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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

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

Statement of Project

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


⁴See The Hexapla Institute [on-line]; accessed 20 March 2010; available at http://www.hexapla.org/; Internet. The Hexapla Institute is a reality despite Sydney Jellicoe’s pessimism concerning a revised and enlarged edition of the hexaplaric fragments, which he did not think was in the “foreseeable future.” Sidney Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 129.
for Job 22-42, and it will build upon Field and upon the critical edition by Joseph Ziegler for the Göttingen Septuaginta. The new edition will also incorporate new sources which Ziegler either did not use or to which he did not have access at the time he completed his edition. Specifically the work on the hexaplaric fragments of Job will make a contribution to the field in three ways. First, it will contribute to an understanding of the complicated text history of the book of Job, including both its Greek versions and the Hebrew text. Second, it will contribute to the history of exegesis of the book of Job, both Jewish and Christian, since this edition will attempt to reconstruct the original text for both Origen’s Hexapla and the readings of the three Jewish revisers (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion). Third, it will contribute to the needs of modern scholarship for a Field for the twenty-first century for the entire Old Testament.

Background

Origen’s Work and Intention for the Hexapla

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

---


7See “Adequacy and Availability of Sources” below for the details.


9For the relevant secondary literature see the following articles: Joachim Schaper, “The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla,” in Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th-3rd August 1994,
The Original Composition of the Hexapla. We can only provide preliminary answers to these questions here, and we will do so in order. It is generally recognized that the Hexapla had the following six columns in this order from left to right: column 1 contained the Hebrew text, column 2 contained the Hebrew text transliterated into Greek, column 3 contained the revision of Aquila (α’), column 4 contained the revision...
of Symmachus (σ′), column 5 contained the LXX (ο′), and column 6 contained the revision of Theodotion (Θ′). The most recent analysis of the existing fragments of the Hexapla, if the existing copies are like the original, show that the Hexapla probably had forty lines per page and there was probably only one Hebrew word per line. With these parameters, one estimates that the Hexapla would have filled almost forty codices of 400 leaves (800) pages each.12

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

---


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

17See Field, Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis hexaplorum, 29-33, where he casts doubt on Montfaucon’s thesis that the Tetrapla was edited before the Hexapla. Jenkins, “Hexaplaric Marginalia and the Hexapla-Tetrapla Question,” 73-87, where he concludes in the first place, “The Septuagint text of the Syrohexapla of the Psalter and Job derives more or less exactly from the Tetrapla, which was an edition with a Septuagint text quite distinct from the (later) fifth column of the Hexapla, and from the edition of Eusebius and Pamphilus” (85-86). Munnich, “Les Hexaples d’Origène, 181-83. Munnich presents the best general treatment of the question and his conclusion is worth citing in full, “In sum, if the tradition attests to the existence of the Hexapla and the Tetrapla, our documentation does not permit us to differentiate them. It seems even hazardous to distinguish them, in the upshot of Epiphanius, by the number of their columns, for one does not know what the copyists were understanding when they used the term, “hexapla”: for the Psalms mentions the word, while it describes a synopsis of seven or eight columns; the Barb. gr. 549 cites a fragment of the synopsis in five columns and ascribes to it “Hexapla.” In certain colophons the word is manifestly a synonym of the hexaplar of the Seventy. In the end, the term sometimes possesses a technical sense, which one is not able to restore with certainty, sometimes it possesses the sense of ‘Origenic synopsis’ in general, which, thenceforth, distinguishes itself poorly from
The colophon of Job in the Syh reads as follows: The book of Job, the righteous, is completed according to the tradition of the Seventy: Job was taken from the old Tetrapla. The colophon consists of two parallel units according to the punctuation, in which the first line identifies the text as from the Septuagint, while the second line clearly states that Job was taken from the Tetrapla. The adjective “old” is curious. Perhaps, it is meant to distinguish the Seventy as the oldest column in the Tetrapla, which refers only to the four Greek Versions minus reference to the first two Hebrew columns. This colophon juxtaposes the edition of the Seventy (the third column) with the oldest edition in the Tetrapla (the Seventy); thus, the scholiast does not intend to distinguish two different compositions, Tetrapla and Hexapla, but rather he probably refers to the Septuagint of the Hexapla with a different designation, Tetrapla. Syh Job also contains interesting scholia in the margins, which identify asterisked readings “not placed” in the Octapla of Origen\(^\text{18}\) and readings which are or are not placed in the Tetrapla.\(^\text{19}\) The question concerns whether the scholiasts understood Origen to have composed three separate works or whether these titles refer to the same work, the Hexapla. An answer to this question is outside of the purview of this chapter, but the present work concurs with the conclusion of Munnich that there was one composition of the Hexapla of Origen, which had neither a precursor nor a subsequent form, but later copyists sometimes used the term Hexapla in a technical sense and sometimes they used the term with the sense “Origenic recension” which distinguishes itself poorly from Tetrapla.


\(^{19}\)See at least two references to the Tetrapla in Syh at Job 32:11, 13b-17. The first example shows a reading that is in other copies, but is not in the Tetrapla, while the second example identifies a reading in the margin as the Tetrapla and the reading in the text as according to the copies of Pamphilus and Eusebius.
Origen’s intention for the Hexapla. Modern scholarship has proposed three reasons for why Origen constructed the Hexapla: (1) to reconstruct the original Septuagint based on the Hebrew text of his day, (2) to create an apologetic tool to aid in Christian and Jewish dialogue, and (3) for the purpose of exegesis.

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

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

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

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

22The statement is as follows: Ἀσκοῦμεν δὲ μὴ ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὰς παρ’ ἑκείνοις, ἵνα πρὸς Ἰουδαίους διαλέγομεν μὴ προφέρωμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μὴ κείμενα ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἱνα συγχρησώμεθα τοῖς φερομένοις παρ’ ἑκείνοις εἰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις οὐ κέιται βιβλίοις. Τοιαύτης γὰρ οὕσης ἡμῶν τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς ξητίσεσι παράσκευης, οὐ καταφρονήσουσιν, οὐδ’ ὅς
clause (ἵνα) in which Origen makes clear that he is comparing the Jewish versions with the LXX (presumably) so that they are prepared for debate with the Jews and so that they will not ridicule them, yet, although there is a purpose clause in this text, one cannot reduce Origen, the man or his work, to apologetics.

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

History of the Hexapla and Hexaplaric Research

The history of the Hexapla is brief, since it was not copied in its entirety due to its immense size and the cost of materials and copying in antiquity. Sufficient evidence that Origen's Hexapla was copied is not conclusive, but there is evidence that at least one copy exists. The Hexapla was a work of scholarship and scholarship was highly valued in ancient society. The Hexapla is a testament to Origen's dedication to scholarship and his commitment to preserving the ancient texts.

---

23See for a further defense of this view, Brock, “Origen’s Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament,” 216.


25Grafton and Williams, Christianity and the Transformation of the Book, 106-07. These authors show that a copy of Virgil’s Aeneid would have cost 3,400 denarii, while a complete copy of the Hexapla would be upwards of 150,000 denarii, 75,000 for the copying and 75,000 for the luxurious copying materials. They add that the Hebrew script would have required extra expertise, and would have probably made the task more costly. Thus clearly, only the wealthy could afford this work, and these authors have shown that Origen’s patron, Ambrose, a member of the upper echelon of Roman society, would have been able to finance the Hexapla. They also put these numbers in perspective in relation to yearly salaries. Origen, as a grammarian in Alexandria, would have made a yearly salary of about 70,000 denarii according to the Price Edict. This salary would not have been enough to finance a project like the Hexapla, but the project would have been in reach for a wealthy bishop like Cornelius of Rome, who
remains, however, to reveal that parts of the Hexapla were copied and translated and disseminated throughout Christendom. It is clear that Origen constructed it in Caesarea between AD 230 and 245, and that it spread widely through various means. In the *Life of Constantine*, Eusebius (d. c. AD 340) records a letter from the Emperor, who orders him to prepare “fifty copies of the sacred Scriptures,” which were to be taken by two public carriages from Caesarea to the growing church in Constantinople. The biblical text of Eusebius was almost certainly that of Origen’s Hexapla. Although this task seems insignificant, it is now clear that these copies provided the biblical text for the Council of Ephesus in AD 431, and it is also clear that the Armenian constituency at this council brought the hexaplaric text home and their biblical text was revised according to it, so that now the Armenian Version in its current form reflects the hexaplaric text including the Aristarchian signs tradition. It is also clear that Bishop Paul of Tella in about AD 616 translated the fifth column into Syriac and included the Aristarchian signs, a work now known as the Syro-Hexapla or Syro-Hexaplar. In AD 638, Caesarea was conquered by the Muslims, and it is speculated that the Hexapla manuscripts were destroyed at this time or were simply forgotten. Although the complete Hexapla had a relatively short life, its impact on the text history of the Greek Bible was already pervasive by the time of Jerome (d. c. AD 420). In a letter to Augustine, written c. AD 398, he says to him:

And I am amazed how you do not read the books of the Seventy in their pure form, as they were published by the Seventy, but rather as emended by Origen or rather corrupted by the obeli and asterisks, and you do not follow the translation of a Christian man, especially when he (Origen) transferred these, which have been annually donated 6 million *denarii* in food to the poor. Therefore Origen’s patron, Ambrose, would have been able to finance the project (107).

---


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

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

The history of hexaplaric research begins in 1578, when would be Pope Sixtus V, Felice Peretti, urged Gregory XIII to prepare a new edition of the Greek Bible.29 When Peretti became Pope, this project flourished under the leadership of Carafa. He also added new editors to this team, and one of them was named Petrus Morinus, who was the editor responsible for the hexaplaric readings placed in the apparatus after each chapter. The edition known as *Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta* appeared in 1587, but it would be surpassed by the Latin translation known as the *Vetus Testamentum secundum LXX Latine* in 1588. In this edition, Flaminius Nobilius included many of the readings from the *recentiores* from Morinus, but he also supplemented these notes with his own. In 1622, Johannes Drusius completed the first commentary on the hexaplaric fragments in *Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. This edition included two introductory notes, one introduced the identities of the recentiores, while the other introduced the works of Quinta and Sexta. According to Law, Drusius added to the material, which had been handed down to him, and he translated the readings into Latin and then added his commentary.30 In 1657, Brian Walton’s London Polyglot (the *Biblia
eius et miror, quomodo septuaginta interpretum libros legas non puros, ut ab eis editi sunt, sed ab Origene emendatos siue corruptos per obelos et asteriscos et Christiani hominis interpretatiunculam non sequaris, praesertim cum ea, quae addita sunt, ex hominis Iudaei atque blasphemi post passionem Christi editione transtulerit. uis amator esse uerus septuaginta interpretum? non legas ea, quae sub asteriscis sunt, immo rade de uolumnibus, ut ueterum te fautorum probes. quod si feceris, omnes ecclesiarum bibliothecas condemnare cogeris. uix enim unus aut alter inuenietur liber, qui ista non habeat. Jerome, Epistle 112 to Augustine, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 55, ed. Isidorus Hilberg (Vindobonae: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996), 389.


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

In 1713, Bernard de Montfaucon published what has been called “the watershed” of hexaplaric studies since this edition was the first definitive collection of hexaplaric fragments, Orgenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt.31 This work was the standard of hexaplaric scholarship for 150 years, until another collection of fragments was undertaken by Frederick Field in 1863 and was published in 1875.32 Field brought hexaplaric scholarship to a higher level in the following ways: (1) he used Montfaucon’s earlier edition, which served as his base text, (2) he provided an extended prolegomenon which addressed subjects such as the Three and an analysis of Sexta and Septima, (3) he discusses the obscure subjects of Ἑβραῖος, Σύρος, and Σαμαρειτικόν, and (4) perhaps his greatest innovation, he not only used the Syh, but he provided retroversions of the Syriac into Greek, which he indicated with a smaller type print in his edition lest they be confused with actual Greek lemmas.33

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

---


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

33 Field had access to the pre-published edition of Ceriani’s Syro-Hexapla, which is now known as A. M. Ceriani, ed., Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolitographice editus, Monumenta sacra et profana, 7 (Milan: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874).
signs, (2) other LXX mss containing marginal notes, (3) manuscripts containing the Syro-hexapla including the Aristarchian signs and marginal notes, (4) catena manuscripts with attributions to one of the Three, and (5) citations from the Church Fathers. However, new evidence has come to light since Field’s edition. In 1896, G. Mercati discovered fragments of the Hexapla from Psalms in palimpsest 0.39.34 In 1897, F. C. Burkitt published a manuscript, which had portions of Aquila’s translation of 1 and 2 Kings.35 Finally, in 1900, C. Taylor published hexaplaric fragments of Psalm 22 (LXX 21) from the Cairo Genizah fragments.36 Significantly, these discoveries have confirmed the arrangement of the Hexapla as passed down to us via patristic testimony, since these were actual fragments of copies of the Hexapla, not preserved in other sources. In addition to these fragments, Swete lists the collections of Pitra, E. Klostermann, and G. Morin.37 With all of this new evidence surfacing, Jellicoe states about sixty-five years later that a new collection of hexaplaric fragments will not be published in the foreseeable future.38

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


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


38Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study, 129.
with asterisks, not the Old Greek *per se*, while the second apparatus lists the evidence of each fragment from the Three. In the first apparatus, Ziegler provides evidence from Origen’s fifth column, and he signals to the reader with a down arrow where readings from the second apparatus have influenced readings in the first apparatus; thus, Ziegler has provided researchers with the most complete collection of the evidence of the ο’ text and of the Three (although see below under “Adequacy and Accessibility of Resources”).

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

**Relevance for Research**

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

---

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

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

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

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

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


42Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 460-61.
exegesis of the Church Fathers cannot be overlooked.

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

**Adequacy and Accessibility of Sources**

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


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

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

**Methodology**

**The Aim of the Project**

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

---


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

arrangement for each biblical book eludes us at this time, but even if one were privy to this information, one would still not know the exact arrangement of each word in each line of the Hexapla as originally constructed.\footnote{R. B. Ter Haar Romeny and P. J. Gentry, “Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Materials for the Book of Genesis,” in \textit{X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998}, ed. B. A. Taylor, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 286-87.}

Therefore, the goal of this project is more manageable: to create a critical edition of hexaplaric fragments for Job 22-42. Ter Haar Romeny and Gentry outline three types of materials that are considered to be hexaplaric, which will be the criteria for this dissertation. The first type is strictly hexaplaric and includes the asterisks and obeli and any other scholia, which indicates pluses or minuses relative to the Hebrew text. The second type comprises materials which are considered hexaplaric because Origen incorporated them into it. These materials include readings from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which existed before the composition of the Hexapla and have come down in other sources besides the Hexapla. The Hebrew text in Greek letters is also considered hexaplaric according to this criterion. The third type is hexaplaric material by association and is as follows: ὁ Σύρος, τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν or ὁ Ἑβραῖος, and τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν. These works are not hexaplaric in themselves but they have traditionally been collected with hexaplaric materials.\footnote{Ibid., 287.}

\section*{Compiling and Presenting Information}

This project follows the methodology outlined by ter Haar Romeny and Gentry in their article on collecting hexaplaric materials for Genesis, and the few changes, which the Hexapla Project has made since that article appeared.\footnote{Ibid., 289-94.}
Choices between readings. Ziegler’s objective for his second apparatus was simply to list the hexaplaric evidence, and at times the witnesses are in conflict. This project’s method aligns with Field and attempts to reconstruct the original text based on the available evidence. At times this reading is different from Field’s because of the new state of the evidence.

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

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

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

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

53Ibid., 290-91.
information about his source.

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

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

**The Project Format**

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

The fifth apparatus lists all non-Greek sources (NonGr). Although the final form of the Hexapla project will include all known non-Greek sources (in particular the Coptic tradition of Job), this project will cover the original texts of Hebrew, Aramaic,
Syriac, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Armenian, and Latin sources. All non-Greek sources listed in Ziegler will be listed in the Witness apparatuses, but only the texts of the aforementioned languages will be included in this dissertation.

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

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

**Job 24 22b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>בַּחַיִּין׃ (יָקוּם וְלֹא־יַאֲמִין) בֵּיתִי</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>(ἀναστὰς τοιγαροῦν οὐ μὴ πιστεύσῃ) κατὰ (τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σ′</td>
<td>περί</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of entry.** The HT and LXX for Job 24:22b are listed first. The parentheses indicate that these words are not under consideration but are supplied for context. The only word for consideration is κατὰ in the LXX and ב for the HT.
lemma line shows the attribution to σʹ and the lemma περί. The first apparatus shows that ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cf L 139 559 732 3006 ↓Syh ↓Pitra attest the lemma and attribution. The down arrow before a manuscript grouping or manuscript indicates that more information is given in the apparatuses below. The second apparatus reports that the L group ὑπέρ for κατά and that 11 257 have περί, which appears to be influenced by the hexaplaric fragment. The third attribution shows that the fragment is sine nomine or omitted from C (= 788-250) 643. The fourth apparatus shows that 740 has περ instead of the lemma and that 260 Syh Pitra contain a plus (τῆς ἐκακτοῦ ζωῆς). The fifth apparatus supplies the full Syriac fragment from the margin of Syh complete with attribution to Symmachus. The sixth apparatus provides the editor’s comments on specific manuscripts and the variants.
CHAPTER 2
DESCRIPTION OF SOURCES

Introduction

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

Text Witnesses

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

\(^1\)Joseph Ziegler, ed. Job, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum, vol. 11.4. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).
through Gentry, but it has not been fully collated for this edition, even though its place in
the Hagedorns’ stemma is clear (see Catena Groups). In addition to these manuscripts,
Reinhart Ceulemans kindly informed me about Ra 788, which had not been collated
previously by Field, Ziegler, or the Hagedorns. Zisis Melissakis of the Institute for
Byzantine Research in Athens was generous to send me the images, but this important
manuscript came to my attention too late in the writing process to incorporate fully into
this edition (for its significance see Catena Groups). At places the readings in the Edition
are corrected by the Kollationen and in many places the images of the manuscripts were
consulted directly in order to verify the correct reading. The witnesses are listed
according to Rahlfs’s Verzeichnis number or as subsequently catalogued in the case of
materials which have not received a Rahlfs’s number previously.

Greek Manuscripts

Uncials

B  Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr.1209, "Vaticanus;" 4th C
C  Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 9, "Ephraemi Syri rescriptus;" 5th C rescr. 13th C
V  Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 1, "Venetus;" 8th C

Minuscules

46  Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl.; 4 8th–14th C
55  Rom, Bibl. Vat., Regin. gr. 1; 10th C
68  Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 5; 15th C
106 Ferrara, Bibl. Comun., 187 II; 14th C
110 Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 230, (Cat.); AD 1549
130 Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 23; 12th–13th C
137 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., D 73 sup., (Cat.) – Fragmentarisch; 9th–10th C
138 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., M 65 sup., (Cat.); 11th C
139 Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., A 148 inf., (Cat.); 10th–11th C
147 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. Gr. 30 (A), (Cat.); 12th C
149 Wien, Theol. Gr. 11 (Cat.); 11th C
157 Basel, Univ.-Bibl., B. VI. 23; 12th C
160 Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, A. 66b.; 14th–15th C
161 Moskau, Russ. Staatsarchiv für alte Dokumente, Fond 1607, Inv. 1.7; 14th C
228 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1764; 13th C
248 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 346; 13th C
249 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Pii II. gr. 1, (Cat.); 12th C
250 München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 148, (Cat.); 13th C
251 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. V 27, (Cat.); 14th C
252 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. VIII 27; 10th C
253 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 336, (see Zi); 11th C
254 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 337; 10th C
255 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 338, (Cat.); 10th C
256 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 697, (Cat.); 13th C
257 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 745; 10th C
258 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 749, (Cat.) – Fragmentarisch; 9th C
259 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Palat. gr. 230, (Cat.) 1:1 und 14:5-16:8 fehlen; 10th – 11th C
260 Kopenhagen, Kgl. Bibl., Gamle Kgl. Saml. 6, (Cat.); 10th – 11th C
261 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. VII 30; AD 1323
296 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Palat. gr. 337; 11th C
336 Athos, Ἡσιοδούς 555; 14th C
337 Athos, Ἡσιοδούς 615; 14th C
339 Athos, Koutloumousiou 8; 11th C
351 Berlin, Staatsbibl., Phill. 1407; 16th C
355 Bologna, Bibl. Comun., A.I.2, see Zi, 12; 12th C
386 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. X 29; 13th – 14th C
395 Prague, Státní knihovna XXV B 3 (Ra = Kosinitza 22); 10th C
406 Jerusalem, Patr. Bibl., Agiou Staurou 36(18), see Edition, 12; 8th C
(rescr. 12th – 13th C)
409 Jerusalem, Patr. Bibl., Agiou Taphou 5; 13th C
471 Moskau, synod. Gr. 147; 13th/14th C
476 Moskau, synod. Gr. 392; 12th C
480 München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 32, (Cat.); 16th C
491 München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 488, (Comm.); 13th C
492 München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 491, (Cat.) 16th C
503 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. E 2.16 (Cat.); 12th-13th C
505 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Auct. E 2.19 (= Misc. 47); 11th–12th C
512 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 176, (Cat.); AD 1562
513 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 178, (Cat.); 16th C
523 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. gr. 20; 13th C
534 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 18; 11th C
540 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 194; 13th C
542 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 10, Fragmentarisch; 9th C
543 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 11; AD 1186
555 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 134 (= Reg. 2434); 13th C
556 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 135 (= Reg. 1830³); AD 1362
557 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 136 (= Colb. 3066); 15th C
559 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 138; 16th C
560 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 151 (= Reg. 1890); 13th C
570 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 162 (= Reg 2873); 13th C
575 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 396; 13th C
577 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 396; 13th C
608 Codex Oratorii in vico S. Honoratii; 10th C
612 Patmos, Ιωάννου του θεολόγου 171 (Cat.) – Fragmentarisch; 7th–8th C
613 Patmos, Ιωάννου του θεολόγου 209; 13th C
620 Patmos, Ιωάννου του θεολόγου 419, 1:1 - 2:9e fehlt; 13th C
631 Raudnitz, Lobkowitz'sche Bibl. VI. E. f. 19; 14th C
632 Rom, Bibl. Angel. Gr. 113 (B.1.2); 16th C
637 Rom, Bibl. Casan. 241; 11th C
643 Rom, Bibl. Vallic. 37, (Cat.); 10th C
642 Rom, Bibl. Vallic. 37, (Cat.); 10th C
660 Rom, Bibl. Vallic. 37, (Cat.) – Portions; 10th C
661 Rom, Bibl. Vallic. 37, (Cat.); 11th C
667 Rom, Bibl. Vallic. 37, (Cat.) – Portions; 10th C
703 Rom, Bibl. Vallic. 37, (Cat.) – Portions; 10th C
705 Athen, Nat. Bibl. 2410, (Cat.); 13th–14th C
706 Athen, Nat. Bibl. 2641; AD 914
728 Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Appendix I 13; 11th–12th C
732 Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 21, (Cat.); 10th–11th C
740 Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 538 (Cat.); AD 905
748 Athen, Byzantinisches Museum 2781, (Cat.) – Portions; 13th –14th C
754 Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 147; 11th C
765 Athos, Δσυρα 220 (B/100); 14th C
788 Tyrrnavos, Dēmotikē Bibl. 25; 10th C
795 Athos, Δσυρα Γ 51 (291); 12th–13th C
797 Athen, Benaki-Museum, Echangeables 72; 13th –14th C
849 Manchester, John-Rylands Library, Rylands Nr. 3; 6th–7th C
3004 Salamantinus Universitatis M 32 (1-2-1); 16th C, Ziegler falsch 704
3005 Genua, Durazzo-Giustiniani A I 10; 9th–10th C
3006.1 Sinai, Cod. Gr. 3; 11th C
3006.2 Sinai, Cod. Gr. 3; 11th C
3007 Sinai, Cod. Gr. 311; AD 1510
3008 Athous Vatopedi 590; 12th C

Papyri

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

27
Other

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

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

Manuscripts Not Used

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

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

The following manuscripts are secondary copies and derivatives of

manuscripts used in the Hagedorns’ stemma and are therefore excluded from *AGK*:³

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

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

**Greek Commentaries**

Der Iobkommentar des Arianers Julian = Iul


Der Iobkommentar des Didymus = Did


Der Iobkommentar des Johannes Chrysostomus = Chr


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

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


**Ol, OlX, OlY, Olymp.** In the *Edition*, Ol designates the commentary alone or together with the catena.

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

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

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

**Latin Commentaries**

Der Iobkommentar des Julian von Eclanum = IulE

---

4 AGK 1, 17.

Der Iobkommentar eines Anonymus = An

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

Der Iobkommentar des Presbyter Philippus = La\(^P\) La\(^Ph\)


Philippi Presbyteri viri longe eruditissimi, in historian Iob commentariorum libri tres, Basileae 1527 = La\(^Ph\)

Der Iobkommentar Gregors des Grossen = GregM


**Indirect Traditions**


Testamentum Iobi = Test

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

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

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

Dam\(^E\) = Escorial, Real Bibl., Ω-III-9; 11th C  
Dam\(^W\) = Wien, Nationalbibl., Suppl. gr. 178; 11th C  
Dam\(^O\) = Rom, Bibl. Vat., Ottob. gr. 79; 15th C  
Dam\(^V\) = Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1236; 15th C
Vat. gr. 1236 is the *Vorlage* of the edition of M. Lequien (PG 95–96, 1712); when no manuscript is cited, but the Migne edition is referred to, Dam (Mi) is noted.

**Translations**

Latin = La


La\(\alpha\) = Ms. Nr. 18 der Bibliothèque Publique in tours, die aus dem Kloster Marmoutiers stammt

La\(\beta\) = Ms. Auct. E. infra 2 Nr. 2426 der Bodleiana in Oxford

La\(\gamma\) = Ms. Nr. 11 in St. Gallen

La\(\alpha\) = Zu diesen drei Hss. kommt noch die Hs. Hinzu, die Augustinus seinen *Adnotationes in Iob* zugrunde legt

La\(\beta\) = Die Zitate aus La im Iobkommentar des Presbyter Philippus

Syrohexapla = Syh

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

Syropalestinian = Syp

J. P. N. Land. *Anecdota syriaca* IV (Lugduni Batavorum 1875; Neudruck Jerusalem, 1971) 223: 21:1-2, 5b, 6-8 (lückenhaft), 9a οἱ οἴκοι σύτων = Syp\(\beta\).


Christian Palestinian Aramaic = CPA

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

Coptic = Co [= Bo + Sa]

Sahidic = Sa


Sa⁷ J. Schleifer, ebd. II 164,6 (Wien 1911) S. 21–23 Nr. VII. Inhalt: 40:12b, 13b-23a, 25, 26b-31a, 32; 41:1-3, 5-7, 8b, 10.


Bohairic = Bo


E. Porcher uses three manuscripts:

M = Manchester 417, Collection Ryland
L = London 724 Add. 18997, Brit. Museum

Fayumic = Fa

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

Aethiopic = Aeth


F. M. E. Pereira used three manuscripts:

- Cod. aeth. 11 (Cat. 7), Paris, Bibl. Nat. = Aeth¹
- Cod. aeth. 55 der Sammlung von A. d’Abbadie, Paris, Bibl. Nat. = Aeth²

Armenian = Arm


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

Arabic = Arab


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


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

**Editions**

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

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

**Text Groups**

*Edition Text Groups*

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

*O* = La-Syh (Syrohexapla): Origen’s recension

253’ = 253-339

*L* = A-V (ab 30:8)-575-637-Iul-Chr: Lucianic recension main group

A’ = A-406

575′ = 575-637

575’ = 575-55

575’’ = 575-637-55

*II* = 46-249-631: first Lucianic sub group

46’ = 46-631

*III* = 254-754: second Lucianic sub group

*III* = 106-130-261: third Lucianic sub group
\[ II'' = II + III + IIII \]
\[ II' = II + III \]
\[ II = II + IIII \]
\[ L'' = L + II + III + IIII \]
\[ L' = L + II \]
\[ L = L + III \]
\[ L = L + IIII \]
\[ L'' = L + II + IIII \]
\[ L' = L + II + III \]

\[ C^1 = 139-147-256-705 \]
\[ C^2 = 260-643-732 \]
\[ C^3 = 255-258-612-740-765 \]
\[ 137' = 137-643 \]
\[ 147' = 147-256 \]
\[ 255'' = 255-612-740 \]
\[ c = 259-337-355 \text{ (Chap 1-15)-480-620-687-703-748: Catena sub group} \]
\[ c^1 = 259-687-748 \]
\[ c^2 = 337-620-703 \]
\[ 259' = 259-687 \]
\[ C' = C + c \]

\[ b = 248-252-542-543-644; \]
\[ 248' = 248-68 \]

\[ d = 157-523-797 \]
\[ 336' = 336-728 \]
\[ 534' = 534-613 \]

**The Catena Tradition**

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although Ziegler did not use the four Montef manuscripts, his Edition incorporated twenty-eight manuscripts in his catena groupings, which made his study in 1982 the most up to date. In order to accomplish this research, Ziegler also used the analyses of catena materials published subsequent to Field done by Karo-Lietzmann (1902), Faulhaber (1903), Bertini (1923), Devreesse (1928), and Hagedorn (1985). Karo-Lietzmann divided the catena manuscripts into two types: Type I and Type II. Type I,
which Karo-Lietzmann divided into nine families, is essentially the Polychronius catena. Type II is the Nicetas catena. Based upon these two larger divisions, Ziegler developed the sigla \( C \) (Type I, Polychronius) and \( c \) (Type II, Nicetas) (Edition, 125-27).

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
C &= 249-257-395-406-788-250-3005 \\
cII &= 259-337-355-480-512-513-555-620-687-703-748
\end{align*}
\]

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

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

\(^7\)The Hagedorns did not have direct access to 476 at the time of their research and publications, but that 476 is a descendant of 139 can be verified. First, 476 agrees with 139 in the unique omissions of the whole catena fragments listed in \( AGK \) 1, 22, which means 476 is related to 139 and no other manuscript of the stemma. Second, 476 agrees with 139 in the significant variants from the original text in \( AGK \) 1, 22. In the first example, 476 agrees with 147, since the catena fragment, \( \text{B 11} \), is absent from both mss. The
determined (cp. Ziegler’s $C^1$). Since these six witnesses are descendents of 139, the Hagedorns did not cite these witnesses in their Nachlese or AGK (AGK 1, 21ff). Ms 476$^\text{cat}$ (there are no marginal notes) is cited sporadically in the critical text, but it is understood to be a descendent of 139 throughout.

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

Third, not all of the mss of $cI$ are equally significant for preserving the hexaplaric fragments. Ms 258 does not preserve marginal hexaplaric notes after Job 2:10b. In AGK, Mosquensis 342 and Mosquensis 412 were listed by the Hagedorns with the sigla 474 for folios 1-16 (where the text is identical to 740) and with the sigla $\Sigma$ for Mosquensis 412 for folios 17ff (the text is derived from a text similar to 612; AGK 1, 9). According to Dieter Hagedorn’s personal notes, 474 only contained four or five hexaplaric notes, but their text was identical to 740, so he did not list them in the Nachlese. The text of $\Sigma$ was far more interesting for the catena, but this manuscript does not contain marginal hexaplaric notes. All of the marginal notes that are present in the agreement with 147 is significant since it adds to the evidence adduced by the Hagedorns where the two mss share unique agreements compared with 139 (AGK 1, 25). Ms 476, therefore, is a descendent of 139 and it shares a few unique agreements with 147. For two relevant unique variants shared by 139 and 476 from the hexaplaric materials, see Job 32:11 $\Theta'$ and 32:11b-12a $\sigma'$.

---

$^8$Dieter Hagedorn, personal correspondance with author, January, 2012.

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

Fourth, the Hagedorns found places where ms 395 belonged to the C group, since the manuscript was contaminated in the first chapters with C readings, which show a close relationship to ms 3005.\footnote{Ursula and Dieter Hagedorn, Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1 Philologisch-Historische Klasse, No. 10 (1991), (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 380.} In Job 22-42, 395 is part of the cl group.

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

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


Pitra incorporated readings from the following manuscripts: 110 255 246 248 249 256 257 258 259 653 654 680 681 687 703. Woods showed that ms 246 (Rom. Vat. Gr. 1238) is suspect since it contains the Testament of Job, and not the biblical Job. She was unable
to verify this suspicion since the microfilm of the ms was unavailable.\textsuperscript{11} Ms 653 (Rom. Ottob. Gr. 9; 16th C) and Ms 654 (Rom. Ottob. Gr. 24; AD 1553) were excluded from the \textit{Edition} because they are sixteenth century manuscripts.\textsuperscript{12}

Also, Klostermann’s citations of hexaplaric fragments from manuscripts 161 255 258 732 740 discussed by Ziegler in the \textit{Beiträge}, are of limited value.\textsuperscript{13} Four of the manuscripts in this group (255 258 732 740) are cited by new collations.


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

\textbf{Notes and Editions}


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


\textsuperscript{12} Edition, 152.

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

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1209, “Vaticanus”</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 9, &quot;Ephraemi Syri rescriptus&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 1, &quot;Venetus&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 4</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Rom, Bibl. Vat., Regin. gr. 1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 5</td>
<td>248’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Ferrara, Bibl. Comun., 187 II</td>
<td>IIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 230, (Cat.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Wien, Nationalbibl., Theol. Gr. 23</td>
<td>IIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., D 73 sup., (Cat.) - Fragmentarisch</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Γ</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., M 65 sup., (Cat.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Γ</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Mailand, Bibl. Ambr., A 148 inf., (Cat.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. Gr. 30 (A), (Cat.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Vindobonensis theol. gr. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Basel, Univ.-Bibl., B. VI. 23</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, A. 66b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Moskau, Russ. Staatsarchiv für alte Dokumente, Fond 1607, Inv. 1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 346</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Rom, Bibl. Vat., Pii II. gr. 1, (Cat.)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>249 (Γ’)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 148, (Cat.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Γ’</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. V 27, (Cat.)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
252 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. VIII 27
253 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 336, (see Edition) 253’
254 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 337
255 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 338, (Cat.) C Γ Q 255
256 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 697, (Cat.) C 256 256 256
257 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 745 O\textsuperscript{X} / C Γ’ X
258 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 749, (Cat.) - Fragmentarisch C Γ V 258
259 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Palat. gr. 230, (Cat.) 1:1 und 14:5-16:8 fehlen c 259
260 Kopenhagen, Kgl. Bibl., Gamle Kgl. Saml. 6, (Cat.) C 260 K
261 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. VII 30 IIII
296 Rom, Bibl. Vat., Palat. gr. 337 296
336 Athos, Ιβηρων 555 336’
337 Athos, Ιβηρων 615 c
339 Athos, Koutloumousiou 8 339
351 Berlin, Staatsbibl., Phill. 1407 c 351
355 Bologna, Bibl. Comun., A.I.2, see Edition, 12
362 New Haven Yale 257 (ehem. Cheltenham Phillipps 14041) 362
386 Florenz, Bibl. Laur., Plut. X 29 386
395 Prague, Státní knihovna XXV B 3 (Ra = Kosinitza 22) Γ Λ 406
406 Jerusalem, Patr. Bibl., Agiou Staurou 36(18), see Edition, 12 Γ’ Θ 409
409 Jerusalem, Patr. Bibl., Agiou Taphou 5
434 Matritensis Bibl. Nac. 4716 (O. 38) 434
471 Mosquensis synod. gr. 147 471
476 Mosquensis synod. gr. 392; 12th C; microfilm unavailable 476
480 München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 32, (Cat.) c
491 München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Gr. 488, (Comm.) Ol\(^{Y} \) / C
492 Monacensis gr. 491 492
503 Oxoniensis Bodleianus Auct. E 2.16 (= Misc. 44) 503
512 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 176, (Cat.) N (Iun.)
513 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Bar. 178, (Cat.) N (Iun.)
523 Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. gr. 20, d 523 B
534 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 18 534`
540 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 194 540
542 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 10, b Fragmentarisch
543 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 11 b
555 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 134 (= Reg. 2434) Reg. duo
556 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 135 (= Reg. 1830\(^{2} \) ) 556
557 Parisinus gr. 136 (Colb. 3066) 557
560 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 151 (= Reg. 1890) Reg. unus 560
570 Parisinus gr. 162 (Reg 2873) 570
575 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 396 L
608 Codex Oratorii in vico S. Honoratii Orat. 608
612 Patmos, Iωασνου του θεολογου 171 (Cat.) - Fragmentarisch C Γ Π
613 Patmos, Iωασνου του θεολογου 209 613 / 534`
620 Patmos, Iωασνου του θεολογου 419, 1:1 - 2:9e fehlt c
631 Raudnitz, Lobkowitz'sche Bibl. VI. E. f. 19 ll
632 Romanus Angelicanus gr. 113 (B.1.2) 632
637 Rom, Bibl. Casan. 241 L
643 Rom, Bibl. Vallinc. 37, (Cat.) C 643 Δ
3006.2 Sinai, Cod. Gr. 3 \( \Gamma \) S
3007 Sinai, Cod. Gr. 311 \( 3007 \) W
3008 Athous Vatopedi 590 \( 3008 \)
\( \Omega \) Vaticanus gr. 709
Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 2002

Die syrischen Übersetzungen
Syrohexapla Ambrosianus, ed. Ceriani
Syropalästinische Übersetzung CPA

Die coptischen Übersetzungen
Sahidische
Bohairische
Fajumische
Aethiopische

Die armenische Übersetzung
Armenische

Die arabische Übersetzung
Arabische

Die alten Druckausgaben
Aldina
Complutensis
Sixtina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sinai, Cod. Gr. 3</td>
<td>Syh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinai, Cod. Gr. 311</td>
<td>Syp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athous Vatopedi 590</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaticanus gr. 709</td>
<td>Co [ = Bo + Fa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sa ( 1 ), Sa ( 2 ), Sa ( 3 ), Sa ( 4 ), Sa ( 5 ), Sa ( 6 ), Sa ( 7/1 ), Sa ( 7/2 ), Sa ( 7/3 ), Sa ( 8 ), Sa ( 9 ), Sa ( 10 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeth ( p ) Aeth ( A ) Aeth ( B )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>Superseded by Cox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3

CRITICAL TEXT OF HEXAPLARIC READINGS
WITH APPARATUS AND NOTES

Chapter 22

Job 22 2

HT: מַשְׂכִּיל׃ יִסְכֹּן עָלֵימוֹ (כִּי)

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

\[\theta^\prime\] κατασκηνώσει ἐφ' ὑμᾶς σύνεσιν

Wit1: 252 Syh

Wit2: fin] + καὶ (> 575-46') κατασκηνώσει ἐφ' ἡμᾶς (ἐπ ἐμὲ Iul) σύνεσιν La

Attr: \[\theta^\prime\] α' 252

NonGr: Syh et habitare facit super nos intelligentiam

La et hastare facit super nos intelligentiam

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

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

Job 22 3a
σ’ μὴ χρήζει ο ἰκανός ἤνα δικαιώθηκ

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

Attr: σ’] > C (= 250) Ω 161mg

Var: μὴ] ου γαρ Ω | χρήζει (χρίζει 559)] χρηζή 138-255; χρηζῆς 137 139 260 643 680 732 | ο] > 680* cII 555 161mg

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

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

Job 22 3b

HT  וְאִם־בֶּצַע כִּי־תַתֵּם דְּרָכֶיךָ׃
E  אוֹתָאֹת הָאָדָמָךְ לְחֹמֶךְ (ti حان μελεί τῷ κυρίῳ, ἢν σῇ ἴσθα τοῖς ἔργοις) ἀμεμπτος;

θ’ Sub ※

Wit1: ↓cI-138 260 395 3006 248 ↓Sa ↓Syh

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

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

NonGr: Syh ※
σ’ ἤ κερδανεῖ, κἂν ἀμωμος ἢ οἶδος σου

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 [395] ↓cII ↓555 ↓161(+161mg)

Attr: σ’ > C (= 250) 161mg

Var: κερδανεῖ] κερδανη 3005; κερδάνη 612 740; κερδάνει 137 260 559 643 680 732 3006 | κὰν] εαν cII 555 161(+161mg); καὶ 137 260 643 732 | ὁδὸς σου] οδοσου 255

Notes: The subjunctives may have arisen from the connection with the prior use of ἵνα + subj. in 22:3a, while the present indicative κερδάνει may have arisen from harmonization with χρῄζει in v. 3a. The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar nor AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 191-2; AGK 2, 372; Nic, 375).

Job 22 4a

HT (יוּכִיחֵךָ) הֲמִיִּרְאָתְךָ

LXX ἦ λόγον σου ποιούμενος (ἐλέγξει σε)

θ’ μὴ διὰ τὸν φόβον σου

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788 3005) ↓cI-139 260 [395] 732 523

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

Attr: θ’ σ’ C (= 3005); > C (= 788) 137 643 680 3006

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

Notes: The variant η for μή in 612 and 740 is interesting. The attribution consists of θ over μ, which resembles the attribution to Methodios (Kollationen, 149). This attribution is the cause of the error in these mss, and was probably in the Vorlage of 3006 given its lower place in the stemma of the catena (AGK 1, 61). The lemma in 3005 is continuous with the following fragment, which means that both fragments, preserved as one, are attributed to Sym in 3005. It is possible that 3005 preserves the original fragment to Sym, but it seems easier to posit that the Th attribution
would be accidentally omitted in one ms instead of being added in all of them, especially since 257 and 788 also preserve two separate fragments; although, these fragments are \textit{sine nomine} in 788 (see \textit{infra}).

\begin{verbatim}
HT \\
LXX
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
σ'
\textbf{διαλεγχθησται σοι}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Wit1: \(\downarrow C (= 257 788 3005) \downarrow cI^{139} 260 [395] 523\)
Attr: \(σ' C (= 257 3005) 732] > rel; \'Αλλος Field\)
Var: \(\text{διαλεγχθησται} \text{ διαλεγχθησται} C (= 788); \text{διαλεχθησεται} 138-255 559; \text{διελεχθησεται} 3006 | σοι] > C (= 257)\)
\end{verbatim}

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

\begin{verbatim}
Job 22 5a
HT \\
LXX
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Sub \(\div\)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Wit1: La
Wit2: \(\text{εστιν}] > Iul^{197,11} = M\)
NonGr: La \(\div \text{est } (+ \checkmark \beta)\)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Job 22 6a
HT \\
E
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Sub \(\ast\)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Wit1: La
Wit2: init\] στι La (\(\ast \text{ quia} \)) II 620 = M
NonGr: La \(\ast \text{ Quia } (+ \checkmark \beta)\)
\end{verbatim}
Notes: The bible lemma of Ω also reads ὅτι ενεχύραζες... showing that it has been influenced by the Hexapla, which incorporated the version of Aq (Epitome, 46; see infra).

HT  

LXX  —(ἡνεχύραζες δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου διὰ κενῆς)

α’  ὅτι

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh ἡνεχύραζες τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου διὰ κενῆς

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

HT  

LXX  (ἡνεχύραζες δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου) διὰ κενῆς

σ’  ἀναιτίους

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

Attr: σ’ > C (= 788)

Var: ἀναιτίους] επαναιτίους 612

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

Job 22 8

HT  

LXX  ἐθαύμασας δὲ τινῶν πρόσωπον, ὑκίσας δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

α’  καὶ ἀνδρὸς βραχίονος, αὐτοῦ ἡ γῆ, καὶ ψηλὸς προσώποις καθίσει ἐν αὐτῇ
σ’ ἄνδρὸς γὰρ ἱσχυροῦ, αὐτοῦ ἡ γῆ, καὶ δεδυσωπημένος προσώπῳ κατοικήσει ἐν αὐτῇ

θ’ καὶ ἀνὴρ βραχίονος, αὐτοῦ ἡ γῆ, καὶ τεθαυμασμένος προσώπῳ κατοικήσει ἐν αὐτῇ
ἐξαίφνης

Wit1:  ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI ↓cII ↓555 ↓161
Attr:  σʹ > C (= 250) 138
Var:  ταράσσει C (= 788-250) | σε] > 612 | φόβος] > C (= 257) |
      ἐξαίφνης] εξαισιος cII 555 161; εξεφνις 395; εξεφνης 559

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

Job 22 11b
HT  וְשִׁפְעַת־מַיִם תְּכַסֶּךֺּ׃
LXX  κοιμηθέντα δὲ ὕδωρ σε ἐκάλυψεν.

αʹ θʹ  καὶ πλῆθος ὑδάτων καλύψει σε

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-260 cII ↓555 ↓161
Attr:  αʹ θʹ] σʹ 139; οἱ ἄλλοι 512-513 555; λʹ 161; > C (= 788-250) 138 643
Var:  πλῆθος] πλήθους 612 740

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

Job 22 13-16
HT  לאמרת מה ידעת אל
      נבואתtaireהלךלאריאה
      רוחון שמם יתבלק:
      נאמרה חוכל השמר
      אוכל דרכך מחישה:
      אשר-נוקמו לрактиיה:
      נבר יнесен שלום:

E  καὶ ἐπιτὰς Τι ἔγνω ὁ ἱσχυρός;
    ἢ κατὰ τοῦ γνόφου κρινεῖ;
    νέφη ἀποκρυφή αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐχ ὀραθίσεται
    καὶ γύρων οὐρανοῦ διαπορεύσεται.
    μὴ τρίβων αἰώνιον φυλάξεις,
ἵν ἐπάτησαν ἄνδρες ἁδικοί,
oἱ συνελήφθησαν ἄωροι;
ποταμὸς ἐπιρρέων οἱ θεμέλιοι αὐτῶν.

θʹ

Sub ※

Wit1:  ↓C (= 3005) ↓cf-138 680 3006 ↓248 ↓252 Arm ↓La ↓Sa Syhˇxt

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

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

NonGr:  Syhˇxt

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

Arm  ※ έγι ασαζερ τη ζη δαντας Ζαχαρ
※ ζην τη ξ μηντα Ζαχαρη
※ Ιαβω δαντηονου ζηναι μη δαντηονου
※ Ιη Ιη ιεν ιόνην ιοίνην
※ Ιαβω δαντηονου ζηναι μη δαντηονου
※ Ιη Ιη ιεν ιοίνην ιοίνην
※ ίδρυ ιεν ιαζονοι ιαζονοι
※ ίδρυ ιεν ιαζονοι ιαζονοι
※ ίδρυ ιεν ιαζονοι ιαζονοι
※ ήνι ιεν ιαζονοι ιαζονοι

57
Notes: The reading is attributed to Th in the majority of the catena tradition. La is not as clearly marked by the asterisks as the Edition suggests.

Job 22 14b

HT

E

καὶ γύρον οὐρανοῦ διαπορεύσεται.

\[ \sigma' \text{ περιγραφὴν δὲ οὐρανοῦ περιοδεύσει (s περιελεύσεται)} \]

Wit1: lemma] Syh | περιγραφὴν] ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ ει 139 732

Attr: σ'] > C (= 250) 138

Var: περιγραφήν] περιγραφή 740

NonGr: Syh

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

Job 22 15

HT

E

μὴ τρίβον αἰώνιον φυλάξεις, ἢν ἐπάτησαν ἄνδρες ἄδικοι,

\[ \sigma' \text{ ἃρα ὅδον τὴν ἀπ' αἰώνος φυλάξεις, ἢν πατοῦσιν ἄνδρες ἄδικοι} \]

Wit1: lemma] Syh | ἃρα τρίβον] ↓252

Wit2: ἄδικοι O (Syh\textsuperscript{lit}) 106\textsuperscript{c} 523\textsuperscript{mg} Compl Gra. Ra.] > 68 257; δικαίοι rel

Attr: σ'] > 252

Var: ὅδον] τρίβον 252
The reading in 252 is a mixture of Sym and LXX. ἀρα is from Sym probably (Busto Saiz, 265), but τρίβον is from the bible text. ἀρα probably underlies ς in Syh (Sokoloff, 618); thus, there is no variant. The retroversion from Syh is probably ὁδόν, since ἀρα is retroverted to τρίβον in the bible text of v. 15.

In Syhtext the index occurs at the end of the line following ↓, which indicates that the marginal note is to be read in place of the bible text.

The Syriac phrase ↓, attributed to Aq, occurs here and at Ps 5:6, where it is retroverted most probably by Field using forms from αὐωφελεῖς “useless,” since Aq uses this word and derivatives to render Hebrew ↓ (cf. Jer 4:14).

Job 22 16a

HT

E

the marginal note is to be read in place of the bible text.

The Syriac phrase ↓, attributed to Aq, occurs here and at Ps 5:6, where it is retroverted most probably by Field using forms from αὐωφελεῖς “useless,” since Aq uses this word and derivatives to render Hebrew ↓ (cf. Jer 4:14).

Job 22 16a

HT

E

the marginal note is to be read in place of the bible text.

The Syriac phrase ↓, attributed to Aq, occurs here and at Ps 5:6, where it is retroverted most probably by Field using forms from αὐωφελεῖς “useless,” since Aq uses this word and derivatives to render Hebrew ↓ (cf. Jer 4:14).
Notes: The relative pronoun in Syh is probably added from the bible text even though Sym usually translates אָשֶׁר (Busto Saiz, 229).

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

Job 22 16b

HT  נָהָר יְסֹ דָּם׃נָהָר יוּצַק יְסוֹ
E  ποταμὸς ἐπιρρέων οἱ θεμέλιοι αὐτῶν.

σʹ  ποταμὸς παρασύρει τὸν θεμέλιον αὐτῶν

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 260 559 643 732 ↓cII-512-513 555
Attr: σʹ C (= 257 788)] > rel
Var: παρασύρει] περισυρει C (= 250); ]συρει C (= 788) | αὐτῶν] αὐτου C (= 257)

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

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

Job 22 17b

HT  (יְשַׁרְיָה יִפְעַל) (שַׁדַּי לָמוֹ)
LXX  (ὃ τί) ἐπάξεται (ἡμῖν ὁ παντοκράτωρ;)

θʹ  ἐργάται

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 732 3006 ↓cII ↓555 161
Notes: The index is at 22:17a (ποιήσει) in 3005 and 559 (Kollationen, 152). The placement of the fragment at 17a in these mss seems plausible when compared to the LXX, but comparison with the HT shows that Th renders מִלֵּא with ἐργάζομαι (Job 33:29a, 34:32b) and ποιέω (31:3b), and דָּר (17a) with ἐκκλίνω (40:2a), μεθίστημι (12:24a), and παρατρέχω (12:20a) (Gentry, 296-7). In the Psalter, Sym also renders מִלֵּא Qal with ἐργάζομαι (Busto Saiz, 511); therefore, the attribution in 788 may also be genuine.

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

Job 22 18a

α’ θ’ καὶ αὐτός

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

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

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

Job 22 19b
HT

καὶ ἀθόρος ἐκγελάσεται αὐτοὺς

LXX

ἀμεμπτὸς δὲ ἐμυκτήρισεν.

\[\text{θ'}\]

καὶ ἀθόρος ἐκγελάσεται αὐτοὺς

\[\text{Wit1:}\] lemma] Syh | ἐκγελάσεται] \(C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \downarrow cf-139 \ 260 \ 559 \ 612 \ 643 \ 732 \ 3006\)

\[\text{Attr:}\] \(\theta' > C (= 788-250) \ 395\)

\[\text{Var:}\] ἐκγελάσεται] εκγελασαται \(C (= 250)\); εγγελασεται 137 680

\[\text{NonGr:}\] Syh

\[\text{Notes:}\] The retroversion is from Field (Field, 43).

\[\text{HT}\]

(ἀθόρος ἐκγελάσεται)

\[\text{LXX}\]

(ἀμεμπτὸς δὲ ἐμυκτήρισεν)—

\[\text{Sub} \ ※ \ αὐτοὺς \ <\]

\[\text{Wit1:}\] Syh\textsuperscript{ixi}

\[\text{Wit2:}\] fin] + (※ Syh) αὐτοὺς rel = M

\[\text{NonGr:}\] Syh\textsuperscript{ixi} \ 

\[\text{Notes:}\] The Th note for the verse contains the 3mp pronoun, which may indicate that Origen used Th for the revision of the fifth column in this instance (see \textit{supra}).

\[\text{Job 22 20}\]

HT

אִם־לֹא נִכְחַד קִימָנוּ

וְיִתְרָם אָכְלָה אֵשׁ׃

E

ei μὴ ἠφανίσθη ἡ ὑπόστασις αὐτῶν,

καὶ τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν καταφάγεται πῦρ.

\[\text{θ'}\]

\[\text{Sub} \ ※\]

\[\text{Wit1:}\] \(C (= 3005) \downarrow cf-138 \ 260 \ 395 \ 680 \ 3006 \ 248 \ Arm \ La \ Sa \ Syh\textsuperscript{ixi}\)
Job 22 22a

HT

LXX (ἐκλάβε δὲ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ) ἔξηγοριαν

α’ θ’ νόμον

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

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

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

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

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

Job 22 24

ΗΤ

ἐτὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου κάτω
καὶ ὡς πέτρᾳ χειμάρρους Ὠφίρ.

E

θήσῃ ἐπὶ χώματι ἐν πέτρᾳ
καὶ ὡς πέτρᾳ χειμάρρους Ὠφίρ.

θʹ

Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 3005) cl 138 159 255 680 732 3006 248 Arm Sa Syh※ Spec

Attr: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ ἐκ 740 612 559inc 395 137(24b) 643) > rel

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

NonGr: Syh※

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

Arm ※ Սանես սապիրես պիտի*
※ եթե ին պիտի դերին Ուփիրամ

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

Job 22 24b
And brute beasts will know it.

καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀκροτόμῳ ὡς ὀχετούς χρυσίου πρωτείου

\(\sigma'\)

\[\text{WitI: lemma}} \mid \text{C} (= 257 788-250 3005) \mid \text{cI}^{-139} 732 3006 \quad \text{cII} 555 161 \mid \text{χρυσίου πρωτείου}} \downarrow 252 \text{Syh}

\[\text{Attr: } \sigma' \alpha' 252; > C (= 250) 740

\[\text{Var: } \tauο] \text{ to 138;} > C (= 257) \mid \text{χρυσίου} \mid \text{χρυσιου} 137 680; \text{χρυσιο} 138 \mid \text{πρωτείου} \mid \text{πρωτειου} 612; \text{πρωτου} C (= 788-250); \text{πρωτου} C (= 257)

\[\text{NonGr: } \text{Syh} \downarrow \text{καιρός αναφέρει του}

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

Job 22 28a

καὶ ὁριεῖς ῥῆμα, καὶ σταθήσεται σοι

\[\theta'\]

\[\text{WitI: } \downarrow C (= 257 788-250 3005) \downarrow \text{cI}^{-139} \text{cII} 555 \downarrow 161

\[\text{Attr: } \theta' \sigma' C (= 257) 260; > C (= 788-250)

\[\text{Var: } \text{ὁριεῖς} \text{ ereis} 732; \text{ορισεις} 161

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

Job 22 28b

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

Job 22 29-30

E ὁτι ἐταπείνωσεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐρεῖς Ἑπερηφανεύσατο, καὶ κύφοντα ὀφθαλμοῖς σώσει· ῥύσεται ἀθὼν, καὶ διασώθητι ἐν καθαραῖς χερσίν σου.

Notes: There are obeli in La at 29a, which may be intended for asterisks, but the line is not included in the NonGr line.
וְנִמְלַטְתָּ בְּבֹרְכָּךְ׃
καὶ διασώθητι ἐν καθαραῖς χερσίν σου.

καὶ διαφεύξεται καθαρότητι χειρῶν ἕκαστος

Job 22 30b

Notes: Although the form $\text{̈ܡܢܬܪܥܐ}$ is difficult, it is the reading of the ms and Sokoloff lists it as a n.f.pl. (Sokoloff, 762). Field emended it to $\text{̈ܡܬܐ}$, a form which is not in the lexicon under the adj. $\text{ܡܟܐ}$ (Field, 43), but, even though there is disagreement over the form, the retroversion is Field’s and does not need to be corrected.

AGK does not contain this fragment in a comment by Origen; therefore, the attribution to Or in the Edition is not supported by AGK but only by Nic (AGK 2, 394-5; Nic, 387). The Nicetas catena itself may not attribute the fragment to Or, because the Sym fragment has been included in the bible text and is not in a alleged comment from Origen. These factors detract from the probability that this fragment has been passed down from Origen.
Job 23 3b

HT

LXX

σ’  ἕως τῆς ἐδρας αὐτοῦ

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

Wit2:  lemma] usque ad solium eius La = M

Attr:  σ’] > 138 Ω; [] C (= 257)


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

〈θ’〉  ἕως ἑτοιμασίας αὐτοῦ

Wit1:  ↓C (= 257) ↓Ω

Attr:  θ’] > Ω; [] 257

Var:  ἕως] καὶ Ω

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

Job 23 4a

HT
LXX eἰποὶμι δὲ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ κρίμα

σ’ προσθήσω ἐμπροσθέν αὐτοῦ κρίσιν

Wit1: lemma ↓ C (= 257 788 3005) cI-138 476 559 732 cII 555 161 | ἐμπροσθέν αὐτοῦ] Syh

Attr: σ’] > C (= 788) Syh; [] 257

NonGr: Syh • μηθεχν •

Job 23 5a
HT (אָדוֹן מַלְשָׂנִים)
LXX (γνώσην δὲ) ῥήματα, (ά μοι ἐρεῖ),

α’ λαλιάς

Wit1: ↓ C (= 257) Syh

Attr: α’[] 257

Var: λαλιάς] λαλιᾶς ῥήματα 257

NonGr: Syh • μηθεχν •

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

σ’ ῥήματα

Wit1: ↓ C (= 257 3005) ↓ cI-476 559 732 740 cII 555 161

Wit2: ῥήματα O L’-S 55 250 523 644 705 Ol] ῥήματα (ἱαμα 248 Aeth; add ῥήματα 256) rel
Attr: $\sigma'>395; [] 257$

Var: $\rho\mu\mu\alpha \lambda\alpha\lambda\varsigma \rho\mu\mu\alpha 257$

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

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

$\theta'$ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\varsigma$

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh $\star$ $\text{חכשככ}$. ק.

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 43). Because the lemma in Syh is the same Syriac word $\text{חכשככ}$ and it was retroverted with $\rho\mu\mu\alpha$, Field used $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\varsigma$ for the retroversion. Since Th uses $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\varsigma$ for $\pi\lambda\nu\alpha\nu$ (e.g. Job 32:15 and 36:4), and this word also provides a contrast with LXX ($\rho\mu\mu\alpha\nu$ $\alpha'=\lambda\alpha\lambda\varsigma$, and $\sigma'=\rho\mu\mu\alpha\nu$), it is most probably the lemma of Th.

Job 23 6a

HT $\text{יָרִיב} \text{עִמָּדִי}$
LXX καὶ εἴ ἐν πολλῇ ἰσχύι ἐπελεύσεταί μοι

$\alpha'$ μήτι ἐν πλήθει ἰσχύος δικασθήσεται μετ' ἐμοῦ

Wit1: 252
Wit2: ἐπελ. μοι $\text{diuidicabitur mecum} \text{La = M}$

HT $\text{דַּבְּרִי בְּךָ} \text{ץֶרֶבְּסֶרֶי}$

70
(καὶ εἰ ἐν πολλῇ ἰσχύὶ) ἐπελεύσεται μοι

σ’ δικάζεται μοι

Wit1: ↓C (= 788 3005) ↓cI-139 137 260 476 559 643 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161

Attr: σ’] > 138 680

Var: δικάζεται C (= 3005)] διαδικάζεται rel

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

Job 23 6b

HT לֹא אַךְ־הוּא יָשִׂם בִּי׃
LXX εἶτα ἐν ἀπειλῇ μοι οὐ χρήσεται

σ’ μόνον αὐτὸς μὴ ἐπιτιθέσθω μοι

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788 3005) ↓cI-476 732 cII 555 161 252

Attr: σ’] > C (= 788); [] C (= 257)


Job 23 8

HT ἡ γῆ κρύπτει ἄλλα ἀγαπητά
LXX εἰς γὰρ πρῶτα πορεύσομαι καὶ οὐκέτι εἴμι·

τὰ δὲ ἔπ’ ἐσχάτοις τί οἶδα;

σ’ ἰδοὺ ἔδω προερχόμαί αὐτόν,
ἀφανής ἐστιν· κἂν ἀκολουθῶ, οὐδὲ αἰσθήσομαι
Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is supported by Kommentar, AGK, and Nic (Kommentar, 203; AGK 3, 6; Nic, 390).

\[\alpha' \] ἵδοὺ ἀρχήθηκαν πορεύσομαι καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει, καὶ ὑπήσω καὶ οὐ συνήσω αὐτὸν

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

Job 23 9

Notes: The Nachlese corrects the Edition in three places (Nachlese, 400). First, the Oxford Collation read 257 as ἀρχων, which is the reading in Field (F-Auct, 8), but the ending of ὑπάρχει in 257 is indeed incertum. Second, 249 attributes the reading to Aq explicitly, which Field and Ziegler posited hypothetically, but in the absence of evidence they could not be certain. In this edition, the angle brackets have been removed from the attribution. Third, 249 preserves the first person singular reading of the verb, which Ziegler suggested in the absence of manuscript evidence.
Job 23 9a

**HT**

וְלֹא־אָחַז

**E**

(ἀριστερὰ ποιήσαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ) οὐ κατέσχον

σʹ

οὐκ ἐπιλήψομαι

**Wit1:** ↓ C (= 257 788-250 3005)

**Attr:** σʹ > C (= 250)

**Var:** οὐκ] ou C (= 3005); pr καὶ C (= 788-250) | ἐπιλήψομαι] περιλήψομαι C (= 3005)

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

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

Job 23 10b-11a

**HT**

בַּאֶל לָאָלָה אֵלָה

בַּעֲשֹׂ (קַנְרְבִּים קַהָּל)

בַּאֲשֻׁרוֹ
LXX διέκρινεν δέ με ὡσπερ τὸ χρυσίον.
ἐξελέύσομαι δὲ ἐν ἐντάλμασιν αὐτοῦ

α’ ἐδοκίμασεν με, ὡς χρυσίον
ἐξελέυσομαι. ἐν ἰχνεσιν αὐτοῦ κατέσχεν
ποὺς μου

Wit1: lemma] ↓Syh | ἐδοκίμασεν] ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI-{137}476
Attr: α’ 138-255 260 559 643 680 740 3006 Syh] α’ α’ C (= 788 3005); α’ θ’ C (= 257); α’ 139 732; > C (= 250) 395 612
Var: ἐδοκίμασεν] εδοκιμασαν 559; εδοκιμασας 138; εδοκιμασεν 3006; + 
NonGr: Syh

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

σ’ ἐδοκίμασεν με, ὡς χρυσίον ἀπέβην.
ἐν εὐθύτητι μου ὑπέμεινεν ὁ ποὺς μου.

Wit1: lemma] Syh | ἐδοκίμασεν] ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI-{137}476
Attr: σ’ 139 732 Syh] α’ α’ C (= 788 3005); α’ θ’ C (= 257); α’ 138-255 260
559 643 680 740 3006; > C (= 250) 395 612
Var: ἐδοκίμασεν] εδοκιμασαν 559; εδοκιμασας 138; εδοκιμασεν 3006
Notes: The retroversion is from Field, who also suggested that ἐνεμείνειν or διέμεινεν could be a retroversion for ἡλίασ (Field, 44).

\[ \theta' \] δοκιμάσει με, ὡς χρυσίον ἐξελεύσομαι. ἐν ἱχνεσιν αὐτοῦ ἐκράτησεν ὁ πούς μου.

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

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

Job 23 11ab

HT (ἐξελεύσομαι δὲ ἐν ἐνταλμασιν αὐτοῦ) — (ὀδοὺς γὰρ αὐτοῦ)

\[ \theta' \] ※ ἐκράτησεν ὁ πούς μου

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

Wit2: fin] + εκρατησεν (ekrot. II) ο πούς La (※ tenuit pes meus) II 253 = M

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

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

NonGr: Syh ※ εκρατησεν ο πούς μου

La ※ tenuit ✹ pes meus vias eius ✹

Notes: Ms 680 has a faded asterisk before the fragment. There is no asterisk and the index is at ἐφύλαξα in 3005 wrongly. Beside 23:11b, 250 612 have an asterisk at the end of verse 23:11a with an index through it. There is no index, asterisk, or attribution in
395. In ms 255, the attribution is detached from the lemma and is at the top left of the bible text.

**Job 23 14a**

| HT | כִּי יַשְׁלִים חֻקִּי |
| LXX | — |

\[ α’ θ’ \] ὅτι ἀπαρτίσει ἀκριβασμόν

*Wit1:* \( C (= 257) \)

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

**Job 23 15cd**

| HT |
| עַל־כֵּן מִפָּנָיו אֶבָּהֵל |
| E | ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ κατασπουδασθῶν κατανοήσω καὶ πτοηθήσομαι ἐξ αὐτοῦ. |

\[ α’ θ’ \] Sub  ※

*Wit1:* ↓\( C (= 3005) \) ↓cf-[137] 680 3006 248 Arm ↓Co La ↓Syhtxt Spec

**Attr:** α’ θ’ (ἐκ τῶν (τοῦ 732) α’ καὶ θ’ οἱ 3005 740 255 559 395 643 732(15b) 139(15b); ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἀκύλα καὶ θεοδοτίων οἱ δύο οἱ τοὺς ἀστερίσκους ἔχοντες 260)) θ’ 612 (ἐκ θ’ οἱ 3005) Syhtxt, ἐκ τῶν ακ[ 138; > rel

**Var:** lemma > Co Spec | 15cd sub ※ 3005 740(non 15d) 255 612 559 395(non 15c) 260 643 732(non 15d) 139(non 15d) 248 Arm La Syhtxt

**NonGr:** Syhtxt

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

Arm ※ ἵ θεοτικὴ ἐπιστήμη; θεοτικὴ ὑποθεσίαν παραπλέον
Job 23 15c

HT ʾטָלָךְ מָסִיָּרֶתָה (אֹכֶל)
E (ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ) κατασπουδάσθω.

σʹ  

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 3005) ↓cI-[137] 139 260 476 643 732 740 3006 ↓523 ↓252 Syh
Attr: σʹ C (= 3005) Syh ] αʹ 252; > 138 255 257 395 523 559 612 680
Var: τετάραγμαι] πρ κατα σπουδήν C (= 3005)
NonGr: Syh

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

Job 23 16b

HT ָּירה
LXX (ὁ δὲ παντοκράτωρ) ἐσπουδάσεν με.

σʹ  ἐθορούβησέν με

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-[137] 139 476 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161′ ↓157
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 788-250 3005) 138 cII 161′ 555 157
Var: ἐθορούβησέν] ἐθορούβησε 138 559 643 | μέ] > cII 555 161′ 157

Notes: The Edition listed two additional readings from 157 (ἐθροήσε με, εταραξέ με), which are discussed in chapter four.
Chapter 24

Job 24 1a

HT  

LXX  (διὰ τι δὲ κύριον ἔλαθον) ὥραι

\[\alpha' \theta' \] καιροί

Wit1: \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005)\) cI \[137\] 139 260 476 643 732

Attr: \(\alpha' \theta' > C (= 788-250)\)

Job 24 1b-2a

HT  

LXX  ἀσεβεῖς δὲ (ὅριον ὑπερέβησαν)

\(\langle \sigma' \rangle \) καὶ γινώσκοντες αὐτὸν οὐκ οἶδασι τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ

Wit1: \(C (= 257)\)

Wit2: \(\delta \) + οὐκ εἰδον ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ II Syh\(^m_g\) = M (1b); + ※ nescierunt dies eius: cf Walters p 202; tr \(\delta \) δὲ post ὥριον \(L^-575-613\); om \(\delta \) 337

Attr: \(\sigma' [] 257\)

NonGr: Syh  

La ※ nescierunt dies eius?

Notes: The Nachlese has provided a new fragment (Nachlese, 400-1). The reading in 257 aligns with 1b in the Hebrew text, while the LXX renders ῥαθμὸς of 2a with ἀσεβεῖς \(\delta\). Wit2 provides the relevant data from the Edition’s first apparatus, which shows that the first Lucianic sub-group contains an addition in the text, while Syh has the reading in the margin and La has the reading under the asterisk; thus, this hexaplaric fragment may have influenced these versions. In particular, Jerome’s lemma nescio equals οὐκ οἶδα, while II and Syh have the verb “to see,” which is a literal translation of the Hebrew. In 257, the attribution could have been lost due to the mutilated margin (Nachlese, 401). Regarding the internal evidence, although οἶδα is used by Aq and Th,
there is no evidence that they use οἶδα for גָּלה or any other verb which means “to see.” Sym uses οἶδα for רָאָה in Isa 53:2, which is the closest example to Job 24:1b. The Nachlese suggests that Th is the author since he is usually the author from which the asterisked material is derived (Nachlese, 401), but since only La puts this text under the asterisk, this conclusion is open to question. Because Origen used other versions and the evidence that Sym uses a Greek verb “to know” for a Hebrew verb “to see” elsewhere, this edition tentatively suggests that Sym is the author of this fragment.

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

**Job 24 2a**

| HT  | בּוֹךְּלָהְוָו רָשִׁית |
| LXX | (ἀσεβεῖς δὲ ὠριον) ύπερέβησαν |

α’ προσελάβοντο

_Wit1:_  ↓C (= 257 788-250) ↓cI [137] 260 476 ↓cII ↓555

_Attr:_  α’ θ’ α’ 395; θ’ 139 643; σ’ 732; > C (= 788-250) 680

_Var:_  προσελάβοντο[προσελαβον] 559; προσλαμβανοντες cII; προλαμβανοντες 555

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

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

**Job 24 3a**

| HT  | תְמוֹר (רָשׁוֹמִים רַעְנַגְנים) |
| LXX | υποζύγιον (ὄρφανῶν ἀπήγαγον) |

λ’ ὀνον

_Wit1:_  C (= 788-250 3005) cI [137] 139 260 395 476 680 3006

_Attr:_  λ’ Ἀλλος Field

**Job 24 4a**

| HT  | יִשָּׁהוּ אֶבְיוֹן מַקְרָא |

79
ἐξέκλιναν ἅδυνάτους ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας

σ’ παρέτρεψαν πενήτων ὁδόν

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

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

Job 24 4a

NonGr: Laβ※ iusta ✓
Laα ⊥ iusta ✓

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

Job 24 4b

Notes: θ’ Sub ※
σ’  ὀμοῦ ἀφανεῖς ἐποίησαν πραιὲς γῆς

σ’  ὀμοῦ ἀφανεῖς ἐποίησαν πραιὲς γῆς

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

Job 24 5a

Sub ⋆

Wit1: Syh La

Wit2: ὀνοι] + (⋆ La Syhmg) αγριοι La Syhmg 575-Iul

NonGr: Syh ⋆κατά Αρμ ⋆
       La ⋆ feri
Notes: The index in Syh is over אֲדָנָא which comes after אֲדָנָא. Field suggests the retroversion אֲגָרְיוֹ on the basis of Job 6:5, where אֲדָנָא translates אֲגָרְיוֹ in the LXX (Field, 45).

Job 24 5b

HT: יָצְאוּ בְּפָעֳלָם מְשַׁחֲרֵי לַטָּרֶף

LXX: ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ἐξελθόντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρᾶξιν

α': ἧξερχονται ἐν κατέργῳ αὐτῶν ὀρθρίζοντες εἰς ἅλωσιν

Wit1: Lemma C\textsuperscript{cat} (= 788-250 3005) 249 c\textsuperscript{cat} 476\textsuperscript{cat} 474\textsuperscript{cat} 523\textsuperscript{cat} c\textsuperscript{II} 555 161 ↓252 | ἧξερχονται] ↓C\textsuperscript{²} (= 257 788-250) ↓c\textsuperscript{I} [\textsuperscript{137}] 139 260 476 643 732

Attr: α'] > C (= 250\textsuperscript{3})

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

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

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

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

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

σ': ἧξερχονται εἰς ἐργασίαν αὐτῶν, ἐπορθρίζοντες θηρεύειν

Wit1: Lemma] C (= 257\textsuperscript{1}) 252 | ἐκπορευονται] ↓C (= 257\textsuperscript{2} 788-250) ↓c\textsuperscript{I} [\textsuperscript{137}] 139 260 476 643 732

Attr: σ'] > C (= 788-250) 138 559; [\] C (= 257\textsuperscript{1})

Var: ἧξερχονται] προσερχονται (προσερχονται conj. Field) 252; εκπορευονται C (= 257\textsuperscript{2} 788-250) c\textsuperscript{I} [\textsuperscript{137}] 139 260 476 643 732; εκπορευονται 559
Notes: The Nachlese presents new evidence from 257 and suggests that either the readings belong to different authors or the wording of one of them represents an error (Nachlese, 401). Both suggestions may be correct, since there is no extant evidence that Sym uses ἐκπορεύομαι (H-R, 440c), which then creates the possibility that the fragment should be attributed to Th, who uses ἐκπορεύομαι for הובָּרִים (e.g. Ex 21:7). Sym uses προσέρχομαι to translate הובָּרִים only once out of three instances (Ps 59(60):12). This evidence shows that Sym prefers to render הובָּרִים with ἔξερχομαι (e.g. Job 5:6, 39:4c, et al.; H-R, 495a).

HT  בֵּשְׁפֶרָה (נָזִירֵי בָּּכַּנְסֵי מַשָּׁרְיָר לַפְּרָה)
LXX  ύπερ ἐμοῦ (ἐξελθόντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρᾶξιν)

ε̣β̣ρ̣'  ἐπ̣'  ἐρήμου

WitI: Nobil (apud Field)

Notes: The source of this reading is still unknown.

Job 24 5c

HT  טֶרֶבֶּה לֵלְבָּב לְבַּצְרֵרָה:
E  ἡδύνθη αὐτῷ ἄρτος εἰς νεωτέρους.

θ'  Sub ※

WitI: ↓cI 138 139 260 643 680 732 3006 248 252 Arm ↓Co La ↓Syh

Attr: θ' 740 255 612 559 137 Syh ] > rel

Var: lemma] > Co | 5c sub ※ 740 255 612 559 137 248 252 Arm La Syh

NonGr: Syh ※ la suavis factus est eis panis in adolescentes.
La ※ suavis factus est eis panis in adolescentes.
Arm ※ puamquamui ūngui huog ënë ënhë

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

σ'  ἡδύς ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν ἄρτος εἰς νεανίσκους

WitI: lemma] C ↓ (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 139 cII 555 ↓161' | νεανίσκους] 252
Attr: \( \sigma' \theta' 612; > C (= 788-250) 643 680 \)

Var: νεανίσκους] νεωτέρους 248

Notes: The variant in 248 comes from the bible text.
The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 207; AGK 3, 14-15; Nic, 395). The word, νεανίσκους, is found in the comment by Olymp, but he does not refer to any source for his interpretation.

HT

LXX

\( \text{παῖδας} \)

Wit1: 252

Job 24 6b

HT

LXX

\( \text{αʹ παῖδας} \)

Wit1: cI (= 740 255 612)

Var: \( \text{αʹ παῖδας} \) sub ÷ 740 255 612

Notes: Since \( \text{αʹ παῖδας} \) is absent from the HT, the catena probably preserve the text of the fifth column of the Hexapla in this instance.

Job 24 8a

HT

E

\( \theta' \) Sub ※

Wit1: cI–138 139 260 680 3006 248 La ↓Sa ↓Syh\text{ext}

Attr: \( \theta' 255 612 559 395 137 643 732 \) Syh\text{ext}] > rel

Var: lemma] > Sa | 8a sub ※ 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 732 248 La Syh\text{ext}
Various sections of the text, including tables and notes, which are not included here for clarity.
σ’ ἐκ πόλεως ἀνδρας στενάξαι ἐποίησαν

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

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

θ’ ἐκ πόλεως ἀνδρες κεκράξονται

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field.

Job 24 12c
HT לאלא לאו־ירשך תפלת
LXX αὐτὸς δὲ διὰ τί τούτων ἐπισκοπήν οὐ πεποίηται;

α’ καὶ θεὸς οὐ θήσει σπουδήν

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Ziegler’s Edition.

σ’ ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐκ ἐμποιεῖ τιμωρίαν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cT-260 Syh
Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250)

NonGr: Syh

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

HT ܠܡܓܕܒܕܐ܀ ܫܛܝܘܬܐ܀
LXX (αὐτός δὲ διὰ τι τούτων ἐπισκοπὴν οὐ πεποίηται;) —

∇’ ἄφροσύνην

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

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

Job 24:13a

HT רַהֵמָּהּ הָיוּ בְּמֹרְדֵי־אוֹ
LXX ἐπὶ γῆς ὄντων αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν

∇’ ἀλλ’ αὐτοὶ γεγόνασιν ἀποστάται φωτος

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl−137 139 260 395 559 643 680 732 3006 Syh
Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250) 138

NonGr: Syh

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

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

Job 24 14b-18a

HT

καὶ νυκτὸς ἔσται ως κλέπτης.
καὶ ὀφθαλμὸς μοιχοῦ ἐφύλαξεν σκότος
λέγων Ὄὐ προσνοήσει με ὀφθαλμός,
καὶ ἀποκρυβὴν προσώπου ἔθετο.
διώρυξεν ἐν σκότει ὡς κλέπτης.
ἡμέρας ἐσφράγισαν ἑαυτούς,
οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν φῶς·
ὅτι ἐπιγνώσεσθαι παραχάς σκίας τινατού.
ἔλαφρος ἔστιν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ύδατος

E

cai vuktos estai ois kleptis.
cai ophalmo moichou efylaxeun skotos
legwov Ouv prosonoieis me ophalmos,
ka apoekrybiun proswpou etheto.
diorewen ev skotei oikias.
hemeras efhrageisan eautous,
ouk epengnwosan fws-
oti omothumadon to prwv autois skia thanatou,
oti epignwsetai paraxas skia thevanatou.
elaphros estin epit prosowpon ydatos

θ'  Sub ※
It is night like a thief. The eye of the adulterer observes the darkness, saying: He does not see my eye, he placed the shade of his face. He burns in the darkness of the houses by day, and by night they did not know the light because the shadow of death was on them.

Levis (pr * μ) est super faciem aquae (+ < β)
Notes: The catena attributes ten lines to Th, but the section begins at 15a and goes through 18b. The Edition has not recorded this correctly. Syh attributes only 14b to Th, and the rest of the lines are anonymous.

Job 24 15c

HT

E καὶ ἀποκρυβὴν προσώπου ἔθετο

σʹ ἄλλος δὲ σκέπαστρον προσώπου περιθέμενος

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 643 732 ↓cII ↓555

Attr: σʹ] > C (= 788-250)


Notes: All of the mss have ἄλλος δὲ as part of the lemma except Nic (Kommentationen, 161). The Edition did not include these words, since there is no equivalent in the HT, yet Sym does render waw with δὲ frequently (Busto Saiz, 226); however, Sym’s use of ἄλλος in this text is not clear. The Edition’s variant (περιτιθῆμ. C⁰) was not confirmed by the Kommentation or the mss checked by the editor.

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

Job 24 16b

HT

E ἤμερας ἐσφράγισαν ἑαυτοὺς

σʹ ὡς ἐν σφραγίδι κρύψουσιν ἑαυτοὺς

Wit1: lemma] ↓C (= 257 788 3005) ↓cI-139 cII 555 161’ 157 | κρύψουσιν] ↓Syh

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

Var: ὡς] pr καὶ 732 | κρύψουσιν] εκρύψαν Syh
**NonGr:** Syh

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

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

**Job 24 17a**

**HT**

כִּי יִכְרָתָה בְּכִירָתָה לָמוֹ זֶלַחְתָּה

**E**

ֶׁׁ֚שׁיָּׁ֚֨וּ֙ חָֽ֙הְמָּּ֚֗וּ וּֽזָּֽֽמָּּ֚֗וּּ

σʹ

ἐὰν γένηται αὐτοῖς ὁρθρός σκία θανάτου.

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

**Attr:** σʹ] > C (= 250) 395 740

**Var:** γένηται] γινεται 255; ἐνειται 559 | ὁρθρος] pr o C (= 3005)

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

**Job 24 17b**

**HT**

כִּי יִכְרָתָה בְּכִירָתָה לָמוֹ זֶלַחְתָּה

**E**

ֶׁׁ֚שׁיָּׁ֚֨וּ֙ חָֽ֙הְמָּּ֚֗וּ וּֽזָּֽֽמָּּ֚֗וּּ

σʹ

φωράθείς γὰρ ἀνύπαρκτος ἐσται σκιασθεὶς θανάτω

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

**Attr:** σʹ] > C (= 250) 395

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

**Notes:** The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 210; *AGK* 3, 21; Nic, 400).
Job 24 18a

HT

עַל־פְּנֵי־מַיִם (קל־דוהי תְל־שֵׁריר־כִּי)

E

(ἐλαφρός ἐστιν) ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ὑδατος

σ’ ἐπιπλέων ὑδατι

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

Attr: σ’] 138; > C (= 788-250) 643

Var: ἐπιπλέων] ἐπιπλέον 137 612 643 cII 512-513

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

Job 24 (18c)-19

HT

לֹא־יִפְנֶה דֶּרֶךְ כְּרָמִים׃ צִיָּה גַם־חֹם יִגְזְלוּ ל חָטָאו׃ מֵימֵי־שֶׁלֶג שְאוֹ

LXX — ἀναφανείη δὲ τὰ φυτὰ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ξηρᾶ· ἀγκαλίδα γὰρ ὀρφανῶν ἵρπασαν.

α’ οὐκ ἐκκλινεῖ εἰς ὁδὸν ἀνεπίβατον ἀμπελώνων, καὶ εἰς θέρμην ἐκβιάσονται

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

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

σ’ οὐκ ἀναστρέψει εἰς ὁδὸν τῶν ἀμπελώνων τοῦ διψάν, καὶ καύμα ἰρπασαν

92
Notes: The retroversion is from Field. The index in Syh is at the beginning of 19a, but the lemma of Sym equals HT 18c-19a, which is not represented in the LXX, even though it appears that Sym has borrowed a form of ἁρπάζω from 19b of the LXX.

\[\text{Oúk ékklínei eîs õdòn ἁμπελώνων en dípsi, kai ãèr aútoì sulwɔsin}\]

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

Job 24 19a

HT (καὶ ἠφέλοντος ταῦτα)
LXX (ἀναφανείη δὲ τὰ φυτὰ αὐτῶν) ἐπὶ γῆς ξηρά

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

Job 24 21b

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

λ’ χήραν

Wit1: C (= 788-250) Ω ↓cI-139 260 559 612 680 732 3006² Syh

Wit2: γύναιον] αγυναιον B’-S* A-Iul Co Glos; χήραν 252²txt = M↓

Attr: λ’] > 138 395

Var: χήραν] χηρα 137

NonGr: Syh

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

Job 24 22b

HT (יְקוּם וְלֹא־יַאֲמִין)

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

σ’ περί

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

Wit2: κατά] υπερ L; περί II 257

Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250) 643

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

NonGr: Syh

Notes: In 260, the fragment is embedded in the text (Kollationen, 163). The longer lemma of Syh and Pitra obtained from harmonization with the bible text of the LXX.
Job 24 23

HT (יִתֶּן־לוֹ לָבֶטַח וְיִשָּׁעֵן)

וְעֵינֵיהוּ עַל־דַּרְכֵיהֶם׃

LXX (μαλακισθεὶς μὴ ἐλπιζέτω ὑγιασθῆναι,) ἀλλὰ πεσεῖται νόσῳ

σʹ ἀποβλέπουσιν δὲ εἰς τὰς οδοὺς ἑαυτῶν

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250) ↓cI 139 260 732

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

Var: δέ C (= 788-250)] > rel | ἑαυτῶν] αὐτῶν C (= 788-250) 138; ἑαυτοῦ 643

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

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

Job 24 24ab

HT (ῥημαὶ οὐκ ἔρισθεν)

LXX πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐκάκωσεν τὸ υψωμα αὑτοῦ ἐμαράνθη δὲ ὠσπερ μολόχη (ἐν καύμιατι)

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

Wit1: 249

Notes: Ms 249 preserves the lemma, which was not previously listed by Field or Ziegler (Nachlese, 401). In 249, the lemma is introduced by the following: περί (lege: ἀντὶ) τοῦ ἐμαράνθη δὲ ὠσπερ ταράχη (lege: μολόχη) οἱ γ οὕτως ἐξεδωκεν· κτλ (Nachlese, 401; the emendations derive from the Nachlese).
Job 24:25a

HT

(מִי יַכְזִיבֵנִי אֵפוֹ)

LXX

ei de μη, (τις ἔστιν ὁ φάμενος ψευδῇ με λέγειν)

σ’

ἀλλὰ νῦν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 260

Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250) 138inc 255 643 732

Job 24:25b

HT

וְיָשֵׂם לְאַל מִלָּתִי׃

E

καὶ θήσει εἰς οὐδὲν τὰ ρήματά μου

θ’

Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 3005) cI-138 260 395 559 643 680 740 3006 La ↓Sa ↓Syh\text{ext}

Attr: θ’ (+ ὁμ(οίως) πρ(όσ)κ(ειται)) 3005 255 612 137 732] σ’ 139; > rel

Var: lemma] > Sa | 25b sub ※ 3005 255 612 137 732 La Syh\text{ext}

NonGr: Syh\text{ext} \[\text{mesum κόσμος μεθ᾽ ἑαυτόν} ※
La \[\text{[[μ] et ponet in nihilum verba mea}

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

σ’

καὶ τάξει τῷ θεῷ λόγον ύπερ ἐμοῦ

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-260

Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250) 395 3006
395 559 643 680 732 740 3006

Notes: Sym attests the vocalization אֵל in this verse. The best witnesses omit παρά, and translation technique supports this external evidence since Sym does not use παρά + dative to render ל in the Psalter but frequently renders the ל with the dative case alone (Busto Saiz, 181-86). The definite article τόν may also have been added in the course of the transmission of the text, since it is not present in the earliest and best witnesses.
Chapter 25

Job 25 2a

HT

κομπελά (ὑποθετήματος)

LXX

Τί γὰρ προοίμιον (ἡ φόβος παρ’ αὐτοῦ)

α’ θ’

ἐξουσία

Wit1: $C (= 3005) \downarrow 139 260 3006$

Var: $ἐξουσία C (= 3005) 740$ εξουσιας $cI - 740$

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

Job 25 2b

HT

κομπελὰ (ὑποθετήματος)

LXX

Τί γὰρ προοίμιον ἢ φόβος παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ

συρ’

τί γὰρ ὁ φόβος προοιμιάζεται καὶ εἰς δειλιαν ἀγεί τὸν μέλλοντα δικάζεσθαι ὡς οἱ παρ’ ἡμῖν δικασταί;

Wit1: Iul

Var: ἡμῖν] υμιν cod

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

Job 25 2b

HT

(ὁ ποιῶν) τὴν σύμπασαν (ἐν ὑψίστῳ)

LXX

(ὁ ποιῶν) τὴν σύμπασαν (ἐν ὑψίστῳ)

λ’

εἰρήνην

Wit1: $C (= 3005) \downarrow 139 260$
Var: εἰρήνην ειρηνη 612

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

Job 25 3a

HT

רֵהוּ׃אוֹ (וְעַל־מִי לֹא־יָקוּם)

LXX

μὴ γὰρ τὸ υπολάβοι ὅτι ἕστιν παρέλκυσις πειραταῖς

σʹ

μὴ ἕστιν ἀριθμὸς τῶν στρατιῶν αὐτοῦ

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cl II 555

Attr: σʹ > C (= 788-250 3005) 3006

Var: στρατιῶν στρατιωτῶν 256-740

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

Job 25 3b

HT

ξυλίμερ ἀρείρχον (ἀριστέρα)

LXX

(ἐπὶ τίνας δὲ ὦκ ἐπελεύσεται) ἐνεδρα (παρ’ αὐτοῦ)

σʹ

ἐπίταγμα

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cl137 139 260 643 732 cl II 555 ↓161′

Attr: σʹ > C (= 788-250 3005) 138

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

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

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 216; AGK 3, 30-31; Nic, 406).
Job 25 4b

HT υὐδοὶς ἡ ἁλθήσας ἀνακαταθήσεται
LXX ἦ τίς ἅν ἀποκαθαρίσαι ἐαυτὸν γεννητὸς γυναικός

σʹ  διὰ τίνος δὲ ἀρρυπος ἐσται τεχθεὶς ὑπὸ γυναικός

Wit1:  ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI–139 138 139 cII ↓ 555 161
Attr:  σʹ] > C (= 250) 3006

Notes:  The δέ has been added pace the Edition on the basis of the evidence of C (= 788-250 3005) and the waw in HT (Kollationen, 165; Busto Saiz, 226). The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 216-17; AGK 3, 31-32; Nic, 407).

