

AN INTRODUCTION TO
THE OLD TESTAMENT
IN GREEK

BY

HENRY BARCLAY SWETE D.D., F.B.A.

HON. D.LITT. OXFORD HON. LITT.D. DUBLIN HON. D.D. GLASGOW
FELLOW OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY

REVISED BY

RICHARD RUSDEN OTTLEY, M.A.

SOMETIME SCHOLAR OF TRINITY COLLEGE

*WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE LETTER
OF ARISTEAS EDITED BY*

H. St J. THACKERAY, M.A.


SOMETIME SCHOLAR OF KING'S COLLEGE

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1914

ἐξεγερῶ τὰ τέκνα σοῦ, Σειῶν, ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

IN PIAM MEMORIAM
EBERHARDI NESTLE
PH. ET TH.D.
VIRI, SI QVIS ALIVS, DE HIS STUDIIS
OPTIME MERITI
HVIVS OPERIS ADIVTORIS HVMANISSIMI



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
University of Toronto

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

WHEN some two years ago it became clear that a reprint of this *Introduction* would shortly be required, the Syndics of the Press at my request put the revision, which I was unable to undertake, into the hands of a scholar already known to students of the Greek Old Testament by his *Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*. Mr Ottley, while leaving intact the form and even the pagination of the *Introduction*, has made every endeavour to bring the contents up to the present state of knowledge. This has been done partly by a careful revision of the text and the occasional rewriting of a paragraph, partly by writing new footnotes and a large number of valuable additional notes, and by expanding the bibliographical lists that follow each chapter, which after the lapse of so many years were necessarily defective.

I cannot sufficiently express my gratitude to Mr Ottley for the unremitting labour which he has expended on my book, and I am confident that future readers will share my sense of obligation. I venture to hope that, thus revised, the *Introduction* may continue for some years to be of service to those who are entering on the study of the Greek Old Testament.

H. B. S.

CAMBRIDGE,

May 11, 1914.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THIS book is an endeavour to supply a want which has been felt by many readers of the Greek Old Testament. The literature of the subject is enormous, and its chief points have been compendiously treated in Biblical Dictionaries and similar publications. But hitherto no manual has placed within the student's reach all the information which he requires in the way of general introduction to the Greek versions.

A first attempt is necessarily beset with uncertainties. Experience only can shew whether the help here provided is precisely such as the student needs, and whether the right proportion has been preserved in dealing with the successive divisions of the subject. But it is hoped that the present work may at least meet the immediate wants of those who use *The Old Testament in Greek*, and serve as a forerunner to larger and more adequate treatises upon the same subject.

Such as it is, this volume owes more than I can say to the kindness of friends, among whom may especially be mentioned Principal Bebb, of St David's College, Lampeter, and Grinfield Lecturer at Oxford; Mr Brooke and Mr McLean, editors of the Larger Cambridge Septuagint; Mr Forbes Robinson, and Dr W. E. Barnes. But my acknowledgements are principally due to Professor Eberhard Nestle, of Maulbronn, who has added

to the obligations under which he had previously laid me by reading the whole of this Introduction in proof, and suggesting many corrections and additions. While Dr Nestle is not to be held responsible for the final form in which the book appears, the reader will owe to him in great measure such freedom from error or fulness in the minuter details as it may possess. Mr Thackeray's work in the Appendix speaks for itself. Both the prolegomena to Aristeas and the text of the letter are wholly due to his generous labours, and they will form a welcome gift to students of the Septuagint and of Hellenistic Greek.

Free use has been made of all published works dealing with the various branches of learning which fall within the range of the subject. While direct quotations have been acknowledged where they occur, it has not been thought desirable to load the margin with references to all the sources from which information has been obtained. But the student will generally be able to discover these for himself from the bibliography which is appended to almost every chapter.

In dismissing my work I desire to tender my sincere thanks to the readers and workmen of the Cambridge University Press, whose unremitting attention has brought the production of the book to a successful end.

H. B. S.

CAMBRIDGE,

September 1, 1900.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK OLD TESTAMENT AND OF ITS TRANSMISSION.

	PAGES
CHAPTER I.	
The Alexandrian Greek Version	1—28
CHAPTER II.	
Later Greck Versions	29—58
CHAPTER III.	
The Hexapla, and the Hexaplaric and other Recensions of the Septuagint	59—86
CHAPTER IV.	
Ancient Versions based upon the Septuagint	87—121
CHAPTER V.	
Manuscripts of the Septuagint	122—170
CHAPTER VI.	
Printed Texts of the Septuagint	171—194

PART II.

THE CONTENTS OF THE ALEXANDRIAN OLD TESTAMENT.

	PAGES
CHAPTER I.	
Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of the Books	197—230
CHAPTER II.	
Books of the Hebrew Canon	231—264
CHAPTER III.	
Books not included in the Hebrew Canon	265—288
CHAPTER IV.	
The Greek of the Septuagint	289—314
CHAPTER V.	
The Septuagint as a Version	315—341
CHAPTER VI.	
Text divisions: <i>Stichi</i> , Chapters, Lections, <i>Catena</i> e, &c.	342—366

PART III.

LITERARY USE, VALUE, AND TEXTUAL CONDITION OF THE GREEK OLD TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.	
Literary use of the Septuagint by non-Christian Hellenists	369—380
CHAPTER II.	
Quotations from the Septuagint in the New Testament	381—405

CHAPTER III.

