general significance to the term, and the reference will then be not so much to particular letters addressed by St Paul to the Thessalonians as to any letter known by them to be his.

(2) That such letters were in existence is shewn by iii 17 (ὅ ἐστι σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ); for the caution there expressed not only proves the existence and recognized authority of genuine letters, but has more point if the Thessalonians might be required to test letters not directly addressed to them.

(3) The conclusion that St Paul's letters were by this time widely read is supported by Prof. Lake's hypothesis that Romans (in the shorter recension) was originally written as a general Epistle by St Paul at the same time as Galatians, and therefore, as he would hold, already in existence (*op. cit.* p. 363).

The main contention, however, of this paper is not that 2 Thess. was written at Beroea, but that it was written before 1 Thess. Some less striking points, however, have been noticed which might be brought in as evidence both for the main contention and for the Beroean origin of 2 Thess., but these are for the moment better postponed that the main issue be not lost in side tracks.

J. C. WEST.

SOME NOTES ON THE TEXT OF JOB.

FEW scholars will, I suppose, be satisfied with the Hebrew text in Job xvi 7, 8 which is thus rendered in the R. V. (omitting the margin):—

'But now he hath made me weary:
Thou hast made desolate all my company.
And thou hast laid fast hold on me, *which* is a witness against me:
And my leanness riseth up against me, it testifieth to my face.'

But when we compare the Hebrew with the Sept. and Vulgate the signs of corruption are evident.

אך עתה הלאני	νῦν δὲ κατάκοπόν με πεποίηκεν,
השמות כל עדתי	μωρόν, σεσηπότα,
ותקמטני לעד היה	καὶ ἐπελάβου μου· εἰς μαρτύριον ἐγενήθη·
ויקם בי כחשי	καὶ ἀνέστη ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸ ψεῦδός μου,
בפני יענה	κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου ἀνταπεκρίθη.

In the first line the Hebrew and Greek correspond,

'But now he (or *it*) has made me worn out',

but in the second line, where the Hebrew has 'Thou hast devastated all my company', the Sept. reads

'(*He* (or *it*) has made me) futile, an utter wreck'.

I suggest that the Hebrew text that they had before them ran thus:—

נשמתי כלי נצדיתי

i. e. the Niphal of the verbs שמם and צדה.

The verb שמם, 'to desolate', when applied to the mind has the meaning *obstupescere*. See Buxtorf, 'Nam stupor animi est quaedam desolatio'. It is used, as Buxtorf points out, in the Targum on 1 Sam. xxi 13 'And he (David) *pretended to be a fool* in their hands'.

Thus the reading נְשַׁמּוֹתַי would account for the difficult word *μωρόν* in the Sept. But further; the verbs שמם and צדה often go together, the latter in the Targum being used for the former in the Hebrew. Both are found in the Hebrew text of Zeph. iii 6:

'... their towns are *desolate* (נְשַׁמּוּ) ... their cities are *wasted* (נְצָדוּ).'

Thus the reading I have suggested

נְשַׁמּוֹתַי כֵּלִי נְצָדֵיתִי

would account for the *μωρόν*, *σεσηπότα* of the Septuagint.

I believe that they had a better text before them than our present Hebrew text, and that it ought to be translated

'I am desolate, utterly wasted'.

The reading עדתי, '*my company*', in the Masoretic text, makes no sense, but it might easily have arisen from our suggested word נצדתי, צ being often mistaken for ע.

If my contention be right then Kittel's critical text is in error in marking the words כל עדתי as having no corresponding words in the Septuagint.

We now turn to the Vulgate and compare it with the Masoretic text.

אך עתה הלאני	'Nunc autem oppressit me dolor meus,
השמות כל עדתי	et in nihilum redacti sunt omnes artus mei.
ותקמטני לעד היה	Rugae meae testimonium dicunt contra me,
ויקם בי כחשי	et suscitatur falsiloquus adversus faciem meam,
בפני יענה	contradicens mihi.'

In the first line we note that 'dolor meus' is merely supplied from the preceding verse, 'It (i. e. my pain) has worn me out'. But when we come to the second line, where we have shewn reason to believe that the Hebrew is corrupt, we find a wholly new rendering which agrees neither with the Hebrew nor with the Septuagint.