Job 25 5a

HT (ὧν) (ὡς ἀληθηταί ἐργάζεται)
LXX (εἰ) (σελήνη) συντάσσει, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιφαύσκει

χʹ  ἰδοὺ

Wit1:  C (= 257 788-250) Ω cI–137 139 260 395 559 643 680 732

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

HT (ὧν) (ὡς ἀληθηταί ἐργάζεται)
LXX (εἰ) (σελήνη) συντάσσει, καὶ) οὐκ ἐπιφαύσκει

αʹ  οὐ διαυγασθῆσεται

Wit1:  ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI–137 139 260 559 643 732
Attr:  αʹ] σʹ C (= 3005); > C (= 788-250) 138-255
Var: διαυγασθήσεται διαυγισθησεται 138-255 612 680 740; διαυγησθησεται 3006

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

Job 25 6a
HT יָהִי כִּי אֶנְוָה שַׁרְמוֹת
LXX εἶ δὲ, (ἀνθρώπος σαπρία)

σʹ ποσῷ μᾶλλον

Wit1: ↓ C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓ Cl-139 260 559 643 732 ↓ Pitra

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

Var: μᾶλλον] + ανθρωπος Pitra

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

Job 25 6b
HT לֵעָה׃וּבֶן־אָדָם תּוֹ
E καὶ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου σκώληξ

θʹ Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 3005) cl (= 255 740) Syhšt
Attr: θ' Syh[*] α' θ' σ' 3005 740 255

Var: 6b sub ※ 3005 740 255 Syh[*]

NonGr: ܘܒܪܗ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܬܘܠܥܐ ↘ ※ ܬ

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

Job 26 3a

HT

יָעַצְתָּ (מַה־) לְלֹא חָכְמָה (וֹיִם תְּקֵמָה)

LXX

(τίνι) συμβεβούλευσα; (οὐχ ἐὰν πᾶσα σοφία;)

α’ σ’ συνεβούλευσας

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-260

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

Job 26 5-11

HT

κράσις ὁ ἥλιος

μαθήτας ημῶν ὁ ἔφης-
νεκρὸς οὐκ ἐκπετάζεται

λέγει ψευδώς ἐλαταρής

τὸ ἀλέον ὑπὲρ ὑδάτων

τὸ ἀπώλειαν

ἐρράγης κάτω, ὁ ἄνθρωπος

πρόσταγλαι θάνατον γεγόρηται

E

μὴ γίγαντες μαιωθήσονται

ὑποκάτωθεν ὕδατος καὶ τῶν γειτόνων αὐτοῦ;

γυμνὸς ὁ Ἀδης ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ,

καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν περιβόλαιον τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ.

ἐκτείνων βορέαν ἐπ’ οὐδὲν,

κρεμάζων γῆν ἐπ’ οὐδενός·

δισεμεύων ὕδωρ ἐν νεφέλαις αὐτοῦ,

καὶ οὐκ ἔρραγη νέφος ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ·

ὁ κρατῶν πρόσωπον θρόνου,

ἐκπετάζων ἐπ’ αὐτὸν νέφος αὐτοῦ.

πρόσταγμα ἐγύρωσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ὕδατος

μέχρι συντελείας φωτὸς μετὰ σκότους.

στύλοι οὐρανοῦ ἔπετάσθησαν

καὶ ἐξέστησαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιτιμῆσεως αὐτοῦ.
\( \theta' \) Sub ※

\textit{WitI:} \( C (= 3005) \text{ cf-}138 139 260 680 3006 248 \text{ Arm La } \downarrow \text{ Sa } \downarrow \text{ Syh}^{\text{tst}} \)

\textit{Attr:} \( \theta' (\varepsilon \kappa \theta' \text{ oi } \iota \delta 3005 \ 740 \ 255 \ 612 \ 395 \ 643; \varepsilon \kappa \theta' \text{ oi } \iota \alpha \ 559 \ 137) \text{ Syh}^{\text{tst}} \) > rel

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

\textit{NonGr:} Syh^{\text{tst}}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \( \text{La} \) nunquid (pr ※ μ) gigantes redigentur in nihilum subter (pr ※ β) aquam et proximi eorum nudus (pr ※ μ) infernus coram (pr ※ β) eo et non est velamen perditioni. extendens aquilonem super nihilum ※ suspendens terram super nihilum in aërem ligans aquam in nubibus suis et (pr ※ μ) non est scissa nubes ab eo (+ β). qui tenet faciem solis et (pr ※ β) extendens super eum nubem suam praecipitum (pr ※ μ) circundedit super faciem aquae (+ β) usque ad consummationem lucis. columnae (pr ※ β) lucis caeli intremuerunt et obstupuerunt ab increpatione eius.
  \item \( \text{Arm} \) ※ \( \text{h} \) ուրարած գրություն և \( \text{h} \) պատկերացույց
\end{itemize}
Notes: There is a mistake regarding the asterisk in La in the Edition (146). There should be an asterisk at 7b in Laβ, which then means eight out of the fourteen lines are asterisked according to Laμβ. Probably, Jerome applied the asterisk to all fourteen lines and the scribes omitted them accidentally. Although La is a good witness to the hexaplaric text, it is a defective witness to the preservation of the asterisk in this instance. 248 and Arm are closer than La even though they have only eleven lines under the asterisk. The Catena tradition with Syh shows that all fourteen lines are under the asterisk and should be attributed to Th. The negative evidence of Sa confirms this conclusion.

Job 26 5

HT

E

α’ μὴ γίγαντες μαζώθησονται ὑποκάτωθεν ὕδατος καὶ τῶν γειτόνων αὐτοῦ:

Wit1: lemma] ↓252 Syh | ’Ραφαείν] ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cF138 139

Attr: α’] > C (= 250)

Var: ’Ραφαίμ Syh | Ραφαείν rel; αρα φαείν 559 | σκηνούντων] σκιν- 252

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

σʹ μὴ θεομάχοι θορυβήσουσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ οἱ γειτνιῶντες αὐτοῖς

Wit1: lemma] Syh | μὴ θεομάχοι θορυβήσουσιν καὶ οἱ γειτνιῶντες αὐτοῖς
252 ] [θεομάχοι] ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ Ccat (= 788-250 3005) ↓ Ω 249 cl cI cat 474 cat 258 cat 3007 cat II 555 161 ↓ OlY ↓ καὶ—fin] ↓ C² (= 788-250 3005) Ω² ↓ cI²-260 ↓ cI² ↓ 555² ↓ 161²

Attr: σʹ αʹ 732²; > C¹ (= 250) Ccat (= 788-250 3005) Ω cI cat 474 cat 258 cat 3007 cat 512-513 12 138² 139² 643² 3006²

Var: θεομάχοι] τοὺς θεομάχους 512-513 OlY; pr oι Ccat (= 788-250 3005) Ω cI cat 474 cat 258 cat 3007 cat | γειτνιῶντες] γειτονες cII 555 161; γειτνιοντες 255 643 732

NonGr: Syh

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

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

Job 26 5a

 HT

Notes:
E (μὴ γίγαντες) ματαιωθήσονται

συρ’ ματαιωθήσονται

* W1: Iul
* W2: ματαιωθήσονται) ματαιωθησονται S* La(redigentur in nihilum) 55

Notes: The comment reads as follows: οἱ δὲ Σύροι ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘ματαιωθήσονται’ ‘ματαιωθήσονται’ ἐκδεδωκασί (Kommentar, 158).

Job 26 7a

HT (יִמָּשְׂאָה) תָּלִיל הָה
E (ἐκτείνων βορέαν) ἐπ’ οὐδέν

α’ ἐπὶ κενώματι

* W1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓Ω ↓cII 555 ↓157
* Attr: α’ σ’ 157 Ω; > C (= 250) 138
* Var: κενώματι] κενωματος Ω

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

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

Job 26 10a

HT (על-סִפְרִים) הָוָה
E πρόσταγμα ἐγύρωσεν (ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ύδατος)

σ’ ὅρον περιέγραψεν

* W1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓Ω ↓cI 157 260 cII 555 161
* Attr: σ’ ] > C (= 788-250) Ω 138inc 139 395 643 680 732 3006
* Var: περιέγραψεν] + τὴν ψάμμον ἐπὶ θαλάσσης Ω 107
Notes: περιγράφω renders Heb ה and περιγραφή renders יה in Job 22:14b (Beiträge, 33). These words are used only by Sym and are not found in the LXX, α’ or θ’. The addition in Ω could be the result of a free rendering based on Jer 5:22 (τὸν τάξαντα άμμον ὅριον τῇ θαλάσσῃ), yet also it cannot be excluded that in this citation there exists a marginal note of the α-Vorlaufferkatene (i.e. C), which the Hagedorns did not come across previously (Epitome, 51).

Job 26 11a

α’ διεκινήθησαν

Wit1: ↓ C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cl-260 cII 555 ↓161’ 252 ↓157 Syh
Attr: α’] σ’ C (= 257); > C (= 788-250 3005) 138 139 255 643
Var: διεκινήθησαν εκινήθησαν 157 248; διεκινήθησαν 3006
NonGr: Syh 86 5.

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

σ’ σπαίρουσιν

Wit1: 252 ↓Syh
Var: σπαίρουσιν επαιρουσιν Syh
NonGr: Syh 86 5.

Notes: Field’s retoversion (ἐπαιρουσιν = ἡμέλησε) is probably right (Field, 47), resulting in a textual variant. פָפוּ יְרוֹ is probably from the geminate root רפף, which means “to sway, totter” (KB, 1279). The reviser would probably use an intransitive verb to match the Hebrew meaning as may be discerned from Aq (see supra). Greek syntax
requires an intransitive verb, since στῦλοι must be the subject of the verb; therefore, the reading in 252, σπαίρω “gasp, pant, or quiver,” suits the context well. The reading in Syh probably arose from an inner Greek error due to confusion of letters of the rounded series Σ(C)-Ε, which is attested in Greek manuscripts (Wevers, 186); therefore, 252 preserves the original text.

Job 26 11b
HT
E

\[ σʹ \] θαμβοῦνται

\[ Wit I: \] \[ \downarrow C (= 257 788-250 3005) \quad \downarrow cI-260 \quad cII \quad 555 \quad 161' \]
\[ Attr: \] \[ σʹ > C (= 257 788-250) \quad 139 \quad 395 \]
\[ Var: \] \[ θαμβοῦνται \] εθαμβουντο \[ C (= 3005) \]

Job 26 12b
HT
LXX

\[ σʹ \] συγκλά ἀλαζονείαν

\[ Wit I: \] \[ \downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \quad \Omega \quad \downarrow cI-260 [680] \quad cII \quad 555 \quad 161 \]
\[ Attr: \] \[ σʹ > C (= 250) \quad 139 \]
\[ Var: \] \[ ἀλαζονείαν \] Ω \[ cII \quad 555 \quad 161 ] \[ αλαζονιαν \] \[ C (= 788-250 3005) \quad cI-260 [680] \]

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

Job 26 13b
HT
LXX

\[ ? \] ἐξώκισται αὐτὸν

\[ Wit I: \] \[ 252 \]
Notes: Ziegler reports that the translator is not able to be ascertained (Beiträge, 36).

σ’ τὸν ὀφιν τὸν συγκλείοντα

Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250)

Var: συγκλείοντα] συγκλιοντα 740 3006

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

Job 26 14ab

HT

θῶρακάς κυνοὶ τραχύα (Q) (elerik西路)

E

ιδοὺ ταῦτα μέρη ὀδοῦ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐπὶ ἰκμάδα λόγου ἀκουσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῷ

θ’ Sub ※

Attr: θ’ (ἐκ θ’ οἱ β 3005 740 255 612 395 137(14b)] > rel

Var: lemma] > Sa Amb | 14ab sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 395 137(non 14a) Syhxt

Job 26 14bc

HT

ομορήσμιον ἡμερον[1][2]σειρά

E/LXX

καὶ ἐπὶ ἰκμάδα λόγου ἀκουσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῷ·
σθένος δὲ βροντῆς αὐτοῦ τίς οἶδεν ὅτι ὁποῖες ποιήσει
σ’ τί δὲ ψιθυρισμάτων λόγων αὐτοῦ ἀκούσομεν, ὅπου βροντήν δυναστείας αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς ἐννοήσει

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

Attr: σ’ > C (= 788-250) 643 3006


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

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

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

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

---

1TLG [on-line]; accessed 17 October 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet.
Chapter 27

Job 27 1

HT רַבָּקָה אֲרֹב שָׂאָה: וַיֹּאמַר:

LXX 'Ετι δὲ προσθείς Ἰὼβ εἶπεν τῷ προοιμίῳ

αʹ καὶ Ἰὼβ προσέθηκεν ἀραὶ τὴν παραβολὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν

Wit1: ↓249 ↓cII ↓555 ↓Syh\textsuperscript{xt} ↓Ol\textsuperscript{Y}

Attr: αʹ θʹ + * Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Var: Ἰὼβ[pr o Ol\textsuperscript{Y}; Ἰὼβ \ προσέθηκεν tr cII 555 | αὐτοῦ] > 249 | καὶ εἶπε]

> cII 555

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Notes: The lemma is established on 249 and Ol\textsuperscript{Y}. The Edition does not list the evidence of Syh in II App, but it lists four instances where Syh has placed the notation inaccurately (27:1, 27:18, 30:29, and 30:30; 77). There are three reasons to doubt the authenticity of Syh\textsuperscript{xt} in this instance: (1) it does not contain a metobelus, which is highly unusual for this witness. (2) Not only is Syh the only witness to this asterisked line, but OG 29:1 preserves the same wording as here, thus showing that 27:1 is also OG. (3) The evidence of Syh contradicts Syh\textsuperscript{xt}, since the marginal note indicates that Th rendered the Hebrew שְׂאֵת with ἀραὶ (see infra), but the asterisked line in Syh\textsuperscript{xt} does not have an equivalent for the Hebrew lemma; therefore, the evidence of 249 and Ol\textsuperscript{Y} is more trustworthy than Syh.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is confirmed, since it is attested by Kommentar and Nic (Kommentar, 225; Nic, 417).

HT רַבָּקָה אֲרֹב שָׂאָה (מַשְׁלָה רַחֲמֹר):

LXX ('Ετι δὲ προσθείς Ἰὼβ)—(εἶπεν τῷ προοιμίῳ)

θʹ ἀραὶ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh הָיוֹסֵם.
Notes: The index is over אָמַה, which translates ἢτι. There is no word in the lemma, which corresponds to the marginal note, which is why the index is placed over the first word in the line.

Job 27 2a

HT: הֵסִירָא (חַי־אֵל)
LXX: (Zή κύριος,) ὃς οὕτω με κέκρικεν

σʹ ὃς παρείδε την κρίσιν μου

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-260 cII 555 161
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 788-250)

Var: παρείδε] παρέεδεν C (= 3005) 395 680; παρείδεν C (= 788) 138-255 612 740; pr παρεδωκε μοι και 139

Job 27 3a

HT: כְּרֵכִלנְעֶזְרָא נֶשָּׁמָה בֵּיר
LXX: ἥ μὴν ἢτι τῆς πνοῆς μου ἐνούσης

σʹ ὅτι μέχρις οὐ ἢ ἀναπνοή μου ἐν ἐμοί

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI
Wit2: ἐνούσης] + ἐν ἐμοὶ O L-613 55 644 Co: cf M
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 788-250 3005) 138 3006
Var: ὅτι] > 3006 | ἦ] > 139 256

Job 27 4a

HT: וָאָמַה (יְהוָה יְהוָה שֶפֶטָה תֹּלָה)
LXX: μὴ (λαλήσειν τὰ χείλη μου ἀνομα)

αʹ θʹ εἰ
Var: εἰ] σεμοῦ 740

Notes: The lemma and attribution of the Edition was based on 255 only, but now the Nachlese has listed 3005 in support of this lemma and attribution (Nachlese, 402). Ms 740 also preserves the attribution, but there is no explanation for the variant σεμοῦ (Kollationen, 170).

Job 27 5b
HT לֹא־יאֶסְכִּיר תָּמָּתִי מִמֶּנִּי׃ לֹא־אָסִיר
LXX οὐ γὰρ ἀπαλλάξω μου τὴν ἁκακίαν.

οὐκ ἐκστήσομαι τῆς ἁπλότητος μου

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓249 ↓cI 137 139 260 643 732 3006 cII 555 161 ′ ↓157
Attr: θʹ] > C (= 788-250)

Notes: The variant in 249 probably arose through LXX influence. The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 226; AGK 3, 49-50; Nic, 419). Perhaps, Sym has influenced Olymp’s exegesis of ἁκακίαν, since Olymp uses ἁπλότητα in a doublet, but Olymp shows no conscious dependence on Sym (Kommentar, 226).

Job 27 6a
HT וְלֹא אַרְפֶּהָ (בְּצִדְקָתִי הֶחֱזַקְתִּי)
LXX (δικαιοσύνῃ δὲ προσέχων) οὐ μὴ προῶμαι

οὐκ ἀφῆσω

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI 137 139 260 643 732 3006
Attr: θʹ] > C (= 788-250)

Notes: This Th fragment is also in Origen’s exegesis of 27:6a in place of οὐ μὴ προῶμαι (AGK 3, 50).

Job 27 7a
HT
(אֹיְבִיכְרָשָׁע
(—)
יְהִי)

LXX
(οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ εἶναν οἱ ἐχθροὶ μου ὀστερὸν ἡ καταστροφὴ
tῶν ἁσεβῶν)

Sub ÷

Wit1:  Syh

NonGr:  Syh \ "

Notes:  Syh and comparison of the OG with HT show that καταστροφή was sub obelus.

Job 27 8a

HT  (כִּי יִבְצָע
(כִּי מַה־תִּקְוַת חָנֵף)

LXX  (καὶ τίς γάρ ἐστιν ἐλπὶς ἁσεβεῖ ὁτι ἐπέχει

λ’  ὅτι πλεονεκτεῖ

Wit1:  ↓C (= 406 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 260 643 732 3006 cII 555 ↓161′

Attr:  λ’] α’ σ’ 248; > 395; [] 406

Var:  ὅτι] > 248 406 | πλεονεκτεῖ] }ε1 406

Notes:  Prov 1:19 also has λ’ where πλεονέκτειν translates הכנע (Reider, 194). In ms 406, only the verb termination can be seen (Kollationen, 171).

Job 27 9a

HT  (יִשְׁמַע אֵל
הַצַעֲקָתוֹ)

LXX  (ἦ τὴν δέησιν αὐτοῦ εἰσακούσεται κύριος;

λ’  μὴ

Wit1:  C (= 3005) cI-137 139 260 395 643 680 732 3006

Notes:  Ziegler was correct to cast suspicion on the placement of this fragment at 9b, since in 9b the HT has רכ, and therefore one expects the Three to have ὅτι (Beiträge, 60). The evidence of 3005 is important, since it preserves the fragment next to 27:9a with an index over ἦ (sic) (Kollationen, 171). Internal evidence confirms that 3005 is correct, for the Three use μὴ for π (Reider, 157; Gentry, 364; Busto Saiz, 265). Since the LXX has ἦ ... ἦ in 9ab, the scribe must have misplaced the fragment at 9b in the Vorlage of cI.
Job 27 12b

HT: רָקֵם רָקֵם יַהֲבֵל
LXX: (ὅτι) κενά κενοῖς ἐπιβάλλετε

σ’ ματαιολογεῖτε

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005)
Attr: σ’] > C (= 250)

Notes: This new fragment has been overlooked in the past, since it was only known in 250, which is anonymous, but now the Nachlese has discovered the fragment in 257 and 3005 with the attribution to Sym (Nachlese, 402). Furthermore, 788 also preserves the attribution to Sym with an index at κενά, showing that this attribution is part of the oldest Greek catena.

Job 27 13b

HT: וְנַחֲלַת עָרִיצִים מִשַּׁדַּי יִקָּחוּ
LXX: κτῆμα δὲ δυναστῶν ἐλεύσεται παρὰ παντοκράτορος ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς.

σ’ θ’ καὶ κληρονομία ἢν οἱ ἀκαμπτεῖς παρὰ τοῦ ικανοῦ κομίσονται

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI cII 555
Attr: σ’ θ’] θ’ 255; σ’ 732; > C (= 788-250)

Notes: The attributions are inverted (θ’ σ’) in 137 138 555 559 612 680 740 3006.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 227; AGK 3, 52-3; Nic, 420).

Job 27 14b

HT: (לא ישבהינליים)
LXX: (ἐὰν δὲ καὶ) ἀνδροθῶσιν, (προσατήσουσιν)
Notes: Although the two C mss passed down this version anonymously, it is still a translation for ἡμᾶς, which the LXX rendered freely with ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀνδρωθῶσιν (Nachlese, 402). Ms 788 also preserves the fragment sine nomine.

The Hebrew lemma בְּּרִיתָנָב concretely refers to plants or “that which emerges” and it has this meaning in Isa 34:1, 42:5, and Job 31:8. The metaphorical meaning refers to human descendants, which is the meaning in Job 27:14. There is evidence for the Three at Isa 22:24, where the LXX rendered the Hebrew with ἀπὸ μικρὸϋ. Hi preserves the Aq reading as sasaim and the Sym reading with nepotes. In the same verse, Th renders the Hebrew with σκεύος τὸ μικρόν. In Isa 65:23, there is a reading with a double attribution to Sym and Th τὰ ἐκγόνον, where the LXX uses σπέρμα to render בּרִיתָנָב. In Job 31:8, Sym uses τὰ ἐκγόνον to render בְּּרִיתָןָב, which probably has the meaning “plants” or “growth” in this context. In Isa 14:22 and Job 18:19, Aq has γονῇ for Heb 낫ה “progeny” and Sym has ἀπόγονος in Isa 14:22.

From the available evidence, Th and Aq may be dismissed as the author of this fragment. Th does not use the root -γον- for בְּּרִיתָנָב, unless Isa 65:23 does apply to him as well as Sym, which seems improbable given the instance in Isa 22:24. In two places, Aq uses -γον- for νάκη and he transliterates בְּּרִיתָנָב once. Only Sym uses the root -γον- consistently to render בְּּרִיתָנָב; however, Sym also uses -γον- to render 낫ה. It is noteworthy that the Vulgate at Job 27:14b has nepotes, and Jerome also translated Sym’s lemma with nepotes in Isa 22:24. Perhaps, the Greek for Sym in Isa 22:24 was from απόγονον-. Given the evidence of translation equivalents, the attribution to Sym is probable.

Job 27 17b

HT

LXX

αʹ θʹ ἀθῷοι

Notes: The attribution is inverted (θʹ αʹ) in 395 (Kollationen, 172).

Although there is strong external evidence for attributing this fragment to Aq alone, considerations of internal evidence support the lemma as it stands. Aq renders נָקִי with ἀθῷος in Deut 19:10 (Prov 1:11 and 6:17 in H-R depend on Nobil readings in Field and
are thus excluded at present), and Th also renders נָקִי with ἀθώος in Judg 15:3 and he uses it in Sus(Dan 13):53. Ms 788 now confirms that the double attribution is correct.

σʹ ἀναίτιοι

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-260
Attr: σʹ θʹ C (= 3005); > C (= 788-250) 138
Var: ἀναίτιοι ανετιοι 612 740

Notes: Sym translates נָקִי with ἀναίτιος in Ps 9(10):29(8) (Busto Saiz, 465), but beyond this instance, there is not another clear example. There is no clear evidence for Th’s use of this word, since ἀναίτιον in Isa 59:7 is anon in Q and attributed to λʹ by Eus. Syh is the only witness to Th, and it cannot be the final arbiter due to the limitation of retroversions; therefore, the attribution to Sym is most probable, and instead of applying the attribution to Th to the first fragment, 3005 applied it incorrectly to the second fragment.

Job 27 18 fin

HT: נֹצֵר׃ (וּכְסֻכָּה עָשָׂה בָּנָה כָעָשׁ בֵּיתוֹ)
E: (ἀπέβη δὲ ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ ὃςπερ σήτες καὶ ὃςπερ ἀράχνη)—.

σʹ ※ ἄ συνετήρησεν

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI Syh\textsuperscript{inx}

Wit2: fin] + ο πλουτος αυτου Lʹ-613-644° 55 795 Glos Dam; + (α sub ※ Syh) α συνετήρησεν(ν) O III Cʹ-296: cf M; + α συ προσθησει 253
Attr: σʹ (ἐκ τῶν Συμ 3005(19a) 740 612; ἐκ τῶν σʹ 559) 255 Syh\textsuperscript{inx}] > rel
Var: 18 fin sub ※ 3005(19a) 740 255 612 559 395 137(pr αυτου) Syh\textsuperscript{inx}
NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{inx} ※ תָּבָה שָׁלֹה

Notes: This fragment is imbedded in the text of the relevant witnesses. The attribution and asterisk are placed erroneously at the beginning of v. 19 in 3005. The Hexapla has influenced the transmission of the text. The best witnesses of cI and Syh\textsuperscript{inx} preserve the lemma, attribution, and asterisk at the end of v. 18, but the middle to the bottom of AGK stemma (AGK 1, 61) preserve only the lemma of Sym, while the attribution and asterisk dropped out of the text.
Job 27 19a

**HT**

(שָׁרֵר רַשֵּׁבָה (ולא חַעַף)

**E**

(πλούσιος κοιμηθεὶς) καὶ οὐ προσθῆσει

**Wit1:** Syh

**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** The asterisk and attribution are imbedded in the text of Syh.

Job 27 19b

**HT**

(עֵינָיו פָּקַח וְאֵינֶנּוּ׃

**E**

ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ διήνοιξεν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν

**Wit1:** Sub

**Attr:** θ' 3005 255 612] > rel

**Var:** lemma] > Sa | 19b sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 137 643 La Syh

**NonGr:** Syh

La ※ oculos suos aperuit, et non est

Arm ※ qvisu hiri hriw q ny hwi hgi

Job 27 20a

**HT**

(שֵׁרְתָהוּ תַּשִּׂיגֵהוּ כַּמַּיִם)

**LXX**

(συνήντησαν αὐτῷ ὡσπερ ὕδωρ) αἱ ὀδύναι

**Wit1:**  

**Attr:** α' σ' C (= 3005) 139 395 cII 555 161

**Var:** ἀνυππαρξία] ανυππαρξεῖαι 137 139 643 732 3006; ανυππαρξ() 257
Notes: The authors are inverted (σ’ α’) in C (= 257). The accusative singular (ἀνυπαρξίαν) in 512-513 is not a variant, since the accusative case is required by the context. The Edition listed the plural equally alongside the singular and did not make a decision on the original text or attribution. The plural agrees with the number of the OG, which indicates that harmonization may have happened. The representatives of the oldest Greek catena C (= 788-250 3005) support the singular. The same Hebrew word occurs in Job 18:14b and the hexaplaric fragment, attributed to Aq and Sym, also contains the singular form (Reider, 23; Woods 333). These considerations lend weight to original singular form and the double attribution.

The Hebrew word means “sudden terror,” which is not a meaning for the Greek word, ἀνυπαρξία. Ziegler, following Liebreich, suggests that the revision results from the reading of Aramaic balhot, lit. no existence/being, and this meaning corresponds to the Greek (Beiträge, 29; Liebreich, JBL 64 (1944): 400f).

Job 27 20b

| HT | לילֶּלֶּה (בנבות חפשה:) |
| LXX | νυκτί (δε ψείλατο αυτὸν γνόφος) |

| α’ σ’ θ’ νύκτος |

Wit1: †C (= 257 788-250 3005) †cf.138 260

Attr: α’ σ’ θ’] θ’ C (= 788-250); οἱ γ’ C (= 257); 3006inc

Notes: The order of the authors in 3005 (θ’ σ’ α’) and 395 (σ’ θ’ α’) differ from the order of the lemma.

Job 27 21-23

| HT | רֵשַׁםּ חַרְיֵים בְּנֶחָל |
| | רֶשַׁםּ חַרְיֵים בְּנֶחָל |
| | מִקְדָּשָׁהּ בֵּאוֹר הָעַלְמָא |
| | כֹּסֶרֶם לִי לִי לִי בֵּאוֹר הָעַלְמָא |
| | מַעַרְחָא מַעַרְחָא מַעַרְחָא |
| | מַעַרְחָא מַעַרְחָא מַעַרְחָא |

E  ἀναλήμψηται αὐτὸν καύσων καὶ ἀπελεύσηται καὶ λικμῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐπηρίζει ἐπ’ αὐτὸν καὶ οὐ φείσεται· ἐκ χείρος αὐτοῦ φυγῆ φεύξεται. κροτήσει ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς χείρας αὐτῶν καὶ συριεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ.

θ’ Sub ※
Job 27 23a

E κροτήσει ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς χεῖρας αὐτῶν

Aq’ συγκροτήσει ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ταρσοὺς αὐτῶν

Notes: Aq does use κροτέω for פְּסֹּה (Reider, 141), and Field has suggested that the retroversion should be συγκροτέω (Field, 48 n. 14). Furthermore, he reconstructs the other elements of the retroversion by noting that Syh has פְּסֹּה for ταρσός in an Aquila fragment in Isa 1:6 (Field, 48 n. 14). In an unpublished article, Peter Gentry has shown that the CG texts are not derived from the Three in Ecclesiastes; thus, it is better to conclude that CG represents a late Byzantine revision of the LXX in this instance, not the version of Aq.
αὐτῶν

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The attribution to Sym is in brackets because there is no attribution in Syh. This fragment follows Aq and is separated by a punctuation mark. Since the Th fragment is under the asterisk and the Aq fragment is clearly marked, the attribution to Sym is probable. H-R records one instance of the verb ψοφεῖν in the Three in I Ki 21:13(14) where it has a double attribution to Sym and Th.

Job 27 23b

HT (ךִּמְּקֹמוּ עָלָיו)
E (καὶ) συριεῖ (αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ)

σʹ ἑκσυριεῖν

Wit1: ↓C ( = 788-250 3005) cI 260
Attr: σʹ > C ( = 788-250)
Var: ἑκσυριεῖν + αὐτὸν C ( = 3005)

Notes: The scribe has added the 3ms pronoun to the lemma from the bible text in 3005.
Notes: The attribution and lemma are established by the catena. The limited evidence of translation technique favors the reading and attribution of 252, since there is evidence that Aq translates מְדַעֲלָה with διυλίζειν in Ps 11(12):7 (Reider, 59). On the basis of this evidence Ziegler asserts that Aq cannot have translated מְדַעֲלָה with χωνεύειν (Beiträge, 60). The word ὅθεν is the lemma of the LXX, and ὅπου is used by Symmachus in a number of places, and it is not used by Aq except for Ezek 20:34, where there is a double attribution with Symmachus, and Syh Job 28:4 (Beiträge, 60; H-R, 1004). Although these factors favor the reading of 252, more evidence is needed to establish the translational equivalents in order to accept the lemma of 252 over and against the catena tradition.
σ’ προθεσμίαν

Var: προθεσμίαν; προθεσμία 740; προοιμιον 395

θ’ πέρας

Var: πέρας; τερας 138-255 395 612 740

Job 28 3b-4a

HT

E καὶ πᾶν πέρας αὐτὸς ἐξακριβάζεται:
λίθος σκοτία καὶ σκιὰ θανάτου,
διακοπὴ χειμάρρου ἀπὸ κονίας:

θ’ Sub ★

Attr: θ’ (ἐκ θ’ οἱ 3005 740 255 612 395(3c)) Syhtxt | > rel

Var: lemma] > Sa | 3b-4a sub ※ 3005(non 4a) 740 255(non 3b) 612 395(non 3b) 248 252(non 3c 4a) Arm(non 4a) La Syhtxt

NonGr: Syhtxt

La et (pr ※ μ) omnem finem ipse invenit.
lapis (pr ※ μ) tenebrae et umbrae mortis,
discissio (discussio β; pr ※ μ) torrentis a cinere (+ ∨ μ)

Arm ※ ὤ συμπτωμάτων ἄθλημα ἄφησεν;
Job 28 3c

HT:

אֶבֶן אֹפֶל וְצַלְמָוֶת:

E:

λίθος σκοτία καὶ σκιὰ θανάτου,

α' λίθος σκοτομήνης καὶ σκιὰ θανάτου

Wit1: 252

Var:

λίθος conj. Ziegler] λιθοῖς 252 cod

Notes:

Ms 252 has the dative plural, but the Edition has correctly emended the text to agree with the HT.

Job 28 4a

HT:

נַחַל מֵעִם־גָּר

E:

(διακοπὴ) χειμάρρου ἀπὸ κονίας·

α' χειμάρρους ὅπου κονία

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes:

The index is over תורע, which is the first word in the line, but the lemma only applies to the revision of the last three words. The retroversion is from Field (Field, 49).
Job 28.4b

HT: נַעֲוצָהּ מִנְעַצֶּהָ טַחַת מִנְעַצֶּהָ (ךָ דָּרָךְ)

LXX: (οὶ δὲ ἐπιλανθανόμενοι ὁδὸν δικάιαν ἐσθένησαν ἐκ βροτῶν.)—

σ’ ἐσείσθησαν

Notes: The index is over κεκεκα, the last word in the line, and the marginal note represents an addition to the OG, which corresponds to the HT נַעֲוצָהּ. The retroversion is Field’s (Field, 49). Field also leaves open the possibility that ἐσαλεύθησαν could be the retroversion (Field, 49), but this lemma is attributed to Th in the catena tradition (see infra).

θ’ *** ἐσαλεύθησαν

Notes: In 788 the scholion is as follows: τὸ ἴμμοστίχιον ἐκ τῶν θ’ ὀμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ θ. The attribution and the text under the asterisk are well attested in 255 395 559 612 740 and 3005 (Kollationen, 176). In 3005, there is an attribution to θ’ in addition to the asterisk. The catena attests to this half line (4b) and the following nine lines (5-9a) as coming from Theodotion (ἐκ τῶν θ’ τὸ ἴμμοστίχιον ὀμοίως καὶ οἱ θ; see infra).

Job 28.5-9a

HT: אֶרֶץ מִמֶּנָּה יֵצֵא לָחֶם וְתַחְתֶּיהָ נֶהְפַּךְ כְּמוֹ אֵשׁ
E  γῆ, ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐξελύσεται ἄρτος,
υποκάτω αὐτῆς ἑστράφη ὡσεὶ πῦρ.
tόπος σαφφίρου οἱ λίθοι αὐτῆς,
καὶ χῶμα, χρυσίον αὐτῷ.
τρίβος, οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτὴν πετεινόν,
καὶ οὐ παρέβλεψεν αὐτὴν ὀφθαλμὸς·
οὐκ ἐπάτησαν αὐτὴν υἱοὶ ἀλαζόνων,
οὐ παρῆλθεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς λέων.
ἐν ἀκροτόμῳ ἐξετείνειν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ,

\[\text{θ'}\] Sub ※

\textit{Wit1}: \( C = 788 3005 \) cI-137 138 139 260 643 680 732 3006 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{ext}

\textit{Attr}: \( \text{θ'} (\text{ἐκ τῶν (> 395 559) θ' (θε' 3005) τὸ ἡμιστίχιον (-στοίχειον 3005) ὁμοίως (> 395; + δὲ 788 3005) καὶ οἱ θ (ο 3005)) 788 3005 740 255 612 559 395]} > rel

\textit{Var}: lemma] > Sa | 5-9a sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 512 559(non 8 9a) 395 248 252 Arm La(non 6b) Syh\textsuperscript{ext}(non 5ab)

\textit{NonGr}: Syh\textsuperscript{ext}

La \( \text{terra (pr ※ υ) de qua egressus est panis super eam (pr ※ υ) versus est quasi ignis. locus (pr ※ υ) sapphiri lapides eius, et aurum eius agger ei. semitam (pr ※ υ) quam non cognovit avis, nec (pr ※ υ) vidit eam oculus vulturis,} \)
nec (pr ※ μ) calcaverunt eam filii arrogantium,  
nec (pr ※ μ; non β) transiit super eam leo.  
in (pr ※ μ) durissimo lapide extendit manum suam.

Arm  ※ ἴδιῃ ἡ συνήγαγεν ἰσαρνηθη διαγένσαι
※ ι ἡ ἐγκατατέθη ἡ τον ίερσαληµνη φησιν αὐτοῖς παντὶ ἰσαρνηθη
※ Στήλη γαρφηχθησεν ῥαβνηθη ἐκδιναι
※ ι ἡνη νεκροι πανηθη
※ Τιμήτη τον η αυτοὶ διανωροηθησιν
※ ι νς ἐφεισθην πνευ μη ανεθη
※ ιν νς ἐπηναυσθην πνευ πηνηθη αὐτηναυσθησιν
※ ιν αυτοὶ ινα παιδη
※ βινικαυσθην ἀφανης παλανη ην

Notes: The negative evidence of the Sa and the positive evidence of the catena 248 252, and the Armenian version establish the asterisk for all of the lines. Furthermore, the catena tradition establishes the attribution to Th for these lines (ἐκ τῶν θ’ τὸ ἡμιστίχιον ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ θ).  

Job 28 6b

HT  וְעַפְרֹת זָהָב לֹ׃  
E  καὶ χωμα, χρυσίων αὐτῷ.

α’  καὶ μόλιβος χρυσοῦς αὐτῷ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: Job 19:24a contains an instance of μολίβος under an asterisk for Hebrew עפרת, and Syh rendered it with אֲבֵרָה in that instance; therefore, internal evidence supports retroversion from Field (Field, 49).

σ’  καὶ ωσεὶ μόλιβος χρυσοῦς αὐτοῦ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 49).
Job 28 8a

HT

E

α’ βαναυσίας

Wit1: 252

Notes: Ms 252 does not contain the word υἱοί, but Job 41:26b does have α’ υἱοὺς βαναυσιάς in 248. The Edition supplied υἱοί in the absence of ms evidence.

σ’ τέκνα σκανδάλου

Wit1: 252

Notes: Ms 252 appears as τέκνα σκανδάλυ (252,86r). The lemma represents the conjecture of the Edition, which is most probable since HT and Aq are singular. Although Sym uses a different translation equivalent in Job 41:26, he still uses a singular noun in that verse (παντὸς βρωμόδους). The other possible form would be the genitive plural σκανδάλων, which would follow Th (see supra).

Job 28 10a

HT

LXX

α’ ἐν στερεοῖς ῥεῖθρα διέσχισαν

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The lemma and attribution are established by Syh and the retroversion is from Field (Field, 49 n. 11). Aq uses στερεός for צָרוֹת (Reider, 221). The evidence in CG, (ἀβροχίαι = אברוכיאיש), does not represent a variant of the Aq fragment, but a Byzantine version of the LXX, which read HT as either צָרוֹת or בַּצּוּרוֹת. Aq does translate this Hebrew word with ἀβροχία in Jer 14:1 (de Lange, 294), but since Aq usually agrees with the proto-Masoretic text, Syh probably preserves Aq, and CG probably preserves a separate version. Since the Aq reading is established, Cox is correct to suggest that the Arm fragment was intended to be a correction to the bible text, and Aq’s name became attached to it accidentally (Cox, 335).
σ’ τὰ ῥεῖθρα τὰ συνεχόμενα τῶν ποταμῶν διέσχισαν

_Wit1:_ lemma] Syh | ῥεῖθρα] ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 139 260 395 643 732 3006 cII 555 161

_Attr:_ σ’ > C (= 788-250) 559

_NonGr:_ Syh

_Notes:_ Field suggests either συνεχόμενα or στενοχωρούμενα as the retroversion of ἔρρηξεν (Field, 49).

The attribution to Olymp in the _Edition_ is not supported by _Kommentar_ or _AGK_ but only by Nic (_Kommentar_, 234; _AGK_ 3, 64; Nic, 427).

_θ’_ ὀχυρώματα

_Wit1:_ ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI cII 555 161 Syh

_Attr:_ θ’ σ’ 137; > C (= 788-250)

_Var:_ ὀχυρώματα] ὀχυρωματα 395

_NonGr:_ Syh

_Notes:_ The lemma reflects a Hebrew vocalization of ῥαβδο vouchers, “inaccessible” or “unassailable” (KB, 147).

The attribution to Olymp in the _Edition_ is not supported by _Kommentar_ or _AGK_ but only by Nic (_Kommentar_, 234; _AGK_ 3, 64; Nic, 427).

_Job 28 10b_

_HT_ (וְכָל־יְקָר רָאֲתָה)

_LXX_ (πᾶν δὲ ἔντιμον εἶδέν) μου (ὁ ὀφθαλμός)

ι’ αὐτοῦ
Wit1:  \( C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \) \( cI^{137} 139 260 \ 643 \ 680 \ 732 \ 3006 \) \( \downarrow \) Arm

Wit2:  \( \muου \ \omega \ \phiθ\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\ ] \ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ ο \ \phi\theta. \ A-S^\omega-Iul; \ oculus eius \ La^\nu = M \)

Attr:  \( \lambda'] \ \alpha' \ \text{Arm} \)

NonGr:  Arm  ὑπηρεύσετον

Notes:  Arm preserves the fragment with an attribution to Aq (Cox, 335-7).

Job 28 11a

HT  כִּבֵּשׁ (תַּמִּבְּכִי נְהָרוֹ)

LXX  \( \betaάθη \ δὲ \ ποταμῶν \) \( \alpha\nu\varepsilonκάλυψεν \)

\( \langle \alpha' \rangle \)  ἐμότωσεν

Wit1:  CG

NonGr:  CG  ἀνιμὸτωσώ

Notes:  Of the Three only Aq uses \( \muοτοῦ\), and he uses it to render \( \text{חבשׁ} \) (Job 5:18, Isa 3:7, 30:26, and 61:1) and \( \text{חבשׁ} \ ) \( \text{pu} \) (Isa 1:6 and Ezek 30:21; Reider, 160). The LXX translates \( \text{חבשׁ} \) with \( \text{μοτοῦ} \) only in Hos 6:2 (H-R, 935). The evidence favors that the Byzantine version has borrowed from Aq, even though this conclusion cannot be proven.

\( \theta' \)  ἐξηρεύνησεν

Wit1:  \( \downarrow C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \) \( cI^{260} 732 \ cII \ 555 \ 161 \)

Attr:  \( \theta'] \ \alpha' \ 612; > C (= 788-250) \ 395 \)

Var:  ἐξηρεύνησεν -σαν  \( C (= 788-250) \) \( 138-255 \ 559 \ 612 \ 680 \ 740 \)

Notes:  Although many strong witnesses have the plural -σαν, \( C (= 3005) \) preserves the original singular, which agrees with the HT.

The Th version presupposes a Hebrew Vorlage of \( \text{ものは} \), “to search, examine.” In Psalm 64:7, Th uses the same equivalent.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 234-5; AGK 3, 64-5; Nic, 428).

Job 28 11b
σ’ ἀπὸ δὲ υπερορωμένου προῆλθεν φῶς

Job 28 12a

α’ θ’ εὑρεθήσεται

Job 28 13a
Var: τάξιν] ταξις 559

Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 235-6; AGK 3, 65-7; Nic, 428).

\[\theta^\prime\] σύνεσιν

Wit1: \(\downarrow C (= 788-250) \downarrow cI^{732} cII 555 161\)

Attr: \(\theta^\prime] > C (= 788-250)\)

Var: σύνεσιν] συνεσις 559; συνεισιν 395

Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 235-6; AGK 3, 65-7; Nic, 428).

\[\sigma^\prime\] τὸ τίμημα

Wit1: \(C (= 3005) cI^{732} \downarrow cII 555 161\)

Var: τό] > 512-513 703

Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 235-6; AGK 3, 65-7; Nic, 428).

Job 28 14-19

Hebrew (HT)

E άβυσσος εἶπεν Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ· καὶ θάλασσα εἶπεν Οὐκ ἔστιν μετ’ ἐμοῦ. οὗ δώσει συγκλεισμὸν ἀντ’ αὐτῆς,
καὶ οὐ σταθήσεται ἀργύριον ἀντάλλαγμα αὐτῆς· καὶ οὐ συμβαστακυφθήσεται χρυσίων Ἡφιρ, ἐν ὑπνῳ τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ· οὐκ ἐσωθήσεται αὐτῇ τὸ ὦφιρ, ἐν ὄνυχι τιμίῳ καὶ σαπφίρῳ.
non aequabitur ei aurum et vitrum,
nec (pr ※ μ) commutatio eius vasa aurea,
et Excelsa, et Gabis non erunt in memoria.
et (pr ※ μ) trahes sapientiam de absconditis.
non componetur ei topadium Aethiopiae.
auro (pr ※ μ) mundo non comparabitur.

Arm ※ Μη ποτε φανθείναι ἣν χεῖν ἑαυτα.
※ Οὐ δοκῇ ἰδεῖν ἡμᾶς ἔτσι ἵνα.
※ Οὐ πηγῆς θεάναι ἕτερας ἱνὰ χαίνῃ.
※ Οὐ προμάδας προμαχήσειν ἐνώπιον ἐνῶπιον
※ Οὐ στρατηγὸς πάνα κατοπτρίζῃ ἐνωπίων ἐνωπίων
※ Οὐ δοκῇ πᾶσιν ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιον ἐνώπιον
※ Οὐ πηγῆς θεάναι ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν
※ Οὐ πηγῆς θεάναι ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν
※ Οὐ πηγῆς θεάναι ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν
※ Οὐ πηγῆς θεάναι ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν
※ Οὐ πηγῆς θεάναι ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν
※ Οὐ πηγῆς θεάναι ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν ἐνώπιοιν

Notes: La does not have all of the lines under the asterisk. According to the stichomotry of the Edition, La only preserves five out of the twelve lines under the asterisk. The single metobelus at 14b probably indicates that this line was intended to be under the asterisk.

Job 28 15a

HT

E οὐ δώσει συγκλεισμόν ἀντ᾽ αὐτῆς,

αʹ οὐ δώσει ἀπόκλειστον ἀντ᾽ αὐτῆς

Wit1: 252

Notes: The reading of Aq only differs from the bible text with respect to the translation of συγκλεισμόν, which Aq renders with ἀπόκλειστον (see 3 Rgns 6:20; Field 1, 605; Job 41:7b, if the anonymous fragment in 248 is attributed to him).

σʹ οὐκ ἀντιδοθήσεται χρυσίον πρωτεῖον αὐτῆς

135
Notes: The Nachlese reports that ms 3005 also preserves the attribution to Sym, hitherto absent in the catena, which now confirms the attribution in 252 (Nachlese, 402).

The placement of this fragment at 15a (pace Edition at 16a) is based on the Hagedorns’ new collation of the catena materials. The fragment occurs beside 15b in 138 139 255 612 643 680 740 3005 252 and at 15a in 788-250. The fragment does not occur at 16a in the catena mss (Kollationen, 179; Nachlese, 402). This suggestion gives the reading in 252 (ἀντιδοθήσεται) the advantage over the reading in the catena (ἀντισωθήσεται; Nachlese, 402). Also, this suggestion not only solves the tension between the variants in the Edition between πρωτεῖον and πρωτείῳ (see 16a infra), but also it may provide a way forward in solving the tension between the two readings attributed to Aq in 16a in the Edition, since now the problematic οὐκ ἀναβληθήσεται may be assigned to Sym theoretically (see infra; Nachlese, 403).

The attribution to Or in the Edition is not supported by AGK, since the hexaplaric fragment has been erroneously embedded in the comment by Origen only in mss 643 and 139 (AGK 3, 68-9); therefore, Or should not be the supposed patristic source of this fragment according to the oldest Greek catena.

Job 28 16a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>(לֹא־)תְּסֻלֶּה (כְּבֵית אופר)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>(καὶ οὐ) συμβασταχθήσεται (χρυσίῳ Ὡφίρ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: There is no attribution in CG, but Aq seems to have coined the word ἀποσκολοπίζεται (cf. LSJ), and he is the only translator to use this word from among the LXX translators and the Three (H-R, 141). In Aq this verb renders סלל (Ps 117[118]:5, Isa 11:16, 36:2, 40:3, 57:14) and סל (Ps 118[119]:118) (Reider, 29). Ziegler makes
clear that in Isa 11:16, 36:2, and 40:3 Aq translates the noun מְסִלָּה with the participle ἀπεσκολοπισμένη (Beiträge, 37).

HT

לָא מְסִלָּה (בְּכֶתֶם אֵפוֹר)

E

(καὶ οὐ συμβασταχθησεται χρυσίῳ Ωφίρ)

〈σ’〉 ὁὐκ ἀναβληθήσεται

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cl732 ↓clII 555
Attr: 〈σ’〉 α’ rel; > C (= 788-250)
Var: lemma] οὐ παραβληθησεται 703

Notes: The attribution to Sym should be considered as probable for three reasons: (1) when the Nachlese moved the Sym fragment from 16a to 15a, Symmachus could then be considered as a legitimate author of this fragment. (2) The Th reading (οὐ συμβασταχθησεται) is secure as the text under the asterisk (see supra), and 3) translation technique confirms that the fragment in CG is best attributed to Aq (Nachlese, 403; see supra). This proposal requires more demonstration. The data in H-R and Reider for Aquila’s use of ἀναβάλλω must be corrected, for they are dependent on Field, who was in turn influenced by a suggestion in Montef. Both of these sources cite three uses of the verb ἀναβάλλω attributed to Aq: Job 28:16, 19, and Jer. 42 (50):12. Jer 42(50):12 contains an example of ἀναβάλλω for Hebrew II עטה, and therefore it only shows that Aq uses ἀναβάλλω, not his translation strategy for the relevant Hebrew word. Job 28:16 has already been explained alternatively to Field, but what of the reference to Aq in 28:19 in Field? Field relies on Montef, who says, “So Aq translates the same expression above v. 16” (Montef, 441). Montef does not list an Aq fragment at 28:19 but only notes that the reading could be from Aq. Field does not offer any additional evidence for the fragment at 28:19 (Field, 50). Ziegler and the Hagedorns do not list an Aquila fragment at 28:19b, probably because there is no evidence for doing so. Thus, there is no indisputable evidence that Aq translates סלָל/סלה with ἀναβάλλω. The word ἀναβάλλω is not listed for Sym, but, since one may rule out attributions to Aq and Th, the attribution is assigned to him provisionally until new evidence from mss or translation technique comes to light.

HT

לָא מְסִלָּה (בְּכֶתֶם אֵפוֹר)

E

(καὶ οὐ συμβασταχθησεται χρυσίῳ Ωφίρ)

〈α’〉 ἐν σπιλώματι
Notes: De Lange transliterated the form as follows: εν ἵσπιλωμαν, which Ziegler then contextualized (De Lange, 292). Only Aq uses σπίλωμα Ὡφίρ in Isa 13:12 for הבט אופיר (H-R, 1284). According to Ziegler, Aq translates the Hebrew word according to Syr. "to be soiled" (Beiträge, 37-8). Aq also uses βάμμα for כתם in Ps 44(45):10 and probably, the anonymous reading in Syh Thr 4:1 also belongs to him (Beiträge, 38).

\[
\text{σ′} \quad \text{πρωτείω}
\]

Notes: The suggestion of the Hagedorns has removed the problem of the variant between the Sym fragment of 15a and this one (see supra; Nachlese, 403; Beiträge, 38). Since Sym is the only translator from the LXX and the Three to use this word and to use it frequently (7x), it is possible that he would use the same word twice in close proximity (Nachlese, 403).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 236-7; AGK 3, 68; Nic, 432).
Var: οὐδὲν 740 | ἀντικαταλλαγήσεται | αντικαταλαγήσεται 559; ἀνταλλαγήσεται 612; ἀντικαταλαγή σ’ 3006

Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 236-7; AGK 3, 68; Nic, 432).

Job 28 18a  
HT  
E  

οὐδὲν 740 | ἀντικαταλαγήσεται | αντικαταλαγήσεται 559; ἀνταλλαγήσεται 612; ἀντικαταλαγή σ’ 3006

Notes: This lemma is confusing in the Edition since it did not list all of the evidence for the fragment. The lemma is both in the margin of the mss and in the catena. The catena preserves the original text and the correct attribution to Sym \( C^{\text{cat}} = (250 3005) \), while the marginal note preserves the correct attribution but has a variant. The Edition did not list the notes of the catena, probably because the attribution to Sym is missing in the catena in all witnesses except \( C^{\text{cat}} = (788-250 3005) \) (see AGK, vol III, 69, which correctly notes that the expanded reading of these witnesses corresponds to the stability of the \( \alpha \)-Vorläuferkatene (i.e. the C group)). The catena also shows that the plus, \( \text{οὐ} \) μνησθήσεται, is secondary, since it is absent in the best witnesses and it is clearly situating the Sym fragment in the context of the LXX, which is a characteristic of the Nicetas catena. A decision between ἐπηρμένα and ὑπερηρμένα is difficult. The latter reading may have arisen accidentally from dittography of the \( \upsilon \), while Sym uses the former word commonly (H-R, 505). His use of the latter term is only attested here because the reference to Prov 18:10 in H-R and Reider is not the reading in Field, who has ἀρθήσεται as the lemma for the Three on the basis of Nobil, which is not good evidence. Based on these factors ἐπηρμένα is the original text.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition stands, since it is confirmed by Kommentar and AGK (Kommentar, 237; AGK 3, 69; Nic, 433).
Job 28 18b

HT

E

καὶ ἐξακολούθεν οἱ σοφοὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσώτερα.

σ′

ɣλυκὺ δὲ σοφία παρὰ τὰ περὶβλεπτα

Wit1:  
\[C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI \downarrow 732 \downarrow cII \downarrow 555 \downarrow 161 \downarrow 252\]

Attr:  
\[σ′ C (= 788 3005) 252] α′ 259 512-513 555 620 161; θ′ 139; > rel\]

Var:  
\[δὲ] > C (= 3005) | παρὰ | υπερ | παντα | 252 | περὶβλεπτα | εσωτατα | 161\]

Notes:  
Ms 3005 confirms the attribution to Sym hitherto known only from 252 (Nachlese, 403). Now, 788 confirms that the attribution belongs to the oldest Greek catena. The Hagedorns also bring a helpful correction to App II of the Edition regarding the attribution to Aq in the catena. The attribution to Aq is supported only by Nic, and not the rest of the catena (Nachlese, 403; Nic, 433). Mss 259 555 620 161 may also be added as Nic (cII) mss, which support the Aq attribution. Field attributes the fragment to Aq on the basis of the Nicetas catena, Colb (559), and Orat (608). Ms 559 has been recollated, and there is no attribution to Aq according to the Hagedorns (Kollationen, 180).

Περὶβλεπτος belongs to the lexicon of Sym (Cant 1:11; see Ceulemans, 314), and in Thr 4:7, περὶβλεπτα stands for פְּנִינִים as in Job 28:18b (Beiträge, 60; Field, 758). The reference to Prov 25:11 in Field is based on Nobil and Syh, and therefore has been omitted from evidence until it can be confirmed.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 237-8; AGK 3, 70; Nic, 433).

Job 28 19b

HT

E

(χρυσίῳ καθαρῷ) οὐ συμβαστάθησεται.

σ′

οὐκ ἀντισταθμισθήσεται

Wit1:  
\[C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI \downarrow 732 \downarrow cII \downarrow 555 \downarrow 248\]

Attr:  
\[σ′ C (= 3005) 139] > rel\]

Var:  
\[ἀντισταθμισθήσεται \ C (= 788-250 3005) 612] ἀντισταθμισθήσεται 138; ἀντισταθμισθήσεται 740; ἀντισταθμισθήσεται 248 255 559; ἀντισταθμισθήσεται 137 139 260 395 680 3006; ἀντισταθμισθήσεται 643\]
Notes: Ms 3005 may be added to 250 and 612 in support of the Greek word ἀντισταθμίζω “to counterbalance” “to compensate” (Kollationen, 180; Beiträge, 17). Ms 788 also has this reading. Ms 3005 also preserves the attribution to Sym. This reading has influenced the exegesis of Olymp in the catena (AGK 3, 71), and it appears in Kommentar as follows: οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται οὖν ἀντί τοῦ οὐκ ἀντισταθμισθήσεται (Kommentar, 238).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is supported by Kommentar and Nic but not by AGK (Kommentar, 238; AGK 3, 71; Nic, 433).

Job 28 21a

HT (росл), (ךל-ר־ר
LXX (λέληθεν)—(πάντα ἀνθρωπον)

\[\text{θ} \] ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν

Wit1: Syh

Wit2: πάντα ἀνθρ.] pr εξ ὀφθαλμῶν II; ab oculis omnis hominis La = M

NonGr: Syh ✻ حَسَّاَمَاءِهِ

Notes: Laθ does not preserve the asterisk, but the text has been influenced by the Hexapla.

Job 28 21b-22a

HT רומא קידם כותרים
E καὶ ἀπὸ πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκρύβη· ἡ ἀπώλεια καὶ ὁ θάνατος εἶπαν

\[\text{θ} \] Sub ✻

Wit1: C (= 3005) cf 138 260 680 3006 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Attr: θ' (ἐκ θ' οἱ 3005 740 612 559 395; θ' 137 643 732 139)] > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 21b-22a sub ✻ 3005 740 255 612(non 22a) 559(non 22a) 395 137 643 732(non 21b) 248 252 Arm(non 22a) La Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{xt} סהרבאמש סמשכם ✻
Notes: La has misplaced the metobelus, and thus 22a appears to be a longer line under the asterisk.

Job 28 22b

HT

LXX

Notes: The fragment in 252 is as follows: σ’ [sup lin] ἀκοὴν αὐτῆς ἦ | ἀκοὴ ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς. The line cannot be read as one note, and therefore there were originally two notes, which have been combined into one, and one of the attributions has fallen out. The Edition suggested that this reading is from Aq, while the following one should be attributed to Sym. This fragment is a formal translation of the HT and thus suits Aq, while Sym may have used a dynamic approach to the line. Both Aq and Sym use ἀκοὴ frequently (H-R, 44).

Job 28 23a

HT

LXX

Attr: σ’ α’ C (= 788); > C (= 250)
**Notes:** Since Aq renders הִי with συνίειν (Reider, 229), 788 may preserve an authentic attribution to Aq.

*Job 28 25-26a*

**HT**

(וּמַיִם תִּכֵּן בְּמִדָּה׃)

(תָּלָרוּחַ מִשְׁקָלַעֲשׂו)

(בַּעֲשׂתוֹ לַמָּטָר חֹק)

**LXX**

ἀνέμων σταθμὸν ὕδατός τε μέτρα·

(ὁτὲ ἔποιήσεν οὕτως,

αʹ

καὶ ὑδῶρ ἐσταθμίσατο ἐν καταμετρήσει ἐν τῷ ποιήσαι αὐτὸν ὑετῷ ἀκριβασμόν

**Wit1:** lemma] C (= 257) | καὶ—καταμετρήσει] ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI 680 732 ↓ cII ↓ 555 ↓ 161

**Attr:** αʹ] > C (= 788-250) 138

**Var:** ἐσταθμίσατο] εσταθμησατο C (= 788-250) 161 395 512-513 555 559 | καταμετρήσει] καταμετρισει 395 559

**Notes:** Ms 257 has preserved the second part of the fragment, which has hitherto been unknown (Nachlese, 403). For Aquila’s use of ἀκριβασμός for חֹק, see Reider (10) and the new fragment attributed to Aq and Th at Job 23:14a (Nachlese, 400).

**HT**

(וּמַיִם תִּכֵּן בְּמִדָּה׃)

(תָּלָרוּחַ מִשְׁקָלַעֲשׂו)

(בַּעֲשׂתוֹ לַמָּטָר חֹק)

**LXX**

ἀνέμων σταθμὸν ὕδατός τε μέτρα·

(ὁτὲ ἔποιήσεν οὕτως,

σʹ

ὑδῶρ δὲ ἐξίσωσεν μέτρῳ

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

**Attr:** σʹ] > C (= 788-250 3005)

**Var:** δὲ] > 138-255 559 | ἐξίσωσεν] ἐξίσω 555; ἐξίσωσε 137 138 139 255 260 395 559 612 643 3006

*Job 28 26b-27a*

**HT**

(וְדֶרֶךְ לַחֲזִיז קֹלוֹ)
καὶ ὁδὸν ἐν τινάγματι φωνᾶς·
tότε εἶδεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐξηγήσατο αὐτήν.

θ’          Sub ※

_Wit1:_ C (= 3005) cf1-138 260 559 680 732 3006 248 Arm Bo La Sa Syh<sup>ext</sup>
 _Attr:_ θ’ (ἐκ θ’ οἱ β 255(27a) 612; ὁμ[] πρ[θ’ οἱ β 740 395; θ’ 137 643 139]) > rel
 _Var:_ lemma] om Sa; om 26b Bo | 26b-27a sub ※ 3005 740 255(non 26b) 612 395 137 643 139(+ 26a) Arm La Syh<sup>ext</sup>
 _NonGr:_ Syh<sup>ext</sup> et et viam tempestatis vocibus.
La※ et et viam tempestatis vocibus.
Arm※ et et viam tempestatis vocibus.

_Notes:_ The asterisk is supported by all of the available evidence with the exception that the Bo omits 26b only, which means 27a was considered not to be under the asterisk in that tradition.

**Job 28 26b**

HT: דֶּרֶךְ (וְדֶרֶךְ)
E: (καὶ ὁδὸν) ἐν τινάγματι φωνᾶς.

α’          εἰς κτύπων φωνῶν

_Wit1:_ ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cf1-139↓732 ↓cfII↓555 ↓161 252 Syh
 _Attr:_ α’] α’ 559(vid) cfII 555 161; > C (= 788-250) 395 680 740
 _Var:_ εἰς] pr καὶ ὁδὸν C (= 257) κτύπων] κτύπων 643
 _NonGr:_ Syh※ כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָa כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָa כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָa כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָa כְּלָא כְּלָa כְּלָא כְּלָa כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָא כְּלָa כְּלָa כְּלָa כְּלָa כְּלָa כְּלָa כְּלָa כְּl
 _Notes:_ α’ Job 38:25b is an exact parallel to this fragment.
The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* and it is inserted into the bible text of Nic and is not in text attributed to Olymp (*Kommentar*, 239-40; *AGK* 3, 74; Nic, 434).

σ′ ὀμβρών βροντάς

*Wit1:* ↓C (= 257) 252 ↓Syh

*Var:* ὀμβρών] pr καὶ ὁδόν C (= 257) | ὀμβρών βροντάς] ομβρον φωνῶν Syh

*NonGr:* Syh + ἃ έκτενο ἄνθηκεν.

*Notes:* Ms 257 is the first catena witness to this fragment and it confirms the fragment and attribution previously known only in 252 and Syh (*Nachlese*, 403; cf. σ′ 38:25b).

Job 28 27b

HT :הִכִּינָהּ וְגַם־חֲקָרָהּ׃

LXX ἑτοιμάσας ἐξιχνίασεν.

θ′ διεταξὲν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐξηρεύνησεν αὐτὴν

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

*Attr:* θ′] > C (= 250) 395

*Var:* αὐτὴν] > C (= 3005) | ἐξηρεύνησεν] ἐξερευνησεν C (= 788-250); ἐξηρευνησε 555

*Notes:* The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 240; *AGK* 3, 74; Nic, 435).
Chapter 29

Job 29 2a

HT  מִי־יִתְּנֵנִי כְיַרְחֵי־קֶדֶם
LXX  τίς ἄν με θείη κατὰ μῆνα ἐμπροσθεν ἡμερῶν

σ’  τίς δώῃ μοι κατὰ τοὺς μῆνας τοὺς πρώτους

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-260 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161
Attr:  σ’] α’ σ’ cII 555 161; > C (= 250)
Var:  μοι C (= 3005) 395] με C (= 788-250) cI-260 395 732 cII 555 161

Notes:  The decision between μοι and με is difficult. Mss 3005 and 395 appear to preserve the original dative, which an early scribe changed to με in accordance with the LXX. The Edition chose the double attribution on the basis of the external evidence of the Nicetas catena, but Aq uses πρῶτος to render ἡμέρας, and this occurrence is the only one in which Aq is recorded as translating בֹּדֵק with πρῶτος (Reider, 207). Sym uses πρῶτος twice for בֹּדֵק in the Psalter (67:34, 76:6; Busto Saiz, 577). This internal evidence supports the best external evidence of C and cI.

Symmachus may have influenced Iulian’s commentary, which is as follows: τίς ἄν δώῃ μοι ἡμέρας ἡ μῆνα (Iul-Kommentar, 176). There are three Iulian mss, which the Hagedorns grouped under the siglum Z (Iul-Kommentar, XXIII). It appears that Z also preserved the dative μοι over and against the accusative με of the LXX. The catena also preserves μοι (AGK 3, 80).

Job 29 2b

HT  הַּ יִשְׁמְרֵנִי׃כִּיִּמֵי אֱלוֹ
LXX  ὥν με ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλαξεν;

θ’  κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἃς ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλασσεν με

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161
Attr:  θ’] α’ σ’ cII 555 161; > C (= 250)
Var:  ἐφύλασσεν C (= 788-250) 255 395 680 740] ἐφύλαξεν C (= 3005);
     ἐφύλασσε 137 138 139 161 260 555 559 643 3006; -λασεν 612
Notes: The Kollationen notes that Ziegler has cited the wrong authors on the basis of Nic (Kollationen, 183). Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Th. C and cl have established the Th attribution. Ms 3005 has ἐφύλαξεν, which is from the LXX.

The attribution to Iul in the Edition is not supported by Iul-Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 176; AGK 3, 80; Nic, 437).

Job 29 3a

HT

בֵּיהַלת (עַדְּרֶה רוֹאֵשָׁה)

LXX

(Ṛṣi ṛṣe) ḫuḡi (ō ᾱυχνος αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς μου)

σ’ ἠλαμπεν

Wit1: C (= 3005) ↓ clf-137 260 732

Wit2: ηὔγει] λαμπει Max II 373

Attr: σ’ C (= 3005) 139] > rel

Var: ἠλαμπεν] ἠλαμπτε 395

Notes: Ms 139 was the only manuscript to preserve the attribution to Sym, but now 3005 confirms this same attribution (Kollationen, 183).

Job 29 4a

HT

כַּאֲשֶׁר חָיָה בָּיָמָיָיו

LXX

 đèn ἡμῖν ἐπιβρήθων ὀδοῖς

σ’ ὀσπερ ὅτε ἡμῖν ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητος μου

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ clf-138 732 ↓ clII ↓ 555 ↓ 161’

Attr: σ’] > C (= 250)


Notes: Perhaps ὅτε came from the LXX, but the best witnesses to the text include it. Sym may have employed a doublet, and Nic and 161’ simplified the reading by omitting ὅτε.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 244; AGK 3, 82; Nic, 438).
Job 29 4b

**HT**

כָּפָרָה אַלּוֹהַי נִטְלָה גָּרְפָן;

**LXX**

οτέ ο θεός ἐπισκοπήν ἐποιεῖτο τοῦ οίκου μου.

σ’ ὅποτε περιέφρασεν ο θεὸς ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν μου

**Wit1:** ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161

**Attr:** σ’ > C (= 788-250)

**Var:** ὅποτε] οτε C (= 788-250) | περιέφρασεν] περιεφρασεν C (= 3005) 559 612; περιεφρα[ ] 138; περιεφρασεν 161 | ἐπὶ C (= 3005)] περὶ C (= 788-250); > rel

**Notes:** Sym read בָּכָרָה, as in HT. Regarding ἐπί in 3005, the Nachlese posits that it is easier to see how an original preposition in Greek could fall out rather than one be added, since περιφράσσω takes an accusative direct object usually in Greek (Nachlese, 403). Accordingly, Sym would have attempted to translate Hebrew על with a Greek preposition, as two mss from the C group testify (Nachlese, 403). The Nachlese did not choose between ἐπὶ and περί as the original text, but this edition has posited that ἐπὶ is the original text based on the following rationale. First, ἐπὶ is the most natural translation for על and Sym uses ἐπὶ for על even when the OG does not have an equivalent (e.g. Job 8:15, 9:26). Second, one can posit that ἐπὶ was the original text and was changed to περί by a later scribe, who was adept to retain a preposition, but he did not recognize Greek valency between περιφράσσω and ἐπὶ. The scribe repeated the preposition used in the compound verb, which is common in Hellenistic Greek (Robertson, 560). The later strands of the catena simply omitted the preposition altogether in the interests of better style. Original ἐπὶ is able to explain the two variants, while περί cannot explain a later change to ἐπὶ. The text that begins with an original omission of a preposition cannot explain how a preposition would enter the text’s transmission.

The Edition does not cite the evidence of Nic for this fragment. The attribution to Olymp in Nic is not supported by Kommentar or AGK (Kommentar, 244; AGK 3, 82; Nic, 439).

Job 29 8a

**HT**

(רַאֲיָהָהּ) נִצְרִים (רְאֵהָנָא)

**LXX**

(ἰδόντες με) νεανίσκοι (ἐκρύβησαν)
σ’ θ’

νέοι

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250) cf^[-138 260 [559] 732

Attr: σ’ θ’] > C (= 250)

Notes: Ms 788 is the first C ms to preserve this attribution. The order of the attributions in the mss is θ’ σ’.

Job 29 8b

HT

κ’ομ’ού ὑσθ’ιν ἀνεπ’ ζ’ερ’ας:

LXX

(πρ’εσβ’υται δὲ πάντες) ἔστησαν.

σ’

παρίσταντο

Wit1: ↓C (= 406 788-250 3005) ↓cf^[-260 [559] 732

Attr: σ’] > C (= 250) 395 740

Var: lemma] παριστ[ 406

Notes: Because the LXX translates the two verbs in HT with one verb, it is not certain whether the Sym version is for θ’σ’ or κ’ομ’ού (Field, 51 n 4). Sym renders θ’σ’ (Judg 3:19) and κ’ομ’ού (1 Sam 20:25) with παριστάναι.

Job 29 9a

HT

σ’ρες (τοντρες θ’κ’μ’λίμ)

LXX

ἀδροὶ (δὲ ἐπαύσαντο λαλοῦντες)

λ’

ἀρχοντες

Wit1: ↓C (= 406 788-250 3005) ↓cf^[-260 [559] 732 3006 ↓cfII 555

Attr: λ’] > C (= 406) 138 395

Var: lemma] pr oi 512-513 555

Notes: Job 34:19a has another instance of this equivalent in the Three. The attribution to Or in the Edition is not supported by AGK (AGK 3, 85-7). Young’s edition preserves the hexaplaric fragment above the Or comment so that it is not clear whether the fragment was preserved in the comment by Or (Nic, 440).
Job 29 10b-11a

HT

E

καὶ γλώσσα αὐτῶν τῷ λάρυγγι αὐτῶν ἐκκλήθη· ὅτι οὐς ἥκουσεν καὶ ἐμακάρισεν με.

\( \Theta' \) Sub ★

\textit{Wit1}: C (= 3005) cI-138 139 260 [559] 680 732 3006 248 252 Arm Sa Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

\textit{Attr}: \( \theta' \) (ἐκ \( \theta' \) οἱ [740 255 612 3004 395; ἐκ \( \theta' \) οἱ [740 255 612 3004 395] > rel

\textit{Var}: lemma\] om Sa | 10b-11a sub ★ 3005 740(non 11a) 255 612 3004(non 11a) 395 137 643 248 252 Arm(non 11a) Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

\textit{NonGr}: Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Arm ★ ἵππα τὴν ἑπί ηὐφνη ῥὴμνυθή ἱλεκγατη

Job 29 11b

HT

LXX

(ὁφθαλμὸς δὲ ἱδών) μὲ Ἐξέκλεινεν.

\( \alpha' \) \( \sigma' \) ἐμαρτύρησεν περὶ ἑμοῦ

\textit{Wit1}: C (= 788-250) C\textsuperscript{cat} (= 3005) \( \downarrow \) cI-260 [559] 732 cI\textsuperscript{cat}-476 [559] 523\textsuperscript{cat} 3004\textsuperscript{cat} 754\textsuperscript{cat}

\textit{Attr}: \( \alpha' \) \( \sigma' \) 3006\textsuperscript{inc}

\textit{Var}: ἐμαρτύρησεν] -ρησε 137 139 643 555 161

\textit{Notes}: The attribution in 3006 is not visible according to the \textit{Kollationen} (\textit{Kollationen}, 185). Ziegler cites Schenker favorably where he doubts that the fragment comes from Aq, since the translation of the HT is too free (\textit{Beiträge}, 60). There is no sound evidence which supports or disproves this statement. According to Reider, Aq translates ἔξεκλεινεν \( \text{Hi} \) with the compound διαμαρτύρεσθαι in Jer 49(42):19, in which there is a dative (ὑμῖν) following the verb, and Jer 39(32):44 Syh, in which the verb is either Ethpe or Ethpa Impf 3mp (ܬܗܕܢ̈), and is therefore passive as the retroversion in Ziegler’s Jeremiah \textit{Edition} shows (375). These examples do not demonstrate sufficiently
how Aq renders the object with this verb, when the verb is transitive. Until more evidence arises to disprove this attribution, the double attribution is established by the external evidence.

AGK assigns this comment as “partially from Olympiodor” (AGK 3, 87). The part of the comment which contains the note from Aq and Sym is not found in Kommentar; therefore, one cannot be certain that Olympiodorus is the source of this hexaplaric fragment, even though Nic has the comment under Olymp and the Edition asserts it (Kommentar, 246; AGK 3, 87; Nic, 441).

Job 29 12a

HT  
כִּי־אֲמַלֵּט עָנִי מְשַׁווּעַ

LXX  
(διέσωσα γὰρ πτωχόν) ἐκ χειρὸς δυνάστου

Sub  

Wit1:  
La

NonGr:  
La liberavi enim ÷ pauperem de manu potentis,

Notes:  
According to La, the obelus is placed before pauperem, but this placement is a mistake since “poor” is in HT, as the Vulgate makes plain: quod liberassem pauperem vociferantem. Probably, Jerome’s Latin version placed the obelus before de, in order to indicate that from there to the end of the line was present in the LXX but not in the HT, but a later scribe misplaced it.

Job 29 13a

HT  
ברכה אובד עליה –

E  
εὐλογία ἀπολλυμένου ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ ἔλθοι,

α’ θ’  

Sub  

Wit1:  
C (= 788-250 3005) cf—138 139 260 [559] 680 732 3006 252 Arm La Sa Syh Eus (Dem) Max p 373 Cyp Lucif Spec

Wit2:  
ελθοί] επελθοι 248-644 336’ Syn Ol; ελθη Iul; veniebat La = Vulg

Attr:  
α’ θ’ (ἐκ τῶν του 3004) α’ καὶ θ’ 788-250(12b) 740 255 612 3004 395; ἐκ θ’ ομ() καὶ α’ πρ()κ() 3005 Syh Eus > rel

Var:  
lemma] om Sa Eus (Dem I, 6, 14 GCS 23) Cyp Lucif Spec | 13a sub ※ 3005 740 612 3004 137 643 248 252 Arm La Syh Eus

NonGr:  
Syh Eus
La  
*benedictio* (pr ※ μ) *perituri super me veniebat*

Arm  ※ υπηρετήσατέ με ηπερτών μου πηλυκε

*Notes:* The line is accounted for in all of the extant traditions. The Church Fathers, combined with Sa, constitute negative evidence for the asterisk, since the line is omitted in those texts.

\[\sigma'\]  
εὐλογία ἀπολλυμένου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ΚΑΤΗΝΤΑ

*Wit1:*  lemma] Syh | κατήντα] ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) cf\(^{-137}\) 139 260 395 [559] 643 680 732 3006 cII 555 161

*Wit2:*  ἐλθοὶ] επελθοὶ 248-644 336' Syn Ol; ἐλθη Iul; *veniebat* La = Vulg

*Attr:*  σ’] > C (= 788-250)

*NonGr:*  Syh

*Notes:* The Vulgate’s *veniebat* is probably dependent on Sym, since no other tradition attests to the imperfect tense.

**Job 29 13b**

| HT | שְׁלֵיךְ תַּרְפֶּן |
| LXX | στόμα δὲ χήρας με εὐλόγησεν |

\[\theta'\]  
καὶ καρδίαν χήρας ηὐφρανα

*Wit1:*  ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cf\(^{-[559]}\) 732 ↓ cII ↓ 555

*Attr:*  θ’] > C (= 788-250)

*Var:*  χήρας] χειρας 395 | ηὐφρανα] εὐφρανα 395 cII 555

*Notes:* The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 246; *AGK* 3, 88-9; Nic, 442). The Nic edition by young has the hexaplaric fragment above the comment by Olymp; therefore, the Nic may not attribute the fragment to Olymp.

**Job 29 17b**

| HT | (הַמַּעַשְׂרָה) |
| LXX | (ἐκ δὲ) μεσού (τῶν οὐδόντων αὐτῶν ἀρπαγμα ἔξεστασα) |
Sub ÷

Wit1:  Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Wit2:  μέσου sub ÷ Syh; > Lucif = M

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Notes:  Syh is the only witness to the obelus, but Lucif provides negative evidence for it. Μέσου is represented in La: et de medio dentium eorum rapinas extorsi, but Jerome did not include it in the Vulgate: et de dentibus illius auferebam praedam.

Job 29 18a

HT  보내 אלמי אגוע
LXX  εἶπα δὲ ἡ ἠλικία μου γηράσει

σʹ  ἔλεγον δὲ μετὰ τῆς νοσσιᾶς μου γηράσειν

Wit1:  ↓C (= 406 788-250 3005) ↓cI\textsuperscript{[559]} 732 cII 555 161

Attr:  σʹ] > C (= 406 3005) 3006

νοσιας 137 139 255 260 395 643 680 3006; νοσσία 612

Notes:  Only ἔλεγον is visible in 406 (Kollationen, 185).
The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 247; AGK 3, 96; Nic, 447).

Job 29 19-20

HT

Ε  ἡ ῥίζα διήνοικται ἐπὶ υδατός,
καὶ δρόσος αὐλισθήσεται ἐν τῷ θερισμῷ μου·
ἡ δόξα μου καινὴ μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ,
καὶ τὸ τόξον μου ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ πορεύεται.
The evidence of the catena tradition, ms 248, Syh, and Arm combined with the negative evidence of Sa firmly establishes the asterisk for these lines. The misplacement of the asterisk in 252 and the omission of the asterisk before 20a in La are probably scribal errors.

Job 29 20a

The evidence of the catena tradition, ms 248, Syh, and Arm combined with the negative evidence of Sa firmly establishes the asterisk for these lines. The misplacement of the asterisk in 252 and the omission of the asterisk before 20a in La are probably scribal errors.

Job 29 20a

The evidence of the catena tradition, ms 248, Syh, and Arm combined with the negative evidence of Sa firmly establishes the asterisk for these lines. The misplacement of the asterisk in 252 and the omission of the asterisk before 20a in La are probably scribal errors.
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The Sym fragment is at 29:18b in 137 139 250 255 395 612 680 740 3006 (Kollationen, 186). In 512-513 555 161, the fragment occurs at 29:18 after the Sym reading for that verse (Nic, 447). The reading does occur in the proper place in Syh and 260 (Kollationen, 186). In 3005, there is an index at the fragment in the margin, but a corresponding index does not appear in the text at 20a; therefore, it is not certain to which line the fragment corresponds.

Whether תחכ in Syh supports the lemma or the variant is indeterminable. If it is Peal, it would support the lemma, but if it is Pael as the diacritical point above the word suggests, then it would support the variant ἀνανεώσει (see Job 33:24 ἀνανεώσει = תחכ Syh).

Job 29 21a

HT לְיַחְלוּ (לְיַחְלָה)
LXX (ἐμοῦ ἀκούσαντες) προσέσχον

σʹ ἐπήνουν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cf-260 [559] 732 3006
Attr: σʹ > C (= 250) 395

Notes: Sym translated the form as from II הלל Pi, which occurs in Cant 6:9 with a double attribution to Aq and Sym (Field 2, 420; cf. Ceulemans, 464). In 788, the orthography is with iota adscriptus (ἐπήνουν).

Job 29 24a

HT אֲנַחַק יִאָסֵל לָא יָאָמְרָה
LXX ἕλαν γελάσω πρὸς αὐτοὺς, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσωσιν,

σʹ προσεγέλων αὐτοῖς, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἐπίστευον

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cf- [559] 732 cfII 555 161'
Attr: σʹ > C (= 250) 612
Var: προσεγέλων] προσεγέλουν 395; προσεγέλω 250

155
Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 248-9; AGK 3, 98; Nic, 449).

Job 29 24b-25c

HT

Notes: The tradition of the asterisk is well preserved in the catena and the versions. The asterisk appears to be misplaced in 248 and 252.
Job 29 25b

HT

בַּגְּדוּד (ן כְּמֶלֶךְ וְאֶשְׁכּוֹ)

E

(καὶ κατεσκήνουν ὡσεὶ βασιλεὺς) ἐν μονοζώνοις

σʹ

ἐν στρατοπέδῳ

Notes: The complete reading in 395 is ἐν μονοζώνοις· ἐν στρατοπέδῳ (Kollationen, 187). The Syriac retroversion constitutes a variant. Syh does not provide any examples for reconstructing the translation equivalent since the Greek word is used only seven times in the LXX, and Syh is not extant in these other instances. The retroversion finds support in the NT Peshitta, since στρατιώτης is translated by פְּלַחָּא in Acts 10:7. Field is correct to reject Middeldorpff’s suggestion that στρατιῶν is the proper retroversion, there is evidence of στρατιά for פְּלַחָּא (Field, 52; Curaes, 625).

In Job 25:3, Sym translates the plural of גְּדוּד with στρατιῶν, where 256-740 had the variant στρατιώτων, showing that these words were confused. Syh, therefore, may represent a harmonization. In 19:12a, Sym had λόχοι for the plural of the same Hebrew word (Woods, 345ff); therefore, Sym appears to vary his equivalents when translating this word.
The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 249; *AGK* 3, 99; Nic, 451).

**Job 29 25c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>כַּאֲשֶׁר †נַחֵם †נַחֵם</td>
<td>ὃν τρόπον παθεινοὺς παρακαλῶν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

σ᾽  καθὼς ἀπάγοι αὐτοὺς ὀδηγῶν

*Wit1:*  
C (= 788-250) clI -395 [559] ↓ cII ↓ 555

*Var:*  ἀπάγοι] απαγει cII 555

*Notes:*  The text of Sym seems to presuppose כַּאֲשֶׁר †נַחֵם for its parent text (cp. Jer 11:19 where Aq and Sym have ἀπάγειν for הוֹבִיל; Liebreich, 401; *Beiträge*, 39). Regarding יֹבִל, Sym may have had a text that had already been corrupted by the change of ס to כ, which was a common change during this period (Segal, 35; Qimron, 31). This initial difference between Sym’s text and HT may have given rise to the rest of his translation; thus, נָהַח from נָהַח “to lead” most probably explains why Sym used ὀδηγῶν in his translation. The variant -οι/-ει arose from phonetic confusion in the Byzantine period (Wevers, 188), but the oldest Greek catena probably has preserved the original text and Nic has the error.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 249; *AGK* 3, 99; Nic, 451).
Chapter 30

Job 30 1ab

HT

וניהו השוק ער

צעריהו המקב עקיב

LXX

νυνὶ δὲ κατεγέλασάν μου,

ἐλάχιστοι νῦν νουθετοῦσίν με ἐν μέρει,

αʹ

καὶ νῦν ἐγέλασαν ἐπʼ ἐμοὶ βραχεῖς

παρʼ ἐμὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις


Attr: αʹ] θʹ 161 680; λʹ 252


NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 52).

Ms 252 has the following reading: ἐν ἡμέραις, which has the preposition ἐν, while the catena tradition preserves only the dative for the Hebrew ל (see the readings infra). The variant ἐν comes from the OG, while the catena and Syh preserve the original text of the Three. Ms 252 probably preserves only the original case of the noun for Sym, but Syh preserves the actual lemma of Sym, since Syh is best retroverted as χρόνοις (see infra).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 250; AGK 3, 100; Nic, 451).

σʹ

νῦν δὲ μυκτηρίζουσίν με οἱ νεώτεροί μου
toῖς χρόνοις

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes:
Notes: The retroversion is from Field. He also lists χλευάζουσι as a possible retroversion for μυκτηρίζω (Field, 52). Sym uses μυκτηρίζω for לְעָג in Prov 1:26 (evidence of Nobil in Field, 313), and there are no extant examples of μυκτηρίζω for שׁחק. There is no extant evidence that Sym uses χλευάζω for שׁחק, but in Isa 37:22 Sym translates לְעָג with χλευάζω; therefore, Sym does not have a formal equivalent for these verbs and thus the retroversion remains only plausible.

και νῦν κατεγέλασάν μου οἱ νεώτεροί μου ἡμέραις


Attr: θ'] α’ 161; λ’ 252; > 139

Var: μου 2°] > Syh | ἡμέραις] ημερα 740; pr ev 252

NonGr: Syh

Notes: For the reading of 252, see the Aq fragment supra.
The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 250; AGK 3, 100; Nic, 451).

Job 30 1c

HT ַתָּםאֲשֶׁר־מָאַסְתִּי אֲבוֹ E ὠν ἐξουδένουν πατέρας αὐτῶν,

〈θ’〉 Sub ※

Wit1: Arm Sa Syh^txt

Var: lemma] om Sa

NonGr: Syh^txt ~  זֶאֶהְיָה רַמְאֵר יַבִּיתָם אֲבָהָה Arm ※ qηrδ qαφηwqαφηw qηrδ qηwu

Notes: The Armenian edition by Cox places this line under the asterisk, which now means the line is under the asterisk in both Syh and Arm. Sa provides negative evidence for the asterisk since the line has been omitted. The use of εξουδενόω for מָאַס.
indicates probably that the fragment should be attributed to Th, since Aq uses ἀπορρίπτω for מָסַל and he uses ἐξουδενόω for דָּבַר in a careful manner (Gentry, 487).

Job 30 1d
HT
LXX

α’ θ’ σ’ μετὰ τῶν κυνῶν τῶν προβάτων μου

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI–139 [559] 732 ↓cII ↓161
Attr: α’ θ’ σ’] σ’ C (= 3005); λ’ cII 555 161; > 395

Notes: The majority of the mss preserve the attribution in the order α’ θ’ σ’, but 260 643 3006 preserve it in the order of α’ σ’ θ’. Mss 161 and 555 agree with the attribution in cII.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 250; AGK 3, 100; Nic, 451).

Job 30 2-4a
HT

E καὶ γε ἵσχυς χειρὸν αὐτῶν ἴνα τί μοι; ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ ἀπώλετο συντέλεια ἐν ἐνδείᾳ καὶ λιμῷ ἄγονος; οἱ φεύγοντες ἀνυδρὸν ἐχθὲς συνοχὴν καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν, οἱ περικλῆντες ἀλίμα ἐπὶ ἤχοντι,

θ’ Sub ※

Wit1:  C (= 3005) cI–138 139 260 [559] 680 3006 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh txt
Attr: θ’ (ἐκ θ’ οί 3005 740 255 612 3004 395) 137 Syh txt] > rel
Var: lemma] om Sa | 3-4a sub ※ 3005 740(non 3c 4a) 255(non 2a 4a) 612
3004 395(non 4a) 137 643 732(non 2 4a) 248 252 Arm La(non 2a 3bc)
Syh^xt(non 3 4a)

NonGr: Syh^xt

La et virtus manuum eorum quasi nihilum mihi erat.
in (pr ※ μ) eis periebat omnis vita.
in (pr ※ μ) egestate et fame instabiles
qui fugiebant in desertum heri
propter angustias et miseras
qui (pr ※ μ) rodebant cortices arborum (+ △ β)

Arm ※ οὖν καὶ γινόμεναι ἄλλως ἡγούμενος ἢ 
※ ἢ πρόκειται ἡ ἁγορά ἡ 
※ ἢ ἡ ἀειπραποτήτως ἢ ἡ ἀπειλή ἀποτῖτη 
※ ἢ η ἀποτίτη 
※ ἢ ἄμελη ἀποτίτη 
※ οὔτε ἀργολὴ ἡ ἀποτίτη 

Notes: The Greek and Armenian traditions preserve six lines under the asterisk.