	PAGES
Quotations from the Septuagint in early Christian writings	406—432

CHAPTER IV.

The Greek Versions as aids to Biblical Study	433—461
--	---------

CHAPTER V.

Influence of the Septuagint on Christian Literature	462—477
---	---------

CHAPTER VI.

Textual condition of the Septuagint, and problems arising out of it	478—497
---	---------

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

pp. 498—530

APPENDIX.

THE LETTER OF PSEUDO-ARISTEAS.

Introduction	533—550
Text	551—606

INDICES.

i. Index of Biblical references	609—616
ii. Index of Subject-matter	617—626

PART I.

*THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK OLD TESTAMENT
AND OF ITS TRANSMISSION.*

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

THE ALEXANDRIAN GREEK VERSION.

1. A Greek version of any portion of the Old Testament presupposes intercourse between Israel and a Greek-speaking people. So long as the Hebrew race maintained its isolation, no occasion arose for the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into a foreign tongue. As far as regards the countries west of Palestine, this isolation continued until the age of Alexander¹; it is therefore improbable that any Greek version of the Scriptures existed there before that era. Among the Alexandrian Jews of the second century before Christ there was a vague belief that Plato and other Greek philosophical writers were indebted for some of their teaching to a source of this kind². Thus Aristobulus (*ap. Clem. Al. Strom. i. 22*; cf. *Eus. praef. ev. xiii. 12*) writes: *κατηκολούθηκε δὲ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων τῆ καθ'*

¹ Individual cases, such as that of the Jew mentioned by Clearchus (*ap. Jos. c. Ap. 1, 22*), who was *Ἑλληνικὸς οὐ τῆ διαλέκτῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆ ψυχῆ*, are exceptions to a general rule. How numerous and prosperous were the Jewish colonies in Asia Minor at a later period appears from the Acts of the Apostles; see also Ramsay, *Phrygia* i. ii. p. 667 ff.

² This belief was inherited by the Christian school of Alexandria; see *Clem. Strom. v. 29*, *Orig. c. Cels. iv. 39, vi. 19*; and cf. *Lact. inst. iv. 2*.

ἡμῶς νομοθεσία, καὶ φανερός ἐστι περιεργασάμενος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ λεγομένων. διηρμήνευται δὲ πρὸς Δημητρίου ὑφ' ἐτέρου¹, πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως, τὰ τε κατὰ τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγωγήν τῶν Ἑβραίων τῶν ἡμετέρων πολιτῶν καὶ ἢ τῶν γεγονότων ἀπάντων αὐτοῖς ἐπιφάνεια καὶ κράτησις τῆς χώρας καὶ τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐπεξήγησις—words which seem to imply the existence before B.C. 400 of a translation which included at least the Books of Exodus, Deuteronomy, and Joshua. A similar claim has been found in the statement attributed by Pseudo-Aristeas to Demetrius of Phalerum: τοῦ νόμου τῶν Ἰουδαίων βιβλία...οὐχ ὡς ὑπάρχει σεσήμανται, καθὼς ὑπὸ τῶν εἰδόντων προσαναφέρεται². But no fragments of these early translations have been produced, and it is more than probable that the story arose out of a desire on the part of the Hellenistic Jews to find a Hebrew origin for the best products of Greek thought³.

2. The earliest and most important of the extant Greek versions of the Old Testament was an offspring of the 'Greek Dispersion' (ἡ διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, Jo. vii. 35), which began with the conquests of Alexander the Great⁴.

The Hebrew Prophets foresaw that it was the destiny of their race to be scattered over the face of the world (Deut. xxviii. 25, xxx. 4, Jer. xv. 4, xxxiv. 17). The word *διασπορά* (O.L. *dispersio*) employed by the Greek translators in these and similar passages (cf. 2 Esdr. xi. 9, Ps. cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) tit. (codd. A^a T), cxlvi. (cxlvii.) 2, Judith v. 19, Isa. xlix. 6, Jer. xiii. 14 (cod. N*), Dan. xii. 2 (LXX.), 2 Macc. i. 27) became the technical Greek term for Jewish communities in foreign lands, whether planted there by forcible deportation, or

¹ δι' ἐτέρων, Eus.

² See Tischendorf, *V. T. Gr.* (1879) *prolegg.* p. xiii. n.

³ Cf. Walton (ed. Wrangham), p. 18; Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 14 f.; Buhl, *Kanon u. Text*, p. 108 f.

⁴ See art. *Diaspora* in suppl. vol. of Hastings' *D.B.*

by their own free agency (Jo. vii. 35, Jas. i. 1, 1 Pet. i. 1)¹. Such settlements were at first compulsory, and limited to countries east of Palestine. Between the eighth and sixth centuries B.C. the bulk of the population of both the Northern and Southern Kingdoms was swept away by Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors (2 Kings xvii. 6, xxiv. 14 ff., xxv. 11 f., 21 f.). A part of the Babylonian captivity returned (Ezra i. ii.), but Babylonia and Mesopotamia continued to be the home of a large body of Jewish settlers (Tob. i. 14 ff., 4 Esdr. xiii. 39 ff., Philo *ad Cai.* 36, Acts ii. 9, Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 5. 2, xv. 3. 1, xviii. 9. 1 ff.). This 'Eastern' Dispersion need not detain us here. No Biblical version in the stricter sense² had its origin in Babylonia; there, as in Palestine, the services of the synagogue interpreter (מְתוּמָן) sufficed for the rendering of the lections into Aramaic, and no desire was manifested on the part of the Gentile population to make themselves acquainted with the Hebrew scriptures. It was among the Jews who were brought into relation with Hellenic culture that the necessity arose for a written translation of the books of the canon. Egypt was the earliest home of the Hellenistic Jew, and it was on Egyptian soil that the earliest Greek version of the Old Testament was begun.