The Vulgate would require some such Hebrew text as the following:—

נְשַׁמּוּ כָּל־יְצָרַי

Compare Job xvii 7, where יְצָרַי is rendered *membra mea* in the

Vulgate. But the text that I have suggested to account for the Septuagint is

נשמתי כלי נצדיתי

The letters י and נ are often mistaken in manuscript, as are, also, the letters ר and ד, consequently the first four letters of נצדיתי might have given rise to the word יצרי which is required by the Vulgate.

Thus, if we adopt the more difficult reading נצדיתי which we have suggested for the Sept., the rendering of the Vulgate can be accounted for. As to the words that follow, there is but little to say. It is scarcely possible that the *verb* (והקמטני *v.* 8) can be correct. We should naturally expect a *substantive* rather than a *verb*.

I suggest that the first two letters may have arisen from the last letters of the preceding word.

The parallelism requires some such reading as that of the Vulgate, '*my wrinkles*'. Perhaps we might render

'Emaciation is come to be witness
And my leanness is risen against me'.

Job means to say that, instead of his affliction bringing him sympathy, it is held to be a witness to his guilt.

I would suggest the following translation of our text thus revised :—

7 'But nów it[1] has máde me out-wórn;
I am désolate, útterly wásted!
8 Emaciátion is cóme to be wítness
And my léanness is rísen agaínst me!
[It testifies to my face.]'

I suspect that the last line is a gloss. It does not suit the metre and is not required by the parallelism.

The next text that we will consider is Job xix 27,

כלו כליתי בחקי

which the R. V. translates

'My reins are consumed within me'.

But בחקי never signifies '*within me*', but always '*in my bosom*'. The translation of the R. V. would require בקרבי not בחקי.

Thus we must translate

'My reins are consumed in my bosom'.

But the bosom is not the seat of the reins, and we begin to suspect our text.

If we turn to the Sept. and Vulgate we find

Sept. *πάντα δέ μοι συντετέλεσται ἐν κόλπῳ.*
Vulg. *Reposita est haec spes in sinu meo.*

[1] i. e. *my pain.*

Here we note that our suspected word '*my reins*' is gone altogether Instead of כְּלָיוֹ כִּלְיֹתַי the Sept. would seem to have read the absolute infinitive with the tense, i. e. כָּלוֹ כָּלְיתִי.

The reading of the Vulgate is more difficult and, at the same time, more interesting.

How did the thought of '*hope*' come in?

It is impossible to suppose the words to be merely a paraphrase of '*my reins are consumed in my bosom*', i. e. *are consumed with longing*: for, though *the eye* is often said to be *consumed with longing*, it implies *disappointment* and not *hope* (Ps. lxix 3 (4), cxix 81, 82, 123; Jer. xiv 6; Lam. ii 11; Job xi 20, xvii 5, &c.).

Is it then possible that the verb כלה should have a different meaning?

I notice, in Buxtorf's Lexicon, that it has, in Chaldee, the sense of *hoping*.

Thus, in the Targ. on Ps. xxxi 7 כליתי is used for '*I hope* (or *trust*) in God' (see also on Pss. xxxii 10, lxii 11, xci 2, cxix 116 quoted by Buxtorf). In the last of these Targum passages כליותי signifies '*my hope*'.

How this meaning of the word כלה was acquired in Chaldee I do not know, unless it be that in every language '*to finish*' will necessarily have two divergent meanings, viz. (a) *to end by destroying*, (b) *to end by completing*.

Certainly כלה in Hebrew has these two meanings, though the former is more frequent.

A thing that is *consummated in the bosom* is *a hope*, or *trust*.

I suggest, therefore, that the Hebrew text which was common to the Sept. and the Vulgate read thus,

כָּלוֹ כָּלְיתִי בְּחֵקִי

which the Septuagint rendered

πάντα δέ μοι συντετέλεσται ἐν κόλπῳ

and the Vulgate, guided by the use of כלה in Chaldee, paraphrased by

Reposita est haec spes in sinu meo.