Job 30 2b-3a

HT כָּלַח׃ (עָלֵימוֹ אָבַד)
בְּכָפָן גַּלְמוּד
בְּחֶסֶר (καὶ λιμῷ ἄγονος·)
αʹ παντελές ἐν ύστερήσει

E (ἐπʼ αὐτοὺς ἀπόλετο) συντέλεια ἐν ἐνδείᾳ (καὶ λιμῷ ἄγονος)

αʹ παντελές ἐν ύστερήσει

Wit1: ↓252 Syh

Var: παντελές] pr ἐπʼ αὐτοὺς ἀπόλετο (Ziegler conj.; ἀπόλετο cod) 252

NonGr: Syh

Notes: Field notes: Syro-hex. legisse videtur: Ἀ. παντελές ἐν στερήσει (Field, 52). Field offers no supporting evidence for this retroversion, and Sokoloff’s lexicon lists “lack, absence” or “deprivation” for ܓܠܝܙܘܬܐ. In the absence of evidence for Field’s retroversion, there is no need to posit that Syh contains a variant. Middendorpf offers the
following retroversion and it appears accurate: παντελὲς ἐν ὑπερήσει (Curaes, 625). The plus in 252 comes from the bible text.

σʹ  πᾶν τὸ πρὸς ζωήν

\[\text{Wit1:} \downarrow C (= 788-250) 3005 \downarrow \text{cI}^{139} [559] \downarrow \text{cII} \downarrow 555 \downarrow 161' \downarrow \text{Suidas}\]

\[\text{Wit2:} \text{συντέλεια} - \text{λειαι} 261; \text{pr η Olymp; τελεια Iul; omnis vita} \text{La}\]

\[\text{Attr:} \quad \sigma' > C (= 788-250) 643 248 \text{ Suidas}\]

\[\text{Var:} \quad \text{πᾶν} \mid \text{pr ἀπώλετο αὐτοῖς cII 555 161} \mid \text{ζωὴν} \mid \text{ζων} 740\]

\[\text{Notes:} \quad \text{The fragment in 248 is as follows: πᾶν τὸ πρὸς ζωήν συντελοῦν ἡτ(οι) ἐυπορία αὐτ(ῶν) ἀπώλετο. The first part of the exegetical fragment betrays dependence on Sym, perhaps arising from the Nicetas catena (Nic, 453), but this exegetical fragment also shows that the Sym fragment has been contextualized with the use of the bible text. C and cI have preserved the original Sym fragment and cII and 248 have expanded it due to contextual concerns. I am thankful to Dieter Hagedorn for pointing to this reference in Suidas: Σ 1630: συντέλεια: πᾶν τὸ πρὸς ζωήν (= Symmachus): Ἰωβ· ἐπ᾿ αὐτοὺς ἀπώλετο συντέλεια (= Job 30,2b) ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδέποτε τι χρηστὸν συνετέλεσαν (= AGK vol. III, 101) (Adler, A., Suidae Lexicon, Vol. IV, 476). \text{La (omnis vita}) seems to have been influenced by Sym. \text{The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 251; AGK 3, 101; Nic, 453).}\]

Job 30 3a

\[\text{HT} \quad \text{בכפר תבכפר (בלומד)}\]

\[\text{E} \quad (ἐν ἐνδείᾳ καὶ λιμῷ) ἀγονος·\]

\[\langle ἐβρʹ \rangle \quad \text{μεμονωμένος}\]

\[\text{Wit1:} \quad 252\]

\[\text{Notes:} \quad \text{The Edition refers to Job 3:7a, where the same word is attributed to ἐβρʹ and translates the same Hebrew word, תבכפר} \text{ (see also Woods, 96).}\]

Job 30 4a

\[\text{HT} \quad \text{טַכְּפִים מַלָּחַת עֲלֵי־שִׂיחַ}\]

\[\text{E} \quad \text{οἱ περικλώντες ἀλιμα ἐπὶ ἰχοῦντι,}\]

163
α’ 

περικλῶντες ἀλίμον ἐπὶ φυτοῦ

Wit1: lemma] ↓Syh | ἀλίμον — φυτοῦ] 252 | ἐπὶ φυτοῦ] C (= 788 3005) ↓cI ↑137
138 139 255 260 [559] 643 732 3006

Wit2: περικλῶντες O-339 575-254↑μμ.336 248] περικυκλουντες rel

Attr: α’] σ’ 612

Var: ἀλίμον] αλειμμαSyh | φυτοῦ] φυτοις Syh

NonGr: Syh 

Notes: Mss 788 3005 are the first witnesses from the C group to attest to the fragment and attribution. There is a scholion in Syh which reads as follows: ḫϯς ḫή ḫή ḫή ḫή ḫή ḫή ḫή (“oil” perhaps read “sea orach”). The latter term would be the equivalent of Greek ἀλίμον, which is the lemma of 252 and the bible text, but not the exact form (Beiträge, 39). Ziegler chose the reading of 252 as the original text and he correctly notes that ἀλειμα is an error for ἄλειμα in Syh, which would agree with the bible text (Beiträge, 39). The Syh reading is without break between the Aq and Sym fragments; thus, Aq appears as the author of the whole fragment according to Syh (see infra).

σ’

ἀποκνίζοντες φλοιοὺς φυτῶν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-μμ.732 cII ↓555 ↓161′ ↓Syh

Attr: σ’] α’ Syh; > C (= 250) 3006


NonGr: Syh 

Notes: The attribution to Sym fell out of Syh; thus, the whole fragment has been attributed to Aq incorrectly. Mss 788 3005 preserve the correct attribution to Sym.

Job 30 4b

HT יָשָׁר רָֽאַהַ֖יִם לְחָ֑כֶם
LXX οὐτίνες ἀλίμα ἐν αὐτῶν ἃ τὰ σῖτα,
α’ θ’
καὶ ρίζας τῶν ραθαμίν ἐσθίουσιν

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh
Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 53).

σ’
καὶ ρίζα ξύλων ἀγρίων ἢ σίτησις αὐτῶν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-[559] 732 cII 555 161 ↓Syh
Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250)
NonGr: Syh
Notes: Syh has ἦν (= λίζας σίτησις), which probably came from the OG.

Job 30 7a

HT
בֵּין־שִׂיחִים יִנְהָקוּ
E
ἀνὰ μέσον εὐήχων βοήσονται.

θ’
Sub *

Wit1: cI-138 139 395 [559] 680 732 252 O Arm Sa
Attr: θ’ 740 255 612 3006 137 643] > rel
Var: lemma] om Sa | 7a sub ※ 740 255 612 3004 137 3006 260 643 252 O Arm
NonGr: Syh† et (pr ※ μ) inter arbores clamabant (+ tert)
La Arm ※ ἐν μέσῳ ὑπάρξεως ἄνθρωποι

165
σ’ μεταξὺ φυτῶν ἄγρίων ἥχοῦντες λιμῶδες

Wit1:  
C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI
Attr:  
σ’ 139; > 643
Var:  
φυτῶν] ϕ.: τῶν 138 | λιμῶδες C (= 788-250 3005) cII
λιμῶδες 138 139 255 260 395 612 643 680 740; λιμῶδης 3006

Notes:  The Nachlese comments that the Edition was not quite clear that the oldest Greek catena contains two separate fragments for Aq (see infra) and Sym (Nachlese, 403); therefore, there is no variant attribution to Aq. The reading of 138 is dependent on the Hagedorns, who have read φ τῶν. Furthermore, ms 680 has φυτῶν and not τῶν as in the Edition. The neuter λιμῶδες is considered the right reading in the Nachlese pace the Edition, since (1) this is the reading in the oldest Greek catena (788 also confirms this reading) and (2) Job 6:5a shows that Sym uses the adverbial function of the neuter singular, and wider Greek literature also confirms this usage (Edition, 340; Nachlese, 403; see esp. 389-90, where the Hagedorns provide an example from Plutarch; see also Woods, 141-2).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 252; AGK 3, 103; Nic, 454-5).

HT (בְּרִיָּהוּ)  (בְּשִׁיחִים בֵּין־)
E (ἀνὰ μέσον) εὐήχον (βοήσονται·)

α’ φυτῶν

Wit1:  
↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI
Attr:  
α’ 612; > C (= 250)

Notes:  The catena has separate readings for Aq and Sym (Nachlese, 403).

Job 30 8a

HT (בְּלִי־שֵׁם בְּנֵי־נָבָל גַּם־בְּנֵי)
LXX (ἀφρόνων υἱοὶ καὶ) ἀτίμων ὄνομα

σ’ ἀνωνύμων

166
Notes: The full reading of ms 395 is as follows: ἀτίμων· ἀνωνύμων (Kollationen, 190). The Beiträge draws attention to the Olymp Kommentar at Job 30:8: ἀνώνυμοι καὶ ἄδοξοι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Kommentar, 252, 23; AGK, vol III, 103; Beiträge, 39; Field, II 53 n 15). Probably, Sym has influenced the exegesis of Olymp in this case.

HT (בְּנֵי בְּלִי־שֵׁם (רָכָּבָא, בְּרֵי־בִילָם
E (ἀφρόνων υἱοὶ) καὶ ἀτίμων (ὀνόμα)

Sub ※

Notes: La preserves these two words under the asterisk, which is probably a mistake for the original placement before ἀτίμων ὄνομα.

Job 30 9a
HT (_below
LXX (νυνὶ δὲ) κιθάρα (ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτῶν,)

σ′ μελῳδία

Notes: The noun, μελῳδία, occurs in Aq and Sym and once in 4 Makk 15:21. Sym uses this noun once elsewhere in Ps 91:4 for הִגָּיוֹן (Busto Saiz, 548).

Job 30 10b
HT (_below
LXX (ἀπό δὲ προσώπου μου οὐκ ἔφεισαντο) πτύελον.

σ′ πτύοντες
Notes: Πτυεῖν is used once by Sym and twice in the LXX (Num 12:14, Sir 28:12), where in Num it renders יָרַק.

Job 30 11b-13a

HT

καὶ χαλινὸν τοῦ προσώπου μου ἐξαπέστειλαν.
ἐπὶ δεξιῶν βλαστοῦ ἐπανέστησαν,
πόδα αὐτῶν ἐξέτειναν
καὶ ὁδοποίησαν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ τρίβους ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν.
ἐξετρίβησαν τρίβοι μου,

Sub *

Var: lemma] om Sa | 11b-13a sub ※ 3005(non 13a) 740(non 13a) 255 612 3004 395 680) 3006 137 643
Syh[ ※] > rel

NonGr: Syh[ ※]
Notes: The stichometry differs between the Edition and the catena, which is problematic when the actual data of the mss is compared to Ziegler’s II App. Most of the catena mss do not preserve 13a under the asterisk because 12c of the Edition is divided into two lines in these witnesses. 12c1 is as follows: καὶ ὡδοποίησαν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ, while 12c2 (now the fifth line) is as follows: τρίβους ἀπωλείας συτῶν. Mss 255 612 have the same stichometry as these other witnesses but they have six asterisked lines even though the attribution states five lines.

This text is not placed under the asterisk in La according to de Legarde’s text pace the Edition. Although the text of La is hexaplaric, it does not aid in determining the placement of the asterisk for these lines and therefore it has been omitted from the evidence.

Job 30 11b

HT

E

Notes: This is the only example of this type of fragment in Syh Job 22-42; thus conclusions about its meaning will necessarily be preliminary. The index is over ܕܪ in Syhtxt. In this context, the scholion indicates that the Aq lemma is identical to the օ’ text. The Seventy is to be understood as a reference to the fifth column of Origen’s Hexapla. In this instance Origen marked the text added to the OG with asterisks and attributed it to Th (see supra). The Wit2 line, cited from Ziegler’s I App, shows that the O-La group and catena preserved the singular, while a few notable witnesses attest the plural (e.g. S* La). The O group is split, since Syh has the singular and La attests the plural, which agrees with M. It is probable that the note intended to show that Aq agreed with a text similar to La, since this text also agrees with HT, a text which resembled Aq’s.

Job 30 12a

HT

E

Notes: The stichometry differs between the Edition and the catena, which is problematic when the actual data of the mss is compared to Ziegler’s II App. Most of the catena mss do not preserve 13a under the asterisk because 12c of the Edition is divided into two lines in these witnesses. 12c1 is as follows: καὶ ὡδοποίησαν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ, while 12c2 (now the fifth line) is as follows: τρίβους ἀπωλείας συτῶν. Mss 255 612 have the same stichometry as these other witnesses but they have six asterisked lines even though the attribution states five lines.

This text is not placed under the asterisk in La according to de Legarde’s text pace the Edition. Although the text of La is hexaplaric, it does not aid in determining the placement of the asterisk for these lines and therefore it has been omitted from the evidence.

Job 30 11b

HT

E

Notes: This is the only example of this type of fragment in Syh Job 22-42; thus conclusions about its meaning will necessarily be preliminary. The index is over ܕܪ in Syhtxt. In this context, the scholion indicates that the Aq lemma is identical to the օ’ text. The Seventy is to be understood as a reference to the fifth column of Origen’s Hexapla. In this instance Origen marked the text added to the OG with asterisks and attributed it to Th (see supra). The Wit2 line, cited from Ziegler’s I App, shows that the O-La group and catena preserved the singular, while a few notable witnesses attest the plural (e.g. S* La). The O group is split, since Syh has the singular and La attests the plural, which agrees with M. It is probable that the note intended to show that Aq agreed with a text similar to La, since this text also agrees with HT, a text which resembled Aq’s.

Job 30 12a

HT

E

Notes: The stichometry differs between the Edition and the catena, which is problematic when the actual data of the mss is compared to Ziegler’s II App. Most of the catena mss do not preserve 13a under the asterisk because 12c of the Edition is divided into two lines in these witnesses. 12c1 is as follows: καὶ ὡδοποίησαν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ, while 12c2 (now the fifth line) is as follows: τρίβους ἀπωλείας συτῶν. Mss 255 612 have the same stichometry as these other witnesses but they have six asterisked lines even though the attribution states five lines.

This text is not placed under the asterisk in La according to de Legarde’s text pace the Edition. Although the text of La is hexaplaric, it does not aid in determining the placement of the asterisk for these lines and therefore it has been omitted from the evidence.

Job 30 11b

HT

E

Notes: This is the only example of this type of fragment in Syh Job 22-42; thus conclusions about its meaning will necessarily be preliminary. The index is over ܕܪ in Syhtxt. In this context, the scholion indicates that the Aq lemma is identical to the օ’ text. The Seventy is to be understood as a reference to the fifth column of Origen’s Hexapla. In this instance Origen marked the text added to the OG with asterisks and attributed it to Th (see supra). The Wit2 line, cited from Ziegler’s I App, shows that the O-La group and catena preserved the singular, while a few notable witnesses attest the plural (e.g. S* La). The O group is split, since Syh has the singular and La attests the plural, which agrees with M. It is probable that the note intended to show that Aq agreed with a text similar to La, since this text also agrees with HT, a text which resembled Aq’s.

Job 30 12a

HT

E

Notes: The stichometry differs between the Edition and the catena, which is problematic when the actual data of the mss is compared to Ziegler’s II App. Most of the catena mss do not preserve 13a under the asterisk because 12c of the Edition is divided into two lines in these witnesses. 12c1 is as follows: καὶ ὡδοποίησαν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ, while 12c2 (now the fifth line) is as follows: τρίβους ἀπωλείας συτῶν. Mss 255 612 have the same stichometry as these other witnesses but they have six asterisked lines even though the attribution states five lines.

This text is not placed under the asterisk in La according to de Legarde’s text pace the Edition. Although the text of La is hexaplaric, it does not aid in determining the placement of the asterisk for these lines and therefore it has been omitted from the evidence.

Job 30 11b

HT

E

Notes: This is the only example of this type of fragment in Syh Job 22-42; thus conclusions about its meaning will necessarily be preliminary. The index is over ܕܪ in Syhtxt. In this context, the scholion indicates that the Aq lemma is identical to the օ’ text. The Seventy is to be understood as a reference to the fifth column of Origen’s Hexapla. In this instance Origen marked the text added to the OG with asterisks and attributed it to Th (see supra). The Wit2 line, cited from Ziegler’s I App, shows that the O-La group and catena preserved the singular, while a few notable witnesses attest the plural (e.g. S* La). The O group is split, since Syh has the singular and La attests the plural, which agrees with M. It is probable that the note intended to show that Aq agreed with a text similar to La, since this text also agrees with HT, a text which resembled Aq’s.
ἀνέστησαν

*Wit1*: lemma] 252 [βλαστῶντος] Syh

*NonGr*: Syh ἁρπαξ.

**Job 30 12c**

*HT*

(καὶ ὁδοποίησαν ἐπὶ ἐμὲ τρίβους) ἀπωλείας (αὐτῶν)

*E*

(καὶ ὁδοποίησαν ἐπὶ ἐμὲ τρίβους) ἀπωλείας (αὐτῶν)

**αʹ**

ἐπιβλυσμοῦ

*Wit1*: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 139 260 [559] 643 732 3006 ↓cII ↓555

*Attr*: αʹ] > C (= 788-250)

*Var*: ἐπιβλυσμοῦ] ἐπικλυσμοῦ (ἐπικλησμοῦ cod) C (= 250); ἐπιβλησμοῦ 395; ἐπιβλυσμῷ 259-748 555

**Notes**: The *C* (= 257 788 3005) group has probably preserved the correct reading. The reading of 250 ἐπικλυσμός resembles the problem in 252 at 21:17b, where the Aq fragment was emended by Ziegler from ἐπικλυσμός to ἐπιβλυσμός, even though he was undecided on the original Aq version (Beiträge, 33; see also Woods, 389). Regarding the original version, there are two considerations: (1) since 250 is a descendent of 788, it is now clear that the reading in 250 is not a separate fragment, but a copyist’s mistake for original ἐπιβλυσμός, (2) Aq uses ἐπιβλυσμός for ἀμ "stream of fresh water" in Gen 2:6 and for ἀμ "final disaster" in Prov 1:26 (ms 248; only Nobil in Field), but he does not use ἐπικλυσμός unless Job 21:17b in 252 is admitted as an instance.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 254; AGK 3, 105; Nic, 456).

**Job 30 15b**

*HT*

(ὄχετο) μου ἡ ἐλπὶς (ὡς πτερ πνεῦμα)

*LXX*

(ὄχετο) μου ἡ ἐλπὶς (ὡς πτερ πνεῦμα)

**σʹ**

tà καταθύμιά μου

*Wit1*: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI 139 395 [559] 732 cII 555

*Attr*: σʹ] > C (= 788-250) 643

*Var*: μου] > 137
Notes: The C (= 257 788-250 3005) group demonstrates that the longer reading in Field, τὰ καταθύμιά μου δικήν ἅνεμον παρεληλυθότος, should be traced not to Symmachus but to the Nicetas catena, which falsely attributed the commentary to Olympiodorus (Field, 53; Beiträge, 39).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 254; AGK 3, 106; Nic, 457).

Job 30 15c

HT (העשות (קשתה:))
LXX (καὶ ὅσπερ νέφος) — (ἡ σωτηρία μου.)

α’ θ’ παρηλθεν

Wit1: Syh

Wit2: ἡ σωτ. μου] pr παρηλθεν La (∗ transiiit) II Aeth = M; + παρηλθεν L’–637

NonGr: 

Notes: The index is at the end of the line in Syh: ܠ. In La, ms μ has the asterisk before transiiit, while ms β has it before nubes (∗ nubes transiiit ‘)

Job 30 16a

HT

E καὶ νῦν ἐτ’ ἐμε ἐκχυθήσεται ἡ ψυχή μου,

θ’ Sub ∗

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI–138 260 [559] 680 732 3006 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh[xi]

Attr: θ’ Syh[xi] ἐκ θ’ καὶ σ’ 3005 788 250 255 612 3004 395; (16b) ἐκ θ’ καὶ σ’ 740 3006 137 643

Var: lemma] om Sa | 16a sub ∗ 3005(ad  porr) 788(ad  porr) 740(b) 255 612(ad  porr) 3004 395 137(b) 643 139(b) 248(mend 16-18) 252 (16ab) La Syh[xi]

NonGr: Syh[cxi] ܡܪܡ ܚܠܡ ܕܝܠܝ ܬܬܐܫ ܢ đốc
La ∗ et nunc super me effundetur anima mea,
Arm ∗ Եւ արդ զինեւ զեղցի անձն իմ
Notes: The asterisked line is attested at 16a in Syh La Arm and Sa (negatively). The Greek witnesses, therefore, are divided between those preserving the asterisk or having the attribution at 16a and those having the variant at 16b. The line is correctly attributed to Th and not both Th and Sym due to translation technique of the ḫaw. Th renders ḫaw with καί almost ubiquitously (Gentry, 366), while Sym avoids translating ḫaw with καί (Salvesen, 220). Translation technique also confirms that the asterisk is at 16a, not 16b, for the same reason.

Job 30 17a

| HT        | לֵאָלָי (מֵעָלָי) | נִקַּר (עֲצָמַי) |
| LXX       | νυκτὶ (δὲ μου τὰ ὀστᾶ) συγκέκαυται |

\[\lambda\]’ ΣΥΓΚΕΚΟΠΠΑΙ ΝΥΚΤΟΣ

\[\text{Wit}1:\] lemma [C (= 257) | νυκτός] C (= 788-250) ↓ cI–137 139 260 [559] 643 732 740 3006

\[\text{Attr:}\] λ’ Ἀλλος Field

\[\text{Var:}\] νυκτός] νοικτος 138

Notes: Although it might be plausible to analyze the fragment in 257 as an erroneous transfer of the OG (συγκέκαυται), more probably it represents a translation for נקר “to prick, to gouge” (Nachlese, 403-4). One expects revision of the OG, since it represents either exegesis or a different Vorlage (ר/ד confusion) which is in the Qumran Targum of Job (יקד from יקדם “to burn”).2

Job 30 18b

| HT        | כְּפִי כֻתָּנְתִּי יַאַזְרֵנִי |
| E         | ὡσπέρ τὸ περιστόμιον τοῦ χιτῶνός μου περιέσχεν με. |

\[\text{θ’} \text{ Sub} \] ※

\[\text{Wit}1:\] C (= 3005) cI–137 138 139 260 395 [559] 643 680 732 3004 3006 248 Sa La Syh²

\[\text{Attr:}\] θ’ 3005 740 255 612 Syh²] > rel

\[\text{Var:}\] lemma] om Sa | 18b sub ※ 3005 740 255 612 248 La Syh²

---

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{txt} \( \text{et (\textstar pr \( \mu \); \textstar uirtute \( \beta \)) quasi ora vestimenti mei circundedit me.} \)

Job 30 20b

HT
\[ \text{"\textstar ܢܝܐܝܟ ܒܪ ܨܘܪܐ ܕܟܘܬܝܢܐ \textstar} \]

E
\[ \text{"\textstar ܐܝܟ ܒܪ ܪܘܬܐ ܕܟܘܬܝܢܐ \textstar} \]

\( \text{θ'} \) Sub \( \textstar \)

\( \text{Wit1:} \) C (= 3005) cf\textsuperscript{137} 138 139 260 395 [559] 643 680 732 3006 248 Arm Sa Syh\textsuperscript{txt} La

Attr: \( \text{θ'} 3005 740 612 3004 Syh\textsuperscript{txt}] > \text{rel} \)

Var: lemma] om Sa | 18b sub \( \textstar 3005 740 255 612 3004 248 Arm La Syh\textsuperscript{txt} \)

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{txt} \( \text{et (\textstar pr \( \mu \); \textstar uirtute \( \beta \)) quasi ora vestimenti mei circundedit me.} \)

Job 30 21a

HT
\[ \text{חַקָּר אָכָזָר לָי} \]

LXX
\[ \text{ἐπέβης δὲ μοι ἀνελεήμων,} \]

\( \text{α'} \text{θ'} \)
\[ \text{ἐστράφης εἰς ἀνελεήμονά μοι} \]

\( \text{Wit1:} \) C (= 257)

Notes: This fragment has not been listed until now, and it corresponds to HT \( \text{חַקָּר אָכָזָר לָי} \) \( \text{(Nachlese, 404). There is evidence that Aq uses ἀνελεήμων for} \)
\( \text{אָכָזָרִי} \) \( \text{(Reider, 19).} \)

Job 30 22b

HT
\[ \text{חַקָּר אָכָזָר Q} \]

E
\[ \text{καὶ ἀπερρίψας μὲ ἀπὸ σωτηρίας.} \]

\( \text{θ'} \) Sub \( \textstar \)

\( \text{Wit1:} \) 248 252 Arm Fa Syh\textsuperscript{txt} La

Attr: \( \text{θ'} Syh\textsuperscript{txt}] > \text{rel} \)
Var: lemma] om Fa | 22b sub ※ 248 252 Arm La Syh

NonGr: Syh ※ La ※ et proiecisti me a salute (+ < β).
      Arm ※ la αὐτῇ γαίρειν αὐτῷ ἑρμηνεύει;

Job 30 24a
HT
LXX εἰ γὰρ διφέλου δυναίμην ἐμαυτὸν χειρώσασθαι,

αʹ πλὴν οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἐκπορθῆσαι (σ
ἐξαναλῶσαι) ἐξαποστελεῖ (χεῖρα)

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 54). The word χεῖρα has been included in parentheses in accordance with the Edition, since it is in the HT and in the other revisers (see infra). The word, יְע, is a hapax legomenon in the Hebrew Bible; therefore, it is not possible to analyze translation equivalents for this word.

σʹ ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν ἱσχύι ἐξετείνετο χεῖρ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 54).

θʹ πλὴν οὐκ εἰκῆ ἐξετείνειν χείρα

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes:
Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 54).

Job 30 24a
HT (אֶל לָא-בָּנִי יִשְׂרָאֵל)
LXX (אֵי γὰρ ὅφελον δυναίμην ἐμαυτὸν) χειρώσασθαι,

Sub ※

Wit1: Syh<sup>txt</sup>
NonGr: Syh<sup>txt</sup>

Notes: This instance of the asterisk in Syh is not in the Edition, but Field lists this text under the asterisk (Field, 54). This reading differs from the HT, but it is still represented in the HT.

Job 30 26a
HT רָעָכִּי טוֹ לָא-בָּנִי יִשְׂרָאֵל
LXX ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπέχων ἀγαθοῖς,

σʹ ἀγαθὰ προσεδεχόμην, ἦλθεν δὲ κακά

Wit1: ↓C (= 788–250 3005) ↓cI<sup>139</sup> [559] 732 cII 555
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 250)

Notes: The attribution to Chr in the Edition is not supported by the extant Chr-Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Chr-Kommentar, 157; AGK 3, 112; Nic, 460).

Job 30 27
HT מֵעַי רֻתְּחוּ וְלֹא־דָמּוּ קִדְּמֻנִי יְמֵי־עֹנִי׃
E ή κοιλία μου ἐξεζεσθεν καὶ οὐ σιωπήσεται,

προέφθασάν µε ἡµέραι πτωχείας.
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\[ \theta' \]

**Sub ※**

**Wit1:**  
\( C (= 788-250 3005) \) \( cl^{1-138} 260 395 [559] 680 732 248 \) Arm Co (= Sa Bo Fa)  
Syh\textsuperscript{xt} La

**Attr:**  
\( \theta' (\varepsilonkr\theta' \ oii' 3005 788-250 740 255 612 3004; \ \theta' \ oii' \ 643 137 3006^{\text{inc}}) \)  
Syh\textsuperscript{xt}] > rel

**Var:**  
lemma\] om Co | 27 sub ※ 3005 740(non 27b) 255 612 3004 137 643 139  
248 Arm La Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

**NonGr:**  
Syh\textsuperscript{xt}  

La  
venter (pr ※ \( \beta' \)) meus efferbuit, et non tacebit.  
occupaverunt me dies inopiae (+ \( \beta' \)).

Arm  
※ ημερημὴν μή τίνας ἴνα ἡμαρμηνῆγης  
※ διαφωνήματι ἢνα συνειπραπαρήθων

**Notes:**  
Ms 3006 probably contains the attribution since it follows 137 in the stemma, but the marginal note is very difficult to read. Only \( \cdot \).οι' \( \beta' \) is visible in the margin of the ms.

**Job 30 27a**

HT  

E  

οὐ ἐπαύσατο

\[ \sigma' \]

**Wit1:**  
\( \downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \) \( \downarrow cl^{1} 260 [559] 732 \) \( cll 555 \) \( \downarrow \) Syh

**Attr:**  
\( \sigma' ] > C (= 788-250) \)

**Var:**  
init[ καὶ Syh | ο\( \nu' \) ouk C (= 788) ] ἐπαύσατο] επαύσατο 680

**NonGr:**  
Syh \( \ast \) ἀκονεῖον 680 680

**Notes:**  
The καὶ probably arose from the bible text. The attribution to Olympiodorus in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 256-7; AGK 3, 112-3; Nic, 460-1).

**Job 30 28a**

176
**σ’** α’θυμομ쉬n

*Wit1:* ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-138 139 [559]

*Attr:* σ’] > C (= 250 3005)

*Var:* αθυμομ쉬ν αθυμό 3006

*Notes:* Ms 788 is the first C ms to preserve the attribution to Sym.

**Job 30 29b**

*HT* שָׁחַר מֵעָלָי (רִיעוֹ)

*LXX* τὸ δὲ δέρμα μου) ἐσκότωται μεγάλως,

**θ’** ※ θυγατέρων στρουθῶν

*Wit1:* Syh\textsuperscript{xxi}

*Wit2:* στρουθῶν filiarum struthionum O: cf M

*NonGr:* Syh\textsuperscript{xxi}

**σ’** στρουθοκαμήλων

*Wit1:* ↓C (= 788 3005) ↓cI-138 [559] cII 555 161 Ol\textsuperscript{Y}

*Attr:* σ’] > C (= 788) 395

*Notes:* The fragment and attribution are attested in C for the first time.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition stands, since it is confirmed by Kommentar (Kommentar, 257; Nic, 461). Although there is no explicit attribution to Sym, στρουθοκαμήλων, appears in the oldest catena of Job in commentary partly attributed to Olymp (AGK 3, 114).

**Job 30 30a**

*HT* תָּנִירוֹ (שָׁהְר מִשָּׁל)

*LXX* (το δε δέρμα μου) ἐσκότωται μεγάλως,
λ’ ἐμελανώθη ἐπάνω μου

**Wit1:**  ↓C (= 257 788 3005) ↓cI \(^{1-138}\) [559] ↓cII ↓555 ↓161

**Wit2:** ἐσκότωται] μεμελανωται O (innigrata est) \(L^{637}\)

**Attr:** λ’ γ’ C (= 257); > 395 680 732 3006

**Var:** ἐμελανώθη \(\text{conj.}\) ἐμελανωθ(η) C (= 257); ἐμελανθη C (= 3005) 139 255 260 395 612 680 740 cII 555 161; ἐμελανθ(η) C (= 788) 643 732 3006; ἐμελανθην 137 | ἐπάνω μου C (= 257)] εἰς βάθος cII 555 161; > C (= 788 3005) cI \(^{1-138}\) [559]

**Notes:** The lemma comes from ms 257 exclusively, and the Nachlese considers it to be complete for the following reasons: (1) ἐπάνω μου is the correct rendering of מֵעָלָי and (2) ἐμελανώθη (from μελανόομαι), although used relatively infrequently (170x [c. 10x through 2nd century CE]), is probably the correct reading of the Three, since it may be the only means for explaining the reading of O (μεμελάνωται), while the rest of the LXX tradition has ἐσκότωται (Nachlese, 404). Later scribes probably changed the less familiar ἐμελανώθη to the more familiar ἐμελάνθη (1485x [c. 400x through 2nd century CE]), and 788 3005 already attest to this early modification as they agree with cI in this respect. Given this reconstruction, cII would have received a fragment with no prepositional phrase (it is absent from 788 3005 cI), and therefore, the Nachlese explains correctly that the addition, εἰς βάθος, which is attested only in cII, is an invention of the compiler of this catena (Nachlese, 404; Beiträge, 39).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported in Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 257-8; AGK 3, 115; Nic, 461).

**Job 30 30b**

**HT**

(ינמַמֵּר) חָרָה (מֵעָלָי)

Ε

(τὰ δὲ ὀστὰ μου)—(ἀπὸ καύματος.)

\(\theta’\)

※ συνεφρύγησαν

**Wit1:** \(C^{\text{exi}} (= 3005) c^{\text{exi}} (= 740 255 612 3004) \text{Syh}^{\text{exi}}\)

---

\(^{3}\)TLG [on-line]; accessed September 9 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sfts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet.

Wit2: ἀπὸ καύμ. [pr συνεφρύγη III C (= 250 3005) cI-[559] cII 248^{mg} 253’ 706
795 (-φριγη) = M; pr (* O) συνεφρύγησαν O d 296 480 Aeth O{comb}; +
συνεφρύγη L’’-396’-613; + συνεφρύγησαν S^{c}-644^{c}

Attr: Θ’ 3005^{txt} 740^{txt} 3004 Syh^{txt}] > rel

Var: lemma sub ※ 740^{txt} 255^{txt}(※ pr τα) 612^{txt}(※ pr απο) 3004(pr ὀστά) O

NonGr: Syh^{txt} et ossa mea ※ frixa sunt (+ ε β) ab aestu.

Notes: Ms 3004 preserves the asterisk and the attribution in the margin with an
index at ὀστά in the bible text. The Kollationen has provided detailed information
regarding the presence, absence, and the placement of the asterisk in the cl group and has
reported that 3005 preserves the attribution to Theodotion (Kollationen, 193). The Wit2
line contains the data from Edition’s App I.

The plural is probably the original reading for the following reasons: (1) the O
group contains this reading and it is most natural to suppose that these witnesses preserve
Origen’s insertion of the Th lemma (συνεφρύγησαν) into the fifth column. In contrast,
Dhorme supposes that the Th lemma is singular originally, but has passed into Syh and
La as a plural (Dhorme, 448). (2) Although it is possible that Th had a different
vocalization than M, the problem is better treated by considering the translator’s
approach to the Schema Atticum, which Peter Gentry provided in his study. There are ten
instances under the asterisk where the subject of the verb is neuter plural. The Greek verb
is singular in four of these instances, but more significantly the Hebrew verb is singular
(Gentry, 225). In the other six instances, the Greek verb is plural, and in all but two of
these instances, the Hebrew verb is also plural (Gentry, 226). In Job 18:15b, Gentry
suggests that there is a natural tendency in Th to ignore the Schema Atticum in Th, since
in this case the Hebrew verb is singular, while the Greek verb is plural. In Job 12:7b, he
posits that the verb is plural in Th since the verb in the OG is plural, yet this example is
closest to this instance, since the Hebrew subject is singular (עוף), but the OG has a
plural subject (πετεινόν). The change from singular to plural may also have caused the
change from a singular verb in Hebrew (ה AuthService) to a plural verb in the OG
(אמר AuthService). Th translates the Hebrew singular collective nouns with Greek plurals
and this happens with πετεινόν specifically in 12:7b and in 28:21b (see Gentry, 104, esp.
n. 71). This same tendency may be operative with the word שמן as translated by ὀστά.
(3) The change from an original plural to singular may be explained via concern for the
Schema Atticum in some sources. In this case the Lucianic group contains a singular verb
in 30:30b, 18:15b, 12:7b, and 20:11a (A’-637-Chr Iul), where OG or Th contained a
plural verb. It is probable that in our case, the catena preserves the correct attribution and
the asterisk, but its text has been corrupted by the Lucianic recension due to Greek
stylistic concerns.

Job 30 31a
HT
(כִּנֹּרִי)
לְאֵבֶל
(וַיְהִי)

LXX
(ἀπέβη δὲ) εἰς πάθος (μου ἡ κιθάρα.)

\[ \gamma' \]
εἰς πένθος

Wit1: Syh
Wit2: πάθος B΄-S 252 542 575' 706 797] πένθος rel
NonGr: Syh ṮᏩ.Ʌ
Notes: The index is over ṮᏩ in Syh\textsuperscript{txt}. 
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Chapter 31

Job 31 1a-4b

HT

ברית כרトー לַעֵינֵי
וּתִּבּוֹנֵן עַל־בְּתוּלָה׃
ְניָתִתה שִׁיר מְפֶרֶתְיוֹ:
ְלֹא־יָרֶנֶו לֹא־לֹא
ְבְּכֶר לַפֶּשֶל שָׁרוּ.
ְלֹא־יוּדוּ הָרִאֲנָה דְרָכֶנָּי
ְכָל־צְעָדַתי יִסְפּוֹר׃

E

diaθήκην ἐθέμην τοῖς οφθαλμοῖς μου καὶ οὐ συνῆσω ἐπὶ παρθένον.
καὶ τί ἐμέρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπάνωθεν καὶ κληρονομία ἱκανοῦ ἐξ ὑψίστων;
οὐχὶ ἀπώλεια τῷ ἀδίκῳ καὶ ἀπαλλοτρίωσις τοῖς ποιοῦσιν ἀνομίαν;
οὐχὶ αὐτὸς ὁμαλώσει ὁδὸν μου καὶ πάντα τὰ διαβήματά μου ἐξαρίθμησεται;

αʹ θʹ Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cf-[559] 680 732 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syhtxt

Attr: 1ab 2b-4 θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ ζ′ ομ() πρ() 740; ἐκ θʹ οἱ ζ′ ομ() πρ()κ() 3005 255 612 3004; ἐκ θʹ οἱ (> 3006 643) ζ′ 3006 137 643; ομ() πρ() ἐκ θʹ οἱ ζ′ 395 (1b) Syh] > rel | 2a αʹ (τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν αʹ (σκυλ.) 3005 788-250 138-255 3004) 740 612 643] θʹ Syh; > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 1-4 sub ※ 3005 740(non 4b) 255(non 2a 4b) 612 (non 4b) 3004(non 2b 3 4) 395(non 4a 4b) 137(non 3a 4b) 3006(non 1 3b 4) 260(non 3b) 643(non 3b 4a) 139(non 1 2a 3 4a) 248 252 706 Arm La(non 2a 3b-4) Syhxt

NonGr: Syhtxt
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Notes: The Edition did not present the evidence clearly and therefore the reader may be led to an incomplete picture of the problems in these verses. The placement of the asterisk will be treated first and then the attribution.

There is reasonable certainty that all eight lines belong under the asterisk on the witness of 248 252 706 Syh Arm and the negative evidence of Sa, which omits the text. The catena tradition is conflicted in this instance. Ms 3005 is the only catena ms, which places all eight lines under the asterisk, while the rest of the mss place 1a-4a (7 lines) under the asterisk, and these mss attest that the “seven stichs” come from Theodotion. Unfortunately, 788-250 does not preserve any of these lines under the asterisk and therefore it also lacks the note attributing the text to Theodotion.

The attribution for these lines is more difficult to determine. Syh attributes all eight lines to Theodotion, while the catena witnesses are again divided. Most of the catena mss attest that seven stichs (ἐκ Θ’ οἱ Ζ) are from Theodotion. These witnesses also contain another marginal note, which the Edition omitted but the Kollationen has preserved: τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν Ἀκύλα (194). Mss 138 and 255 place the note at the end of 2a, near the word ἀπάνωθεν. Ms 788-250 preserves this note, but it is further to the right of the end of the line making less clear to what the note actually refers. Ms 740 places the note before the line, and ms 3005 places it also before the line but clearly below the line without an index. These factors make difficult it to ascertain what the catena tradition is attributing to Aquila, but there are two options: (1) the word ἀπάνωθεν, which seems to be the intention of 138 and 255 and is the most natural meaning of the pronoun τοῦτο, since στίχος is masculine, or (2) the whole line, which seems to be the intention of the rest of the mss which preserve this note, since some place it at the beginning of the line

La  ※ testamentum feci oculis meis,
et (pr ※ μ) non cogitavi de virgine.
et quae est pars alia dei desuper (+ √ β μ),
et (pr ※ μ) hereditas omnipotentis de excelsis.
nonne (pr ※ μ) perditio erit iniquo,
et abalienatio facientibus iniquitatem?
nonne ipse videbit viam meam,
et omnes gressus meos dixerunt?
(i.e. 740 3005) or at some distance from the last word of the line (i.e. 788-250). Realizing that the former interpretation is fully possible, the two marginal notes are better read as complementary and this assumption provides a basis for interpreting both notes. Since one marginal note indicates that seven lines come from Theodotion and the other that some element (τοῦτο) is from Aquila, it seems better to interpret the Aquila note as referring to the line, not simply one word in the line. Conversely, since the mss gave attention to line 2a and attribute it to Aquila, it seems probable that one should subtract 2a from the lines attributed to Theodotion, leaving him with seven lines; thus, originally, there were eight lines under the asterisk, and seven of these were attributed to Theodotion (1ab, 2b-4b) and one to Aquila (2a). The Aq fragment at 2a in the Edition should be removed and the asterisked data should be updated.

Job 31 1b

HT  יַהֲנָנִית אֵשָׁנִית בְּתוּלָה׃
E   καὶ οὐ συνήσω ἐπὶ παρθένον.

αʹ  καὶ τί κατανοήσω ἐπὶ παρθένον

Wit1: lemma] ↓252 | καὶ—κατανοήσω] Syh
Var: κατανοήσω] συνήσω 252
NonGr: Syh +κατανοέωκατανοέω

Notes: Ms 252 has borrowed the verb from the LXX and therefore it is to be considered secondary. The retroversion and the following rationale come from Field. First, Aquila renders Hebrew הִתְבּוֹנֵן with κατανοέω in Job 23:15 (Θʹ), 37:14, and 38:18. Second, Syh (_catalog) may be retroverted with κατανοέω on the evidence furnished in Job 30:20, Ps 93(94):9, and (142):5 (Field, 54). In Curaeus, Middeldorpf conforms the Aq reading to Holmes-Parsons (συνήσω), even when he initially had κατανοέω (Curaeus, 626; Field, 54).

σʹ  καὶ οὐδὲν ἐνενόησα περὶ παρθένου

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cII-[559] 732 cII 555 ↓252 Syh
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 250 257) 3006
NonGr: Syh +κατανοέωκατανοέω
Notes: The Edition has ἐνόησα for Syh and 252, but it may have overlooked Field’s rational for ἐνόησα as the retroversion of אֶתָּכָה. Field notes that אֶתָּכָה may be retroverted with ἐνοέω according to Job 1:5, Isa 41:20, and most significantly Sym Psalms 140(141):4. The Syriac word may also be retroverted with νοέω according to Job 20:9, Prov 1:2, 3, and 19:5 (Field, 54-5). The evidence is divided, but the occurrence in the Psalter is sufficient to posit that Syh does not contain a variant in this case. The reading of 252 was caused by an inner Greek error of haplography due to homoioarcton or homoioteleuton. The reading παρθένου in 788 is παρθ(έν)ου.

Job 31 5a

HT אַשָּרֶךְ (תְּנָשָׁרֶךְ)
LXX (εἰ δὲ ήτιν πεπορευμένος) μετὰ γελοιαστῶν,

θ′ μετὰ ματαιότητος

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI 138 [559] 732 ↓ cII ↓ 555 ↓ 161
Attr: θ′] σ′ cII 555 161; > C (= 788-250)

Notes: The attribution to Sym in cII may have been caused by the Sym fragment in 252 (see infra).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 259; AGK 3, 118; Nic, 465).

σ′ ἐν ματαιότητι

Wit1: 252

Notes: Sym uses μάταιος to translate שָׁוְא in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 546); therefore, 252 probably preserves the correct Sym reading.

Job 31 6a

HT יִשְׁקְלֵנִי בְּמֹאזְנֵי־צֶדֶק
LXX ἱσταίη με ἀρα ἐν ζυγῷ δικαίῳ,

α′ σταθμίσει με ἐν ζυγῷ δικαίῳ

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI 732 cII 555 161
Attr: α′] > C (= 3005)
Notes: Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Aq and the lemma belong to the oldest Greek catena. Ziegler asserts that εν ζυγῷ δικαιο is not from Aq but from the LXX, since Aq renders מזזו with ζυγιον in Prov 11:1 and 16:11 and Aq has exact equivalents for צדוק, צדיק, and צדקא (Beiträge, 60-1). There are two problems with Ziegler’s suggestion: (1) the evidence from Proverbs is based on Nobil in Field and has not yet been confirmed. (2) The earliest evidence from the catena includes the prepositional phrase, and therefore until sound evidence to the contrary surfaces, the whole fragment should be considered as from Aq.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 259; AGK 3, 119; Nic, 465).

Job 31 6b

HT (אלא ומענה)
LXX οIdle δε (ο κυριος την ακακιαν mou.)

και γνοιη

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732

Attr: σʹ] > 3006

Notes: In all manuscripts, except C (= 788-250 3005), the fragment is introduced with the words αντι του (Kollationen, 195). In 559, the fragment is at 31:7a, which may explain partially Field’s misplacement of the fragment for ει εξεκλινεν (Kollationen, 195; Beiträge, 40; Field, 55).

Job 31 8b

HT ( kristo)
LXX αρριζος δε γενοιμην επι γης.

και τα έγκονα μου έκριζθειη

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732 cII 555 ↓161 ↓Syh

Attr: σʹ] λ' Syh; > C (= 250 257) 138-255

Var: έγκονα] εγγονα 161
Notes: The Edition has ἔγκονα for the c group, but 512-513 555 actually affirm the lemma; thus Ziegler’s other c mss must have this variant. Ms 3005 is the first C witness to confirm the attribution to Sym. Now 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym belongs to the oldest Greek catena. The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 260; AGK 3, 121; Nic, 466).

Job 31 9a

HT

LXX

\[\text{α’ θ’ ηπατήθη}\]

\[\text{α’ θ’ 257] α’ 788 3005; > 250}\]

Notes: The Edition lists this reading only as from 257, but the Nachlese has provided the evidence of 250 and 3005, the latter preserving the attribution to Aquila only (Nachlese, 404). Ms 788 adds further evidence that this fragment belongs only to Aq. The double attribution of 257, however, is still probably original, since the external evidence lists the attribution to Aq, and Th uses ἀπατᾶν to render פתָּה in Job 31:27; therefore, the double attribution in 257 is probably correct.

\[\sigma’ \text{ ἥρμησεν}\]

\[\text{σ’} > C (= 250)\]

Notes: The Nachlese presents this new fragment, which is only preserved in C (Nachlese, 404). Ms 788 confirms the fragment and the attribution to Sym, which was only known previously in 3005. The reason for the translation of פָתָה “to be deceived” with ὡρμᾶω “to rush, hasten” is not immediately clear. The Nachlese suggests that Sym may have thought פָתָה meant “to head in a particular direction,” but positing a different Vorlage is unnecessary, since in all probability Sym only clarifies the translation of the Greek text, ἔξηκαλουθήσεω “to follow.” Sym is primarily interested in revising the OG, since he uses the verb in the active voice (= LXX) and not the middle/passive (= HT Aq.
Th). Sym, therefore, does not attempt a translation of HT *de novo*, but only attempts to revise the Greek text before him.

**Job 31 9b**

HT  
(ἐκλέψατε Ῥησίων Ἀρβήτς)

LXX  
(ἐστεὶ καὶ) ἕγκαθετος ἑγενόμην (ἐπὶ θύρας αὐτῆς)

\[\lambda^′\]  
\[\text{ἐνήδρευσα}\]

*Wit1:* \[\downarrow C (= 257 788-250 3005) cI 139 260 395 732 cII 555 \downarrow 161′ \downarrow 252\]

*Attr:* \[\lambda^′ \sigma^′ α′ 248; \alpha′ 252; > C (= 257)\]

*Notes:* The oldest Greek catena, \[C (= 788-250 3005)\], has preserved the proper attribution of this fragment, since the Three use ἐνεδρεύειν to render בֹּר (H-R, 472).

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 260; *AGK* 3, 122; Nic, 467).

**Job 31 10a**

HT  
(הָנַשׁ (לָאָבְרִים))

LXX  
ἀρέσαι (ἀρα καὶ ἡ γυνή μου ἐτέρῳ)

\[\epsilon βρ′\]  
\[\text{ἀλέσαι}\]

*Wit1:* Nobil

*Notes:* The reading is in Field with the following note: *Schol. apud Nobil.* (Field, 55). There is no record of this reading in the available sources.

**Job 31 11ab**

HT  
כִּרְדוֹנָה (עֲמָה) (Q) הָנַשׁ (לָאָבְרִים)

LXX  
θυμὸς γὰρ ὀργῆς ἀκατάσχετος τὸ μιᾶναι ἀνδρὸς γυναῖκα.

\[σ′\]  
\[\text{ὀπερ ἐστὶ μῦσος καὶ τοῦτο ὑπερβάλλουσα ἀδικία}\]

*Wit1:* \[\downarrow C (= 257 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI 137 139 643 732 3006 cII (= 512-513 555) \downarrow 523\]

*Attr:* \[σ′ C (= 257 3005)] > C (= 788-250) cI 137 139 643 732 3006 523 512-513 555\]

Notes: The Nachlese says, “Both of these σ-Versions, while handed down in many cases, until now have remained unnoticed, because they are not marginal notes in all Γ-Hss with the exception of 740, but rather they appeared in exegetical comments and furthermore they were anonymous” (Nachlese, 404). The cII group (Nic) has preserved this fragment at the beginning of an exegetical comment at 12a, which we now know is a comment from Iul (Nachlese, 405; Iul-Kommentar, 190; Nic, 468). The C (= 257 3005) group has preserved the reading in the margins with the attribution to Sym at 11ab. Additionally, the Hagedorns show that Sym uses μύσος for זִמָּה in many places (cf. Le 18:17, Ps 25(26):10, Ezek 22:9, 23:21, 48) and 2) Sym has read פְּלִילִים as though from פלא, since he used υπερβάλω (cp. Vulg. maxima). This last problem occurs also in Ezek 16:52 where Sym used υπερβαλες for פָּלַל (Nachlese, 405).

Job 31 12a

HT כִּי אִם חַי אֶתַּבְדוּרֵךְ תָּאֵכְל
LXX πῦρ γάρ ἐστιν καιόμενον ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν μερῶν,

σ’ τύρ δὲ τὸ ἕως συντελείας ἀναλίσκον

Wit1: ↓ C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓ 249 ↓ cI-732 ↓ 754cat ↓ 523cat
Attr: σ’ C (= 257 3005)] Χρυ(σοστομου) 139 3006; > C (= 788-250) 249 cI 139 732 3006 754cat 523cat

Notes: The Nachlese lists this fragment among the hexaplaric materials for the first time (Nachlese, 405).

Job 31 13a

HT אֲמִתָּה (מִשְׁפַּט עַבְדִּי וַאֲמָתִי)
LXX (ei δε και) ἐφαύλισα (κρίμα θεράποντός μου ἢ θεραπαίνης)

α’ ἀπεέρριψα

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI-680 732 cII 555 161
Attr: α’] > C (= 250) 138 395
Var: ἀπέρριψα απεριψα C (= 788-250)

Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar nor AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 261; AGK 3, 124-5; Nic, 469).

HT
LXX

σ’ εἰ ὑπερεφρόνησα

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI-680 732 ↓ cII ↓ 555

Attr: σ’ C (= 788 3005)) > rel

Var: εἰ C (= 3005) ἦ 740; ἦ 137 138 139 255 260 395 559 643 3006 cII 555;
> C (= 788-250) 612

Notes: Ms 3005 is the first witness to preserve the attribution for this fragment, even though the Edition postulated this already. It is the only ms with the right spelling (εἰ instead of ἦ). Ziegler did not list ἦ (Nachlese, 405). Ms 788 also preserves the correct attribution, but it does not have εἰ.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar nor AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 261; AGK 3, 124-5; Nic, 469).

Job 31 13b

HT
LXX

α’ ἐν τῷ δικάζεσθαι αὐτοῦ σε μετ’ ἐμοῦ

Wit1: 252

Notes: Nearly without exception Aq uses the construction ἐν τῷ + infinitive to render ב + inf. cstr. (Hyvärinen, 74). Ms 252 has the Aq fragment, which preserves his revision of the genitive absolute construction in the LXX.

Job 31 14b

HT
LXX

189
σ’ ἐὰν ἐπιζητῇ, τί ἀποκρινοῦμαι αὐτῷ;

**Wit1:** ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732 cII 555

**Attr:** σ’] > C (= 250)

**Var:** ἐὰν] pr καὶ C (= 788-250); + καὶ 260 | ἐπιζητῇ] ἐπιζητεῖ 137 559

**Notes:** The preceding καὶ in 788-250 is an interesting variant that agrees with HT, but the misplacement of it in 260 probably indicates that it is an inner Greek error caused by harmonization with LXX.

The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 261; *AGK* 3, 124-5; Nic, 469).

**Job 31 15b**

HT (رؤיתם ברוחם א獸)

LXX (γεγόναμεν δὲ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κοιλίᾳ.

σ’ ἐν ὁμοίῳ τρόπῳ

**Wit1:** ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI-732 3006 cII 555

**Attr:** σ’] > C (= 250)

**Notes:** The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* nor *AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 261; *AGK* 3, 124-5; Nic, 469).

**Job 31 17b**

HT (רָלוֹאָבָאָל: הַרְחוֹם)

E (καὶ οὐ χῆ ὀρφανῷ μετέδωκα)—

θ’ ※ ἐξ αὐτοῦ

**Wit1:** C (= 3005) cI (= 740 255 612) 248 O

**Wit2:** fin B’-S* A-637-534’ Aeth Arm Eus (Dem) Cyr Did Dam Antioch] + (※ O) ἐξ αὐτοῦ rel = M

**Attr:** θ’ 3005 255 612] α’ 740; > rel
Notes: The attribution and asterisk are one line above in 612, which clearly marks the lemma as from Th. The addition is in the bible text of 138 248 and 559. In 395, μετέδωκα ἐξ αὐτοῦ is the ordinary lemma text and has no asterisk or attribution, but the asterisk is at the following verse and in the margin: ὁμοίως ἐκ θ’ οἱ (see infra; Kollationen, 198).

Job 31 18ab

HT

καὶ δοκήσας, ἐξακολούθησεν ὁμοίως εἰς τοῦ ἰσχύος μου, ἠδυνάμησεν τὸν κατάκομμαν ἐκ τοῦ προσμέτρου μου ἀπεκοιλήθη τοῦπροσμέτρου μου ἀπεκοιλήθη.

E

ὅτι ἐκ νεότητός μου ἐξέτρεφον ὡς πατὴρ καὶ ἐκ γαστρὸς μητρός μου ὡδήγησα·

θ’ Sub ※

Witl: cI 138 260 680 732 3006 248 Arm La Co Syh \[Eus (Dem) Spec

Attr: θ’ (ὁμοίως ἐκ θ’ οἱ 740 255 612 559 395) Syh] ] 137; > rel

Var: lemma] om Co Eus (Dem) Spec | 18 sub ※ 740(non 18b) 255 612 559 395 137 643(non 18b) 139(non 18b) Arm La Syh\[xxt

NonGr: Syh\[xt

Job 31 19ab

HT

(אֶשָּׁרָם אָוֹב מָכָל לָבְשָׁה

E

(εἴ δὲ καὶ ὑπερείδον γυμνὸν ἀπολλύμενον καὶ οὐκ ἢμφίασα,) —

Sub ※ μὴ ἔχοντα περιβόλαιον

191
Notes: La preserves the lemma under the asterisk, and it has the rest of verse 19 under the asterisk, which is not correct. Syh has the index at the end of v. 19b and preserves the lemma in the margin with the following scholion: “this was not placed in the exemplar of Origen” (Edition, 348; Field, 55).

Job 31 20a

HT (חֲלָצָיו Q) בֵּרֲכוּנִי חֲלָצָו אִם־לֹא

LXX ἀδύνατοι δὲ εἰ μὴ εὐλόγησάν με, αʹ καὶ οὐκ εὐλόγησάν με ὁσφύες αὐτοῦ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 55). The Aq fragment agrees with the Qere.

Job 31 20b

HT

LXX ἀπὸ δὲ κουράς ἀμνῶν μου ἔθερμάνθησαν οἱ ὀμοὶ αὐτῶν, θʹ καὶ ἀπὸ κουράς ἀμνῶν μου ἔθερμάνθησαν

Wit1: Syh
Notes: The index was placed wrongly at verse 20a. The text of Syh 31:20b reads as follows: The Th fragment has καί instead of δέ and it omits the subject, which the LXX made explicit.

Job 31 21a

HT (אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ) תִּיאִם הַנִּפְנוּ

LXX (εἰ ἐπῆρα) ὀρφανῷ (χεῖρα)

σ’ κατὰ ὀρφανοῦ

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI-137 643732 3006 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161’

Attr: σ’] > C (= 250)


Notes: The C (= 257 788-250 3005) group preserves the singular, which agrees with both the OG and the HT. The variants are best explained as deviating from this lemma. The Kollationen draws attention to the agreement of 248 with the Nicetas catena or cII group (Kollationen, 198). Field based his reading of the plural on Nic and Drusius and mss 248 and 259, another cII ms (Field, 55, esp. n. 20).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 262-3; AGK 3, 128; Nic, 471). The Sym fragment is embedded in the bible text according to Young’s edition and may not be connected to Olymp.

α’ θ’ ※ ἐπ’ ὀρφανὸς

Wit1: La Syh

Wit2: ὀρφανὸς] pr (※ O) επὶ O V (ἐπὶ)-575-Iul Co Spec (ad) = M

Attr: α’ θ’] > La

Var: ὀρφανὸς] + La

NonGr: Syh

La ※ super pupillum
Notes: The Syh has preserved the correct placement of the asterisk and the metobelus in this instance.

\[\gamma' \epsilon\beta\rho' \ast \muou \\]

**Wit1:** Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

**Wit2:** \[\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\varsigma \mu\nu \nu \text{V;} + (\ast \text{Syh}) \mu\nu \text{O 575-III-Iul Aeth Spec = M}

**NonGr:** Syh\textsuperscript{txt} 

Notes: Field notes Hieron.: \textit{manum} \ast \textit{meam} (Field, 55), but La\textsuperscript{vb} does not confirm this reading. Perhaps, Field supplied the asterisk for this reading, since the addition of \textit{meam} clearly indicates hexaplaric influence.

**Job 31 22a**

HT \[\text{כָּתֵפִי מְשָׁכִמוֹ (תֵהוֹל)}\]

LXX \[\text{ἀποσταίη (ἄρα ὁ οἴμος μου ἀπὸ τῆς κλειδός,)}\]

\[\alpha' \ \pi\epsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}t\omega\]

**Wit1:** \[\dagger248* 248\textsuperscript{e}\]

**Var:** \[\pi\epsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}t\omega 248\textsuperscript{c}] \[\pi\epsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}t\omega 248*\]

Notes: Field has “Nobil” as the evidence for this fragment, and 248 confirms the reading (Field, 55-6).

HT \[\text{כָּתֵפִי מְשָׁכִמוֹ (תֵהוֹל)}\]

LXX \[\text{ἀποσταίη ἄρα ὁ οἴμος μου ἀπὸ τῆς κλειδός,)}\]

\[\sigma' \ \tauou \ \acute{a}krwmiou\]

**Wit1:** \[\dagger C (= 788-250 3005) \dagger Cl^{-732} cII 555 \dagger 161\]

**Attr:** \[\sigma'] > C (= 250)\]

**Var:** \[\tauou \ η\ του C (= 3005) | \acute{a}krwmiou] ακρωμίου 3006; ακρωτομου 161\]

194
Notes: The attribution is put in a place where it might be mistaken in 395 (θ over σ, under the entries in each row) (Kollationen, 199). The Sym and Th lemmata are combined (θ′ σ′ τοῦ αὐχένος τοῦ ἀκρωμίου) in 137 139 260 643 680 3006 (Kollationen, 199; see infra). The variant in 161, noted already in Klostermann (Analecta, 73), but not in Field, is treated in the Beiträge. Ziegler notes that Sym uses ἀκρότομος for יְהוֹ in Job 22:24b Ps 30(31):3, and Ho 9:13 (α′ σ′); therefore, the hapax legomenon, ἀκρώμιον, should be preferred (Beiträge, 40).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 263; AGK 3, 128; Nic, 472).

\[\theta' \text{ τοῦ αὐχένος}\]

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) cI\(^{732}\) cII 555 161

Attr: θ′] > C (= 250)

Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 263; AGK 3, 128; Nic, 472).

Job 31 23b-24a

HT

לֹא אוּכָל׃ וּמִשְּׂאֵתוֹ אִם־שַׂמְתִּי זָהָב כִּסְלִי

E
cαι ἀπὸ τοῦ λήμματος αὐτοῦ οὐχ ὑποίσω.
eἰ ἔταξα χρυσίον ἵσχυν μου,

\[\theta' \text{ Sub ※}\]

Wit1: C (= 3005) cI (= 740 255 612) 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh\(^{ext}\)

Wit2: ἵσχυν εἰς (ως 706 Iul Chr VII 395\(^{p}\)) χουν B΄-S C Syh-253 L΄-336΄-644c 55 252\(^{mag}\) 542 543 706 Aeth Arm Chr VII 395 Max II 373 Dion (Nic p 97); pr εἰς 613

Attr: θ′ (ἐκ θ′ οἱ β‾ EA 3005 740 255 612) Syh\(^{ext}\)] > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 23b-24a sub ※ 3005(+ 23a; non 24a) 740(+ 23a; non 24a) 255(+ 23a; non 23b 24a) 612(+ 23a; non 24a) 248 252 Arm La(non 24a) Syh\(^{ext}\)

NonGr: Syh\(^{ext}\) a pondere eius non sustinebo
The catena has the asterisk at 23a-b and not at 23b-24a as the Edition presents. These mss are mistaken on the exact placement of the asterisks as 248 252 Arm Sa Syh make plain, but they still accurately testify to the attribution to Th.

**Job 31 23b**

**HT**


**E**

καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ λήμματος (αὐτοῦ οὐ υποίσω).

\[σʹ\]

καὶ τὸ βάρος

**Wit1:** ↓\(C (= 257 788-250 3005)\) cI\(^{139,260,680,732}\) ↓cII 555 ↓161′ 157

**Attr:** \(σʹ] > C (= 250)\)

**Var:** καὶ] > 512-513 555 161 | τό] > 248 | βάρος] + αὐτοῦ οὐ υποίσω 248

**Notes:** The plus in 248 comes from the LXX. The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 263; AGK 3, 128; Nic, 472).

**Job 31 24a**

**HT**


**E**

εἰ ἔταξα χρυσίον ἰσχὺν μου,

\[σʹ\]

εἰ ἡγησάμην χρυσίον ἀφοβίαν μου

**Wit1:** lemma\] 252 | ἀφοβίαν μου\] ↓\(C (= 257 788-250 3005)\) ↓cI\(^{260,732}\) cII 555 161′

**Attr:** \(σʹ] > C (= 250) 395\)

**Var:** ἀφοβίαν] ἀφοβείαν 3006 | μου] > C (= 257) 138-255

**Job 31 25b**

**HT**


**LXX**

(εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ) ἀναρίθμητοις (ἐθέμην χεῖρά μου,)
σʹ ἐνδόξοις

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI-137 138 260 395 732
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 250)

Job 31 27a

E καὶ εἰ ἡπατήθη λάθρᾳ ἡ καρδία μου,

θʹ Sub ★

Wit1: C (= 3005) cI-138 139 260 395 559 680 732 3006 248 La Sa Syh

Wit2: εἰ] η 261-lul; > La 110-256 296 = M

Attr: θʹ 3005 740 255 612 137 643 Syh > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 27a sub ★ 3005 740 255 612 137 643 248 Arm La Syh

NonGr: Syh + deceptum est clam cor meum (+ β).

αʹ καὶ εἰ ἐθέλχθη ἐν ἀποκρυφῇ καρδία μου

Wit1: 252

Notes: Ms 252 has ἀποκρύφης, but the genitive cannot be the object of ἐν. The Edition suggests ἀποκρύφη as the reading, while the Kollationen suggests emending the text to the dative plural, ἀποκρύφοις, which accounts for the final sigma (Kollationen, 200). Probably, the Edition’s suggestion is correct given the singular in the HT.

σʹ καὶ ἐπλατύνθη κρύφα ἡ καρδία μου

Wit1: lemma] 252 | ἐπλατύνθη] ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-260 732 cII 555 161
Attr: σʹ] θʹ C (= 3005); > 255 612
Notes: The attribution to Th in the right margin of 3005 cannot be correct, since the same ms also attributes the asterisked line correctly to Th in the left margin. In this instance, 788-250 along with cI and cII preserves the attribution to Sym correctly.

Job 31 27b

| HT | וַתִּשַּׁק יָדִי לְפִי׃ |
| LXX | εἰ δὲ καὶ χεῖρά μου ἐπιθεὶς ἐπὶ στόματί μου ἐφίλησα, |

σʹ καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἡ χείρ μου περὶ τὸ στόμα μου

Wit1: ↓C (= 788 3005) ↓cI-139 732 ↓cII 555 161
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 788) 680

Job 31 29b

| HT | רָע׃ וְהִתְעֹרַרְתִּי כִּי־מְצָאוֹ |
| LXX | καὶ εἶπεν ἡ καρδία μου Εὖγε, |

σʹ καὶ ἐπανέστην ὅτι κατέλαβεν αὐτὸν κάκωσις

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 732 cII 555
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 250); [] C (= 788)

Notes: The Edition chose ὅτε instead of ὅτι, but 3005 788 also attest ὅτι. Evidence from translation technique confirms the reading of the best mss. In the Psalter, Sym translates temporal כִּי with ὅταν + subjunctive and not with ὅτε (Busto Saiz, 242-2). In the Psalter, Sym translates causal כִּי with ὅτι and sometimes with γάρ (Busto Saiz, 254-5).
The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported in Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 265; AGK 3, 133; Nic, 476).

Job 31 31a

HT אִם־לֹא אָמְרוּ אָהֳלִי

LXX εἰ δὲ καὶ πολλάκις εἶπον αἱ θεράπαιναί μου

α’ σ’ θ’ εἶ μὴ εἶπον οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς σκηνῆς μου

Notes: The Edition presents two separate fragments, one attributed to Aq (α’ εἰ μὴ εἶπον) and the other attributed to Sym and Th (σ’ θ’ οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς σκηνῆς μου), but, as the apparatus shows, there is no ms which attests to this division of readings and attributions, but rather there was one original fragment and attribution (Kollationen, 201).

There are four stages of development. First, mss 788 and 3005 attest to the original lemma and attribution. Both of these mss keep distinct the hexaplaric fragment from the exegetical fragment, since in 788 the hexaplaric fragment occurs on the left side of the bible text and the exegetical fragment (εἰ μὴ πολλάκις (= Ἀλλος Field, 56) AGK 3, 134) is on the right side, and in 3005, the hexaplaric fragment occurs at the top right of the folio, while the exegetical fragment occurs clearly below it, marked with an index. Most important the lemma appears as one continuous fragment in both mss. Second, the lemma was divided between the Three, and this divided fragment became the tradition of the archetype of cl as attested by 740 138-255 612. The lemma was divided into three distinct readings, and each reading was assigned to one of the Three. Third, mss 395 and 680 (significantly both mss are below 612 on AGK stemma) attest a further stage of development, since accidentally they have added (in different places) the exegetical fragment εἰ μὴ πολλάκις, though they still preserve multiple hexaplaric attributions to the different readings. Final, the Nicetas catena contaminates both the exegetical fragment and the hexaplaric fragment, since it combines the fragments under a reading attributed to λ’: οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ οὗτος ἔξεδωκεν εἰ μὴ πολλάκις εἶπον οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς σκηνῆς μου (AGK 3, 134; Nic, 477).
Job 31 31b

LXX: Τίς δὲ ψυχὴ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐμπλησθησόμεθα

Attr: θʹ] > 512-513 555 161; [] C (= 788)

Var: τίς τις C (= 788); + ἄν 395 | καὶ] > 3006 | ἐμπλησθησόμεθα] εμπλησομεθα C (= 250)

Notes: In 788, the verb reads ἐμπλησθησόμεθα. The letters in parentheses are represented by a ligature above the line; therefore, it is easy to see that the variant in 250 arose by the accidental omission of the ligature resulting in εμπλησομεθα. Although the Edition did not list the evidence of Nic, this fragment follows the previous one without attribution (Nic, 477).

Job 31 32a

LXX: ξένος, προσήλυτος

Notes: Aq uses προσήλυτος to render רָעַ (Reider, 205).

Job 31 32b

Notes: This occurrence of ἐταῖρος for רָע is the only one in the Th corpus.
αʹ ὀδοιπόρῳ

Notes: The translation equivalent is also in Jer 9:2(1) with a double attribution to Aq and Sym and Jer 14:8 with attributions to Aq and Th.

HT (ῥλήρις (Ἀραχαὴς))
LXX (ἡ δὲ θύρα μου) παντὶ (ἐλθόντι ἄνέφκτο.)

Sub ᵈ

Notes: Ziegler observes that the genitive form ὀχλου is conspicuous and that it was certainly conditioned by πλὴθους. He concludes that ὀχλος renders דֵּประก in Aq (Beiträge, 40; Reider, 180).

Job 31 34a

Attr: αʹ Zieg conj.] > 252 cod

Notes: Ziegler observes that the genitive form ὀχλου is conspicuous and that it was certainly conditioned by πλὴθους. He concludes that ὀχλος renders דֵּ_ipc in Aq (Beiträge, 40; Reider, 180).

Job 31 35a

Attr: θʹ (ομ[ο] πρ[κ] 255(35b) 612) 3005 Syh² > rel
Notes: In addition to the witnesses listed in the Edition, ms 3005 also preserves the asterisk in the correct place as well as the attribution to Th; thus, the catena is now represented. Ms 612 does not have the asterisk at 35a, but it does have the scholion: οὐ (πρὸς καὶ) (ὁμοίως πρόσκειται), which means the line is considered to be under the asterisk even when the asterisk is absent (Edition, 137-139).

Job 31 39a

HT יִפְתַּחְתִּי
LXX (אֶלְּכָה בֻּלָּדִית בִּרְדֶּרֶם)

Job 31 39b

HT :ןַעַמְּשָׁנָה בּוֹעָלְיָה הַשּׁהָרָה
LXX (אֶלְּכָה בֻּלָּדִית בִּרְדֶּרֶם)

Notes: The retroversion is from the Edition. Field used the Latin, contristassem, where Ziegler used ἐλύπησα (Field, 56).
LXX  (εἰ δὲ καὶ ψυχὴν κυρίου τῆς γῆς) ἐκβαλὼν ἐλύπησα.

σ’  ἐλπίδος ἐστέρησα

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 732 3006 cII 555 161
Attr:  σ’] > C (= 250) 559

Job 31 40a

HT

LXX  ἀντὶ πυροῦ ἄρα ἐξέλθωι μοι κνίδη,

σ’  ἀντὶ σίτου βλαστήσαι ἄκανος

Wit1:  lemma] ↓cII ↓555 Ol↑ | ἄκανος] 252
Var:  βλαστήσαι] βλαστησάω cII 555

Notes:  The attribution to Olymp in the Edition stands, since it is confirmed by Kommentar and Nic (Kommentar, 267; Nic, 482).

HT

LXX  (ἀντὶ πυροῦ ἄρα ἐξέλθωι μοι) κνίδη,

θ’  ἄκανθα

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 395 732 3006 cII 555 161 ↓252 ↓Syh
Attr:  θ’] α’ σ’ θ’ Syh; > 138 252
Var:  ἄκανθα] ἄκανθαι Syh

NonGr:  Syh ̂סְאֱנֶּשׁ . לֹא. כב

Notes:  Syh preserves a triple attribution to the reading ἄκανθαι, which is only the Th fragment, since 252 preserves separate words for Sym and Aq. The catena tradition preserves the original singular form, which comparison with the HT confirms.

α’  ἄκαν

Wit1:  252
Job 31 40b

HT

LXX

(ἀντὶ δὲ κριθῆς) βάτος.

σʹ ἀτελεσφόρητα

Wit1:  ¶C (= 788-250 3005) ¶cI–139 732 3006 cII 555 161 Klostermann

Attr:  σʹ] > C (= 250) 138 260

Var:  ἀτελεσφόρητα] τελεσφορητα 559; ατελεσφορα Klostermann

Notes:  Klostermann modified the lemma in 161 in two significant ways: (1) he understood the lemma to be in place of κνίδη in 40a, even though the ms reads ἀντὶ βάτος ἀτελεσφόρητα, and (2) he shortened ἀτελεσφόρητα to ἀτελέσφορα (Analecta, 73). Ziegler appeals to LSJ to show that ἀτελέσφορος does not occur because it is an incorrect shortening of the form, and that ἀτελεσφόρητος is a hapax legomenon (Beiträge, 40). TLG yields 70 instances of ἀτελεσφόρητος, while yielding no occurrences of Klostermann’s shortened form. The database also reveals that the first occurrence of the word is in Posidonius Phil. (2-1 BCE) and then occurs next in Methodius (3-4 CE). Thus, Sym is neither the only one nor the first to use this word, and this evidence may indicate that Sym is responsible for passing this word into the vocabulary of Christian authors (e.g. Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, and Eusebius), where it occurs 69 times.

---

5 TLG [on-line]; accessed March 2 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet.
Chapter 32

Job 32 1b

HT  כִּי הוּא צַדִּיק בְּעֵינָיו׃
LXX  ἦν γὰρ Ιωβ δίκαιος ἐναντίον αὐτῶν.

σ′  διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν δίκαιον φαίνεσθαι ἑαυτῷ

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-138 260 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161
Wit2:  αὐτῶν] −του O (SyhINT) 55 68 157* 795 Aeth.Assign = M
Attr:  σ′] > C (= 250) 3006
Var:  αὐτὸν / δίκαιον] tr 161 | ἑαυτῷ] εαυτῶν 139 255 395 559 612 643;
       αὐτῶν 740; εαυτῶν 680; επ αὐτῶν cII 555 3006 161

Notes:  The Nachlese draws attention to this text because ἑαυτῷ was not
        recorded as a variant in the Edition. It clarifies that C (= 3005 and 788 250 (εαυτῶν)) and
        137 preserve the singular as the correct reading, which is also the reading of HT (ךציפיר) and
        the Vulgate (sibi) (Nachlese, 405; Kollationen, 204). In 137, the ω is written above
        the τ and should not be confused with the ligature, which indicates the genitive plural
        termination.

        Probably, the plural variant ἑαυτῶν, arose through harmonization with the LXX or
        through internal factors. Since 250 preserves the iota adscriptum, it is possible that this
        form became mistaken for a final -v earlier in the transmission of the catena.6
        Furthermore, now it may be clearer how the singular, αὐτοῦ, arose in the O text and
        subsequent mss, since there is now clear attestation to a singular pronoun in one of the
        Three.

        The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK,
        but only by Nic (Kommentar, 268; AGK 3, 141; Nic, 482).

Job 32 2a

HT  וַיִּחַר אַף אֱלִיהוּא בֶּן־בַּרַכְאֵל הַבּוּזִי
LXX  ὠργίσθη δὲ Ἐλιοῦς ὁ τοῦ Βαραχίηλ ὁ Βουζίτης

χ′  νιός

6I am thankful to Dieter Hagedorn for this suggestion.
Notes: The index occurs at different places in the mss. In 3005, the index occurs after βαραχιήλ, which supposes the following reading: ὁ τοῦ βαραχιήλ υἱὸς. In 559, the index is above ὁ and in 788-250 the index is above βαραχιήλ. There is no index in 255 612 and 740 (Kollationen, 204). The Edition, therefore, is potentially misleading in its reconstruction υἱὸς (τοῦ βαρ.).

Job 32 2b

HT  מִמִּשְׁפַּחַת
LXX  ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας Ρὰμ (τῆς Αὐσίτιδος χώρας.)

σ′  Συρίας

Notes: The index is at ἀντίθετα in 3005, and the Kollationen notes that the index is at ἀντίθετα in 255 (Kollationen, 205).

Job 32 3b

HT  תּולְשׁ אָשֶׁר לֹא־מָצְאוּ (מצנף)
LXX  διότι οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν ἀποκριθῆναι ἀντίθετα (Ἰωβ)

σ′  ἐναντίον

Notes: The index is at ἀντίθετα in 3005, and the Kollationen notes that the index is at ἀντίθετα in 255 (Kollationen, 205).
Job 32 4a
HT
(אֶלְיָהוּ) תַּאֲדוֹת אֵלִיָּהוּ בַּע maרָמִים
LXX
(Ἐλίῳς δὲ) ὑπέμεινεν δοῦναι ἀπόκρισιν Ἰωβ,

σ’ ἐπληξεν τὸν Ἰωβ λόγοις

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 732
Attr: σ’ > C (= 250) 3006

Job 32 4b-5c
HT
כִּי זְקֵנִים מִמֶּנּוּ לְיָמִים׃
מַעֲנֶהוַיַּרְא אֱלִיהוּא כִּי אֵין
בְּפִי שלושת הָאֲנָשִׁים
וַיִּחַר אפּו
E
ὅτι πρεσβύτεροι αὐτοῦ εἰσιν ἡμέραις.
καὶ εἶδεν Ἐλιοῦς ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀπόκρισις
ἐν στόματι τῶν τριῶν ἀνδρῶν,
καὶ ἔθυμώθη ὀργή αὐτοῦ.

θ’ Sub ※

Wit1: cI-260 732 680 3006 248 252 Arm Co La Syh
Attr: θ’ 740 138-255 612 559 395 137 643 139 Syh] > rel
Var: lemma] om Co | 4b-5abc sub ※ 740(non 4b) 138-255(non 4b) 612(non 4b) 559(non 4b 5bc) 395(non 4b 5c) 137(non 4b) 643(non 4b 5c) 139(non 4b) 248 252 Arm(non 4b 5bc) La(non 4b 5ab) Syh
NonGr: Syh

La quia seniores se erant in diebus.
et vidit Elius quia non est responsio
in ore trium virorum,
et (pr ※ μ) iratus est furor eius.

Notes: Laβ has an asterisk before daret in 4a. This may be a misplaced asterisk intended for 4b.

The situation in the catena is complex. In 740, the stichometry of the ms does not match the stichometry of the Edition; therefore, there are six asterisks in 740, but these clearly mark only 5abc. In 612, it is the same situation, but seven asterisks appear, which again are clearly marking 5abc of the Edition. This same strategy was used in 255, in which only five asterisks were employed. The rest of the catena mss used only one asterisk at 5a. The catena treat 5abc as a totality or one line and, therefore, one asterisk at 5a is best interpreted as marking all three stichs of the Edition as under the asterisk. The apparatus reflects, therefore, that the archetype of cI preserves the asterisk for verse 5abc and not 4b. Ms 559 probably does not preserve the asterisk at 4b 5bc, and 395 probably does not preserve the asterisk at 4b 5c.

Job 32 5c

HT :אַפּוֹ (וַיִּחַר)

E (καὶ ἐθυμώθη) ὀργὴ (αὐτοῦ.)

σʹ ο θυμός

Wit1:  cI1-39 732

Job 32 6d

HT מָהָהוּ (אֲחֵכֶם)

LXX (τού μὴν ἀναγγείλαι τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ) ἐπιστημήν.

αʹ θʹ γνῶσιν

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cI1-38-255 732

Job 32 7a

HT אַמְרָתי (רָמֵם רָבָבָה)

LXX (εἴπα δὲ οὕτι) Οὐχ (ὁ χρόνος ἐστίν ὁ λαλῶν.)

Sub ⊕

Wit1:  Syhixi

NonGr:  Syhixi

Subsequently, we see...
Job 32 7b

HT (רֹאשׁ שָׁלוֹם) — (רֹאשׁ תִּקְמָה)
LXX (ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ ἔτεσιν) οὐκ (сидאינו σοφίαν,)

Sub .respond

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Job 32 8a

HT שֶׁאֶכֶן רוּחַ־הִיא בֶאֱנוֹ
LXX ἀλλὰ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἐν βροτοῖς,

σ’ ὅντως δὲ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώποις

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

Attr: σ’ > C (= 250 3005) 643 740

Var: ἀνθρώποι] αὐτοῖς 703; βροτοῖς 137 643 680 3006

Notes: The variant, βροτοῖς, is from the LXX.

Job 32 8b

HT (نفسمه شير) (תִּקְבֵּינֵם)
E (πνοή δὲ παντοκράτορός ἐστιν ἢ διδάσκουσα) —

α’ θ’ ※ αὐτούς

Wit1: Syh

Wit2: ἢ διδ.] + (※ Syh) αὐτοὺς O-253 III Bo Aeth' = M

NonGr: Syh

HT (نفسمه شير)
LXX πνοή (δὲ παντοκράτορός ἐστιν ἢ διδάσκουσα)
Wit1: 252

Notes: This fragment is unattributed, but it has a possible relationship to the Hexapla, since ζωή and πνοή are connected in Genesis 2:7 for חַיִּים  נִשְׁמַת. In Gen 2:7, the Three have ἀναπνοήν ζωῆς, while the LXX has πνοήν ζωῆς. LXX Gen 2:7 could be the basis for the scholion but, in a source like 252, it is probable that this note is from the Hexapla.

Job 32 11a

HT

LXX ἐνωτίζεσθέ μου τὰ ῥήματα·

θʹ ἰδοὺ ἔξεδεξάμην τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν

Wit1: ↓C_cat (= 257 788-250 3005) 249-cat ↓c_cat ↓754-cat ↓474-cat ↓258-cat ↓476-cat ↓505-cat ↓cII ↓555 ↓161 ↓Ol_Y

Attr: θʹ C (= 788-250 3005) 249 cl (= 258 559 612 740) [σʹ 138-255; οἱ ἠτέροι ἑρμηνευταὶ C_cat (= 257 788-250 3005) cI_cat–258 559 612 740 754-cat 474-cat 258-cat 476-cat 505-cat cII 555 161 Ol_Y


NonGr: La ecce (pr ※ μ) patiens fui in (ad?) verba vestra

Notes: Citing the full lemma from AGK aids in reconstructing this hexaplaric fragment and the one below, since it is clear that Olymp has combined two fragments from two different revisers into one citation under the general attribution “the other interpreters”: οἱ δὲ ἠτέροι ἑρμηνευταὶ οὕτως ἐκδεδώκασιν· “ἰδοὺ ἔξεδεξάμην τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἠκροασάμην ἐφ’ ὅσον ἠφρονεῖτε, ἐφ’ ὅσον ἠξητάζετε λόγους, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ἐφικέσθαι ὑμῶν ἑννόουν” (AGK 3, 152).

In the margin, C (= 788-250 3005) 249 and a few mss of cl preserve the original attribution to Th for the section corresponding to 11a (σʹ in 138-255), while the rest of the witnesses preserve no additional attribution. In this regard, 3005 is most interesting because it is written in stichs and it alone has the attribution to Th at the first line with no attribution to Sym for 11b (Kollationen, 206; see infra). Ms 249 is not written in stichs, and it also contains only the attribution to Th.
La omits LXX 11ab but contains an asterisk at HT 11a, and it has certainly departed from the OG here. Jerome either translates the Hebrew *ad hoc* or he is dependent on Th for his rendering. The Latin prepositions *in* and *ad* would render HT $k$ suitably.

The Edition's attribution to Olymp stands, since it is supported by Kommentar, AGK, and Nic (Kommentar, 274; AGK vol. III, 152; Nic, 488).

**Job 32 11b-12a**

**HT**

$\text{םאָזִיןּ עַד־תְּבוּנֹתֵיכֶ}$

$\text{עַד־תַּחְקְרוּןּ מִלִּין׃}$

$\text{ןנָ וְעָדֵיכֶםּ אֶתְבּו}$

**LXX/E**

$\text{ἐρῶ γὰρ ὑμῶν ἀκουόντων,}$

$\text{ἄχρι οὗ ἔτασητε λόγους,}$

$\text{kai μέχρι ὑμῶν συνήσω,}$

$\text{σʹ ήκροασάμην ἐφʹ ὅσον}$

$\text{ἐφρονεῖτε, ἐφʹ ὅσον ἐξητάζετε}$

$\text{λόγους, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ}$

$\text{ἐφικέσθαι ὑμῶν ἐνενόουν.}$

**Wit1:**

$\uparrow C^{\text{cat}} (= 257 788-250 3005) \downarrow 249 \downarrow c^{\text{cat}} \downarrow 474^{\text{cat}} \downarrow 258^{\text{cat}} \downarrow 476^{\text{cat}} \downarrow 505^{\text{cat}} \downarrow c^{\text{II}}$

$\downarrow 555 \downarrow 161 \downarrow O^{\text{II}}$

**Attr:**

$\sigma^{' C} (= 788-250) c^{\text{I}} (= 138-255 258 559 612 740) \uparrow \theta^{' C} (= 3005) 249; \ \mathrm{oί}$

$\text{έτεροί ἐρμηνευταί \text{C}^{\text{cat}} (= 257 788-250 3005) c^{\text{cat}}–138-255 258 559 612 740}$

$474^{\text{cat}} 258^{\text{cat}} 476^{\text{cat}} 505^{\text{cat}} c^{\text{II}} 555 161 O^{\text{II}}$

**Var:**

$\text{ηκροασάμην} > 139 | \text{ἐφʹ 2°—λόγους} > 139^{\text{cat}} 476^{\text{cat}} | \text{ἐξητάζετε}$

$\text{ἐξητάζετε 3006 161 O^{\text{II}}, \text{ἐξητάζετε} 512-513}$

**Notes:** In the margin, several mss preserve an attribution to Sym for this fragment. Although 3005 and 249 attribute 11a and 11b to Th, it is more probable that the attribution to Sym fell out of these mss than that it was added to the others, since 11c and 12a are under the asterisk and the attribution to Th is well attested for these lines; therefore, this fragment should be attributed to Sym.

La contains an asterisk at 11b and 12a, showing that it does not represent what is in the OG but what is in the HT, and these lines either represent Jerome’s *ad hoc* translation of HT or dependence on Sym (Field, 57-8 n. 17 favors the latter, while the Edition seems to favor the former).

The Edition’s attribution to Olymp stands, since it is supported by Kommentar, AGK, and Nic (Kommentar, 274; AGK vol. III, 152; Nic, 488).
Job 32 11b

HT  "— (אָזִין עַד־תְּבוּנֹתיכֶ)

LXX  "׳ֶרֶבֶּוּ שִׁמְךָ (׳עֵמוֹן ָאָקָוֹנְנָו,)

Sub ÷

Wit1: Syh


NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Notes: Although the obelus is not used, the scholion contains a reference to the Tetrapla, which did not place ἐρῶ γάρ or ἀναγγέλῳ γάρ before ὑμῶν ἀκουόντων. The words, ἐρῶ γάρ, are part of the OG as attested by the majority of witnesses, but the Tetrapla has omitted them, since they are absent from the HT.

Job 32 11c-12

HT

E  ἀρχὴ  οὐ  ἔτασπη  λόγους,  καὶ  μέχρι  ὑμῶν  συνήσω,  καὶ  ἰδιοῦ  οὐκ  ἦν  τῷ  Ἰωβ  ἐλέγχων,  ἀνταποκρινόμενος  βῆματα  αὐτοῦ  ἐξ  ὑμῶν,

θ’ Sub ※

Wit1:  C (= 3005) cI\textsuperscript{-137} 138 139 260 643 680 732 3006 248 252 Arm Sa La Syh\textsuperscript{xt}
Attr: \( \theta' (\varepsilon \kappa \theta' \; o\iota \; o\iota() \; \pi\rho() \; \kappa() \; 3005; \varepsilon \kappa \theta' \; o\iota \; o\iota() \; \pi\rho() \; 740 \; 255 \; 612 \; 559 \; 395) \) Syh\textsuperscript{ext} > rel

Var: lemma om Sa | 11c-12 sub ※ 3005(non 12bc) 740 255 612(non 12a) 559(non 12a) 395 248 252(non 12c) Arm La Syh\textsuperscript{ext}

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{ext} | ※ 
La usque quo discuteretis sermones, 
et (pr ※ μ) donec intellegrem vos: 
et (pr ※ μ) ecce non est qui arguat Iob, 
et (pr ※ μ) respondeat sermonibus eius ex vobis.
Arm ※ μὴ ξενοπέπιπα προφήτη 
※ τι ἄνερ γαρ ἠπάτησα
※ η διὰ τὴν γάς ἄνθρωπον γινθηκέναι
※ ή σωτηριανεύσαντα μαθήματα ἀντί ή δέχοντ

Notes: The catena preserves the attribution at 11c, which indicates that Th is the author of all four stichs, even though the asterisks have not been applied accordingly.

Job 32 11c

HT (זְדוֹן) (אֵל יִדְּפֶנּוּ לֹא־אִישׁ׃)
E (ἀχρὶ οὗ) έτάσητε (λόγους.)

α’

εξιχνιάσητε

Wit1: C (= 257 788-250 3005) \( \downarrow \) Cl–732

Attr: α’] α’ 137 139 260 643 3006; > C (= 257)

Var: εξιχνιάσητε] –ται 740; εξιχνιαση 395 612; εξιχνιασει 137 139 260 559 643 680 3006

Notes: In 255, the index is at έτάσητε, while the fragment is next to 32:12a in 788-250 (Kollationen, 206).

