ }^{2}$ is better omitted so that $v .43$ shall form one sentence.
liefore following $\boldsymbol{7}$ Insert $\}$.
(44) At the beginning of $\sqrt{2} 44$ insert, with (G, `xwיp, marking a new paragraph.

 is not the inner gate through which the l'rophet is led. The ' repeated by ( 5 from next clause.



fll arper, miswriting for angin (so ( $\mathfrak{a}$ ), which the connection shows. The whole verse is omitted by Siegrried as incurably corrupt.
( 48 ) 11 ll (second); $\mathbb{6} \mathrm{ar} \lambda$. Read bיs, which is required by the context.
 is not three cubits (as in (1), but fourteen cubits, with two jambs of threc cubits each, which gives twenty cubits for the whole front, as in v. 49. The words fell out of All by homadelenton.
(49) Ill east to west, which accords with the other measurements: outer wall 5 , porch 12 , wall of temple 6 , outer room 40 , dividing wall 2 , inner room 20 , wall 6 , annex 4 , outer wall $5,=100$ culbits for whole length of Temple-building from east to west (1)atioson).

1lt necessary:
 breadth of the Temple, or comparing them with the measurements of the in Exodus; Ezekicl does not use for the Temple.
 understood.
After insert, with (5 ETwuidaẹ, תinnz; the sidewalls must be mentioned in
 $\pi \eta \chi$ ûv $\in \pi T \dot{\alpha}$ ěvAev.

 Corsint. 1:zck.

40 (6 has aủtinv kai tà $\theta_{\epsilon \in ~}$ kui, of. v. 29; these details are, both in $4 l l$ and in ( 6 , uncertain.
(25). 4 .


At the end of the verse write for kethib
 The shorter form of ועשער לחצר seems here preferable, since it is not obscure.
$414+$, 4 , ( 5 , repetition from the preceding clause; the measurement would be more naturally northward, since the Prophet does not reach the inner 10 gate till v .28 .
(2S) The second an is lacking in $\mathfrak{G}$, and is in fact not necessary. If it be retained the article must be omited in המשע.
 be written throughout this chapter, and it will be unnecessary to note them. V. $29^{\mathrm{b}}\left(=25^{\mathrm{b}}\right)$ is omitted by Cornill.
(30) An + from preceding verse.
(32) 纤 =
 been sufficiently treated above, proposes to read areat for arpara.

(36) Following the norm of v.33, after insw insert and after ib insert ithei. - V. $36^{\mathrm{b}}=25^{\mathrm{b}}$, is omitted by Cornill.
(37) Ill iלsi; read inks, with (G) and from the connection.
 reading, which, for its shortness, might be preferable, but for the 4 readings in $v \mathrm{v} .6 .49$, in which forms of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ are maintained. Where is employed, it may be better to write the preposition = before the numeral.
$(38-43)$ In $1 \mathrm{r} \cdot 38-43$ the texts of 41 l and $(6$ differ widely, so that, instead of attempting to 30








 тò űyos è $\pi^{\prime}$ aủtò émə

 Enpaoiaç. Neither al nor $\mathfrak{G}$ gives a satisfactory text in w. $38-43$, and the details of the sacrificial arrangements can hardiy be recovered. See Smend, Cornill, Davidson, Siegried, Grätz, Bertholet. For the principal differences of 45 111 and 6 in this section of. especially 11. 49-53 and p. 105, 11. 4-7.9-11. 15-1\%.

All

(39) $39^{90}$ (6, which councets $3 \hat{8}$ with arrew.

In $\hat{3}^{1 / 1}$ ה the
written ינלת, in construction with the following words. These stand in shll םיקת is, the zindows consisted of the openings between beams, through which light could come; so © סוктumiai, útopaúणeis. They were placed in the three parts of the building, and were, according to $\sqrt[1 l]{ }$, הנְ seems to be wamting in (6) (it is deleted by CORN:); a sense may be got by reading but the words are better omitted (see below, 1. 15).