3. Long before the time of Alexander Egypt possessed the nucleus of a Jewish colony. Shashanq, the Shishak of 1 K. xiv. 25 f., 2 Chr. xii. 2 f., who invaded Palestine³ in the tenth century B.C., may have carried into Egypt captives or hostages from the conquered cities whose names still appear upon the

¹ The later Hebrew term was גּוֹלָה, 'exile'; see Dr Hort on 1 Pet. *l. c.*

² The 'Babylonian' Targum is of Palestinian origin (Buhl, p. 173). On early Aramaic translations arising out of the synagogue interpretations, see *ib.*, p. 168 f.; and for the traditional account of the origin of the Syriac O. T. see Nestle, *Urtext u. Übersetzungen der Bibel* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 229.

³ Professor Driver in D. G. Hogarth's *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 87 f.

walls of the temple at Karnak. Isaiah (xix. 19 f.) foresaw¹ that a time must come when the religious influence of Israel would make itself felt on the banks of the Nile, while he endeavoured to check the policy which led Judah to seek refuge from Assyrian aggression in an Egyptian alliance (xxx. 1 ff.). Jewish mercenaries are said to have fought in the expedition of Psammetichus I. against Ethiopia *c.* B.C. 650 (cf. Ps.-Arist.: ἐτέρων ξυμμαχιῶν ἐξαπεσταλμένων πρὸς τὸν τῶν Αἰθιοπίων βασιλέα μάχεσθαι σὺν Ψαμμιτιχῷ). The panic which followed the murder of Gedaliah drove a host of Jewish fugitives to Egypt, where they settled at Migdol (Μάγδωλος), Tahpanhes (Ταφνάς = Δάφνη)², Noph (Memphis), and Pathros (Παθούρη)³, i.e. throughout the Delta, and even in Upper Egypt; and the descendants of those who survived were replenished, if we may believe Pseudo-Aristeas, by others who entered Egypt during the Persian period (ἤδη μὲν καὶ πρότερον ἰκανῶν εἰσεληλυθότων σὺν τῷ Πέρσῃ). These earlier settlers were probably among the first to benefit by Alexander's policy, and may have been partly hellenised before his birth.

4. Alexander's victory at Issos in B.C. 333 opened the gate of Syria to the conqueror. In the next year he received the submission of Tyre and Gaza and, according to Josephus, was on the point of marching upon Jerusalem when the statesmanship of the High Priest turned him from his purpose⁴. Whether the main features of this story be accepted or not, it is certain that the subsequent policy of Alexander was favourable to the Jews. His genius discovered in the Jewish

¹ The passage is thought by some scholars to belong to the Ptolemaean age; see Cheyne, *Intr. to Isaiah*, p. 105.

² Cf. *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 117.

³ Jer. li. = xlv. 1 ff. ἅπασιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου κτλ. Many of these refugees, however, were afterwards taken prisoners by Nebuchadnezzar and transported to Babylon (Joseph. *ant.* x. 9. 7).

⁴ *Ant.* xi. 8. 4 f. The story is rejected by Ewald and Grätz, and the details are doubtless unhistorical: cf. Droysen, *l'histoire de l'Hellenisme*, i. p. 300.

people an instrument well fitted to assist him in carrying out his purpose of drawing East and West together. Jews served in his army (Hecataeus *ap.* Joseph. *c. Afr.* i. 22 ἔτι γε μὴν ὅτι καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ συνεστρατεύσαντο καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τοῖς διαδόχοις αὐτοῦ μεμαρτύρηκεν); and such was his sense of their loyalty and courage that when Alexandria was founded (B.C. 332), although the design of the conqueror was to erect a monument to himself which should be essentially Greek¹, he not only assigned a place in his new city to Jewish colonists, but admitted them to full citizenship.

Joseph. *ant.* xix. 5. 2 ἐπιγνοὺς ἀνάκαθεν τοὺς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἰουδαίους... ἴσης πολιτείας παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων τετευχότας: *c. Afr.* ii. 4 οὐ γὰρ ἀπορία γε τῶν οἰκησόντων τὴν μετὰ σπουδῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κτιζομένην Ἀλέξανδρος τῶν ἡμετέρων τινὰς ἐκεῖ συνήθροισεν, ἀλλὰ πάντας δοκιμάζων ἐπιμελῶς ἀρετῆς καὶ πίστεως τοῦτο τοῖς ἡμετέροις τὸ γέρας ἔδωκεν. *B. J.* ii. 18. 7 χρυσάμενος προθυμοτάτοις κατὰ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Ἰουδαίους Ἀλέξανδρος γέρας τῆς συμμαχίας ἔδωκεν τὸ μετοικεῖν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἐξ ἴσου μοίρας πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας.