Job 32 13-18a

HT (סְפִּרְתָּאָמָר מִמאָנוּת תָּבְכָּה) (אָל יִשְׂאַר לָאָם שֶׁ)
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וְלֹא־עָרַךְ אֵלַי מִלִּין וּבְאִמְרֵיכֶם לֹא אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ׃

דַחַתּוּ לֹא־עָנוּ עֹ הֶעְתִּיקוּ מֵהֶם מִלִּים׃

חַלְתִּי כִּי־לֹא יְדַבֵּרוּ וְהוֹ ד׃כִּי עָמְדוּ לֹא־עָנוּ עֹ

אַעֲנֶה אַף־אֲנִי חֶלְקִי הֲדֵי אַף־אָנִי׃אֲחַוֶּ אָמְדוּ עָנוּ עֹ

(18a) מִלִּים כִּי מָלֵתִי)

LXX/E 13 (ίνα μὴ εἴπητε Εὕρομεν σοφίαν) κυρίῳ προσθέμενοι·
14 ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ ἐπετρέψατε λαλῆσαι τοιαύτα ρῆματα.
15 ἐπτοήθησαν, οὐκ ἀπεκρίθησαν ἐτί,
ἐπαλαίωσαν εξ αὐτῶν λόγους.
16 ὑπέμεινα, οὐ γὰρ ἐλάλησαν·
ὁτι ἐστησαν, οὐκ ἀπεκρίθησαν.
17 Ὡπολαβὼν δὲ Ἐλιους λέγει
18a Πάλιν λαλήσω· (πλήρης γάρ εἰμι ῥημάτων.)

(σʹ)

(13b) ἵσχυρὸς ἐκρῖπτει αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἀνήρ.
(14) καὶ οὐκ ἔταξεν πρὸς με λαλιάς· καὶ ἐν
λόγοις ὑμῶν οὐκ ἀνταποκρινοῦμαι αὐτῷ.
(15) ἐπτοήθησαν, οὐκ ἐποιοῦντο ἀπόκρισιν
ἐτί· ἀπήρθησαν (s ἐξήρθησαν s ἀφηρεθησαν) ἀτ' αὐτῶν λαλιάι. (16) καὶ
ὑπέμεινα (s ἁνέμεινα) ὡτι οὐκ ἐλάλησα,
ὅτι ἐστησαν, οὐκ ἐποιήσαντο ἀπόκρισιν
ἐτί· (17) ἀποκριθήσομαι κἀγὼ τὸ μέρος
μου, ἀναγγελῶ τὴν γνῶσιν μου κἀγὼ

Wit1: lemma] Syh | τὸ μέρος μου] C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139
Attr: ⟨σʹ⟩ > C (= 250) Syh
Var: τὸ] pr καὶ 137 260 395 643 680 732 3006
NonGr: Syh

سلطنة بعدك لَمَّا
La  dominus (pr ※ μ) abiecit eum, et non vir.  
necdum (pr ※ μ) ad me locutus est,  
et (pr ※ μ) in sermonibus vestris non respondebo ei.  
obstupuerunt (pr ※ μ), non responderunt ultra.  
defecerunt (pr ※ μ) ab eis sermones.  
quia (pr ※ μ) ergo expectavi, et non sunt locuti,  
et (pr ※ μ) sieterunt, et non responderunt ultra,  
respondebo (pr ※ μ) et ego partem meam,  
et (pr ※ μ) annuntiabo scientiam meam.  
(homini (pr ※ μ) vero permisistis loqui talia verba.)

Notes:  The catena fragment is explicitly attributed to Sym, even though the Sym attribution for the whole lemma must remain an open question.  
The retroversion is from Ziegler who departed from Field in the following places:  
v. 13  
ἰσχυρός] pr ὁ Field  
ἐκρίπτει] απορριψει Field  
v 14  
καὶ οὐκ] οὐδὲ Field  
λόγοις] ρημασιν Field  
ἀνταπκρινοῦμαι] αποκριθήσομαι Field  
The determination of attribution is a problem. Field is convinced this fragment belongs to Symmachus for the following reasons: (1) Th cannot be the author, since vss. 15-16 belong to him according to Syh, (2) it is possible for Aq to be the author only if one removes ἀπόκρισιν ποιεῖσθαι for ἔφη (v. 16), since he hardly has use of such an interpretation, and (3) Symmachus remains, and two reasons commend him as the author: (1) part of the fragment (τὸ μέρος μου) is specifically attributed to him in the catena tradition and (2) Jerome appears to have followed him in verses 11bc and 12a (see supra), and he has followed him in these verses (Field, 58 n. 21).  
The scholion in Syh reads as follows:  
This note may be translated, “on
the one hand in the Tetrapla are [read] like these of the outside (i.e. the margin), but on the other hand in that [copy] of Eusebius and Pamphilus are read like these of the inside (i.e. the text).” The scholion introduces a contrast between the text of the margin (= Tetrapla) and the bible text (= Eusebius).

Job 32 15-16

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI¬138 260 732 3006 248 La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

Wit2: 16b fin ] + οτι αποκριθω καγω (+ το 130) μερος (+ μου 130) II’ C’-296
= M (17a); + ※ respondeam (respondebo\textsuperscript{v}) et ego partem meam, et admuntiabo scientiam meam La = M (17b); superadd homini vero permisisti loqui talia verba La = LXX (14)

Attr: θ’ (ομ\textsuperscript{v}) πρ(\textsuperscript{v}) ἐκ θ’ οἱ δ̄ 740 255 612 559 395; ομ\textsuperscript{v} πρ(\textsuperscript{v}) ἐκ θ’ και οἱ δ̄ 680(14); θ’ δ̄ 137 643; ἐκ θ’ οἱ δ̄ 788; ἐκ θ’ οἶδα 250; ομ\textsuperscript{v} πρ(\textsuperscript{v})κ(\textsuperscript{v}) 3005 Syh\textsuperscript{txt} > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 15-16 sub ※ 3005(non 15b) 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 643(non 16b) 139(non 15 16b) 248 La Syh\textsuperscript{txt} | 16c (οτι αποκριθω καγω μερος) sub ※ 255 559

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{txt} 

La obstupuerunt (pr ※ μ), non responderunt ultra.
defecerunt (pr ※ μ) ab eis sermones.
quia (pr ※ μ) ergo expectavi, et non sunt locuti,
et (pr ※ μ) steterunt, et non responderunt ultra,
Notes: The asterisks are well preserved by the catena, Syh, La, and there is also the negative evidence of Sa.

The attribution to Th in the catena mss is preserved in various ways. In 680, the note, ομ(πρ(έκ θ' καϊ οι δ' (ὀμοίως πρόσκειται ἐκ θ' καϊ οϊ δ'), appears at 32:14, and thus the attribution is misplaced in this ms, since it includes v. 14 as a fifth line, “from Th and the four.” In the rest of the catena tradition the note occurs at 32:15a and affirms that the four lines are from Th; 3005 has not preserved the attribution.

Job 32 18b

HT

LXX

σ' συγκαίει

Wit1: ↓ C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓ cI 139 732 3006 cII 555 161'

Attr: σ'] > C (= 250) 138

Notes: The attributions to Origen and Olympiodorus in the Edition are not supported by Kommentar and AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 278; AGK 3, 158-9; Nic, 491). Young’s edition supports the attribution to Olymp but not to Origen; therefore, Ziegler does not cite his source for Origen.

Job 32 19a

HT

LXX

σ' ως οἴνος νέος ἀδιάπνευστος

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI 137 138 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓ cII 555 ↓ 161'

Attr: σ'] > C (= 250) 612 248

Var: ως] ωσπερ 512-513

Notes: For the discussion of the fragment in 257 at 32:19b, see chapter 4.

Job 32 20

HT

LXX/E

θ' ※ ἀποκριθῶν
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**Wit1:**  \( C (= 788\ 3005) \) \( cI^{139} 260\ 643\ 732 \)

**Wit2:**  \( \text{fin]} + (\ast \text{Syh}) \alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\theta\omicron\omega \text{O-253} \) \( S^c-II = M \)

**Attr:**  \( \Theta'\ 3005\ 788\ 138-255\ 612\ 559\ 395\ 680\ 137\ 3006] > 740 \text{Syh} \)

**Var:**  \( 20\ \text{fin sub} \ast\ 788\ 740\ 255\ 612\ 559\ 137(\acute{\alpha}n\alpha\ast\pi\alpha\gamma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota) \text{Syh}^{\text{iv}} \)

**NonGr:**  \( \text{Syh}^{\text{iv}} \)

**Notes:**  The fragment with attribution appears in the margin of the catena and the asterisk precedes it in the majority of the mss. Syh preserves the asterisk in front of the lemma without the attribution.
Chapter 33

Job 33 2b

HT  רַבָּרָה לְשׁוֹנִי (בַּחֲכִי)
LXX/E  (καὶ ἐλάλησεν ἡ γλῶσσά μου.)—

\[\theta' \quad \text{※} \quad ἐν τῷ λάρυγγί μου\]

Wit1:  Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Wit2:  2b fin] + (※ O) ἐν τῷ λάρυγγί μου O-253 L־A 637 = M

Var:  sub ※ La Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

NonGr:  مَحَل لَعْبِمِ نَهْر مَعْصَر سِحْر مَصْر.  \\
La  et locuta est lingua mea ※ in guttere meo.

Job 33 3a

HT  נֶשֶׁר (לְבָרָה לְשׁוֹנִי)
LXX  καθαρά (μου ἡ καρδία ρήμασιν.)

\[\alpha' \quad \theta' \quad εὐθεία\]

Wit1:  C (= 257 788-250 3005) cl\textsuperscript{–139} 732

Notes:  In ms 138, this note succeeds the following one without an attribution for the second note (Kollationen, 208; see infra).

\[\sigma' \quad ἀπλῆ\]

Wit1:  C (= 257 788-250 3005) cl\textsuperscript{–137} 139 260 643 732 3006

Attr:  σ' [ > 138

Job 33 3b

HT  נֶשֶׁר (שְׂפָתַי בָּרוּר מִלֵּלוּ)
LXX  σύνεσις (δὲ χειλέων μου καθαρὰ νοήσει.)

\[\alpha' \quad \theta' \quad γνῶσις\]

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cl\textsuperscript{–138} 139 732
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Attr: \( \alpha' \theta' \) \( \sigma' \) \( C (= 3005); > C (= 250) \)

Var: lemma] \( \gamma\nu\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma \) \( \theta\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon \) \( 3006 \)

Notes: The fragments of 3a and 3b are placed in close proximity in 250 and 3005. In 250, they are vertically arranged with no intervening text or space as follows: \( \alpha' \theta' \) \( \epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\alpha, \sigma' \) \( \acute{\alpha}p\lambda\iota\tilde{n}, \gamma\nu\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma. \) In 3005, the fragments of 3a are horizontally arranged as follows: \( \alpha' \theta' \) \( \epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\alpha, \sigma' \) \( \acute{\alpha}p\lambda\iota\tilde{n} \) with \( \sigma' \) \( \gamma\nu\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma \) of 3b appearing directly under \( \epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\alpha. \) This situation led probably to the confusion of attributions, but it is difficult to determine whether the error is in 3005 or \( cI \) (whose mss preserve the fragments of 3a together but the fragment of 3b is more remote as 740 and 612 attest). Ms 788 (ancestor of 250) clearly has the reading: \( \alpha' \theta' \gamma\nu\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma; \) therefore, it is most probable that the attributions have been confused in 3005, and 788 and \( cI \) preserve the original text.

In 395, the reading is \( \sigma \nu \nu \sigma\varsigma \) \( \gamma\nu\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma. \) Ms 3006 combined this fragment with the one in 4a erroneously (\( \alpha' \theta' \gamma\nu\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma \) \( \theta\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon \)), and Pitra supposed it to be the original fragment, though he attributed it to Sym, probably combining the lemmas of 3b and 4a under the variant attribution of 4a (\( Kollationen, \) 208; \( Beiträge, \) 40; Pitra, 557).

**Job 33 4a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>(עָשָׂתְנִי) אֵל (רוּחַ־)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(πνεῦμα) θεῖον (τὸ ποιῆσάν με,)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \sigma' \) \( \theta\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon \)

Wit1: \( \downarrow C (= 788-250 \: 3005) \) \( \downarrow cI^{138 \; 139 \; 732} \) \( \downarrow \) Pitra

Attr: \( \sigma' \) \( \theta' \) \( \sigma' \) \( \theta' \) \( C (= 3005); > C (= 250) \) \( 3006 \)

Var: lemma] \( \gamma\nu\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma \) \( \theta\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon \) \( 3006 \) Pitra

Notes: For the attribution of Pitra, see supra. Given the new evidence of 788, the double attribution in 3005 is probably not the original text, even though Th renders the free form of the Hebrew bound phrase with the Greek genitive in 90% of the instances in Job (Gentry, 114). It is possible that the attributions between 3b and 4a were confused in 3005, since the original attribution for 3b did include one to Th. This attribution was incorrectly assigned to the fragment in 4b, since now 788 and \( cI \) attest only Sym here.

This lemma and 3b are combined in 3006 (\( \alpha' \theta' \gamma\nu\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma \) \( \theta\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon; \) \( Kollationen, \) 209; see supra).

**Job 33 5b-6a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>(שָׁרָה לְפָנַי הָתִיָּבָה׃) (חַלְצִיעֵי קַמְסָא קַלָא)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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LXX     (ὑπόμεινον, στῆθι) κατ’ ἐμὲ καὶ ἕγω κατὰ σέ.
(ἐκ πηλοῦ διήρτισαι σὺ ὡς καὶ ἕγω.)

σ’     ἀρα τοιοῦτός εἰμι οἶος σὺ; οὐκ εἰμὶ θεός

Wit1:    ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ 249 ↓ cI -139 732
Attr:    σ’] > C (= 788-250) 249 559 740

Notes:   This fragment equals 6a in HT. The fragment is at 33:6a in 559 (Kollationen, 209). The index is at 5b in 788.

Job 33 6b
HT     מָחַר קָרַצְתִּי
LXX    ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ διηρτίσμεθα.

Sub  ⅓

Wit1:    C (= 788-250 3005) cI -138 139 260 732 Syhxt
Attr:    οὐ κεῖται ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 680 137
3006inc(οὐ κεῖται ἐν Ἑβρ...) 643
Var:     6b sub  3005 740 612 559 Syhxt
NonGr:   Syhxt

Notes:   The full fragment in 3005 is as follows: τὸ διηρτίσμεθα οὐ κεῖται ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ. The note indicates that διηρτίσμεθα is “not in the Hebrew,” even though the whole line is under the obelus. The fragment is difficult to read in 3006, but the reading is listed as read by the editor, and it was checked also by Dieter Hagedorn.

Job 33 7a
HT     תְבַעֲתֶךּ (לֹאהִנֵּה אֵמָתִי)
LXX    (οὐχ ὁ φόβος μου σε) στροβήσει,

σ’     ἐκθαμβήσει

Wit1:    ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI -138 139 732 ↓ 248
Notes: Aq uses the ἐκθαμβέω in Job 3:5 (for ב Helena) and 15:23. Also, Aq uses the noun ἐκθαμβησις in Isa 52:12, while Sym uses ἐκθαμβος in 3 Rgns 4:13 and Jer 51(28):32 and θαμβος in Isa 52:12. The external and internal evidence suggests that this fragment could be attributed to both Aq and Sym, but the catena has probably preserved the original attribution.

Job 33 8a

HT

אַךְ אָמַרְתָּ בְאָזְנָי

E

πλὴν εἶπας εν ὠσίν μου,

θʹ

Sub ※

Wit1: cI−138 139 260 395 680 732 248 252 Sa La Syh\textsuperscript{ext}

Attr: θʹ 740 255 612 559 137 3006 643] αʹ θʹ Syh\textsuperscript{ext}; > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 8a sub ※ 740 255 612 559 137 3006 643 248 252 La Syh\textsuperscript{ext}

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{ext} \textbackslash

La ※ veruntamen dixisti in auribus meis

Job 33 9b

HT

(תָּחָה) אֲנָכי רָאִי תְּנוּ לְךָ

LXX

(ἀμεμπτος δὲ εἰμί,) οὐ γὰρ ἤνομησα·

αʹ

καὶ οὐκ ἀνομία μοι

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Job 33 10b

HT

(ῥωσυπερ) καὶ ὁπεναντίον

LXX

(ἡγηταὶ δὲ με ὀφεπρ ὑπεναντίον) —

γʹ

αὐτῶ
Notes: In Syh the index is at the end of the verse (+ ἐν ξυλοπέδῃ). HT and La provide warrant for emending Syh from the genitive plural αὐτῶν to the dative singular αὐτῷ. The inner Greek error may have been caused by iota adscriptum, which was confused for -v (see 32:1b for an analogous example).

Job 33 11a
HT (רַגְלָי) בַּסַּד (יָשֵׂם)
LXX (ἔθετο δὲ) ἐν ξύλῳ (τὸν πόδα μου,)

〈αʹ〉 ἐν ξυλοπέδῃ

Wit1: 252
Attr: 〈αʹ〉 > 252 cod

Notes: At 13:27a, ms 252 contains ἐν ξυλοπέδῃ for Hebrew בַּסַּד and attributes the reading to Aquila (Woods, 261; Edition, 359). Since there is no explicit attribution here, the probable attribution to Aq is placed in angle brackets.

Job 33 13
HT מַרְגָּז אֵלָיו רִבְבוֹ
כֶרֶךְ כַּלְתַּכֶּרָה לָא-רָכָחֲנָה:
LXX λέγεις δὲ Διὰ τὶς δίκης μου οὐκ ἐπακῆκοεν πᾶν ρῆμα;

αʹ τί οὖν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐδικάσω; ὅτι πάντα τὰ ρήματα αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀποκρινεῖται

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl1 138 732 ↓clII 555 Syh
Attr: αʹ > C (= 250) 3006
σ′ ὅτι οὖν αὐτῷ δικάζῃ; πάντες γὰρ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ ἀναντίρρητοι

θ′ τί πρὸς αὐτὸν κρίσις, ὅτι πᾶσιν τοῖς ῥήμασιν (σ λόγοις) αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀποκρινεῖται
Concerning the variant, Field says, “Likewise this ὅτι at the beginning of the fragment appears to have been written falsely for the interrogative” (Field, 59).

**Job 33 14a**

**HT**

כִּי־בְאַחַת יְדַבֶּר־אֵל

**LXX**

ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἀπαξ λαλήσαι ὁ κύριος,

σʹ ὅτι ἀπαξ λαλήσει ὁ θεός

---

**Notes:** Probably, Field’s conjecture is correct, since Sym normally translates the Hebrew imperfect with the future indicative (Busto Saiz, 132). This part is absent in 248 (pace Edition); only a related scholion is found (Kollationen, 210). Ms 248, therefore, has been omitted from the Wit1 line.

**Job 33 14b**

**HT**

בֵּשַׁתְיוֹנָם לָא יִשְׁרָקַנְהוּ:

**LXX**

ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐνύπνιον,

σʹ ἐκ δευτέρου οὐκ ἀκυρώσει αὐτόν

---

**Notes:** Concerning the variant, Field says, “Likewise this ὅτι at the beginning of the fragment appears to have been written falsely for the interrogative” (Field, 59).
Sub ※ non considerabit illud

Wit1: La

NonGr: ※ non considerabit illud (+ β),

Job 33 15a
HT блгהל תורוגג ליל 활
LXX הַיְּנִאָה וְּנַעַטְרֵיהּ.

αʼ ὑπνόω ὁραματισμοῦ νυκτός

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 732

Attr: αʼ] αʼ 559 612 740; > C (= 250)


Notes: Only the two C mss have preserved the right reading, ὁραματισμοῦ (Nachlese, 405). Previously, the Edition based the reading on the testimony of 250, but ms 3005 confirms this reading. Ms 788 confirms also the correct reading and the attribution. Aq uses ὁραματισμός for ἡραμάς, while Sym uses ὅραμα (cp. the Aq and Sym versions at Job 4:13; Woods, 116).

Job 33 15b
HT בָּנַף הַרְדֵּמָה (עַל-אַנְשֵׁים)
LXX (ὡς ὤταν ἐπιτίπτησι) δεῖνός φόβος (ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους)

θʼ ἐκστασίς

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI 139 260 732

Attr: θʼ] > C (= 788-250 3005)
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Job 33 16b

א"כוּבְּמֹסָרָם יַחְתֹּם׃

א"כἐν έιδεσίν φόβου τοιούτοις αὐτούς εξεφόβησεν

α′
καὶ ἐν παιδείᾳ αὐτῶν πλήξει αὐτοὺς

Wit1: \(\downarrow\) C (= 788-250 3005) \(\downarrow\) cI 732

Attr: α′ | α′ 740; > C (= 788-250 3005)

Var: πλήξει | πλήξη 3006

Job 33 19a

(ἐπὶ κοίτης)

σ′
διὰ πόνου

Wit1: C (= 3005) \(\downarrow\) cI 260 732

Attr: σ′ > 138 139 643

Job 33 19b

και πλήθος ὀστῶν αὐτοῦ ἐνάρκησεν,

θ′

Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788-250) cI 138 260 643 680 732 248 252 Sa Syh	

Attr: θ′ 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 Syh	| > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 19b sub ※ 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 248 252 Syh

NonGr: Syh	

Job 33 20b

και ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ βρῶσιν ἐπιθυμήσει,
228

\( \theta' \quad \text{Sub} \quad \star \)

\textit{Wit1:} \quad C (= 788-250) 248 La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

\textit{Attr:} \quad \theta' 788-250 Syh\textsuperscript{txt}] > \text{rel}

\textit{Var:} \quad \text{lemma] om Sa} \mid 20b \text{sub} \star \text{250} 248 \text{La Syh}\textsuperscript{txt}

\textit{NonGr:} \quad \text{Syh}\textsuperscript{txt} \quad \downarrow \quad \text{La} \quad \star \quad \text{et anima eius desiderabit cibum (+ } \beta \text{)}

\textit{Notes:} \quad \text{The Edition does not report any evidence of the asterisk for the catena, but ms 250 preserves the asterisk with the attribution to Th. Ms 788 also preserves the asterisk and the attribution to Th.}

\textbf{Job 33 21a}

\textbf{HT} \quad \text{נֶּאֶל (בְּשָׂרוֹ מְרַמֵי)}

\textbf{LXX} \quad \text{(ὅς ἂν) σαπῶσιν (αὐτοῦ αἱ σάρκες)}

\( \epsilonβρ' \quad \epsilonκλείψωσιν \)

\textit{Wit1:} \quad C (= 788-250 3005) ↓C\textsubscript{l} \textsuperscript{732}

\textit{Var:} \quad \epsilonκλείψωσιν] εκλειψουσιν 138-255

\textit{Notes:} \quad \text{The full note is as follows: ὁ ἐβραῖος ἐκλείψωσιν ἔχει. Ms 260 omits the ὁ before ἐβραῖος (Kollationen, 212).}

\textbf{Job 33 22a}

\textbf{HT} \quad \text{חַכֶּרֶם (לְשָׁחַת מֶרֶם)}

\textbf{LXX} \quad \text{(ἐν γίγνεσιν δὲ) εἰς θανάτον (ἡ ψυχή αὐτοῦ,)}

\( \lambda' \quad \epsilonις \deltaιαφθοράν \)

\textit{Wit1:} \quad C (= 788-250 3005) ↓C\textsubscript{l} \textsuperscript{137} 139 260 643 732 3006

\textit{Attr:} \quad \lambda' ] > 680

\textbf{Job 33 23ce}

\textbf{HT} \quad \text{אֲדָמֵי שְׁעָלוֹר מִלְצָאֵל (מִלְצָאֵל אֱחוֹד מַעְרֵי) (מִלְצָאֵל אֱחוֹד מַעְרֵי מִלְצָאֵל) (מִלְצָאֵל אֱחוֹד מַעְרֵי מִלְצָאֵל)}

228
228 (לְהַגִּיד לְאָדָם יָשְׁרוֹ)

24 (וַיְחֻנֶּנּוּ וַיֹּאמֶר)

23 (פְּדָעֵהוּ מֵרֶדֶת שָׁחַת)

LXX

23 (ἐὰν ὦσιν χίλιοι ἄγγελοι θανατηφόροι,)

(εἰς αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ τρώσῃ αὐτόν-)

εὰν νοήσῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐπὶ κύριον,

(ἀναγγείλῃ δὲ ἄνθρωπο τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μέμψιν,)

24 (ἀνθέξεται τοῦ μὴ πεσεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς θάνατον,)

(ἀνανεώσει δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ὡσπερ ἀλοιφὴν ἐπὶ τοίχου,)

Sub ÷

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI–138 Arm La Syhtxt

Attr: οὐ κεῖται(κεῖται 3005² 395¹ 680¹ 139¹) ἐν τῷ ἕβραϊκῷ 3005(23a 23e)

Var: 23ce sub ÷ 3005(+ 23b) 788(+ 23b) 740(+ 23abd) 612(+ 23abd) 559(+

NonGr: Syhxt

La quod si fuerint ※ angeli mortiferi, ※ non respondebit ei ※ unus ex eis non vulnerabit eum, si intelleixerit corde converti ad dominum, et nuntiaverit homini culpam suam, ※ stultitiam suam ostenderit (pr ※ β), subveniet (pr ※ μ) sibi, ut non cadat in morte, et renovabit corpus (pr ※ μ) sicut litura in pariete,

Arm ※ եթե իմասցի սրտիւ իւրով դառնալ առ ☆ Տէր ※ և ցուցցէ զանմտութիւն իւր
Notes: The placement of the obelus has been preserved accurately by Arm and Syh. Comparison with HT shows probably that 23ce were invented by the OG translator and that 23abd consist of a dynamic translation of HT; therefore, the catena and La have preserved more lines under the obelus than the Hexapla probably did.

Job 33 25b

HT יָשׁוּב לִימֵי עֲלוּמָיו׃
LXX ἀποκαταστήσει δὲ αὐτὸν ἀνδρωθέντα ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

αʹ θʹ ἐπιστρέψει εἰς ἡμέραν νεανιότητος αὐτοῦ

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI 137 260 643 732 3006 ↓ cII ↓ 555 ↓ 161
Attr: αʹ θʹ] λʹ cII 555 161; > C (= 250)
Var: ἐπιστρέψει] ἐπιστρέφει cII 161 555] νεανιότητος C (= 788-250 3005)] νεοτητος rel

Notes: The Nachlese reports that only the C (= 250 3005) group preserves the right reading νεανιότητος, which was previously known only in 250 (Nachlese, 405). Ms 788 also preserves the correct reading. Ziegler arrived at this same conclusion based on 250 and the internal evidence of Aquila’s translation technique. Aquila translates נעריה with νεότης and נעלמה with νεανιότης (Beiträge, 40, 61).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 284-5; AGK 3, 172; Nic, 498).

Job 33 26a

HT יָשׁוּב לִימֵי עֲלוּמָיו
LXX ευξάμενος δὲ πρὸς κύριον, καὶ δεκτὰ αὐτῷ ἔσται,

θʹ δειηθῆσεται τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εὐδοκήσει αὐτόν

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI 137 260 643 732 ↓ cII ↓ 555 ↓ 161
Attr: θʹ] σʹ 137 260 643; > C (= 788-250) 138 395 3006
Var: δειηθῆσεται] pr καὶ 260 643] εὐδοκήσει C (= 788-250 3005)] εὐλογήσει rel
Notes: The Nachlese reports that only C (= 250 3005) preserves the right reading εὐδοκήσει, which was previously known only in 250 (Nachlese, 405). Ms 788 also confirms that this reading is part of the oldest Greek catena. Ziegler notes that the change from original εὐδοκεῖν to εὐλογεῖν occurred often in the transmission of the text (e.g. Ps 48(49):14; Beiträge, 40-1).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 285; AGK 3, 172; Nic, 498).

Job 33 26b

HT (בִּתְרוּעָה (בְּתֵרָה)—וַיַּרְא פָּנָיו)
LXX (eiσελεύσεται δὲ προσώπῳ καθαρῷ (σὺν ἐξηγορίᾳ·)

δγρʹ ἱλαρῷ

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓clI 137 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓clII ↓555 ↓161
Wit2: καθαρῷ ἱλαρῷ B′-S* O (Syh\textsuperscript{ix} sub +) 534\textsuperscript{ix} Sa Arm: cf M
Attr: δγρʹ λʹ 395 559 clII 555 161; δη γαρ 612; > 680
NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{ix} ↓ אֲלָלָלָגָמְו Syh\textsuperscript{ng} ↓ אֲלָלָלָגָמְו

Notes: In mss 788-250 and 255, the index is at καθαρῷ. Rightly, Ziegler notes that there is no equivalent for καθαρῷ in the Hebrew text, and therefore ἱλαρῷ cannot be assigned to οἱ λοιποί (Beiträge, 61).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition and the Beiträge is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 285; AGK 3, 172; Nic, 498; Beiträge, 61).

HT (וַיַּרְא פָּנָיו)
LXX (eiσελεύσεται δὲ προσώπῳ καθαρῷ (σὺν ἐξηγορίᾳ·)

αʹ θʹ ἐν ἀλαλαγμῖῳ

Wit1: C (= 257 788-250 3005) clI 137 139 260 643 732 3006 clII 555 ↓161
Attr: αʹ θʹ] αʹ 248

Notes: Aquila renders תרעה with ἀλαλαγμός (Reider, 11), and in Job 8:21 a double attribution to Aq and Th is probably original (Woods, 179). In 33:26b, the oldest
Greek catena probably preserves the original double attribution also, while 248 has lost the attribution to Th.

The Edition suggests that the anonymous fragment, μετὰ ἐξομολογήσεως, should be attributed to Th. There are two challenges to this proposal: (1) there are no known instances of ἐξομολογήσις in Th and (2) Th does not translate ב with μετά (Gentry, 315-22); therefore, it is more probable to correct the attribution of the fragment to both Aq and Th on the basis of the external evidence and to interpret the other fragment as an exegetical one, perhaps taken from the comment by Olympiodorus for the same verse (AGK 3, 172; see chapter 4 “Omitted Marginalia.”).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 285; AGK 3, 172; Nic, 498).

σʹ  ἐν ὑμνολογίᾳ

Wit1:  ↓ C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓ cI-1 137 139 260 643 732 3006  cII 555 161'
Attr:  σʹ] > C (= 250)
Var:  ἐν] > 680

Notes:  The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 285; AGK 3, 172; Nic, 498).

Job 33 26c
HT (רֶשֶׁב (פּוֹדָה)
LXX (ἀποδώσει δὲ ἀνθρώποις (δικαιοσύνην.)

λʹ  ἀνθρώπωπῳ

Wit1:  C (= 788 3005) cI-1 137 139 260 643 732 3006
Wit2:  ἀνθρώπῳ L 542 543 Glos Aeth Ol = M; -πος 740

Notes:  Ms 788 also attests this fragment and attribution for the C group. The fragment is written twice with two different hands in 255 (Kollationen, 214).

Job 33 27a
HT (וַיֹּאמֶר (—)יָשֹׁר עַל־אֲנָשִׁים)
LXX (εἶτα τότε ἀπομέμψεται ἀνθρώπος) αὐτὸς (ἐαυτῷ λέγων)

Sub ⅸ
Notes: There is no metobelus in Syh, but La and other witnesses omit only αὐτός.

Job 33 28-29

HT

ฉบับ

E

σῶσον ψυχήν μου τοὺς μή ἐλθεῖν εἰς διαφθοράν,
καὶ ἡ ζωή μου φῶς ὄψεται.

ιδοὺ ταῦτα πάντα ἐργάται ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ὁδῷς τρεῖς μετὰ ἀνδρός.

θʹ  Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788-250) cI 138 260 680 732 248 252 Arm Co La Syh

Attr: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἳ ὁ 788-250 740 612 255 559 395; θʹ ὁ 137 3006 643) Syh] > rel

Var: lemma] om Co | 28-29 sub ※ 788-250 740 255 612 559 395(non 29b)

NonGr: Syh

La ※ salva animam meam, ne veniam in corruptionem,
et (pr ※ μ) vita mea lucem videbit.
ecce (pr ※ μ) haec omnia faciet deus
vices (pr ※ μ) tres cum viro (+ ✓ β).

Arm ※ Φησίν αυτῷ μὴ γῆς μὴ μέγας ἡμῶν ὁ σωτῆρις
※ η ἡμῶν μὴ συνηκάθισθεν ἐμοὶ
※ Σωσίμαχυ σωσίμαχος πράξεις γεγονότα
Job 33 29a
HT (יהוה אלהי אלהי הפסל [יחזקאל])
E (יווה תאו פניא) ערבתי (וה ישרוור)

σ’ πράξει

Wit1: \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow c_I^{137} 139 260 395 559 612 643 680 732 3006\)
Attr: \(\sigma’ > C (= 250)\)

Job 33 29b
HT עונתך שלושה מעבר
E רודווע תרייס מתא אנדרוס.

σ’ δίς τρίς πρός έκαστον

Wit1: \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow c_I^{732} \downarrow c_{II} 555\)
Attr: \(\sigma’ > C (= 788-250)\)
Var: τρίς 138-255 512-513 τרייס rel

Notes: The variant was caused by itacism.
The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 286; AGK 3, 174; Nic, 499).

Job 33 30a
HT קלחשבר נפשי (מהירשהר)
LXX ἀλλ’ ἐρρύσατο τῆν ψυχήν μου (ἐκ θανάτου).

σ’ ὠστε μετακαλέσαι τὴν ψυχήν μου

Wit1: \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow c_I^{732} \downarrow c_{II} 555\)
Attr: \(\sigma’ > C (= 250) 395\)
Var: μετακαλέσαι] μετακαλέσα(ι) 740; μετα το καλέσαι 3006 | μου] + ἐκ θανάτου 512-513
Notes: The Nicetas catena added the words ἐκ θανάτου from the LXX. The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 286; AGK 3, 174; Nic, 499-500).

Job 33 31b-33

HT

יהוה רואים איבר
אַשְׁמֵר תּוֹרָהּ לְשׁוֹב
דֵבַר חַרְשׁ וְאֱלֹקֵךְ:
אָמֶר אָתְהֵשֵׁם שְׁמַע

E

κώφευσον, καὶ ἔγω εἰμὶ λαλήσω.

θʹ Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788 3005) cI-138 260 680 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh

Attr: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οί = 3005 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 643) [ > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 31b-33b sub ※ 3005 788 740 255(non 32b) 612 559(non 33b) 395(non 33a) 137 3006 643 732(non 32) 139(non 32 33) 248 252 Arm La(non 33b) Syh

NonGr: Syh

La
tace (pr ※ β), et ego loquar.
si (pr ※ μ) est tibi sermo, responde mihi :
loquere (pr ※ μ), volo enim iustificari te.
aliocuin (pr ※ μ) audi me,
tace, et docebo te sapientiam.

Arm

235
Job 33:33b

**HT**  שַׇיֵּרֶךְ וַאֲלֶּפְךָ חָכָּמָה׃

**LXX**  κώφευσον, καὶ διδάξω σε σοφίαν.

**σʹ**  σίγα, καὶ διδάξω σε φρόνησιν

*Wit1:*  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI–732

*Attr:*  σʹ] > C (= 788-250) 260 395

*Notes:*  In 788-250 the fragment is placed incorrectly at 33:31b with an index (Kollationen, 215).
Chapter 34

Job 34 2a  
HT שמעו חכמים (מִלָּי)  
LXX (Ἀκούσατε μου, σοφοί)—

Sub  ※ τὰ ρήματα μου

Wit1:  Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

Wit2:  fin] + τὰ ρήματα μου O II = M

NonGr:  Syh\textsuperscript{txt}  

Notes:  In Syh the metobelus should have been placed after מִלָּי, since the pronoun, μου, is also omitted from the LXX.

Job 34 3a–4b  

HT כיראתך מלבך התבהק  
E ὅτι οὖς λόγους δοκιμάζει,  
καὶ λάρυγξ γεύεται βρῶσιν.  
κρίσιν ἑλώμεθα ἑαυτοῖς,  
γνῶμεν ἀνὰ μέσον ἑαυτῶν ὁ τί καλόν.

Sub  ※

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cf–138 680 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

Attr:  θ’ (ἐκ θ’ οἱ δ 3005 788-250 740 612 559 395(2a) 137 3006 643 139(4b);  
ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ δ οἱ τοὺς ἀστερίσκους Ἐχοντες 260) Syh\textsuperscript{txt} > rel

Var:  lemma] om Sa | 3-4 sub ※ 3005 788 740 255 612 559 395(+ 2ab) 137 260 643 732(non 3a) 139 248 252(non 3b) Arm La(non 4b) Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

NonGr:  Syh\textsuperscript{txt}  

Notes:  In Syh the metobelus should have been placed after מִלָּי, since the pronoun, μου, is also omitted from the LXX.
La  * quia auris verba probat,
et (pr * μ) guttur gustavit cibum.
iudicium (pr * μ) eligamus nobis,
sententiam inter nosmetipsos

Arm  * ὡς τῆς φρασίς ῥύθμις
   * και ηυσαρχη θηραρχη μεμρωθή
cλειπενειρ μετα ημανασαν
   * θηρασανῃ ἡ ἰσαρχ ἱφηνυ ρη ρηβη ἦ

Notes: The catena mss contain the attribution to Th at 3a with the exception of 139, which preserves the marginal note at 4b.

Job 34 5b

HT  (Ὡς ἄρα) ἔκρηξις (μηθυμαν)
LXX  (ὁ κυρίος) ἀπήλλαξεν (μου τὸ κρίμα,)

α’  ἀπέστησεν

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 139 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161
Attr:  α’] α’ 395; α’ σ’ cII 555 161
Var:  lemma] παρέτρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστησεν ἀπ’ ἐμου (+ τὸ 161 512-513 555 703) κρίμα (+ μου 161) cII

Notes: The oldest Greek catena preserves separate readings for Aquila and Symmachus at 5b. The cII group preserves a corruption of the fragments by conflating the Aquila and Symmachus fragments and attributions and by adding elements from the LXX.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 289-90; AGK 3, 179; Nic, 502).

σ’  παρέτρεψεν

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cI 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161’
Attr:  σ’] α’ 248; α’ σ’ cII 555 161
Var:  lemma] παρέτρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστησεν ἀπ’ ἐμου (+ τὸ 161 512-513 555 703) κρίμα (+ μου 161) cII
Notes: For the explanation of the variants see above. Ms 248 does not preserve the Aq fragment, but rather it preserves the Sym fragment with the Aq attribution. The omission of the Aq fragment may also contribute to the error of attribution in the fragment at 6a (see infra).

Job 34 6a
HT יָלְלَا נֶפֶשׁ אֶרֶךְ
LXX ἐμεύσατο δὲ τῷ κρίματί μου,

α’ θ’ περὶ τὴν κρίσιν μου ψεῦσμα

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 139 732 ↓cII 555 ↓161’
Attr: α’ θ’] σ’ 395 161’; α’ σ’ cII 555; > C (= 250)
Var: τὴν] > 395

Notes: In ms 248, this fragment remained directly under the fragment of 5b. The Aq fragment was lost, but the attribution was retained and erroneously assigned to the Sym fragment of 5b and then probably the Sym attribution was misapplied to the fragment of 6a.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 289-90; AGK 3, 179; Nic, 502).

Job 34 6b-7b
HT אָנוּשׁ חִצֵּי בְּלִי פָשַע׃
EB βίαιον τὸ βέλος μου ἀνεύ ἀδικίας.

θ’ Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788) cI 138 260 680 3006 248 252 706 Arm Co La Syh\textsuperscript{txt}
Attr: θ’ 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 139 Syh\textsuperscript{txt}] > rel
Var: lemma] om Co | 6b-7 sub ※ 788(non 7) 740(non 7) 255(non 7) 612(non 7) 559(non 7) 395(non 7) 137(non 7) 643(non 7) 732(non 7) 139(non 7) 248 252(non 7b) 706 La(+) 8a Arm(non 7) Syh\textsuperscript{txt}
NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{txt} مَلِيَّةً مِنَ الطَّائِرَاتِ جَعَلَ مِنَها
Job 34 6b

HT: בְָלִי־פָשַׁע׃ (אָנוּשׁ חִצִּי)

E: (βίαιον τὸ βέλος μου) ἀνευ ἀδικίας.

σʹ ἀναιτίως

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI 732

Attr: σʹ] > C (= 250 3005) 138-255 740

Notes: Sym uses ἀναιτίως for חִנָּם in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 465) and in Job 9:17 (Woods, 192). Aq also uses ἀναιτίως for חִנָּם in Ps 34(35):7, 19. Although this translation equivalent is unattested in the LXX and the Three, the evidence for the attribution in C (= 788 257) and other cI mss is probably genuine, since Sym is not a literal translator.

Job 34 8a

HT

LXX: οὐχ ἀμαρτών οὔτε ἀσεβήσας

Sub ÷

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI 138 732 706 Syh

Attr: οὐ κείται (κεῖται 740 255 612 395(7a)) ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 260(8b) 643 139(7b)

Var: 8a sub ÷ 788 740 139(7b, 8b) 706 Syh

NonGr: Syh

Job 34 8c
Sub ※ ἀνδρῶν

Wit1: O
Wit2: ἀσεβῶν] pr (※ O) ἀνδρῶν O II = M

NonGr: Syh\text{hi} \backslash \text{μή} \times
La viris (pr ※ μ)

Job 34:9

HT

כִּי־אָמַר לֹא יִסְכָּן־גָּבֶר

LXX

μὴ γὰρ εἴπῃς ὅτι Οὐκ ἔσται ἐπισκοπὴ ἀνδρός· καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ αὐτῷ παρὰ κυρίου.

θʹ ὅτι εἶπεν· οὐ κινδυνεύσει ἀνήρ ἐν τῷ εὐδοκῆσαι αὐτὸν μετὰ θεοῦ

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI\text{-732} ↓cII ↓555
Attr: θʹ] > C (= 250)

Var: εὐδοκῆσαι C (= 788-250)] εὐδοκιμῆσαι rel | αὐτόν] > C (= 250)

Notes: The reading of 788-250 is correct, since there is no evidence that Th used εὐδοκιμεῖν except for this variant. Th uses εὐδοκεῖν for ἄνδρα in Isa 42:1 and Cant 6:3(4).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 290; AGK 3, 181; Nic, 503).

σʹ οὐχὶ σωθῆσεται ἀνήρ
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Notes: The variant in 3005 680 resulted from improper word division between οὐχί σωθήσεται. When the i was transferred to the verb, the form of the negative changed from οὐχ to οὐκ.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 290; AGK 3, 181; Nic, 503).

Job 34 10bc

HT

חָלִלָה לָאֵל מֵרֶשַׁע וְשַׁדַּי מֵעָוֶל׃

LXX

Μή μοι εἴη ἐναντίον κυρίου ἀσεβῆσαι καὶ ἐναντίον παντοκράτορος ταράξαι τὸ δίκαιον·

σʹ

ἀπείη τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνομία καὶ τοῦ ἰκανοῦ ἀδικία

Notes: Ms 788 is the first C ms to preserve the attribution to Sym. The lemma of 643 3006 has two letter spaces between ἀπεί and τοῦ. The fragment occurs at 9a in 788-250.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 291; AGK 3, 181; Nic, 503).

Job 34 11b

HT

וֹכָאֶרֶת אִישׁ יַמְצִיאָנּוּ׃

E

καὶ ἐν τρίβῳ ἀνδρός εὑρήσει αὐτόν.

θʹ

Sub ※

Notes: The variant in 740 248 252 resulted from improper word division between καὶ ἐν τρίβῳ ἀνδρός. When the ι was transferred to the verb, the form of the negative changed from καὶ to καὶ.
Attr: \( \Theta' \ C (= 788 \ 3005) \ 740] > \text{rel} \\
Var: \text{lemma} \ om \ Sa \ | \ 11b \ \text{sub} \ \times \ 3005 \ 788 \ 740 \ 248 \ 252 \ Arm \ La \\
NonGr: \text{La} \ \times \ \text{et iuxta viam suam unus quisque repperiet.} \\
\ Arm \ \times \ \text{καὶ ἀπελεύσεται.} \\
Notes: \ Mss 788 \ and 3005 \ also \ preserve \ this \ line \ under \ the \ asterisk \ and \ attribute \ it \\
to \ Th; \ therefore, \ the \ C \ group \ confirms \ the \ attribution \ known \ previously \ from \ 740 \ only.

σʹ \ καὶ \ κατὰ \ τὴν \ ὁδὸν \ αὐτοῦ \\
\ekάστω \ συμβήσεται

Wit1: \( \downarrow C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \downarrow cI \downarrow 732 \downarrow cII \downarrow 555 \downarrow 161' \\
Attr: \( \sigma' \ | \ \sigma' \ 139; \ > \ C (= 250) \ 248 \\
Var: \ \kαὶ \ κατὰ] \ \kατὰ \ γάρ \ cII \ 555 \ 161' | \ τὴν] \ γῆν \ 559 | \ ὁδὸν] > \ 740 \\
Notes: \ In \ 161 \ the \ fragment \ follows \ the \ one \ of \ 10bc \ without \ a \ break, \ and \\
therefore \ it \ still \ preserves \ the \ attribution. \\
The \ variant \ κατὰ \ γάρ \ arose \ within \ the \ Nicetas \ catena \ and \ should \ not \ be \ understood \\
as \ the \ original \ Sym \ lemma, \ which \ is \ preserved \ by \ C \ and \ cI. \ In \ context, \ Nic \ used \ the \\
fragment \ of \ Sym \ as \ the \ final \ reason \ and \ had \ no \ use \ for \ the \ original \ καὶ. \\
The \ attribution \ to \ Olymp \ in \ the Edition \ is \ not \ supported \ by \ Kommentar \ and \ AGK, \\
but \ only \ by \ Nic \ (Kommentar, \ 291; \ AGK \ 3, \ 181; \ Nic, \ 503-4). \\

Job 34 15b
HT \( \text{ חוֹם } \text{ על־מור רִשׁוֹב:} \) \\
LXX \( \text{πᾶς δὲ βροτὸς εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσεται, } \) \( \text{όθεν καὶ ἐπλάσθη.} \)

Sub \( \div \\
Wit1: \ cI (= 740 \ 255 \ 612) \ La \ Syh^{ixi} \\
Var: \ 15b \ \text{sub} \ \div \ 740 \ 255 \ 612 \ La \ Syh^{ixi} \\
NonGr: \ Syh^{ixi} \ \| \ \div \\
La \ \div \ \text{unde formatus est.} \\

Job 34 16a
σ’ εἰ μὴ συνίεις

\textit{Wit1}: \(\downarrow C (= 257 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI-139^\text{732} \downarrow 512-513 \downarrow 555\)

\textit{Attr}: \(\sigma’ \lambda’ 512-513 555; > C (= 250) 138\)

\textit{Var}: \(\varepsilonι mη > 257 | \varepsilonη + \delta C (= 3005) | συνίεις] συνίης C (= 257) 137 643^c 680 | συνίεις] + \acute{\alpha}κουε 512-513 555\)

\textit{Notes}: The \textit{Edition} did not list the evidence of Nic in this instance, but the fragment is present and it is has been attributed to \(\lambda’\). Ms 257 appears to have συνίης, but it is possible that it has the lemma instead, if the epsilon is written more narrowly than usual.

Job 34 17a

\textit{HT}: הָאִיךְ קָשָׁה מִשְׁפָּט יַחֲבוֹ וֹ הַאַף

\textit{LXX}: ιδὴ σὺ τὸν μισοῦντα ἀνομα

σ’ ἄρα ὁ μισῶν κρίσιν ἐπιδίσει εἰς ἱάσιν

\textit{Wit1}: \(\downarrow C (= 788-250) \downarrow cI-138^\text{732} \downarrow 512-513 \downarrow 555\)

\textit{Attr}: \(\sigma’ 740] \alpha’ 255 395 559 612; \lambda’ 512-513 555; > C (= 788-250) 137 260 643 680 3006\)

\textit{Var}: \(\varepsilonις] + την 137 260 643 680 3006\)

\textit{Notes}: The external evidence is divided regarding the attribution. The use of ἄρα favors the attribution to Sym over the other revisers (Busto Saiz, 265). The \textit{Beiträge} reports that Aq uses μήτι καίπερ for ἡ ἀφ (so Job 40:8) and he renders τῶν with μοτόν (\textit{Beiträge}, 61).

Field and Ziegler considered εἰς ἱάσιν to be a scholion, but there is no evidence for this conclusion. These words belong to the Sym fragment.

Job 34 18a

\textit{HT}: הָאִיךְ קָשָׁה לְמֶלֶךְ בְּלִיָּעַל

\textit{LXX}: ἀσέβης (ὁ λέγων βασιλεῖ Παρανομεῖς,)
Notes: The Nachlese reports this fragment together with the following two fragments for the first time, but unfortunately the attributions have been cut from the margin of the manuscript (Nachlese, 405). The Hagedorns cite a parallel in Judges 19:22, where the readings from the Three are cited as revisions for παράνομος in the LXX. In Judges 19:22, for בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל Aquila has (ויוֹי) ἀποστάσις, Symmachus has ἀπαίδευτοι, and Theodotion has βελιάλ, which leaves בליעל untranslated (Nachlese, 405-6). They include that Aq also translates בְּלִיַּעַל with ἀποστάτης in 1 Regn. 30:22.

Notes: For the translation equivalent of Sym, see the comments above.
Notes: Since the first two attributions are probably correct, it is also probable that the last fragment should be attributed to Th.

Job 34 18b

HT  רָשָׁע אֶל־נְדִיבִים:  $\dfrac{\text{הט}}{\text{E}}$
E  ἀσεβέστατε τοῖς ἀρχουσιν.

Sub  ※

Wit1:  $C (= 3005) 248 \text{ La Sa Syn Chr Dam II 1208}$

Var: lemma] om Sa Syn Chr Dam II 1208 | 18b sub ※ 3005 248 La

NonGr:  $\text{La}  ※ Impiissime principibus$

Notes: Ms 3005 is the first catena ms to attest the asterisk for this line.

Job 34 19a

HT  אָשֶׁר לֹא־נָשָׂא פְּנֵי$
LXX  ( hiç่ ἐπησχύνθη πρόσωπον) ἐντίμου

$\lambda'$  ἀρχόντων

Wit1:  $C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow \text{cI } 137 260 643 732 3006 \text{ cII } 555 161$

Var: ἀρχόντων] αροντων 612

Job 34 22

HT  וְאֶין צַלְמָוֶת (אֵין־חֹשֶׁך)
LXX  (οὐδὲ ἔσται τόπος)—(τοῦ κρυβῆναι τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὰ ἄνομα·)

$\alpha'$  θ'

καὶ οὐκ ἔστι σκιὰ θανάτου

Wit1:  Syh

Wit2:  τόπος] + (※ La) καὶ οὐκ ἔστι σκιὰ θανάτου La ll-Iul = M

NonGr:  Syh  ※ et non est umbra mortis

La  ※ et non est umbra mortis
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Notes: The index in Syh is over אֲם, which corresponds to οὐδὲ in the LXX. The lemma could be placed before or after the phrase “there is no place.” La adds the text clearly after locus, which gives plausibility to Ziegler’s suggestion in the Edition that the fragment comes after τόπος.

HT

E

Notes: The Edition lists the attribution at verse 22 and notes that there is an asterisk at 23a in 255, but it makes no attempt to combine these observations, probably since the note is at 22 in 255 and 23a begins on another folio. When the asterisk in 788-250 and 3005 is consulted, the situation becomes clear (see infra). The Edition did not place the half line under the asterisk and in App II it only listed the marginal note and did not comment on the asterisk, which is in C and cf; therefore, the marginal note may potentially be misunderstood. The stichometry, combined with the use of an asterisk at 23a of 3005 is instructive, for verse 22(τοῦ ἄνομα) is split over two lines in 3005, but the second line is indented, perhaps indicating that this line is the rest of the “half line,” and not the “next line,” to which the note refers. Verse 23a confirms this observation, since 3005 marks “the next line” with an asterisk. Ms 788-250 has a similar situation. The half line begins with an asterisk at τοῦ and the next line is the rest of verse 22. Verse 23a begins with an asterisk confirming that this line is “the next line,” to which the marginal attribution referred.

The translation of the infinitive construct + ἄνομα + inf is common in Th and Aq but also the LXX (Gentry, 266; Hyvärinen, 72). The translation of τοῦ ἄνομα is not attested in Th Job, for Th usually renders this word with ἄδικος/-ία (3x; see Gentry, 136, 139). Th does use ἄνομοις one time in 31:3b, but Gentry explains this usage as variation, since Th used ἄδικος in 31:3a. The half line, therefore, may not be under the asterisk or from Th and Aq, but 23a is from the revisers and is under the asterisk in the catena and other witnesses.
Job 34 23a

כִּי לֹא תַּעֲשֶׂה יָשִׂים תֹּנֶר

经开区 经济发展

E 23a Sub ※

\[\text{θ'}\]

\textit{Wit1:} C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 255 559 395) Arm La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{Ixt}

\textit{Attr:} θ' Syh\textsuperscript{Ixt} α' θ' (εξ ἀκυλ(ἀκύλα 395) καὶ θ' το ἡμισυ και ὁ εξῆς 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 680; εξ α' και θ' το ἡμισυ και ὁ εξῆς 137 3006\textsuperscript{inc} 643 139)

\textit{Var:} lemma] om Sa | 23a sub ※ 3005 788-250 255 559 395(22 fin) Arm La Syh\textsuperscript{Ixt}

\textit{NonGr:} Syh\textsuperscript{Ixt} \textsuperscript{※} quia non in homine positum est ultra \textsuperscript{※}

\textit{Notes:} In 395 the asterisk appears at the end of verse 22, and thus it marks verse 23 as under the asterisk. For the double attribution to Aq and Th, see supra.

\[\text{σ'}\]

\[\text{οὐ γὰρ ἔπ' ἀνθρώπῳ κεῖται ἔτι}\]

\textit{Wit1:} ↓C (= 249 788-250 3005) ↓cl\textsuperscript{732} ↓cII ↓555 ↓161' ↓252 Syh

\textit{Attr:} σ'] > C (= 788-250)

\textit{Var:} ἔπ' ἀνθρώπῳ C (= 249 788-250 3005) 252 Syh] ἐπάνω cl\textsuperscript{732} cII 555 161' | ἔτι] > 252 260 3006

\textit{NonGr:} Syh

\textit{Notes:} The Nachlese reports that only C (= 249 788-250 3005) with 252 preserve the correct lemma ἔπ' ἀνθρώπῳ (Nachlese, 406). Syh also preserves this reading instead of the variant ἐπάνω. It is probable that ἐπάνω is derived from the nomen sacrum for ἔπ' ἀνθρώπῳ (= ἔπ ἀνω) (Nachlese, 406); therefore, the error arose from improper word division.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 293; AGK 3, 187; Nic, 506).
Job 34 23b

HT  לַהֲלֹךְ אֶל־אֵל בַּמִּשְׁפָּט׃
LXX  ὁ γὰρ κύριος πάντας ἐφορᾷ

\[\theta'] \text{τοὺ προσαχθὴναι πρὸς τὸν ἰσχυρὸν ἐν κρίματι}\]

\textit{Wit1:} \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI-732\)

\textit{Attr:} \(\theta'1 \sigma' 139; > C (= 250)\)

\textit{Var:} \(κρίματι] κλήματι 3006\)

\textit{Notes:} The Edition's alleged variant (προσαχθ.) in 250 was not confirmed, and 250 supports the lemma (\textit{Kollationen}, 219).

Job 34 25b

HT  וְהָפַךְ לַיְלָה וְיִדַּכָּאוּ׃
E  καὶ στρέψει νύκτα, καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται.

\[\theta' \text{Sub} \star\]

\textit{Wit1:} \(C (= 788 3005) cI-138 139 255 260 643 680 732\) Arm La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

\textit{Wit2:} ταπεινωθήσεται] ταπεινωθήσονται \(C O L'' C' d (157c) 248c' 543\) Arm Ol = M

\textit{Attr:} \(\theta' 3005 788\) Syh\textsuperscript{txt]} > rel

\textit{Var:} \(\text{lemma]} \text{om Sa} | 25b \text{sub} \star 3005 788 740 612 559 395 137 3006\) Arm La(+ 25a) Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

\textit{NonGr:} Syh\textsuperscript{txt} \(\text{et (pr} \star \mu) \text{vertet noctem, et humiliabuntur.}\)
La \(\text{et (pr} \star \mu) \text{vertet noctem, et humiliabuntur.}\)
Arm \(\star \text{ημιγάλησετ ἡ ἐχθρὴ ἡ ἱμύσεσετ ἡ ὑποστηρίζουσιν}
\textit{Notes:} The fragment in 3005 appears in the margin with an asterisk and attribution to Th. The index appears after ἔργα in 25a which then shows at what place the fragment is to be inserted. Ms 788 preserves the line under the asterisk and attributes it to Th; therefore, the \(C (= 788 3005)\) group confirms the attribution known previously only in Syh.
Job 34 28-33

סְפִּיךְ יִתְפַּאֵר עָלָיו צַעֲקַת־דָּל וְצַעֲקַת עֲנִיִּים יִשְׁמָע׃ וְהוּא יַשְׁקִט וּמִי יַרְשִׁיעַ וְיַסְתֵּר פָּנִים וּמִי يְשׁוּרֶנּוּ יְוַעַל־אָדָם׃וְעַל־גוֹ מִמְּלֹךְ אָדָם חָנֵף מִמֹּקְשֵׁי עָם׃

כִּי־אֶל־אֵל הֶאָמַר نָשָׂאתִי לֹא אֶחְבֹּל׃ בִּלְעֲדֵי אֶחֱזֶה אַתָּה הֹרֵנִי אִם־עָוֶל פָּעַלְתִּי לֹא אֹסִיף׃

כִּי־מָאַסְתָּ הַמֵעִמְּךָ יְשַׁלְמֶנָּה כִּי־אַתָּה תִבְחַר וְלֹא־אָנִי וּמַה־יָדַעְתָּ דַבֵּר׃

E

tоú ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐπ’ αὐτόν κραυγήν πενήτων, καὶ κραυγήν πτωχῶν εἰσακούσεται. καὶ αὐτὸς ἰσυγχαί παρέξει, καὶ τίς καταδικάσεται; καὶ κρύψει πρόσωπον, καὶ τίς οὕτε αὐτόν; καὶ κατὰ ἔθνους καὶ κατὰ ἀνθρώπου ὁμοῦ βασιλεὺς ἄνθρωπον ὑποκριτὴν ἀπὸ δυσκολίας λαοῦ.

ὅτι πρὸς τὸν ἰσχυρὸν ὁ λέγων Εἴληφα, οὐκ ἐνεχυράσω· ἀνευ ἐμαυτοῦ ὁμοία, σὺ δεῖξόν μοι· εἰ ἀδικίαν ἠγαςάμην, οὐ μὴ προσθῆσομ. μὴ παρὰ σοῦ ἀποτείσει αὐτήν; ὅτι ἀπώσῃ, ὅτι σὺ ἐκλέξῃ καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ· καὶ τί ἐγὼς λάλησον.

Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) c£-138 260 680 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh

Attr: θ’ (ἐκ θ’ οἱ ὅ 3005 788-250 740 255 612) Syh [ἐκ θ’ οἱ δ 395 137 139 643(28b) 3006; > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 28-33 sub ※ 3005(non 29bc 31 32a) 788 740 255(non 30) 612 559 395(non 28b 30 31b-33) 137(non 29a1 32a; + 34a) 3006(non
NonGr: Syh²

La

Arm
Notes: The catena tradition contains the attribution to Th at 28a except in 643, where the marginal note is at 28b. The note in 137 139 643 3006 contains an error of haplography (οἱ δ for οἱ ιδ), since it is clear that fourteen lines are from Th, not four. Mss 137 139 do not preserve the first part of 29a (καὶ αὐτὸς ἡσυχίαν παρέξει) under the asterisk, but only the second part. Likewise, mss 139 732 do not preserve the first part of 33b (ὅτι ἀπώσῃ,) under the asterisk. La preserves the asterisks since there is an asterisk in each line. The appearance of missing asterisks may be due to the different stichometries in these mss.

Job 34 29a

HT וְהוּא יַשְׁקִט וּמִי יַרְשִׁעַ

E καὶ αὐτὸς ἡσυχίαν παρέξει, καὶ τίς καταδικάσεται;

σ’ αὐτοῦ δὲ ἠρεμίαν δόντος τίς κατακρίνει

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cl-138-255 732 cII ↓ 555 ↓ 161 Syh

Wit2: ἡσυχίαν] ἡρεμίαν 620

Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250) 3006


NonGr: Syh
Notes: The best witnesses preserve δόντος not διδόντος. The word ἐρέμια belongs only to the lexical stock of Sym (Beiträge, 15; H-R, 620).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 295; AGK 3, 189; Nic, 507).

Job 34 29c

Notes: The index is at κατά 1° in 788.

Job 34 31

Notes: The presentation of Syh in the Edition is not clear, since it lists the evidence of the Syro-Hexapla as Syh, which indicates the reading is in the margin. In this edition, the siglum, Syh\textsuperscript{cat}, indicates that the fragment is not found in the text or the margin. Rather, the fragment is embedded in a scholion from the commentary of Olymp in the lower part of the folio (Ceriani, 42). The comment is introduced as in the catena: "Now Symmachus rendered thus" = ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος οὕτως ἐκδέδωκεν; cf. AGK 3, 190).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is established on the basis of Kommentar, AGK, and Nic (Kommentar, 296; AGK 3, 190; Nic, 508).
Job 34 32a

HT

בָּלַעֲרֵי רֹאָה (אָתָּה)

E

(אָנֵן הָמָעְתּוּ הָשְׁפַּמָּא,) מְדֶיַּדְנָנְנָנְנָנָנְנָנָנָה

σ’

σ’ διασάφηςόν μοι

Wit1: $C_{\text{cat}}^{\text{Wit} 1} (= 249 257 788-250 3005) cI_{\text{cat}}^{\text{Wit} 1} 754_{\text{cat}}^{\text{Wit} 1} 474_{\text{cat}}^{\text{Wit} 1} 258_{\text{cat}}^{\text{Wit} 1} 505_{\text{cat}}^{\text{Wit} 1} cII_{\text{cat}}^{\text{Wit} 1} 555_{\text{cat}}^{\text{Wit} 1} 161_{\text{cat}}^{\text{Wit} 1}$

NonGr: Syh_{\text{cat}}^{\text{NonGr}}

Job 34 33b

HT

כִּי־מָאַסְתָּ כִּי־אַתָּה תִבְחַר וְלֹא־אָנִי

E

ὅτι ἀπώσῃ, ὅτι σὺ ἐκλέξῃ καὶ οὐκ ἔγω·

σ’

ὅτι ἀπεδοκίμασας· σὺ γὰρ ἐπελέξω καὶ οὐκ ἔγω

Wit1: $\text{lemma}^{\text{Wit} 1} 249 | \text{ἀπεδοκίμασας} | \downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI_{\text{Wit} 1}^{\text{Wit} 1} 139_{\text{Wit} 1}^{\text{Wit} 1} 260_{\text{Wit} 1}^{\text{Wit} 1} 732_{\text{Wit} 1}$

Attr: $\sigma’ > C (= 788-250) 138$

Var: $\text{ἀπεδοκίμασας} \text{αποδοκιμασης} C (= 788-250 3005) 255 612; \text{αποδοκιμασεις} 137 138 395 643 680 740; \text{αποδοκιμασης} 559; \text{αποδοκιμασεις} 3006$

Notes: Apparently, 249 shares a different source, which is independent of the other catena tradition (Nachlese, 406). In the Edition, Ziegler only cited the verb from the lemma, but the longer fragment agrees with HT and should be properly attributed to Sym. The Nachlese also shows that Sym uses ἐπιλέγομαι for רָקַב in 3 Rgns 18:25 and Ps 24(25):12b (Nachlese, 406). It concludes that given the fact that the two witnesses attest the same author but different forms of the verb ἀποδοκιμάζω, there must be an error of either the author attribution or the verb form in one of them (Nachlese, 406). Since the attribution to Th for the asterisked lines is secure, one may exclude this possibility. According to Reider, there are no instances of ἀποδοκιμάζω for Aq, who instead uses ἀπωθέω for מַמְמָה (Reider, 27, 30). In contrast, Sym uses ἀποδοκιμάζω for מַמְמָה in Ps 35:5, 52:6, 77:59, and 88:39 (Busto Saiz, 471). It is best, therefore, to posit that there is an error in the verb form, which occurred in the transmission of the fragment. Ms 249 preserves an aorist active indicative, while the other catena tradition preserves an aorist active subjunctive. The former is the preferred translational equivalent for the Qal perfect in Sym (Busto Saiz, 118, 121). There are 326 examples of this phenomenon.
compared to 3 examples where Sym uses the aorist subjunctive to translate the Qal perfect, and these three examples occur only when Sym introduces the clause with ἵνα. Therefore, ἀποδοκιμάσῃς is probably from 249, but how did the variant arise? There is evidence of the interchange ε > ο but the examples are mostly limited to situations before σ/ς and ν (Gignac, I, 290; Mayser, I, 96). The interchange between α and η is attested only sporadically (Gignac, I, 286; Mayser, I, 62).

Job 34 34b

HT וְגֶבֶר חָכָם שֹׁמֵעַ לִי:
LXX (ἀνὴρ δὲ σοφὸς ἀκῆκοέν) μου τὸ ῥῆμα.

Sub ÷

Wit1: La Syh

Var: μου τὸ ῥῆμα sub ÷ Laβ Syh] 34b sub ÷ Laμ

NonGr: Syh \\ La verbum (pr ÷ β) meum (+ ✓ β)

Notes: Laβ has preserved the correct words under the obelus, while Laμ has preserved the entire line under the obelus.

Job 34 35a

HT לא ידֹבֵר (הָרְבָּרָה)
LXX (יוֹב дὲ) οὐκ ἐν συνέσει (ἐλάλησεν,)

σʹ οὐ φρονίμως

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI–137 138 139 260 643 680 732 3006

Attr: σʹ > C (= 250)

Var: φρονίμως[ φρονίμος 612; φρονίμος 559; φρονήμως 395
Chapter 35

Job 35 2b
HT —(אָמַרְתָּ צִדְקִי מֵאֵל׃)
LXX σὺ τίς εἰ (ὅτι εἰπας Δίκαιος εἰμι ἐναντὶ κυρίου;)

Sub ÷

Wit1: Syh^txt
NonGr: Syh^txt

Job 35 3
HT קָרָה אָמַר מִבְּדָלְכּוֹן (מֵהָדְבַּלְךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ תִּשְׁעָה (מֵאֵל׃)
LXX ἢ ἐρεῖς Τί ποιήσω ἁμαρτῶν;

σʹ εἰπας γάρ, ὅτι οὐδὲν συμβαλεῖται σοι

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 260 732 cII 555 ↓161
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 250) 643 161

Notes: The OG paraphrased the HT, combining the two stichs into one by summarizing the second via a participle. The Sym fragment corresponds only to the A line in the Hebrew text, not the B line, since there is no equivalent for ἁμαρτῶν or חַטָּאתִי in Sym.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 300; AGK 3, 197-8; Nic, 512).

Job 35 6a
HT —(απερανὰ μεταφράζεις)
LXX εἰ ἠμαρτες, τί πράξεις;

σʹ ἐὰν ἀμάρτης, τί εἰργάσω αὐτόν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 139 260 643 732 3006

256
Attr: \( \sigma' > C (= 250) \)

Var: \( \alphaυτόν \] \( \alphaυτω \) 255 559 612 680 740; \( \alphaυτ(\) 138

Notes: The accusative, \( \alphaυτόν \), is the reading of the \( C (= 788-250 \text{ 3005}) \) group and 395 (through conjecture) (Nachlese, 406). The word \( \varepsilonργάζομαι \) takes a double accusative in the construction “to do something to someone” (LSJ, s.v. \( \varepsilonργάζομαι \), II, 2a; Nachlese, 406). The Nachlese also cites evidence of this construction from the post classical period (Nachlese, 406; Aelius Aristides, 'Ετι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἐπιτάφιος 84, 10 (I p. 139 Dind.); Idem Δευκτρικός σ 414, 31 (I p. 623 Dind.)). The variant in the \( cI \) group may have arisen due to a ligature as in ms 138, which caused the scribe to guess the dative case, while the \( C \) group shows that the accusative case was original.

Job 35 7b-10a

HT

\[ \text{א} \] מה מיידך יקח׃ או�ך רשקך ליא אדם צדקך׃ יזעיקו מרב עتكنولوجيا ערב׃ ישות מזרו החויא לאמר איה אלהי קrections propor

E

\[ \text{ἡ} \] τι \( \varepsilonκ \) χειρὸς σου λήμμεται;
\( \alphaνδρὶ \) τῷ \( \text{oμοίῳ} \) σου \( \text{ἡ} \) ἁσεβείᾳ σου,
καὶ \( υἱῷ \) \( \text{ἀνθρώπου} \) \( \text{ἡ} \) δικαιοσύνη σου.

καὶ \( οὐκ \) εἶπεν \( \text{Ποῦ} \) \( \text{ἐστιν} \) ὁ \( θεὸς \) \( \text{ὁ} \) ποιήσας με,

\[ \theta' \] Sub ※

Wit1: \( C (= 788-250 \text{ 3005}) \) \( cI-138 \text{ 680} 252 \text{ 706} \text{ Arm La Sa Syh}^{xt} \)

Attr: \( \theta' (\varepsilonκ \theta' \text{ οί} \text{ 3005 788} \text{ 740} 255 \text{ 612 559 395} 137 \text{ 3006 643} \text{ 139} \text{ Syh}^{xt}]) \)
(\( \varepsilonκ \\theta' \text{ οί} \text{ 250 (7a); > rel} \)

Var: lemma \( \text{om} \text{ Sa | 7b-10a sub ※ 3005(9 10a) 788} \text{ 740} \text{ 255(9a 10a)} \)
\( 612 \text{ 559 395(non 7b-9a) 137} \text{ 3006(non 7b 8b 9 10a)} \text{ 260(non 7b 9b)} \)
\( 643(non 9b) 732(non 7b 9b) 139(non 9 10a) \text{ 252} \text{ 706 Arm La(non 9b)} \text{ Syh}^{xt} \)

NonGr: Syh^{xt}
Job 35 8a

E  (ἀνδρὶ τῷ ὁμοίῳ σου) ἢ ἄσεβειά σου,

σʹ  ἢ παρανομία σου

Wit1:  ↓⁴C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI⁻²⁶⁰    ⁷³²
Attr:    σʹ] αʹ σʹ 139; > C (= 250)
Var:     ἡ] > C (= 3005)

Job 35 9a

E  (ἀπὸ πλῆθους) συκοφαντούμενοι (κεκράξονται,)

σʹ  συκοφαντῶν

Wit1:  ↓⁴C (= 788-250 3005) cI⁻¹³⁸    ⁷³²
Attr:    σʹ] > C (= 250)
Notes: Sym agrees with the vocalization of MT, “oppressions”, while Th has read קִים שׁוֹעָנְו “oppressors.”

Job 35 9b

HT (יְשַׁוְּעוּ) וְהָרָעָשׁ (רַבִּים)
E (βοίσονται) ἀπὸ βραχίόνος (πολλῶν.)

σ’ διὰ βίαν

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ clf^138-255 732
Attr: σ’] > C (= 250)
Var: διὰ βίαν] διαβασιν 137 139 260 395 643 680 3006

Job 35 10b

HT (תַּבָּלָיְלָה) רַבִּים
LXX ὁ κατατάσσων φυλακὰς νυκτερινάς

θ’ ὁ διδοὺς αἴνεσεις ἐν νυκτί

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ clf^732 3006 ↓ Ol^Υ
Attr: θ’] θ’] ε’ C (= 3005); σ’ 139; > C (= 250) 137 260 395 559 643 680
Var: αἰνέσεις] ενεσεις 559; ανεσεις Ol^Υ | ἐν] + τη 139 260 643

Notes: The fragment probably comes directly from Olymp as Kommentar indicates (Kommentar, 302).

HT (נָתַן חֲמַרְתָּן בְּקִלָּלָה)
LXX ὁ κατατάσσων φυλακάς νυκτερινάς

α’ μελῳδίας

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ clf^137 139 260 395 643 732 3006
Attr: α’] > C (= 250) 138
Var: μελῳδίας] μελῳδια 138 680

Notes: The fragment is at 35:11a in 138 250 255 559 680 740 (Kollationen, 222).
Job 35 11a

HT

מַלְּפֵנוּ מִבַּהֲמוֹ

LXX

ὁ διορίζων με ἀπὸ τετραπόδων γῆς,

dιδάσκων ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς

Wit1:  C (= 3005) ↓cl<sup>1</sup> 260 643 732 ↓512-513 ↓555 ↓161

Attr:  σʹ λʹ 512-513 555 161

Var:  lemma] > 137 3006

Notes:  Although the Edition does not cite the evidence, Nic contains this fragment in a patristic citation attributed to Origen but attributes it to λʹ instead of σʹ (Nic, 514; cf. Beiträge, 61-2). AGK does not confirm this hexaplaric fragment in the comments by Origen for this verse; thus, Nic probably invents it (AGK 3, 203-4). The whole fragment reads as follows in Nic: κατὰ δὲ τοὺς λοιποὺς· διδάσκων ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς καὶ σοφίζων ὑπὲρ τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά (Nic, 514). Probably Nic has combined a genuine hexaplaric fragment of Symmachus, part of the Aquila fragment (σοφίζων comes from Aquila, but via a bible text revised by Lucian such as the one employed by Iulian; Iul-Kommentar, 225; see infra), with part of the Olymp commentary (cp. κατὰ ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά; Kommentar, 302), and he attributed the fragment to οἱ λοιποὶ, since he probably knew he was combining fragments of the Three. He then attributed the whole citation to Origen erroneously.

Mss 137 and 3006 contain only the attribution but not the text of the fragment (Kollationen, 222). Ms 680 contains a divided lemma as follows: σʹ διδάσκων ήμᾶς θʹ ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς (Kollationen, 222).

A final observation about the text history of this fragment and the following one is in order. The C group preserves the original fragments of Sym and Aq, while cl at the top of the Hagedorns’ stemma contains revision (cp. the attribution in C and cl at 11b; AGK 1, 61) and the bottom of it contains deterioration, since the readings themselves are lost (e.g. 137). Nic, then, represents the final revision and contaminated form of the fragments, since the specific attributions are lost and the hexaplaric fragments are combined with a comment from Olymp.

Job 35 11b

HT

יְחַכְּמֵנוּ׃

(ף † הַשָּׁמַיִם וּמֵעוֹ)

LXX

ἀπὸ δὲ πετεινῶν οὐρανοῦ;—

Notes:  Although the Emission does not cite the evidence, Nic contains this fragment in a patristic citation attributed to Origen but attributes it to λʹ instead of σʹ (Nic, 514; cf. Beiträge, 61-2). AGK does not confirm this hexaplaric fragment in the comments by Origen for this verse; thus, Nic probably invents it (AGK 3, 203-4). The whole fragment reads as follows in Nic: κατὰ δὲ τοὺς λοιποὺς· διδάσκων ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς καὶ σοφίζων ὑπὲρ τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά (Nic, 514). Probably Nic has combined a genuine hexaplaric fragment of Symmachus, part of the Aquila fragment (σοφίζων comes from Aquila, but via a bible text revised by Lucian such as the one employed by Iulian; Iul-Kommentar, 225; see infra), with part of the Olymp commentary (cp. κατὰ ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά; Kommentar, 302), and he attributed the fragment to οἱ λοιποὶ, since he probably knew he was combining fragments of the Three. He then attributed the whole citation to Origen erroneously.

Mss 137 and 3006 contain only the attribution but not the text of the fragment (Kollationen, 222). Ms 680 contains a divided lemma as follows: σʹ διδάσκων ήμᾶς θʹ ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς (Kollationen, 222).

A final observation about the text history of this fragment and the following one is in order. The C group preserves the original fragments of Sym and Aq, while cl at the top of the Hagedorns’ stemma contains revision (cp. the attribution in C and cl at 11b; AGK 1, 61) and the bottom of it contains deterioration, since the readings themselves are lost (e.g. 137). Nic, then, represents the final revision and contaminated form of the fragments, since the specific attributions are lost and the hexaplaric fragments are combined with a comment from Olymp.

Notes:  Although the Edition does not cite the evidence, Nic contains this fragment in a patristic citation attributed to Origen but attributes it to λʹ instead of σʹ (Nic, 514; cf. Beiträge, 61-2). AGK does not confirm this hexaplaric fragment in the comments by Origen for this verse; thus, Nic probably invents it (AGK 3, 203-4). The whole fragment reads as follows in Nic: κατὰ δὲ τοὺς λοιποὺς· διδάσκων ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς καὶ σοφίζων ὑπὲρ τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά (Nic, 514). Probably Nic has combined a genuine hexaplaric fragment of Symmachus, part of the Aquila fragment (σοφίζων comes from Aquila, but via a bible text revised by Lucian such as the one employed by Iulian; Iul-Kommentar, 225; see infra), with part of the Olymp commentary (cp. κατὰ ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά; Kommentar, 302), and he attributed the fragment to οἱ λοιποὶ, since he probably knew he was combining fragments of the Three. He then attributed the whole citation to Origen erroneously.

Mss 137 and 3006 contain only the attribution but not the text of the fragment (Kollationen, 222). Ms 680 contains a divided lemma as follows: σʹ διδάσκων ήμᾶς θʹ ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς (Kollationen, 222).

A final observation about the text history of this fragment and the following one is in order. The C group preserves the original fragments of Sym and Aq, while cl at the top of the Hagedorns’ stemma contains revision (cp. the attribution in C and cl at 11b; AGK 1, 61) and the bottom of it contains deterioration, since the readings themselves are lost (e.g. 137). Nic, then, represents the final revision and contaminated form of the fragments, since the specific attributions are lost and the hexaplaric fragments are combined with a comment from Olymp.

Notes:  Although the Edition does not cite the evidence, Nic contains this fragment in a patristic citation attributed to Origen but attributes it to λʹ instead of σʹ (Nic, 514; cf. Beiträge, 61-2). AGK does not confirm this hexaplaric fragment in the comments by Origen for this verse; thus, Nic probably invents it (AGK 3, 203-4). The whole fragment reads as follows in Nic: κατὰ δὲ τοὺς λοιποὺς· διδάσκων ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς καὶ σοφίζων ὑπὲρ τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά (Nic, 514). Probably Nic has combined a genuine hexaplaric fragment of Symmachus, part of the Aquila fragment (σοφίζων comes from Aquila, but via a bible text revised by Lucian such as the one employed by Iulian; Iul-Kommentar, 225; see infra), with part of the Olymp commentary (cp. κατὰ ἀέρα διιπτάμενα πετεινά; Kommentar, 302), and he attributed the fragment to οἱ λοιποὶ, since he probably knew he was combining fragments of the Three. He then attributed the whole citation to Origen erroneously.

Mss 137 and 3006 contain only the attribution but not the text of the fragment (Kollationen, 222). Ms 680 contains a divided lemma as follows: σʹ διδάσκων ήμᾶς θʹ ὑπὲρ τὰ κτήνη τῆς γῆς (Kollationen, 222).

A final observation about the text history of this fragment and the following one is in order. The C group preserves the original fragments of Sym and Aq, while cl at the top of the Hagedorns’ stemma contains revision (cp. the attribution in C and cl at 11b; AGK 1, 61) and the bottom of it contains deterioration, since the readings themselves are lost (e.g. 137). Nic, then, represents the final revision and contaminated form of the fragments, since the specific attributions are lost and the hexaplaric fragments are combined with a comment from Olymp.
αʹ 

σοφίζει ἡμᾶς

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl-260732 ↓248 Syh

Wit2:  οὐρανοῦ] + σοφίζει ἡμᾶς V-575 253 523 644* 706 795 = M; + σοφιζῶν με Iul; + sapientiorem me facit (fecitA) La

Attr:  αʹ C (= 3005) 248 Syh] αʹ θʹ 137 138-255 139 395 559 612 643 680 740 3006; > C (= 788-250)

Var:  lemma] > 137 139 643 3006 | σοφίζει] σοφίζῃ 559; σοφίζεις C (= 788-250); σοφιστή 248

NonGr:  Syh  *

Notes:  In Syh the index is after καταθέμα, which is at the end of the line, indicating that this fragment should be inserted post οὐρανοῦ. The Nachlese comments that the attribution to Aquila in 248, C, and Syh appears more reliable than the attribution to αʹ θʹ in cl (Nachlese, 406), but 788 confirms that the attribution is not present in 250; therefore, only 3005 preserves this attribution for the C group.

Mss 137 139 643 and 3006 contain only the attribution but not the text of the fragment (Kollationen, 222).

Job 35 12a

HT

E  ἐκεῖ κεκράξονται, καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσῃ

θʹ  

Sub  *

Wit1:  C (= 788) Arm La Sa Syh

Attr:  θʹ 788 Syh] > rel

Var:  lemma] om Sa

NonGr:  Syh        La  ibi (pr μ) clamabunt, et non audiet
              Arm    ※ Անդաղակեցածեն և մի լուիցես

Notes:  Ms 788 is the first Greek witness to preserve this asterisked line and the attribution to Th; therefore, it confirms the attribution in Syh.
καὶ νῦν, ὅτι οὐκ ἦστιν ἐπισκεπτόμενος, ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω παραπτώματι σφόδρα· καὶ Ἰοβ ματαίως ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ ρήματα βαρύνει.

Sub

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI 138 260 395 732 680 Arm La Sa Syh

Attr: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ 3005 788-250(14b) 740 255 612 559 137 3006 643 139(16α)) Syh ] > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 15-16 sub ※ 3005 788 740 255(non 15b) 612 559(non 15b 16) 137(non 15b) 3006 643(non 15a) 139(non 15a) 252(non 15a 16) Arm La(non 16α) Syh

NonGr: Syh

La et (pr ※ β) nunc, quia non est visitans (uisi※tans β) iram suam,
nec(pr ※ μ)cognovit delicta vehementer(uehe※menter β) ✓
et Ἰοβ vane aperit os suum,
in (pr ※ μ) ignorantia verba multiplicat.

Arm ※ θι αὐτὴ ῥωμαὶ ἥξῃ νὰ ἥξῃ ἀπερατήρια ἑαυτὸν
 ※ ἡ νὰ ἁμαρτήσῃ παρατίθεσθαι ἑαυτῷ μη
 ※ ᾿ο μῆν ὑπέλθη θείῃρητὶ ὡς ἀρνήσεται ἑαυτῷ
 ※ ἣ ἀπαντήσῃ πολλῆς μισαμαρτήσῃ ἑαυτῷ ✓

Job 35 15a

HT

E (καὶ νῦν, ὅτι οὐκ ἦστιν) ἐπισκεπτόμενος, (ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ)
σʹ ἑπιλογιζόμενος

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cl-139 732

Job 35 15b
HT
E καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω παραπτώματι σφόδρα.

σʹ μηδὲ γνωρίζων παραπτώματα σφόδρα

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cl-139 732
Wit2: παραπτώματι] παραπτωματα La (delicta) 637 c Arm

Job 35 16b
HT
E ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ ῥήματα βαρύνει.

σʹ ὡς ἀναίσθητος λόγους βαρεῖς ἐποιήσατο

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl-139 732 ↓clII ↓555 ↓161′
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 3005) 139 740

Notes: The variant in 248 is from the Nicetas catena (Kollationen, 223). The Edition chose ἀνόητος as the lemma even though the best external evidence favors ἀναίσθητος. This word only occurs here in Sym’s corpus. Sym uses ἀνόητος in many instances. Busto Saiz lists the following Hebrew equivalents in the Psalter: קְסִיל (48:11 cum αʹ), בָּעַר (91:7), and אֵין בַּעַר Hi. (31:9). H-R includes four references to Ecclesiastes: 4:13 is retroverted from Latin and is omitted, קְסִיל (9:17), גִּמְר (10:3), and סִכְל (10:14). There are three instances in Isaiah: Isa 32:4 (נַמְרוֹר), 35:4 (נַמְרוֹר), 56:10 (יְוַנָּא לָא וְרַדֵּה) and one at Zach 3:1 (יוֹנָה). Even though Sym uses ἀνόητος, there is no exact analogue to Job 35:16b; therefore, the lemma is established on the basis of the best external evidence.
The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 304; AGK 3, 207; Nic, 516).
Chapter 36

Job 36 2a

HT
כִּי (ָלִי, בֵּשֵׁר נַעֲרוֹ) 
LXX
Меіνον (με μικρόν ἐτι, ἵνα διδάξω σε·)

\\[\theta^]\ 

υπόμεινον

**Wit1:** ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 139 732

**Attr:** \(\theta^\) σ′ 260 643 3006; [] C (= 257)

**Notes:** The attribution was lost in 257 due to mutilation of the margin.

Job 36 2b

HT
כִּי תוֹדֶה קַאָלָהָ מְלָהָ 
LXX
ἐτι γὰρ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐστὶν λέξις.

\(\sigma^\)

[ἐτ]ι γὰρ περὶ θεοῦ [εἰ]σὶ λόγοι

**Wit1:** C (= 257)

**Wit2:** ἐστὶν λέξις] ἐν ἐστὶν λέξεις Α; ἐστὶ λεγεῖν Sym; sunt sermones La = M

**Attr:** σ′ [] C (= 257)

**Var:** περὶ conj.] παρα cod

**Notes:** This fragment occurs directly under the fragment for 2a and thus has undergone the same mutilation of the margin. The lemma has been taken from this reading of the ms: ἐτι γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ | εἰ]σὶ λόγοι. The Nachlese presents this new fragment from 257. The author and the initial parts of the two lines have been cut off from the margin (Nachlese, 406). The Nachlese retained the possibility of supplying μιοι before εἰσὶ in the lacuna. Although έμοι is in the LXX, the pronoun is absent from the Hebrew and it is probably better to omit it from the reconstruction.

D. Fraenkel argues that Symmachus is most suitable for the author of this fragment since מלה is rendered with λόγος and רכ is rendered with γάρ (Nachlese, 406). Fraenkel’s observation about γάρ is confirmed, since Th Job uses ὅτι 36x for רכ and γάρ only 5x (Gentry, 370–1). Aq does use γάρ for רכ in Gen 26:20 and 47:22, but he uses ὅτι in the majority of instances (Hyvärinen, 53). In contrast, Sym uses γάρ for רכ commonly in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 255). Regarding the rendering of מלה with λόγος, Fraenkel’s observation is less helpful. There are no instances of λόγος rendering מלה in
the corpus of Aq; therefore, no positive evidence suggests an attribution to him, though no negative evidence denies one to him. The evidence is divided between Th and Sym. Th uses λόγος to render מלה 4x (Job 24:25b, 32:11c, 32:15, and 36:4a), while Sym uses the same equivalent 4x (Job 16:4, 32:11c, 35:16, and 36:4a)—both authors use λόγος to translate other Hebrew words. To these observations of Fraenkel one may add that Th does not use περί or παρά to render ש in Job (Gentry, 324-32). These factors support the attribution to Sym.

The manuscript has the ligature for παρά, which consists of π with an oblique stroke over it. This ligature is similar to the one used for περί, which consists of π with a horizontal stroke over it. According to the instances listed in H-R, Sym does not render ש with παρά + genitive, and this construction is not attested in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 181-187). The full analysis of Sym’s use of παρά is as follows:

παρά = עם Jud 9:6 and 3 Rgns 1:9 ρ'
παρά = על Cant 1:8
παρά = ב Ps 72(73):2
παρά = ב Isa 57:1 θ'
παρά + acc. = ש Gen 4:7
παρά = no equivalent Ps 9:29 (10:8)

In contrast Sym uses περί + genitive for ש eight times in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 184). The Nachlese compares this fragment with the commentary of Olymp, which shows dependence on Symmachus: ἔτι περὶ θεοῦ λέγειν ἔχω (Nachlese, 406; Kommentar, 306). The evidence of translation technique and Olymp probably indicates that 257 contains an error of παρά instead of περί, which is a common error in the mss using these ligatures; therefore, περί is conjectured as the original text.

Job 36 3a
HT אֲשָׂא דֵעִי
LXX ἀναλαβὼν τὴν ἐπιστήμην μου μακρὰν

ο'

διὰ μακροῦ

WitL: ↓ C (= 257 788-250) cI-139 732
Attr: σ'] [] C (= 257)
Notes: Ms 788 is the first C witness to attest the attribution to Sym.