If we turn to the whole passage we shall see that the Vulgate gives the meaning which best suits the context. The Hebrew might be translated thus:—

'I know my Redeemer is living,
And will stand the last upon earth.
Though my bodily-tent[1] be destroyed,
Yet apart from my flesh[2] I see God;
Whom I shall behold as mine,
And mine eyes shall see (Him) no stranger.'

[1] *Skin.* [2] Text doubtful.

Then follows the line that, in the Masoretic text, would have to be translated

'My reins are consumed in my bosom'.

Surely this is a strange ending to the magnificent hope of the preceding words?

If, however, we accept the text which the Sept. seem to have had before them, and read

כָּלוֹ כָּלְיֹתַי בְּחֵקִי

we might possibly translate

'I am fully determined in my bosom'.

Or, if we might accept the guidance of the Chaldee as suggesting the sense of *hope* or *trust* in the word כלה,

'I fully trust in my bosom',

or, as the Vulgate paraphrases,

'Reposita est haec spes in sinu meo'.

I confess that such a sense for כלה is not easy to defend in Hebrew, as it is generally used of that which *comes to an end* through *destruction* rather than through *completion*. But in the difficult passage, Isa. x 22 f (cf. xxviii 22), which is quoted by St Paul in Rom. ix 28, כלה is used of a thing '*conclusive* and concise' or, better still, a '*consummation*', this '*consummation*' being the sure purpose of God with respect to the remnant of Israel that should return. Since this consummation is said to '*overflow with righteousness*' it can scarcely refer to '*destruction*'.

We now pass to Job xx 7.

The verse, with the context, in the R. V. is as follows:—

6 Though his excellency mount up to the heavens,
And his head reach unto the clouds;
7 Yet he shall perish for ever like his own dung:
They which have seen him shall say, 'Where is he?'

That a poet, in such a context, should have written *v.* 7 a is simply inconceivable.

We turn then to the Septuagint and we find that *v.* 7 reads thus:—

ὅταν γὰρ δοκῇ ἤδη κατεστηρίχθαι,
τότε εἰς τέλος ἀπολεῖται·
οἱ δὲ εἰδότες αὐτὸν ἐροῦσιν Ποῦ ἐστιν;

This gives a useful hint as to the original text. Evidently the Septuagint read, not בְּגֵלְלוֹ, '*like his dung*', but as an *Infin.* (with an affix) of the verb גלל. Now the verb גלל properly signifies '*to roll*', but it is also used in the sense of '*trusting*' or '*confiding*', e.g.

Ps. xxii 8 (9) E.V. '*He trusted* on the Lord' (marg. *He rolled* himself). See also Ps. xxxvii 5; Prov. xvi 3.

I would therefore suggest that

כגללו לנצח יאבד
ראיו יאמרו איו

should be translated

'While he is confiding (i. e. building himself up in self-confidence) he perishes utterly;
Those that were looking at him say, Where is he?'

I leave the reader to judge whether this be not more suitable to the context than the rendering of the R. V.

Job xxxiii 21.

The R. V. translates:

'His flesh is consumed away, that it cannot be seen;
And his bones that were not seen stick out.'

Those who can be satisfied with such a translation must be few in number.

The Masoretic text reads:—

יִכֶּל בְּשָׂרוֹ מֵרְאִי
וְשֶׁפּוּ עֲצָמֹתָיו לֹא רֵאוּ

The Septuagint:—

ἕως ἂν σαπῶσιν αὐτοῦ αἱ σάρκες,
καὶ ἀποδείξῃ τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ κενά.

The first line suggests

יִכֶּל בְּשָׂרוֹ מֻרָּי

i. e. '*His flesh is consumed with leanness*'.

In the second line, where the Sept. use the verb ἀποδεικνύναι for שפה, they were probably under the impression that the root שפה signified '*to stand out*' (see Isa. xiii 2), whereas it there signifies, not an *eminence*, but a *bare* hill; the proper meaning of the verb being '*to waste*' or '*make bare*'. But the chief interest lies in the word κενά. Clearly the Sept. had not the words לא ראו in their Hebrew text, but rather לָרִק.

This gives us a hint to the true text: for the word רק is used of *lean* of flesh (Gen. xli 19).