Mommsen indeed (*Provinces*, E. T. ii. p. 162 n.) expresses a doubt whether the grant of citizenship² was made before the time of Ptolemy I., but in the absence of any direct evidence to the contrary the repeated statement of Josephus justifies the belief that it originated with Alexander³.

5. The premature death of Alexander (B.C. 323) wrecked his larger scheme, but the Jewish colony at Alexandria continued to flourish under the Ptolemies, who succeeded to the government of Egypt.

It may be convenient to place here for reference the names and dates of the earlier Ptolemies. I. Lagi, or Soter (B.C. 322—285). II. Philadelphus (B.C. 285—247). III. Euergetes I. (B.C. 247—222). IV. Philopator I. (B.C. 222—205). V. Epiphanes

¹ Plutarch *Alex.* 26 ἐβούλετο πόλιν μεγάλην καὶ πολυάνθρωπον Ἑλληνίδα συνοικίσας ἐπ' ὠνυμον ἑαυτοῦ καταλιπεῖν.

² See Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 86.

³ On the relations in which the Jews stood to Alexander and his successors see Wellhausen, *Isr. u. jüd. Geschichte*, c. xvi.

(B.C. 205—182). VI. Eupator (B.C. 182). VII. Philometor (B.C. 182—146). VIII. Philopator II. (B.C. 146). IX. Euergetes II., also known as Physkon (B.C. 146—117). Of the brief reigns of Eupator and the younger Philopator nothing is known.

The first Ptolemy added considerably to the Jewish population of Alexandria. His expeditions to Palestine and capture of Jerusalem placed in his hands a large number of Jewish and Samaritan captives, and these were conveyed to Alexandria, where many of them acquired civic rights. The report of the King's liberality towards his captives, and of their prosperity in Egypt, attracted other Palestinians to Alexandria, and many came thither as voluntary settlers.

Joseph. *ant.* xii. 1. 1 ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος πολλοὺς αἰχμαλώτους λαβὼν ἀπὸ τε τῆς ὄρεινῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τῶν περὶ Ἱεροσόλυμα τόπων καὶ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος καὶ τῶν ἐν Γαριζείν, κατῴκισεν ἅπαντας εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀγαγὼν· ἐπεγνώκως δὲ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων περὶ τὴν τῶν ὄρκων φυλακὴν καὶ τὰς πίστει βεβαιοτάτους ὑπάρχοντας· πολλοὺς αὐτῶν τοῖς Μακεδόσιν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ποιήσας ἰσοπολίτας· οὐκ ὀλίγοι δὲ οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον παρεγίνοντο, τῆς τε ἀρετῆς τῶν τόπων αὐτοὺς καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πτολεμαίου φιλοτιμίας προκαλουμένης.

A separate quarter of the city was assigned to the colony (Strabo *ap.* Joseph. *ant.* xiv. 7. 2 τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας πόλεως ἀφώρισται μέγα μέρος τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ¹); it lay in the north-east of Alexandria, along the shore, near the royal palace. Here the Jews lived under their own ethnarch², who exercised judicial authority in all cases between Jew and Jew. They were permitted to follow their own religion and observe their national customs without molestation. Synagogues sprang up not only in the Jewish quarter, but at a later time in every part of the city

¹ In Philo's time the Jews occupied two districts out of five (*in Flacc.* 8). Droysen, iii. p. 59.

² Strabo *ap.* Jos. *ant.* xiv. 7. 2; cf. Schürer *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*³, iii. 40; Lumbroso, *Recherches*, p. 218; Droysen, iii. p. 40 n. On the ἀλαβάρχη (ἀραβάρχη) who is sometimes identified with the ethnarch see Schürer iii. 88.

(Philo *ad Cai.* 20, in *Flacc.* 6¹). In the time of Philometor the Jews stood so high in the royal favour that they were suffered to convert a disused Egyptian temple at Leontopolis into a *replica* of the Temple at Jerusalem, and the Jewish rite was celebrated there until after the fall of the Holy City, when the Romans put a stop to it (Joseph. *ant.* xii. 9. 7, xiii. 3. 1, *B. J.* vii. 10. 4)². Under these circumstances it is not surprising that shortly after the Christian era the Jewish colony in Egypt exceeded a million, constituting an eighth part of the population (Philo in *Flacc.* 6, Joseph. *c. Ap.* ii. 4). In the Fayûm villages were founded by Jews, and they lived on equal terms with the Greeks³. Nor were the Jewish settlers on the African coast limited to the Delta or to Egypt. A daughter colony was planted in Cyrenaica by the first Ptolemy, and at Cyrene as at Alexandria the Jews formed an important section of the community. The Jew of Cyrene meets us already in the days of the Maccabees (1 Macc. xv. 23, 2 Macc. ii. 23), and he was a familiar figure at Jerusalem in the Apostolic age (Mt. xxvii. 32, Acts ii. 10, vi. 9⁴, xi. 20, xiii. 1; cf. Strabo *ap.* Joseph. *ant.* xiv. 7. 2).

6. The Jews of the Dispersion everywhere retained their religion and their loyalty to national institutions. In each of these settlements among Gentile peoples the Holy City possessed a daughter, whose attachment to her was not less strong than that of her children at home. "Jerusalem," in the words of Agrippa⁵, "was the mother city, not of a single country, but of most of the countries of the world, through the

¹ On the magnificence of the principal synagogue see Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation* (ed. White), p. 67.