Job 36 4a
HT בִּרְאָמֶס לִאְשָׂא מִלֵּי
LXX ἐπὶ ἀληθείας καὶ οὐκ ἀδικα ρήματα·
σ’ ὅτι ὀντως ἀψευδεῖς οἱ λόγοι μου

Wit1:  C (= 3005) cI-137 139 260 643 732 3006

Notes: The fragment is at 36:3b in 559 (Kollationen, 224).

θ’ ὅτι ἀληθῶς οὐκ ἄδικοι οἱ λόγοι μου

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 732
Attr:  θ’ α’ θ’ 395; > C (= 250)
Var:  ὅτι] + οὐκ 260

Notes: The fragment is at 36:3b in 559. Ms 260 contains two markers of negation (Kollationen, 224).

Job 36 4b

HT  תְּמִים דֵּעוֹ LXX  ἄδικως συνείσ.

θ’ ἄμωμοι γνώσεις μετὰ σοῦ

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-137 139 260 395 643 732 680 3006
Attr:  θ’ α’ C (= 3005); σ’ 138; > C (= 788-250)

Notes: The fragment is recorded at 36:4a in 138-255 612, but it belongs at 4b in accordance with the Hebrew text (Kollationen, 225). Although the attribution to Aq in 3005 is interesting, Aq renders תֹּם with ἁπλότης in Job 21:23a (Woods, 395), and there are no instances of Aq using ἄμωμος to render this word.

Job 36 5b-9

HT  כבירה כה לב: LXX  לאויראתה לאש
ומשם עביכים יתוח: לאיראת מועדיך משחר
האש-מקלבים לכסא
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E

dunatōs ἵσχυς καρδίας
ἀσεβὴς οὐ μὴ ζωοποιήσει
καὶ κρίμα πτωχῶν δώσει.
οὐκ ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ δικαίου ὅφθαλμον
καὶ καθιεὶ αὐτοὺς εἰς νῖκος, καὶ ψυχήσονται.
καὶ εἰ πεπεδημένοι εἰς θρόνον
καὶ τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἵσχυσον.

θ'

Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788 3005) cf 137 138 260 643 680 732 3006 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh

Attr: θ’ (ἐκ θ’ οἱ 3005 788; ἐκ θ’ οἱ ὁδ 740 255 612 559 395(6b)) Syh > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 5b-9 sub ※ 3005 788 740(non 7a 7c 8-9) 255(non 7c 8-9) 612(non 7e 8-9) 559(non 7bc 8-9) 395(non 5b 6a 7b-9b) 248(+ 10a) 252(non 9) 706 Arm La(+ 10a) Syh

NonGr: Syh

La fortis (pr ※ μ) robore cordis
non vivificabit impium,
※ et iudicium pauperum dabit.
non auferet a iusto (pr ※ β) oculos suos,
et (pr ※ μ) cum regibus in solio,
et (pr ※ μ) sedere eos (pr ※ β) facit in perpetuum, et
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exaltabuntur.
est (pr * µ; + * β) qui compediti sunt compedibus,
capientur (pr * µ) in (pr * β) funibus paupertatis,
et annuntiabit eis opera (pr * β) eorum,
et delicta (pr * µ), cum fuerint roborati

Notes: Ms 3005 has nine lines under ten asterisks with two asterisks at the
catena’s first line, which equals 5b and 6a in the Edition; therefore, 3005 preserves all of
the lines under the asterisk and attributes them all to Th. Ms 788 preserves nine lines
under nine asterisks (the first line = 5b 6a of the Edition). The cl group, therefore,
represents the deterioration of the catena tradition over time, since the mss at the top of
the stemma have only the first four lines under the asterisk and the mss at the bottom of
the stemma preserve no lines under the asterisk. In La, 6a may be included with 5b as one
line as in C.

Job 36 5b-6a

HT

E

α'

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh
Notes: The retroversion is from Field, corrected by Ziegler (Field, 64; Beiträge, 41). The index is overрест. Ziegler suggests that if the retroversion πάμπολυς is correct, then one would prefer Sym as the reviser of 36:5b, given that πάμπολυς is only witnessed by Sym (Ps 39(40):6: Ps 88(89):51), and Job 36:31b. In place of πάμπολυς one could also render παμπληθύων; this is the version of Aq for נקבר in Job 36:31b (Beiträge, 41).

Job 36 9b

αʹ  ὅταν δυναμωθῶσιν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl-137 139 260 643 732 3006 Klostermann

Attr:  αʹ] > C (= 250)

Var:  lemma] + κατʹ αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν 740 Klostermann

Notes: Aquila was able to distinguish between the demonstrative and the temporal meaning of כּ by using sometimes ὅτε and other times ὅτι (Hyvärinen, 53). Klostermann considered κατʹ αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν to be a part of the Aquila fragment, but it is better considered to be a scholion, which was added erroneously to the fragment through the textual transmission (Klostermann, 73; Beiträge, 62; AGK 3, 214; F-Auct, 10). Mss 788-250 and 3005 provide sound evidence for this conclusion, since these mss keep the hexaplaric fragments distinct from the scholion. In 788-250, the Aquila fragment is on the left side of the bible text, while the scholion is on the right side (788, 155). In 3005, the hexaplaric fragments are underneath the scholion, and these three notes are kept distinct in the margin (3005,149r). Later transmission of the fragments shows that the two hexaplaric fragments were not kept distinct from the scholion. Ms 740 preserves the scholion directly under the Aq fragment without any divider (740, 202v), and in the same manner ms 255 preserves the scholion after the Sym fragment (see infra); thus, the scholion corrupted the fragments of Aquila and Symmachus and it confused later scholars.

σʹ  ὅτι κατεδυνάστευον

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cl-139 732 3006 cII 555 161

Attr:  σʹ] > C (= 250)

Var:  lemma] + κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν Field
Notes: Field’s longer lemma, ὅτι κατεδυνάστευον κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, is incorrect, and in a note he says, “The remaining, κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, appears to be a scholion” (Field, 64, n. 7). The C group preserves the fragment attributed to Sym, while the plus comes from the same scholion, which was listed above for the Aq fragment (see supra; Beiträge, 41; Field, 64).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 307-8; AGK 3, 214; Nic, 518).

Job 36 10a

HT

LXX

Notes: In 139, the reading occurs as bible text at the end of 10a (Kollationen, 225; Edition, 373, App I.). In 395, it is possible to interpret the fragment as part of the bible text as in 139 or as the first exegetical note, since it follows the bible text (Kollationen, 225). The reading in 788-250 is as follows: οὖς αὐτ(ῶν) | αὐτῶν. The dittography arose due to the reading, which is divided over two lines.

Job 36 10b-11

HT

Notes: In 139, the reading occurs as bible text at the end of 10a (Kollationen, 225; Edition, 373, App I.). In 395, it is possible to interpret the fragment as part of the bible text as in 139 or as the first exegetical note, since it follows the bible text (Kollationen, 225). The reading in 788-250 is as follows: οὖς αὐτ(ῶν) | αὐτῶν. The dittography arose due to the reading, which is divided over two lines.
Attr: \( \theta' (\text{ὁμοίως} \epsilon \kappa \theta' \text{o}i \delta \ 788(\Delta): 740; \text{ὁμοίως} \epsilon \kappa \theta' \text{o}i \delta \ 612 559; \epsilon \kappa \theta' \text{o}i \delta \ 3005(11a) 395 137 3006 643; \text{ὁμοίως} \epsilon \kappa \theta' \text{οιδα} 250) \text{Syh}\text{txt} > \text{rel} \)

Var: lemma] om Sa Clem | 10b-11 sub ※ 3005(non 10b; +12a) 788 740 255(non 10b 11a) 612 559 395(non 11c) 137(non 11a) 3006(non 11c) 260 643(non 11b) 248(non 11c) 252 Arm La(non 11c) Syh\text{txt}

NonGr: Syh\text{txt} ܠܚܘܢ ܥ ܢܦ ܐܢ ܢܫܡ ܒܕܘܬܐ ܠܚܘܢ ܥ ܢܦ ܐܢ ܢܫܡ ܒܛܒ ܠܘܢ ܝܘ ܢܫܡ ܝܬܐ ܢܝܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܒܫܦܝܪܘܬ ܦܐ ܪܘܐܡ ܡܠܘܢ ܝܘ ܢܫܡ ܒܕܘܬܐ ܠܚܘܢ ܥ ܢܦ ܐܢ ܢܫܡ ܒܛܒ ܠܘܢ ܝܘ ܢܫܡ ܝܬܐ ܢܝܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܒܫܦܝܪܘܬ ܦܐ

Notes: The scholion in 788 does not have the line over the delta, which would mark the numeral and it also has two vertical dots (:) after it, which usually mark the end of a scholion in this ms, but to a later scribe they may have been understood as the ligature for final -α. The scribe of 250, either working from 788 or an intermediate ms, understood the text in precisely this way, for he wrote οἰδα.

Job 36 10b

HT (יוהו) יאָוֶן׃
E (καὶ εἶπεν) ὅτι ἐπιστραφήσονται (ἐξ ἀδικίας.)

\( \sigma' \) ἵνα μετανοήσωσιν

Wit1: \( \downarrow C (= 3005) \downarrow cT^{139} 260 732 \)

Var: μετανοήσωσιν] μετανοησουσι 740; μετανοησουσιν 612; μετανοησωσι C (= 3005)

Notes: Ms 3005 is the first representative of the C group to preserve both the fragment and the attribution.

Job 36 11b
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σ’ **παλαιώσουσιν**

*Wit1:* $C$ (= 788 3005) ↓$cI$ 137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Var:* παλαιώσουσιν] παλαιώσουσι 680

*Notes:* Ms 788 preserves this fragment, while it is absent from 250. This fragment and the following one have influenced the Nicetas catena (καὶ μετ’ εὐδοξίας τὸν βίον παλαιώσουσιν); although, there is no attribution (Nic, 519, 22).

Job 36 11c

HT

E

(καὶ τὰ ἔτη αὐτῶν) ἐν εὐπρεπείαις.

σ’ **μετ’ εὐδοξίας**

*Wit1:* ↓$C$ (= 788 3005) ↓$cI$ 139 732

*Attr:* σ’ ] > 138

*Var:* εὐδοξίας] εὐαξίας 612vid | μετά] εν $C$ (= 788)

*Notes:* Ms 788 preserves this fragment while it is absent from 250. Also, 788 assimilated its text to the bible text resulting in ἐν + genitive singular or accusative plural.

Job 36 13

HT

E

καὶ υποκριταί καρδίᾳ τάξουσιν θυμόν· οὐ βοήσουνται, ὅτι ἔδησεν αὐτούς.

θ’ **Sub ※**

*Wit1:* $C$ (= 788-250 3005) $cI$ 138 680 732 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh

*Attr:* θ’ (ἐκ θ’ οἱ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 643 139; ἐκ θεοδοτίων οἱ δύο 260) Syh > rel
**Var:** lemma | om Sa | 13 sub ※ 3005 788(non 13b) 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 260 643(non 13b) 139(non 13b) 248 252 Arm La Syh※

**NonGr:** Syh※

La et (pr ※ μ) hypocritae corde (γ; > βμ) ponent (pr ※ β) furorem.
non clamabunt, quia ligavit eos (+ < β)
Arm ※ ήξευδασηςης ηραμήρ ροκρητου ρωμυσυνηρήν ηξιαρδετου ηρημηρω ρωμυν

**Job 36 13a**

HT יָשִׂימוּ אָף (וְחַנְפֵי־לֵב)
E (καὶ ὑποκριταὶ καρδίᾳ) τάξουσιν θυμόν

σʹ ἐποίησαν ὀργήν

*Wit1:* C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 260 643 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > 138

**Job 36 14a**

HT בַּנֹּעַר נַפְשָׁם
LXX ἠποθάνοι (τοίνυν ἐν νεότητι ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν)

σʹ θανατωθήσεται

*Wit1:* C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-137 139 260 643 732 3006

*Attr:* σʹ] > 138-255

**Job 36 14b**

HT בַּקְּדֵשִׁים׃
LXX ἡ δὲ ζωὴ αὐτῶν τιτρωσκομένη (ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων)

Sub ½

*Wit1:* C (= 788-250 3005) cI-137 138 732
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Attr: οὐ κεῖται παρ’ (παρὰ 788-250 3006) Ἑβραίοις τὸ ἡμιστίχιον (ἡμιστιχιν 255 612; ἡμιστιχὸν 559inc 680 260 643 139) 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 680 137 3006inc 260 643 139(14a); οὐ κεῖται ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ εἰς τὸν στίχον 395

Var: τιτρ. ύπὸ ἀγγέλων sub ÷ 3005 788 740 255 612 559 395(* pro ÷)

Notes: Ms 559 may have ἡμιστίχιον or ἡμιστιχιν, since the letter in question (ι or ο) is a blot in the manuscript. In ms 3006, the ending of ἡμιστιχιον is not clear since only ἡμιστιχ-- can be read. The obelus along with the marginal notation is well attested in the catena tradition. Ms 139 preserves the note at 14a instead of 14b.

Comparison with HT shows that only τιτρωσκομένη is intended to be under the obelus, even though the marginal note indicates the “half line” is under the obelus.

Job 36 16

HT

E καὶ προσέτι ἡπάτησεν σε ἐκ στόματος ἑχθροῦ· ἀβυσσος, κατάχυσις ὑποκάτω αὐτῆς· καὶ κατέβη τράπεζά σου πλήρης πιότητος.

θ’ Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI-138 680 732 248 252 Arm La Sa Syhtxt

Attr: θ’ (ἐκ θ’ οἱ 3005 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 643 139(bis); ἐκ θεοδοτίων οἱ τρεῖς 260) Syhtxt] > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 16 sub ※ 3005 788 740(non 16a) 255(non 16bc) 612(non 16c) 559(non 16bc) 395(non 16bc) 137(non 16ac) 3006(non 16ac); ※ sup ὑπακατω; + 17) 260(non 16c) 643(non 16a) 248 252 Arm La Syhtxt

NonGr: Syhtxt

La ※ et quia decepit (pr ※ β) te ab ore inimici abyssus effusi (pr ※ μ) subter (pr ※ β) eam, et descendit (pr ※ μ) mensa tua plena pinguedine.

Arm ※ θ’ ηπάτησεν σε ἐκ στόματος ἑχθροῦ· ἀβυσσος, κατάχυσις ὑποκάτω αὐτῆς· καὶ κατέβη τράπεζά σου πλήρης πιότητος.
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Job 36 16c

HT

E

και κατέβη τράπεζά σου (πλήρης πιότητος.)

σ’

και θέση τῆς τραπέζης σου

Job 36 19c-20

HT

E

και πάντας τοὺς κραταίοντας ισχύν.
µὴ ἔξελκύσῃς τὴν νύκτα
tοῦ ἄναβηναι λαοὺς ἀντ αὐτῶν.

θ’

Sub *

Job 36 19c-20

HT

E

και πάντας τοὺς κραταίοντας ισχύν.
µὴ ἔξελκύσῃς τὴν νύκτα
tοῦ ἄναβηναι λαοὺς ἀντ αὐτῶν.

θ’

Sub *

Job 36 19c-20

HT

E

και πάντας τοὺς κραταίοντας ισχύν.
µὴ ἔξελκύσῃς τὴν νύκτα
tοῦ ἄναβηναι λαοὺς ἀντ αὐτῶν.

θ’

Sub *

Job 36 19c-20

HT

E

και πάντας τοὺς κραταίοντας ισχύν.
µὴ ἔξελκύσῃς τὴν νύκτα
tοῦ ἄναβηναι λαοὺς ἀντ αὐτῶν.

θ’

Sub *
Notes: Ms 3005 preserves five lines from Th (19c-20 and 21b-22a), which are marked with the asterisk (see 21b-22a infra).

Job 36 20

HT

E

σ'

σ’ μὴ προθυμηθῆς νυκτὸς,
ἐπαναβήναι λαοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ
tόπου αὐτῶν

Notes: Ms 248 is added to the Wit1 on the basis of the Kollationen, which noted that the Edition did not list it (Kollationen, 227). Regarding τόπου, the text of ms 3006 is uncertain, for it may support the lemma or the variant found in 680, but it is more probable that it supports the lemma since it would then agree with 137 260 643 (Kollationen, 227).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 311-12; AGK 3, 220-21; Nic, 522).

Job 36 21b-22a

HT

E

θ'

Notes: C (= 788-250 3005) cf−138 395 559 680 732 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh
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Attr: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ 788-250 740(22a) 255 137 3006 643; ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ 788 260; ἐκ θ οἱ 3005(19c) Syh\textsuperscript{xt}) > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 21b-22a sub ※ 3005 788 740 255 612(non 22a) 137 643 139(non 21b) 248 252 Arm La(non 22a) Syh\textsuperscript{xt}(non 22a)

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{xt} ※ 

Notes: The retroversion is from Field, who presents evidence for the retroversion of θλῖψις from Şܚܩܐ in Syh Job 15:24 and θλιβῶδες in Aq Gen. 22:7 (Field, 65, n. 24; Curaes, 629).

Job 36 21b

HT: ἐρήμῳ ἔξω προκρίνῃς αʹ

E: επὶ τούτων γὰρ ἐξεῖλω ἀπὸ πτωχείας.

αʹ: ὅτι ἐπὶ τούτων ἐξελέξω ἀπὸ θλίψεως

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh: ἔξελεξω

Notes: The retroversion is from Field, who presents evidence for the retroversion of θλίψις from Şܚܩܐ in Syh Job 15:24 and θλιβῶδες in Aq Gen. 22:7 (Field, 65, n. 24; Curaes, 629).

σʹ: ἵνα ταύτην προκρίνης πτωχείας

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI\textsuperscript{-732} Syh

Attr: σʹ C (= 788) 139 Syh] > rel

Var: προκρίνης] προκρινείς 3006 | πτωχείας] πτωχείαν 137 139 260 395 680 3006; πτωχείαν 643; πτωχείας C (= 788-250)

NonGr: Syh
Notes: Ms 788 is the first C ms to support the attribution to Sym and it thus confirms the attribution in Syh. In the corpus of the LXX, Wis 7:8 has the only other instance of προκρίνειν (H-R, 1207). In the Psalter, Sym uses ἐπιλέγεσθαι (24(25):12) and αἱρεῖσθαι (118(119):173) to render בחר Qal (Busto Saiz, 625), but these instances are not comparable to Job 36:21b, since Sym rendered this verse as a comparison.

Job 36 22b
HT
(כמוה מורה;)
LXX
(תָּאָב) וְהָיוּ (קָדָם אֵינְיָהּ דְּעָמָהּ;)

Sub ://

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The Edition and Field did not include this instance of the obelus, but it belongs to the the hexaplaric materials since the text is present in the LXX but it is absent from the HT.

Job 36 23a
HT
(כִּפֶּה הן;)
LXX
(תָּאָב) וְהָיוּ (קָדָם אֵינְיָהּ דְּעָמָהּ;)

σ’  ὅς ἔξτας ἰueba

Wit1:
↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI 137 139 260 643 732 3006
Attr: σ’ > C (= 788-250)
Var: ἔξτας[ει] ἔξτασει C (= 788-250)

Job 36 23b
HT
(אֶשֶׁר (אֶשֶׁר רָסְלָת;)
LXX
(תָּאָב) וְהָיוּ (קָדָם אֵינְיָהּ דְּעָמָהּ;)

σ’  ἔρει

Wit1:
↓C (= 788-250) ↓cI 137 139 260 643 732 3006
Notes: Sym has the future tense, while HT has the perfect. 4QJob' has the imperfect (יָשַׁר), which either indicates that Sym had a different Vorlage or an early interpretation of the HT (DJD, XVI, 175). The error may be explained as due to haplography or dittography of the ו.

Job 36 24b-25a

HT

אֲשֶׁר שֹׁרְרוּ אָנָשִׁים׃

כָּל־אָדָם חָזוּ־בוֹ

E

ὡν ἦρξαν ἀνδρεῖς.

πᾶς ἀνθρωπος εἶδεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ,

\(\theta'\) Sub ※

Wit1: \(C (= 788-250)\) cI\(^{138}\) 620 680 732 3006 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh\(^{\text{txt}}\)

Attr: \(\theta'\) (ἐκ \(\theta'\) οἱ \(788-250\) 740(25a) 255(25a) 612 559 395 137; \(\sigma'\) ἐκ \(\theta'\) οἱ \(643\) 139) Syh\(^{\text{txt}}\) > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 24b-25a sub ※ 788 740 255 612(non 24b) 559 137 643(non 25a) 139(non 25a) 248 252(mend 23b-24b) 706(+ 25b) Arm La Syh\(^{\text{txt}}\)

NonGr: Syh\(^{\text{txt}}\)

La ※ quem laudaverunt viri.

omnis (pr ※ μ) homo respecit ad eum,

Arm ※ qn υψησαν ψαρρ ψηρημερ

※ ζητησαν την την ἅπαντα

HT

אֲשֶׁר שֹׁרְרוּ אָנָשִׁים׃

E

ὡν ἦρξαν ἀνδρεῖς.

⟨\(\sigma'\)⟩ ἣς ἐξουσιάζουσιν ἀνθρώποι

Wit1: 252

Attr: \(\sigma'\) > 252 cod

Var: ἣς \textit{conj} Field] ἡ cod
Notes: The emendation of Field has warrant, given that the antecedent would probably have been the feminine noun πρᾶξις (in v. 24a) as in Ps 27(28):4 and Ps 76(77):13 and for other derivatives from the same root such as עַלפֹּ (Ps 27(28):5) and מִפְעָל (Ps 65(66):5) (F-Auct, 10; Busto Saiz, 573). The Psalter does not provide any evidence of Sym’s use of εξουσιάζω for Hebrew שלוש. Probably, Sym read the Hebrew שלוש as from I שלוש “to rule, reign.”

Job 36 25b

HT

אנוש רכיב מְרָחֵק

LXX

וְאֶפְרֵבָּם וַתִּפְלְּמַנְוַנְוַ מַאָרּוֹתָן

σʹ

ἐκαστὸς ἀποβλέπτων μακρόθεν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cII 732 cII 555

Attr: σʹ] > C (= 788-250 3005) 139 643 740

Var: μακρόθεν] μακρωθεν 3006

Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 313; AGK 3, 224; Nic, 523).

Job 36 26

HT

הָאֵל שַּגִּיא וְלֹא נֵדָע מִסְפַּר שָׁנָיו וְלֹא חֵקֶר

E

ἰδοὺ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς πολὺς, καὶ οὐ γνωσόμεθα· ἀριθμὸς ἐτῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπέραντος.

θʹ

Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788-250) cI 138 680 732 3006 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh[^{text}]

Attr: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ 788-250(26b) 740 255 612 559 395(25b) 137 643 139; ἐκ θεοδοτίων οἱ δύο 260) Syh[^{text}] > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 26 sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559(non 26b) 137(non 26b) 260 643 139(non 26; + 27) 248 252 706 Arm La Syh[^{text}]

NonGr: Syh[^{text}] 281
Job 36:26a

HT

E

Job 36:27b-28aβb

HT

E

Sub

Notes: Ms 3005 confirms that the earliest Greek catena preserves the attribution to Sym.

Job 36:26a

La ※ ecce deus multus, et nesciemus *

numerus (pr ※ μ) annorum eius (pr ※ β) infinitus

Arm ※ Υπώ την γνῶσιν ἡμῶν

σʹ

ὑπὲρ τὴν γνῶσιν ήμῶν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl⁻²⁶⁰

Attr: σʹ] > C (= 788-250) 137 139 395 559 612 643 680 3006


Notes: Ms 3005 confirms that the earliest Greek catena preserves the attribution to Sym.

Job 36:27b-28aβb

θʹ

Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 250) 248 252 Arm La Sa Syhḷt

Wit2: 28b] ※ et tenebrascent super homines plurimos O (pr Syh) Arm (add); pr γνωφησονται (και γνωφ. 575) επ ανθρωπους πολλους (πολλουι V) V-575-336'-Iul = M (28b)

Attr: θʹ (εκ θʹ οι κγ 250(28α)) Syhḷt] > rel

Var: 27b-28aβ] om Sa | 27b-28aβ sub ※ 248(om 28β) 252(om 28β; + 28b) Arm(28β post 28a) La Syhḷt
NonGr: Syh²

La

Arm

Notes: The note in ms 250 has twenty-three lines attributed to Th. In 250, the stichometry differs from the Edition. The ms preserves 28cdef after 37:5a, and except for 28b, it attributes the total correct number of lines to Th. The twenty third line in ms 250 ends with the word θαυμάσια, which occurs at the end of 5a in the Edition; therefore, 250 is the only catena witness to attest Th as the author of 36:28ab-37:5a (see infra).

The lemma follows the stichometry of Syh, which attributes the lines to Th, and therefore the lines agree with HT. Arm places 28β after 28b as represented in the NonGr line. Ziegler notes that 28β created a doublet in the witnesses represented in the Wit2 line except La, which preserved only the text of Th by excluding 28b. Syh contains the doublet, but it preserves the Th lemma under the asterisk and places OG 28b under the obelus rightly (see infra; Edition, 143).

Job 36 28a

HT

E

σ’

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250) 3005 ↓ cl-732 cII 555 161 252

Attr: σ’ > C (= 788-250) 3006

Var: ρυησονται] ρυσονται 740 | αιθερος] εθερος 138 395

Notes: Ms 252 has been added to the evidence on the basis of the Kollationen (Kollationen, 229).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 314; AGK 3, 225; Nic, 524).
(ῥυήσονται) παλαιώματα,

⟨αʹ⟩ ṕοτσαΐ

Wit1: ↓Ccat (= 249 257 788-250 3005) ↓cfcat–139 ↓505cat

Attr: αʹ > Ccat (= 249 257 788-250 3005) cfcat–139 505cat

Var: ṕοτσαΐ cf. Hagedorn] αἰ τροτσαΐ Ccat (= 249 257 788-250 3005) cfcat–139 505cat

Notes: This is a new instance of the well attested τροτσαΐ for original ṕοτσαΐ, not noted by Ziegler previously (AGK 3, 225). The Hagedorns made this conjecture based on the evidence that Aq uses ṕοτσαΐ consistently in places where LXX-Job has παλαιώματα (see also Beiträge, 42, 62; for a full discussion of this problem and the relevant factors see Job 37:18a infra).

Job 36 28bcdef

HT ḫ gettimeofday ḫ gıda r b:

—

—

—

LXX ἐςκίασεν δὲ νέφη ἐπὶ ἀμυθήτων βροτῶν.
ὅραν ἔθετο κτήσιν,
οἶδασιν δὲ κοίτης τάξιν.
ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἔξισταται σου ἢ διάνοια
οὐδὲ διαλλάσσεται σου ἢ καρδία ἀπὸ σώματος;

Sub ÷

Wit1: C (= 3005) cl 248 252 706 Arm La Syh

Var: 28b sub ÷ Syh | 28cdef sub ÷ 3005 740 255(non 28c) 138(non 28cd) 612(non 28df) 559 395 680 137(non 28f) 3006 260 643 732 139 248 252 706 Arm(non 28b) La Syh

NonGr: Syhxt ÷ 3οιλα ὅπως ἐπέκειτα ἀλήθεια
÷ ἐκείνη τῇ αὑτῆν αὐτῶν.
÷ ἐπεξεργάσθη ἑαυτὸν ἔχοντες.
÷ ἐπικεφαλεῖ τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ.
et tenebrascent super homines plurimos.

et sciunt (pr ÷ β) cubilis ordinem.

in (pr ※ μ) his omnibus non stupescit (stu=pescit β) animus tuus,

※ nec mutatur cor tuum a corpore.

Notes: The stichometry in Syh varies from the other witnesses since it includes the doublet caused by the Th reading, but it clearly preserves what is from Th and therefore the revision which agrees with HT. In Syh, 28b is placed under the obelus since it was considered not to be in agreement with HT, but rather it was considered to be OG (see supra). In La, 28b is included, since it does represent a translation of HT 28b, but it is not under the obelus, since it represents only the translation of the line in that version.

Besides preserving the obelus accurately, the catena also has an extended note on these lines at 36:28c. There are two versions of this note, which are listed below with the relevant ms evidence.

The witnesses, C^cat (= 788-250) c^cat 474^cat [505^cat] 523^cat, have the following note: οὗτοι οἱ Δ (τεσσαρες 680; τεσσαρες στίχοι 137−) οὐ κεῖνται ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ διὸ καὶ ὁμολογήσαν. ἐν τῷ δὲ ἀντιγράφοις ἐνταῦθα κεῖνται: ὁραν (ὁραν — fin > 395^cat 523^cat) ἔθετο κτήνεσιν, οἶδασι (οἶδασι — fin καὶ ξής οἱ ἐτεροὶ Γ στίχοι 137−) δὲ κοίτης τάξιν. ἐπὶ τούτοις πάσιν οὐκ ἐξίσταταί σου ἡ διάνοια, οὐδὲ διαλάλεσται σου ἡ καρδία ἀπὸ σώματος; (AGK 3, 226; Edition, 83-84). Ms 788-250 places the four lines after 37:5a in the bible text but records the same verses in the catena at 36:28c as shown in the note (see below for the note at 37:5a). Most of the catena tradition contains the four lines under the obelus here and after 37:5a in the bible text with the accompanying scholion.

Ms 3005 has the following marginal note: οὗτοι οἱ ὁμολογεῖσάν Α στίχοι ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις ἐνταῦθα κεῖνται, ἐν ἐτεροὶς δὲ ἐμπροσθέν μετὰ ΙΘ στίχως εἰς ἀνταγμένοι μετὰ τόν στίχον, οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ: ὁ ἱσχυρὸς ἐν φωνῇ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν ἐτέρῳ τούτους τέταχα τόπῳ. (AGK 3, 226). Ms 3005 along with the whole catena tradition has the four lines under the obelus both here and after 37:5a in the bible text. The note refers to a copy like 788-250, which only has the lines after 37:5a in the bible text.
The relevant scholion at 37:5a in the catena tradition, attested in the witnesses C (= 788-250 3005) cFcat 505cat (οὕτωι οἱ ὃβελισμένοι οἱ Δ ἐν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις ὑπόσω κείνται πρὸ εἶκοσι (K 3005 740 138-255 612 559 258 395) στίχων μετά τὸ ἐσκίασε δὲ νεφὴ ἐπὶ ἀμυθήτων βροτῶν (βροτῶν 3005 740 138-255 612 559 258 395 680 137 732 139), ὥς καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετραπλοῖς Ὄμιρομεν (ηρμεμεν 255 258; > 139) (AGK 3, 235; Edition, 83-84). The note contains a clear reference to the Tetrapla of Origen, which contained these four obelised lines after 36:28b.

**Job 36 29-37 5a**

HT

καὶ ἐὰν συνῇ ἀπεκτάσεις νεφελῆς,
ισότητα σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ,
οὐδὲν ἔκτείνει ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἥδω
καὶ ῥιζώματα τῆς θαλάσσης ἐκάλυψεν.
ἐν γὰρ αὐτῶι κρίνει λαιοῦς,
δῶσε τροφὴν τῷ ἰσχύοντι.
ἐπὶ χειρῶι ἐκάλυψεν φῶς
cαι ἐνετειλατο περὶ αὐτῆς ἐν ἀπαντῶντι·
ἀναγγελεὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ φίλον αὐτοῦ·
και ταύτης ἐταράχθη ἡ καρδία μου
καὶ ἀπερρύη ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς.

2 lawmakers ἀκούν ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ κυρίου,
καὶ μελέτη ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξελέυσται.

3 ύποκάτω παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἐξελεύσεται.

4 ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ βοήσεται φωνή,
βροντήσει ἐν φωνῇ ὑβρείας αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οὐκ ἀνταλλάξει αὐτοῦ,
ὅτι ἀκούσει φωνὴν αὐτοῦ.

5 βροντήσει ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν φωνῇ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια.
si (pr ※ μ) cogitaverit extendere nebulam (nebulam β),
aeque (pr ※ μ) ad tabernaculum expandit eam.
※ ecce effundit super eum lucem suam,
et (pr ※ μ) radices maris (pr ※ β) contexit.
in (pr ※ μ) eis iudicabit populos,
※ dabit escam plurimis.
in manibus contexit lumen (pr ※ β),
et (pr ※ μ) mandavit de eo in contrarium,
ut (pr ※ μ) nuntiaret (pr ※ β) super illo amico suo
possessionem (pr ※ μ; possessio※em β) contra eum qui
ascendere nititur.
sed (pr ※ μ) et in (pr ※ β) his obstupuit cor meum,
et (pr ※ μ) evulsum est de (pr ※ β) loco suo.
audite (pr ※ μ) sonitum terroris,
et (pr ※ μ) strepitum (pr ※ β) oris ipsius exeuntem.
subter (pr ※ μ) universum (pr ※ β) caelum circuit,
et (pr ※ μ) lumen eius in finibus terrae (pr ※ β).
post (pr ※ μ) eum fremet vox.
tonabit in sonitu (pr ※ β) superbiae suae,
et (pr ※ μ) non poterit investigari, cum audita fuerit vox eius.
tonabit (pr ※ μ) fortis in voce sua mirabiliter

La

Arm

si (pr ※ μ) cogitaverit extendere nebulam (nebulam β),
aeque (pr ※ μ) ad tabernaculum expandit eam.
※ ecce effundit super eum lucem suam,
et (pr ※ μ) radices maris (pr ※ β) contexit.
in (pr ※ μ) eis iudicabit populos,
※ dabit escam plurimis.
in manibus contexit lumen (pr ※ β),
et (pr ※ μ) mandavit de eo in contrarium,
ut (pr ※ μ) nuntiaret (pr ※ β) super illo amico suo
possessionem (pr ※ μ; possessio※em β) contra eum qui
ascendere nititur.
sed (pr ※ μ) et in (pr ※ β) his obstupuit cor meum,
et (pr ※ μ) evulsum est de (pr ※ β) loco suo.
audite (pr ※ μ) sonitum terroris,
et (pr ※ μ) strepitum (pr ※ β) oris ipsius exeuntem.
subter (pr ※ μ) universum (pr ※ β) caelum circuit,
et (pr ※ μ) lumen eius in finibus terrae (pr ※ β).
post (pr ※ μ) eum fremet vox.
tonabit in sonitu (pr ※ β) superbiae suae,
et (pr ※ μ) non poterit investigari, cum audita fuerit vox eius.
tonabit (pr ※ μ) fortis in voce sua mirabiliter

Arm

※ ւ ձվայրանք անձրևացիչ զանգված կնոջ
※ ի ձգուց կնոջ կազմակերպել իր իշակ
※ իրեն հանվածային մարդկանց հերթ
※ կարծիքային համարվող մարդկանց հերթ
※ արկած զրահան իրեն ձվայրանք անձրևաց
※ ի ձգուց կնոջ կազմակերպել իր իշակ
※ զին նույն համարվող ֆիզիկական
※ տարած երկրաչափական զանգված կնոջ
※ ի ձգուց կազմակերպել իր իշակ
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Notes: Arm begins at verse 28ij in Cox’s text.

Job 36 29a

HT

אַף אִם־יָבִין מִפְרְשֵׂי־עָב

E

cαι ἐὰν συνῆ ἀπεκτάσεις νεφέλης,

α’

ἐὰν συνῆ ἐκπετασμοῦς πάχους

Wit1: ↓252 ↓Syh

Var: συνῆ] συνῆς Syh | πάχους] > 252

NonGr: Syh

σ’

κἂν ἐννοήσῃ ἐκτεῖναι νεφέλην

Wit1: 252

Var: νεφέλην conj] νεφελίν 252 cod

Notes: Ms 252 has νεφελίν, which arose from νεφέλην due to itacism.

Job 36 29b

HT

תְּשֻׁאוֹתָו תָּסוּכָּתוֹ

E

ισότητα σκινής αὐτοῦ,
σʹ ἐξ ἵσης ὡς σκηνὴν

Wit1: 252

Job 36 30a

HT ἑξὸς ἐκ τῆς ἀναληψίας
E ἵδου ἐκτείνει ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἠδὼ

αʹ ἐκπετάζει ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν φῶς αὐτοῦ

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 732 ↓cII 1555 ↓161' ↓252 Syh

Wit2: ἠδώ] lucem suam La = M

Attr: αʹ 248 680 Syh] σʹ C (= 788 3005) cI 680 cII 1555 161; > C (= 250) 252 643

Var: ἐκπετάζει] ἐκπετασέει 252; ἐκπεταζῇ 3006; pr ἵδου 248 252 | αὐτὴν] αὐτὸ 248c 252; αὐτ(ων) 138; αὐτον 512-513 | φῶς] pr το 512-513

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The reading of 248 is difficult to determine. Ziegler’s 248c is not obvious, but it is possible to construe the reading in the ms as αὐτό with the ligature for -ήν over it, and therefore it is reflected in the apparatus as it appears.

Mss 248 680 Syh and internal evidence determine that Aq is the author of this fragment. According to H-R, there is no evidence for Sym’s use of ἐκπετάζω for perí; he uses ἐκπετανῦμαι forインターチェンジ in Ps 89(90):10 and ἐκπεταζω for פיק in Ezek 32:10 (attributed to αʹ σʹ θʹ). Busto Saiz lists καταμερίζειν for פיק Pi (Ps 67 (68):15) and ἔξαπλοῦν for פיק Hi (Ps 43(44):21) (Busto Saiz, 711). In contrast, Aq uses ἐκπετάζω for פיק in Job 11:13b (Woods, 222-3), and he uses the noun ἐκπεταζόμος for פיק in Job 36:29a (see supra). In addition, Reider lists Ex 9:33, 25:19(20), Deut 32:11, and Isa 37:14 in support of this translation equivalent in Aq (Reider, 75). Perhaps the attribution to Sym in the margin was influenced by the attribution to Sym in the catena of Olymp (see infra).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 314-5; AGK 3, 227; Nic, 525).
σʹ  φῶς αὐτοῦ

*Wit1:* C\textsuperscript{cat} (= 249 788-250 3005) cf\textsuperscript{cat} 754\textsuperscript{cat} 474\textsuperscript{cat} 258\textsuperscript{cat} 505\textsuperscript{cat} O\textsuperscript{IY}

*Wit2:* ἡδώ [lucent suam La = M]

*Notes:* The fragment belongs with the Olymp materials. The entire quote is as follows: – ἡδώ δὲ ἔρμηνευται “φῶς αὐτοῦ”· οὕτω (οὕτως O\textsuperscript{IY}) γὰρ καὶ (>O\textsuperscript{IY}) ὁ Σύμμαχος ἐκδέδωκεν, ἦτερα δὲ ἀντίγραφα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡδὼ “τόξον” ἔχουσιν – (AGK 3, 227; Kommentar, 315).

εβρʹ  ὀρώ

*Wit1:* Nobil (apud Field)

*Notes:* This fragment remains unattested in the mss.

**Job 36 30b**

* HT *

* E *

* αʹ σʹ  ῥίζας

*Wit1:* ↓ C (= 788-250 257 3005) cf\textsuperscript{139} 612 732

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

*Notes:* The attributions are inverted in 138-255 (σʹ αʹ). The evidence of C is split three ways. It appears that 257 has preserved the correct double attribution, which entered into the cf group, and one or the other attributions has fallen out of 788-250 and 3005.

**Job 36 31a**

* HT *

* E *

* σʹ  διὰ γὰρ αὐτῶν

*Wit1:* ↓ C (= 257 788 3005) cf\textsuperscript{137} 139 260 643 732 3006 248 252 Syh
Notes: Ms 788 preserves the fragment but not the attribution. Ms 250 does not attest this fragment.

Job 36 31b

Attr: $\sigma'$ > C ($= 788$)

NonGr: Syh ἀναδιδεῖν λαμπρὰς

Notes: The fragment belongs to the Olymp tradition and is preserved as follows: ὁ Σύμμαχος “παρέξει τροφὴν παμπόλλην” ἐκδέδωκεν (AGK 3, 228; Kommentar, 316; Nic, 526). The designation Σ(υμμάχου) παμπόλλην is found additionally in numerous mss in the margin (AGK 3, 228); Wit1 presents this evidence as a second lemma. The full lemma is in the margin of 257, not the text of its catena. Ms 250 contains an additional attribution to Sym ($\sigma'$) in the margin beside the relevant catena text. Ms 788 actually preserves the attribution to Sym in the marginal note. Ms 252 is “anon” and does not preserve the attribution to Sym, as the Edition lists in II App (Kollationen, 230; Edition, 377).

Job 36 32a

Attr: $\alpha'$ > C ($= 250$) 252

Notes: This is a hapax for Aquila and the Three and does not occur in the LXX (H-R, 1052; Reider, 183; cf 36:5b-6a for a parallel reading of Aq).
E (ἐπὶ) χειρῶν (ἐκάλυψεν φῶς)

σ’ παλάμαις

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI-137 139 260 643 732 3006
Attr: σ’ > C (= 250)
Notes: Ms 788 preserves the attribution to Sym, while it has fallen out of 250.

Job 36 32b

Job 36 32b

HT רָאָה לְעַלְיהָ כְּמוֹשָׁר:
E καὶ ἐνετείλατο περὶ αὐτῆς ἐν ἀπαντῶντι.

σ’ καὶ ἐπιτάξει αὐτῷ ὡστε ἀπαντῆσαι

Attr: σ’ > C (= 250)
Notes: This Sym fragment belongs to the Olymp tradition and is preserved as follows: ὁ Σύμμαχος “καὶ ἐπιτάξει αὐτῷ ὡστε ἀπαντῆσαι” ἐρμήνευσεν (AGK 3, 229; Kommentar, 316; Nic, 526). Mss 248 and 257 preserve the full fragment in the margin, while much of the catena preserves only ὡστε ἀπαντῆσαι in the margin. Ms 250 preserves an additional attribution to Sym in the right margin beside the fragment in the catena.

Job 36 33a

Job 36 33a

HT יַגִּיד עָלָיו רֵעֹה
E ἀναγγελεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ φίλον αὐτοῦ·

α’ ἀναγγελεῖ ύπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἐταίρῳ αὐτοῦ
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Notes: This fragment has three textual issues, which will be treated in order. Although ἀναγγελεῖ has good textual support, it should be considered secondary for three reasons: (1) ἀπαγγελεῖ also has good textual support since both 788-250 and 788-250 CAT have this reading and most of CAT and CL testify to it. (2) Translation technique favors this lemma, since Sym only uses ἀπαγγέλλειν to render "Hi in the Psalter four times (29:10, 36:6[O'], 91:3, 91:16) (Busto Saiz, 470, 684). (3) It is easier to explain how a scribe could harmonize the reading of Sym to his bible text, than to change ἀναγγελεῖ to ἀπαγγέλλειν, which means ἀπαγγέλλειν is the lectio difficilior. These factors indicate that ἀπαγγέλλειν is probably the original text.

8Busto Saiz also lists one instance where ἀναγγέλλειν renders ἔλλειψις Hi, but he underlines it, marking it as dubious, since the instance in Ps 63:10 is actually a retroversion from Syh; thus, Sym probably uses ἀπαγγέλλειν five times in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 684).
The variant ἑτέρῳ probably arose from ἑταίρῳ due to itacism (α > ε), common in Greek mss (Wevers, 188; see the sup lin correction back to α in 788). Translation technique indicates that Sym uses ἑταίρος for יִרְשׁ five times in the Psalter (27:3[α'], 34:14[α'], 37:12, 44:15[α'], 87:19) and רֹב once (44:18[α']) (Busto Saiz, 513, 727).

Perhaps the most difficult textual decision is over whether to choose the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ or the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ, an interchange that is attested from Att. inscriptions from the 4th century BCE (Gignac, II 170, n. 5). The word under consideration is the third person pronoun αὐτοῦ, not the contracted reflexive pronoun αὑτοῦ, since the few instances of αὑτοῦ in comparison with αὐτοῦ warrant reading αὐτοῦ as αὐτοῦ in the Koine period (Gignac, II 170, esp. n. 4). Regarding Sym’s usage of the reflexive pronoun, Busto Saiz says, “The pronominal suffix on a noun is translated by the Greek reflexive pronoun when the subject of the Greek verb which governs that noun, and the person represented by the pronominal suffix, are identical” (Busto Saiz, 83).9 This fragment meets these criteria since the pronominal suffix and subject are identical; therefore, ἑαυτοῦ is preferred over αὐτοῦ.

The attribution to Olymp is established on the basis of Kommentar, AGK, and Nic (Kommentar, 316; AGK, vol III, 230; Nic, 326).

Job 36 33b

\[\text{מִכְנֶהuffman אַף עַל-עוֹרְבֵי הקָדָם אֲדֻלָּתֶהלֶכַאִיםিַאִים.}\]

\[\alpha'\] κτήσεις καὶ περὶ ἀδικίας.

\[\langle\alpha'\rangle\]

\[\text{επὶ παρανομίαις.}\]

\[\text{Wit1: Syh}\]

\[\text{Attr: }\alpha' > \text{Syh}\]

\[\text{Var: κτήσεις conj.} \text{ κτίσεις cod}\]

\[\text{NonGr: Syh}\]

Notes: Syr בְלָכַתmalı most probably should be retroverted as καίπερ since this seems to be common translation technique of Greek into Syriac (Field cites Pesh Heb 5:8 and 2 Pet 1:12; Sym Hex Eccl 4:14) and Aq translates ἀφ with καίπερ (Lev 26:39; Hyvärinen, 89).

9I am grateful to Jason Parry for his help translating this sentence.
σʹ ζῆλον καὶ περὶ ἀδικίας

Wit1: lemma] C\textsuperscript{cat} (= 249 788-250 3005) cf\textsuperscript{cat} 754\textsuperscript{cat} 474\textsuperscript{cat} 258\textsuperscript{cat} 505\textsuperscript{cat} 3007\textsuperscript{cat} ↓cII 555 161 252 O\textsuperscript{Y} Syh | ζῆλον] ↓C (= 257 788-250) ↓cI\textsuperscript{-137} 260 732 3006

Attr: σʹ] > C (= 250)

Var: ζῆλον] ζηλος C (= 788-250) cfI (= 395 559 680); καὶ pr 703 | καί 252] > rel

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The καὶ in 252 could be explained as an assimilation to the bible text of the scribe, but Sym’s usual practice is to translate ἃς with καὶ, which he does three out of six times in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 211). In one instance, Sym may have left this adverb untranslated, but Ps 67:9 may be an occurrence of where Sym used δὲ to render ἃς (Busto Saiz, 211). The nominative form ζῆλος is explained as preserving the lexeme of Sym without concern for the original case of the word. The accusative is original since it functions as the direct object of ἀπαγγελεῖ in 36:33a (see supra).

The text of Syh has been divided between 33a and 33b here. The manuscript has one reading attributed to Sym.

The attribution to Olymp is established on the basis of Kommentar, AGK, and Nic (Kommentar, 317; AGK, vol III, 230; Nic, 326).
Chapter 37

Job 37 1a

HT אֲנִיָּהַרְדְּלֵבִי

E καὶ ταύτης (ἐταράχθη ἡ καρδία μου)

α’ καίπερ εἰς τοῦτο

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh *

Notes: καίπερ is the probable retroversion (cf. 36:33b). The retroversion of the Edition, ἐν, is a problem, since it does not appear that Aquila uses ἐν to render ל but most often uses it to render ב (Hyvärinen, 48). Aq uses εἰς and acc. often to render ב (Hyvärinen, 46). There are three possible explanations: (1) Aq could have varied his technique and used ἐν for ב. (2) Syh rendered εἰς with א. Job 37:13 is an interesting example of the technique of Syh. There are three instances of ב rendered with εἰς by Th, and Syh renders the first and third instances with the expected א but the second with א. In 37:6b and 12b Syh renders ἐν with א; thus, one might suppose that Syh varied technique. (3) An inner Greek error of ἐν for εἰς occurred. These prepositions became confused in the Koine with εἰς + acc becoming used to indicate rest and ἐν + dat used occasionally to indicate motion towards (Browning, 42, 1969). Given the literal translation technique of Aq, it is best to posit he used εἰς + acc for ב, and to suggest that א be retroverted with εἰς or perhaps an inner Greek error of ἐν for εἰς occurred in the transmission of the text.

σ’ καὶ περὶ τοῦτου

Wit1: ↓C (= 788 3005) ↓cl (= 138-255 740) ↓clII ↓555 ↓252

Attr: σ’] > C (= 788) 138 252


Notes: The Nachlese calls attention to the following items: (1) 3005 is the first Γ’ (C) witness to this fragment, (2) the attribution to Aq in the Edition is erroneous due to a misprint, and therefore only Symmachus is possible, and (3) the longer reading in Nic is the result of later stylizing of the older catena tradition by a redactor (Nachlese, 407; Kollationen, 232).
Nic has the following reading: ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος· καὶ περὶ τούτων πτήσσει ἡ καρδία μου, while the older catena preserves only the prepositional phrase. The question, whence does the longer reading come, cannot yet be answered with certainty. The Hagedorns suggest that the longer reading arose due to the changing of the style of the older catena tradition by the redactor. They say, “Since it is not possible that the older recension of the catena is the source of N (because 3005 has the same text as Γ), we do not see, whence the redactor could have obtained the information, if it were not the case, that he himself transformed it so freely” (Nachlese, 407). This explanation is sound, though it should be noted that Symmachus does use πτήσσειν for רָרָר Qal with לֵבִי as subject in 1 Rgns 28:5 (H-R, 1238), which is similar to the structure in Job 37:1a. Either the redactor knew the tendency of Sym and added the correct verb, or perhaps the verb is original to Sym and cII preserves the right reading.

Since the fragment in 252 is anonymous and the readings of Th and Aq are established (see supra), the reading is best treated here. The fragment of 252 is as follows: καὶ περὶ ταυτῆς. This fragment preserves καὶ ταυτῆς from its bible text. Of the six times Sym translates נַתח in the Psalter, he uses καὶ three times (Busto Saiz, 211). This evidence is sufficient, given that Sym does not leave נַתח untranslated, except for one possible instance in Psalm 67:9, but rather than being untranslated, δὲ probably translates it (Busto Saiz, 211); therefore, 252 probably preserves the original καὶ, even though the catena has not preserved it.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported in Kommentar and AGK, but only in Nic (Kommentar, 317; AGK 3, 231; Nic, 527).

The apparatus of 4QJoba at 37:1 should be revised based on the new lemma, since this shorter lemma does not reveal whether Sym had the יָלָה of that text or not (DJD, XVI, 177). The listing of σ’ should be removed.

Job 37 1b

HT

E καὶ ἀπερρύη (ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς.)

α’ καὶ ἔλυθη

Wit1: 252

Notes: According to Reider, this is the only occurrence of λύειν pass in Aq. The lexicon lists three roots for רָרָר. The first root means “to loose, remove” in Job 6:9, while the second means “to leap” in Job 37:1 (HALOT, 736-7). Aq used ἐπιβάλλειν in Job 6:9 (Woods, 143), and here he renders I רָרָר with λύειν pass.

⟨σ’⟩ καὶ κατερείπτει

Wit1: 252
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**Notes:** The Edition lists Symmachus as the author of the fragment, but the Kollationen has returned it to Th, which Field suggested on the basis of 252 (Kollationen, 233; Field, 66). This occurrence of κατερείπειν is the only one in the corpora of the LXX and Hexapla, so analysis of translation technique is not possible. Since Th is already the author of the bible text under the asterisk and the Aq reading is already established, Sym is probably the author of this fragment.

**Job 37 2a**

**HT**

שלמה שמה ברך 집ני

**E**

ἀκοῦε ἀκοὴν ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ κυρίου,

αʹ ἠκουσα ἀκοὴν ἐν κλονησει φωνης αὐτοῦ

**Wit1:** 252

**Notes:** Job 3:17a provides another example of κλονησις for רֹגֶז in Aq (Woods, 101). The first personal singular indicative verb (ἠκουσα) presupposes that Aq read a 1cs suffix (שׁמעי).

**Job 37 2b**

**HT**

(הָעְנָה (משרר נ戕

**E**

καὶ μελέτη (ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξελεύσεται.)

αʹ καὶ φθογγή

**Wit1:** ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732 cII 555 161 ↓252 ↓Syh

**Attr:** αʹ αʹ αʹ 139; > C (= 250) 138

**Var:** καὶ > 252 260 Syh

**NonGr:** Syh ˖. ˖. ˖. ˖. ˖.

**Notes:** Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Aq. The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 317-8; AGK 3, 231; Nic, 527).
HT

וְהֶגֶה (מִפִּיו יֵצֵא׃)

E

(καὶ) μελέτη (ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξελεύσεται.)

σʹ 

ἡχος λόγου

Wit1: 252 ↓Syh

Var: ἡχος] ἰχνη Syh

NonGr: Syh Ἑχος λόγου

Notes: Sym renders ᾿ἐχος in Psalms 48:6, 55:7, and 88:52 (Busto Saiz, 527), while he renders Hebrew words denoting sound with ἡχος (e.g. קול in Job 39:24). The Hebrew word, הֶגֶה is used only three times in the Hebrew Bible, and there are no Sym fragments for Ps 90:9 and Ezek 2:2. Given this evidence, the reading in 252 is preferred over Syh.

Job 37 3a

HT

יִשְׁרֵהוּ (תַּחַת־כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם)

E

(ὑποκάτω παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ,

αʹ 

ἐφοδεύσει αὐτό

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250) ↓cI-732 ↓252

Attr: αʹ] > C (= 250)

Var: ἐφοδεύσει C (= 788-250) 252] ἐφεδρεύσεις 138 255 740; ἐφεδρεύσεις 612; ἐφεδρεύσεις 139 260 559 643 680 3006; ἐφεδρεύσεις 395; ἐφαιδρεύσεις 137 | αὐτό C (= 788-250)] αὐτοῦ rel

Notes: Ms 788 is the first C witness to confirm the attribution to Aq. The text of this fragment has two problems: (1) whether Aq used the verb ἐφοδεύω or the noun ἐφεδρεύσεις and (2) whether the acc. neut. sing. or the gen. masc./neut. pronoun should be considered original.

The HT consists of a verb from the root I שׁרה Qal impf 3ms + 3ms suffix. Probably, Aq has read the form as from I שׂרר "to rule, reign; to have oversight of," as Th also does in this verse (Gentry, 516). In Ps 5:9 and Ps 26(27):11, Aq renders שׂרר "enemy" (cp. ἐχθρῶν LXX) with the participle of ἐφοδεύω, again reading I שׂרר for שׁרה. This understanding of HT makes ἐφοδεύω "to visit, inspect," "superintend, watch
over,” the more probable reading over ἐφέδρευσις “lying in wait”, which is otherwise unattested in the LXX and the Three (Beiträge, 41). La has circuit, which is also dependent on ἐφοδεύσει (Beiträge, 41).

Before the inclusion of 788, determination of the pronoun was problematic on textual and grammatical grounds. The text of 250 is difficult to read, but it appears to read αὐτό,10 and Dieter Hagedorn has confirmed this conclusion. Although Ziegler’s suggestion of an original αὐτοῦ, which was corrected to αὐτό, is possible, it was not confirmed by looking at the image (Kollationen, 234; Beiträge, 41). Ms 788 now affirms that this reading of 250 is correct. Second, there are no examples of ἐφοδεύω + genitive to analyze according to TLG. This conclusion renders the reading of 252 improbable, but probably 252 preserves an intermediate stage (correct verb form with incorrect genitive form), and this awkward reading may have caused the intentional scribal change from ἐφοδεύσει to ἐφέδρευσις.

Job 37 3b

HT

E

σʹ  ἀκρων

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl-

Attr: σʹ] αʹ 137; > C (= 250) 138

Var: ἀκρων] ακρων 138-255

Notes: Job 38:13a contains the same translation equivalent, where the attribution is attested by the C group (ἀκρων = ἀκρών).

Job 37 4b

HT

E

αʹ  ἐν φωνῇ ὑπερφερείας αὐτοῦ

Wit1: lemma] Syh ς ὑπερφερείας αὐτοῦ C\textsuperscript{cat} (= 249 788-250 3005) ↓cl\textsuperscript{cat}

754\textsuperscript{cat} 474\textsuperscript{cat} 258\textsuperscript{cat} ↓505\textsuperscript{cat} cII 555 ↓161′ ↓252 Ol

10The reading is as follows: ἐφοδεύσει αὖ-τό [supra linear]. The omicron is not perfectly shaped and so was probably formed from a blot. For this reason one might suggest an erasure occurred in the ms, but this is by no means an obvious conclusion. Given the spacing of the letters, it is best to conclude that the ms originally and only contained αὐτό.
Notes: The attribution to Olymp in the Edition stands, since it is well attested by Kommentar, AGK, and Nic (Kommentar, 318; AGK 3, 232; Nic, 528). The full context of the catena is as follows: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑβρεώς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἀκύλας “ὑπερφερείας αὐτοῦ” ἐκδέδωκεν.

(Job 37 4c)

HT  יִשָּׁמַע־קָוִּים תּוֹלֵד
E  καὶ οὐκ ἀνταλλάξει αὐτοὺς, ὅτι ἀκούσει φωνήν αὐτοῦ.

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 67).

(Job 37 5b)

HT  נִשְׂחָה וְלֹא יְעַקְּבֵם כִּי־יִשָּׁמַע קֹו
LXX  ἐποίησεν γὰρ μεγάλα, ὧ σὺν κτύπῳ (ψόφῳ) ἐνδοξασμοῦ αὐτοῦ
ποιῶν μεγάλα καὶ οὐ γνωσόμεθα

Wit1: ↓ C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓ clF-137 139 260 559 643 732 3006 ↓ OIY

Attr: λʹ C (= 257 788-250) 255 395 612 740] σʹ C (= 3005) OIY; > 138 680; Ἄλλος Field

Notes: The Kollationen reports that 3005 also preserves an attribution to Sym, which agrees with OIY (Kollationen, 235), but the C (= 257 788-250) group attests λοιποί and the best witnesses of cl agree. Furthermore, the version could be attributed to the Three since there are no idiosyncrasies in the translation.

Job 37 6a
HT (כִּי לַשֶּׁלַג יֹאמַר)
LXX συντάσσων (χιόνι Γίνου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς)

λʹ ἐρεῖ

Wit1: C (= 3005) clF-137 139 260 395 643 680 732 3006

Job 37 6b-7a
HT καὶ χειμῶν ὑετῶν δυναστείας αὐτοῦ.
E ἐν χειρὶ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου κατασφραγίζει,

θʹ Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788-250) clF-138 680 732 252 Arm La Sa Syh


Attr: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ β 788-250 740 255 612 559 395 137 3006 643(6a) 139(6a); ἐκ θεοδοτ(οί) οἱ β 260) Syh
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Var: lemma] om Sa | 6b-7a sub ※ 788 740 255(non 7a) 612 559 395 137 3006
260 643 139 252 Arm(non 6b) La Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{xt} ※ ܐܘܣܬܐ ܡܛܪܐ ܘܣܬܐ ܕܡܛrella
La ※ ܐܠܐ ܐܠܢܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ Antar
Arm ※ ܗܕܢܗו ܡܒܠܒܘܚܝܐ ܒܘܗܪܐ

Job 37 6b

HT καὶ χειμῶνα υετῶν δυναστείας αὐτοῦ.

E καὶ χειμῶνα υετῶν κράτους αὐτοῦ.

αʹ καὶ ὀμβροὶ υετοῦ, καὶ ὀμβροὶ υετῶν κράτους αὐτοῦ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 67).

σʹ καὶ χειμῶνα υετοῖς χειμάσει ὀμβροὶς ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓c\textsuperscript{I} 137 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓c\textsuperscript{II} 555 ↓Syh

Attr: σʹ > C (= 250)

Var: χειμῶνα C (= 788-250 3005) c\textsuperscript{I} 138 395 559 680 740] χειμῶν 395 559 680 740
Syh; χειμῶν 138 χειμάσει] χειμάζει C (= 3005); χειμάσεις 395 680
ὁμβροὶ C (= 788 3005) c\textsuperscript{I} 680 740] ομβροὶς 680 740 Syh; ομβροὶς 250;
ομβροὺς 512-513

NonGr: Syh
Notes: Ziegler chose the variants χειμών and ὀμβροῖς, but now that the manuscript stemma is established, it is clear that the lemma is supported by the best witnesses to the text. The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 320-1; AGK 3, 236; Nic, 529).

Job 37 9a

HT  מָרִידָה תַבָּנה הַמַּיִם
LXX  (ἐκ ταμιείων ἐπέρχονται) δίναι,

αʹ  συσσεισμός

Wit1: ↓C (= 3005) ↓cI-137 139 260 643 732 3006 248

Var: συσσεισμός 248] συγκλεισμός C (= 3005) cI-137 139 260 643 732 3006

Notes: At present there is no evidence for συγκλεισμός in the corpus of Aq, but he uses συσσεισμός for סוּפָה in the following places: Job 21:18, Isa 5:28, and Prov 1:27 (Field = Nobil = 248). Ms 248, therefore, has the correct reading.

σʹ θʹ  καταιγίς

Wit1:  C (= 3005) ↓cI-732

Attr: σʹ θʹ] θʹ 138

Notes: The index is at 9a in many of the catena mss, but it is over ψῦχος at 9b in 3005 (Kollationen, 236). For similar lexical equivalences with αʹ and σʹ see Job 21:18b (Woods, 389).

Job 37 9b

HT  מָרִידָה תַבָּנה (קרָדָה)
LXX  ἀπὸ δὲ ἀκρωτηρίων (ψῦχος.)

αʹ θʹ  καὶ ἀπὸ Μαζορίμ

Wit1: ↓248 Syh

Wit2: ἀπὸ δὲ] καὶ απὸ La III Aeth Arm

Attr: αʹ θʹ] αʹ 248
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Notes: Syh preserves the actual Greek reading above the Syriac as shown in the NonGr line. Ms 248 has a corrupt form of what is found in Syh and it does not preserve the complete attribution. Job 38:32a provides an example of Th transliterating this word; therefore, the double attribution is probably correct.

Job 37 10a

HT

E καὶ ἀπὸ πνοῆς ἰσχυροῦ δώσει πάγος,

\(\theta'\)

Sub ※

Wit1:  

\(\theta'\) (ἐκ θ′ οἱ \(\theta\) 250(9b) 740(9b) 255(9b) 612(9b) 559(9b) 395(9b) 137 3006(9b) 643(9b); ἐκ θεοδοτ(\(\theta\) οἱ δύο 260(9b)) > rel

Var:  10a] om Sa | 10a sub ※ 740(+ 9b) 255(+ 9b) 612(+ 9b) 559(+ 9b) 395(+ 9b) 137(+ 9b) 3006(9b) 260(+ 9b) 643(+ 9b) 248(mend 10b) 252 Arm La

NonGr:  La ※ et a spiritu dei dabitur glacies ✲

Arm ※ έν η ωπότη φαβορή αναπλαυφήμι

\(\sigma'\)

ἀπὸ ἐμφυσῆσεως θεοῦ δοθῆσεται πάγος

Wit1:  ⌣C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl-260 732 ↓clI ↓555 ↓161'

Wit2:  δώσει] dabitur La

Attr:  \(\sigma'\] > C (= 788-250) 139 643

Notes: The best witnesses have ἐμφυσήσις, which is not attested in the LXX or the Hexapla. Furthermore, the word ἐμφύσημα is not attested elsewhere; therefore, the testimony of the oldest Greek catena should be considered genuine. Probably, Ziegler is correct to suggest that the nomen sacrum ὁνος is the cause of the variant (Edition, II App, 380).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 321-2; AGK 3, 237-8; Nic, 530).

Job 37 11-12abc

HT

(job 37 11-12abc)

E

καὶ ἐκλεκτὸν καταπλάσσει νεφέλη,
diaσκορπιεῖ νέφος φῶς αὐτοῦ.
καὶ αὐτὸς κυκλώματα διαστρέψει
ἐν θεοθυλαθὼ εἰς ἔργα αὐτῶν·
πάντα, ὁσα ἂν ἐντείλήται αὐτοῖς,

\[\text{θ}'\]

Sub ※

Wit1: \(C (= 788)\) cI\(^{138}\) 680\(^{732}\) 248 252 706 Arm Sa Syhtxt

Wit2: ἐν θεοθυλαθῷ Ῥα] ἐν –θωμ III; \(\text{ἐν -θωμ 339; \(\text{ἐνθα} εβουλετο} S^1; \(\text{ἐν θεοθυλαθ} S^2; \(\text{ἐν θεοθυλαθθω} (\text{θεβ}. \text{Bo}) \text{rel}

Attr: θ' (11b-12ab: \(\text{ἐκ θ'} \text{ oι } \bar{p} 137\)
3006(12a) 643 139(bis); \(\text{ἐκ θεοδοτ}() \text{ oι } \bar{p} 260(11b))\) 788 Syhtxt > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 11-12abc sub ※ 788 740(non 11a 12c) 255(non 11a 12) 612(non 11a 12c) 559(non 11a 12) 395(non 11 12ac) 137(non 11a 12) 260(non 11a 12bc) 643(non 11a 12bc) 139(non 11a 12) 248(non 11b; + 12d) 252(non 11) 706 Arm Syhtxt

NonGr: Syhtxt

Arm ※ ὁ τι χρήζῃ αὑτῷ γενέσθη
※ γρηγορία ἄρῃ ἀναστύγῃ
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Notes: Ms 788 is the first catena ms to preserve all five lines under the asterisk and attribute them to Th. Syh preserves the Greek ἐν θεοβουλαθωθ for θεοβουλαθωθ in the margin.

Job 37 11a

HT

אַף־בְּרִי יַטְרִיחַ עָב

E

cαι ἐκλεκτὸν καταπλάσσει νεφέλη,

α’

cαίπερ ἐκλεκτὸν ἐνοχλήσει (ς παρενοχλήσει) πάχος

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: παρηνώχλησε is the correct retroversion for ἐν Ἀφ according to the evidence of Judg 14:17, 16:16, Jer 46:27, and Dan 6:18, but ἐνόχλησις is the proper retroversion of ἐν Ἀφ based on α’ σ’ θ’ Isa 1:14, where the Hebrew has יַד (Field, 68).

σ’

ἀλλὰ καὶ καρπῷ ἐπιβρίσει νεφέλη

Wit1: ↓Cat (= 249 257 788-250 3005) cI CAT 754 cat 258 cat [505 cat] 523 cat 3007 cat cII 555 ↓252 ↓OlY ↓Syh

Attr: σ’] α’ 252

Var: καὶ] > Syh | ἐπιβρίσει] ἐπιβρύσει OlY; ἐπιβρωσει 3005 cat; δοσει Syh (conj. Ziegler)

NonGr: Syh

Notes: Regarding the second variant, Field notes: one retroverts the Syriac: Σ. ἀλλὰ καρπῶν δῶσει νεφέλη, but only if it be transcribed soundly: ἀλλὰ καρπῶν δῶσει νεφέλη.
Or must it be read inclinabit? [“Codex, as the scholion has suggested: inclinabit.” – Ceriani] (Field, 68, n 27). It appears Ziegler has followed Field’s suggestion of reading “to give” instead of “to draw, pull; fall down,” which is the meaning of the Greek fragment (Edition, II App, 380). Syh appears, however, to have not Δ, and the scholion adds greater probability to this suggestion.

The evidence listed in the Edition is incomplete, since it only records the evidence of 252 138-251-732 c OlY. In actuality, this fragment is preserved in all of the mss in the catena; therefore, the attribution to Olymp in the Edition is confirmed by Kommentar, AGK, and Nic (Kommentar, 322; AGK 3, 238; Kollationen, 237; Nic, 530).

Job 37 12a

HT

E

καὶ αὐτῶς κυκλώματα διαστρέψει

αʹ
καὶ αὐτὴ μεταστροφαῖς περιστρέψεται

Wit1: 252 Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The Edition and more recently the Kollationen report the reading of 252 as περιστρέψεται pace Field’s περιστρέφεται (Kollationen, 237; Field, 68).

σʹ
αὐτὸς δὲ κυκληδὸν ἀναστρέφεται

Wit1: C (= 788-250) cI\(^{138}\) 260 \(\downarrow\) cII \(\downarrow\) 555 \(\downarrow\) 161′ 252 OlY Syh

Attr: σʹ C (= 788) 255 559 612 cII 555 161′ 252 OlY Syh] > rel

Var: αὐτὸς δὲ] καὶ αὐτὸς 248; > \(\delta \varepsilon \) 555

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The attribution is confirmed by 788. The fragment is next to 12c in 252 (Kollationen, 237). In OlY, the Sym fragments of 12a and 12b are combined (Kommentar, 323; see infra).
Job 37 12b

HT

E

α’ ἐν οἰακώσεσιν εἰς ἔργα αὐτῶν

Attr: α’] σ’ C (= 3005)

NonGr: Syh ἤσασται κατὰ ἅ.κ.

Notes: The attribution is confirmed by 788. In 3005, the attribution to Sym is probably misplaced, since the Aq fragment and the Sym fragment are placed on top of each other. The attribution was intended for the second marginal note, which would then leave this note Anon. The apparatus for this problem and the one below reflect the situation in ms 3005.

σ’ ἐν τῇ κυβερνήσει αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἔργαζεσθαι αὐτά

Attr: σ’] C (= 3005) 138-255

Var: αὐτά] > 252

NonGr: Syh ἤσασται κατὰ ἅ.κ.

Notes: The longer reading is probably the original version of Sym. It agrees with the HT, since Sym renders ἔτων Qal with ἔργαζεσθαι (Busto Saiz, 511). The vocalization of the Hebrew noun with pronominal suffix and the Hebrew infinitive construct is identical. Sym translated the text as an infinitive construct with 3mp suffix, while Th and Aq translated it as a noun with 3mp suffix. In Job 7:2b, Aq and Th translate the same vocalized word with a singular noun, ἔργον (Woods, 151). In Job 24:5b, Sym uses a singular noun, ἔργαςια, to render the word with the same vocalization.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is confirmed by Kommentar, AGK, and Nic (Kommentar, 323; AGK 3, 240; Nic, 531).
Job 37 13

HT

אִמ־לְשֵׁבֶט אִמ־לְאַרְצוֹ
אִמ־לְחֶסֶד יַמְצִיאֵהוּ

E

ἐὰν εἰς παιδείαν, ἐὰν εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ,
ἐὰν εἰς ἔλεος εὑρήσει αὐτόν.

θ’

Sub ※

Wit1: 248 252 706 Arm La Sa Syh

Attr: θ’ Syh > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 13 sub ※ 248 252(non 13a) 706 Arm La Syh

NonGr: Syh

La sive (pr ※ β) in tribu (tri※bu β), sive (pr ※ μ) in terra sua, sive (pr ※ μ) in misericordia inveniri (inueni※ri β) voluerit eam.

Arm ※ ζηρὴν ἠμαν, ἢ ἤρης ἠμὴν ἡμ
※ ζηρὴν ημηνημὴνι δανζε ψώς

Job 37 13a

HT

אלם לָשֵׁבֶט (אִמ־לְאַרְצוֹ)

E (ἐὰν) εἰς παιδείαν, (ἐὰν εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ.)

σ’

εἰς φυλῆν

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI-138 395 732

Wit2: εἰς παιδείαν] in tribu La = M

Var: εἰς C (= 788-250 3005)] > rel | φυλῆν] φυλακὴν 740

Notes: The additional evidence of 788 and 3005 confirms that the oldest Greek catena preserves εἰς as part of the original Sym fragment, and therefore εἰς does not need to be placed in angle brackets as the Edition has it (Edition, 381; Kollationen, 238).

The variant φυλακὴ for original φυλῆ is well attested in the mss (Beiträge, 42).

Job 37 14b

HT

ירָתְתָהוֹן (רֵאֶלֶּא: 

311
LXX  
(στῆθι) νουθετοῦ (δύναμιν κυρίου.)

α’  
κατανόησον

*Wit1:* ↓C (= 788-250 257 3005) cI–732 cII 555 ↓161  
*Attr:* α’] θ’ 161; > C (= 250)  
*Notes:* For general comments regarding this fragment see the Th entry below.

σ’  
ἐνθυμήθητι

*Wit1:* ↓C (= 788-250 257 3005) cI–732 cII 555 161  
*Attr:* σ’] θ’ C (= 788) 3006; > C (= 250)  
*Notes:* For general comments regarding this fragment see the Th entry below.

θ’  
καὶ σύνες

*Wit1:* ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI–732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161  
*Attr:* θ’] α’ 161; σ’ C (= 788) 3006; > C (= 250)  
*Var:* καί] > 137 138 139 260 643 3006 cII 555 161 | σύνες] συνεσις 137 3006inc  
*Notes:* Ms 788 has confused the attributions of Sym and Th. At 38:18a, the ms has preserved the correct attributions for Sym and Th (see Job 38:18a). The presence of the copula καὶ in the oldest Greek catena has not been noted hitherto (*Nachlese*, 407). The καὶ most probably belongs to the original Th fragment since it translates Hebrew *waw*, and it is not borrowed from the LXX.  
The fragments at 14b may be at 14a in 3005 since the readings appear without index (*Kollationen*, 238-9). The index over νουθετοῦ in 788-250, however, makes clear that these fragments are revisions of νουθετοῦ at 14b.  
The attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar, AGK*, but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 324; AGK 3, 241; Nic, 532).

*Job 37 15a*  

HT  
הַּעֲלֵיהֶםהֲתֵדַע בְּשׂוּם־אֱלוֹ  
LXX  
oίδαμεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο ἔργα αὐτοῦ  
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σʹ ἀρα γνώσῃ ὅπότε ἔταξεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ αὐτῶν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250) ↓cI-732 cII 555 161 OlY
Attr: σʹ] > C (= 788-250)

Notes: Translation technique confirms the reading of the oldest Greek catena and OlY, since Sym does use ὅπότε/ὅτε + indicative for ב+ infinitive construct in the Psalter and there are no instances of πότε + indicative (Busto Saiz, 244ff).

The attribution to Olymp is confirmed by Kommentar (Kommentar, 324; Nic, 532).

Job 37 17a
HT אֲשֶׁר־בָּגָדוּךָ הַחַמִּים
LXX σοῦ δὲ η ἁσταλ ἁθερμή·

αʹ οὗ ἵματία σου θερμά

Wit1: ↓248 ↓252 Syh
Var: οὗ] οὐκ 248; οὐχ 252
NonGr: Syh

σʹ ὅπότε ἵματία σου θερμά

Wit1: 248 252

Job 37 17b
HT בֵּהַשְׁקִט אֶרֶץ
LXX ἡσυχάζεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

αʹ ἐν τῷ ἡσυχάσαι γῆν

Wit1: 252
The catena does not preserve 18a under the asterisk **pace** the *Edition*. The asterisk marking ἀπὸ νότου appears at the end of the 17b in some mss and therefore, 18a
seems to be under the asterisk according to those mss, but it is best to interpret this asterisk as marking ἀπὸ νότου at the end of 17b.

Job 37 18a

HT

E

(στερεώσεις μετ’ αὐτοῦ) εἰς παλαιώματα,

αʹ
e ῶ ποπάς

Wit1: ↓C¹ (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓C² (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cF ▼cII ↓555 ▼1161 ▼252 Syh

Attr: αʹ’ θʹ 257 395²; σʹ 137 139 260 3006; > C² (= 788-250 1² 3005) 138² 255² 559² 612² 643² 680² 732² 740²

Var: ἐστερέωσε –σαι 680 | εἰς ῶ ποπάς 252 | εκτροπάς 138¹ 255¹ 559¹; εἰς τροπάς rel | init αὐτὸς ἐστερέωσε τὸν οὐρανὸν C² (= 257 788-250 3005) cF ▼cII 161 555

NonGr: Syh ἃ, ἃ, ἃ

Notes: The Wit1 line represents the evidence for an actual fragment of Aq. Initially Ziegler considered the longer variant a longer Aq fragment, since the prepositional phrase, εἰς ῶ ποπάς, is from Aq, but later Ziegler concluded rightly in the Beiträge that αὐτὸς—οὐρανὸν was a scholion to which the Aq fragment was added (Beiträge, 62; see also AGK 3, 244). A few mss wrongly attributed this fragment to Sym, while others wrongly attributed it to Th. The Nicetas catena must have been aware that at least part of the fragment belonged to Aq and therefore attributed the conflated reading to Aquila.

The variant τροπάς for original ῶ ποπάς in the catena mss is a problem attested elsewhere in Job (cf. 36:28a). The lemma is based on the following considerations: (1) Syh Aq uses ἃκ τις “weight, load” (Job 37:21, 38:37; Ps 17(18):12 [Ps 36(37):6 has ἃκ τις “moment,” which is retroverted to a form from ῶ ποπάς]), which is retroverted to a form from ῶ ποπάς. (2) In 37:18, ms 252 actually preserves original ῶ ποπάς instead of τροπάς, which is significant since the only other place where αʹ ῶ ποπάς is preserved is in ms 248 (Prov 8:28a; Field’s “Nobil” is confirmed, Field, II 327 n. 46). These external factors make the lemma most probable.

The relationship between ῶ ποπάς “weight, scales; weight in scales” and ἁν “dust, cloud” is not immediately apparent. The Beiträge provides the following considerations: (1) one expects Aq to use νεφέλη, but Aq uses this word to render ἁν (Reider, 163). (2) The verb ἁν means “to grind, crush,” and the noun means “mote, dust”; therefore, the noun “dust” would be the result of the verb “to grind.” (3) Most importantly the
translation equivalent is attested in the LXX at Isa 40:15 with the same sense (Beiträge, 42-3). Probably these observations allow one to reconstruct the technique of Aquila.

Ziegler listed Syh at 37:21b, but the reading is clearly beside 18a in the manuscript. I thank Jerome Lund for this observation.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 325-6; AGK 3, 243; Nic, 533).

HT מְדֻרָה מִן הַמְּדֻרָה לְפָנָיו
E (←) στερεώσεις μετ’ αὐτοῦ εἰς παλαιώματα,

σ’ εξ ύψους συνέση αὐτῶ ἐν τῷ στερεώματι εἰς αἰθέρα

Attr: σ’ | Arm; > C (= 250)
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The Edition notes that εξ ύψους comes from reading מִמְרָה “from the height” instead of מִדְרוּ “from the south,” which is at the end of HT 37:17b.

Job 37 18b
HT חֲזָקִים כִּרְאִי מוצָק׃
E ἰσχυραὶ ὡς ὀρασίς ἐπιχύσεως,

α’ ἐνισχύουσαι ὡς ὀρασίς συγχύσεως

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cf-138 732 cfII 161 555
Attr: α’ > C (= 788-250)
σ’ ἵσχυραὶ ὀφθὲναι ἐπιχύσεσιν

WitI: 252

Job 37 20b

HT אִם־אָמַר אִישׁ כִּי יְבֻלָּע׃
LXX ἵνα ἄνθρωπον ἑστηκὼς κατασιωπήσω;

σ’ ἐὰν εἶπητ· ἀνὴρ καταποθήσεται

WitI: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) eI 732

Attr: σ’ C (= 3005]) > rel; Ἄλλος Field

Var: ἐὰν] ίνα C (= 3005)

Notes: The Nachlese reports that 3005 is the first ms to designate an author to this fragment, and it preserves an attribution to Sym (Nachlese, 407). In the Beiträge, Ziegler argues that the translation technique indicates that Aquila is the author, but the Nachlese contradicts the premise that καταποθήσεται derives from καταποντίζω instead of καταπίνω. Aq uses καταποντίζω to translate בלע frequently, but primarily Sym uses καταπίνω to render בלע (Nachlese, 407; Beiträge, 43; Reider, 130; Busto Saiz, 533).

Job 37 21b

HT מִדְרוֹשׁ הָיוּ בְשָׁקִים
E τηλαυγές ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς παλαιώμασιν,

θ’ Sub ※

WitI: C (= 788) eI (= 740 612 559) Sa

Attr: θ’ 788 740 612 559] > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 21b sub ※ 788 740 612 559

σ’ συννεφήσει τὸν αἰθέρα
Job 37 21c

Wit1: \(248\, 252\) Syh

Var: συνεφήσει [ συνεφήσει 248 | αἰθέρα] αερα 248

NonGr: Syh

HT
크르허 (והא נשкурן)

E
tηλαυγής (éstëin èn tois palaiómaïsiv.)

\(\alpha'\)

tηλαυγής

Wit1: \(\downarrow C (= 788-250) \downarrow c\bar{I} - 138\, 260\, 395\, 559\, 680\, 732\)

Attr: \(\alpha' > C (= 788-250)\, 643\, 3006\)

Job 37 22a

Wit1: \(\downarrow 252\) Syh

Var: ἐκαθάρισεν - ἦσεν 252

NonGr: Syh

Job 37 22b
σ’ περί δὲ θεοῦ φοβερὸς αἰνὸς

Notes: Although Sym most frequently translates על with ἐπί (Busto Saiz, 195) and C (= 788-250) has ἐπί, it is easier to explain ἐπί as deriving either from the LXX or from the Th fragment (see infra); therefore, περί is probably the original text.

θ’ ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ μεγάλη ἡ δόξα

Job 37 23a

σ’ τὸν ἰκανὸν οὐκ ἐξευρίσκομεν

Job 37 23b

α’ καὶ κρίσιν καὶ πλῆθος δικαιοσύνης οὐ κακουχήσει
Job 38 1

HT

—( diá βασιλείας αὐτοῦ ἠτράφησαν τοὺς πονηρούς Q)

LXX

Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παύσασθαι Ἐλιοῦν τῆς λέξεως (ἐἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ Ἰὸβ διὰ λαίλαπος καὶ νεφῶν)

Sub 〈‡〉

Wit1: 252

Attr: οὐ κεῖται παρ’ Ἑβραίος 252

Var: ‡ > cod

Notes: There is no obelus in the text of 252, but the marginal note combined with the internal evidence indicates that there probably was one present in the original Hexapla. The Edition indicates that the note applies to all of verse one, but it should only apply to the first part as indicated by the punctuation of 252.

It is worth noting that Syh\textsuperscript{int} has κύριος (־ κύριος ‡) under the obelus, which is an error, since the word is present in HT, but perhaps it may represent an error of the placement of the original obelus at the beginning of v. 1.

Job 38 2a

HT

—(τίς οὗτος) ὁ κρύπτων με βουλήν,

LXX

(Τίς οὗτος) ὁ κρύπτων με βουλήν,

σ’ σκοτεινός γνώμη

Wit1: C (= 257 3005) ↓cI\textsuperscript{139} 260 732 cII 555 ↓248

Var: σκοτεινός, σκοτίνος 680; pr o 248 | γνώμη, γνώμη 138-255

Job 38 2b

HT

(βιβλικά κειλίδρεται:)

LXX

(συνέχον δὲ ρήματα ἐν καρδίᾳ,) ἐμὲ δὲ οἴεται κρύπτειν;

Sub 〈‡〉

Wit1: 252 La Syh\textsuperscript{int}
Attr: οὐ κεῖται παρ’ Ἑβραίοις 252

Var: sub ÷ La Syh

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{xx} ÷
La ÷ et putat me latere?

Notes: The Edition interprets 252 as having all of 2b under the obelus, i.e., not present in the HT, but only the latter part of the verse is absent from the HT.

Job 38 5b

HT קָו׃ (מִי־נָטָה עָלֶיהָ אוֹ)
LXX (ἢ τίς ὁ ἐπαγαγὼν σπαρτίον ἐπ’ αὐτῆς;)

αʹ κανόνα

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-137 139 643 732 3006 cII 555 ↓161′ ↓252

Attr: αʹ] σʹ 248 252 395; > 260

Var: κανόνα] pr τον 260

Notes: In 260, the hexaplaric fragments are accidentally included in the catena of Methodius in the following form: μέτρον ἤγουν τὸν κανόνα, τὸ σχοινίον (Kollationen, 244; AGK 3, 265). Ms 680 preserves the two fragments for verse 5b under an Aq attribution. Given the stemma of the Hagedorns, in which mss 137 139 643 are placed below ms 680, it is probable that the two fragments attributed to Aquila in 680 is the reason for the omission of this fragment in those three mss, since it makes little sense to have two fragments attributed to the same author.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 336-7; AGK 3, 264-5; Nic, 541).

σʹ σχοινίον μέτρου

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732 cII 555 ↓161′ ↓252

Attr: σʹ] αʹ 137 139 248 252 260 395 643 680; > C (= 250) 138 260 3006

Var: σχοινίον] pr το 260 | μέτρου] αὐτοῦ 252; αὐτῆς 248; > 260

Notes: The Edition treats the fragments in 248 252 and the catena as separate, but this proposal is probably not correct. Mss 248 and 252 already preserve the wrong attribution to Aq, which is present in many witnesses of the cI group, notably 395, which
contains the same confusion as 248 and 252, attributing to Sym the Aq fragment (see supra) and to Aq the Sym fragment. In 252, the reading ἀυτοῦ seems to be a mistake for μέτρου and in 248 αὐτῆς is from the LXX.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 336-7; AGK 3, 264-5; Nic, 541).

**Job 38 6a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>שליכו (וכת.setColor</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>(ἐπὶ τίνος) οἱ κρίκοι (αὐτῆς πεπήγασι;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α׳ θ׳</td>
<td>αὶ βάσεις</td>
<td>Attr:</td>
<td>α׳ θʹ] αʹ C (= 788); οἱ ἄλλοι cII 555 161; &gt; C (= 250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var:</td>
<td>βάσεις] βασ[] 161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The Edition does not add the evidence of cII in this instance. Nic preserves the readings of the Three, but it groups them together without specific attribution. Ms 788 preserves an attribution to Aq, but the double attribution is probably correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>σʹ</th>
<th>οἱ καταπῆγες</th>
<th>Wit1:</th>
<th>↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI-138 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attr:</td>
<td>σʹ] αʹ 248 252; οἱ ἄλλοι cII 555 161; &gt; C (= 250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var:</td>
<td>καταπῆγες] καταπηγεῖς 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job 38 7a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ברך בורכי (מצבים בָרָן)</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>(Ὅτε ἐγενήθησαν;—(ἀστρα,)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α׳ θ׳</td>
<td>ἀμα</td>
<td>Wit1:</td>
<td>↓C (= 788 3005) cI-137 138 139 260 559 643 732 3006 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161 Syh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wit2:</td>
<td>ἀστρα] pr αμα II Laβ9 Cass (co 8,9) = M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attr:</td>
<td>αʹ θʹ] αʹ C (= 788); λʹ 161; οἱ ἄλλοι cII 555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NonGr: Syh ᵃasions variants.

Notes: This fragment is absent in 250, but 788 preserves it. The Syh preserves the exact placement of this fragment before ἄστρα, since the index is between the two words ἄστρα ὃς, where the word appears in the HT. This fragment is at 38:7b in 255 559 612 680 (Kollationen, 245). In 395 the exact reading is ἐκ θ’ α’ υἱοὶ θεοῦ | ἃμα (Kollationen, 245). The placement of the two fragments together is the potential cause for the confusion (οἱ ἄλλοι) that obtained in Nic. The Edition does not list the evidence of cII for this fragment. This fragment and the following one are preserved together at 7a in the cII group: ἃμα υἱοὶ θεοῦ.

Job 38 7b

HT ἔγγισεν με φωνῇ μεγάλῃ πάντες ἄγγελοί (μου.)

LXX (ἥνεσάν με φωνῇ μεγάλῃ πάντες) ἀγγελοὶ (μου.)

α’ σ’ θ’ υἱοὶ θεοῦ

Wit1: C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓cII ↓161 ↓555
Attr: α’ σ’ θ’ C (= 788-250 3005)] α’ θ’ 255 395 612 680 740; λ’ 161; οἱ ἄλλοι cII 555; > C (= 257) 559

Notes: The Nachlese corrects the Edition and the Beiträge by noting that 250 and 3005 count Sym as an author of this fragment also (Nachlese, 407; Beiträge, 12). Ms 788 may now be added as support for this attribution. In 559 this fragment follows the one at 7a without separation (Kollationen, 245), which provides more evidence for the conflation of the two fragments that eventually obtained in the Nicetas catena.

