

should be rejected. (See discussion of construction, in exegesis.)

v.27. \mathcal{A} and B read $\epsilon\pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\mu\alpha$. Other mss. follow the LXX in substituting $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\mu\alpha$. Transcriptional probability is against conformity to the LXX. Another case where the Neutral, though slightly supported by other mss. commends itself as the best.

v.28. Western and Syrian authorities insert five words which \mathcal{A} and B and a few other manuscripts omit. These words conform the passage to the LXX, but on another plea of transcriptional probability, Alford urges their retention. Intrinsic probability favors their excision (details of this latter are given in the discussion of the exegesis, below).

v.31. The original writing of \mathcal{A} , B, D, and G, all support the omission of $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$ after the second $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$. Some commentators plead for it, in the interest of their theories of exegesis. (See in loc.)

v.32. Many mss. add $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$ after $\epsilon\acute{\rho}\gamma\omega\nu$, but we follow \mathcal{A}^* , B, and G in omitting it.

v.32.(2). It is best to follow \mathcal{A}^* , B, D, and G, in omitting $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ after $\pi\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\psi\alpha\nu$.

v.33. $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ after the second $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ seems to have crept in from 10:11, and we do well to follow \mathcal{A} , B, D, and G, in omitting it.

v.33.(2) Only D and G substitute $\acute{o}\upsilon\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\nu\theta\eta$ for $\acute{o}\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\nu\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, conforming it to the LXX. They are hardly to be followed here.