² Temporary checks seem to have been sustained by the Alexandrian Jews under Philopator I. and Physcon; see 3 Macc. ii. 31, and cf. Mahaffy, pp. 267 ff., 381, 390.

³ See Mahaffy, *Empire, &c.*, p. 86 n.; cf. Philo *de sept.* 6.

⁴ Where Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 69 f.) proposes to read $\Lambda\beta\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\omega\omega$ for $\Lambda\iota\beta\epsilon\rho\iota\upsilon\omega\omega$.

⁵ Philo *ad Cai.* 36.

colonies which she sent forth at various times." No colony was more dutiful than the Alexandrian. The possession of a local sanctuary at Leontopolis did not weaken its devotion to the temple at Jerusalem¹; pilgrimages were still made to Jerusalem at the great festivals (Philo *ap.* Eus. *praep. ev.* viii. 14. 64; cf. Acts ii. 10); the Temple tribute was collected in Egypt with no less punctuality than in Palestine (Philo *de monarch.* ii. 3). But it was impossible for Jews who for generations spent their lives and carried on their business in Greek towns to retain their Semitic speech. In Palestine after the Return, Aramaic gradually took the place of Hebrew in ordinary intercourse, and after the time of Alexander Greek became to some extent a rival of Aramaic. In Alexandria a knowledge of Greek was not a mere luxury but a necessity of common life². If it was not required by the State as a condition of citizenship³, yet self-interest compelled the inhabitants of a Greek capital to acquire the language of the markets and the Court. A generation or two may have sufficed to accustom the Alexandrian Jews to the use of the Greek tongue. The Jewish settlers in Lower Egypt who were there at the coming of Alexander had probably gained some knowledge of Greek before the founding of his new city⁴; and the children of Alexander's mercenaries, as well as many of the immigrants from Palestine in the days of Soter, may well have been practically bilingual. Every year of residence in Alexandria would increase their familiarity with Greek and weaken their hold upon the sacred tongue⁵. Any prejudice

¹ See Schürer³, iii. 97 ff.

² Droysen, iii. p. 35.

³ Mommsen, *Provinces*, ii. p. 163 f. On the whole question see Hody, *de Bibl. textibus*, p. 224 f.; Caspari, *Quellen zur Gesch. d. Taufsymbols*, iii. p. 268 ff.; Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 61 ff.; Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Gk.*, p. 21 ff.

⁴ There was a large Greek settlement on the Pelusiac arm of the Nile at an early period; see Herod. ii. 163.

⁵ Cf. Streane, *Double Text of Jeremiah*, p. 11 f.

which might have existed against the use of a foreign language would speedily disappear under a rule which secured full liberty in worship and faith. The adoption of the Greek tongue was a tribute gladly paid by the Alexandrian Jews to the great Gentile community which sheltered and cherished them.

The Greek which they learnt was the *κοινή* as colloquially used in Alexandria: based on the less elevated kind of Attic, with some loss of the niceties; but less exclusive in its vocabulary, retaining many old Ionic and Homeric words, and adopting, but less freely, others of foreign origin. When the Jews employed this tongue, now common to the regions of Greek life and Greek conquest, to translate the Old Testament, they naturally used forms of expression which matched the original as closely as possible; though many of them were more or less prevalent, or paralleled, in the *κοινή*. Their ingrained habits of thought, and their native speech, even if partly forgotten, led them to give constant prominence to these expressions, which correspond with Semitisms, as well as, to some extent, with the current Greek speech and colloquial writings.

7. The 'Septuagint¹,' or the Greek version of the Old Testament which was on the whole the work of Alexandrian Jews, is, written in full, the *Interpretatio septuaginta virorum* or *seniorum*, i.e. the translation of which the first instalment was attributed by Alexandrian tradition to seventy or seventy-two Jewish elders. In the most ancient Greek MSS. of the Old

¹ Irenaeus (iii. 21. 3) speaks of the *seniorum interpretatio*; Tertullian (*Apol.* 18) of the *septuaginta et duo interpretes*; Jerome, of the *LXX. interpretes*, or *translatores* (*praef. in Esdr., Isai.*), *LXX. editio* (*praef. in Job, ep. ad Pammach.*), *editio LXX.* (*praef. in Paralipp.*). Augustine, *de civ. Dei*, xviii. 42, remarks: "quorum interpretatio ut *Septuaginta* vocetur iam obtinuit consuetudo."

Testament it is described as the version 'according to the LXX.' (κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα, παρὰ ἑβδομήκοντα, *O. T. in Greek*, i. p. 103, ii. p. 479), and quoted by the formula οἱ ὄ or οἱ οβ'. All forms of the name point back to a common source, the story of the origin of the version which is told in the pseudonymous letter entitled Ἀριστεῆος Φιλοκράτει. See App.