Job 38 8b

HT ὃτε ἐμαίμασσεν (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτῆς ἐκπορευομένη·)

LXX ὐτε ἐμαιμασσεν (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτῆς ἐκπορευομένη·)

α’ ἐν τῶι παλαίειν

Wit1: Ccat (= 249 788-250 3005) cIcat–138 732 248 252

Notes: This fragment is embedded in the catena of an unattributed author (AGK 3, 270; Kollationen, 245). Mss 248 and 252 preserve the reading in the margin. The translation of ἐν + infinitive construct with ἐν τῶι + infinitive accords with the translation technique of Aquila (Hyvärinen, 74-5).
Job 38 9a

HT

לְבֻשׁוֹ נָ בְּשׂוּמִי

LXX

ἐθέμην δὲ αὐτῇ νέφος ἀμφίασιν,

σ’

καὶ ὡς νεφέλην περιείλησα αὐτήν

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓cl–732 cII 555 ↓161 ’ ↓252

Attr:  σ’ α’ 248 252; > C (= 788-250 257)


νεφέλη 137 139 260 395 643 680 3006 | περιείλησα] –είλισα 740; –ήλισα 559 3006; –εἰλισσα 138; περιείλασα 137 | αὐτήν] αὐτῷ C (= 3005inc) 138 255 559 612; αὐτον C (= 788*); αὐτον 740; αὔτ) 3006; > 248 252

Notes:  The ending of the last word is not fully certain in 3005 (Kollationen, 246). The last letter could have the ligature for the -ην termination or for -ω, but it is too faint to decide. The reading of 788 was originally αὐτῶν, but it was corrected to αὐτήν. Although there is no waw in HT, which would correspond to καὶ, it appears that this may be a revision of δὲ, since καὶ is in all the witnesses except 680.

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 338; AGK 3, 271; Nic, 543).

Job 38 9b

HT

חֲתֻלָּתוֹ

LXX

ὁμίχλῃ δὲ αὐτὴν ἐσπαργάνωσα·

α’ θ’

καὶ γνόφον πλάνησιν (s πλάνην) αὐτοῦ

Wit1:  Syh

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  The retroversion is from Field (Field, 70, n. 10).
σʹ εἴλημα αὐτῷ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh σοὶ ἠξιῶντο.

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 70, n. 10).

Job 38 11b

HT

LXX

σʹ ἐώς ὡδε τετάχθω τῷ ἐπάρμα τῶν κυμάτων σου

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cII 555 ↓161′ ↓Pitra

Attr: σʹ] > C (= 250) 139 643


Notes: Pitra and 680 attest wrongly to a form from ταράσσειν “to stir, trouble,” since the entire tradition attests to a form from τάσσειν “to order,” which Sym uses to translate (Beiträge, 44; Busto Saiz, 590).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar and AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 338; AGK 3, 272; Nic, 544).

Job 38 12a

HT

LXX

γʹ ἠ ἀφ’ ἡμερῶν σου

Wit1: C (= 257)

Notes: The Nachlese provides this new fragment from ms 257, which was hitherto unnoticed (Nachlese, 407; Kollationen, 246).
α’ θ’ ἐγνώρισας τῶν ὀρθῶν τόπων αὐτοῦ

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161
Attr: α’ θ’) α’ C (= 788); λ’ cII 555 161; > C (= 250)
Var: ἐγνώρισας] -ρησας 139 | τόπων] ταξίν 395

Job 38 13a
HT
LXX

σ’ ἀκρων

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005)
Attr: σ’ > C (= 250)

Notes: Ms 3005 supports the author attribution in 257 (Nachlese, 407). Ms 788 also supports the attribution, adding to the probability that the text and attribution are part of the oldest Greek catena. Symmachus uses ἀκρων for ταξίν in Job 37:3b, where the attribution is well attested in C and cI.

Job 38 15a
HT
LXX

σ’ περιαπεθήσεται

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 3005) ↓cI-559 732
Attr: σ’ > C (= 3005) 139 260 643
Var: περιαπεθήσεται] -εθήσεται 3006

Job 38 15b
HT
LXX  
(βραχίονα δὲ υπερηφάνων) συνέτριψας;

α’  
συντρίψεις

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl־139 260 643 732 3006
Attr:  α’] > C (= 788-250)
Var:  συντρίψεις] συντριψη 138

Notes:  In mss 255 680, the following scholion is appended nearby: τὸν ἀδίκως εἰκτεινόμενον. In ms 138, it is completely appended (Beiträge, 62; AGK 3, 277; Kollationen, 247; Klostermann, 73). Klostermann mistook this longer reading for the complete Aq reading, but the oldest Greek catena confirms that originally these readings were separate, one a hexaplaric fragment, the other a scholion.

Job 38 16a
HT (תֶּהֶם שֶׁרְכֵכֵכָּרִי) עַד־נִבְכֵי (הֲבָאתָ)
LXX (ἦλθες δὲ) ἐπὶ πηγὴν (θαλάσσης.)

α’  
ἕως φρουρημάτων

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl־732
Attr:  α’] > C (= 250) 612 3006
Var:  φρουρημάτων C (= 788-250 3005)] φορου ρηματων 137 139 255 260 559 612 643 680 740 3006; ψοφου ρηματων 395

Notes:  Both C mss confirm the conjecture of Field for this fragment (Nachlese, 407; F-Auct, 10; Beiträge, 44). Ms 788 also confirms the conjecture of Field and the reading of the Nachlese.

σ’  
ἕως συνοχῆς

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl־732
Attr:  σ’] θ’ C (= 3005); > C (= 250) 138-255

Notes:  Ms 3005 has an attribution to Th for this fragment (Nachlese, 407), but 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym is probably correct. Th uses συνοχῆ to render נִבְכֵי in Ezek 7:25, which may indicate that he would not use the word here for נִבְכֵי.
Sym uses συνοχή for נָטָר in Ps 106(107):39 and Prov 30:16 (only Nobil is cited by Field as evidence for each of these).

Job 38 16b
HT

ףְּתַחֵר (חתום החתומה):
LXX

ἐν (δὲ) ιχνεσιν (αἰβύσσου περιπλάτησαις;)

σʹ

ἐν ἐξιχνιασμῷ

Wit1: ↓ C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓ clL-732
Attr: σʹ C (= 257) αʹ clL-395 732; > C (= 788-250 3005) 395
Var: ἐν] > C (= 3005)

Notes: To make a decision about the attribution of this fragment is difficult, since the external and internal evidences are divided. The Nachlese presents evidence from Judg 5:16 in which Sym uses ἐξιχνιασμός to render חֵקֶר, but there is also evidence of the translation equivalent in Aq at Job 11:7 (Nachlese, 407-8; Woods, 219-20). The weight of the earliest Greek catena plus evidence of the translation equivalent in Sym indicates that this fragment should be attributed to him.

Job 38 17a
HT

הִתְהַלָּכְתָּ׃תְּהוֹ (—)
LXX

ἐν (δὲ) ἰχνεσιν (αἰβύσσου περιπλάτησαις;)

Sub ÷

Wit1: cl (= 559 612) Syh
Var: sub ÷ 559(pr ἀνοίγ.) 612 Syh

NonGr: Syh

Job 38 17b
HT

חֵקֶר (חתום החתומה):
LXX

πυλωροὶ δὲ (δὲ δούλου ἰδοντες σε ἔπτηξαν;)

αʹ

καὶ τὰ νέρτερα

Wit1: 252
Notes: There is reason to doubt that this reading comes from Aquila, since he always renders שער with πύλη (Beiträge, 44); however, the rendering of waw with καί is a trait of the translation technique of Aq (Hyvärinen, 52).

HT (שער צלמה תראה;),—
LXX (πυλώροι δὲ ἰδόντες σε) ἐπιτηξαν;

Sub ÷

Wit1: cl (= 559 612 740)
Var: sub ÷ 559(pr πυλώροι) 612 740

Job 38 18a

HT (הבותנֵה (עָדְרֵה–רַחֲבֵי–אָרֶץ))
LXX νενουθέτησαι (δε το ευρος της υπ’ ουρανον;)

α’ κατενόησας

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cl-732
Attr: α’ [] C (= 257)
Var: κατενόησας] α κατενόησας 559
Notes: The variant in 559 may have arisen because of dittography of the attribution α.

σ’ ἐνενόησας

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cl-137 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓clII ↓555
Attr: σ’ [] C (= 257); 138inc; > clII 555

θ’ συνήκας

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cl-732 3006 ↓clII ↓555 ↓161\textsuperscript{mg}
Attr: θ’ α’ 248; σ’ 139; [] C (= 257); 138inc; > clII 161\textsuperscript{mg} 555
Var: συνήκας] μι συνήκας 161\textsuperscript{mg}; συνικάς 612
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Job 38 19a

HT: רָאָה נְהָרִים (רָאָה)
LXX: ποίος δέ γῇ αὑλίζεται (τὸ φῶς).

α’ θ’ σκηνοῦ

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓ cI-139 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓ cII ↓ 161mg
Attr: α’ θ’] σ’ C (= 788-250); α’ 248; άλλοι cII 555; [] 257; > 161mg
Var: σκηνοῖ] σκηνοῖ 395

Notes: Probably, 788-250 confused the attributions of this fragment and the following one (see infra).

σ’ ἠρεμεῖ

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓ cI-732 ↓ cII ↓ 161mg
Attr: σ’] α’ C (= 788-250); άλλοι cII 555; > 161mg 559
Var: ἠρεμεῖ] ἠρεμεῖ 612 740; ηγεμὴ 260

Notes: This fragment follows σκηνοῖ without a division in 559 (Kollationen, 249).

Job 38 20b

HT: רְכִיעַתָה (רְכִיעַתָה בִּירָה)
LXX: (εὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπίστασαί τρίβους αὐτῶν;

σ’ ἀτραποὺς οἰκήσεως

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) cI-139 260 643 3006 cII 555 161
Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250)

Job 38 22b

HT: (הָעָרִים) בּוֹרְד (הָעָרִים)
LXX: (θησαυροὺς δὲ) χαλάζης (ξόρακας.)
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σʹ κρυστάλλου

Wit1: 248

Notes: There is no extant evidence to compare the use of this word by Sym.

Job 38 24a
HT אֲיֵי־זֶה הַדֶּרֶךְ יֵחָלֶק
LXX πόθεν δὲ ἐκπορευέται πάρχη

αʹ σʹ θʹ φῶς

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 680 732 ↓248
Attr: αʹ σʹ θʹ C (= 788-250) αʹ θʹ C (= 3005) cI-139 680 732; αʹ 248

Notes: Since φῶς is a common equivalent for ἀραξ in the LXX and the Three, 788-250 probably preserves the original attribution to all three revisers. The evidence of 3005 shows that the attribution to Sym dropped first and 248 attests that Th was dropped last.

Job 38 24b
HT יָפֵץ (עֲלֵי־אָרֶץ׃)
LXX οὐ διασκεδάννυται νότος (εἰς τὴν ὑπ΄ οὐρανόν;)

σʹ ἄνεμος

Wit1: C (= 3005) cI-137 139 260 643 732 3006

Job 38 25a
HT μὴ ἐπετήρητα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπαίκρα
LXX τίς δὲ ἤτοιμασεν υπότω λάβρῳ ρύσιν,

⟨θʹ⟩ τίς διέστειλεν τῶν κατακλυσμῶν ύδραγωγόν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-138 260 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161
Attr: θʹ conj.] αʹ θʹ rel; οἱ ἄλλοι cII 555 161; > C (= 788-250) 680
Notes: The catena preserves this fragment under the double attribution of Aq and Th. This attribution is improbable, since the Aq reading is better preserved by 248 (see infra). Aq uses the noun διαίρεσις three times to render the noun פְּלַגָּה or פֶּלֶג (Beiträge, 44; Reider, 54). Symmachus should not be considered because he renders פִּלַּג with ἀσύμφωνον ποιεῖν in Ps 55(56):10 (Beiträge, 44).

HT (מיר) פְּלַג (ךְּשֶׁהָתָו הָעָלְיָה)
LXX (tics de) ήτοιμασεν (υετο λάβρο ρύσιν.)

α’ διεῖλεν

Wit1: 248

Job 38 25b
HT "רָדָךְ לַחֲזִיז קֹלוֹ"
LXX οδὸν δὲ κυδοιμῶν

α’ καὶ οδὸν εἰς κτύπον φωνῶν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓clI-138 732 ↓clII ↓555 ↓161’ 252 Syh
Attr: α’] > C (= 250)
NonGr: Syh 

Notes: The lemma appears as a revision of the OG in accordance with HT. The initial words appear to have dropped out of the catena tradition.

HT :תֵּלקָה לַחֲזִיז קֹלוֹ (רָדָךְ)
LXX (οδὸν δὲ) κυδοιμῶν

σ’ ψόφου βροντῶν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓clI-137 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓clII-512-513 ↓555 ↓161’
Attr: \( \sigma' > C (= 250) \)

Var: ψόφου \( C (= 788-250) \) \( \text{248 255 395 559 612 740} \) \( \psiφους C (= 3005) \); ψόφον \( 138 680 \) | \( \beta\rhoοντόν C (= 788-250) \) \( 3005) \) \( 138-255 395 680 \) \( \beta\rhoοντῆς \) \( 559 612 740 \) \( \text{cII}^{512-513} 555 161' \)

Notes: The variants for this fragment are interesting given the fragment in 28:26b:

\( \sigma' \) \( όμβρων \) \( βροντάς \)

Wit1: \( C (= 257) \) \( 252 \) Syh

Var: \( όμβρων \) \( pr \) καὶ \( ο̂δόν C (= 257) \) \( όμβρων \) \( βροντάς \) \( φωνῶν Syh \)

NonGr: Syh ⁎ ܢܘ ܢ ܐ ܨ ܐ ܝ ܐ ܕܡ ܐ ܕܩ.

In 38:25b, the best evidence supports the gen. pl. \( \beta\rhoοντόν \), which agrees with the HT and LXX. Ms 740 has \( \beta\rhoοντῆς \) for the Sym fragment and in a scholion, which may account for its inclusion in the Sym fragment, and from 740 the genitive singular may have spread to other witnesses of \( cI \) (cf. AGK 3, 284). The Beiträge adds that ψόφος is part of the Sym lexicon on the basis of Job 37:4c (Beiträge, 38).

**Job 38 26-27**

HT

E

θʹ  Sub ※

Wit1: \( C (= 788-250) \) \( cI^{137} 138 \) \( 732 \) \( 248 252 \) Arm La Sa Syh\textit{int}

Attr: \( \theta' (\varepsilon \theta' \text{ oī } \varepsilon 788-250 740(26b) 612 395 3006(26b) 643 139; \varepsilon \) \( \text{θεοδότωνος } \text{oī } \text{téssar}() 260) \) Syh\textit{int} \( ] > \text{rel} \)

Var: lemma] om Sa | 26-27 sub ※ \( 788 740(\text{non } 26a) \) \( 255 612 559(\text{non } 26a) \) \( 395 680(\text{non } 26a \text{ 27}); + 28b) 3006(\text{non } 26a) \) \( 260 643(\text{non } 27a) \) \( 139(\text{non } 26a \text{ 27}) 248 252 \) Arm(\text{non } 26b \text{ 27}) La Syh\textit{int}
NonGr: Syh

La  ut (pr * μ) et pluat super terram ubi non est vir,  
* in deserto ubi non est homo, 
ut (pr * μ) satiet invium et inhabitabile,  
et (pr * μ) ut germinet herbae viror?

Arm  ※ Σκηνωσή τίμημα πυρ νη πη υπηρή

Job 38 27b
HT  רְחוֹמִיתָה (חֹסֶה)  
E  (και τού ἐκβλαστῆσαι) ἔξοδον (χλόης);

σʹ  ἀνάφυσιν

Wit1:  ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732

Attr:  σʹ C (= 3005) 139] > C (= 257 788-250) cI-139 732

Var:  ἀνάφυσιν] ἀνάφυσις 260

Notes:  The attribution to Sym is confirmed by 3005 (Kollationen, 252). The complete reading of 395 is ἔξοδον· ἀνάφυσιν (Kollationen, 252).

Job 38 28a
HT  ἐστὶ·  
LXX  τίς ἐστιν ὑπετὸν πατήρ;

αʹ  μήτι ἐστίν τῶν ὑπετῶν πατήρ


Attr:  αʹ 248 252 Syh] αʹ θʹ rel

Var:  ἐστίν] ἐνεστίν 248

NonGr:  Syh  אֲנָמַיָּה. α.  
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Notes: Th does not translate ע with מ in Job (Gentry, 364-5); therefore, the attribution should be restricted to Aq, who uses מ for ע in numerous places in Job (4:2, 10:3 11:7, 14:14, 15:2, 15:8, 23:6, 26:5, and 40:31).

σʹ ἀρα ἐστὶν ὑετῶν πατήρ


Attr: σʹ αʹ 252

Notes: The author attribution in 252 is a mistake, since the Aq fragment has been determined on internal and external evidence (see supra).

Job 38 28b
HT אֲרֵי יָדְהוֹדִיל (אַנָּגִלְיִים);
LXX (τίς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ τετοκός) βόλους (δρόσου;

αʹ συστάδας

Wit1: 252

σʹ συστροφάς

Wit1: 252

Notes: Sym probably did not differentiate between אֵגֶל “drop” and עֵגֶל “young bull” (Ps 67(68):31) given that he translates both of these words with συστροφή (Beiträge, 44).

Job 38 29a
HT מְבָשֵׂן מִזְאָא (דָּקֵר)
LXX (ἐκ γαστρὸς δὲ τίνος ἐκπορεύεται ὁ) κρύσταλλος;

αʹ θʹ πάγος

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cf-260 732

Job 38 30b
HT הַמֵּשָּׁם הָתָמְכָרָה:
LXX  πρόσωπον δὲ ἀβύσσου τίς ἐπηξέν;

εβρ’  πρόσωπον δὲ ἀβύσσου πήγνυται

Wit1:  Nobil (apud Field)

Job 38 31a

HT  תִּקַּשֵּׁר מַעֲדַנּו
LXX  συνήκας δὲ δεσμὸν Πλειάδος

σʹ  ἡ συνάψεις μόρια Πλειάδος

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cf.260 732 512-513 ↓555 ↓161’ ↓252 Syh
Attr:  σʹ] αʹ 248 252; αʹ σʹ 139; > C (= 250) 643 3006

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  The decision over ἡ or εἰ is difficult, but perhaps Sym read the initial π as the interrogative, which he renders with ἥ in the Psalter (Busto Saiz, 265).

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 342; AGK 3, 288; Nic, 551).

Job 38 32

HT  תְּבִעְתָּר מַחְרָה כֶּנֶּה
E  ἡ διανοίξεις Μαζουρώθ ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἑσπερόν ἐπὶ κόμης αὐτοῦ ἀξεῖς αὐτᾶ;

θʹ  Sub ※

Wit1:  248 252 La Sa Syh

Attr:  θʹ Syh] > rel
Var: lemma] om Sa | 32 sub ※ 248(31b-33a) 252 La Syh	

NonGr: Syh	

Notes: In the margin Syh gives the Greek (Maẓurow) for מזירות. La has used Aq instead of Th in 32b (see infra).

Job 38 32a

HT

E

σ'

η ἀναφύσεις τὰ σκορπισθέντα κατὰ καιρὸν αὐτῶν ἐκαστὸν

Wit1: lemma] ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-{680} 732 ↓248 ↓252 ↓Syh | ἀναφύσεις τὰ σκορπισθέντα] ↓Arm

Attr: σ'] α' Arm Syh; > C (= 250) 559 612

Var: η] pr Maẓurow 3005 | ἀναφύσεις τὰ σκορπισθέντα] ἀναφύσει

Arm ἀναφύσεις τὰ σκορπισθέντα

Notes: The variant, αὐτοῦ, is probably from the bible text, while the lemma, αὐτῶν, is the reading of the best witnesses.

The Arm variant attempts to convey the reading in Greek which Cox presented in Latin: exebit Arcturus (Cox, 343-44). Given the Greek and Syriac traditions of this fragment, the authenticity of this Arm fragment is questionable, but until more is learned about the Armenian tradition, it should remain in the collection of hexaplaric fragments.

Notes: The variant, αὐτοῦ, is probably from the bible text, while the lemma, αὐτῶν, is the reading of the best witnesses.

The Arm variant attempts to convey the reading in Greek which Cox presented in Latin: exebit Arcturus (Cox, 343-44). Given the Greek and Syriac traditions of this fragment, the authenticity of this Arm fragment is questionable, but until more is learned about the Armenian tradition, it should remain in the collection of hexaplaric fragments.
Job 38:32b

HT
καὶ Ἑσπερὸν ἐπὶ κόμης αὐτοῦ ἄξεις αὐτά;  

E
καὶ Ἑσπερὸν ἐπὶ κόμης αὐτοῦ ἄξεις αὐτά;  

α'
καὶ Ἑσπερὸν ἐπὶ οἰκοδομῆς αὐτοῦ καθοδηγήσεις αὐτοὺς


Var: καθοδηγήσεις] -γησης C (= 788-250) 137; οδηγησεις 395

NonGr: Syh

Notes: Ziegler notes that Aq renders ἄξεις Hi with καθοδηγεῖν here and in Ps 60(61):3, 77(78):53, 72 as well as Isa 57:18, which are in Reider (Reider, 121). Ziegler also notes the influence of Aq on La (see supra; Beiträge, 45).

Job 38:33a

HT
(ἢ πᾶτερ θεοῦ)

LXX
(ἐπιστασαι δὲ) τροπάς (οὐρανοῦ)

θ'
συντάγματα

Wit1: C (= 788-250) cI-139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

Var: συντάγματα] συνταγμα C (= 788-250)

σ'
διατάξεις

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI-139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

Notes: At 38:32b ἄξεις in 3005 (Kollationen, 254).

α'
ἀκριβείας

Wit1: 248
Job 38 35a

HT: וְיֵלֵכוּ בְּרָקִים (הַתְשַׁלַּח)
LXX: ἀποστελεῖς κεραυνοὺς (καὶ πορεύσονταί)

λʹ: ἀστραπάς

Job 38 35b

HT: יִדְעֻּ הַמֵּאֵי (הַכַּנֵּה)
LXX: ἐροῦσιν δὲ σοι Τί ἐστιν;

αʹ: ιδοὺ ἡμεῖς

σʹ: πάρεσμεν

Notes: Field attributed the fragment to αʹ σʹ θʹ, but Ziegler corrected Field on the basis of the C mss. Mss 780 and 3005 confirm this correction (Beiträge, 45; Field, 71 n 37).

The C group (788-250 257 3005) and the cI-[680] group have the correct version of Aq. Ziegler notes that Th may be read in place of Aq in 248, but the Kollationen still attributes the fragment to Aq in 248 (Beiträge, 45; Kollationen, 255). The cII group preserves an anonymous amalgam of the readings of Aq and Sym (see infra).
Job 38 36b

HT

אֲרוֹן כְּפָרְכֹּר לְשֶׁכֶר בֵּיתָה.

LXX

ἡ ποικιλτικὴν ἐπιστήμην;

σʹ

ἡ τὶς ἐδώκεν μεμωρωμένῳ ἐννοιαν

Job 38 37a

HT

מִי־נָתַן לַשֶּׂכּוֹר בִּינָה׃ אוֹ

LXX

ἢ ποικιλτικὴν ἐπιστήμην;

αʹ

τὶς ἐξηγήσεται (s διηγήσεται) ῥοπᾶς ἐν σοφίᾳ

Notes:

Despite the strong external evidence for the attribution to Th, the evidence of 3005 and translation technique indicate that the attribution to Sym is correct. Sym uses πάρειμι for הִנֵּנִי in I Rgns 3:4, 22:12; II Rgns 1:7 (Beiträge, 45). Th uses ἰδοὺ or ἐστίν (Gentry, 365-6).

Notes:

The attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK, but only by Nic (Kommentar, 344; AGK 3, 292; Nic, 553).
Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 71). In Syh there are three distinct versions for 37-38, which have been divided into three sections in the NonGr apparatus. The NonGr line in the subsequent sections will be a continuation of the fragment which began in 37a and therefore the attribution to the Syriac attribution will not be repeated in the NonGr line.

σʹ 

τίς ἀριθμήσει τὸν αἱθέρα ἐν σοφίᾳ

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 71).

θʹ 

τίς ἀριθμήσει παλαιώματα ἐν σοφίᾳ

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 71).

Job 38 37b

HT 

וְנִבְלֵי שָׁמַיִם מִי יַשְׁכִּיב׃

LXX 

οὐρανὸν δὲ εἰς γῆν ἐκλίνεν;

αʹ 

καὶ ἀπορρέοντα οὐρανοῦ τίς κοιμήσει

Wit1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 71). According to Ziegler, Aq uses ἀπορρέειν to translate יָבַל in Isa 1:30, even though the source (Eus) attributes the fragment to Sym not Aq (cf. Ziegler’s Isaias Edition). Aq also uses the noun ἀπόρρευσις to render נְבָלָה in Deut 22:21, where the critical text reads αʹ ἀπό <ρ>ρεύσιν (cf. LSJ ἀπόρρευσις “flowing from”). Although HT means “to whither, decay” “folly,” in these references, one may presuppose that Aq had יָבַל “jar for
liquid” in mind, which is the meaning in Job 38:37. Aq must be employing etymological translation technique or stereotyping in these instances. Aq translates שׁכב Hi with κοιμάω in Hos 2:18.

\[\sigma' \quad \eta \ \text{ὀργανα} \ \text{oυρανου} \ \tau\zeta \ \text{συνθήσει}\]

\[\text{Wit1: } \downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow \text{Syh} \downarrow \text{Pitra}\]

\[\text{Attr: } \sigma' \ C (= 3005) \ \text{Syh} \ \sigma' \ \theta' \ 137 \ 139 \ 260 \ 559 \ 612 \ 643 \ 732 \ 740 \ 3006; \ \sigma' \ \theta' \ 395; \ \theta' \ 138-255 \ \text{Pitra}; > C (= 788-250)\]

\[\text{NonGr: } \text{Syh}\]

\[\text{Notes: } \text{Ms 3005 joins Syh as testimony for the attribution to Sym.}\]

\[\theta' \quad \text{kai} \ \text{ὀργανα} \ \text{oυρανου} \ \tau\zeta \ \text{κοιμήσει}\]

\[\text{Wit1: } \downarrow 161' \downarrow \text{Syh}\]

\[\text{Wit2: } \text{oυρανον} \ \text{δε} ] \ \text{οργανα} \ \text{δε} \ \text{ουρανου} \ \text{II}; \ \text{οργανα} \ \text{oυρανου} \ \text{δε} \ \text{III}; \ \text{pr} \ \text{οργανα} \ \text{V}; \ * \ \text{et organa caeli} \ \text{La}^{\text{tr}} = \text{M}\]

\[\text{Attr: } \theta' \ \text{Syh}] \ \sigma' \ 161'\]

\[\text{Var: } \text{kai} ] \ \eta (= \Delta \alpha) \ \text{Syh} \ \text{| κοιμήσει} ] \ \text{κοισμήσει} \ 161'\]

\[\text{NonGr: } \text{Syh}\]

\[\text{Notes: } \text{The attribution to Sym in 161’ is an error for Th, and the verb κοισμήσει is probably an error for κοιμήσει, which is part of the corpus of Th (cf. Woods, 225; the fragment in 11:18ab belongs to Th not Aq pace Edition).}\]

\[\text{Job 38 38}\]

\[\text{HT} \quad \text{בָּצֶקֶתָּ עָפָרָה לַמּוּצָק} \quad \text{וּרְגָּבִים יְדֻבָּקוּ׃}\]

\[\text{LXX} \quad \text{kέχυται} \ \text{δε} \ \text{ώσπερ} \ \gamma\eta \ \text{κονία}, \ \text{κεκόλληκα} \ \text{δε} \ \text{αυτόν} \ \text{ώσπερ} \ \text{λίθω} \ \text{kύβον.}\]
α’  ἐν τῷ ἐκχεῖσθαι γῆν εἰς καταχύσιν καὶ χερμάδες (s χερμάδια) κολληθήσονται

Wit1:  Syh

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  The retroversion here departs from Field and the Edition with respect to the < of Syh. Ziegler retroverted it with ἐν and Field used the simple dative (Field, 72). Aq is rendering ἐν, which he renders usually with εἰς + accusative (Hyvärinen, 47) and, therefore, the retroversion reflects this tendency. Syh did use < to translate εἰς (cf. Notes at Job 37:1a and 37:13).

σ’ ὅταν κέχυται εἰς κόνιν γῆς ἐπίχυσις, ἵνα βῶλοι γένωνται συγκολληθεῖσαι

Wit1:  lemma] Syh | γῆς—συνκ.↓252

Attr:  σ’] α’ 252

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  The retroversion is from Field (Field, 72).

θ’  ἐν τῷ ἐκχεῖσθαι γῆν καταχύσει καὶ βῶλοι συγκολληθήσονται

Wit1:  Syh

NonGr:  Syh
Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 72).

Job 38 39a

HT

אֵיךְ לַכְּבֵּרָה (אֲבִי)

LXX

(θηρεύσεις δὲ λέουσιν) βοράν.

αʹ σʹ

θήραν

Wit1: C (= 3005) ↓c\textsuperscript{137} 139 260 395 643 [680] 732 3006

Attr: αʹ σʹ] θʹ σʹ 559 612 740; > 255

Notes: 3005 is the first C ms to attest this fragment and attribution, and since Aq uses θήρα to render טָרֶף, it is plausible that 3005 has preserved the correct attribution (Nachlese, 408; see Job 4:11 in Woods).

Job 38 40a

HT

כַּמְּעוֹ (בִּמְעַנְנָה)

LXX

δεδοίκασιν γὰρ (ἐν κοίταις αὐτῶν.)

σʹ

ὁτι φωλεύσουσιν

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓c\textsuperscript{260} [680] 732

Attr: σʹ C (= 788 3005)] > rel; 'Αλλος Field

Var: φωλεύσουσιν C (= 788-250 3005) 395 612 740] -ευσουσί 559; -ευουσί 137 138-255 3006; φολευοσι 139; φολευουσιν 643

Notes: Ms 3005 is the first witness to name an author for this fragment (Nachlese, 408). Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym is part of the oldest Greek catena. The verb φωλεύω is otherwise unattested in the LXX and the Three, and the use of causal ὅτι for כִּי is a regular pattern for the LXX and the Three (Salvesen, 223ff); therefore, translation technique cannot determine the attribution. The external evidence is probably genuine.
Chapter 39

Job 39 1a

HT

יהוה ית את כלת ונילך-כלת

E

εἰ ἔγνως καιρὸν τοκετοῦ τραγελάφων πέτρας,

θʹ

Sub ※

Wit1:  cI–138 260 395 559 [680] 732 3006 248 La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Attr:  θʹ 740 255 Syh\textsuperscript{xt}] > rel

Var:  lemma] om Sa | 1a sub ※ 740 255 612 137 643 139(super τραγ.) 248 La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

NonGr:  Syh\textsuperscript{xt}  εἰ ἔγνως καιρὸν τοκετοῦ τραγελάφων πέτρας,

Notes:  The asterisk and the attribution are well attested for this reading. The evidence of Syh 255 740 is sufficient to establish the attribution, since 740 and 255 are at the top of the stemma and are the best representatives of the Vorlage of cI; thus, a very important part of the catena tradition preserves the attribution to Th. The additional evidence of the attribution to Sym in 3005 for the following fragment also aids in determining that Th is the correct author.

σʹ

νέβρων ἐν πέτρα


Wit2:  πέτρας] ἐν πέτρα Iul; in petris La\textsuperscript{v} = Vulg

Attr:  σʹ C (= 788 3005)] θʹ 255 559 612 740; αʹ Arm; > C (= 250) 395

NonGr:  Arm μιδρημηνγ
Notes: In the Edition, II App presents this fragment as follows: θ’ (leg σ’) νεβρῶν ἐν πέτρᾳ C on the basis of the external evidence available but, since the whole line is under the asterisk and attributed to Th, Ziegler rightly attributed this fragment to a different author, Sym. Now, the Nachlese reports that 3005 preserves the attribution to Sym (Nachlese, 408). In addition, 788 preserves the original attribution to Sym, and confirms that it was part of the oldest Greek catena. Internal evidence does show that Sym uses νεβρός in 1 Rgns 10:3 (Field 1, 502), and there is no evidence that Aq or Th uses this word.

Job 39 2a

HT

תִּסְפֹּר יְרָחִים תְּמַלֶּאנָה

LXX

ἠρίθμησας δὲ μῆνας αὐτῶν πλήρεις τοκετοῦ,

σʹ

ἡρίθμησας δὲ σελήνας πληρῶσαι αὐτάς

Wit1: 161′

Notes: Ms 161′ preserves this fragment and the attribution. The first two words may be from the LXX, but the rest of the fragment is from Sym.

HT

(תִּסְפֹּר הַרְוֵי הַמַּלָּאָן)

LXX

(ἡρίθμησας δὲ) μῆνας (αὐτῶν πλήρεις τοκετοῦ,)

αʹ θʹ σελήνας

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250) ↓cl-137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

Attr: αʹ θ’] > C (= 250)

Var: σελήνας C (= 788-250)] σελήνης 138-255 395 559 612 740

Notes: Ms 788 is the first witness from the C group to attest the attribution and it also preserves the original text of the fragment. Ms 395 preserves the attribution in reverse order θ’ α’ (Kollationen, 257). The Edition does not list the variant, which is preserved in the majority of the witnesses from the cl group (Kollationen, 257).

Job 39 3a

HT

תִּכְרַעְנָה יַלְדֵיהֶן תְּפַלַּחְנָה

LXX

ἐξέθρεψας δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ παιδία ἐξω φόβου;
§

The fragment is divided into two parts in 139 as follows: σ’ ἐνδώσουσι τὰ παιδία αὐτῶν α’ διασώσεις αὐτά (Kollationen, 257).

Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Th in the majority of the cl group is correct. Ms 3005 preserves an attribution to Sym, which is possibly correct according to internal evidence. Given that מלח or מלח מלח is an error for מלח מלח in this instance, both Th and Sym use διασώζω for מלח מלח (cf. Dan 11:41 for Th; Job 20:20 for Sym, see also Busto Saiz, 708). Job 20:20 contains an instance in which Sym used διασώζω for מלח מלח, while Th used σώζω (Woods, 369), but this instance cannot be considered conclusive. Given the state of the external evidence (the division of the C mss), it is possible, though not probable, that both attributions are genuine.

The patristic attribution to Chr in the Edition is not supported by the Chr-Kommentar nor AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 192; AGK 3, 298-9; Nic, 556).
Var: lemma] om Sa | 3b-4 sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 395(non 3b 4c)
137(non 4bc) 643(non 4bc) 139(non 3b 4ac) 252 Arm La Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

\[\text{Notes:} \text{ The asterisk and the attribution to Th are established sufficiently by the external evidence.}\]

\textbf{Job 39 3b}

\textit{HT} 

\[ \text{הָבְלֵיהֶם תְּשַׁלַּחְנָה׃} \]

\textit{E} 

\[ \text{ὠδίνας αὐτῶν ἐξαποστελεῖς;} \]

\[ \sigma' \quad \lambda \  ὧδίνησαν ἀπολείπουσιν \]

\textit{Wit1:} \quad \downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow \text{cf}^{-559}[^{680}] 732 \text{cII 555} \\

\textit{Attr:} \quad \sigma' \alpha' 395; > C (= 250) \\

\textit{Var:} \quad \alpha' > 395 | ὧδίνησαν | ὧδίνησαν 612 | ἀπολείπουσιν | \text{Katapaleipouvin} \\

\[ 137 \ 139 \ 260 \ 643 \ 3006 \]

\textit{Notes:} \text{ The attribution in 395 arose due to confusion between the relative pronoun \(\alpha\) and the attribution to Aq (Kollationen, 257). This fragment is followed by the Sym fragment in 4a, but since there is a divider between them, the fragments were viewed as two parts (Kollationen, 257; cf. Ms 250, 72v; cp. Ms 3005, 169v-170r where the two fragments are on two separate leafs with two distinct attributions to Sym). The patristic attribution to Chr in the Edition is not supported by the Chr-Kommentar nor AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 192; AGK 3, 298-9; Nic, 556).} \\

\textbf{Job 39 4a}

\textit{HT} 

\[ \text{-חלָמוּ בְנֵיהֶם} \]

348
απορρήξουσιν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν,

ἀποβάλλονται τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν

Job 39 4b

Notes: Field and the Edition rightly conjectured ἀγριότητι (Field, 73; Edition, 391), but now 3005, the only witness for the C group, attests the correct text (Nachlese, 408).

Job 39 4c

Notes: εξελέψις and ἀνακατάσχεσις are suggested by Field and the Edition, respectively.
Notes: The reading in 260 arose from the layout of the manuscript, which contains very narrow columns that caused the scribe to use an abbreviated style periodically. Unfortunately, one cannot be certain whether the scribe is abbreviating -ει or -ουσι, but the importance of the stemma shifts the probability to the former termination, since 260 is below 3006 on the stemma.

Job 39 6a
HT (אֲשֶׁר־שַׂמְתִּי בֵיתוֹ כָּרֹבֶה)
LXX (ἐθέμην δὲ τὴν διάιταν (αὐτοῦ ἔρημον)

α’ θ’ ὀικον

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cIf 137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006

Notes: The fragments in 559 are composite presented as α’ θ’ σ’ ὀικον ἀοικητον (Kollationen, 258).

HT (אֲשֶׁר־שַׂמְתִּי בֵיתוֹ עֲרָבָה)
E (ἐθέμην δὲ τὴν διάιταν αὐτοῦ ἔρημον)

α’ ὀμαλήν

Wit1: 248 252

σ’ ἀοίκητον

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cIf 137 [680] 732 3006 248 ↓252
Attr: σ’ [] 252; > 643

Notes: For the lemma and attribution of 559 see 6a supra.

θ’ ἀραβά

Wit1: 248 ↓252
Attr: θ’ [] 252

Notes: The lemma and the attribution stand, even though Gentry questions whether this transliteration was produced by Th (Gentry, 312-3). Probably, it did not originate from Th since it is common in the LXX (e.g. Deut 1:7, 2:8, 3:17), but he
employs the transliteration here as he does elsewhere (cf. Isa 41:19, 51:3; Am 6:14; Jer 39(46):4 Syh).

**Job 39 6b**

HT: המְלֵחָה׃וּמִשְׁכְּנוֹ

E: καὶ τὰ σκηνώματα αὐτοῦ ἁλμυρίδα-

θ’

Sub ※

*Wit1:* C (= 788) cI^{138} 260 [680] 732 3006 248 252 Arm La Sa Syh

*Attr:* θ’ 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 139(6a) Syh > rel

*Var:* lemma] om Sa | 6b sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 139(6a) 248 252 Arm La Syh

*NonGr:* Syh η Δυτικής ἑτεροδόξους.

La ※ et tabernacula eius salsuginem

Arm ※ η πρωπηπηρητῆι ἑλα χωμηπηπητητῆι

θ’

※ γoriously

*Wit1:* C (= 788) ↓cI^{260} 680 732

*Var:* ※] > 138 559 3006

*Notes:* Ms 788 is the first witness from the C group to preserve this fragment and it has two asterisks preceding it. Most of the cI group contains this fragment in the margin under an asterisk after ἁλμυρίδα. It is perhaps recorded in this way in the mss in order to indicate that this fragment is not a different version for הָלָם, but rather this fragment is a complement to ἁλμυρίδα in the version of Sym. Although Ziegler does not list the asterisk, he comments that Field incorrectly understood the fragment to be for σκηνώματα αὐτοῦ, and he suggests that Sym had γoriously (ἁλμυρίδος) (Beiträge, 46).

**Job 39 7b**

HT: קָשָׁהוּ (לָא, שְׁמַהוּ)

LXX: (μεμιστὶν δὲ) φορολόγου (οὐκ ἀκοὐν)
Notes: The lemma and the attribution are secure based on external and internal grounds (Beiträge, 14). Probably the variant in 248 was caused by a lunar sigma next to an iota (ιϲ) without proper spacing (cp. Ms 252, 128r, which has the proper spacing between lunar sigma and iota), which then may have appeared as a kappa to the copyist.

Job 39 8ab
HT
E

θʹ Sub ※

Notes: Ms 788 is the first catena witness to attest the attribution and asterisked lines.

Job 39 9a
HT
LXX

αʹ ῥινόκερως
Notes: The lemma is the fragment found in the margin of many mss, and in context it would be the proper grammatical form of Aq. The second fragment preserves the lexeme, but in the context of the catena the accusative singular was required in place of the nominative.

The new evidence of 788 attributes the fragment to Aq and thereby establishes Aq as the author, but the Sym attribution in 3005 could indicate that this version belongs to more revisers than Aq. Although Jerome rendered his hexaplaric source correctly with monoceros (La\textsuperscript{df}), rinoceros from the Hexapla appears in the Vulg.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is supported by Kommentar, AGK and Nic (Kommentar, 347-8; AGK 3, 302; Nic, 559).

---

Job 39 10b

| HT | μορφὴν δὲ θρήνης
| LXX | ἢ ἐλκύσει σου αὐλακας ἐν πεδίῳ; |

σ′ ἢ ὀμαλίσει κοιλάδας ἀκολουθῶν σοι

---

Job 39 11b

| HT | ὁ ταχὺς (Ἄργιλος γεννήθη)
| LXX | ἐπαφήσεις δὲ (αὐτῷ τὰ ἔργα σου; |

θ′ μὴ ἐγκαταλείψης
Notes: This occurrence is the only one in Gentry’s study where Th renders waw with μή (Gentry, 368). Even though this instance goes against the normal technique of Th, sound external evidence attributes this fragment to him, and it should be considered authentic.

Job 39 12a

HT

E

π′ + ※ αὐτῷ

Wit1: La Syh

Wit2: πιστ. δὲ + αὐτῷ S* La (※ ei) L = M

Attr: π′] > La

NonGr: Syh • • • • • • • • • • •

La aut credes ei ※ quia reddet tibi sementem

Notes: The asterisk may be misplaced in the mss of La, but the word is clearly in the La tradition.

HT

LXX

σ′ ἀποκαταστήσει

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI 260 [612] [680] 732

Attr: σ′] > 395

Notes: Sym translates the Qere, the Hi imperfect, since the context requires a transitive verb. Sym uses ἀποκαθιστάναι to render ברא Hi in Ps 34:17 (Busto Saiz, 472).
Job 39 12b

HT

קְרָנָּהָמִּים קְנָלָּהָ
אָמָרֹתָה תּוֹרָה וֹנֶדֶה:
מִרְרָה וּבָאֵרַיִן בְּנֶהָה
לַעֲלַיִם חָסְמָה
הָקִשָּׁה עֵינָיו וּתְחַמֶּם:
וַתִּשְׁכַּח כִּי־רֶגֶל יְזוּרֶהָ
וְחַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה תְּדוּשֶּה:
הִקְשִיח בָּנֶיהָ לְּלֹא־לָהּ
לְרִיק יְגִיעָה בְּלִי־פָחַד:
הַחָכְמָה כִּי־הִשָּׁה אֱלֹ
וּלֹא חָלַק לָהּ בַּבִּינָה:
ם תַּמְרִיא כָּעֵת בַּמָּרו:
תִּשָּׁחַק לַסּוּס וּלְרֹכְבוֹ

LXX

εἰσοίσει (δὲ σου τὸν ἄλωνα;)

\[\theta^{'}\]

συνάξει

\[Wit1:\]

\[C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow F^{137} 139 260 [612] 643 [680] 732 740 3006\]

\[Var:\]

συνάξει [συναξαι 138-255 395 559]

\[Notes:\]

The variant is not mentioned in the Edition, but the \(C (= 788-250 3005)\) group preserves the original text, while \(cI (= 138 255 395 559)\) preserves the variant.

\[\alpha^{'}, \sigma^{'}, C (= 788-250)\]

\[συλλέξει\]

\[Wit1:\]

\[\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI^{137} 139 260 [612] 643 [680] 732 740 3006\]

\[Attr:\]

α' C (= 788-250] σ' rel

\[Var:\]

συλλέξει [συλλεξαι 395]

\[Notes:\]

Although the majority of the manuscript tradition favors the attribution to Sym, \(C (= 788-250)\) combined with the internal evidence indicates that the attribution to Aq is correct (Reider, 225-6; \(συλλέγειν\) as an equivalent for אסף is established for Aq). According to the evidence currently available, Sym does not use \(συλλέγειν\) to render אסף.

Job 39 13-18

HT

καὶ ὁ ὀρνιθὸς τερπομένων
πτέρυξ τερπομένων νεέλασα
ἐὰν συλλάβῃ ἁσιδὰ καὶ νεσσά.
ὅτι ἀφῆσει εἰς γῆν τὰ φα αὐτῆς καὶ ἔτι χοῦν θάλψει καὶ ἐπελάθετο ὅτι ποὺς σκορπιεῖ καὶ θηρία ἀγροῦ καταπατήσει· ἀπεσκλήρυνεν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς ὥστε μὴ ἑαυτῇ, εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασεν ἄνευ φόβου· κατά καιρὸν ἐν ὑψεῖ ὑψώσει, καταγελάσεται ἵππου καὶ τοῦ ἐπιβάτου αὐτοῦ.

\[\Theta\]

Sub ★

Wit1: C (= 788-250) cI 137 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 248 252 Arm La Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

Attr: θʹ (ἐκ θʹ οἱ 788-250 740 255(13b) 395; ἐκ θʹ οἱ 559) Syh\textsuperscript{xt}(13b)] > rel

Var: 13-18 sub ★ 788 740(non 14a) 255(non 13a) 612(non [13-15]) 559 395(non 17b 18b) 248 252 Arm(non 15a) La(non 15a) Syh\textsuperscript{xt}(non 13a)

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{xt}

La penna (pr ★ μ) struthionum mixta (mix★ta β) est alis herodionis et accipitris, et (pr ★ μ) reliquit (re★linquit β) in terra ova sua, et (pr ★ μ) in pulvere calefiunt (ca★lefiunt β). et oblitā est, quia pes dispersit ea, et (pr ★ β) bestiae conculcabant ea. obduruit (pr ★ μ; Obduru★it β) contra filios suos, ne sint eius. frustra (pr ★ μ) laboravit (labo★rauit β; laboravit ★ μ)

356
absque ullo timore,
quia (pr ※ μ) despexit eam (pr ※ β) dominus in sapientia,
et (pr ※ μ) non distribuit ei intellectum (in※tellectum β).
cum (pr ※ μ) tempus fuerit, in alium se levavit,
et (pr ※ μ) deridebit equitem et ascensorem.

Notes: There is a lacuna in 612, which contains verses 13-15, but 16-18 is under the asterisk. The attribution in 559 resulted from haplography of the iota.

Job 39 13a

HT  כְּנַף־רְנָנִים נֶעֱלָסָה
E  πτέρυξ τερπομένων νεέλασα,

αʹ  πτερύγιον αἰνούντων συναναπλέκεται

Wit1: ↓161’ 252 Syh
Var: συναναπλέκεται] -πλεκει 161’
NonGr: Syh

σʹ  πτερόν ἀγλαϊσμοῦ περιφύεται

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI-[612][680] 732 cII 555 ↓161’ ↓252
Attr: σʹ] αʹ σʹ C (= 3005); > C (= 788-250) 139 643; [] 257
Notes: The Kollationen is the first to list 248 as evidence for this fragment (Kollationen, 261). Ms 252 poses two significant variants: (1) πτερυγιον and (2) ὡραϊσμοῦ. The first is the lemma of Aq (see supra) and also a common translation of כְּנף in the LXX (11x according to Beiträge, 46). Πτερόν is used infrequently in the LXX (4x; Beiträge, 46), but Sym does use this word to render “birds” as in Job 5:7 (ᡠ = πτερόν; Woods, 128) and to render “wings” as in Ezek 12:14. In that text, כְּנף in Heb means “troop,” but in Aramaic the word means “wing” (Sokoloff, Palestinian Aramaic, 34). Sym, therefore, probably used πτερόν to render כְּנף.

The word ὡραϊσμός is used only two times, once in the LXX and once in Th. In contrast, Sym uses ἀγλάϊσμα (Ps 47:3, 88:18; Prov 19:11) and ἀγλαϊσμός (Ps 44:8). This internal evidence combined with the external evidence of C and ciI make the lemma likely to be authentic.

Job 39 13b

HT

E

σ’

εἰ ἐναγκαλίσεται ὁ κύκνος πτίλους αὐτοῦ

Wit1: 161’ ↓252

Attr: σ’] > 252

Var: ἐναγκαλίσεται] εναγγκαλίσεται 252 | πτίλους] πτιλοις 252

α’

ἐρωδιοῦ καὶ ἱέρακος


ciI^2 555^2
Notes: The Aq fragment is more complex than appears in the Edition, since it appears in different places in some of the same sources but in a different form (Edition, 393; AGK 3, 303). Previously, the Edition presented the evidence for the first lemma, but it did not note that the fragment appears in two places in two different forms in Ol\(^\gamma\) (Kommentar, 349, 12 and 350, 13). AGK notes that Ziegler did not use the second lemma, which is attributed to Aq in Nic and now more clearly in AGK (Nic, 559, 37-38; AGK 3, 303). Ms 395 preserves the second lemma in the margin, not in the catena.

The Edition’s attribution to Polychronius is supported only by Nic and not by AGK (Nic, 560; AGK 3, 303). The fragment should be attributed to Olymp probably, since it is found in his commentary (Kommentar, 349-50).

Job 39 15a

HT  הקשתה עירערלה תוחרת

E  καὶ ἐπελάθετο ὅτι ποὺς σκορπιεῖ

α’  καὶ ἐπελάθετο ὅτι ποὺς λικμήσει αὐτά

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 73).

σ’  καὶ ἐπελάθετο ὅτι ποὺς λικμήσει αὐτὸ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 73).

Job 39 17a

HT  בֶּרֶךְ כָּלָה (אַלְכִּיָּהוּ נָבִימָה)

E  (ὅτι) κατεσιώπησεν (αὐτῇ ὁ θεὸς σοφίαν)
\(\sigma'\) παρεῖλεν

\textit{Wit1:} \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI-^{137} 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006\)

\textit{Attr:} \(\sigma' > C (= 250)\)

\textit{Var:} παρεῖλεν] παρειδεν 395

\textbf{Job 39 17b}

\textit{HT} Καὶ οὐκ ἔνειμεν αὐτῇ σύνεσιν

\textit{E} καὶ οὐκ ἐμέρισεν αὐτῇ ἐν τῇ συνέσει.

\(\sigma'\) καὶ οὐκ ἔνειμεν αὐτῇ σύνεσιν

\textit{Wit1:} \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI-{680} cII 555 161\)

\textit{Attr:} \(\sigma' > C (= 788-250)\)

\textit{Var:} ἔνειμεν] ενιμεν 559 | σύνεσιν] συνέσει 137 139 260 395 559
612(σύνεσει) 643 3006

\textbf{Job 39 18a}

\textit{HT} Κατὰ καιρὸν ἐν ὑψώσει,

\textit{E} (κατὰ καιρὸν ἐν ὑψει) ὑψώσει,

\(\sigma'\) πετομένη

\textit{Wit1:} \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) cI-{680} 732\)

\textit{Attr:} \(\sigma' > C (= 250)\)

\textit{Var:} πετομένη] πετωμενη \(C (= 3005)\)

\textbf{Notes:} The evidence of ms 3005 increases the probability that this fragment belongs to Sym, and therefore it is not a scholion (Nachlese, 408; pace Beiträge, 47, and Field, 74 n. 31). Now 788 supports the attribution to Sym. The HT contains a \textit{hapax legomenon} (יאתַּמְרִ Hi impf 3fs from II זמרא), and, therefore, it is not possible to compare this text with how Sym translates it in other contexts. Ziegler suggests, “If \(\sigma'\) were the translator, then he would have written πέταται, see \textit{volog} Targ. Also Ol p 350, 12s speaks of “to fly” and of “flight” (ἀφίπτανται...ἐν τῇ πτήσει) of the storks” (Beiträge, 47).
The edition of the Targum by Stec has the following text, כעדן דבמרומא מגחכא לסוסא ولרכביהטייסא, which is translated: at the time of rising in flight (flying), she laughs at the horse and its rider (Stec, 284*; The Aramaic Bible, 86). The word in question, טייסא, is parsed as a Peal present active participle fem. sing. from טוס “to fly,” and is not a finite verb as Ziegler’s Latin (volat) suggests; therefore, through polygenesis, not textual dependence, Sym and Targum probably translated the text in accordance with Jewish exegesis. The external evidence of the C (= 788 3005) group combined with the broader context of Jewish exegesis indicates that this fragment is probably from Sym.

**Job 39 19b**

| HT | רַעְמָה׃ (הֲתַלְבִּישׁ צַוָּארוֹ) |
| LXX | (ἐνέδυσας δὲ τραχήλῳ αὐτοῦ) φόβον; |

**θʹ** χρεμετισμόν

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

*Attr:* θʹ > C (= 250)

*Var:* χρεμετισμόν, χραιμετισμον 138-255; χραιμετισμον C (= 250)

*Notes:* The index is at πανοπλίαν in 20a in 3005 and the fragment is next to 19a in 250 (Kollationen, 263). Ms 788 actually preserves the original text, while its descendent, 250, has a minor variant.

The HT contains a *hapax*, for which there are two possible meanings: (1) “mane” (< III *רעם) and (2) “thunder” “uproar” (< I *רעם). Th appears to have translated the noun in this verse as from the same verbal root as in 37:4 and 5, where he used βροντάω “to thunder.”

**σʹ** κλαγγήν

*Wit1:* lemma] \[C (= 788-250 3005) \[cI-[680] 732 | κραυγήν] cII 555

*Attr:* σʹ > C (= 250)

*Var:* κλαγγήν, κλαγην 139

*Notes:* The oldest Greek catena preserves the lemma, while Nic has κραυγή. The lemma is a *hapax legomenon* and is the original text, while κραυγή stands in Chr and Olymp in the Nicetas catena (Beiträge, 47).
Job 39 20b

HT

(וְּדוּרָךְ כְּתֵרָה) אֵימוּהָ

LXX

(δόξαν δὲ στηθέων αὐτοῦ) τύλμῃ;

σ᾽ θʹ

φόβος

Wit1: ✓C (= 788-250 3005) □cf-[680] 732

Attr: σ᾽ θʹ] αʹ θʹ C (= 788-250)

Var: φόβος] φοβον 260

Notes: Aq does not translate אֵימה with φόβος but with εἴδωλον (Jer 27[50]:38) and he uses φόβος to translate מֵרָא and פָּד (Reider, 67; 250); therefore, the attribution in 788-250 is probably incorrect.

Job 39 21a

HT

(יוֹרֵרָה) הָנָּמַכַּק (רַחֶשֶׁי)

LXX

(ἀνορύσσων) ἐν πεδίῳ (γαυριᾷ)

αʹ σʹ θʹ

ἐν κοιλάδι

Wit1: ✓C (= 788-250 3005) □cf-139 260 643 [680] 732 Syh


Var: κοιλάδι] κυλαδι C (= 3005)

NonGr: Syh *<.

Notes: Since the Three use κοιλάς for עֵמֶק, it is probable that Syh preserves the correct attribution. The catena witnesses agree that the attribution to Aq is correct, while the majority of mss omit the attribution to Sym. Ms 788 attests the attribution to Sym, which indicates that it is probably part of the original attribution (cf. Job 39:10 for translation equivalent of Sym).

Job 39 22a (HT 21b)

HT

(בְּכֵית לְגָּרָהָן) בּוֹשׁ (כָּתָרָה)

LXX

συναντών βέλει (καταγελά)
Notes: The versification in LXX and HT differs because the LXX retranslated לִקְרַאת־נָשֶׁק (21a) in 21b, and, therefore, the LXX translates לִקְרַאת־נָשֶׁק of 21b in 22a (Dhorme, 608).

The groups, C and cl, preserve the hexaplaric fragment at 21b in the bible text. Ms 3005 has the index over εἰς πεδίον of 21b.

The Edition did not include Nic, which actually preserves this fragment and the following one.

σ′ 
εἰς ἀπάντησιν καταφράκτων

Notes: For the discrepancy in versification between HT and LXX, see supra. The mss place this fragment at 21b and a few at 21a (138-255 740).

Mss 161 and 555 preserve only the Sym fragment attributed incorrectly to οἱ λοιποί. This instance is a case of the devolution of the catena of Job since the earliest tradition preserves both fragments under the correct attributions, while cII preserves the accurate readings but not the attributions.

Job 39 22b

HT

LXX

σ′ θ′ 
ἀπὸ μαχαίρας

Notes: The attribution, σ′ θ′, is inverted in 740 (θ′ σ′). In 252, the fragment is at 21a, but the meaning “donkey” is not clear in this verse. Regarding the second lemma Field says, “I do not know what Codd. 161, 248, which convey: Σ. ἡμιόνου, wish for themselves,” (Field, 74 n. 37).

Job 39 23-24a

363
HT ֨תָלְיָרַחְתֶּה אַשְׁפָּה לֲּב
LXX (ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γαυριᾷ τόξον) καὶ μάχαιρα.

\[\theta’\]

\[\phiλόξ\]

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: *םָּמָּעְלֵּד אַוּ .ח.

Notes: In Syh the index is over אַשְׁפָּה, which indicates that the Th fragment is read in place of "καὶ μάχαιρα," which accords with HT. Φλόξ is used in the LXX to describe a blade of a dagger or a spear in Judges 3:22 and α’ θ’ I Rgns 17:7 and renders לַהַב (Field, I 515).

HT ֨תָלְיָרַחְתֶּה אַשְׁפָּה לְּב (תִּרְנֶה אַשְׁפָּה לֲּב) הָברֵעַ.
LXX (ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γαυριᾷ τόξον καὶ μάχαιρα,)—καὶ ὀργῇ

\[\theta’ + ※\]

\[λόγχης καὶ ἀσπίδος σεισμῷ\]

Wit1: Syh La

Wit2: fin] + λογχη και ασπιδος σεισμος II = M (23b) ; + λογχης και ασπιδος σεισμος Iul ; + ※ lanceae hastaeque ( + cum) tremore LaPr ; + lancea haste et tremore LaP ; + et tremor lanceae et hastae Arm

Attr: \[\theta’ > La\]

NonGr: Syh *םָּמָּעְלֵּד אַוּ .ח.

Notes: The retroversion is from Field, who explains that the Syriac has changed the order of the words for grammatical reasons, and he follows Jerome’s text, which accords well with HT. The Edition represents a literal rendering of the marginal note, since it is not clear whether the beth preposition renders ἐν or marks the dative. The beth in HT supports that Th would have had beth, but ἐν does not appear in the other sources with this addition.

Directly under this fragment and marked with an index in the Syh the following scholion appears: *םָּמָּעְלֵּד יָאֵר חַלָּו יָאֵר יָאֵר לְאַי (“it was not placed by Origen”). Perhaps this note explains the appearance of the Th fragment in the margin under the asterisk and why it is not in the bible text itself. The text is from Th, but Origen did not incorporate it into his hexaplaric revision. The scholion is probably not correct since this
fragment eventually entered La under the asterisk, and this version is probably the best witness to the hexaplaric version of Job.

**Job 39 24a**

HT

בְּרַעַשׁ וְרֹגֶז יְגַמֶּא־אָרֶץ

LXX

και ὄργῃ ἀφανεῖ τὴν γῆν

σʹ

ἐν σάλῳ καὶ ὄργῃ ὡς καταπινών γῆν

*Wit1:* ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI[^680] 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161

*Attr:* σʹ] σʹ σχο( ) 395; > C (= 250) 138

*Var:* ὄργη] ὀργη 3006 | γῆν] > 559 612 cII 555 161

*Notes:* The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (*Kommentar*, 351; *AGK* 3, 307; Nic, 562).

**Job 39 24b**

HT

וֹלָא־נִכְרִית קְרִיֵּית שֵׁפֶר

LXX

καὶ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσῃ, ἢς ἀν σημάνη σάλπιγξ.

σʹ

καὶ οὐ δειλωθήσεται ύπὸ ἤχους σάλπιγγος

*Wit1:* ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI[^680] 732

*Attr:* σʹ] > C (= 250) 139 643


*Notes:* The *Edition* does not list the evidence of the variant spelling of 250 δειλω, now also attested in 788, and thus it presents all the mss as having δηλω. The *Nachlese* reports that 250 has δειλω, which would be from δειλόομαι “to be afraid,” “to fear” (*Nachlese*, 408). This reading fits the context more sufficiently, and the phoneme /i/ was represented graphemically by both ει and η among other symbols (Wevers, 188). This confusion accounts for the variant, which entered the textual tradition quite early. The conjecture of Kreysigius, reported by Schleusner, has now found significant support.
in mss 788-250, despite Schleusner’s own rejection of it (Schleusner, vol I, 540, s.v. δηλόο (1829)).

The Syriac Peshitta has (“and he was not afraid of the sound of the trumpet”). Probably Sym is not dependent on Pesh and Pesh is not dependent on Sym but, since there is a reference to the horse’s scorn of fear in 39:22, each translator/reviser could have come to the same conclusion in verse 24 independently. Polygenesis probably accounts for this agreement.

Job 39 25b

HT

\(\text{טומחכום קרית מלכחה (רפואה שלום והزراعة):} \)

LXX

πόρρωθεν δὲ οὐφραίνεται πολέμου (σὺν ἀλματι καὶ κραυγῇ).

\(\text{σ’ καὶ πόρρωθεν ἀλαλάξει πολεμικόν} \)

\(\text{Wit1: } \downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow C I^{559} [680] 732 \)

\(\text{Attr: } \text{σ’} \alpha’ \text{ σ’} 139-256; > C (= 250) 740 \)

\(\text{Var: } \alphaλαλάξει \text{ άλαλαξει} 740; \text{ αλαλαξει} 139 260 643 3006 \)

Job 39 27b (HT 28a)

HT

\(\text{(שערינ קיסר (חכת):} \)

LXX

(γυψ δὲ ἐπὶ νοσσιᾶς αὐτοῦ) — καθεσθεὶς αὐλίζεται

\(\text{σ’ ἐν πέτρᾳ ἠρεμῶν αὐλισθήσεται} \)

\(\text{Wit1: } \downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow C I^{137} 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 | \text{ἐν πέτρᾳ}] \text{ Syh} \)

\(\text{Attr: } \text{σ’} \text{ σχολ(}) 395; > C (= 250) \)

\(\text{Var: } \alphaυλισθήσεται \text{ αυλησθησεται} C (= 788-250); \text{ αυλησθησεται} 612 \)

Notes: The Three have the first part of this fragment, but the last two words are attributed only to Sym (see infra). The LXX omits verse 28, and thus there is no mention of the “rock.” This fragment contains the reference to the “rock” in 28a, and the following fragment represents the text for HT 28b.

HT

\(\text{(שערינ קיסר ( повыצ):} \)

LXX

(γυψ δὲ ἐπὶ νοσσιᾶς αὐτοῦ) — (καθεσθεὶς αὐλίζεται)
αʹ θʹ

\[ \varepsilon\nu\; \pi\text{é}\tau\rho\alpha \]

Wit1: Syh

Wit2: αὐτοῦ] + in petra La

NonGr: Syh adap. (\.\.\.)

Job 39 28 (HT 28b)

HT

\[ \text{עַל־שֶׁן־סֶלַע וּמְצוּדָה} \]

E

\[ \text{ἐπ’ ἐξοχῇ πέτρας καὶ ἀποκρύφῳ;} \]

θʹ 

Sub ※

Wit1: \( C (= 788) \) cl\(^{-137} 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 248 \) La Syh\(^\text{txt} \)

Attr: θʹ 788 740 255 612 559 395 Syh\(^\text{txt} \] > rel

Var: 28 sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 395 248 La Syh\(^\text{txt} \)

NonGr: Syh\(^\text{txt} \)

La ※ in summitate petrae et in caverna

Notes: Syh, \( C (= 788) \), and cl provide sufficient evidence for the attribution to Th to be correct.

HT

E

\[ \text{ὁχυρώματος} \]

Wit1: \( C (= 788-250 3005) \) ↓ cl\(^{-139} 260 643 [680] 732 3006 161^\text{mg} \)

Attr: αʹ] > 740

Job 39 29a

HT

\[ \text{μὴν ἢπερ} \] \( \text{нолог�} \)

LXX

\[ \text{ἐκεῖσε ὃν ζητεῖ} \] \( \text{tà σῖτα,} \)

αʹ 

βρῶμα

367
Job 39:29b

HT  
E  

\[\text{λιμάντων γυνὴ νεῖνε}:\]  
\[\text{πόρρωθεν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ σκοπεύουσιν.}\]

\[\text{θ′} \quad \text{Sub} \quad \ast\]

\text{Wit1: } C \ (= 788) \ cI-137 \ 138 \ 139 \ 260 \ 559 \ 643 \ [680] \ 732 \ 3006 \ \text{La Syh}^\text{nt}

\text{Attr: } \ θ' \ 788 \ 740 \ 255 \ 612 \ 395] > \text{rel}

\text{Var: } 29b \ \text{sub} \ \ast \ 788 \ 740 \ 255 \ 612 \ 395 \ \text{La Syh}^\text{nt}

\text{NonGr: } \text{Syh}^\text{nt} \quad \text{Messinga, Xyste, etc.} \quad \ast \quad \text{La} \quad \ast \quad \text{longe oculi eius prospiciunt}

\text{Notes: } \text{Ms 788 preserves the attribution to Th as well as the asterisk.}

Job 39:30a

HT  
LXX  

\[\text{Ὁμφαρὰ (Q) ἀπερατρὶς (υπέρτρις) (νεοσσοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ) φύρονται ἐν αἵματι,}\]

\[\text{α′} \quad \text{ἔστομισμένοι}\]

\text{Wit1: } 161^\text{mg}

HT  
LXX  

\[\text{Ὦμφαρὰ (Q) ἀπερατρὶς (υπέρτρις) (νεοσσοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ) φύρονται ἐν αἵματι,}\]

\[\text{σ′} \quad \text{καταρροφῶσιν αἷμα}\]

\text{Wit1: } \downarrow C \ (= 788-250 \ 3005) \ \downarrow cI-[680] \ 732

\text{Attr: } \ σ′] > C \ (= 250) \ 138

\text{Var: } \text{καταρροφῶσιν] καταρροφῶσιν 137 139 260 395 559 643 3006}

\text{Notes: } \text{The Hagedorns were not able to find this fragment in their new collation of 249 (pace Edition; Kollationen, 266). The spelling with two rho’s is to be preferred over the spelling with one, since it is in the best witnesses.}
Job 39 30b

οὗ δ᾽ ἄν ὤσιν τεθνεῶτες, παραχρῆμα εὑρίσκονται.

σʹ ὅπου δὲ σάρκες τετρωμένων, πάρεστιν

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

Attr: σ’] θ’ C (= 3005); θ’ σ’ 139; > C (= 250) 137 643 3006; [] 138


Notes: The Nachlese treats the issues of attribution and text adequately. First, although 3005 preserves an attribution to Th, τιτρώσκω is a word that is used by Sym and not Th (Nachlese, 408; H-R, 1362). This observation is now confirmed by 788, which is the first C ms to preserve the correct attribution to Sym. Second, the evidence of C (= 788-250 3005) combined with the singular in HT shows that the correct text is πάρεστιν and that παρεισιν arose due to revision as evidenced by its place in cI (pace Edition). The LXX and the Sym fragment, preserved in cI, refer to the bird’s young, while, according to C, Sym preserves the HT, which refers only to the bird itself (Nachlese, 409).
Chapter 40

Job 40 1-2

HK

E

Kai ἀπεκρίθη Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἰωβ καὶ εἶπεν
Μὴ κρίσιν μετὰ ἰκανοῦ ἐκκλινεῖ,
ἐλέγχων θεὸν ἀποκριθήσεται αὐτῇν;

ω'       Sub ※

Wit1: Arm La Syh

Wit2: ὁ θεὸς] > O Bo Aeth Iul Syn = M

Attr: ω' Syh] > La

Var: 1-2 sub ※ Arm(non 2b) La(non 1 2a) Syh(non 2b)

NonGr: Syh

Job 40 2a

HK

E

Mὴ κρίσιν μετὰ ἰκανοῦ ἐκκλινεῖ,

σ'    ἀρα ὁ δικαζόμενος πρὸς τὸν ἰκανόν περιγενήσεται;

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cf-[680] cII 555 161’ ↓252 Syh

Attr: σ'] > C (= 250) 138-255; [] 257

Var: πρὸς] μετα 732 | τὸν] > 252 732

NonGr: Syh

370
Notes: The Nachlese reports that the Edition II App contains an error, since no catena ms, which the Hagedorns collated, contained the variant μετά instead of πρός (Nachlese, 409). Ms 732 has μετά, but the ms is very low in the catena’s stemma and it was not included in the final publication of the Nachlese.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 353; AGK 3, 312; Nic, 564).

Job 40 4abc
HT

Notes: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 353; AGK 3, 312; Nic, 564).
ἀκούων τοιαῦτα οὐθὲν ὄν;
ἔγὼ δὲ τίνα ἀπόκρισιν δῶ πρὸς ταῦτα;

Sub ANNOTATION

Wit1:  C (= 788 3005) cI-138 [680] 252 La Syh\textsuperscript{rt}

Attr: οὐ κεῖνται (κεῖται 559 395 137 3006 260 643 732 139(3)) ἐν τῷ (> 3006) Ἑβραϊκῷ 788 οἱ Γ (> 740 255 612); ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ 252

Var:  sub ÷ 3005(non 4c) 788(non 4c) La(non 4c) Syh\textsuperscript{rt}

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{rt}  sub ÷ 3005(non 4c) 788(non 4c) La(non 4c) Syh\textsuperscript{rt}

La  ※ (pro ÷) quid ergo iudicor, ÷ commonitus et increpatus a domino,
audiens (pr ÷ β) talia, cum nihil sim quod responsum dabo?

Notes: Ms 559 places the note after the text and there is an index at 4a; thus perhaps it has only 4a as not in the Hebrew. Ms 260 marks the proper beginning (4a), but with the singular κεῖται, only that line is not in the Hebrew. In 643, the note must mark the beginning of the text not in the Hebrew, again only 4a due to the singular κεῖται.

Mss 788 740 255 612 preserve the plural κεῖνται. Ms 788 is the only witness to attest the complete scholion: οὐ κεῖνται ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ οἱ Γ. Mss 740 255 612 preserve the plural but the subject has fallen out. After this stage, the verb was changed to the singular beginning at 559.

Job 40 4b (HT 4a)

HT  הָלָֽאְפָּרָֿבָּר (כַּלֶּה יַעֲרַבֵּךְ)  קָלֶּה יַעֲרַבֵּךְ

LXX  ἀκούων τοιαῦτα οὐθὲν ὄν;

αʹ  ἰδοὺ ἧλαφρύνθην

Wit1:  248 252
Notes: This fragment strengthens the probability of the retroversion at 7:6a (Woods, 153).

σ’ ἵδοὺ κοῦφος ἐποίησα

Wit1: 248 252
Var: κοῦφος] – φως 248

Job 40 5

HT ( אָהָתִרֵה (קשורת רָכַבִּים) )
LXX (ἀπαξ λελάληκα,—(ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ οὐ προσθήσω.)

σ’ ὃ μὴ ἀνεφθεγξάμην

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-[680]
Attr: σ’] > C (= 250) 138
Var: μὴ ἀνεφθεγξάμην] μιαν εφθεγξαμην 138 3005 | ἀνεφθεγξάμην] ανεφθεγξαμην 612; ανεφεγγξομην 395

Notes: The OG omitted this phrase, but Sym translated it and the catena has preserved his text. According to the Beiträge, the note in Pitra is incorrect since it read the scholion as part of the Sym fragment: οὐ μὴ ἀναφθεγξάμενος ἐτόλμησα ὑπὸ ἀκακίας, τὰ μὲν θέλω ὑπὲρ παιδείας (Beiträge, 47; Pitra, 557; Pitra does note: scholia videntur, which may indicate he thought they appeared as a scholia). AGK records this scholion, and notes that it appears without break with the Sym fragment in cI (AGK 3, 316). The proof that this is a scholion is found in 788-250 and 3005, the representatives of the earliest catena tradition. In 788-250, the fragment appears well above the scholion and is clearly marked as a marginal note distinct from the scholion. In 3005, the fragment appears in the margin, while the scholion is found in the text of the catena, clearly distant from the hexaplaric fragment. The marginal notes in the Vorlage of 250 must have become less and less distinct so that in cI they appear as one unified marginal note.

Job 40 8a

HT רֶפֶנִי בֵּיתָן כָּרֶס
LXX μὴ ἀποτοποιοῦ μου τὸ κρίμα.

⟨α’⟩ μήτι καίπερ ἀκυρώσεις κρίσιν μου

373
Notes: Ms 3005 preserves a double attribution to Aq and Sym, while the rest of the witnesses preserve an attribution to Sym (Nachlese, 409). Ms 788 also attests the double attribution, indicating that the attribution to Aq is part of the historical memory of the text. Already, Ziegler noted that the vocabulary in this fragment shows the attribution to Aq as correct and he favored him as the author in the Edition (Beiträge, 47; Edition, 397).

Based upon the vocabulary and translation technique (e.g. μήτι καίπερ), Aq is probably the author of this fragment, but already in the Vorlagen of 3005 and 788, the attribution to Sym was added to the attribution to Aq. After this intermediate stage, the rest of the catena lost the attribution to Aq and only the one to Sym remained.

Job 40 8b

Notes: Ms 3005 confirms that 248 preserved the correct attribution to Sym against 252, which has Aq (Nachlese, 409). Ms 788 also supports this attribution. The Edition already favored Sym as the author based on 248, but it considered this lemma different than the one preserved in the catena (Edition, 397). Since the fragment is now identified in the catena, it is clear that these fragments are from the same source.
σʹ ὡς θεοῦ ὑπάρχει σοι

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250) ↓ cI–137 138 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006
Attr: σʹ > C (= 788-250)

Notes: Only C (= 788-250) has the correct the text, since in the cl group ὑπάρχει σοι has become ὑπάρχεις οἶον, due to a following scholion (ἀντὶ τοῦ· δειχθῇς), to which οἶον does not originally belong but was added to cl secondarily (AGK 3, 325; Kollationen, 269; Chr-Kommentar, 226ff). The sigma of σοι became the ending of the verb υπαρχεις and the οἰ of σοι as the first word of the scholion became οἶον. This scholion does not interfere with the hexaplaric fragment in 788-250 and thus 788-250 preserves the correct text.

Job 40 10a
HT בּוֹגָהּ עֲדֵה נָא גָאוֹ
LXX ἀνάλαβε δὴ ὕψος καὶ δύναμιν,

αʹ κόσμησαι δὴ ὑπερφερεία καὶ μετεωρότητι

Var: κόσμησαι] κοσμισαι 255 559 740; (κ)οσμισαι 612 | δὴ] δε δι 559; δὴ και 3006 | ὑπερφερεία καὶ] υπερφερειαις 255 740 | μετεωρότητι] μεωροτητι 740

Notes: The Nachlese reports that 3005 preserves the attribution to Aq, which confirms Field’s conjecture that he made in the Auctarium (Nachlese, 409; F-Auct, 11 n. 1). Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Aq was part of the oldest Greek catena.

Job 40 10b
HT בתְּלוּ דָוֹדְרוֹ הָדוֹר
LXX δόξαν δὲ καὶ τιμὴν (ἀμφίεσαι)
θʹ εὐπρέπειαν καὶ ὕψος

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-[680] 732
Attr: θʹ] > C (= 250) 138-255 3006
Var: καὶ > C (= 3005) | ὕψος] δοξαν 137 139 260 643 3006

Notes: Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Th. Ms 139 has an additional θʹ εὐπρέπειαν in the line above this lemma; therefore, it has the attribution and this word twice (Kollationen, 269).

Job 40 12a
HT רָאָהּ כְלֶֽלֶת (רָאָהּ הַכְּנִיעֵהוּ)
LXX —(ὑπερήφανον δὲ σβέσον,)

αʹ θʹ ἰδοὺ πάντα

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh ܐ.ܗܐ ܠܟܠ܀. ܬ

Notes: In Syh, the index occurs after פָּחַד “to abase, humble,” which translates ταπείνωσον in v. 11b; therefore, the fragment comes before LXX 12a and corresponds to the HT.

Job 40 12b
HT נְזֵרִים (רָשָׁעִים תַּחְתָּם׃)
LXX σῆψον δὲ (ἀσεβεῖς παραχρῆμα)

αʹ καὶ ἐπίρριψον

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-260 [680] 732
Wit2: 12b] ασεβεῖς δὲ παραχρῆμα κρυψον (κρ. παραχ., 157 Bo) II΄C‘-296 b’
248 d 55 253’ 644 706 795 Bo Aeth Ol | 13a κρύψον B-S O L‘-534’ 248’
Arm Pris Spec] σῆψον rel
Attr: αʹ C (= 788) 138-255 395 559 612 740 30062 248 252] αʹ 137 139 643 3006; > C (= 250 3005)
Var: ἐπίρριψον] ἀπορριψον 559 612; ἐπιστρεψον 30062 248 252
376
Notes: Ms 788 is the first C ms to attest the attribution to Aq. Ms 3006 contains the traditional fragment of the catena, but it also contains a marginal note from a different hand and a different source as follows: ἐν ἑτέρῳ σῆψον. Ἀκύλας, ἐπίστρεψον | Σύμμαχος, καταχώνευσον αὐτοὺς εἰς κενὸν (Kollationen, 270). Ms 3006, therefore, has agreements with the catena on the one hand and 248 and 252 on the other. The second part of this note will be treated below. Nic also seems to be influenced by the variant, ἀπόρριψον αὐτοὺς μακράν (Nic, 571).

As Wit2 shows, the catena has a different text for 12b than the OG, and it is not clear how this reading arose; although, it seems to be the result of an error of sight due to homoioteleuton of the -ψον of the verbs κρύψον and σηψον, which then gave rise to the other variants (see 13a infra). As the catena stands, σηψον is in verse 13a and the hexaplaric fragment is also marked at 13a or next to it. Ms 248 is representative of the OG and has its note at σηψον at 12b. Ms 252 has its note at 14, which is incorrect.

Since the situation in the catena is difficult to discern and the HT at 12b has a hapax leg. ([II] ἡδὲ “to tread down,” HALOT), this edition has based its text on the HT and not the difficulties in the catena witnesses (cf. Field, 75 n. 5). The HT has waw + verb at 12b, which corresponds to Aq’s καί in the note itself. The HT does not have waw at 13a, even though the OG has δέ. The hexaplaric fragment, therefore, corresponds to 12b, despite the catena tradition placing it 13a. In this case the actual phrase that is marked in the catena (σῆψον δέ = ἡδὲ) takes priority over the differing stichometries.

The reading of 248 and 252 must be a variant of this fragment. Perhaps it is plausible to posit that ἐπίστρεψον derives from ἐπίρριψον, since the two words begin and end the same and the first rho may have been read as a stigma.

HT

רְשָׁעִים תַּחְתָּם׃

LXX

σῆψον δὲ ἁσεβεῖς παραχήμα

σʹ
καταθλῶν ἁσεβείς ἤττησον αὐτοὺς

Wit1: 252

Job 40 13a

נְחָבר בֶּעָפָרְנֵּם (רַחֵּם)

LXX

κρύψον δὲ εἰς γῆν (ἔξω ὁμοθυμαδόν,)

σʹ
κατάχωσον αὐτοὺς εἰς κόνιν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓cL-[680] ↓cL (= 3006²) ↓248

377
\[ \text{Wit2: } 13b \text{ ἐμπλήσον} \] + κρυψον \[ \delta ε \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \omega (> 336' = M) \text{ ομοθυμαδον} \] (ομοθ. \( ε \varepsilon \omega \) d Aeth) \[ II \text{-} 336' \text{ C'296 55 253' 542 543 706 795 Bo Aeth Ol} = M (13a); \text{ superadd κατάχωσον αὐτους εἰς κονιν II} = M \]

\[ \text{Attr: } \sigma'] \alpha' 248; \alpha' \sigma' 139; > C (= 250 3005) 732 \]

\[ \text{Var: } \text{κατάχωσον} \text{ καταχωνευσον} cI (= 3006') 248 | \text{αὐτοὺς} > 732 | \text{κόνιν} \text{ κονιην} 139 612; \text{κενον} 248 \]

\[ \text{Notes: } \text{Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym in 257 is part of the oldest Greek catena. The catena has added the equivalent of OG 13a to the end of 13b, which created 13c. The hexaplaric fragment is at 13c in the catena, while it is at 13a in 248. The first Lucianic sub group has incorporated the Sym fragment at the end of 13c.} \]

\[ \text{Job 40 15a} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{HT} \\
(אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי עִמָּךְ)
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{LXX} \\
(הִנֵּה־נָא בְּהֵמוֹ)
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{α'} \theta' \\
\text{κτῆνη}
\end{array} \]

\[ \text{Wit1: } \downarrow C (= 257 3005) \]

\[ \text{Attr: } \alpha' \theta'] > C (= 3005) \]

\[ \text{Notes: } \text{Ms 3005 is the second witness to this fragment after 257, which Field knew from Holmes-Parsons’ collation (Nachlese, 409; Field, 76).} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{HT} \\
(אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי תָּהִנֵּה־נָא בְּהֵמוֹ)
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{LXX} \\
(אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי תָּהִנֵּה־נָא בְּהֵמוֹ)
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{α'} \theta' \\
\text{※ â ἐποίησα}
\end{array} \]

\[ \text{Wit1: } \text{Syh} \]

\[ \text{Wit2: } \text{θηρια α ἐποιησα π. σοι II} = M \]

\[ \text{NonGr: } \text{Syh} \text{※ασά ομματι} \text{.} \]

\[ \text{Notes: } \text{The index is over לָכֹם ("with you"), and was inserted before this word under the asterisk in the Hexapla.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{HT} \\
(אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי בְּהֵמוֹ)
\end{array} \]
LXX   (ἀλλὰ δὴ ἰδοὺ θηρία) παρὰ σοί.

α’    μετὰ σοῦ

Wit1: 252

Job 40 16a

HT    (תְּמוּרָה אֲחֵרָה)
LXX   (ἰδοὺ δὴ ἱσχὺς αὐτοῦ) ἐπὶ ὀσφύι,

α’    ἐν νῷτῳ αὐτοῦ

Wit1:  ↓C (= 3005) ↓cI 260 612 [680] ↓cII ↓555 ↓161 252
Var:  ἐν 252] ἐπὶ C (= 3005); > rel | νῷτῳ 252] νωτοῦ (νωτοῦ 3005) rel; ο
νωτοὺς cII 555 161 | αὐτοῦ 252] > rel

Notes: Ms 252 preserves the correct reading, for it is a translation of the HT. Usually, Aq translates ב with ἐν and he does not use ἐπὶ (Hyvärinen, 48-9). Hyvärinen lists two places where Aq appears to have ἐπὶ for ב, but he posits that these texts (Gen 6:7(6), Job 40:11(16)) have been adjusted to the LXX. The ἐπὶ of 3005 probably comes from the LXX and the genitive ending (νωτοῦ) and omission of αὐτοῦ in the rest of the catena tradition may have arisen by parablepsis from the νῷτῳ συτοῦ, from which νωτοῦ arose.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 360; AGK 3, 331; Nic, 573).

σ’   ἐπὶ λαγόσιν

Wit1:  C (= 3005) ↓cI 260 612 [680] ↓cII ↓555 ↓161
Attr:  σ’/θ’ 559
Var:   ἐπὶ] > cII 555 161 | λαγόσιν C (= 3005)] λαγόνον) 138; λαγός 137 139
559 643 740 3006; λαγὸ(] 255 732; η λαγών cII 555 161

Notes: Ms 3005 is the only witness which clearly preserves the plural and probably represents the correct version, since also there is a plural in the Hebrew (Nachlese, 409). Additionally, Symmachus uses this word in the plural in Job 12:18b (Woods, 236; Nachlese, 409). The Hagedorns posit that this original form became the shortened form λαγόσιν, which soon was no longer dispersed correctly (Nachlese, 409).
The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 360; AGK 3, 331; Nic, 573).

HT: כהה יראת בְמָתְנָיו (כֹּחָו)
LXX: (וְהִנֵּה נָא כֹּחֲוַי) —

π

HT: בְמָתְנָיו (כֹּחָו)
LXX: (וְהִנֵּה נָא כֹּחֲוַי) —

Wit1: Syh La
Wit2: δύναμις + (La) αυτου O L' Co Aeth Arm Bas ap Pris Quod ap Cass ap = M
Attr: π' > La
NonGr: Syh D L La ※ εἰς († β)

Notes: The index comes after ἀνάστασις (the final ἡ is the anticipatory suffix) “loin,” showing that the pronoun was under the asterisk in the Hexapla.

Job 40 16b

HT: (בִּשְׁרִירֵי בִטְנוֹ)
LXX: (וְאֹנָו) — (ἐπ’ ὀμφαλού γαστρός)

γ

HT: בִּשְׁרִירֵי בִטְנוֹ
LXX: (וְאֹנָו) — (ἐπ’ ὀμφαλοῦ γαστρός)

Wit1: Syh La
Wit2: δύναμις + (La) αυτου (-τω Syn) rel = M
Attr: γ' > La
NonGr: Syh D L La ※ εἰς (pr ※ μ)

Notes: The index is after וְאֹנָו “but, now” and it marks where the pronoun was in the Hexapla.

Job 40 17a

HT: (בִּשְׁרִירֵי בִטְנוֹ)
LXX: (ἔστησεν οὐράν ὡς κυπάρισσον.)
σʹ τονώσει

Wit1:  C (= 3005)

Notes: This rendering for יַחְפֹּץ was not known until now (Nachlese, 409). This lexeme is new to the LXX corpus.

HT יָחְפֹּץ (וכְּרָב כְּמֹו)אָרֶז
LXX (הֹצְמֶהָא בְּרֵאשִּׁים)קֵטְרִיסֶנ (ְעַרַּנְנֵה בְּרֵאשִּׁים)קֵטְרִיסֶנ

λʹ κέδρον

Wit1:  C (= 3005) cf-138 260 [680] 740 ↓ 248
Var: κέδρον] ως νεδρον (oder νεδρος) 248

Notes: The reading in 248 is difficult to discern. The ligature for ος appears over the ρ, but κέδρον would suggest the ending –ον. This word does not occur in TLG database.11

Job 40 18a
HT תָּקֹטֲפָרָה (אֲפִיקֵי נְחוּשָׁה)עֲצָמָיו
LXX (αἱ πλευραὶ αὐτοῦ)πλευραὶ χάλκειαι,

σʹ ως σωλήνες χαλκοῖ

Wit1:  252

Notes: The reading of the last word of the ms is actually χαλκ[.]

Job 40 18b
HT בָּרִזלֶן (כִּמְטִיל בַּרְזֶל)גְּרָמָיו
LXX (ἡ δὲ ράχις αὐτοῦ)σίδηρος χυτός.

σʹ ως συμβλήματα σιδηρᾶ

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cf-260 [680] ↓ cII ↓ 555 ↓ 161

---

11TLG [online]; accessed 26 July 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet.
Job 40 19a

HT  
\( \text{דַּרְכֵי־אֵל} \) (רֵאשִׁית)

LXX  
(τοῦτ’ ἔστιν) ἀρχὴ (πλάσματος κυρίου,)

\( \alpha' \)  
κεφάλαιον

**Attr:**  
\( \sigma' \) > \( C (= 250) \)

**Var:**  
\( \omega \) 3006 | συμβλήματα \( \sigma \) 740; συμβλήματος 555; συμβλήματος 748 | σιδηρᾶ \( cII \) 555 161

**Notes:**  
Ms 788 preserves the attribution to Sym. The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar nor AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 362-3; AGK 3, 334; Nic, 575).

\( \sigma' \theta' \)  
οδῶν ἰσχυροῦ

**Attr:**  
\( \sigma' \theta' \) \( C (= 257) \)

**Var:**  
οἱ \( \alpha' \) 252; οἱ \( cII \) 555 161

**Notes:**  
Translation equivalents do not help isolate the author of this fragment, since all three revisers use these words as equivalents for the Hebrew words in this text; therefore, it is possible to attribute the fragment to the Three (Reider, 119; Gentry, 145; for Sym see Job 41:17).
Job 40 19b

**Greek Text**

σ’ ποιηθὲν προσαχθῆναι τῇ μαχαίρᾳ αὐτοῦ

**Translation**

 Pedidothen prosachthēnai tī machairā autōu

**Notes**

Ms 788 is the first ms of the oldest Greek catena to attest the attribution to Sym. The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar nor AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 364; AGK 3, 335-6; Nic, 575).

Job 40 21b

**Greek Text**

κάθυγρον

**Translation**

Kathugron

**Notes**

The index is at booutomon in 3005 (Kollationen, 273), and now preserved also in 788.

Job 40 22a

**Greek Text**

σκιεπάσουσιν αὐτὸν σκιαὶ αὐτοῦ

**Translation**

Skepasousin autōn skiai autōu

**Notes**

The index is at 'solei' in 3005 (Kollationen, 273), and now preserved also in 788.
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The δένδρα μεγάλα of OG renders צֶאֱלִים, not צִלֲלוֹ. The OG renders צִלֲלוֹ with σὺν ῥαδάμνοις, which is in 22b. Aq reads צֶאֱלִים צִלֲלוֹ together; thus, he has σκιαὶ αὐτοῦ for both words in the HT.