In the following sentence ( 5 accords loosely with ${ }^{\text {all }}$, though with additions that yicld no good meaning. The description of the interior boarding is parallel 10 to the statement in $\mathbf{I} \mathbf{K} 6,10$. The doubtful (im. $\lambda_{\text {er. }}$. who writes "\$p coicred, ceiled, after 2 Chr. 3.5. where © has ミulow, as here, and his emendation may be accepted. Then, following a hint in (f) (ठ оiкоц), we may bring the sentence into general accord with 1 K 6 , 10 by inserting $n=0$ before " 1 ת; : ill ing is given in the following clause, in which for the after © © èk toû ésdiqouç.

The next statement of $\operatorname{ll}$, תroz pand, must be omited as unintelligible; it is not at all probable that the windows were covered, or that such a cletail, if given, would be given here; the supposition of an insertion is strengthened by the 20
 €iऽ̧ to btakútetiv, in which it does not appear why the windows (the windowshutters) should be triply folded, or how this would specially serve the purpose of looking through (and the windows were not meant to be looked through; this is a later interpretation).
(17) The עַ of 111 yiekls no sense, and must be thrown out; © is equally obscurc:
 giving the horizontal extent of the boarding by writing a before ngen. On this sentence see Dalimson.
 Tuple must be omitted.


(20) V. 20 gives the vertical (as i: 17 the horizontal) extent of the ornamentation. 35

AI
The next sentence begins with iph, for which seems to have read wita;

The first is copyist's repetition.
Instead of רp SMEND, after I K 6,31.33, prefers nos, holding this necessary hy to reason of the nemp ( Y .21 ); but a referen e to the door seems here out of place, and it is better, with $s$, to omit nim.


(22) After the second insert, with (6, io complete the measurement, eng ian it nise, fallen out by thomaticleuton.

(24) All ת
all + + .
 AII preceding.
is described；but，to get orderly arrangement，he is obliged to transpose freely， and it secms unlikely that the original had this formal orderliness．For his con－ struction of the complicated material of this chapter and the next，see his notes．
（6）All ロッジ times，that is，three stories of 30 cells each： 1 K 7.4 .5 ．
 ably be read here，in spite of the graphic difficulty；if the $b$ were omitted be－
 －$\underset{\sim 1}{ }$ is ingenious，but the word does not elsewhere occur in this sense（retate－
 1 K゙ 6,8 ，and of $\begin{gathered}\text { and in Ezek．} 41,7 \text {（so Rashi）．A staraiay is a desideratum in }\end{gathered}$ the next verse，but in this verse（as in $1 K 6,6$ ）the point is the way in which the side－chambers were attached to the house．
 from the next following phrase．
 Verses 6－11 are omitted by Siegraied as unintelligible．


All תית possible，however，that there lurks in this clause some expression for the mode
 whether this word means zinding stair（ $(6$ enıктi）or trafdloor．Such a term is to be expected here，but it scems impossible to discover it．
 $\pi \lambda a r u ̈ v \eta t a l$ üvu日ev，whence we might read
All $\mathrm{i}=1$ ；read，with $\mathbb{G}$,
 לתיכונה
 to sec is improbable，as the Prophet nowhere else uses such a form in the de－ scription of the measurements．Read＇וב：；Corsill ion foundation． Fin may be doubtfully retained in the sense of raised platform（1）av．，Siegrr．）． Cors．takes the verses in the order 7．9．11．8．10．12．
Kethîb מיפרות；writc Qerê nitop．
 （ 13,18 ），as a measure of the cubit．It is omitted as unintelligible by Rex．ss， Cornille．
（9）After $\operatorname{p}$ insert，with $£$ ，תixe war，to which the main objection is that the same measurement is given in $n^{\text {b }}$ ；yet such a repetition is not improbable．
The $\bar{n}$（first occurrence）must be read ${ }^{\prime}$ ב to correspond to the following $\mathfrak{i}=$