LITERATURE. The text of the letter of Aristeas is printed in the Appendix to this volume. It will be found also in Hody *de Bibl. text. orig.* (Oxon. 1705), and in Constantinus Oeconomus *περὶ τῶν ὁ ἑρμηνευτῶν βιβλία δ'* (Athens, 1849); a better text was given by M. Schmidt in Merx, *Archiv f. wissenschaft. Erforschung a. A. T.* i. p. 241 ff.; the latest separate edition appeared in 1900 under the title: *Aristeae ad Philocratem epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX. interpretum testimoniis. Ludovici Mendelssohn schedis usus ed. Paulus Wendland.* A trans. by Mr H. St J. Thackeray appeared in *J. Q. R. Ap.* 1903 (since reprinted). For the earlier editions see Fabricius-Harles, iii. 660 ff.; the *editio princeps* of the Greek text was published at Basle in 1561.

The controversies raised by the letter may be studied in Hody or in Fabricius-Harles; cf. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch f. d. Literatur d. bibl. Kritik u. Exegese*; Dähne, *gesch. Darstellung d. jüdisch Alex. Religions-Philosophie*, ii. p. 205 ff.; Papageorgius, *Über den Aristeasbrief*; Lumbroso, *Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Égypte*, p. 351 f. and in *Atti di R. Accademia della Scienza di Torino*, iv. (1868-9). Fuller lists will be found in Schürer³, iii. 472 f., and in Nestle (*Real-encyklopädie f. p. Th. u. K.*³ 3, p. 2), and Hastings (*D.B.* iv. 438 f., where much interesting information is collected); cf. Van Ess, *Epilegg.* p. 29 f.

8. The writer professes to be a courtier in the service of Philadelphus, a Greek who is interested in the antiquities of the Jewish people¹. Addressing his brother Philocrates, he relates the issue of a journey which he had recently made to Jerusalem. It appears that Demetrius Phalereus², who is

¹ From the mention of Cyprus as 'the island' (§ 5) it has been inferred that Aristeas was a Cypriot. The name occurs freely in inscriptions from the islands of the Aegean and the coast of Caria (*C. I. G.* 2262, 2266, 2349, 2399, 2404, 2655, 2693, 2694, 2723, 2727, 2781, 2892), and was borne by a Cyprian sculptor (see *D. G. and R. B.*, i. 293). Wendland, however, thinks 'the island' is Pharos, as certainly in § 301. The Aristeas who wrote *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* (Euseb. *praep. ev.* ix. 25) was doubtless an Alexandrian Jew who, as a Hellenist, assumed a Greek name.

² See Ostermann, *de Demetrii Ph. vita* (1857); Susemihl, *Gesch. d. gr.*

described as librarian of the royal library at Alexandria, had in conversation with the King represented the importance of procuring for the library a translation of the Jewish laws (τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμιμα μεταγραφῆς ἄξια καὶ τῆς παρὰ σοὶ βιβλιοθήκης εἶναι). Philadelphus fell in with the suggestion, and despatched an embassy to Jerusalem with a letter to the High Priest Eleazar, in which the latter was desired to send to Alexandria six elders learned in the law from each of the tribes of Israel to execute the work of translation. In due course the seventy-two elders, whose names are given, arrived in Egypt, bringing with them a copy of the Hebrew Law written in letters of gold on rolls¹ composed of skins (σὺν...ταῖς διαφόροις διφθέραις ἐν αἷς ἢ νομοθεσία γεγραμμένη χρυσογραφία τοῖς Ἰουδαικοῖς γράμμασι). A banquet followed, at which the King tested the attainments of the Jewish elders with hard questions. Three days afterwards the work of translation began. The translators were conducted by Demetrius along the Heptastadion² to the island of Pharos, where a building conveniently furnished and remote from the distractions of the city was provided for their use. Here Demetrius, in the words of Aristetas, 'exhorted them to accomplish the work of translation, since they were well supplied with all that they could want. So they set to work, comparing their several results and making them agree; and whatever they agreed upon was suitably copied under the direction of Demetrius...In this way the transcription was completed in seventy-two days, as it that period had been pre-arranged.'

The completed work was read by Demetrius to the Jewish community, who received it with enthusiasm and begged that a copy might be placed in the hands of their leaders; and

Litt. in d. Alexandrinerzeit, i. p. 135 ff. On the royal library at Alexandria see Susemihl, i. p. 335 ff., and the art. *Bibliotheken* in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, v. 409 f.

¹ See Birt, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 21 f.

² The mole which connected the Pharos with the city: see art. *Alexandria* in Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geography*, pp. 96 f.

a curse was solemnly pronounced upon any who should presume to add to the version or to take from it. After this the Greek Pentateuch was read to the King, who expressed delight and surprise, greeted the book with a gesture of reverence (*προσκυνήσας*), and desired that it should be preserved with scrupulous care (*ἐκέλευσε μεγάλην ἐπιμέλειαν ποιῆσθαι τῶν βιβλίων καὶ συντηρεῖν ἀγνῶς*).

9. The story of Aristeas is repeated more or less fully by the Alexandrian writers Aristobulus and Philo, and by Josephus.