\(\sigma'\) (ἐν) σκιὰ σκιάζονται

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh • σκιὰσκιᾶςσκιᾷ•

Notes: The retroversion is from Ziegler, and the ἐν in parentheses represents the uncertainty of the retroversion of beth. Field understood the dative case to be the proper retroversion, not ἐν + dative (Field, 76).

\(\theta'\) σκιαὶ σκιῶν αὐτοῦ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh • σκιὰσκιὰςσκιᾶς

Job 40 22b(22a HT)

HT צֶאֱלִים (רָצוֹן וְיְקָרְבָנוּ):

LXX σὺν ῥαδάμνοις (καὶ κλώνες ἄγνου.)

\(\sigma'\) σὺν ταῖς παραφυάσιν

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cI-260 cII 555 ↓ Syh

Attr: \(\sigma'\) \(\theta'\) 395; > C (= 250) 138 559

Var: παραφυάσιν] + αὐτων Syh

NonGr: Syh • σκιὰσκιὰςσκι篼σκι篼

Notes: This fragment corresponds to OG 22b (σὺν ῥαδάμνοις), which seems to be the OG equivalent to צֶאֱלִים in HT 22a (cf. Field, 76). The Edition omitted the evidence of Syh for this fragment, even though Field listed it (Field, 76). The possessive pronoun
in Syh perhaps corresponds to HT, but its omission from all the other witnesses probably indicates that it is secondary.

In 138 and 559 this fragment follows ἵεται χειμάρρους without division (see infra). In 395 the notes are composed as follows: α’ ἵτεαι, σ’ χειμάρρους, θ’ σὺν ταῖς παραφυάσιν (Kollationen, 274).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 365; AGK 3, 339; Nic, 577).

HT ḫrēḇi (טִטְרֵכִּיתֶל)
LXX (סוּנְי ῥαדָםְנוֹיכָּו קַלְוַנְיָס (אַגְּנוּּוּ.

α’ ἵτεαι χειμάρρου

Wit1:  
C (= 3005) ↓cI-260 cII 555 161’ 252

Wit2:  ἀγνου] torrentis La = Vulg

Var:  ἵτεαι] ἵτεαι 138 740; [ἐ][ε]τε’αι 255 | χειμάρρους 3005 cII 555 161’ 252]
χειμαρρους cI-260 3006

Notes: In 395 the notes are composed as follows: α’ ἵτεαι, σ’ χειμάρρους, θ’ σὺν ταῖς παραφυάσιν (Kollationen, 274).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 365; AGK 3, 339-40; Nic, 577).

HT ייטאה (טִטְרֵכּייהָ)
LXX (סוּנְי ῥscenarioְנְיָס קַלְוַנְיָס (אַגְּנוּּוּ.

λ’ ἵτεαι

Wit1:  
C (= 788-250 257 3005) ↓cI-137 138 139 260 395 643 732 3006

Attr:  λ’] > 680

Var:  ἵτεαι] ἵτεαι 255 559 612 740

Notes: This fragment was not listed in the Edition or Beiträge, but ἵτεαι was also identified as the version of Symmachus and Theodotion (Nachlese, 409).

Job 40 23a

HT נָחַל׃ עָרְבֵי־נָחַל׃(יְסֻבּוּהוּ)
LXX (ἐὰν γένηται πλημμύρα,) οὐ μὴ αἰσθηθῇ.
σ’ οὐ καταπλαγήσεται

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI 137 139 260 643 732 3006 cII 555 161
Attr:  σ’ > C (= 250)
Notes:  The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 365; AGK 3, 340; Nic, 578).

Job 40 23b-24

Notes:  The asterisks and attribution are well attested for these lines.
Job 40 23b
HT
(יבשת) יר(י)נינה נָתַן אָלִיםירוה
E
(πέποιθεν) ὅτι (προσκρούσει ὁ Ἰορδάνης εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.)

α’ ὅταν

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 139 260 643 732 3006
Attr: α’] σ’ 395 680 740; > C (= 250) 138

Notes: The index is at ὅτι in 3005 (Kollationen, 275) and in 788.
Aq distinguished the demonstrative and temporal meanings of the ἐρCc by using ὅτε (+ ἀν = ὅταν) sometimes and ὅτι other times (Hyvärinen, 53).
La has cum, “when,” which shows that Jerome may be dependent on Aq, not Th.
The Vulgate adopted quod “because” (see supra).

Job 40 24a
HT
(בַּשְׁשָׁרָה) קְשִׁים יֵנַקָּב־אָף
E
(ἐν τῷ ὁφθαλμῷ αὐτοῦ) δέξεται (αὐτὸν,)

α’ λήψεται

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI 260 732
Attr: α’] > C (= 250)

Notes: The fragment occurs two times in 740, once here and once at 24b (Kollationen, 275).

Job 40 24b
HT
בָּנָקָשׁ הַקַּבִּירָא
E
ένσκολιευόμενος τρήσει ῥῆνα;

σ’ ἐν περόνῃ τρυπηθῆσεται τὴν ῥῆνα

Wit1: ↓C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓cI 138 260 643 732 ↓cII 555 ↓161’
Attr: σ’] > C (= 250) 3006
Var: περόνῃ] περώνῃ 161 559; περονι 255 | τῆν] > 703

387
Notes: In 138, only σ’ and τρ[ are able to be read (Kollationen, 275).
The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar nor AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 366; AGK 3, 340; Nic, 578).

Job 40 25a

**HT**

(בְּחַכָּה לִוְיָתָן)

**LXX**

(ἄξεις δὲ δράκοντα ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ)

**α’ σ’ Λευϊαθάν**

**WitI:**  

C (= 257 3005) ↓ cII 3006 ↓ cII ↓ 555 ↓ 161

**Attr:**  

α’ σ’] > 138 395; λ’ cII 555 161

**Var:**  

Λευϊαθάν 740 cII 161] Λευϊαθάμ C (= 3005); Λευϊάθαν C (= 257) cII 740; Λευίσθαν 259 555

Notes: Although only a few catena mss preserve the correct orthography in this place, Job 3:8 makes clear that the original orthography according to the catena tradition was Λευϊαθάν (Woods, 97-8).

Originally the Aq and Sym fragments were probably preserved separately and in their longer form as they appear in the Syh (see infra). The evidence of the catena shows that from a very early time the fragments were combined under a double attribution and only the most relevant part of the fragment, Λευϊαθάν, was preserved, since this is the point of contrast with the LXX. The readings of 248 and 252 preserve part of the longer reading, but they have erroneously preserved the attribution, each omitting one of the original authors (252 omits Sym, while 248 omits Aq; see infra). The general attribution to λοιποί in the cII group is not correct, since Syh has a different reading for Th (see infra).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 366; AGK 3, 342; Nic, 579). AGK contains the following comment by Evagrius: οἶμαι τὸ προειρημενὸν κῆτος καὶ τὸν ἐνταῦθα δράκοντα ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, ἐπεὶ τὸ Ἑβραϊκὸν ἐν ἀμφοτέροις Λευϊαθάν περιέχει σὺχ οὕτως τῶν ἄλλων δρακόντων παρ’ Ἑβραίος ὄνομαζομένων, ἀλλ’ ἐχόντων τὸ οἰκεῖον ὄνομα τού γένους αὐτῶν· τοῦ γε μὴν εἰς τὸν ἀρχοντα τῶν ἀντικειμένων δυνάμεων ἀναφερομένου δράκοντος ἰδίως ὄνομα Λευίαθαν κέκληται ὀσπερ κυρίαν ταύτην κεκτημένου προσηγορία (AGK 3, 342-3).

**HT**

(נֶשֶׁץ לִוְיָתָן)

**LXX**

(ἀξείς δὲ δράκοντα ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ)
αʹ  ἐλκύσεις Λευϊαθάν ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ

Wit1: ↓252 Syh ↓Hi (Ezek 32,10)

Var: ἐλκύσεις] extrahens Hi | ἐν ἀγκ.] > 252

NonGr: Syh

Hi  extrahens Leuiaathan in hamo

Notes: Extrahes is a variant in the Hi commentary on Ezekiel (450).

σʹ  ἐλκύσεις Λευϊαθάν ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ

Wit1: ↓248 ↓Syh


NonGr: Syh

θʹ  ἐλκύσει δράκοντα ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Job 40 25b

HT  הבעל תשקיע לשה
LXX  περιθήσεις δὲ φορβεάν περὶ ρίνα αὐτοῦ;

αʹ  et funibus colligabis linguam eius

Wit1: Hi (Ezek 32,10)

Notes: Jerome does not include an equivalent for beth (ἐν), which probably Aq would have had (Hyvärinen, 48-9).

Job 40 26a
HT

E

ei δήσεις κρίκον ἐν τῷ μυκτηρὶ αὐτοῦ,

\[\theta'\]

Sub ※

Wit1: \( cl^{1-137} \) 138 260 559 643 680 732 3006 Arm La Sa Syh\textit{txt}

Wit2: 26a] om \( C^{1-705} \) Sa Eus (Ps 88,9-11) Pris

Attr: \( \theta' \) Syh\textit{txt}] > rel

Var: lemma] om 139 Sa Pris | 26a sub ※ 740 255 612 395 Arm La Syh\textit{txt}

NonGr: Syh\textit{txt} εἰ δήσεις κρίκον ἐν τῷ μυκτηρὶ αὐτοῦ,

La ※ si (+ ≤ β; ※ sigillabis μ) ligabis circulum in ore eius

Arm ※ ζρῆ ήμωξηδὲ ὑπερὴ ἧ βηρῳ ἤμρω

Job 40 26b

HT תָּבֹת הַקַּח בּהֹלָה

LXX ψελίῳ δὲ τρυπῆσεις τὸ χεῖλος αὐτοῦ;

\[\theta'\]

καὶ χαλινῷ τρήσεις σιαγόνα αὐτοῦ

Wit1: }`}C (= 257 788-250 3005) \( \downarrow C \) 555 161

Attr: \( \theta' \) ] σ' C (= 257); > C (= 788-250) 395

Var: τρήσεις C (= 257) \( cII 555 161 \) τρυπῆσεις C (= 3005); τρίσῃς C (= 788-250); τρίσεις 395 740; τρίσει 137 139 559 612 643 680 3006; τρήσει 138 255 260 | σιαγόνα] σιαγόνα 255 395 559

Notes: Translation technique indicates that Th is both the author and that τρήσεις (from τετράινω) (for בּהֹלָה) is the correct lemma (cf. Th Job 40:24b supra). The reading τρυπῆσεις in 3005 is from the LXX. The rest of the variants derive from τρήσεις through the phonological error of η-τ, which is a common scribal error in Greek mss (Wevers, 189).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the 
Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 367; AGK 3, 343; Nic, 579).
Job 40 27

**HT**

אֲרַכְרֵךְ אַלֶיךָ רַעְחָה

**LXX**

λαλήσει δὲ σοι δεήσει,

ικενηρία μαλακός;

**εβρʼ**

ʔʼרַכּוֹ (אִם־יְדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ)

**LXX**

(ικενηρία) μαλακός;

αʹ θʹ

άπαλά

**Wit1:** Nobil (apud Field)

Job 40 27b

**HT**

אֲרַכְרֵךְ אַלֶיךָ רַעְחָה

**LXX**

(ικενηρία) μαλακός;

**αʹ θʹ**

άπαλά

**Wit1:** ↓ C (= 257 788-250 3005) ↓ cI-680 732 Syh

**Attr:** αʹ θʹ] αʹ σ΄ C (= 3005); > C (= 788-250)

**Var:** ἄπαλά] απλα 612

**NonGr:** Syh *אֵפָּלָה*.

οʹ

πολλά

**Wit1:** Syh

**Wit2:** μαλακός] + πολλά V-III-Iullem

**NonGr:** Syh *אָפָּלָה*.

**Notes:** The Vorlage of Sym must have had רַבּוֹת instead of רַכּוֹ or he misread his Vorlage. This fragment may be the cause of the doublet found in part of the Lucianic tradition, including the lemma of the commentary of Iul.

Job 40 28a

**HT**

(ברירה פסקה)
LXX  θήσεται δὲ (διαθήκην μετὰ σοῦ,)

\(\theta'\)  μὴ διαθήσεται

Wit1: \(\downarrow C (= 257\ 788-250\ 3005) \downarrow I^{139}\ 732\)

Attr: \(\theta' > C (= 250\ 3005)\)

Notes: Ms 788 joins 257 as the second C ms to attest the attribution to Th.

Job 40 29a

HT  רַכָּצִיפּוֹ ־בּוֹ
LXX  παίξῃ δὲ (ἐν αὐτῷ ὡσπερ ὀρνέῳ)

σ’  μὴ ἔμπαίξης

Wit1: \(C (= 788\ 3005) \downarrow I^{139}\ 260\ 732\)

Attr: \(σ' > 643\)

Var: ἐμπαίξης] –εις 559\ 740; ἐμπεξης 138

Notes: Ms 788 is the second C ms to attest the attribution and text of this fragment.

Job 40 30a

HT  יִכְרוּ עָלָיו חַבָּרִים
LXX  ἐνσιτοῦνται δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔθνη,

σ’  ἐνδιαγωγίσαιντο αὐτὸν κοινωνοί

Wit1: \(\downarrow C (= 257\ 788-250\ 3005) \downarrow 252\)

Attr: \(σ' > C (= 250\ 257)\)

Var: ἐνδιαγωγίσαιντο] ἐνδιαγνώσαιντο \(C (= 3005)\); ἐνδιαγωγήσαιντο \(C (= 788-250)\); ἐγνδιαγωγίσουνται 252
Notes: The fragments for 30a and 30b are combined in 252 as follows: διαιρεθήσονται μεταξύ μεταβόλων ἐνδιαγωγίσονται κοινωνί under αʹ αʹ and next to 40:30b (Kollationen, 277).

The Nachlese provides a significant update of the evidence for this fragment, since the reading in 257 and 3005 was still unknown to Ziegler (Nachlese, 409-10; Beiträge, 48). Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Sym. The the issues of root to which the verb is traced, the meaning which Sym assigned to the word (not documented elsewhere), and the determination of the form (future or optative) must remain unsettled (Nachlese, 410).12

\[ \theta' \] ἀγοράσωσιν αὐτὸν μέτοχοι

Wit1: \( \downarrow C (= 257 \ 788-250 \ 3005) \downarrow 248 \downarrow 252 \)

Attr: \( \theta' > C (= 250) 252 \)

Var: αὐτὸν μέτοχοι > 252 | μέτοχοι > 248

Notes: Ziegler was unaware of the fragment in 257 and 3005, which confirm the whole reading known before only in 250. These two witnesses confirm the authorship preserved only in 248 until now (Nachlese, 409-10). Ms 788 also confirms the attribution to Sym and the full lemma. The form ἀγοράσωσιν is a typographical error in the Beiträge, but the correct form, ἀγοράσωσιν, is in the Edition (Nachlese, 410; Beiträge, 48).

Job 40 30b

HT יֶחֱצוּהוּ בֵּין כְּנַעֲנִים׃

LXX μεριτεύονται δὲ αὐτὸν Φοινίκων γένη;

\[ \alpha' \] ἡμισεύσουσιν αὐτὸν μεταξὺ Χανααίων

Wit1: \( \downarrow C (= 257 \ 788-250 \ 3005) \downarrow cI-559 \ 732 \ cII \ 555 \ 161 \)

Attr: αʹ > C (= 250) 138

Var: ἡμισεύσουσιν | ἡμισεύσουσιν 3006 | μεταξύ | μεταξοι 3006

12The word still does not occur in TLG [on-line], accessed 28 July 2011 http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch; Internet. It is also not listed in Ἐπιτομὴ Λεξικοῦ Κριαρᾶ [on-line], accessed 18 February 2012 http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/medieval_greek/kriaras/index.html; Internet.
σ’ διαμερισθήσονται μεταξὺ μεταβόλων

*Wit1:* ↓248 ↓252 ↓Syh

*Attr:* σ’] α’ 248 252

*Var:* διαμερισθήσονται] -σεται Syh

*NonGr:* Syh

*Notes:* Sym uses διομερίζω for בְּקֵל in Isa 53:12, and there are no instances of this verb listed for Aq (H-R, 305-6). This observation combined with the attribution to Sym in Syh makes it probable that this fragment should be attributed to him and not Aq.

*Job 40 31a*

*HT*  בהמקל אֶּנְשָׁו תֹּ נָרָּא

*LXX*  פָּנָנ דֶּ פִּ לְוֹתִון סְעֶ נֶ לְּוֹן עוֹ מִּהְּ עֶ נֶגֶּ קְ וַ סִיֵּ נ בּ ויְרְסָנִין מִיַּ נ מּּ עֶ רָגָס אֻ חָ тוּ

*α’*  מְ הִ תְיִ פְּ לַ הְ רְ וֹ סִיֵ נ אֶ ה ֶ נ אֶ נֶגֶּ קְ וִ סִי לְ דֶ ר מְ מְ דָא אֻ חָ тוּ

*Wit1:* 252

*Job 40 31b*

*HT*  הבְּ כְ לַ לַ ל ה תּ לְ עָ מָ רֵ שָׁ אָ נָ שוּ יִ שְׁ אָ

*E*  כָּ יִ אֶ ה ֶ נ פּ לְ לְ לְ כּ לְ ל ה לְּ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה לְ ל ה מְ לְ ل ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ לְ ל ה מְ ل ה מְ ל ה מְל ה מְל H
\[\text{Wit1: } C (= 788) \ cI (= 740 \ 612) \ \text{Arm La Sa}\]

\[\text{Attr: } \theta' \ C (= 788)] > \text{rel}\]

\[\text{Var: } \text{lemma]} \text{om Sa} | 31b \text{sub} \star 788 \ 740 \ 612 \ \text{Arm La}\]

\[\text{NonGr: } \text{La} \star \text{et in navibus piscatorum caput eius.}\]
\[\text{Arm} \star \text{in \ h\i\ s\i\ m\i\ d\i\ h\i\ n\i\ m\i\ h\i\ m\i\ h\i\ m\i}\]

\[\text{Notes: } \text{Ms 788 is the first witness to preserve the attribution to Th.}\]

\[\text{HT} \quad \text{םךַלָּל רֹאֶשׁ (רַאֲשָׁה)}\]
\[\text{E} \quad \text{kai en plioiis alienov (kephali\n autow,)}\]

\[\sigma' \quad \text{kai en i\xthree{ch}thuophoroi\xthree{c}}\]

\[\text{Wit1: } 248 \downarrow 252\]

\[\text{Var: } \text{kai]} > 252 | \text{i\xthree{ch}thuophoroi]} \text{–} \text{fora 252; + kephal\n a\xthree{t}ou 252}\]

\[\text{Notes: } \text{The addition in 252 comes from the LXX.}\]

\[\text{Job 40 32bc}\]

\[\text{HT} \quad \text{זְכֹר מִלְחָמָה סַף: אַל־תּוֹ}\]

\[\text{LXX} \quad \text{μνησθεὶς πόλεμον τὸν γινόμενον ἐν σώματι αὐτοῦ,}\]
\[\text{kai µηκέτι γινέσθω.}\]

\[\alpha' \quad \text{μνήσθητι πολέμου, µὴ προσθῆκης}\]

\[\text{Wit1: } 248 \downarrow 252\]

\[\text{Attr: } \alpha' ] \sigma' 252\]
Chapter 41

Job 41 1a
HT  הָרְדֵּה הָלָה הָכֹוָה
LXX  οὐχ ἔσκακα καταν

\[\theta'\]  ἰδοὺ ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ διεψεύσατο

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI-732 cII 555 ↓252
Attr:  \(\theta'\) C (= 788) cI-732 cII 555] σ' 252; > C (= 250 3005)
Var:  διεψεύσατο] > 252

Notes:  Ms 788 is the first C ms to preserve the correct attribution to Th. The Edition has two fragments, one for Sym based on 252, and the other for Th based on the catena. The Kollationen viewed these two fragments as one, since it is the same fragment with a confusion of attribution (Kollationen, 278).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 370; AGK 3, 351; Nic, 583).

α'  ἰδοὺ ἡ προσδοκία αὐτοῦ διαψεύσεται

Wit1:  252

Notes:  Ziegler notes that προσδοκία for הָלָה is suspect, since Aq typically uses καραδοκία and derivatives for translation equivalents (Beiträge, 63). Sym, however, has a preference for προσδοκία (5x) and προσδοκεῖν (18x) and the lemma may very well have come from him, but it is also possible that προσδοκία was written for καραδοκία (Beiträge, 63).

Job 41 1b
HT  הָרְדֵּה הָלָה הָכֹוָה
LXX  οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις τεθαύμακας

\[\sigma'\]  ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἰδέαν αὐτοῦ καταβαλεῖ

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732 cII 555

396
Attr: \( \sigma' > C = (250) \)

Var: \( \ldots > C \)

Notes: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 370; AGK 3, 351; Nic, 583-4).

Job 41 2a
HT
לֹא־אַכְזָרִי כִּיּוּרֶנּוּ
LXX
οὐ δέδοικας ὅτι ἤποιμασταί μοι;

\( \alpha' \theta' \)

\( \text{où μὴ ἀσπλαγχνίσω, ὅταν ἔξεγείρω αὐτὸν} \)

Wit1:
\( \downarrow C = (788-250 3005) \downarrow \text{cf-732 } \downarrow \text{II-555} \)

Attr: \( \alpha' \theta' \) \( \alpha' \theta' \) \( \sigma' \) \( = 139 \); \( \lambda' \) \( 512-513 555 \); > \( C = (250) \)

Var: \( \text{où } C = (788-250 3005) \) \( \text{oùδέ } 255 559 612 740 512-513 555 \); \( \text{oùδ' } 137 139 260 395 643 680 3006 \) \( \text{ἀσπλαγχνίσω} \) –νησω \( C = (788-250) 137 139 260 643 3006 \) \( \text{ἐξεγ. / αὐ. } \) \( \text{tr } C = (788-250) \)

Notes: The agreement of 250 and 3005 shows that \( \text{où } \) rather than \( \text{oùδέ } \) (and accordingly \( \text{oùδ' } \) \( \text{où} \)) is the original text for the catena (Nachlese, 410). Ms 788 confirms that this reading is part of the oldest Greek catena. The variant, \( \text{oùδέ } \), represents a corruption from the LXX (\( \text{où δέδοι. } \)). The root of the first verb, which is attested only here, must have been \( \text{ἀσπλαγχνίζομαι } \), not \( \text{ἀσπλαγχνέομαι } \) because of the parallel formation \( \text{εὐσπλαγχνίζομαι} \) (Nachlese, 410; cf. Lampe s.v. \( \text{εὐσπλαγχνίζομαι} \)).

Job 41 4
HT
♭ךְָשַּׁר הֲנָּחָרָה רְבִי
E
\( \text{où σιωπήσομαι δι’ αὐτόν, καὶ λόγον δυνάμεως ἐλεήσει τὸν ἵσον αὐτοῦ.} \)

\( \theta' \)

Sub ※

Wit1:
\( C = (788) \text{cf-} 138 680 732 3006 248 \text{Arm La Sa Syh} \)

Attr: \( \theta' \) (\( \text{εκ } \theta' \) \( \text{οἱ } \) \( \beta \) 740 255 612 559 395 137 643 139; \( \text{εκ } \text{Θεοδοτιωνὸς } \) \( \text{οἱ } \) \( \text{δύο } \) \( \text{οἱ τοὺς ἀστερίσκους } \) ἔχοντες 260) \( \text{Syh} \) > rel
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Job 41 4a
HT
E

α’ 

περὶ αὐτοῦ 

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 137 260 643 3006 cII 555
Attr: α’] > C (= 250) 559
Notes: Nic has absorbed this fragment into its commentary (Nic, 584).

Job 41 4b
HT
E

σ’ 

λόγος δὲ κἂν ὁ δυνατώτατος

Wit1: lemma] ↓C (= 788-250 3005) Syh [λόγος δὲ ἱκανοῦ ἀδιάπτωτος] 252
Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250)
NonGr: Syh
Notes: The Greek wording for this fragment was cited for the first time in
Ziegler’s Beiträge, and therefore Field’s retroversion of Syh was shown to be invalid
(Nachlese, 410; Beiträge, 48; Field, 78). Ms 788 confirms the Greek wording, but it does
not preserve the attribution. The reading of 252 does not align with HT, and it is doubtful whether it belongs to Sym, given the evidence of C and Syh.

HT

E

(καὶ λόγον δυνάμεως) ἔλεησε τὸν ἴσον αὐτοῦ.

α’

δωρήσεται τάξει αὐτοῦ

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-732

Attr: α’) σ’ 559; > C (= 250) 740

Var: αὐτοῦ] εαυτου 680

Notes: Ms 788 also preserves the attribution to Aq, while is absent from 250.

Job 41 5a

LXX

τίς ἀπελέπισεν ἐπιφάνειαν ἐνδύματος αὐτοῦ;

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005)

Attr: σ’] > C (= 250)

Var: ἀπελέπισεν] απελπισεν C (= 788-250)

Notes: The Symmachus version has been overlooked until now, since in 250 it has no author attribution (Nachlese, 410). Ms 788 confirms the attribution to Sym. The rare word, ἀπολεπίζω “to peel,” is found in the LXX only twice in the Book of Tobit (11:8,13) (Nachlese, 410).

Job 41 5b

LXX

εἰς δὲ πτύξιν θώρακος αὐτοῦ τίς ἄν εἰσέλθῃ;

σ’

εἰς υποδύσει φολίδος αὐτοῦ τίς υποδύσει
Notes: The word φολίς is difficult to explain and probably indicates that Sym read סִרְיוֹנוֹ “his coat of armor,” which is a deviation from the HT (רִסְנוֹ), due to metathesis of ס and ר and confusion of sibilants (Beiträge, 48-9; HALOT, s.v. סִרְיוֹן and טָרִים). The Three translate סִרְיוֹן with χαλίνος, and טָרִים is always rendered with θώραξ in the LXX (10x; Beiträge, 48-9).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 371; AGK 3, 354-5; Nic, 586).

Job 41 6a
HT דַּלְתֵי (פָנָיו מִי פִתֵּחַ)
LXX πύλας (προσώπου αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνοίξει;)

θυρας

Notes: The variant arose probably because of graphemic similarity between Ο and Θ (Edition, 404).

Job 41 6b
HT סִיבִּרְבָּה שְׁרָקִים (אֲרוֹמָה)
LXX κύκλῳ ὀδόντων (αὐτοῦ φόβος.)

θερας

Notes: The word φολίς is difficult to explain and probably indicates that Sym read סִרְיוֹנוֹ “his coat of armor,” which is a deviation from the HT (רִסְנוֹ), due to metathesis of ס and ר and confusion of sibilants (Beiträge, 48-9; HALOT, s.v. סִרְיוֹן and טָרִים). The Three translate סִרְיוֹן with χαλίνος, and טָרִים is always rendered with θώραξ in the LXX (10x; Beiträge, 48-9).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 371; AGK 3, 354-5; Nic, 586).
Notes: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 371-2; AGK 3, 356-7; Nic, 587).

Job 41 7a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>נָאַ֖ה אַפִּ֣יקֵי מָגִ֥נִּים</td>
<td>τὰ ἐγκατὰ αὐτοῦ ἀστίδες χάλκειαι,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

α’ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ὑπερεκχυσὶς θυρεῶν

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cl II 555 ↓ 161'
Attr: α’] σ’ 395; > C (= 250)

Notes: The variant ὑπερεκχυσὶς in 248 395 agrees with the HT in the plural number. Cant. 5:12 preserves an Aq fragment for ἐκχυσής, and there Aq has the plural ἔκχυσεις on the testimony of 161-248 (Ceulemans, 440; see also Aq Isa 8:7 for the same Greek lemma for a plural in the HT). Although these factors are important, they are not conclusive. Ms 395 shows that -εις is a variant of the original version -ις and this variant has influenced 248. The translation data is not conclusive because the contexts are different. In Cant 5:12 the word in question occurs as the object of a preposition. In Job 41:7a the word in question is the predicate nominative of a singular subject.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 372; AGK 3, 357; Nic, 587). Perhaps Aq has influenced the exegesis of 7b in the commentary of Olymp: σύνδεσμος ὅλον τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (Kommentar, 372; AGK 3, 358).

σ’ ὑπερφρονεῖ προερχόμενος ἐν θυρεοῖς

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓ cl II 555 161
Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250)
Var: ὑπερφρονεῖ] αφρονεῖν 555 | θυρεοῖς] θυραιοὶς C (= 788-250 3005)
255 559 612
Notes: The patristic attribution to Olym in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 372; AGK 3, 357; Nic, 587).

Job 41 7b

HT  תם בּרֵא
LXX σύνδεσμος δὲ αὐτοῦ ὡσπερ σμιρίς λίθος.

\[\langle \alpha' \rangle \] ἀποκλείστου σφαγίς στενή

Wit1: 248
Attr: \( \alpha' \) > 248 cod
Var: σφαγίς cod

Notes: Aq uses ἀποκλείστον for גוגְּר in Job 28:15. He uses σφραγίς for בּר in Gen 38:18 and Ezek 28:12. He uses στενός for צַר in Isa 59:19. The attribution must remain plausible in the absence of explicit witness to the attribution.

Job 41 8a

HT  יָדָךְ בַּיָּדָךְ יְגַשּׁו
E  eĩς τοῦ ἕνος κολλῶνται,

\( \theta' \)  Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788) cl138 680 248 La Sa Syh\textsuperscript{txt} Pris
Attr: \( \theta' \) (788 740 612 559 395 3006 137 643 139; ἐκ θεοδοτίωνος οἱ δύο 260) Syh\textsuperscript{txt} | rel
Var: lemma| om Sa Pris | 8a sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 395 137 260(+ 8b) 643 732 139 248(+ 8b) La(+ 8b) Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{txt}  unus uni ※ adhaeret, et spiritus non pertransibit eum

\( \alpha' \)  ἕĩς τῶ ἐνὶ προσεγγίσουσιν

Wit1: 252
Notes: In 252 this lemma and Sym’s lemma at 8b are next to v. 8 and are under α’ σ’ as follows: εἴς τὸ ἑνὶ προσεγγίσουσιν, καὶ διάστημα οὐκ ἔσται. The readings are clearly divided by the point and a wider space between προσεγγίσουσιν and καὶ in the ms.

Job 41 8b
HT

Job 41 9
HT

Notes: Ziegler believes that Aq read רֶוַח “width,” space,” for he would have used πνεῦμα as the LXX, if he had read רוּחַ (Beiträge, 49). This occurrence is the only usage of ανάπνοια in Aq, but this suggestion is probably correct. Sym read the consonants with the same vocalization as Aq, since Gen 32:17 shows that διάστημα renders רוּחַ in the LXX (Beiträge, 49).

Job 41 9
HT
Job 41 9a

HT

יאשאכברוהרהרבק

E

אִישׁ־בְּאָחִיוּ יְדֻבָּקוּ

Job 41 10a

HT

שֻׁメールהַר לָה֯ אָרָו

LXX

ἐν πταρμῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπιφαύσκεται φέγγος,
Notes: The full lemma in 248 has been considered to be the original text, since it follows the HT or at least Aq’s Hebrew Vorlage closely (חנוך; cp. the singular pronoun in LXX, Vulg. Targ.; see Dhorme, 635).

The Nachlese says, “that 3005 assigns to Aquila the fixed words φέγγος πυρός, which were otherwise anonymous in the catena, raises the certainty that it is a relevant component of the same designation, which we also detect in 248” (Nachlese, 410). The Nachlese suggests that one reexamine once more Ziegler’s argument that the version belongs to Sym (Nachlese, 410). Now, we add the evidence of ms 788 to support the attribution to Aq, which means that the oldest Greek catena probably had the attribution to Aq.

At the beginning of his argument Ziegler says that πταρμός could be authentic, but then he writes that the version cannot come from Aq for the following reasons: (1) Aq has never translated tahael 'or with φέγγος πυρός and (2) Aq would have certainly rendered 'or with φῶς (Beiträge, 63-4). In light of these considerations, he posits Sym as the probable author of the fragment (Beiträge, 64). There are two problems with Ziegler’s reconstruction: (1) the verb I הַלָּל Hi occurs only three times in the HT (Isa 13:10; Job 29:3, 41:10) and has אוֹר as its subject in Isa 13:10 and Job 41:10. There are no instances of a noun derived from this root (see HALOT ?II הַלָּל, which concludes that the word in Hab 3:3 is I הַלָּל “praise”). No hexaplaric evidence for the words in question is available for Isa 13:10; although, there is relevant evidence at Job 29:3 (Sym renders I הַלָּל with λάμπειν); therefore, at present there is no evidence to show that Aq has translated tahael 'or with φέγγος πυρός, since there are no relevant analogues. (2) Although it is correct that Aq usually translates אוֹר with φῶς, perhaps the rare Hebrew word combined with אוֹר has caused him to alter his usual approach. Ziegler’s proposal for Sym is not satisfactory because it does not account for Job 29:3, where Sym uses λάμπειν to render I הַלָּל Hi. This piece of evidence stands contrary to Ziegler’s proposal. In the final analysis, the evidence of C (= 788 3005) 248 is sufficient to establish the attribution to Aq.

Ziegler treated this fragment as an anonymous scholion (Edition, II App 404; Beiträge, 81), but now it should be considered as part of the hexaplaric tradition which is in the catena of Job.

Job 41 10b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(יִשְׁתַּחַר)</td>
<td>(οἱ δὲ ὄφθαλμοι αὐτοῦ)—(εἴδος ἐξωσφόρου.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda' \quad \omega' \]

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI-137 138 139 260 643 680 732 3006

Notes: In ms 3005 the index is over εἴδος, which does not necessarily indicate a substitution for the LXX lemma, but it shows the reading of \( \lambda' \) belongs close to this word. Ms 788 has the index between αὐτοῦ and εἴδος, which perhaps shows that the marginal
note is not intended to supply a substitution for the LXX lemma. Comparison with the HT and the index in 3005 and 788 provide sufficient evidence to place this fragment in its proper place.

Ziegler clarifies that the full lemma in Field (ὡς εἶδος ἑωσφόρου) is incorrect, since the mss have noted only λʹ ως (= M), and εἶδος ἑωσφόρου is the LXX text and has nothing to do with the Three (Beiträge, 64).

Job 41 11a

| HT | (טִמְרוּ לֵפְרִים) — (ירֵכְנוּ) |
| LXX | (אֶקֶּפֶּן מַלְאָכָן אֲשֶׁר קאֹּרִים וְרֹכְשֵׁי עֵדָהָּ) קאֹּרְנְב֫ |

Sub ÷

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh ÷

Notes: The Syh marked the participle with an obelus since it was absent in the HT.

Job 41 11b

| HT | (כָּרֶדֶךְ אֱשֶׁר יִהְנָכָה) |
| LXX | (מָאָרְבַּל אֲשֶׁר לֹא קאֹּנְם וְרֹכְשֵׁי עֵדָהָּ) |

λ′ δαλοί

Wit1: C (= 3005) cI-138 260 680 732 740 ↓ 248

Attr: λ′ α′ 248

Job 41 13a

| HT | (נָשִּׁים שַׁלְחָן) |
| LXX | (יִשְׁתַּקֵּם אִשֵּׁים וְרֹכְשֵׁי עֵדָהָּ) |

σ′ θ′ φλέξει

Wit1: Syh

Wit2: ανθρακες[ ανθρακες(κς V) φλέξει La V-637-Iul Dam II 1405 = M

NonGr: Syh DoubleClick.κ.κ.
Notes: The index is at the end of the line after "coals." The index marks where the verb appears in the HT, showing where Sym and Th add it. This fragment has influenced La and some witnesses of the Lucianic text.

Job 41 14b
HT
��סניוות חוורית (דרשבה)
LXX
(ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ τρέχει) ἀπώλεια.

Notes:  Aq translates the verb דאבון with ἐκλιμώσσειν in Deut 28:65.

Job 41 15b
HT
נוצרו שכילר ביכירموت:
E
καταστεί ἔπ’ αὐτόν, οὐ σαλευθήσεται.

Notes: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 376; AGK 3, 364-5; Nic, 592).
Job 41 17a

תְּהֹּקְוָ יָגוּרָו אֵלִים

στραφέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ φόβος θηρίοις τετράποσιν ἐπὶ γῆς ἄλλομένοις.

υπὸ τῆς κινήσεως αὐτοῦ εὕλαβηθήσονται ἰσχυροὶ

Attr: σ'] > C (= 250)

Var: υπὸ] απὸ 512-513 | κινήσεως] σκηνεως 138; κηνισεως 3006

Notes: Ziegler notes that Aq translates אֵלִים with ἰσχυροὶ at Isa 1:29 and the Three do the same at Isa 6:13 (Beiträge, 49; see infra).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 376; AGK 3, 365; Nic, 593).

Job 41 18a

καταβαλοῦσα αὐτὸν μάχαιρα οὐχ ὑποστήσεται

Attr: σ'] > C (= 250)

Notes: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 376-7; AGK 3, 366-7; Nic, 594). Perhaps there is detection of Sym’s influence on the exegesis of Olymp, since he uses the phrase καταβάλωσιν αὐτόν in his explanation of verse 18a (Kommentar, 376-7; AGK 3, 366-7).

Job 41 18b

HT

E δόρυ ἐπηρμένον καὶ θώρακα.

θ’ Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788) cI-138 260 [612] [680] [732] 248 Arm La Sa

Attr: θ’ 788 740] > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa | 18b sub ※ 788 740 255 559(mend 18b-19) 395 3006 137 643 139 248 Arm La

NonGr: La ※ hastae elatio et thoracis (+ β)

Arm ※ qτύρι ὑπεριμωρ

Notes: Ms 788 confirms that the attribution and asterisk were part of the oldest Greek catena.

σ’ οὐδὲ λόγχης ἄρσις καὶ θώρακος

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-[612] [680] 732 cII 555 161

Attr: σ’] > C (= 250) 395

Var: λόγχης] ὀλογχης 139 | ἄρσις] ἄρσης 559; ἄρσης 3006

Notes: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 376-7; AGK 3, 366-7; Nic, 594).

Job 41 19a

HT נחש (ברזיל)
LXX (ἤγηται μὲν γὰρ σίδηρον)—(ἄχυρα,)

α’ θ’ εἰς


Var: εἰς] + αχυρα C (= 3005); pr ※ 788 740 255

σ’ ὡς

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cIT-138 260 [612] [680]

Var: ὡς] + αχυρα C (= 3005) 139; pr ※ 788 740 255

Job 41 20a

HT לֹא־יַבְרִיחֶנּוּ בֶן־קָשֶׁת

LXX οὐ μὴ τρώσῃ αὐτὸν τόξον χάλκειον,

σ’ οὐ φυγαδεύσει αὐτὸν ἀνὴρ τοξότης

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cIT-260 [612] [680] 732 161

Attr: σ’] > C (= 788-250 3005) 139 395 643

Var: οὐ] > 139 643 3006 | φυγαδεύσει] -δευσι C (= 788-250); -δευει 740

Notes: Ms 161 has this fragment and attribution also.

Job 41 20b

HT קֵלַקְשׁ קָרָבָּר לָכַּרְפַּרְלָך

LXX (ηγηται μὲν) πετροβόλον (χόρτον·)

λ’ λίθους σφενδόνης

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cIT-137 139 260 [612] 643 [680] 732 3006 cII 555 161

Attr: λ’] > 395

Var: λίθους] λιθου 138-255 740

410
Notes: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 376-7; AGK 3, 366-7; Nic, 594). Perhaps, the Three have influenced the exegesis of Olymp, since he uses σφενδόνη to explain πετροβόλον in verse 20b (Kommentar, 376-7; AGK 3, 366-7).

Job 41 21a

HT כֻּכְקְשׁ נְכָשְׁבָּה תִּרְחָה
E ως καλάμη ἐλογίσθησαν σφῦραι,

α’S θ’S Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788) cf. 260 [612] [680] 732 3006 Arm Sa Pris

Attr: α’S θ’S 788 740 255 559 395 137 643] > rel

Var: lemma] om Sa Pris | 21a sub ※ 788 740 255 559 395 137 643 Arm

NonGr: Arm ※ ܒܝܚܢܐ ܩܝܢܝܐ. ܣܝܒܐ ܠܗ̣ חܫ ܐܪܙܦܬܐراتيج

Notes: The Edition lists the fragment: καλάμη] α’S θ’S χόρτος 255. This entry has been added erroneously due to misreading 255. The double attribution to Aq and Th is in the left margin to the left of the asterisk, which is also to the left of the word in the bible text χόρτον. In 255, the asterisk and attribution are often placed above the first letter of the line that is under the asterisk, and this instance is not an exception to the pattern. Ms 255 has 21a under the asterisk; therefore, this entry should be taken out of the hexaplaric corpus. The Beiträge analyzes this fragment as if it is genuinely a hexaplaric fragment (Beiträge, 64). The Kollationen, however, sees that χόρτον is in a completely normal place in v. 20b (only on a separate line), and that the attribution applies to the whole of verse 21a (Kollationen, 286).

σ’S ως καλάμη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῶ σφῦρα

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversion is from Field (Field, 79, n. 34).

Job 41 21b

HT יְרֵשָׁהוּ(לְרַעַשׁ כִּידוֹ)
LXX  (καταγελᾷ δὲ) σεισμοῦ πυρφόρου.

σ′  σειομένου θυρεοῦ

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 138 260 [612] [680] 732 ↓cII ↓555 ↓161′
Attr:  σ′ C (= 788-250 3005) 248] > rel
Var:  θυρεοῦ] θυραιου C (= 788-250 3005)

Notes:  Both C mss (thus 250 as well, which was not previously listed) agree with 248 in the attribution to Symmachus (Nachlese, 410). Ms 788 also supports the attribution to Sym.

HT  (יוֹרֵשׁ לְרַעַשׁ)
LXX  (καταγελᾷ δὲ σεισμοῦ) πυρφόρου.

α′  ἀσπίδος

Wit1:  248

Job 41 22a
HT  חַדּוּדֵי חָרֶשׂ (תַּחְתָּיו)
LXX  (ἡ στρωμνὴ αὐτοῦ) ὀβελίσκοι ὀξεῖς,

θ′  σιδήρια τέκτονος

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI 138-255 740 cII 555 161
Attr:  θ′ C (= 788) 138-255 740 cII 555 161] α′ C (= 3005); σ′ 137 139 260 643 559; > C (= 250) 395 3006
Var:  σιδήρια] σιδηρα C (= 3005) 139 | τέκτονος] τεγυτονος 138; τεκτονας 643

Notes:  The authorship of this fragment is difficult to determine because the manuscript evidence is divided and the HT contains a hapax legomenon (חַדּוּדֵי); therefore, translation equivalents cannot decide the question. Each of the Three uses τέκτων to render שֶׁרֶשׁ “worker.” Aq favors ὀστρακόν for שֶׁרֶשׁ, but Aq, Th, and Sym use this word in Ezek 23:34 (see infra). The new evidence of 788 favors the correctness of the attribution to Th, since now it and the best witnesses of the cI group have the Th attribution.
The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 377; AGK 3, 367; Nic, 595).

\[ \alpha' \quad \sigma\acute{\zeta}v\upsilon\nu\tau\eta\varsigma\varsigma\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\varsigma \delta\sigma\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}k\varsigma\nu\nu \]

\textit{Wit1:} \quad cII-555 248

\textit{Notes:} Given that 788 attributes the above fragment to Th, this fragment can now be more probably attributed to Aq on the basis of 248.

Job 41 23a

| HT | (כַּסִּיר מְצוּלָה) יַרְתִּיחַ |
| LXX | \(\text{ἀναζεῖ} (τὴν \, \overset{\text{τὴν}}{\text{ἀβυσσον}} \overset{\text{όσπερ}}{\text{χαλκίον}},)\) |

\[ \alpha' \quad \kappa\alpha\chi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\varepsilon\iota \]

\textit{Wit1:} \quad \downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI-[612][680] \downarrow cII 555 161

\textit{Attr:} \quad \alpha' > C (= 250)

\textit{Var:} \quad \kappa\alpha\chi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\varepsilon C (= 788-250) 137 138-255 395 559 740 3006 cII 555 161]

\textit{Notes:} The C witnesses are divided between the future and present tense, while the best cI mss favor the future tense over the present. In addition, Aq translates the Hebrew prefix forms with the Greek future frequently, but if the prefix form has a frequentative or gnomic sense, he does use the Greek present to translate it (Hyvärinen, 65). With the new evidence of 788, the external evidence and the probability of translation technique favor the lemma. Furthermore, the present tense could be considered a harmonization to LXX.

Job 41 23b

| HT | (רָמֶרֶץ) |
| LXX | (ἡγηται δὲ τὴν θάλασσαν) ωςπερ ἔξαλειπτρον, |

\[ \alpha' \quad \omicron\varsigma \mu\nu\rho\epsilon\psi\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\vartheta\iota\rho\iota\nu\nu \]

\textit{Wit1:} \quad \downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI-[612][680] 732 \downarrow cII-512-513 \downarrow 555 \downarrow 161'

\textit{Attr:} \quad \alpha' > C (= 250) 138
Var:  ὡς 248] > rel

Notes:  The word, ὡς, is an equivalent to ὦ in HT, and therefore should be considered original.

σʹ  ὡς ἀναβρασσομένην ἄρτυσιν

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-139 [612] [680] 732 cII-512-513 555 161′
Attr:  σʹ] > C (= 250)
Var:  ὡς] > C (= 3005) | ἀναβρασσομένην] -μενων 643

Job 41 24b
HT ἡθοπόθοι Ληστρῆς
E ἐλογίσατο ἄβυσσον εἰς περίπατον.

θʹ  Sub ※

Wit1:  C (= 788) cI-138 260 395 [680] 3006 La Sa Syh⁴xt Pris
Attr:  θʹ 788 740 255 612 559 643 732] > rel
Var:  lemma] om Sa Pris | 24b sub ※ 788 740 255 612 559 643 732 La Syh⁴xt
NonGr:  Syh⁴xt  ❌ סֹּךְ לִכְחָמָה לְחָמָה
La  ※ computavit abyssum quasi in deambulacrum ✓

Job 41 25a
HT Σαρδουδεῖον Μεσσῆλι
LXX οὐκ ἐστιν οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὁμοίων αὐτοῦ

σʹ  οὐκ ἐστιν ἐπὶ χοὸς ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) cI-139 [680] 732 cII 555
Attr:  σʹ] > C (= 250)
Notes: The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 378; AGK 3, 369; Nic, 596).

Job 41 25b
HT  הָעָשׂוּ לִבְלִי־חָת׃
E  (πεποιημένον ἐγκαταπαίζεσθαι) ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων μου.

Sub ÷

Wit1:  cI (= 740 612 559 395) Syh
Var:  25b sub ÷ 740 612 559(θ' pro ÷) 395 Syh
NonGr:  δܝܠܝ, ↓ ܟܐ ܕܥܒܝܕ ሣܚܟܘ ܡܢ ܡܠܡܬܓ

Notes: The evidence of Syh preserves a variant of the original, which the cI group preserves.

Job 41 26a
HT  אֵת־כָּל־גָּבֹהַּ יִרְאֶה
LXX  πᾶν ὑψηλὸν ὁρᾷ,

θ'  πάντα υπερήφανον ἐμβλέψεται

Wit1:  ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI (680) cII 555 161
Attr:  θ' > C (= 250)
Var:  υπερήφανον] υπεριφανον 138 | ἐμβλέψεται] ὀρα 3006

Notes: The longer reading in Klostermann (ὅλος γὰρ ἐστιν υπερηφανίας μηδὲν ταπεινὸν λογιζόμενος; Nic, 596) is not part of Th, but is a scholion from the commentary of Olymp (see Klostermann, 74; Kommentar, 379; AGK 3, 370; Nic, 596; Beiträge, 49).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 379; AGK 3, 370; Nic, 596).

Job 41 26b
HT  מֶלֶךְ אֲלֵהוֹן
LXX  (ἀυτὸς δὲ βασιλεὺς) πάντων τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν.

α'  ἐπὶ πάντας υἱοὺς βασιλείας
Notes: There is no variant for the attribution, since both Aq and Th use this preposition (see Th infra). Syh places the index after \( \text{ἐπὶ} \) “king,” which indicates that the preposition should be inserted after this word. Furthermore, this word order also accords with HT.

\[ \theta' \quad \text{ἐπὶ πάντων υἱῶν βαναυσίας} \]

Notes: This fragment has been reconstructed from Syh and 3005. The Edition has \( \text{πάντων} \) in angle brackets, indicating that there is no textual witness for this word, but 3005 actually contains it (Kollationen, 288).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 379-80; AGK 3, 370-1; Nic, 596).

\[ \sigma' \quad \text{παντὸς βρωμώδους} \]

Notes: The majority of the tradition favors the variant \( \deltaρομώδους \), but this word is unattested in Greek.\(^{13}\) The word would be derived from the root \(*δρομ- \) “race,”

\(^{13}\)TLG [on-line]; 9 August 2011; available from http://ezproxy.sbts.edu:2319/inst/textsearch;
“speed” and has the –ωδες derivational morpheme, which is usually added to nouns to form adjectives which denote “fullness” or “similarity” (Smyth, § 858.16). If this analysis is correct, then the term may denote a quick-like or rapid-like object. With the addition of 788 to the evidence, the lemma is now more firmly established. LSJ notes that βρωμώδης is frequently read for βρομώδης (s.v. βρομώδης), and thus both orthographies are attested.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 379-80; AGK 3, 370-1; Nic, 596).

Internet. It is also not listed in Ἐπιτομὴ λεξικοῦ Κριαρᾶ [on-line]; accessed 18 February 2012; available from http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/medieval_greek/kriaras/index.html; Internet.
Chapter 42

Job 42 2b

HT

וְלֹא־יִבָּצֵר מִמְּךָ מְזִמָּה׃

LXX

ἀδυνατεῖ δέ σοι οὐθέν.

\(\theta'\)

καὶ ὄνκ ἀφαιρεθῆσεται ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐνθύμημα

\textit{Wit1:} \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI-139 \downarrow 260 \downarrow cII \downarrow 555 \downarrow 161\)

\textit{Attr:} \(\theta' C (= 788 3005) \uparrow \lambda \uparrow 161; \text{oī ἀλλοὶ } cII 555; > C (= 250) cI-139 \downarrow 260 \downarrow \)

\textit{Var:} ἐνθύμημα ἐνθυμημα 138

\textit{Notes:} Ms 3005 is the first witness to provide an author for this fragment (Nachlese, 410). Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Th is part of the oldest Greek catena.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 382; AGK, 374-5; Nic, 598).

Job 42 3b

HT

ј

LXX

φειδόμενος δὲ ῥημάτων καὶ σὲ οἴεται κρύπτειν;

\(\sigma'\)

ἐγνων, διὰ τοῦτο ἐλάλησα ἀνοήτως

\textit{Wit1:} 248

\textit{Notes:} There is most probably an ellipsis of ὄνκ at the beginning of this fragment, given the lemma of the HT (Field cites Montef, 80 n.2). Field suggests that ἀνοήτως may render ἐγνων ἐν, based on the evidence of Job 35:16b, but I have established that ἀνοήτος is a variant for ἀναίσθητος in that verse. Furthermore, Field recognized that this suggestion would result in the reading: ἀνοήτως; διὰ τ. ἐλάλησα ἄ ὄνκ ἐγνων (Field, 80 n.2), which is not a probable solution. Montef most probably arrived at the correct solution to this problem.

Job 42 3d

HT

—

LXX

μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ ἁ ὄνκ ἐπιστάμην;
Sub ÷

Wit1:  C (= 3005) cl⁻¹₃⁹ 260 643 [680] 732 3006 La Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

Var:  3d sub ÷ 3005(※ pro ÷) 740 138-255 612 559 395 []137 La Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

NonGr:  Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

Notes:  This line is in the HT (תנִפְלָאוֹ מִמֶּנִּי וְלֹא אֵדָע׃), but the LXX contains a very dynamic translation of it, which probably prompted Origen to place it under the obelus.

Job 42 4a

HT  שְׁמַע־נָא וְאָנֹכִי אֲדַבֵּר

LXX  ἀκοήν δὲ (μου, κύριε, ἵνα κἀγὼ λαλήσω·)

Sub ÷

Wit1:  Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

NonGr:  Syh\textsuperscript{txt}

Notes:  The Edition did not note this instance of the obelus in Syh.

Job 42 5a

HT  צְמַעְתִּיךָ (לְשֵׁמַע־אֹזֶן)

LXX  ἀκοὴν μὲν ὠτὸς ἠκούόν σου (τὸ πρότερον,)

\(\lambda '\quad \sigma ε\)

Wit1:  cl⁻¹₆⁸⁰(= 255 612) ↓cII ↓555 ↓161\textsuperscript{mg}

Attr:  \(\lambda '\) > 161\textsuperscript{mg}

Var:  σε] pr ηκουον cII 555

Notes:  The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 383; AGK 3, 376-7; Nic, 599).
Job 42 6a

HT

וְנִיחַמְתִּי (וניחמתי)

LXX
dio ἐφαύλισα ἐμαυτὸν (καὶ ἐτάκην,)

σʹ
diá toû to katégnwv émautoû

Wit1:  \( \downarrow C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \downarrow cI-260 \ 559 \) \[680\]

Attr:  σʹ] > C (= 250)

Var:  katégnwv] kategyno 732 | émautoû] emauton 732

Job 42 6b

HT

גֹּהָמִית שְׁלֵשֶׁר גָּפֵר

LXX

ἡγημαὶ δὲ ἐμαυτὸν γῆν καὶ σποδὸν.

αʹ
cai παρεκλήθην ἐπὶ χοὶ καὶ σποδῶ

Wit1:  248

Job 42 7b

HT

ハウス אפר בְּכֵן בֵּשֵׁכֵּר רַעְשֶׁר

LXX

"Ημαρτες σὺ καὶ οἱ δύο φίλοι σου.

σʹ

ὀργίσθη ἡ θυμός μου σοὶ καὶ τοῖς δυσὶν ἑταῖροις σου

Wit1:  248

θʹ

ἐθυμώθη ἡ ὀργή μου ἐν σοι καὶ ἐν τοῖς δυσι φίλοις σου

Wit1:  \( \downarrow C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \downarrow cI-\[680\] 732 \ cII-[555] 161 \)

Attr:  θʹ C (= 788) cI-138\[680\] 732 cII-[555] 161] σʹ 138; > C (= 250 3005)

Notes: Ms 788 is the first C ms to preserve the attribution to Th. In 139 the complete fragment cannot be seen due to a crease at the edge of the folio (255v; Kollationen, 290). The μου appears as μ at the end of the first line. The τοῖς is clearly seen at the end of the second line, and φι appears below τοῖς. Unless δυσί was written after τοῖς, there may not be space for it, but this conclusion remains speculative. The definite article was omitted due to haplography of the η of the verb termination.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 385-6; AGK 3, 382-3; Nic, 601).

Job 42 7c

HT (כִּי לֹא דִבַּרְתֶּם אֵלַי)

LXX (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε ἐνώπιόν μου ἀληθές) οὐδὲν

Sub 郢

Wit1: Syh²

Wit2: οὐδὲν > Iul

NonGr: Syh²

HT (כִּי לֹא דִבַּרְתֶּם אֵלַי)

LXX (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε ἐνώπιόν μου ἀληθές (οὐδὲν)

ζ' εὐθύτητα

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) cI 137 139 260 643 [680] 732 3006 ↓ cII [555] ↓ 161

Attr: ζ'] > C (= 250)

Var: εὐθύτητα] pr οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε cII [555] 161

Notes: The words οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε, which precede εὐθύτητα only in cII 161 and which were read as the text of all the catena in Field and Ziegler, are taken from the LXX by cII only for the purpose of clarifying the position of the relevant word in the phrase. They have no place in an edition of the minor translator (Nachlese, 411).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 385-6; AGK 3, 382-3; Nic, 601).

σ' ὄρθως
Job 42 8a

HT  לשבעה פרים וشبهע אילים

LXX  νῦν δὲ λάβετε—(ἐπτὰ μόσχους καὶ ἐπτὰ κριοὺς)

σʹ θʹ  ※ ἐαυτοῖς

Wit1:  Syh La

Wit2:  λάβετε] + εαυτοῖς Iul = M; + (※ La) vobis La Co

Attr:  σʹ θʹ] > La

NonGr:  Syh ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܟܘܢ܀  ※ La  ※ vobis

Notes:  The Edition presents the fragment as from Aq and Th erroneously, since Syh preserves the attributions for Sym and Th.

Job 42 8c

HT  והעליהם שלקה (שערכם)

LXX  (καὶ) ποιήσει καρπώσεις (περὶ ὑμῶν·)

αʹ  ἀναβιβάσετε ὁλοκαύτωσιν

Wit1:  ↓248

Var:  ὁλοκαύτωσιν] ὁλοκαυτώματα 248

Notes:  Aq uses ἀναβιβάζειν for נלך Hi (Reider, 16). Although Aq uses both ὁλοκαύτωμα and ὁλοκαύτωσις for נלך (Reider, 171), probably the catena has preserved the correct direct object for both Aq and Th (see infra), since the form is singular, which agrees with HT.

422
α’ θ’ ὀλοκαύτωσιν

*Wit1*: $C (= 788-250 3005) \text{c}I^{137} 139 260 395 643 [680] 732 3006 \text{cII} \downarrow 555 \downarrow 161$

*Attr*: α’ θ’] α’ 161

*Var*: ὀλοκαύτωσιν] ὀλοκαυτωματά 555

*Notes*: Ms 161 has confused the attributions by only preserving the attribution to Aq here and then assigning ἀναφοράν to Th (see *infra*). The variant in 555 agrees with 248, and therefore suggests that 248 had contact with *cII* (see *supra*).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (Kommentar, 386; AGK 3, 384-5; Nic, 602).

ο’ ἀναφοράν

*Wit1*: $\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \text{c}I^{137} 139 260 395 643 [680] 732 3006 \text{cII} 555 \downarrow 161$

*Attr*: ο’ θ’ 161; $C (= 250)$

*Notes*: Klostermann had access to 161, and, therefore, he incorrectly attributed this fragment to Th. Ziegler has shown that Sym always renders לָהְעֹ with ἀναφορά (Beiträge, 49; Klostermann, 74).

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the *Edition* is not supported by *Kommentar* or *AGK* but only by Nic (Kommentar, 386; AGK 3, 384-5; Nic, 602).

Job 42 8e

*HT*

καὶ μὴ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ λήμψομαι.

*E*

ότι εἰ μὴ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ λήμψομαι.

θ’ Sub ※

*Wit1*: $C (= 788) \text{c}I^{138} 260 559 [680] 3006 \text{Arm Sa Syh}^{\text{IIX}}$

*Attr*: θ’ 788 740 255 612 395(8d) 137 643 139] > rel

*Var*: lemma] om Sa | 8e sub ※ 788 740 255 612 395(8d) 3006(8f) 137 643 732 139 Arm Syh^{\text{IIX}}
Job 42:8g

HT: (כִּי לֹא דִבַּרְתֶּם אִיּוֹ נְכוֹ אֵלַי)

LXX: (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαλήσατε)—(ἀληθὲς κατὰ τοῦ θεράποντός μου Ἰωβ.)

α’ θ’ πρόσ με

Wit1: Syh

Notes: Ms 3005 supports the attribution which was only known from 250 (Nachlese, 411). Ms 788 also supports the attribution to Sym. Regarding the internal evidence for the attribution to Sym, the comments of Ziegler are also worth noting. One must mistrust the attribution οἱ ἄλλοι, since Aq normally translates נשׂא with αἴρειν (Beiträge, 64).

The Hagedorns draw attention to this fragment because the text history illustrates well how in the course of time more and more information is lost from the catena. In the transfer from C to cl, the author attribution and the conjunction γάρ were already lost. Later the αὐτοῦ disappeared first and in a later stage πρόσωπον also (Nachlese, 411). The Hagedorns’ comment regarding the remnant of the fragment in the Nicetas catena may now be updated moderately based on the evidence of 161 (Nachlese, 411). The evidence of 161 appears in the catena (not the bible text) with the index at 8e as follows: οἱ λοιποὶ· παραδέξομαι. It appears, therefore, that this remnant was part of the catena with the hexaplaric attribution to the λοιποὶ before it was taken from the catena and placed into the lemma with the attribution οἱ ἄλλοι.

The Hagedorns are correct that this fragment has no relevance for Olympiodorus, since there is no evidence for it in Kommentar or AGK but only in Nic (Nachlese, 410; Kommentar, 386; AGK 3, 384-5; Nic, 602).
σ’ ἐπ’ ἐμοῦ

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-395 [680] 732 Syh
Attr: σ’ > C (= 250)
Var: lemma] εμοί 740
NonGr: Syh 𐀜𐀝.𐀢.𐀠.

Notes: There is no variant in Syh since Job 38:12 shows that μετά renders ἐπὶ σοῦ (Field, 80 n. 16).

α’ ὡς ὁ δοῦλός μου Ἰώβ

Wit1: 248

θ’ καθὼς ὁ δοῦλός μου

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cI-680 732
Var: καθὼς] καθος 255 612

Job 42 9a

HT (ἦλθεν Ἀλφάς καὶ Θαυμάτωρ) καὶ Σωφὰρ καὶ Βαλδαδὸ (καὶ Σωφὰρ οἱ Μίναῖοι)
LXX (ἐπερεύθη δὲ Ἐλιφὰς ἀνὰ Ἐλιμώτης καὶ Θαυμάτωρ) οἱ Σαυχίται (καὶ Σωφὰρ οἱ Μίναῖοι)

σ’ ὁ Σωφὰρ
Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) \(\downarrow\)cI^{-138} 139 [612] [680] 732

Var: lemma] ο Ἔωιτς 260

\(\theta'\) ὁ Σωίτης

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) \(\downarrow\)cI^{-139} 260 [612] [680] 732

Attr: θ'] σ' 138

HT οικὴ περὶ ἄρθρου μετὰ τὴν θέσην τοῦ μόνα τοῦ έπεσονς (τὸ νεομηνικὸ)
LXX (ἐπορεύθη δὲ Ἐλιφὰς ὁ Θαιμανίτης καὶ Βαλδὰδ ὁ Σαυχίτης καὶ Σωφὰρ ὁ) Μιναῖος

σ' Ναμαθίτης

Wit1: \(\downarrow\)C (= 788-250 3005) \(\downarrow\)cI^{-260} [612] [680] 732

Attr: σ'] θ' 137; > C (= 250)

Var: lemma] -θήτης 559 3006


\(\theta'\) Νωμαθίτης

Wit1: \(\downarrow\)C (= 788-250 3005) \(\downarrow\)cI^{-139} 260 [612] [680] 732

Attr: θ'] σ' 137

Var: lemma] -θήτης C (= 788) 559 3006; Ναμαθίτης 395

Job 42 9c

HT ονησίων ἕκακος ἐφησάν Αἰρέβ
LXX καὶ ἔλυσεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰωβ.

σ' καὶ προσήκατο ὁ θεὸς τὸ πρόσωπον Ἰωβ

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) \(\downarrow\)cI^{-139} [612] [680] 732 cII 555 161

426
Var: προσήκατο] προσικατο 138

Notes: Sym translates נושא פנים with προσήμι here and in Ps 81(82):2, and he uses the verb in Jer 6:10 for ἱπταμένος. This verb is not found in the LXX; therefore, Schenker, cited in Ziegler, has designated it “an exclusive Symmachian word” (Beiträge, 49-50).

Job 42 10ab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Var</td>
<td>יִהְרִיָה יָבֹא אֶתְשָׁבִיה (שב)</td>
<td>בֵּיתוֹ פָּלִיל בֵּיתוֹ יְרֵשֶׁה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ο’ καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐπέστρεψεν τὴν ἀποστροφὴν τοῦ Ἰωβ ἐν τῷ προσεύξασθαι αὐτὸν περὶ τῶν ἑταίρων αὐτοῦ

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The question of authorship of these fragments is problematic for two reasons: (1) Syh contains two fragments, both attributed to Sym, which is an error. (2) The best witnesses of the catena do not attribute 10bc to Sym but only to Aq and Th (see infra). The best way forward separates the authors of the catena fragment from the Syh fragments, since it is improbable that Aq is the author of the first or second fragments in Syh, for he uses αἰχμαλωσία to render שבית/שיבות (Reider, 8; see esp. Jer 37[30]:16), and this word is the retroversion of Syh יֵתָא, not מֵתֹא (e.g. Syh Am 1:6, 9).

Although the catena does not support Sym as the author of the infinitive clause, the Greek fragment still controls the wording of the Sym fragment. The Syriac temporal construction of the first fragment is used in the second also; therefore, the same retroversion is required for both. Sym, then, has used ἐν τῷ + the inf to render ἃ + inf construct, a strategy he does not employ in the Pentateuch but that he uses in the Psalter occasionally (Salvesen, 229; Busto Saiz, 244ff).

⟨Θ’⟩ κύριος ἐπεστράφη πρὸς μετάνοιαν τήν
διὰ τοῦ Ἰὼβ ἐν τῷ προσεύξασθαι αὐτὸν περὶ τῶν ἑταίρων αὐτοῦ

Wit1: Syh
Attr: ⟨θʹ⟩ σ΄ cod
NonGr: Syh

Notes: This fragment is attributed to Th on the basis of the catena tradition and the fact Aq probably did not author it (see supra).

HT (רָקַח יְהוָה) בְּעַד רֵעֵהוּ בְּהִתְפַּללו
LXX (ὁ δὲ κύριος ηὔξησεν τὸν Ἰὼβ) εὐξαμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ (καὶ περὶ τῶν φίλων)

αʹ θʹ ἐν τῷ προσεύξασθαι αὐτὸν

Wit1: ↓ C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cl-139 [612] [680] 732
Attr: αʹ θʹ C (= 788 3005) 138-255 559 740] σ΄ 395; αʹ C (= 250); σʹ θʹ 137 260 643 3006

Notes: The Edition chose σʹ θʹ as the original attribution, but the best witnesses have the correct αʹ θʹ. Furthermore, 788 shows that its Vorlage had the double attribution to Aq and Th, and therefore, the single attribution to Aq in 250 arose from miscopying.

Job 42 10c
HT (רָקַח יְהוָה)–(אַחֵרֵכִּי אֲשֶׁר לָאֵיךָ לְפָשׁוּת;
LXX (ἐδοκεῖν δὲ ὁ κύριος) διπλά (ὦ σα ἤν ἐμπροσθεν Ἰῳβ εἰς διπλασιασμόν.)

Sub -divider

Wit1: Syh⁹⁵
NonGr: Syh \( \setminus \) διπλά

HT
(רַקַּנִּים רַחַיִּים) (אָחָשְׁר אָשֶׁר לְאִיּוֹ וַיֹּ)

LXX
(ἐδώκεν δὲ ὁ κύριος) διπλά (ὡς ἦν ἐμπροσθεν Ἰωβ εἰς διπλασιασμόν.)

(?) προσθήκην

Wit1: 248

Notes: The index is over διπλά in the ms. The word προσθήκη does not occur in the LXX. Aq uses προσθήκη in Prov 1:9 for ἡ λέῃ “wreath” (Field = Nobil = 248). Sym uses this word in Ezek 27:33 to render ἀγαθόν “merchandise.” Although there is not a corresponding word in HT, it is probable that 248 has preserved a hexaplaric fragment for διπλά.

Job 42 10c
HT
(רַקַּנִּים רַחַיִּים) (לְמִשְׁנֶה)

E
(ἐδώκεν δὲ ὁ κύριος διπλά ὡς ἦν ἐμπροσθεν Ἰωβ) εἰς διπλασιασμόν.

σ’ θ’ Sub ※

Wit1: C (= 788) \( \downarrow \) 248
Wit2: lemma] > La
Attr: σ’ θ’] > 248

Notes: The Edition places these words under the asterisk sine nomine in 255 and 248. Ziegler has incorrectly listed 255 as evidence for the asterisk, since the scribe of this ms used decorative asterisks to bracket the last line of a κεφαλαίων (255, 176v, 177v, 179r, 179v et al.). In 248, there is a clear asterisk at the beginning of the line at ὡς, and there may be a faint asterisk before εἰς in the same line. Ms 788 confirms that there is an asterisk before εἰς, and these words are hexaplaric, taken from Sym and Th, and therefore are not part of the OG as Ziegler proposed. Syh has an obelus before διπλά, indicating that the Hexapla considered this word to be absent from the Hebrew but present in the OG; therefore, the hexaplaric fragment, εἰς διπλασιασμόν, has corrupted the transmission of the Greek text. The omission of the words in La suggests that they were not part of the hexaplaric version but, in this case, La may actually attest the OG and not the hexaplaric version of Origen.
α’ εἰς δευτέρωσιν

Wit1: ▼C (= 788-250 3005)

Attr: α’ C (= 788) > C (= 250 3005); (α’) Edition

Notes: Ms 788 is the first manuscript to attest the attribution to Aq for this fragment. The fragment was previously sine nomine in the C mss (Nachlese, 411). The Edition originally posited an attribution to Aq, but the Beiträge posited that perhaps Sym should be accepted as the translator on the basis of 2 Suppl 34:22, where Sym renders בַּמִּשְׁנֶה with ἐν τῇ δευτερώσει (Beiträge, 50). It also suggested the possibility of attribution to Aq, given that he renders the root שֵׁנָה with δεύτερος, δευτεροῦν, and δευτέρωσις (for προσώπος in Deut 28:37; Beiträge, 50; Reider, 52).

Job 42 11bc

HT —

LXX πάντα τὰ συμβεβηκότα αὐτῷ
καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν

Sub ÷

Wit1: Syh

NonGr: Syh \ 添加字节 \ 机床成声 至于 有声 乐

Notes: These lines are not present in the HT, and probably they should have been included under the obelus in the Edition and Field.

Job 42 11d

HT (כְּלָל־וֹדְעָי) לְפָנִים (וְכָל־יֹדְעָיו)

LXX (καὶ πάντες ὁσοὶ ἤδεισαν αὐτὸν) ἐκ πρώτου.

α’ εἰς πρόσωπον

Wit1: 248

σ’ πρίν

Wit1: ▼C (= 788-250 3005) cI 139 260 559 643 732 3006

Attr: σ’ > C (= 250)
\[ \theta' \quad \text{ἐμπροσθεν} \]

**Wit1:** \( \downarrow C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \) \( \downarrow cI^{137} 139 \ 260 \ 559 \ 643 \ 732 \ 3006 \)

**Attr:** \( \theta' > C (= 250) \)

**Notes:** Th uses \( \text{ἐμπροσθεν} \) for \( \text{לפני} \) only one other time (cf. Job 21:33; Gentry, 350).

**Job 42 11e**

**HT** (ריאכול) — (רחא לֶחֶם בּכָּרִיהוֹ וְנָעַרְבָּה לָהּ)

**LXX** (φαγόντες δὲ) καὶ πιόντες (παρ’ αὐτῷ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτόν.)

**Sub ÷**

**Wit1:** Syh\(\text{xi}^\)**

**NonGr:** Syh\(\text{xi}^\) ÷

**HT** (ריאכול לֶחֶם בּכָּרִיהוֹ וְנָעַרְבָּה לָהּ (לָהּ) רְנָהָמש (אָוֹה))

**LXX** (φαγόντες δὲ καὶ πιόντες παρ’ αὐτῷ) παρεκάλεσαν (αὐτόν.)

\[ \sigma' \quad \text{παρεμυθήσαντο} \]

**Wit1:** \( \downarrow C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \) \( \downarrow cI^{139} 260 \ 559 \ 643 \ 732 \ 3006 \)

**Attr:** \( \sigma' C (= 788 \ 3005)) > C (= 250) \) \( cI^{139} 260 \ 559 \ 643 \ 732 \ 3006 \)

**Notes:** The Edition assigned the fragment to Sym in the absence of external evidence, but ms 3005 confirmed this conjecture (Kollationen, 295). Ms 788 confirms that the attribution to Sym is part of the oldest Greek catena. Ms 3005 has the index over παρεκάλεσαν, which is what Sym revised. In actuality, the OG has translated two Hebrew verbs for “show sympathy” (נוד) and “to comfort” (נחם) with one verb. Sym usually translates בְּרֵיחָב with παραμυθεῖν or παρηγορεῖν, while Aq uses παρακαλέιν (Beiträge, 13). The internal evidence combined with the attribution in 788 and 3005 makes Sym the probable author of this fragment.

**Job 42 11f**

**HT** (רְנָהָמש (אָוֹה) על כָּלָלִרָה (אָשְׁר-יְהוֹעַר אַחֵר הָגּוֹאר (לָהּ)))

**LXX** (καὶ ἐπεθαύμασαν) ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, (οἷς ἐπιήγαγεν αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος.)
\(\langle \alpha' \theta' \rangle \) \text{ peri πάσης τῆς κακίας}

\textit{Wit1:} \(\downarrow C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \downarrow cI \ 139 \ 260 \ 559 \ 643 \ 732 \ 3006 \downarrow cII \downarrow 555 \downarrow 161\)

\textit{Attr:} \(\langle \alpha' \theta' \rangle \sigma' \theta' C (= 788); \sigma' C (= 3005); \sigma' 138-255 \ 612 \ 680 \ 740 \ cII \ 555 \ 161; > C (= 250) \ 137 \ 395\)

\textit{Var:} \(\piερι] \epsilonπι \ C (= 3005)\)

\textit{Notes:} Ms 788 has updated the evidence for this fragment, since now there is an attribution to Th in the oldest Greek catena. From the external evidence, it appears that the original attribution was to Aq and Th. Ms 788 attests an original double attribution and also the early intrusion of the attribution to Sym in place of Aq, which became the only attribution preserved in the catena. Ms 3005 preserves the attribution to Aq, but its \textit{Vorlage} had already lost the attribution to Th. Also, its text was already corrupted by the LXX, since it has \(\epsilonπι\) instead of \(\piερι\).

The internal evidence confirms this conclusion. The translation of the noun רעה with κακία is important. Aq is careful to distinguish the adjective רַע (= κακός) from the noun רָעָה (= κακία; Reider, 123). In Job, Th translates רעה with κακία one time and רע with κακία one time. He also translates רע with πονηρός one time. There are no examples of κακός for רעה in Th Job (Gentry, 137). Th translates רעה with περί three times in Job (Gentry, 347). There are no other instances of περί for רעה in Aq at present (Hyvärinen, 50-1).

There are now two fragments for this verse. This fragment is attributed to Aq and Th, and the one below is best attributed to Sym on the evidence of 248 and translation equivalents.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the \textit{Edition} is not supported by \textit{Kommentar} nor \textit{AGK} but only by Nic (\textit{Kommentar}, 390; \textit{AGK} 3, 394-5; Nic, 606).

\(\sigma' \) \text{ \epsilonπι πάσιν τοῖς κακοῖς}

\textit{Wit1:} 248

\textit{Wit2:} \(\epsilonπι \ πάσιν] + τοῖς κακοῖς (αγαθοῖς \ Iul) L^r-A.575 = M; in omnibus malis\)

\textit{La: cf M}

\textit{Notes:} In 248, the marginal note \(\sigma' \) τοῖς κακοῖς is placed above πάσιν of the bible text and is intended to be read as an addition, as one observes from La and the Lucianic text group in \textit{Wit2}.

Sym renders the noun רעה with the Greek adjective κακός very consistently in the Psalter (20(21):12, 40(41):8, 89(90):15, 90(91):10 [contrast with Aq who has κακία], and 106(107):39; Busto Saiz, 529), and only once is Sym listed as using κακία (140(141):5),
but in this place there is evidence that Sym may have had κακῶν instead of κακίων (Field, 297 n. 13). H-R lists several instances of Sym’s use of κακία, and it is worth listing the evidence in full. Job 17:5 is erroneous and should be dismissed from the evidence, since the lemma is κακοὶς (from κακός not κακία) for יִרְעִים (Woods, 320). Prov 26:26 is based on Nobil, and is therefore set aside until confirmed. I Rgns 24:10, Prov 6:18, 11:19, and Zach 8:17 have attributions to the Three not specifically Sym. In Isa 57:1, Sym is coupled with Th. Sym uses κακία for רֵעִים in four instances in Jeremiah (9:3(2) 2x, 17:16, and 28(51):24), but nowhere else does he employ this translation equivalent.

Before the evidence of 3005 and 788 became available, Ziegler concluded that C’ passed down the correct Sym version, while 248 attested to the Lucianic recension (Beiträge, 50). This conclusion is no longer tenable for two reasons: (1) 3005 and 788 have introduced a hexaplaric fragment attributed to Aq and Th, which do not conflict with the fragment in 248. (2) The Lucianic recension used a hexaplaric base text, to which La attests. Ms 248 provides an attribution to Sym as the hexaplaric source in this instance. One cannot dismiss a hexaplaric fragment on the basis of its relationship to the Lucianic text group but, rather, this relationship is probably the reason it should be considered genuinely hexaplaric.  

Job 42 11g

HT

(וְאִישׁ נֶזֶם זָהָב אֶחָד׃
   קְשִׂיטָה אֶחָת
      †אִישׁ  וַיִּתְּנוּ־לוֹ

LXX

(ἔδωκεν δὲ αὐτῷ ἑκάστος ἁμνάδα μίαν (καὶ τετράδραχμον χρυσοῦν ἀσημον,)

⟨σʹ⟩

νόμισμα ἐν

\[(σʹ)\] ἐτερος τὸν ἐμνηυνετῶν C_{cat} (= 249 788-250 3005) c_{cat} 754_{cat} 474_{cat} 258_{cat} 3007_{cat} cII 555; > 161'

Attr:

\[(σʹ)\] ἐτερος τὸν ἐμνηυνετῶν C_{cat} (= 249 788-250 3005) c_{cat} 754_{cat} 474_{cat} 258_{cat} 3007_{cat} cII 555; > 161'

Notes: Although there is no direct evidence for Sym as the author of this fragment, there are two reasons for assigning this fragment to Sym: (1) Sym is the only one of the Three to use the term νόμισμα (Num 3:47; Burris, 124). (2) Ursula and Dieter Hagedorn make the case that νόμισμα ἐν must have been written in place of ἁμνάδα μίαν by a minor translator. After the identification of the hexaplaric marginal notes, the catena has Aq Th ἐνώτιον in place of τετράδραχμον and Sym ἐπιρρίνιον (see infra).

From the information of ms 248 we may infer that Sym is the sought after translator, although the name (pace Ziegler) is not mentioned there. The line in 248 reads: ὦς μὲν νόμισμα ἕν, δὲ πυρίνιον (read ἐπιρρίνιον) ἑν χρυσοῦν (AGK 3, 398). The Hagedorns have interpreted the evidence correctly. The catena preserves the second fragment with an attribution to Sym (ἐπιρρίνιον ἑν χρυσοῦν), and 248 preserves the same fragment (incorrectly) and the version for ἁμνάδα μίαν; therefore, 248 preserves the first Sym fragment as well and, on this basis, one can attribute the fragment to him tentatively.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is confirmed, since it is confirmed by AGK (AGK 3, 398; Nic, 607).

| HT | ᾲσχύλος ἡ χρυσάνθε γάντικα | (איש קשחתא גאַהא יאָה) |
| LXX | (אֶדֶ֑וֹקֵנּ דֶ֑נ אָ֑וֶ֝וֶ֢ו אָ֑וֳָוֶ֛וָוֶ֪וָוֶ֬וֶ֪וֶ֬וֶ֪وֶ֪וֶ֪...
Notes: Ms 248 preserves the full lemma, which corresponds to HT. Ms 788-250 preserves the correct spelling of ἐπίρρινιον for two reasons: (1) the ending of the incorrect πυρινιον in 248 suggests it, and (2) most important is the unique σ’ ἐπιρρίνιον in Ezek 16:12, where LXX Aq Th have ἐνώτιον for נֶזֶם (Beiträge, 50). Ms 788 confirms the attribution and the orthography.

The patristic attribution to Olymp in the Edition is not supported by Kommentar or AGK but only by Nic (Kommentar, 390; AGK 3, 398; Nic, 607).

Job 42 12a
HT  יְרֵדָה בָּרָךְ אֲחָרִית אָיּו (מְחַסֵּרַה)
LXX  (ὁ δὲ κύριος εὐλόγησεν τὰ ἐσχατὰ Ἴωβ) ἢ (τὰ ἐμπροσθεν)

σ’ θ’  ὑπέρ

Wit1: ↓C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cf. 139 260 643 732 3006 ↓Syh
Attr: σ’ θ’] α’ σ’ 395 680; > C (= 250) 138 Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The scholion in Syh is sine nomine, but the catena tradition provides its source.

Job 42 14a
HT  רִכְרַא שְׁפֵרָה נַפְרוֹת (נַפְרוֹת)
LXX  (καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὴν μὲν πρώτην) Ἰημέραν,

α’  Ἰεμιμα

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) ↓cf. 260 ↓248 ↓252 Syh
Attr: α’] α’ σ’ 248 252 732; > 612inc
Var: Ἰεμιμα C (= 788-250 3005) 248] υεμημα 137 138 139 255 395 559 612 643 680 740 3006; υεμημα 732; > 252
NonGr: Syh
Syhtxt  שֵׁמִים

435
Notes: The spelling of the name in 248 is confirmed by C (= 788-250 3005). Ms 252 has the double attribution like 248 but no text after it (Kollationen, 297). The attribution in 612 appears to be in a breach or gap in the manuscript (Kollationen, 297). According to Field, Syh was accustomed to imitate the Pesh with respect to proper names (Field, 81). The reading in the margin, attributed to Aq, agrees with the text of the OG, while the reading in the text is closer to what Aq has according to the catena.

\[ \sigma' \quad 'Ymim\alpha \]

\textit{Wit1:} \quad C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI^{260} \hspace{1cm} 680

\textit{Attr:} \quad \sigma' \quad \alpha' \quad \sigma' 732

\textit{Var:} \quad 'Ymim\alpha \quad C (= 788-250 3005) 559] \upsim\alpha 137 138 139 255 395 612 643 740; \upsim\alpha 732; \upsim\sigmaim\mu 3006

\textit{Notes:} \quad Ms 788 confirms that the oldest Greek catena had 'Ymim\alpha, which agrees with HT.

\textbf{Job 42 14b}

HT \quad (\textit{תֵּשֶׁם הַשֵּׁנִית} \textit{כְּנַרִית})

LXX \quad (\textit{τὴν δὲ δευτέραν} \textit{Κασίαν},

\[ \sigma' \quad Kin\varsigma\iota\alpha \]

\textit{Wit1:} \quad 248 252

\textbf{Job 42 14c}

HT \quad (\textit{תֵּשֶׁם הַשְּׁלִישִׁית} \textit{כְּרַדָּה})

LXX \quad (\textit{τὴν δὲ τρίτην} \textit{Ἀμαλθείας Κέρας}

\[ \alpha' \quad \sigma' \quad Kar\nu\alpha\varphi\nu\circ\acute{u}k \]

\textit{Wit1:} \quad \downarrow C (= 406 788-250 3005) \downarrow cI^{260} \downarrow 248 \downarrow 252 \downarrow Syh

\textit{Attr:} \quad \alpha' \quad \sigma'] \quad \alpha' \quad 252; \quad \sigma' \quad Syh; \quad > \quad C (= 250 406) 559 248

\textit{Var:} \quad Kar\nu\alpha\varphi\nu\circ\acute{u}k \textit{conj.} \quad Kar\nu\alpha\beta\ou\circ\acute{u} \quad C (= 3005); Kar\nu\alpha\varphi\nu\circ\acute{u} \quad C (= 788-250) 395 612 740; Kar\nu\alpha\varphi\nu\circ\acute{u} \quad 559; Kar\nu\alpha\varphi\nu\circ\acute{u} \quad 138-255; Kar\nu\alpha\varphi\nu\circ\acute{u} \quad 248 252; Kar\nu\alpha\varphi\nu\circ\acute{u} \quad C (= 406) 137 139 643 680 732 3006; Na\varphi\ou\circ\acute{u}k Syh
Notes: The reading in 740 is on two lines as follows: α’ Καρναφ σ’ Φουθ (Kollationen, 297). Ms 612 preserves the correct attribution but, like 740 its reading is also on two lines. Given the number of variants, no witness has the correct spelling of the proper name pace Ziegler, who read 248 as Καρναφουκ incorrectly, and Field, who depended on Drusius and Nobilius (Morinus, see chapter 2), who have Schol. Καρναφουκ; Field, 81 n. 33). By conjecture the name can be reconstructed according to the sources in comparison with the HT. The dagesh forte in the ב is represented by the double φ (as 788-250 and the best mss of cI) and Syh provides the correct ending of the word.

Job 42 16a
HT
(יָשָׁנָה וְאַרְבָּעִים (באחרי-זאת מֵאָהוַיְחִי אִיּוֹ)
LXX
(ἔζησεν δὲ Ἰωβ μετὰ τὴν πληγὴν ἐτή ἕκατον) ἐβδομήκοντα,

α’ τεσσαράκοντα

Wit1: 248

Job 42 16b
HT
—
LXX
τὰ δὲ πάντα ἔζησεν ἐτή διακόσια τεσσαράκοντα ὀκτὼ.

Sub ÷

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cI-138 139 260 395 680 3006 La Syh^xt

Attr: οὐ κεῖται παρὰ (πε(*) 250) τοῖς λοιποῖς(λοιπ] 643) 3005 788 250 740
255 612 559 395 137 643

Var: 16b sub ÷ 3005 788-250 740 612 732(* pro ÷) La Syh^xt

NonGr: Syh^xt 

La et (pr ÷ β) omnes anni vitae eius fuerunt CCXLVIII.

Notes: There is a stain over the beginning of this scholion in 788. Therefore, one cannot determine the initial part of the reading. There is no visible οὐ or obelus, but 250 preserves both of these elements, so it is probable that 788 had them also.
Job 42 16cd-17

**HT**

καὶ εἶδεν Ἰὼβ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ
καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ τετάρτην γενεάν·
καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰὼβ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πληρής ἡμερῶν.

**E**

καὶ εἶδεν Ἰὼβ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ
καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ τετάρτην γενεάν·
καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰὼβ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πληρής ἡμερῶν.

**Notes**: In 643, the asterisk for 16c is at 16b.

**Job 42 17**

**HT**

(καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰὼβ πρεσβύτερος καὶ) πληρής (ἡμερῶν.)

**E**

καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰὼβ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πληρής ἡμερῶν.

**Notes**: Although the fragment is *sine nomine*, it corresponds to HT and both Aq and Sym use ἐμπιπλᾶν to render שׂבע Qal (Reider, 79; Bust Saiz, 503; cf. Isa 1:11). It is, therefore, probably hexaplaric.

**Job 42 fin**

**HT**

(καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰὼβ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πληρής ἡμερῶν.—)

**E**

(καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰὼβ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πληρής ἡμερῶν.—)
τοῦτο τὸ τέλος τοῦ Ἑβραϊκοῦ

Wit1: 248 252

Var: τὸ > 248

Notes: This scholion appears here in 248 252.

Job 42 17α γέγραπται—fin (βασιλεύς 17εδ)

HT  —

LXX 17a γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι μεθ᾽ ὦν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν.
17b Οὗτος ἔριμηνεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου ἐν μὲν γῇ κατοικῶν τῇ Λυσίτιδι ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀρίοις τῆς Ἰδουμαιάς καὶ Ἰραβίας, προὔπηρχεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὄνομα Ἰοβᾶβ.
17c λαβὼν δὲ γυναῖκα Ἰραβίας γεννᾷ υἱὸν, ὃ ὄνομα Ἰωννών, ἤν δὲ αὐτὸς πατρὸς μὲν Ζάρε, τῶν Ἰσαυ νιών νίός, μητρὸς δὲ Βοσόρρας, ὡστε εἶναι αὐτὸν πέμπτον ἀπὸ Ἁβαμ.
17d καὶ οὗτοι οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ βασιλεύσαντες ἐν Ἅδωμ, ἢς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦρξεν χώρας· πρῶτος Βαλὰκ ὁ τοῦ Βεώρ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ πόλει αὐτοῦ Δεννάβα·
17e οἱ δὲ ἔλθόντες πρὸς αὐτὸν φίλοι· Ἐλιφᾶς τῶν Ἰσαυ νιῶν Θαιμανῶν βασιλεύς, Βαλδᾶδ ὁ Σαυχαίων τύραννος, Σωφᾶρ ὁ Μιναϊών βασιλεύς.