（15．16）A new paragraph begins with לקֵּ in in 15 ，and the following word must be 45 connected by ，as in（ 5 ．The The at end of 1.15 must be ignored．
 porch，are thus given．
 as there is only one porch．
 ＝’：
A new sentence begins with the next word of 111 ，Eubent，which must be
all these places; it is a scribal insertion induced by the word The unit, -ins, is left to be supplied. - [For the Hebrew cubit see English Translation of Evikicl, pp. 179f.]
(16.17) ©ll פבוּ

(17) \#1 $2=0$; read $2 \equiv 01$, and insert at beginning of $v, 18$.

 with ( 6 , so as to gain the regular order: east, north, west, south.

Al the profane; (5 $\pi$ fotexiouatos outaink, $=$ hn, which is improlable. The limits of the sacred territory are wider in 45,$4 ; 48,12$, and CORN. therefore throws out
 and profone are here used relatively: the Temple-enclosure is sacred in comparison with the land lying outside.

43 (1) 11 +
(3) Al + annan, copyist's repetition.

 too üpuatos oú îdov. - Ill $h_{x}$ (twice) for לy.
 $\pi \rho \dot{s} \zeta \epsilon^{\prime}$, a parallel reading to that of All.

 ת\%n, perhaps corruption of ir .
$111+$ onim (point anta with ex, Smend, Blertholet), gloss, explanatory of
 ロรּู
(10) To

A11 + añ verse (which reads differently in (6), here an interruption.
 inserted after the corrupt verb. [11 תא may be a remnant of the original reading


(11) The following ax in Esimay be omited, or, with (G) (aủoi), an may be writen.



 lerse.
(13) In write the article instead of the i, the word beginning the measurement.
Omit the article in the unit המהּ, and after it insert, from ( 6, , which is here 45 necessary:
Al
 ling the pro. Read pint the measurement of the altar



Ill
 to the doors of the nare, instead of including those of the adytum.
 perhaps a brief table of contents (PETERS). (GV kai Tì $\pi \lambda \in u \rho \dot{a}$ toû oúkou EĚuru-

 the preceding scene lies in the inner court.
 improbable detail.
$(6)$ gives the number of chambers as five.
(2) 110 פְּ תאเ.

(3) All + an old ghoss, 15 standing in different form in (J, apparently an explanation of the preceding description ( r .1 ), but here out of place, and an interruption of the description. On the © dayerpaupèval as = crasel sce J. 1'. Peters, Journ. Fitio. Jit. 12, 47.
 of the walk between the two parts of the chamber-building.
all
an


(8) 组 त, point, after ( $\mathbb{6}$,




With דוד begins a new sentence. 30

building.

11 Whnaer ; write jornel as beginning of a new sentence, as in 5.4 , at end.
(I2) $\mathrm{Al}+$ +
and in place of the last two may be written 6 , as in 1.4.

$13+7$, copyist's ropetition.
 , after $\because 9$.
(13) Before the second nrew insert ), with ( $\mathbb{G}$, as the connection requires.
第 This statement, copied from 44.19, is, as Cors. points out, as irrelerant here as it is appropriate there. Corx. kecps the first clause, writing, aficr (G, e,
(15) All itpp; omit the final, arhich has no antecedent. (fa inserts as object to umóbevrua tou ourou the plan of the house.
(16) At the beginning of the measurement (G gives the man's position: kai ěorn katü
 ably a gloss on the 11 ebrew text.
IIt + , repetition from the end of the clause.
Kethib תמוֹ; read Qcrê now.
$\mathfrak{A l l}+\boldsymbol{a}$. This word, lacking in $\mathfrak{G}$ here and in $\times 17.18 .19$, is to be omitted in

44 (18) min wip



 seems not to have been in use. From $\mathfrak{v i} 17$ we might surmise 4 a wool, which, though graphically hard, may be the right reading. Failing a satisfactory interpretation or emendation, the expression is hest omitted.