Aristobulus *ap. Eus. praef. ev. xiii. 12. 2*: ἡ δὲ ὅλη ἐρμηνεία τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως σου δὲ προγόνου [he is addressing Philometor] προσενεγκάμενου μείζονα φιλοτιμίαν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων¹. Philo, *vit. Moys. ii. 5 ff.*: Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Φιλάδελφος ἐπικληθεὶς...ζῆλον καὶ πόθον λαβὼν τῆς νομοθεσίας ἡμῶν εἰς Ἑλλάδα γλῶτταν τὴν Χαλδαϊκὴν μεθαρμόζεσθαι διανοεῖτο, καὶ πρὸς βεβαίως εὐθὺς ἐξέπεμπε πρὸς τὸν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀρχιερέα.. ὁ δὲ, ὡς εἰκός, ἤσθεῖς καὶ νομίσας οὐκ ἄνευ θείας ἐπιφροσύνης περὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔργον ἐσπουδακέναι τὸν βασιλέα...ἀσμένως ἀποστέλλει...καθίσαντες δ' ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ καὶ μηδενὸς παρόντος...καθάπερ ἐνθουσιῶντες ἐπροφήτεον, οὐκ ἄλλα ἄλλοι, τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ πάντες ὀνόματα καὶ ῥήματα ὡς περ ὑποβολέως ἐκάστοις ἀοράτως ἐνηχοῦντος κτλ. Josephus, *ant. i. prooem. 3*: Πτολεμαίων μὲν ὁ δεύτερος μάλιστα δὴ βασιλεὺς περὶ παιδείαν καὶ βιβλίων συναγωγὴν σπουδάσας ἐξαιρέτως ἐφιλοτιμήθη τὸν ἡμέτερον νόμον καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν διάταξιν τῆς πολιτείας εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν μεταλαβεῖν κτλ. In *ant. xii. 2. 1—15* Josephus gives a full account obviously based on Aristeas (whom he calls Ἀρισταῖος), and to a great extent verbally identical with the letter.

The testimony of Josephus establishes only the fact that the letter of Aristeas was current in Palestine during the first century A.D. Philo, on the other hand, represents an Alexandrian tradition which was perhaps originally independent of the letter, and is certainly not entirely consistent with it. He

¹ In defence of the genuineness of this testimony see Schürer, *G. J. V.*³ iii. 384—392. On the other hand cf. L. Cohn in *Neue Jahrbücher f. d. Klass. Alterthum* i. 8 (1895), and Wendland in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* vii. (1898), 447—449. For Aristobulus see Susemihl, p. 630 f.

states (*l. c.*) that the completion of the work of the LXX. was celebrated at Alexandria down to his own time by a yearly festival at the Pharos (μέχρι νῦν ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἑορτὴ καὶ πανήγυρις ἄγεται κατὰ τὴν Φάρον νῆσον, εἰς ἣν οὐκ Ἰουδαῖοι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ παμπληθεῖς ἕτεροι διαπλέουσι, τό τε χωρίον σεμνύνοντες ἐν ᾧ πρῶτον τὸ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐξέλαμψε κτλ.). A popular anniversary of this kind can scarcely have grown out of a literary work so artificial and so wanting in the elements which ensure popularity as the letter of Aristeas. The fragment of Aristobulus carries us much further back than the witness of Philo and Josephus. It was addressed to a Ptolemy who was a descendant of Philadelphus, and who is identified both by Eusebius (*l. c.*) and by Clement¹ (*strom.* i. 22) with Philometor. Whether Aristobulus derived his information from Aristeas is uncertain, but his words, if we admit their genuineness, establish the fact that the main features of the story were believed by the literary Jews of Alexandria, and even at the Court, more than a century and a half before the Christian era and within a century of the date assigned by Aristeas to the translation of the Law.

10. From the second century A.D. the letter of Aristeas is quoted or its contents are summarised by the fathers of the Church, who in general receive the story without suspicion, and add certain fresh particulars.

Cf. Justin, *apol.* i. 31, *dial.* 68, 71, 'cohort. ad Graecos' 13 ff.; Iren. iii. 21. 2 f.; Clem. Alex. *strom.* i. 22, 148 f.; Tertullian, *apol.* 18; Anatolius *ap.* Eus. *H. E.* vii. 32; Eusebius, *praef. ev.* viii. 1—9, ix. 38; Cyril of Jerusalem, *catech.* iv. 34; Hilary, *prol. ad Psalmos, tract. in Pss.* ii., cxviii.; Epiphanius, *de mens. et pond.* §§ 3, 6; Philastrius *de haer.* 138; Jerome, *praef. in Gen., praef. in libr. quaest. Hebr.*; Augustine, *de civ. Dei* xvii. 42 f., *de doctr. Chr.* ii. 22; Theodore of Mopsuestia *in Habakk.* ii., *in Zeph.* i.; Chrysostom, *or. i. adv. Jud.*, c. 6, *hom. iv. in Gen.*, c. 4; Theo-

¹ Clement of Alexandria identifies this Aristobulus with the person named in 2 Macc. i. 10 Ἀριστοβούλῳ διδασκάλῳ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως. See Valckenaer *diatribe de Aristobulo* (printed at the end of Gaisford's edition of Eus. *praef. ev.* iv.).

doret, *praef. in Psalmos*; Cyril of Alexandria, *adv. Julian. or.* 1; Pseudo-Athanasius, *synops. scr. sacr.* § 77; the anonymous *dialogue of Timothe' and Aquila* (ed. Conybeare, Oxford, 1898, p. 90 f.).