Sub ⅸ

Wit1: O

NonGr: Syhxt

439
scriptum est autem resurrecturum eum cum his quos dominus suscitabit.

Hic (pr + μ) interpretatur de syraico libro, in (pr + β) terra quidem habitasse Ausitide (pr + μ) in finibus (pr
et erat ei antea (pr + μ) nomen (pr + β) Iobab. 
et accepit uxorem Arabissam ∨ genuitque (pr + β); (ge+nuitque μ) filium cui nomen erat Ennon.  
erat autem (pr + β) ipse (pr + μ) filius quidem Zare, de Esau filiis filius (pr + β), de matre (pr + μ) vetro Bosram ∨ 
ita ut sit quintus ab (pr + β) Abraham. 
et (pr + μ) hi sunt reges qui regnaverunt in (pr + β) Edom, in quia et ipse regnavit (pr + μ) regione. 

prius (pr + β) Balaac filius Beor, et (pr + μ) nomen civitatis eius (pr + β) Dennaba. 
post Balaac autem Iobab (pr + μ), qui vocatur (pr + β) Iob. 
post hunc Asum, qui erat dux ex Themanorum regione. 
post hunc Adad (pr + β) filius (pr + μ) Barad, qui excidit Madian in campo (pr + β) Moab ∨ et (pr + μ) nomen civitatis eius Gethem. 
qui (pr + β) autem venerunt ad eum amici (pr + μ), Eliphaz (pr + β) ex filiis Esau Themanorum rex, 
post Baldad Saucheorum tyrannus, Sophar (pr + μ) Minaeorum rex.

Notes: The O group supplies sufficient evidence for placing these lines under the obelus. In addition to this evidence there is evidence from the catena (Olymp), a scholion from 248, and a comment by Origen, which indicates that these lines were in the LXX and Th but not in the HT, Aq, and Sym.

The evidence for the comment by Olymp is as follows: C^cat (= 249 250 3005) cF^cat [612] 474^cat [505^cat 523^cat] 560^cat 3007^cat 3008^cat cII 555 161. The note reads: μέχρι τοῦ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πλήρης ἡμερῶν Ἀκύλας καὶ Σύμμαχος ἐλθόντες συνεπέραν τὸ βιβλίον ὡς δὴ τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ ἀκολουθοῦντες, οὗ δὲ Θεοδοτίων συμπεραίνει (συμπαραθεῖται 560 3008 559 754 258) τοῖς Ἐβδομήκοντα (O 250 740 754 137 3006 643 139) (AGK 3, 405). The note in 161, derived from the former note, reads: μέχρι τοῦ Ἀκύλας καὶ Σύμμαχος τὸ βιβλίον συνεπέραν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἵσως τῷ Ἐβραϊκῷ· θεοδοτίων δὲ τοῖς ο´ ἐξηκολοθήθησεν.

In 248, a scholion reads: ἐντεῦθεν οὖν κεῖται ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ ὡς Ἀκύλας καὶ Σύμμαχος· παρὰ Θεοδοτίων κεῖται.

Concerning the last verse in the Hebrew text in his letter to Africanus Origen says: οὐ κεῖται παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραῖοι· διότι οὐδὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἀκύλα· παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἐβδομήκοντα καὶ Θεοδοτίων τὰ ἰσοδυναμοῦντα ἀλλήλοις (Origen, II.6, 528 La Lettre à Africanus, de Lange, 1983).
LXX  (γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι) μεθ’ ὦν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν.

Θ’  μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὅτι θεὸς ἀναστήσει

_Wit1:_  
\[\text{C} (= 3005) \downarrow \text{cI}^{137} 139 260 [612] 643 732 3006\]

_Attr:_  \[\theta’ \text{ C} (= 3005)] > \text{cI}\]

_Var:_  \[\text{ότι]} + ΠΠΠ 138-255 395 740 \mid \text{θεὸς / ἀναστήσει}] \text{tr 559; + ΠΠΠ 559} \mid \text{ἀναστήσει}] \text{αναστισει 255}\]

_Notes:_  For the first time, ms 3005 has made clear that these words belong to Th, the only reviser to follow the LXX past the Hebrew Vorlage (Nachlese, 411). The mark of the Tetragrammaton, which corresponds to κύριος in the LXX, is clearly separated from the Th fragment in 3005, since it is passed down in the line above it. This mark is inside the Th fragment in the cl mss but, in 137 and the subsequent mss of the Hagedorns’ stemma, it is found erroneously at 42:17Ba βιβλου and the Th fragment is absent altogether (Nachlese, 411). It is clear, then, that ΠΠΠ has nothing to do with the Th fragment, but it has been included in the variant line because it is in the cl mss.

Previously, Ziegler treated this fragment as an anonymous scholion, even in 3005, but this assessment was incorrect. This new evidence demonstrates it is hexaplaric and therefore should be removed from Ziegler’s chapter on scholia in the Beiträge (cf. Beiträge, 81).

**Job 42 17εβ**

HT  —

LXX  Ἐλιφὰς τῶν Ἡσαὺ υἱῶν (Θαιμανῶν βασιλεύς,)

Θ’  υἱός Ἰωσαφάτ

_Wit1:_  
\[\text{C} (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow \text{cI}^{137} 139 260 [395] [559] 643 732 3006 \text{cII 555} 161\]

_Attr:_  \[\theta’] > 138\]

_Var:_  \[υἱός] τιοι 138\]

**Job 42 17εγ**

HT  —

LXX  Βαλδὰδ (ὁ Σαυχαίων τύραννος,)

_442_
\[\theta'\]

υἱὸς Ἀμμὼν τοῦ Χοβόρ

\textit{Wit1:} \[
\downarrow C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow \text{cI} [137] 139 260 [395] [559] 643 732 3006 \downarrow \text{cII} \downarrow 555 \downarrow 161
\]

\textit{Attr:} \[
\theta' > 138 680
\]

\textit{Var:} \[
Χοβόρ C (= 3005) 740 555] Χωβόρ 138-255 612 \text{cII}; Χοβόρ C (= 788-250) 161; Χωβόρ 680
\]

\textbf{Job 42 17eδ}

HT

LXX \[
(Σωφὰρ) ὁ Μιναίων (βασιλεύς,)
\]

\[\theta'\]

ὁ Ἰεμιναίων

\textit{Wit1:} \[
C (= 788-250 3005) \downarrow \text{cI} [137] 138 139 260 [395] [559] 643 732 3006
\]

\textit{Attr:} \[
\theta' C (= 788 3005)] > \text{rel}
\]

\textit{Notes:} This fragment has been uncatalogued until now, since before 3005 became available, it was anonymous (Nachlese, 411). Ms 788 supports the attribution to Th. It is observed, however, that Th renders the corresponding word Μιναίως (נמאיה) with Νωμαθίτης, where he translates from the Hebrew (Job 2:11e, 42:9a; Nachlese, 411). Since there is no HT for this text, perhaps Th varied his approach for factors not yet known. The fragment should be included in an edition of hexaplaric fragments of Job due to the evidence of 3005 and 788.
CHAPTER 4
FRAGMENTS OF DUBIOUS HEXAPLRIC SIGNIFICANCE

In the course of compiling a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Job 22-42, there were a number of anonymous fragments from various sources which could not be traced back to the Hexapla or any other source with reasonable probability. These readings are listed in this chapter with the anticipation that they might become the object of future study, in order that their relationship to the Hexapla or other sources might be more acutely defined as more critical editions of the Hexapla and translation technique studies of the Three are produced and more about the Lucianic recension is known.

Ziegler’s *Beiträge* was the source for the majority of these marginal notes (*Beiträge*, see especially 75-81, 84-87). The following selection includes those fragments to which Ziegler did not assign an attribution, unless there was reason to doubt this attribution. Additional fragments were added from *AGK*, if there was a manuscript which preserved a hexaplaric attribution, and from Ziegler’s II App, if these fragments could be shown to be non-hexaplaric. In all cases, the specific manuscript evidence is from *AGK*. Initially Field listed twenty-four instances of ἄλλος. Of these instances, seven have received hexaplaric attributions in the critical edition,\(^1\) two are associated with the Lucianic recension,\(^2\) one is influenced by Olympiodorus,\(^3\) four are part of the text history.

\(^1\)In chapter three, see 22:4, 24:3, 30:8, 30:17, 37:5, 37:20, and 38:40.

\(^2\)24:24 and 31:16 (see *Beiträge*, 91-92).

\(^3\)39:16 (see *Beiträge*, 91).
of LXX Job, four three are unconfirmed from later collations of these materials, and seven are sine nomine with varying significance. Five of the final seven are reproduced in this chapter with Field’s attribution Ἀλλος.

**Job 22 6b**

| HT | וּבַנְכָּרָיו תַּרְגּוֹמִים חֲמָשִׁים: |
| LXX | ἀμφίασιν δὲ γυμνῶν ἀφείλου· |

<sup>?</sup> ἐπιτείνων αὐτοῖς τὴν πενίαν

*Wit1:*  
C (= 257<sup>cat</sup> 3005) cl<sup>cat</sup> (= 740<sup>mg</sup> 255<sup>mg</sup>-138<sup>mg</sup> 612 3006 559 (474) 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139)

**Job 22 12a**

| HT | גֹּבַהּ שָׁמָיִם |
| LXX | μὴ οὐχὶ ὁ τὰ ὑψηλὰ ναίων (ἐφορᾷ) |

<sup>?</sup> οἰκῶν

*Wit1:*  
C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680) 252 Iul Syh

*Wit2:*  
ναίων] αἰών C; νεών B*-S Syh A-575*-754* 255<sup>xt</sup>-612<sup>xt</sup>-740<sup>xt</sup>-765 797 (νεών); + οἰκῶν Iul]: cf praef p 164; ανίων 795; ὄρων 637; pr καὶ S*

*Attr:*  
<sup>?</sup> Ἀλλος Field

*NonGr:*  
Syh סָמַהְי מִכְהְי

*Notes:* There is no clear connection to the Hexapla. Translation data do not establish a link to the Hexapla. Aq uses οἰκεῖν (οἰκουμένη) to translate תֵּבֵל in Ps 89(90):2 and Isa 14:21 and אֶרֶץ in Hab 3:3. According to Busto Saiz, in the Psalter Sym uses οἰκεῖν to render ישׁב Qal (60:8; 126:2), οἰκεῖσθαι to render ישׁב Qal (124:1), and

---

<sup>4</sup>In Field and Edition (I App), see 26:8, 26:9, 36:16, and 36:26.


<sup>6</sup>In this chapter see 22:12, 27:21, 28:16, 29:5, and 37:7. For the probable hexaplaric value of 42:17, see chap. 3. For a discussion of the exegetical fragment of 31:31, see the hexaplaric fragment for 31:31 in chap. 3.
οἰκουμένη to render תֵּבֵל (32:8, 89:2, 95:10, and 97:7; Busto Saiz, 555). Outside of the Psalter Sym uses οἰκεῖν to render ישׁב Qal (Ex 2:21, 4 Rgns 15:5, Isa 6:5, 8:14, Jer 29:9(49:8), 35(42):7, and 51(44):14), οἰκείσθαι to render ישׁב Qal (Isa 58:12), οἰκουμένη to render תֵּבֵל (Isa 14:21, ) Th uses οἰκουμένη to render תֵּבֵל in Isa 14:21 and in Hab 3:3. Ziegler shows the relationship between ναίων and οἰκῶν, and how one can be substituted for the other, but there is no connection to the Hexapla in his comments (Edition, 164-5).

The Hagedorns are correct to list the text as an exegetical fragment in AGK (AGK 2, 382).

**Job 22 14b**

**HT**

רָוִי חֶנָּא הַיָּהלָל

**E**

καὶ γύρον ούρανοῦ διαπορεύσεται.

< ? > ἐκπεριέρχεται ἡ πρόνοια τοῦ θεοῦ

**Wit1:**  

C (= 3005) cfcat (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139mg) [505]

**Attr:** (?) σ’ 139mg

**Notes:** In 139, the attribution to Sym is probably incorrect, since there is a well attested Sym fragment in the catena for this verse both in C and Syh.

**Job 22 20a**

**HT**

אֶ-לֶּךָ נֶּכְּחַד-ךָּךֶּנָּאָךְּ קָרָנָא

**E**

(εἰ μὴ ἡμφανίσθη) ἡ ὑπόστασις αὐτῶν,

< ? > τίνων αὐτῶν; τῶν ἀσεβῶν

**Wit1:**  

C (= 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 258 395 680 137 260 643 732)

**Notes:** This scholion influenced the exegesis of Nic (AGK 2, 387; Beiträge, 75).

**Job 22 21a**

**HT**

הָפָכְּרַא אָמְרָא לָמָּה שָׁלֹם

**LXX**

(γενοῦ δὴ σκληρός,) ἐὰν ὑπομέινης.

< ? > εἰ ὑπέστησαν ἐκεῖνοι, πείρασον
Notes: This scholion appears to be an exegetical fragment, which also influenced Nic (AGK 2, 388; Beiträge, 75).

**Job 22 25b**

**HT**

רֵכָשׁ (תְּרֵשׁ רְכָשׁ)

**LXX**

καθαρὸν (δὲ ἀποδώσει σε ὡσπερ ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον.)

Notes: At present, there is no wider context to interpret the significance of this fragment (AGK 2, 391; Beiträge, 76).

**Job 22 29b**

**HT**

רָשָׁה (תָּרָשׁ רָשׁ)

**LXX**

(καὶ) κύφοντα (ὄφθαλμοὶς σώσει)

Notes: The reading is as follows: κύφοντα ὀφθαλμοίς, τουτέστι τὸν ταπεινόφρονα (AGK, II 394). Ms 3005 attributes the fragment to Olymp, where Ziegler attributed it to Or on the basis of Nic, since Or = τοῦ αὐτοῦ (Beiträge, 86, 99; Nic, 387). Ms 3005 preserves the correct attribution. There is an attribution to Ἀκύλα in 249 643 732, though this attribution may have been caused by a misunderstanding of the catena sign Α (AGK, 394). The exegetical fragment has influenced the exegesis of Nic, which connects this fragment to the tax collector in the Gospels (cf. Beiträge, 86).

At present, there is no evidence to determine whether Aq used ταπεινόφρονα to render רָשָׁה. He uses the word to render the Psalm title מִכְתָּם in 16:1. Sym and Th use κύφοντες for רָשָׁה in Isa 60:14 (Field, 552).

**Job 23 7b**

**HT**

(צְפַקְתִּים בְּנֵי הַמַּכַּפֵּה)

**LXX**

(ἐξαγάγοι δὲ) εἰς τέλος (τὸ κρίμα μου.)
παρ’ Ἑβραίοις τὸ τέλος καὶ ἡ νίκη διὰ μιᾶς σημαίνεται λέξεως

Wit1: $C^{cat} = (249 \ 250^{mg} 257 3005^{mg})$  
$c^{cat} = (740 \ 138-255 \ 612 \ 3006 \ 559 \ 258 \ 395 \ 680 \ 137 \ 260 \ 643 \ 732 \ 139)$ [505] 523

Notes: This fragment is included here because AGK posits that this fragment is possibly from Polychronius, due to the relative frequency with which he cites ὁ Ἑβραῖος (AGK, III, 5; I, 105), while Ziegler posited incorrectly that it was from Chrysostom (see Chr-Kommentar, 141). Ziegler adds that, although the LXX and the Three use εἰς τέλος and εἰς νίκην to render לָנֶצַח, neither the LXX nor the Three use εἰς νίκην to render לָנֶצַח (Beiträge, 76). The note is probably not hexaplaric, but it remains in this list since its source is not known.

Job 23 10a

HT 
כִּי־יָדַע דֶּרֶךְ עִמָּדִי
LXX 
οἶδεν γὰρ ἤδη ὁδόν μου,

διὰ τοῦτο ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ θέλω κριθῆναι

Wit1: $C = (250 \ 3005)$  
$cl = (740 \ 138-255 \ 612^{cat} \ 3006 \ 3006^{cat} \ 559 \ 559^{cat} \ 258 \ 395 \ 395^{cat} \ 680 \ 680^{cat} \ 137 \ 643 \ 732 \ 139) \ 505$

Notes: Although 505 attributes this fragment to Olympiodorus, AGK maintains that the fragment is sine nomine (AGK 3, 7). It has also influenced the exegesis of Nic (Beiträge, 76).

Job 23 11a

HT 
אָחֲזָה רַגְלִי
LXX 
ἐξελεύσομαι (δὲ ἐν ἐντάλμασιν αὐτοῦ)

ωδευσά

Wit1: 523

Notes: This fragment is listed in Edition II App, as 253 (O ms), but the Beiträge corrects this to read 523 (Beiträge, 99).
There are no instances of this word in the corpus of Aq. In the Psalter, Sym uses ὀδεύειν to render לֶךֶל Qal (25:1, 25:11, 31:8, 80:13, 83:8, 12, 88:31, 90:6), Pi (85:11), Hitp (55:14), and לֶךֶל (49:23) (Busto Saiz, 554). Outside of the Psalter, Sym uses ὀδεύειν to render לֶךֶל Qal (Ex 13:21, Eccl 6:9), לֶךֶל (Job 29:25a), and עבר Qal (Ezek 5:17). Th uses ὀδεύειν to render לֶךֶל Qal (Ex 13:21).

The word, ὀδευσσα, appears in Kommentar as exegesis of this verse (Kommentar, 204; Beiträge, 99).

Job 23 12a
HT  
LXX

Sub  

Wit1:  Syh

Wit2:  fin] + ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνω L'-644° Syh (sub ~) Arm Dam

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  This instance of the lemnisk in Syh has been identified with the Lucianic recension; therefore, it is not an indicator of a Hexaplaric reading (Edition, 113). Syh has misplaced the metobelus.

Job 23 12b
HT  
LXX

〈?〉  

Wit1:  C (= 250 3005) ci (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 [137] 260 643 732 139) [505]

Notes:  This fragment does not appear to be hexaplaric but it has influenced the exegesis of Nic (AGK, III, 8; Beiträge, 76). Although Ziegler cites Ol as the source, the verbal parallel is too narrow to make such a claim (Ol = ἐν τῷ βαθεὶ τῆς διανοίας; Kommentar, 204)

Job 23 13a
HT  
LXX

449
εἰ δὲ καὶ δικαιοπραγοῦντα κατέκρινεν

Wit1: \( C (= 250 3005) \) cl \( (= 740 138-255 612^{\text{cat}} 3006^{\text{cat}} 559^{\text{cat}} 474^{\text{cat}} 258^{\text{cat}} 395^{\text{cat}} \) 680\(^{\text{cat}} [137] 643 139) [505] 523

Var: δικαιοπραγοῦντα δικαιοπραγίαν 395

Notes: Ms 395 attributes this fragment to Olymp (AGK, III, 8). Ziegler attributes this fragment to Chr, but this attribution is probably not genuine (Beiträge, 76; cp. Chr-Kommentar, 141).

HT 
(דרה הָבְּשָׂחַ הַמַּיְשִׁירֵי)
LXX 
(εἰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκρίνειν οὐτὼς;) τίς (ἐστιν ὁ ἀντειπών αὐτῷ?)

άντὶ τοῦ· οὐδείς

Wit1: \( C (= 3005) \) cl \( (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 [137]) [505] [523]

Notes: This fragment has no context here, but the Beiträge directs the reader to 36:23a, where this same fragment appears in Nic and it influences the exegesis of that catena (AGK, III, 8; Beiträge, 76).

Job 23 13b
HT 
(ךְִנְשַׁה אֶתְּהָנֵיהּ רָכַשְׁנָה)
LXX 
ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἠθέλησεν, καὶ ἐποίησεν.

συντρέχουσαν ἔχει τῇ θελήσει τὴν δύναμιν

Wit1: \( C (= 250 257^{\text{cat}} 3005) \) cl \( (= 740 138-255 612^{\text{cat}} 3006^{\text{cat}} 559^{\text{cat}} 258^{\text{cat}} 395^{\text{cat}} \) 680\(^{\text{cat}} [137] 260^{\text{cat}} 643^{\text{cat}} 732^{\text{cat}} 139^{\text{cat}}) [505] 523

Notes: The oldest Greek catena does not attribute this fragment to an author (AGK, III, 8). On the basis of Nic, the Beiträge attributes the fragment to Chrysostom (Beiträge, 76).

Job 23 16b
HT 
(חֶהָלְדֵּנָה ḥוֹרְבֵי הָרֶבֶן)
LXX 
(παντοκράτωρ) ἐσπούδασέν με.
Job 23 16b2

HT  ἐθρόησέ με
LXX  (παντοκράτωρ) ἐσπούδασέν με.

Job 23 17a

HT  כִּי־לֹא נִצְמַתִּי מִפְּנֵי־חֹשֶׁךְ
LXX  οὐ γὰρ ἦδειν ὑπὲρ ἐπελεύσεται μοι σκότος,

Job 23 16b

Notes:  See notes on the fragment below.

Job 23 17a

Notes:  In the Edition, these fragments were listed as unattributed scholia in II App. Dieter Hagedorn has informed me that 157 (a witness of Ziegler’s d group) has many marginal notes, which are excerpts from a Nicetas catena and which the scribe has shortened and manipulated for his purposes. These fragments are examples of this phenomenon. In personal correspondence, Dieter Hagedorn presented the following suggestion. The fragments were originally at 23:15a as evidenced in 161 and 248. The reading in 161 is as follows: ἐσπούδασάκα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐθροήθην, ἐταράχθην τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς ἄγνοων, and the reading in 248 is as follows: ἐθροήθην καὶ ἐταράχθην ἄγνοων τῆς πληγῆς τὴν αἰτίαν. These readings have been influenced by Nic, which in the same verse according to Young’s edition reads as follows: ἐσπούδασα, τούτεστιν, ἐταράχθην, οὐκ εἰδὼς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς, but in the Hagedorns’ collation of 259, ἐθροήθην is read instead of ἐταράχθην. All of this material appears to come from Olympiodorus who, in his commentary has the following: διὰ τοῦτο, φησίν, ἐθροήθην οὐκ εἰδώς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς (Kommentar, 205, 5). It appears these fragments are exegetical fragments and they are not hexaplaric. The scribe of 157 adapted exegetical fragments from 15a and applied them to 16b.

Job 23 17a

Notes:  In the Edition, these fragments were listed as unattributed scholia in II App. Dieter Hagedorn has informed me that 157 (a witness of Ziegler’s d group) has many marginal notes, which are excerpts from a Nicetas catena and which the scribe has shortened and manipulated for his purposes. These fragments are examples of this phenomenon. In personal correspondence, Dieter Hagedorn presented the following suggestion. The fragments were originally at 23:15a as evidenced in 161 and 248. The reading in 161 is as follows: ἐσπούδασάκα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐθροήθην, ἐταράχθην τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς ἄγνοων, and the reading in 248 is as follows: ἐθροήθην καὶ ἐταράχθην ἄγνοων τῆς πληγῆς τὴν αἰτίαν. These readings have been influenced by Nic, which in the same verse according to Young’s edition reads as follows: ἐσπούδασα, τούτεστιν, ἐταράχθην, οὐκ εἰδὼς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς, but in the Hagedorns’ collation of 259, ἐθροήθην is read instead of ἐταράχθην. All of this material appears to come from Olympiodorus who, in his commentary has the following: διὰ τοῦτο, φησίν, ἐθροήθην οὐκ εἰδώς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς (Kommentar, 205, 5). It appears these fragments are exegetical fragments and they are not hexaplaric. The scribe of 157 adapted exegetical fragments from 15a and applied them to 16b.
Var: μαστίγων] συμφορών 512-513

Notes: There is no attribution for this fragment in the oldest Greek catena (AGK, III, 10). Nic attributes the comment to Olymp, but it is not possible to discern the authenticity of this attribution (Nic, 393).

Job 24 1

HT מַדּוּעַ לֹא־נִצְפָּנוּ
LXX διὰ τί δὲ κύριον ἔλαθον ὤραι,

〈?〉 ὤραι οἱ καιροὶ τῆς κρίσεως τῶν ἁσεβῶν. «διὰ τί οὐκ αὐθωρὸν ἀνταποδίδωσιν, εἴπατε.»

Wit1: C (= 249cat 250 3005) cFcat (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 754 474 258 395 680 [137] 260 643 732 139) [505] 523 3007

Notes: Ms 395 attributes this fragment to Olymp, while 139 attributes it to Polychronius and 523 attributes it to Chrysostom (AGK, III, 11). The word, καιροί, belongs to Aq and Th, but the whole fragment is probably from patristic sources. This exegesis has influenced Nic (Beiträge, 76).

Job 24 2a

HT תַּשִּׂיגוּ גְּבֻלוֹ
LXX ἀσεβεῖς δὲ ὑπερέβησαν τὸ δίκαιον ἐπάτησαν καὶ κτήνη ὀρφανῶν καὶ βοϊδίον χήρας;

〈?〉 τὸ δίκαιον ἐπάτησαν

Wit1: C (= 250 3005) cFcat (= 740 138-255 612 3006 395 680 [137] 643 732 139) [505]

Attr: (??) σ’ 395

Notes: Ms 395 attributes the fragment to Sym, but there are no extant examples of Sym using πατέω to render נשׂג or שׂג. The fragment has either influenced Iulian’s comments or has come from them: πῶς ἁσεβεῖς πατήσαντες τὸ δίκαιον ποίμνιον σὺν ποιμένι ἠρπασαν καὶ κτήμα ὀρφανῶν καὶ βοϊδιον χήρας; (AGK, III, 11; Iul-Kommentar, 149; Beiträge, 76).

Job 24 5a
HT (בְּפָעֳלָם) יָצְאוּ (הֵן פוֹרַים בַּמִּדְבָּר)
LXX ἀπέβησαν (δὲ ὡσπερ ὁνοὶ ἐν ἀγρῷ)

〈?〉 ἀδεῶς καταπατοῦντες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους

Wit1:  C (= 3005) cl (= 138-255 612 3006 559 754 395 680 [137] 260 643) [505]

Notes:  The note appears without separation from a hexaplaric note in 260 643 (AGK, III, 13). Otherwise there is no apparent connection to the Hexapla. Ziegler notes that the comment has been absorbed by Nic (Beiträge, 76).

Job 24 6a
HT בְּשָׂדֶהּ בְּלִילוֹ יַקְצִירוּ (Q)
LXX ἀγρὸν πρὸ ὥρας οὐκ αὐτῶν ὄντα ἐθέρισαν·

〈?〉 ληστρικῶς

Wit1:  C (= 250) cl (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680)
Wit2:  fin] + ληστρικῶς II C³ mg

Notes:  This fragment appears to be an adaptation of the exegesis of Kommentar (Kommentar, 207; AGK, III, 15), and it has influenced the exegesis of Nic (Beiträge, 76). The lemma actually appears in the first Lucianic group. Whether this reading is an original part of the Lucianic tradition or was accidentally added to the text from the marginal gloss is not clear at present.

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

〈?〉 τῆς καταδυναστείας εἶκονες

Wit1:  C (= 250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 137 643 732) [505]

Notes:  This fragment has influenced the exegesis of Nic, but it has no apparent connection with the Hexapla (AGK, III, 15; Beiträge, 76).
Job 24 9a
HT
ְקִנְיָלוֹן (מְשֻֽׁרֶד) (רָזָה)
LXX
𝒦 تصنيف ὄρφανον (ἀπὸ μαστοῦ,)

〈?〉
ἐπὶ τῷ πωλῆσαι

Wit1:  C (= 250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 3006 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) [505]

Attr:  (??) α’ 3006

Notes:  Ms 3006 has an attribution to Aq (AGK, III, 17). Ziegler notes a parallel with Kommentar, which may indicate that this fragment has come from Olympiodorus, although it has been modified by the scholiast (Beiträge, 76).

Job 24 9b
HT
significant הָעַל־ָעַנָי יַחְבֹּלוּ׃
LXX
ἐκπεπτωκότα δὲ ἐταπείνωσαν.

〈?〉
ἐκπεσεῖν ποιήσαντες τῶν ὑπαρχόντων

Wit1:  C (= 249cat 250 3005) cfCat (= 740mg 255mg-138mg 612 3006 559 754 474 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) [505] 523

Notes:  This exegesis may be adapted from the commentary of Olympiodorus and is probably not related to the Hexapla (Kommentar, 208; AGK, III, 17; Beiträge, 76).

Job 24 10b
HT
ַפַּרְעֵבִים (וּרְעֵבִים)
LXX
(πεινώντων δὲ) τὸν ψωμὸν ἀφείλαντο.

〈?〉
ἐπίτασις πονηρίας

Wit1:  C (= 250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 137 643 732 139)

Var:  ἐπίτασις ἐπιτασεῖ 3005

Notes:  This scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic, but it has no clear correspondence to HT or the Hexapla (AGK, III, 17; Beiträge, 77).

Job 24 12b
Job 24 13b

HT

לֹא־הִכִּירוּ דְרָכָיו

LXX

ὁδὸν δὲ δικαιοσύνης οὐκ ᾔδεισαν

Notes: This note corresponds to Matthew 5:8 and Psalm 23:4 (AGK 3, 20; Beiträge, 77). It is a secondary addition to the catena since it is not present in 643.

Job 24 20ab

HT

יִשְׁכָּחֵהוּ רֶחֶם

LXX

εἶτ ἀνεμίνησθη αὐτοῦ ἡ ἁμαρτία,

Notes: This exegesis either influenced Olympiodorus or it is a summary of his exegesis in Kommentar (AGK, III, 19; Beiträge, 77). It has no clear correspondence to HT or the Hexapla.

Job 24 20ab

HT

וְנֶפֶשׁ־חֲלָלִים תְּשַׁוֵּעַ

LXX

ψυχὴ δὲ νηπίων ἐστέναξεν μέγα,

Notes: This exegesis either influenced Olympiodorus or it is a summary of his exegesis in Kommentar (AGK, III, 19; Beiträge, 77). It has no clear correspondence to HT or the Hexapla.
Notes: Ms 474 contains an attribution to ἄλλος, while 395 has an attribution to τοῦ αὐτοῦ (= Olympiodorus) (AGK 3, 23; Beiträge, 77). There is no parallel to this scholion in any other source.

Job 24 20d

HT

סונתריביה תַּהַר כָּעֵץ עַוְלָה׃

LXX

סונתריביה דָּיָּאָה פָּאָּה אַדִּיקָּו יֵּסָּא הָעֵלָּה אָנִּיאָּתָו.

〈?〉 ἀρχήστω γενομένω μετὰ τὴν συντριβήν

Wit1: C (= 250 3005*) cfal (= 740mg 255mg-138mg 612 3006 559 754 474 258 395 680 137 260 643 732 139) [505 523]

Var: γενομένῳ γινομενῳ 740 138-255 612 3006 559 258 395 680

Notes: The asterisk after 3005 indicates that the ms has not been completely collated in AGK. The only variant from the lemma is that the ms preserves the fragment in the accusative case (-ον) instead of the dative case. Ziegler notes that this note has influenced the exegesis of Nic (Beiträge, 77).

Job 24 23

HT

טְהַנּוֹלֶהְּ לְכָּעֵץ רַחֲשָׁנָּו (שְׁנֵי הָדָּרֶךְ־רָכִּיֶּהּ)

LXX

(μαλακισθεὶς) μὴ ἐλπίζετω (ὑγιασθῆναι, ἀλλὰ πεσεῖται νόσῳ.)

〈?〉 ἀντὶ τοῦ· οὐκ ἐλπίζει

Wit1: C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 3006 559 395 680 137 643 139) [505 523]

Notes: There is no wider context in which to interpret the significance of this fragment (AGK 3, 25; Beiträge, 84).

Job 24 24b1

HT

רַחֲשָׁנָּו (טְהַנּוֹלֶהְּ)

LXX

(ἐμαράνθη δὲ) ὁσπερ μιλόχη (ἐν καύματι)

〈?〉 ὁσπερ χλόη

Wit1: Montef
Notes: Since the reading of the Three is established for this line, this reading cannot be hexaplaric. Even before the new evidence of the Nachlese, Ziegler had already identified this reading with the Lucianic recension (Beiträge, 92).

Job 24 24b

HT

LXX

\(\text{ἐμαράνθη (δὲ ὡσπερ μολόχη ἐν καύματι)}\)

\(\text{ἐν ᾿απορρήτῳ, μετ’ οὐδενὸς συσκοπῆσας}\)

Notes: AGK contains a catena fragment which contains this scholion at the beginning of a comment which has correspondences to the Olympiodorus Kommentar (AGK 3, 25 §§73-74; Beiträge, 84).

Job 25 2a

HT

LXX

\(\text{ὅ ποιῶν τὴν σύμπασαν ἐν ὑψίστῳ;}\)

\(\text{μὴ γὰρ τις ὑπολάβοι ὅτι ἔστιν παρέλκυσις πειραταῖς;}\)

Notes: Ms 732 preserves an attribution to Olympiodorus, while 139 has an attribution to Polychronius. These witnesses are not the best representatives of the oldest Greek catena and therefore these attributions are probably not genuine. The scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (Beiträge, 77).
παράτασις ζωῆς ή ύπερθεσις

tιμωρίας

Notes: Ms 395 attributes the scholion to Evagrius (AGK 3, 31). Ziegler notes that a form of the scholion is in Olympiodorus (Beiträge, 77).

Job 25 3b

Notes: The scholion answers the question about whether it is the πειραταί, which are mentioned in 25:3a (Beiträge, 86; AGK 3, 31).

Job 25 5a

Notes: The scholion answers the question about whether it is the πειραταί, which are mentioned in 25:3a (Beiträge, 86; AGK 3, 31).
Notes: Ms 395 attributes the fragment to Aq but, since the Aq fragment is established for this verse, this scholion arose probably due to the scholiast combining a comment of Olympiodorus and Isa 13:10 (cp. Matt 24:29; Mark 13:24) (AGK 3, 33; Kommentar, 217,6-7; Beiträge, 77). It also influenced Nic.

Job 26 7a

Notes: The word, ἀπέραντος, occurs 4x in the LXX and the Three. Th uses it in Job 36:26 and it occurs in 3 Makk 2:9. Since the Th and Aq fragments are established for this verse, is it possible that this one belongs to Symmachus? He uses εἰς ἀπέραντον for ὄλλοι ἐκ τῆς γῆς in Ps 20(21):7 and ἀπέραντος for σῶς (LXX: ἐσχάτη) in Jon 2:6. Although at present it is not probable that Sym is the author of this fragment, perhaps more evidence from translation technique will reveal that it is from him, since he is the author to use this term most frequently. ἀπέραντος also occurs in the Job catena in two other places, used by both Polychronius (AGK 2, 78 §25) and Olympiodorus (AGK 3, 130 §156).

Job 26 13a

Notes: This fragment is separate from the following one in the oldest Greek catena. Nic has been influenced by this fragment (Beiträge, 77; AGK 3, 43).

Job 26 13a²
κλείθρα δὲ οὐρανοῦ (δεδοίκασιν αὐτὸν.)

συνάγει γὰρ τὸν ἀέρα καὶ πάλιν διαλύει ὡς ἂν ἐθέλη

Wit1:  
C (= 250 3005)  
cf_{cat} (= 740^{mg} 255^{mg}-138^{mg} 612 559 754 474 258 395 [680]) [505 523]

Var:  
ἐθέλη] ἐθελεῖ 740 3005; ἐθελοί 138-255 395; θελεῖ 474

Notes:  This fragment is separate from the one above in the oldest Greek catena. Nic has been influenced by this fragment (Beiträge, 77; AGK 3, 43).

Job 27 7a

רַחֲבֹּתִים אֲשֶׁר אִירִים  

LXX  
οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ εἶπαν οἱ ἔχθροί μου ὡσπερ ἡ καταστροφή τῶν ἀσεβῶν.

ἀπόλοιτο φησιν οἱ ἔχθροί μου· συκοφαντοῦσι γὰρ με

Wit1:  
cf_{cat} (= 740 138-255 612 559 754 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139) [505 523]

Notes:  This scholion is attributed to Chrysostom and is from Chr-Kommentar, and therefore is not hexaplaric (AGK 3, 51; Beiträge, 77; Chr-Kommentar, 146).

Job 27 15a

שִׁירֵי שֶׁרְכִּיר (שֶׁרְכִּיר Q)  

LXX  
οἱ δὲ περιόντες αὐτοῦ ἐν θανάτῳ τελευτήσουσιν,

ἀντὶ τοῦ· πρόωροι

Wit1:  
C (= 788-250 3005) cI (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006_{cat} 260_{cat} 643_{cat} 732 139_{cat}) [505 523]

Notes:  πρόωρος is not listed in the LXX concordance (H-R, 1234), and it is only used here in the Job catena (AGK 4, 319). This fragment appears to have influenced the exegesis of Nic (AGK 3, 54; Beiträge, 84).

Job 27 19a
Job 27 20b

Notes: Two important mss have an attribution to Sym, but the rest of the tradition preserves the note sine nomine (AGK 3, 55; Beiträge, 77). There is no correspondence to the HT and, therefore, it is probably not hexaplaric.

Job 27 21b

Notes: This scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (AGK 3, 56; Beiträge, 78). Ziegler notes that this scholion was incorrectly attached to the hexaplaric fragment for this verse (Beiträge, 37).
κονιορτός is used 19x in the LXX, while κόνις is used 2x in the LXX and 4x in Symmachus (Beiträge, 91; Field, 48).

Job 28 7b
HT
E

\( \langle \alpha' \rangle \) \( \text{ικτίνως} \)

Wit1: T-S NS 309.9

NonGr: CG שירנין

Notes: De Lange has the following note on the reading in the Cairo Geniza: xxviii 7 'yh. There is another word following, which is illegible. Aq., Sym. and Th. use ικτίνες for דַּיָּה at Isa 24:15 (Reider, 117). His transliteration of the Hebrew letters into Greek is ιχτῖνας, which Ziegler emended to ικτίνος (De Lange, 292, 294). The Th fragment is under the asterisk, so hypothetically this lemma could belong either to Aq or Sym on the assumption of De Lange that these CG fragments are from the Three.

The LXX also uses ικτίν for הָיוֹ in Lev 11:14 and Deut 14:13 (H-R, 684), which means that the word cannot be limited to the Three. Perhaps with more evidence this fragment will be shown to belong to the Three, but at present this fragment is best treated as a Byzantine version of Job, which had contact with the LXX translation tradition of using ικτίν for הָיוֹ.

Job 28 16b
HT
LXX

\( \langle ? \rangle \) \( \text{σαρδονυχίω} \)

Wit1: 248 512-513 555

Attr: ⟨?⟩ Ἀλλώς Field

Var: lemma -δων 248; σαρδονυχί 512-513 555

Notes: The word does not occur in the LXX and in the Job catena it occurs only here in a comment attributed to Olympiodorus (AGK 3, 68). It is probable that the note came from Olympiodorus and is, therefore, not hexaplaric.

Field notes that Drusius suspects that Aq is the author on the basis of Gen 2:12 et al. (Field, 50 n. 21), but the evidence there and in other places points to ὄνυξ as the reading of the Three.
Job 28 17a

HT  לָא־יַעַרְכֶנָּה (יִוְּכָרָה)

E (וֹיָק יָסְוְתָהָּ אֶתְּיָא) הַרְכָּבָה

〈?〉 κρύσταλλος διαφανής

\[Wit1: \ C (= 3005) \ cI (= 740 138-255 612 559 680) \ [505]\]

Notes: This scholion was probably influenced by the exegesis Olympiodorus (\textit{AGK} 3, 69; \textit{Beiträge}, 78; see especially the comment by Olympiodorus in \textit{AGK} 3, 68 §85).

Job 28 19a

HT  כֵּרַיִת־כּוּשׁ (סֵתְרָכָה)

E (וֹיָק יָסְוְתָהָּ אֶתְּיָא) חָסָרֶנָּה תֹּסָאָ_duplicates אֹיֵד אֲוָיָאָא

〈?〉 τοὺς θησαυροὺς

\[Wit1: \ C (= 788 3005) \ cI (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) \ [505]\]

Notes: \textit{AGK} lists this fragment at 28:18b on the basis of 3005, noting that \textit{cI} (= \Gamma) has it at 19a (= \textit{Beiträge}, 78; \textit{AGK} 3, 71). Ms 788 is the second \textit{C} ms to preserve this fragment and it preserves it at 19a; therefore, we place it at 19a here. This fragment appears to be an exegetical comment on the text and is not related to the Hexapla.

Job 29 5b

HT  כֶּסְרוּבָה (גֶּרֶשֶׁר)

LXX (κύκλῳ δέ μου) οἱ παῖδες·

〈?〉 ἀγόμενοι ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ

\[Wit1: \ C (= 788-250 3005) \ cI (= 740 255 612 559 395 680) \ [505]\]

Attr: (??) Ἀλλὸς Field

Notes: Field listed this fragment with the hexaplaric fragments, but in a footnote he comments that it is a scholion from Olymp (Field, 51 n. 6; \textit{Beiträge}, 91). This note entered Nic and was attributed to Olymp, but the oldest Greek catena preserves it separate from the catena and therefore it is a scholion, which remains \textit{sine nomine} (\textit{AGK} 3, 82).
Job 29 10a

HT

καὶ ἀκουόντων μου καὶ μακαρίζοντων με, ἐφ’ οἷς ἔλεγον, ἡ γλῶσσα τῷ λάρυγγι ἐκολλήθη

LXX

οἱ δὲ ἀκουόσαντες ἐμακάρισάν με,

〈?〉

τῶν ἀκουόντων μου καὶ μακαρίζοντων με, ἐφ’ οἷς ἔλεγον, ἡ γλῶσσα τῷ λάρυγγι ἐκολλήθη

Notes: Ms 523 attributes this fragment to Chrysostom, while there is no attribution in 474. The majority of the tradition attributes this fragment to Origen and AGK accepts this attribution as authentic (AGK 3, 86). The text in italics is from the bible text of 29:10b.

Job 29 20a

HT

עבורי תורש שנפניר

E

ἡ δόξα μου καινὴ μετ’ ἐμοῦ,

〈?〉

ἀεί μου ἀνακαινίζεται ἡ δόξα

Notes: AGK comments on this fragment as follows: Ziegler has not considered that it could be treated as a hexaplaric note; however, compare the version of the Vulgate: gloria mea semper innovabitur (AGK 3, 96). The readings for Th and Sym are established for this verse and, therefore, Aq is the only eligible reviser. According to Reider and H-R, there are no instances of ἀνακαινίζειν for Aq (Reider, 17; H-R, 78). More evidence will need to come to light before we can assign this fragment to the Hexapla.
Job 29 20b

HT

καὶ τὸ τόξον μου (ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ πορεύσεται.)

E

καὶ τὸ τόξον μου.

〈?〉

ο σκοπός μου πρὸς αὐτόν

Wit1: 

C (= 788-250 3005) cf<cat> (= 740<mg>255<mg>138<mg>612 [559] 3004 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139<mg>[505] 523

Notes: This fragment is related to the exegesis of Olympiodorus, and is probably not hexaplaric (AGK 3, 96; Beiträge, 78; Kommentar, 248).

Job 29 21b

HT

רְדֵּם לָמוֹ (לְמֵרְדֵּם)

LXX

(ἐσιώπησαν δὲ) ἐπὶ τῇ ἐμῇ βουλῇ.

〈?〉

νόμον αὐτήν ὀριζόμενοι

Wit1: 

C (= 788-250 3005) cf (= 740 138-255)

Notes: This fragment is best treated as sine nomine, even though a version of it appears after a comment from Olympiodorus in C (= 3005) and cf (AGK 3, 97; Beiträge, 78). In C (= 788-250) this scholion is distinct from the comment of Olympiodorus, but it appears to have been influenced by Olympiodorus and therefore it is probably not hexaplaric.

Job 29 24b

HT

אֶזֶר עֲצָתִי (לְאֶזֶר עֲצָתִי).

E

καὶ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου μου (οὐκ ἀπέπιπτεν).

〈?〉

ἡ δόξα τῆς διδασκαλίας μου

Wit1: 

C (= 257 788-250 3005) cf<cat> (= 740 255<mg>138<mg>612 [559] 3004 754 474 258 395 680 137 3006<mg> 260 643 732 139<mg>[505] 523<mg>

Var: hattan > 258 612

Notes: Ms 395 attributes this fragment to τοῦ αὐτοῦ (= Olympiodorus), but the fragment is probably not from him. This fragment is partially parallel to Olympiodorus, and therefore it is probably not hexaplaric (AGK 3, 98; Beiträge, 78; Kommentar, 249).
Job 29 25a

Wit1:  

\[ C (= 257 788-250 3005) \text{cat} (= 740 255\text{mg}-138\text{mg} 612 [559] 3004 754 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 732 139) [505] 523 3007 \]

Notes:  Mss 740 and 139 preserve an attribution to Olympiodorus. This scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (\textit{AGK} 3, 99; \textit{Beiträge}, 78).

Job 30 3a

Wit1:  

\[ C (= 788-250) \text{cat} (= 740 138-255 612 [559] 3004 395 680 137 3006^\text{cat} 643^\text{cat}) [505] \]

Wit2: \[ \ddag \text{γονος}^\text{-} \nu \text{oi La (instabiles)} \text{III} 620 644 \text{Co Aeth} \]

Notes:  The \textit{Edition} contained this fragment in App II, but Ziegler then reassigned it to marginal scholia in the \textit{Beiträge} (\textit{Beiträge}, 84). The reading is witnessed in La and the third Lucianic group. The plural number may indicate that it is not hexaplaric, since Th translated HT with a singular number. Th has influenced this version, but its source is not known beyond this point.

Job 30 3b

\[ \text{οι φεύγωντες (ἀνυδρον ἔχως συνοχήν καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν,)} \]

Job 30 16a
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HT

(נַפְשִׁי)

E

(καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ ἐμὲ) ἐκχυθήσεται (ἡ ψυχή μου.)

Job 30 18a

HT

כִּבְרָב־כֹּחַ יִתְחַפֵּשׂ

LXX

(ἐν πολλῇ ἰσχύι ἐπελάβετό μου) τῆς στολῆς,

Job 30 25a

HT

סְלִיקָשֶׁה־יוֹ בָכִיתִי

LXX

(ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ παντὶ ἀδυνάτῳ) ἔκλαυσα,

Job 30 28b

HT

(כִּבְרָב־כֹּחַ יִתְחַפֵּשׂ)

E

(καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ ἐμὲ) ἐκχυθήσεται (ἡ ψυχή μου.)

-notes-

A catena fragment has the following: ἐκχυθήσεται ἀντὶ τοῦ συγχεῖται..., which is partly from Olympiodorus (AGK 3, 107 §90; Nic, 457). This portion is not from Kommentar, and therefore the source is not clear. The fragment in 248 is probably not from Olympiodorus and there is no demonstrable connection to the Hexapla.

Job 30 18a

-notes-

There is no wider context in which to interpret the significance of this fragment (AGK 3, 108; Beiträge, 78).

Job 30 25a

-notes-

Mss 137 523 680 attribute this fragment to Chrysostom, but this is probably an error for the well-attested fragment of Chrysostom for the same verse. This scholion was absorbed by Nic and attributed to Olympiodorus incorrectly (Beiträge, 78; AGK 3, 111). There is no correspondence with HT and therefore this fragment is probably not hexaplaric.
Job 31 4a

HT  רִאָשֶׁה  (רָאוֹת)
E  (ואִי) אֵּשֶׁת  (ואֵל)

Job 31 4b

HT  כְּעִילָתִי (עִקָּר)
E  קַיִּים פַּרְקָרָה (עִקָּר)

Notes: For the specific manuscript data see AGK (AGK 3, 117).
Notes: There is no wider context in which to evaluate this scholion, since it does not appear in any of the patristic sources or Nic (AGK 3, 117; Beiträge, 79).

Job 31 7b

HT

Notes: Ms 395 attributes the fragment to Evagrius. The scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (AGK 3, 121; Beiträge, 78).

Job 31 8a

HT

Notes: Concerning this note AGK concludes that it is based on a misunderstanding, which also intruded into the text of an Olympiodorus fragment of the catena (AGK 3, 122; see also page 121; Beiträge, 78). It is not from the Hexapla.

Job 31 12b

HT

Notes: The Beiträge places this fragment at 12a, but AGK and the mss place it at 12b. For the specific manuscript evidence, see AGK (AGK 3, 124; Beiträge, 84). This word is not a clear substitute for any word in 12a or 12b.
Job 31 16b
HT  רַעְשֵׁנִי אָכַלֶּהָ (ךְּלֵכֶלָה)
LXX  (χήρας δὲ τὸν ὀφθαλμόν) οὐκ ἐξέπηξα.

〈?〉  τοῖς δάκρυσιν

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 740 612 559 [258] 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

Wit2:  fin] + τοῖς δακρυσιν ll 620 C³ mg

Attr:  (??) 'Αλλος Field

Notes:  This fragment occurs in the margin in the catena tradition, but it is also at the end of the bible text in ll 620 (AGK 3, 127; Beiträge, 91; Field, 55 n. 13). It is probably not hexaplaric

Job 31 26a
HT  רָעְשָׁנָה אוֹרֶךְ יָכֵל
LXX  (ἡ οὖχ ὄρῳ μὲν ἢλιον τὸν ἐπιφαύσκοντα) ἐκλείποντα,

〈?〉  σημείωσαι, ὅτι ἔζητήθη

Wit1:  cl (= 740 138-255 612)

Var:  σημείωσαι] σημίο() 612; ση 740 138-255

Notes:  The abbreviations could stand for σημείωσαι or σημειωτέον (AGK 3, 132; Beiträge, 87).

Job 31 26b
HT  רַעְשֵׁנִי אָכַלֶּה (ךְּלֵכֶלָה)
LXX  (σελήνην δὲ φθίνουσαν;) οὐ γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἔστιν.

〈?〉  ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ ἐπιτάξαντι

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

Attr:  (??) σ’ 740
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**Notes:** This fragment has no corresponding phrase in HT but, theoretically, this fragment could be a revision of OG. There are no known hexaplaric fragments at this verse so that it might be possible for this fragment to be one. This fragment has influenced the exegesis of Nic (AGK 3, 132; Beiträge, 79).

**Job 31 35b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>לִי׃תאֶעֶנְדֶנּוּ עֲטָרוֹ(אִם־לֹא עַל־שִׁכְמִי אֶשָּׂאֶנּוּ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>επ' οὕμοις ἄν περιθέμενος στέφανον (ἀνεγίνωσκον,)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** There is no wider context in order to interpret the significance of this fragment (AGK 3, 138; Beiträge, 79). It has no discernable connection to patristic sources and it does not appear to have formal correspondence with HT. It is probably an explanatory gloss on the Greek text.

**Job 31 36**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>מִסְפַּר צְעָדַי אַגִּידֶנּוּ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>καὶ ἐὰν (ῥήξας αὐτὴν ἀπέδωκα)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The scholion is at 37a in 788-250 and 740. There is no formal equivalent to HT or connection to patristic sources and it appears to be an exegetical comment on the Greek text.
Job 32.13

HT: 

LXX: 

Notes: There is no equivalent to HT for this fragment. This scholion appears to be a guide to the reading of this verse, even though there is no textual evidence for this reading according to Edition I App (AGK 3, 139; Beiträge, 79).

Job 32.19b

HT: 

LXX: 

Notes: Ms 395 attributes this scholion to Chrysostom. Job 32:11b is the source of this scholion (AGK 3, 154; Beiträge, 79).

Job 32.22b

HT: 

LXX: 

Notes: The Kollationen contains this fragment and comments that the index is at ἐρρηγώς (Kollationen, 207). This fragment could be an error for the established fragment, ἀδιάπνευστος, at Job 32:19a.
Notes: In 249\textsuperscript{cat}, the scholion was incorporated into a directly named comment from Chrysostom, but this evidence does not connect the fragment to him. Also, Nic incorporated this exegesis and attributed it to Olympiodorus (\textit{AGK} 3, 162; \textit{Beiträge}, 79). There is no formal correspondence to the HT and it is doubtful whether this fragment has hexaplaric significance.

\textbf{Job 33 3a}

\textit{HT} (ישָרִי לְבֵי (אִמְדוּר)

\textit{LXX} (καθαρά μου ἢ καρδία) ρήμασιν.

\textit{(?)} \textit{μηδὲν κατὰ πρόκριμα λέγουσα}

\textit{Wit1:} \(C\) (= 249\textsuperscript{cat} 257\textsuperscript{cat} 788-250) \(cI\) (= 740 255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 260 643)

\textit{Wit2:} ρήμασιν + μηδὲν κατὰ πρόκριμα λέγουσα \textit{II}

Notes: This scholion is an addition in the first group of the Lucianic recension (\textit{AGK} 3, 162; \textit{Beiträge}, 79). Also, it entered into the exegesis of Nic (\textit{Beiträge}, 79). Since there is no correspondence to HT or OG, it is probably not hexaplaric.

\textbf{Job 33 12b}

\textit{HT}

\textit{LXX} αἰώνιος γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ἑπάνω βροτῶν.

\textit{(?)} \textit{τουτέστι· οὐκ ἐπὶ σοὶ πρῶτον δοκιμασθῆσεται}

\textit{Wit1:} \(C\) (= 788-250 3005) \(cI\) (= 740 255\textsuperscript{mg-138mg} 612 559 754 474 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) \(505\) 523

Notes: Mss 559 395 attribute the fragment to Chrysostom (\textit{AGK} 3, 167). This fragment has influenced the exegesis of Nic (\textit{Beiträge}, 86).

\textbf{Job 33 13}

\textit{HT}

\textit{LXX} (λέγεις δὲ Διὰ τὴς δίκης μου) οὐκ ἐπακήκοεν πᾶν ρῆμα;

\textit{(?)} \textit{ὅποια ποτ’ ἂν ἢ αἰτησίς ἢ}

\textit{Wit1:} \(C\) (= 788-250 3005) \(cI\) (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680) \(505\)
Notes: This fragment cannot be hexaplaric since the readings of the Three are already established for this verse.

Job 33 16a

HT  יִגְלֶה אֹזֶן אַנְשִׁים

LXX  (τότε) ἀνακαλύπτει νοῦν ἀνθρώπων,

〈?〉 ἕκαστον ὡς δυνατὸν ἐπιστρέφων

Wit1:  \( C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \ cI^{\text{cat}} (= 740^{\text{mg}} 255^{mg}-138^{\text{mg}} 612 \ 559 \ 474 \ 258 \ 395 \ 680 \ 137 \ 3006 \ 260 \ 643 \ 139) \ [505] \ 523 \)

Notes: There is an attribution to Chrysostom in 395. There may be an imprecise parallel to Olympiodorus (Beiträge, 79; AGK 3, 169), from which this scholion may have come.

Job 33 17b

HT  מִגֶּבֶר יְכַסֶּה׃ וְגֵוָה

LXX  τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πτώματος ἐρρύσατο.

〈?〉 ἐπιστρέφων πρὸ τῆς τιμωρίας

Wit1:  \( C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \ cI (= 740 138-255 612 \ 559 \ 754 \ 395 \ 680 \ 137 \ 3006 \ 643 \ 139) \ [505] \)

Attr:  〈?〉 \( \alpha' \ \sigma' \ 139 \)

Notes: This fragment has entered into the exegesis of Nic. Ziegler notes that Kommentar uses τιμωρία 3x and ἐπιστρέφειν 2x (Beiträge, 79; AGK 3, 169).

Job 33 26b

HT  בִּתְרוּעָה (וַיַּרְא פָּנָיו)

LXX  (εἰσελεύσεται δὲ προσώπῳ καθαρῷ) σὺν ἐξηγορίᾳ.

〈?〉 μετὰ ἐξομολογήσεως

Wit1:  \( C (= 788-250 \ 3005) \ cI^{137} 138 \ 139 \ 260 \ 643 \ 732 \ 3006 \)

Attr:  〈?〉 \( \text{Edition (Θ')} \)
Notes: This note follows διγράφῳ ἱλαρῷ in 559 (Kollationen, 213). In 788, the hexaplaric fragments of Aq, Th, and Sym are on the left side of the bible text and this fragment appears on the right side. In this early witness these fragments were intended to be separate. Furthermore, the hexaplaric fragments for this verse are established (see chapter 3 “Hexaplaric Fragments.”), but whence does this scholion come? The commentary of Olympiodorus has the following reading and it is similar in AGK: τότε ὁ διασωθεὶς εὐχαριστήριον ὁδήν καὶ ἐξομολόγησιν εὐπρόσδεκτον ἀνοίσει θεῷ, προσώπῳ δὲ καθαρῷ, τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς διηλεύτῳ καθαίρεται γὰρ ἡ ψυχή διὰ παιδείας καὶ ἐξομολογήσεως (Kommentar, 285; AGK 3, 172). There are two possibilities: (1) either this fragment has influenced the catena or (2) the catena has influenced this fragment. Certainty on this question is elusive, but it appears that this is an exegetical fragment and not hexaplaric in this verse (cp Chapter 3, 22:22a Sym for the possible hexaplaric influence on patristic exegesis).

Job 34 10b

| HT     | לַעֲלֹלֵת לַאֵל מַעְרָשׂ |
| LXX    | מִהְמַוָיָהָי קַרְיאִיתֶהָיָי |

〈?〉 μὴ εἰπόμαι αὐτὸν ἀκρίτως τι ποιεῖν

Wit1:  
C (= 788 3005) cl\textsuperscript{cat} (= 740\textsuperscript{mg} 255\textsuperscript{mg}-138\textsuperscript{mg} 612\textsuperscript{mg} 559 258 395\textsuperscript{mg} 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505]

Attr:  
〈?〉 σ’ 395

Notes: The attribution to Sym in 395 is incorrect, since there is a well established Sym fragment for this verse. The fragment has entered Nic with one change (τὸν θεὸν for αὐτόν) (AGK 3, 182; Beiträge, 79).

Job 34 11b

| HT     | רַכְאַרָה אֶרֶץ יִקָּשְׁנֵהּ |
| E      | καὶ ἐν τρίβῳ ἀνδρός εὑρήσει αὐτόν. |

〈?〉 ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ ἔλεγξει αὐτόν

Wit1:  
C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680) [505]

Notes: The readings of Th and Sym are established for this verse and this fragment is not from Aq. This scholion entered Nic (AGK 3, 182; Beiträge, 41, 79).

Job 34 13a
Job 34 19b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>מִי־פָקַד (צָה⬛עָלָיו אָרְךָ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ὃς ἐποίησεν (τὴν γῆν·)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{Wit1: } C (= 788-250 3005) \ cI (= 740 138-255 612^{\text{cat}} 559^{\text{cat}} 474^{\text{cat}} 754 258^{\text{cat}} 395 680^{\text{cat}} 137^{\text{cat}} 3006^{\text{cat}} 260^{\text{cat}} 643^{\text{cat}} 139^{\text{cat}}) \ [505]\)

\(\text{Attr: } (\text{?}) \ ,^\sigma^\text{395}\)

\(\text{Notes: } \text{This scholion is at 13b in the } cI \text{ group. This scholion has influenced the exegesis of Nic (AGK 3, 182; Beiträge, 79).}\)

Job 34 23a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>יִכָּל לָא תֵּלֵי־אֲמֵתָא שִׂמְשֹׁתׁ נוֹדָךְ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ ἄνδρα θήσει ἔτι·</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{Wit1: } C (= 788-250 3005) \ cI (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) \ [505]\)
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Job 35 7a

HT

Job 36 18a

HT

Job 36 22a

HT
This scholion has no correspondence with HT or E. It appears to be a
direct object supplied for the verb κραταιώσει. The form ὀρθά is used in two other
places in the Job catena: one of those is attributed to Olympiodorus (AGK 3, 212) and the
other comes from a fragment which is closely parallel to Olympiodorus (AGK 1, 346;
AGK 4, 280).

Job 36 23a

HT
מֵרָא יִלְיָיר רַֽקֵּם

LXX
tίς (δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐτάζων αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα;)

〈?〉 ἀντὶ τοῦ· οὐδείς

Job 36 24a

HT
זָכָר רֵי (חֶשְׁנָה (צֹעֲלָ))

LXX
(μνήσθητι ὅτι) μεγάλα (ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα,)

〈?〉 ἀντὶ τοῦ· θαυμαστά

Job 36 26b

HT
מַסֶּר נָגִיָּר (לַֽאֶרֶץ תֶּהֶרֶךְ)

E
(ἀριθμὸς ἐτῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ) ἀπέραντος.

〈?〉 τούτεστιν· ἀἰδίος

Notes: Ziegler shows that the works of God often called “wonderful” in the OT
Notes: This word is used 6x in the Job catena, and most significantly it is connected with ἀπέραντον (ἀπέραντον καὶ οὗτος) in a comment by Polychronius at Job 11:7a (AGK 2, 78; AGK 3, 224). The word is not listed for the Three, and in the LXX it appears at WisSal 7:26 and 4 Makk 10:25.

Job 36 28c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>μεσφρέα χναήν (ἐλασρήχα)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ὦραν (ἐθετο κτήνεσιν,)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>*</sup> μέτρα καὶ ὀροὺς

*Wit1:*  
C (= 3005) cI (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

*Attr:* [?] σ’ 139

Notes: These words belong to Olympiodorus in the Job catena at ΚΕΕ 64 (AGK 3, 234) and this comment is from Kommentar (320; Beiträge, 80). The scholion, therefore, belongs to Olympiodorus and has no connection to the Hexapla.

Job 37 7a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>βυνυκρήπιον (ῥθομΐ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ἐν χειρὶ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου (κατασφραγίζει,)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>*</sup> τὰ πάντα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

*Wit1:*  
C (= 788-250 3005) cI (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 137 3006 643 139)

*Attr:* [?] σ’ C (= 3005); Ἀλλος Field

*Var:*  ἀνθρώπου] ουρανου 139 643

Notes: There is no corresponding phrase to the HT, and a fragment from the Three would resemble the Th reading under the asterisk. This scholion is probably a marginal gloss without connection to the Hexapla (AGK 3, 236; Beiträge, 80).

Job 37 16b-17a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>μπλάβα τοῦ χώμος ῥῦμας</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἡξεισία δὲ πτώματα πονηρῶν. σοῦ δὲ ἡ στολὴ θερμή·</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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καὶ πῶς ἔξαισίως ἐπιπίτουσι
toῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς ἐν θέρμῃ
ὀντών τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων

Wit1:  C (= 249\textsuperscript{cat} 257 788-250 3005) cf\textsuperscript{at} (= 740\textsuperscript{mg} 255\textsuperscript{mg}-138\textsuperscript{mg} 612 559 258 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) 505

Var:  ἐν θέρμῃ] ενθεν μη 137 3006 260 643 139

Notes:  This scholion does not appear to be a version of HT but it is a comment on the LXX (AGK 3, 242; Beiträge, 80).

Job 37 21b

HT  ובַּשְׁחָקִים
E  (תילאוּגֵהוֹן) ἐν τοῖς παλαιώμασιν

τουτέστιν: ἐξ ἀναριθμήτων
χρόνων

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 643 139) [505]

Attr:  (?)] α’ 395

Var:  τουτέστιν] > C (= 788-250)

Notes:  The attribution to Aq in 395 is an error. There is an Aq fragment at this verse, but it has fallen out of 395; therefore, the attribution is for the missing hexaplaric fragment not the exegetical fragment (AGK 3, 246). The scholion has been included in Nic (Beiträge, 86).

Job 37 24b

HT  מַעְרָקָּה כּלָהוּ(הוּמהָלִים)
LXX  (φοβηθήσονται δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ) οἱ σοφοὶ καρδία.

οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ τὸ τέλειον
κατειληφότες

Wit1:  C (= 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 3006 260\textsuperscript{cat} 643 139) [505]
Attr:  (%45; 92, 395) 

Var:  σὐτοί] συτο 260; > 139 

Notes:  *AGK* and *Beiträge* draw a parallel between this scholion and *Kommentar* (οὐδὲ...κατέλαβον τὸ τέλειον) (*Kommentar*, 328; *AGK* 3, 248; *Beiträge*, 80). It appears that this scholion is influenced by Olympiodorus and is not hexaplaric.

**Job 38 6b**

HT  (אָמַר מֶרְכֶּרֶד אֶבֶן)  
LXX  (τίς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ βαλὼν λίθον ἑπ` αὐτῆς;) 

\[\text{ἐν ὃ τείνεται τὸ σπαρτίον}\]

Wit1:  \(C (= 3005)\) cl (= 740 138-255 612 395 680 137 3006 260 643 139) [505]

Notes:  *AGK* places the fragment correctly at 6b, while *Beiträge* had it at 5b (*AGK* 3, 267; *Beiträge*, 80). The scholion appears to have come from Olympiodorus (*Beiträge*, 80; *AGK* 3, 267), and it has no overt connection to the Hexapla.

**Job 38 13b**

HT  (רְשָׁעִים וְיִנָּעֲרוּ)  
LXX  (ἐκτινάξαι ἀσεβεῖς ἐξ αὐτῆς;) 

\[\text{τοὺς ἐν σκότῳ λῃστάς}\]

Wit1:  \(C (= 788-250 3005)\) cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 680 137 260 643 139) [505]

Notes:  There is verbal correspondence between this fragment and Chr-Kommentar for this verse (...τῶν λῃστῶν...) (Chr-Kommentar, 187; *AGK* 3, 275; *Beiträge*, 80).

**Job 38 30a**

HT  (καταβαίνει ύδωρ ρέον;)  
LXX  ἢ καταβαίνει ύδωρ ρέον; 

\[\text{ἡ πάχνη κατιοῦσα κρυσταλλοῖ τοὺς ποταμοὺς ὡς ὁπὸς γάλα}\]
Job 38 36a

Merrshah beqem rehem

LXX  

τίς δὲ ἐδωκεν γυναῖξιν υψάσματος σοφιαν

καίτοι τὰ ἄλλα ἀσθενέσιν οὐσαις

Job 39 21a

רִּחְמֵר בַּעְמֶק בִּרְשׁוֹכִים

Notes: Ms 395 attributes the fragment to Chrysostom. The comment entered the tradition and influenced Nic (AGK 3, 287; Beiträge, 80).
LXX ἀνορύσσων ἐν πεδίῳ γαυριᾷ.

〈?〉 τῷ δὲ ποδὶ κατακροαίνων τὴν γῆν γαυριᾷ καὶ φρυάττεται

Wit1:  

C (= 788-250 3005) 

cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 139) [505 523]

Notes:  This fragment is from Olympiodorus and is not hexaplaric (AGK 3, 306; Beiträge, 80).

Job 39 27a

HT אִם־עַל־פִּיךָ יַגְבִּיהַ נָשֶׁר

LXX ἐπὶ δὲ σῷ προστάγματι υψοῦται ἀετός,

〈?〉 τὴν δὲ ὑψιπετῆ πτῆσιν σὺ τῷ ἀετῷ προσέταξας ἔχειν;

Wit1:  

C cat (= 249 788-250 3005) 

cl cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 732 139) [505 523]

Var:  υψιπετῆ πτῆσιν C cat (= 249 788-250 3005) υψιπετῆ κτίσιν Ol Y; υψιπετησιν cl

Notes:  This fragment is from Kommentar (AGK 3, 310; Kommentar, 352; Beiträge, 80), and it is probably not hexaplaric.

Job 39 30a

HT נֵאָסָרָהֵת (Q) וְאֶפְרֹחָיו וְאֶפְרֹחֶה

LXX νεοσσοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ φύρονται ἐν αἷματι,

〈?〉 φασὶ τὸν γύπα λάπτειν

Wit1:  

C (= 788-250 3005) 

cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 139) [505 523]

Var:  φασί + γαρ 3006 cat 260 643 139

Notes:  There is no wider context in order to interpret the significance of this fragment. The word λάπτειν occurs only here in the Job catena (AGK 4, 256). The scholion appears to be an explanatory gloss on the Greek text.
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Job 40 4a

HT

—

LXX  
Τί ἐπὶ ἐγὼ κρίνομαι νουθετούμενος (καὶ ἐλέγχων κύριον)

〈?〉  
μετὰ τὰ πάθη τοῖς λόγοις

Wit1:  
cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 139) [505 523]

HT

—

LXX  
(Τί ἐπὶ ἐγὼ κρίνομαι νουθετούμενος) καὶ ἐλέγχων κύριον

〈?〉  
λείπει τὸ «ὡς», ἵν' ἦ· ὡς ἐλέγχων κύριον νουθετοῦμαι ὁ ἄθλιος.

Wit1:  
C (= 788-250 3005) cl\textsuperscript{cat} (= 740\textsuperscript{mg} 255\textsuperscript{mg}-138\textsuperscript{mg} 612 559 754 474 258 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 732 139) [505 523]

Var:  
νουθετοῦμαι C (= 788-250 3005) νουθετούμενος cl

Job 40 7

HT  

c

LXX  
Μή, ἀλλὰ ζωσάι ὡσπερ ἀνὴρ (τὴν ὀψιν σου,) ἐρωτήσω δέ σε, σὺ δέ μοι ἀποκρίθητι.

〈?〉  
«μὴ σιώπα», φησίν, «ἀλλὰ ἀνδρίζου πρὸς τὰς ἐρωτήσεις.»

Wit1:  
C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395\textsuperscript{cat} [680] 137 260 643 732 139) [505 523] 3007*

Attr:  
〈?〉 σ′ 139

Var:  
ἀλλά] ἀλλά C (= 788-250) 740

Notes:  
The fragment is at 7a in the catena. Ziegler’s evidence for drawing a parallel to Origen for this fragment is only one Nicetas manuscript (Beiträge, 81; AGK 3,
which indicates that this fragment is probably not from Origen. This scholion was absorbed by Nic and attributed to Origen, but its prehistory is still unknown.

Job 40 8b
HT  רָשָׁעָן לָמַשׁ (ךֵכֶרֶךְ)
LXX  (οίει δὲ μὲ ἄλλοις σοι κεχρηματικέναι ἢ ἴνα) ἀναφανὴς δίκαιος;

־אָנָּתַּיְ הוָּּיִּ וְדֶאַיְחַחְיִּּךְ
Wit1:  C (= 3005) cl (= 740 255 612 559 395 [680]) [505 523]

Notes: For comments regarding the οἶον in Zeigler’s Beiträge, see AGK (AGK 3, 325 §15; Beiträge, 87). It is not part of this scholion or the related hexaplaric fragment.

Job 40 11b
HT  רָאָתָה (ךֵכֶרֶךְ)
LXX  πάν δὲ ὑβριστήν (ταπείνωσον;)

־טּוּשׁ דַּאִ帡וֹנָס
Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137) [505 523]

Notes: AGK lists this fragment at 11a, since this phrase may be exegesis of ἀγγέλους in that line. Ms 788 has the index over ὑβριστήν in addition to 3005 and the cl group; therefore, this edition maintains the placement at 11b, which also the Beiträge had (AGK 3, 327; Beiträge, 81). The fragment does not appear to have any contact with HT or the Hexapla.

Job 40 12a
HT  רַאֲהָ חֲכַרֵּךְ (ךֵכֶרֶךְ)
LXX  ὑπερήφανον (δὲ σβέσον;)

־τὸν ἄρχεκακον
Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cl (= 740 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137) [505 523]

Notes: AGK places this fragment at 40:11b, but the manuscripts and the Beiträge have it at 12a (AGK 3, 327; Beiträge, 81).

Job 40 13b
HT  סְפֵּרַה (ךֵכֶרֶךְ)
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LXX  (τὰ δὲ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν) ἁτιμίας ἐμπλήσον·

(?)  διὰ τῶν ἐλέγχων

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cI (= 138-255 612 559 395 [680] 137 3006 643 732 139) [505 523]

Attr:  (?) στ 139

Notes:  There appears to be no connection to HT or Hexapla (AGK 3, 328; Beiträge, 81).

Job 40 20a

HT  קֵרֵבָהוֹל חָרָם הַשָּׁרָרִים

LXX  (ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπὶ ὄρος) ἀκρότομον

(?)  ἀκρότομον· τὸ δύσβατον


Var:  ἀκρότομον] > 3005 | δύσβατον C (= 788-250 3005)] δυνατὸν cI

Notes:  The Suidas reads as follows: ἀκρότομον δὲ ὄρος τὸ δυνατὸν παρὰ τῷ Ἰῶβ, and it is dependent on the cI group (AGK 3, 337; Beiträge, 81). There is no discernable correspondence to HT or the Hexapla.

Job 41 13a

HT  נְפֶשׁ חַלְקֵי חַלְקֵי

LXX  ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἀνθρακες,

(?)  ἀρ' ἢς ἐξέρχονται τὰ πεπυρωμένα βέλη

Wit1:  C (= 788-250 3005) cIext (= 740 255I 255IIm-138I 138IIm 612 559 474 258 395 [680] 137 3006 260 643 139) [505 523]

Notes:  This fragment is unattributed in Beiträge, but AGK attributes it to Evagrius (AGK 3, 362). Mss 255I-I 138II do not have an attribution, but ms 788 has a
clear attribution to Evagrius. The words in italics allude to Ephesians 6:16. There is no
connection to the Hexapla.

**Job 42 17bγ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(προυπηρχεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὄνομα) Ἰωβάβ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈?〉 πατὴρ ἐν αὐτοῖς

*Wit1:* 252

*Notes:* This fragment was not listed in the *Edition* but in the *Kollationen* (298). It
does not appear to be hexaplaric but rather an explanation of the name Ἰωβάβ
(*Kollationen*, 298). There is no onomasticum sacrum for Ἰωβάβ in de Lagarde’s work
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY

Introduction

The primary goal of this project was to produce a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Job 22-42, which would not only gather data from previous editions but also update those editions by incorporating new findings and sources. There were two types of updates: (1) newly added materials and revised materials and (2) placing the already known fragments on a surer textual foundation through the use of the manuscript stemma of the Hagedorns and translation technique studies. This summary lists relevant preliminary findings of the first type of update and demonstrates where this edition moves beyond Ziegler’s Edition II App. The material is arranged as follows: (1) newly identified hexaplaric fragments and attributions, (2) revision of attribution and lemma, (3) revision of attribution only, (4) revision of lemma only, (5) unattributed scholia, and (6) removed readings.

Preliminary Findings

Newly Identified Hexaplaric Fragments and Attributions

This project lists twenty-two newly identified hexaplaric fragments. Of these fragments, fourteen have an attribution preserved in the witnesses, while eight were assigned an attribution through considerations of translation technique. The following fragments are not listed in Ziegler’s II App and all of them except one have not been listed until now. Field listed Job 39:18a σ’ πετομένη, but in a footnote he considered it to be a scholion, and Ziegler did not list it in his II App. Initially, only the cl group
preserved this fragment and attribution to Sym, and therefore it could have been interpreted as a scholion. The $C$ (= 788 3005) group now confirms that this fragment and attribution belong to the oldest Greek catena, and therefore it should be listed among the hexaplaric materials of Job. The newly identified fragments are as follows:

23:3b 〈θ’〉 ἐως ἑτοιμασίας αὐτοῦ
23:14a α’ θ’ ὅτι ἀπαρτίσει ἀκριβασμόν
24:1b-2a 〈σ’〉 καὶ γινώσκοντες αὐτὸν οὐκ οἶδασι τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ
24:10a γ’ ἀνευ ἐνδύματος
24:24ab γ’ ὀλίγον καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει, καὶ ταπεινώσει αὐτὸν καθὼς πάντα τὰ συγκλασθησόμενα
27:12b σ’ ματαιολογεῖτε
27:14b 〈σ’〉 οἱ ἀπόγονοι
30:21a α’ θ’ ἐστράφης εἰς ἀνελεήμονά μοι
31:9a σ’ ὑπάρχειν
31:11ab σ’ ὅπερ ἐστὶ μύσος καὶ τούτο ὑπερβάλλουσα ἀδικία
31:12a σ’ πῦρ δὲ τὸ ἐως συντελείας ἀναλίσκον
34:18a 〈σ’〉 ἀποστάτα
34:18a 〈σ’〉 ἀπαιδευτε
34:18a 〈θ’〉 ἀδικὲ
36:2b 〈σ’〉 [ἐτῇ γὰρ περὶ θεοῦ [εἰ]σὶ λόγοι
36:28a 〈α’〉 ἰσοπαύ
38:12a γ’ ἦ ἀφ’ ἡμερῶν σου
39:18a σ’ πετομένη
40:17a σ’ τονώσει
40:22b λ’ ἵτεαι
42:17a θ’ μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὅτι θεὸς ἀναστήσει
42:17εδ θ’ ὁ ἰεμιναίων

Revision of Attribution and Lemma

This category covers two types of revision: (1) six actual fragments which required revision of attribution and lemma of identified hexaplaric fragments, and (2) twenty-six places in the Edition, where Ziegler listed multiple attributions and lemmata,
which have been reassessed in order to ascertain the original attribution and lemma.¹

There were six instances of the first type, and two of these instances require further explanation. The attribution to Aq in Job 37:1a was a typographical error in the Edition, which has been corrected here. Job 30:7a α′ appears as a variant in the Edition II App, but this edition has clarified that there are two fragments for that verse; thus, the Aq fragment appears as a new fragment here. The six instances of this type are listed as follows with the attribution of the Edition in parentheses:

- Job 23:8: α′ (α′) ἰδοὺ ἀρχήθεν πορεύσομαι καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει, καὶ ὁπίσω καὶ οὐ συνήσω αὐτόν
- Job 23:9a: σ′ (σ′) οὐκ ἐπιλήψομαι
- Job 28:16a: (σ′) (α′) οὐκ ἀναβληθήσεται
- Job 30:7a: α′ (σ′) φυτῶν
- Job 31:13a: σ′ (σ′) εἶ ύπερεφρόνησα
- Job 37:1a: σ′ (α′) καὶ περὶ τούτου

Two examples of the second type should be sufficient for this summary. At Job 31:31a, Ziegler lists two fragments as follows: α′ εἰ μὴ εἶπον and σ′ θ′ οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς σκηνῆς μου, but there is no manuscript which attests these readings and attributions. The C (= 788 3005) group attests one fragment with an original triple attribution. From this starting point, it is easier to see how the longer fragment was divided and the attributions were placed the way they were in the cI group.

At Job 41:1a, Ziegler lists the following two fragments: σ′ ἰδοὺ ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ (διαψεύσεται) 252; θ′ ἰδοὺ ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ διεψεύσατο C′. The fragments are the same (252 omits the verb), but the attributions are different. The new evidence of 788 shows that the attribution to Th is part of the oldest Greek catena and, therefore, the attribution to Sym for the same fragment in 252 is incorrect.

¹They are listed as follows: 22:18a α′ θ′, 24:2a α′, 27:20a α′ σ′, 28:1b λ′, 28:15a σ′, 29:25b σ′, 30:12c α′, 31:21a α′, 31:31a α′ θ′, 31:40a θ′, 32:11c σ′, 34:5b, 37:3a α′, 37:9a α′, 37:9b α′ θ′, 38:25a (θ′), 38:25a α′, 38:35b α′, 39:13a σ′, 39:19b σ′, 40:8b σ′, 41:1a θ′, 41:10a α′, 42:11g σ′, 42:14a α′, 42:14c α′ σ′.
Revision of Attribution

This project revised the attributions of twenty-four previously established hexaplaric fragments. Of these fragments, twenty-two have attributions which are attested in manuscript evidence, while two are conjectures based on other considerations. In fourteen cases, there is a revision of an existing attribution (e.g. 29:2b). In six cases, old conjectures are confirmed by new manuscript evidence (e.g. 22:16b). In two cases, a new attribution was assigned on the basis of manuscript evidence (e.g. 38:40a).

Job 42:11f is a good example of a new attribution assigned by conjecture through new manuscript evidence and translation technique. Previously, Ziegler listed two fragments attributed to Sym, one on the basis of 248 and the other on the basis of the catena. The new evidence of 788 and 3005 brings this conclusion into question. Ms 3005 has an attribution to Aq and 788 preserves a double attribution to Sym and Th. Ms 788 preserves the original double attribution, but it has already been corrupted by the insertion of Sym and the omission of Aq, which 3005 confirms as genuine. These two mss preserve the attributions to Aq and Th, and translation equivalents confirmed this textual reconstruction, since Sym usually translates פָּרַה with κακός as the fragment in 248 attests, and Aq and Th (to a lesser degree) render פָּרַה with κακία, as the oldest Greek catena attests. The revised attributions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>New Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22:16b</td>
<td>σ' (σ')</td>
<td>ιτοταίος παρασύρει τον θεμέλιον αυτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:22a</td>
<td>α' θ' (α')</td>
<td>νόμον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:2a</td>
<td>σ' (α' σ')</td>
<td>τις δφη μοι κατα τους μηνας τους πρωτους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:2b</td>
<td>θ' (α' σ')</td>
<td>κατα τς ημερας ας ο θεος εφυλασσεν με</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:11b</td>
<td>α' σ' ([α'] σ')</td>
<td>εμαρτυρησεν περι έμου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:1d</td>
<td>α' θ' σ' (λ')</td>
<td>μετα των κυνων των προβατων μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:9b</td>
<td>λ' (α' σ')</td>
<td>ενηδρευσα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:7a</td>
<td>σ' (α')</td>
<td>εκθαμβησει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:26b</td>
<td>α' θ' (α')</td>
<td>εν αλαλαγμω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:20b</td>
<td>σ' (σ')</td>
<td>εαι ειπη άνηρ καταποθησεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:7b</td>
<td>α' σ' θ' (α' θ')</td>
<td>υιοι θεου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:16b</td>
<td>σ' (α')</td>
<td>εν εξιχνιασμω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:24a</td>
<td>α' σ' θ' (α' θ')</td>
<td>φως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:28a</td>
<td>σ' (σ')</td>
<td>αρα εστιν ύπτω πατηρ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revision of Lemma

There were sixty-six places where the lemma of II App was revised, but the attribution was confirmed.\(^2\) Not all of these revisions are equally significant: some consist of minor changes, while others consist of more substantive ones.

Job 23:6a \(\sigma'\) furnishes an example of minor change. Ziegler’s II App had: διαδικαζεται μοι, while this edition has δικαζεται μοι on the basis of 3005 and consideration of translation equivalents.

Job 26:5a \(\sigma'\) is an example of two separate lemmata in Ziegler’s Edition, which were able to be combined into one here. The lemma is comprised of three different fragments, and the integrity of these witnesses is still intact in the Witl line.

Job 27:9a \(\lambda'\) was not revised with regard to the wording of the lemma, but the placement of the fragment itself. The Edition listed it at 9b, but the evidence of 3005 and considerations of translation technique show that it should be listed at 9a.

Some revisions were more substantive. At 28:25-26a \(\alpha'\), the Edition has the

\(^2\)They are listed as follows: 22:3b \(\sigma'\), 22:16a \(\sigma'\), 22:17b \(\theta'\), 23:6a \(\sigma'\), 23:8 \(\sigma'\), 24:5b \(\sigma'\), 24:12c \(\sigma'\), 24:15c \(\sigma'\), 24:22b \(\sigma'\), 24:23 \(\sigma'\), 24:25b \(\sigma'\), 25:2a \(\alpha' \theta'\), 25:3b \(\sigma'\), 25:5a \(\alpha'\), 26:5 \(\alpha'\), 26:5 \(\sigma'\), 26:14ab \(\sigma'\), 27:1 \(\alpha'\), 27:9a \(\lambda'\), 27:23a \(\alpha'\), 28:18a \(\sigma'\), 28:19b \(\sigma'\), 28:25-26a \(\alpha'\), 28:26b \(\sigma'\), 29:4a \(\sigma'\), 29:4b \(\sigma'\), 29:25c \(\sigma'\), 30:2b-3a \(\sigma'\), 30:2b-3a \(\alpha'\), 30:3a \(\sigma'\), 30:7a \(\sigma'\), 30:17a \(\lambda'\), 30:27a \(\sigma'\), 30:30a \(\lambda'\), 31:6a \(\alpha'\), 31:29b \(\alpha'\), 32:1b \(\sigma'\), 33:13 \(\alpha'\), 34:11b \(\alpha'\), 34:17a \(\sigma'\), 34:33 \(\sigma'\), 35:6a \(\sigma'\), 35:16b \(\sigma'\), 36:5b-6a \(\alpha'\), 36:33a \(\sigma'\), 37:6a \(\sigma'\), 37:10a \(\alpha'\), 37:13a \(\sigma'\), 37:14b \(\theta'\), 37:15a \(\sigma'\), 37:18a \(\alpha'\), 38:9a \(\sigma'\), 38:25b \(\sigma'\), 38:32a \(\sigma'\), 38:38 \(\alpha'\), 39:4b \(\sigma'\), 39:24b \(\sigma'\), 39:30b \(\sigma'\), 40:16a \(\sigma'\), 40:30a \(\sigma'\), 41:2a \(\alpha' \theta'\), 41:4b \(\sigma'\), 42:5a \(\lambda'\), 42:7c \(\theta'\), 42:8c \(\alpha'\).
following: καὶ ὕδωρ ἐσταθμίσατο ἐν καταμετρήσει, while this edition based on the new evidence of 257 as presented in the Nachlese has: καὶ ὕδωρ ἐσταθμίσατο ἐν καταμετρήσει ἐν τῷ ποιῆσαι αὐτὸν ἕπτῳ ἀκριβασμόν. The expanded lemma agrees with HT and is found in a reliable witness. At 30:17a λ’, the Edition has the following lemma: νυκτός, while this edition, based on the new evidence of 257 as presented in the Nachlese, has the following: συγκέκοπται νυκτός. The expansion agrees with HT and is preserved in a reliable witness. At 34:33 σ’, the Edition has the following lemmata attributed to Sym: ἀποδοκιμάσεις C; ἀπεδοκίμασας 249, while this edition based on the new evidence of 249 as presented in the Nachlese, has the following: ὅτι ἀπεδοκίμασας· σὺ γὰρ ἐπελέξω καὶ οὐκ ἐγώ. The longer reading agrees with HT and is found in a reliable witness.

Unattributed Scholia

In the Edition, there were eleven unattributed scholia. Of these instances 23:9a and 38:40a were found to be hexaplaric (see Revision of Attribution and Revision of Attribution and Lemma above). In ms 157 Job 23:16b (2x) contains two fragments, which are probably related to the Nicetas catena (see discussion in chapter four). When the Hagedorns recollated ms 523, they found that the ms supported the lemma in 23:15c. Job 26:13b probably records a hexaplaric reading, but there is no way to determine the author. The rest of the instances are listed in chapter four.

Removed Readings

There were also four readings in II App that needed to be removed from the corpus for various reasons. Job 24:13b σ’ is not hexaplaric (see the relevant discussion in chapter three). The fragment of Job 31:2a α’ was caused by misreading the attribution to

---

³The references are as follows: 22:12a, 22:29b, 23:9a, 23:15c, 23:16b (2x), 26:13b, 28:16b, 30:3a, 30:16a, 38:40a.
Aq (see chapter three). Job 38:27b was not found in any manuscript which the Hagedorns collated. Job 41:21a χόρτος α’ Θ’ arose from a misreading of manuscript 255 (see discussion in chapter three).
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ABSTRACT

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

John Daniel Meade, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012
Chair: Dr. Peter J. Gentry

Primarily, this dissertation provides a critical text of the hexaplaric fragments of Job 22-42, which updates the previous editions of Field (1875) and Ziegler (1982), and which may serve as the fascicle for the second half of Job for The Hexapla Project. The critical text includes (1) extant readings of the Three, (2) Aristarchian signs’ material, and (3) other materials usually related to the Hexapla. The project includes all relevant and available evidence from Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Armenian sources.

Chapter 1 provides a summary of the history of the Hexapla and hexaplaric research. This chapter also presents the methodology for the project and an introduction to interpreting the apparatuses.

Chapter 2 gives a full listing and description of the textual witnesses used for the project. These witnesses include the text groups of Ziegler’s Edition, but, regarding the catena tradition of Job, this chapter provides an update to the status questionis by providing a brief history of the catena of Job in past hexaplaric editions and a new way forward.

Chapter 3 provides the critical text. The Hebrew and Greek lemmas are listed first, followed by the hexaplaric attribution and lemma. All variants to the attribution and lemma are listed in the appartuses underneath along with editorial notes.

Chapter 4 contains the readings that are of dubious significance for the Hexapla of Job. These readings are anonymous in the margins of manuscripts, which
preserve hexaplaric readings, and therefore, they are included in this separate chapter.

Chapter 5 gives a summary of the preliminary results of the project. This chapter focuses on those instances where Ziegler’s Edition has been updated with regard to (1) new fragments and attributions, (2) revision of attribution and lemma, (3) revised attributions, (4) revised lemma, and (5) removed readings.
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