 7,8 ), or perhaps $10:$.
 Omit A1

$K^{e}$ thîll 1 ; write, after Q'rê, hexsur:
(25) fil sw: must be written plaral.
(26) All introun; rad, with $\$$, as Cornili, points out; and, with Cornili, of the verse, to make the sense complete.
(27) $11+$ ( 10 , an unnecessary statement, doubtless an explanatory whoss.

(28) ill (against (G). Read omitted; it was inserted as the proper construction iffer inio.

(30) The $5 x$ is better written $夕 \boldsymbol{y}$; ( 5 Emi.

45 (1) Omit the second 7 Kis copyist's repetition.

(2) Corvill is doubtess right in placing 1.2 after rv. 3.4 , for w. 3.4 mark out a subrlivision of the area of $v .1$, and $v .2$ describes at part of this subrdivision. Cf., on the other hand, Bertholet.
(3.4) In ir. 3.4 the text is confused in both ill and ( 5 , and the emendation must be
 following words. The rar can hardly be original, since the phe pip is not in the reserved area, hut is
 retained. But this latter, ${ }_{\wedge}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, seems to be scribal repetition form the foregoin: words, and is better omitted, and then the imbint, with Corn., be thrown out, and the the of $v .4$ attached to v. 3 .

The order of the following part of $\mathrm{r}, 4$ is not clear, but no help is to be got

 had for the first is doubtful. Smenn שapa לupa, but the reference to a fried
 official dwellings, in aciordance with their sanctity; but such at tetait here we do not expect, and it is doubtful whether this sense belongs to TpEb; the romnection in 43,21 is different. Simind's suggestion for the first word secms the best. We expect mention of the commons, which were an important attachment
 must, howerer, wite arendeha, corresponding to aby. The second word must be thrown out, in spite of its orcurrence in (ii, as a ghoss or douldet. The satered
 （6）twice aptl $\lambda$ ，once d́pm入．［Cf．Cinetine on Is．29，1］．

See Corviti，＇s notes for his construction of the numerical details of the altar．


 officiators as in IT． 22.25 of 1 ll ．
41

（21）A1 מৈחק



 stands in 0 ，in which the verb is 2 pers．

（26）The pies at the end of $v, 25$ is to be disregarded，and the Oriental k＂thit）
 tioned in BäR）to be kept．－Read Qerê MT：，at end of verse．
（27）All and
44 （2）Omit ill as explicitum．
 Kethîb לsak（Qctê לą心）may be retaincd．
 בצוד יהוה ית הבית．
（5）יהוה（first occurrence）omit as explicitum．
 the bricfer text of 41 seems preferable．
 ，ביח המחי，as in c． 2. fll



thinel；write，with（ 5 ，man，as the sense requires．
Alt בל
（S） $1: S^{a}$ of $A$ ，ending with ${ }^{2}$

All לִ？


（10） 11 将 （f）one is in the same way tempted to omit it in the English translation．
（11）Al a ben；（5，defining the pronoun，Évavtiov toû daoû．

Ilt priate here．


 taken for granted in the text；if retained，it is better writed תי：

46 Kethill $1 \times{ }^{\prime}$; write Qrê sex. The same change is to be made at the end of 1. 10.
 of putting the movements of the prince in contrast with those of the people, and is, on this ground, preferred by Cornill. But v. to then repeats r. 8 , and docs not the $\begin{gathered}\text { anm make some difficulty? The prince would in this case not go out }\end{gathered}$ among the people, but by a separate way (apparently by the cast grate, v. 2). All may be understond as adding the statement that on feast-days ( r .9 ) he is merely a layman, has no privileges, and goes in and out with the people (IfrTz.).
(12) All , נִ, (5, perhaps scribal gloss or copyist's repetition.

(14) Al ת"pr: read, with ( $5, \pi p \pi$, as the connection requires.

The following aby is to be omitted, with ( $(\mathbb{G}$, as in next werse.
 subject.