I should therefore translate our revised Hebrew:—

'His flesh is consumed with leanness
And his bones wasted with emaciation.'

Thus the parallelism is preserved.

Sometimes a Sept. rendering, even when it makes no sense, suggests a text which is better than our present Hebrew, e. g.

Job xxxvi 4.

The Hebrew text has

תְּמִים דֵּעוֹת עִמָּךְ, which would make Elihu describe himself as '*One perfect in wisdom*', a title that belongs to God alone.

But the Sept. read ἀδίκως συνίεις.

Now, in Ps. xxxii (xxxiii) 15, the Sept. use συνιείς for מֵבִין.

No doubt they got ἀδίκως from דעות, reading רעות instead of דעות.

But, in any case, there is no interest as there is no sense in their reading.

If, however, we accept מֵבִין as the correct text, i. e. מֵבִין דֵּעוֹת עִמָּךְ, we get a reading which harmonizes with the parallelism, i. e.

'For truly my words are no lie;
One is with thee who understands knowledge'.

There is an exceedingly difficult passage in the speech of Elihu (xxxvii 19–21), which the R. V. is contented to translate as follows:—

19 'Teach us what we shall say unto him;
For we cannot order *our speech* by reason of darkness.
20 Shall it be told him that I would speak?
Or should a man wish that he were swallowed up?
21 And now men see not the light which is bright in the skies:
But the wind passeth, and cleanseth them.'

The Hebrew (omitting the vowel points) is as follows:—

19 הודיענו מה נאמר לו
לא נערך מפני חשך
20 היספר לו כי אדבר
אם אמר איש כי יבלע
21 ועתה לא ראו אור
בהיר הוא בשחקים
ורוח עברה ותטהרם

The difficulty begins with *v.* 19b, which the Sept. render καὶ παυσώμεθα πολλὰ λέγοντες, and the Vulgate *nos quippe involvimur tenebris*. If we seek for common ground in these two texts we note first that both omit the word לא, '*not*'. This seems probable since the word before it is לו. Next we note that the verbs παυσώμεθα and *involvimur* might both be accounted for if we used the verb עצר instead of ערך. Compare Job xxix 9, where the Septuagint translate שָׂרִים עָצְרוּ בְמִלִּים by ἄδροὶ δὲ ἐπαύσαντο λαλοῦντες. Here, of course, עָצְרוּ בְמִלִּים signifies literally '*They were restrained in words*'.

Let us, then, suppose that the original text *v.* 19b read as follows:—

כי נעצר מפני חשך

This would account for the Vulgate *nos quippe involvimur tenebris*, and also for παυσώμεθα in the Septuagint.

We pass to the next verse. And here the Septuagint render

היספר לו כי אדבר

by μὴ βίβλος ἢ γραμματεύς μοι παρέστηκεν!

Clearly they were in despair and pointed היספר first as *sepher*, 'a book', and then as *sopher*, '*a scribe*'. This cannot help us. The only point of interest is that they seem to have read a verb in the 3rd person instead of the 1st person אדבר. Let us follow this hint and write ידבר, pointing it as a *Pual* to correspond with the Pual in the second member of the verse, thus:—

הֵיִסָּפֵר־לוֹ כִּי יְדֻבַּר
אִם אָמַר אִישׁ כִּי יְבֻלַּע

The parallelism suggests that we must translate דבר not in the usual sense of *speaking* but of *destroying*, as in 2 Chron. xxii 10,

'and she *destroyed* (וַתְּדַבֵּר) all the royal seed'.

Our verse would then read

'Should it be said of him that he was destroyed
Or would a man say that he was swallowed up?'

If these slight emendations be accepted we obtain a consistent view of the whole passage. The point of Elihu's contention is that we must not assume that God is not present simply because His action is not seen and understood. He illustrates this by the light that is shining above the clouds while all below, in the valley, may seem dark.

Thus I would translate:—

19 Teach us what we should say about Him:
For we are restrained by the darkness.
20 Should it (then) be said that He is destroyed?
Or should one say that He was swallowed up?
21 Yea now, though men see not the light,
It is bright in the upper-skies.
A wind but passes and clears them (i. e. the clouds) away.'

E. G. KING.