Ill expression; it is not clear which reading is original.
 translator.

Ill נחנל ; write, after (f, תלת, as the construction requires.

(19) All naw int omit the article, the word being in status constructus.

(20) All requires. (5 appears to have had owi in place of the sill
 43, 17, writes ? ? ? ?
(22) All pexp yields no sense. The meaning enclosed cannot be got from the Tahmud- 30
 signifying avithout roof; and Castle (Lex. Syr:) cites Syr. lind (A) as = houses not roofed [of. l'arae Smitil 3589; Ges.-Buml'33 s. ©t.]. But there is no evidence that the Helrew word has this sense. nivep, as in 42,5 is not suitable here. It is better to adopt the reading nisup, given in $\mathfrak{\Sigma}$, and suggested by (6. 3 atriola. 35

(23) Ill

47 (i) All
Ilt + תngn, ( $\sqrt{ }$, here inappropriate, repetition of copyist from preceding clause. to The $\Omega$ ne, after the next word, ${ }^{(J 6}$, is in place, though not necessary.
(2) :1ll
(3) V. $3^{2}$, clown to הaxy, is omitted by Corn., who takes exception to the expressions P (here only in Fzek.) and הres, to the mention of the man (who has not been so mentioned since his first introduction, 40,3 , and to the slightness of the in- 45 crease of depth of water at the distance of 1000 cubits from the gate. These difficulties are scrious, but whether they suffice to throw out the passage as a gross is douluful. p may be scribal crror for (see Kethib in Jer. 31, 39; Zech.
 plicitum; and, as to the rate of increase of depth of water in this stream, we 50 know too little of the conditions to decide this point. On the other hand, it is not unnatural that, in the account of the measuring, the man should be described as moving castward. Cf. Bertholet.
area is for the priests' houses and commons (see 48,15 ), corresponding to the citics and commons in Lev: and Num.
 Ewald
 but may be original fulness of writing.
 be written int (f kai éotar.
After צשׁ
 offers a common and natural expression, but, on the other hand, the comection favors the reference in the sll to the royal power.

Corvill objects to the absolute construction of $a \mathfrak{\Sigma}=9$; but, besides 1)eut. 3, 26, sce 1 K 19,4.



(4) At + + הn verse see I'eters, Journal of Biblical Literature 12, 49 .
 statement of the relation of the $\pi$ to the 2 . The rest of the verse, תר゙ָy y
 ed, with (5, the preceding clause must be thrown out. But it scems more likely that the second clause is a gloss intended to bring the $\because 2$ into relation with the 25 familiar 7 n.


(16) Omit (1) $^{\text {M }}$, with $\sqrt{2} ; 46,3$ is clifferent.
(18) For sing. Whas ( 5 has plural, address to the people or to the body of priests; ill 30 is equivalent, onty individualizing. In $v .20$ (6) has singular.

 following naturally on that of the first month in V .18 .
 ably to the people.
(21) All er ity ity ity is noteworthy, as Smexd points out, that the feast is here put on the fourteenth day, white in 6.25 the corresponding feast is on the fifteenth, and one is tempted (with Cors.) to read הwmen, as in Lew: 23, 6; smexis suggests that the text may have been changerl to arcord with P . On the other hand, to (i5 has here the same reading as $\mathrm{In}^{1}$, and the relation between Ezekiel and Lev. 17-26 makes it possible that the rule of Lev. 23,5 existed at this time. It seems safer, therefore, to retain the reading of 1 th.

 two words. [For the origin of the clistom of eating unleavened bread at the feast of the l'assover, see the note in the English Translation of Euchich, p. 199, I. 40. - P. II.]





Ill nky for ast. The same error in $\mathrm{V}: 19$.


48 (1) 41 T ד


 ויעֵּ פגח ימה
(9) :11 ת
 pression.
 who refers to 43,12 , but here not probable; it is the $\begin{gathered}\text { en } \\ \text { e } \\ \text { itself, and not its } 15\end{gathered}$ character as mountain, that here comes into consideration; of the similar expression in v .15.

(13) H anhin; read, with (G, Evt, as the sense requires.

All
(14) All ${ }^{\text {An }}$ : read Nif. sing, with ( 6 , and in accordance with the following clause.


 UTh (repeated from preceding clause). The limits of the city proper having been stated above, this verse gives the area devoted to agriculture. Or, we might retain the text of Alt, only transposing anter and adding 7 ancer
 ?

 (wice).
For the first 6 swrite $6 ;$, and for the second write
(21.22) Omit order to gain a connection between w. 21 and 22. The © ( P . 21 ) is
 (v. 22) the whole being enclosed by the prince's domain. Corv., Sll:Grr. omit
 Nedt at end of $1: 22$. The text is in serious disorder, and the double statement to of the northern and southern boundaries of the royal territory seems unnecessary.
(25). [For the name
 aluays become ss; for instance korassu 'his stomach' for koras'sur (DEL. +5 § 51 ). -11.11$]$


(31) The statement in $31^{11}$, of how the gates were named, is here singularly placed, interrupting the description of the loundaries, and having the appearance of an $\mathbf{g}^{\circ}$
 CRÄ̌\%, to suppose an carly displacement, and transpose, arranging w. 3031 in the orter: $30^{2} \cdot 31^{a} \cdot 30^{6} 31^{11}$. The הuses at the end of $\mathrm{v} \cdot 31^{a}$ must then be omited.
 (wice in 5.4 ), and renders and one could pass through, in conerast with the one could not fuss throught of $\mathbf{x}, 5$. Neither text has decidedly the advantage over the other.
 = $=$
After following "יymer insert era, according to the norm of the parallel clauses.
 torical repetition.
(6) The preposition is omitted by BAR and Gonsburg before שמפת הגחל, where the to Oriental codd. had $k$; insert y with (Ge, Qamhi. See de Rosst's note.
(7) $41+\cdots$ ?




The second part of the verse consists of repetitions which, though found in $\sigma_{1}$ appear not to be original. After 111 ixp?? Cors. inserts 0 'ha, and omits the rest of the rerse. It is better to omit ${ }^{\text {b }}$ altogether (so Haulit).

 ent use of the expression in 26,5,14.
 the term see Gen. 1, 11.12, al.; if it be retained, it should be written הנמים, and


(11) :Il Omit the 1 in ins.
(12) Kethîb rin; write Qerê

For in read $\pi$. Refore we expect the article.
All + or mor, a gloss pointing out that, l, evi being omitted, the number 12 is sained by counting Joseph as two (the ' $\pi$ is to be pointed as dual). (5 hat the words in slightly different form ( $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \sigma 1 \zeta ~ o x o ו v i \sigma u a t o s), ~ b u t ~ d i d ~ n o t ~ u n d e r s t a n d ~$ them. They here interrupt the connection, and it is not likely that Ezekiel 35 would have inserted in this place so well known a fact. The term לָ̣̃, also, is strange, the proper wurd being pin (Corvilat).
(15) After לניד we should expect, from Num. 34,7.8, the mention of Moumt Hor, and CORN. accordingly inserts it. The plus or minus is hard to determine.
Sll
 חמת.

Sll so written.
(17) $\mathfrak{A l}+$ +
: $11+$ + תñ out of a reference to Hamath after the easternmost point of the boundary has been stated to be Hazar-enan.
thl $\pi$ ת is for תnt, as in $x .20$.
(18) Il $\mathfrak{i}$ (four times); write $\mathfrak{i}=$, with (6 and according to the demands of the connection.
新趽 for
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48 [תונה might be retained, but $31^{2}$, 4 , seems to be a
 (or on 'וֹ in $35^{\text {b }}$ ). - P. H.]
(32) In الشُער omit the :
(34) Before ם must be written = as in the preceding verses.
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