Most of these Christian writers, in distinct contradiction to the statement of Aristeas, represent the Seventy as having worked separately, adding that when the results were compared at the end of the task they were found to be identical (so Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine, &c.). The author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*¹ declares that at Alexandria he had been shewn the vestiges of the cells in which the translators had worked (αὐτοὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξάνδρειᾳ γενόμενοι καὶ τὰ ἵχνη τῶν οἰκίσκων ἐν τῇ Φάρῳ ἑωρακότες ἔτι σωζόμενα, καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐκεῖ ὡς τὰ πάτρια παρειληφῶτων ἀκηκοότες ταῦτα ἀπαγγέλλομεν). This story of the cells therefore was probably of Alexandrian origin, and had grown out of the local belief in the inspiration of the Seventy which appears already in the words of Philo quoted above². The Fathers generally accept both the belief and the legend which it generated, though the latter sometimes undergoes slight modification, as when Epiphanius groups the LXXII. in pairs (ζύγη ζύγη κατ' οἰκίσκον). Jerome is an honourable exception; he realises that the tale of the cells is inconsistent with the earlier tradition (*prol. in Gen.* "nescio quis primus auctor LXX cellulas Alexandriae mendacio suo exstruxerit, quibus divisi eadem scriptitarint, quum Aristeas...et Josephus nihil tale retulerint"), and rightly protests against the doctrine which was at the root of the absurdity ("aliud est enim vatem, aliud est esse interpretem")³.

¹ On the date of this treatise, which is commonly ascribed to Justin, see Krüger, *Hist. of Chr. Literature* (E. T.), p. 112 f., and cf. Harnack-Preuschen, p. 107.

² Cf. *ib.* οὐχ ἑρμηνεῖς ἐκείνους ἀλλ' ἱεροφάντας καὶ προφήτας προσαγορεύοντες.

³ The story of the cells is not peculiar to Christian writers; it is echoed by the Talmud (Bab. Talm. *Megillah* 9^a, Jerus. Talm. *Meg.* c. i.; cf. *Sopherim*, c. i.).

II. Doubts as to the genuineness of the Aristeas-letter were first expressed by Ludovicus de Vives in his commentary on Aug. *de civ. Dei*, xviii. 4 (published in 1522), and after him by Joseph Scaliger. Ussher and Voss defended the letter, but its claim to be the work of a contemporary of Philadelphus was finally demolished by Humphry Hody, Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford (1698—1706)¹. A few later writers have pleaded in its favour (e.g. Grinfield *Apology for the LXX.*, and Constantinus Oeconomus, *op. cit.*); but the great majority of modern scholars, and perhaps all living experts, recognise the unhistorical character of much of the story of Aristeas.

Indeed it scarcely needed the massive learning of Hody to convict the letter of Aristeas of being pseudonymous, and to a large extent legendary. The selection of the elders from all the tribes of Israel awakens suspicions; their names are clearly imaginary; the recurrence of the number seventy-two seems to have struck even the writer as open to remark²; the letters of Philadelphus and Eleazar are of the same stamp as the confessedly fictitious correspondence between the Egyptian and the Palestinian Jews in 2 Maccabees³. Above all, whereas the letter professes to have been written by a Greek and a pagan, its purpose proclaims it to be the work of a Jew; while it addresses itself to Gentile readers, its obvious aim is to glorify the Jewish race, and to diffuse information about their sacred books. On the other hand, though the story as 'Aristeas' tells it is doubtless a romance, it must not be hastily inferred that it has no historical basis. That the writer was a Jew who lived in Egypt under the Ptolemies seems to be

¹ In his *Contra historiam LXX. interpretum Aristeae nomine inscriptam dissertatio*, originally published in 1684, and afterwards included in *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis, et Latina vulgata libri iv.* (Oxon. 1705). For other writers on both sides cf. Buhl, p. 117 (E. T. p. 115).

² On the Rabbinical partiality for this number, cf. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, v. 252 n. (E. T.); Schürer II. i. p. 174; Buhl, p. 117 (= 116, E. T.).

³ Or the letters of Philopator in 3 Maccabees.

demonstrated by the knowledge which he displays of life at the Alexandrian Court¹. There is also reason to suppose that he wrote within fifty years of the death of Philadelphus, and his principal facts are endorsed, as we have seen, by a writer of the next generation². It is difficult to believe that a document, which within a century of the events relates the history of a literary undertaking in which the Court and the scholars of Alexandria were concerned, can be altogether destitute of truth. Detailed criticism is impossible in this place, but it is necessary to examine the credibility of the chief features of the romance so far as they affect questions relating to the date and origin of the LXX. There are certain points in the letter of Aristæus which demand investigation, especially the statements (1) that the translation of the Law was made in the time of Philadelphus; (2) that it was undertaken at the desire of the King, and for the royal library; (3) that the translators and the Hebrew rolls which they used were brought from Jerusalem; and (4) that their translation when completed was welcomed both by Jews and Greeks³.

12. There is no improbability in the first of these statements. The personal tastes of Philadelphus, if by no means purely literary, included a fancy for the society of scholars and the accumulation of books⁴. He founded a second library at the Serapeion to receive the overflow of that which Soter had established near the Museum and the Palace⁵. His syncretistic temperament disposed him to listen to the representatives of various creeds. A Buddhist mission from the Ganges found a welcome at his court⁶; and the reign which produced

¹ See the remarks of Wilcken in *Philologus* liii. (1894), p. 111 f., and cf. Lombroso, p. xiii.

² See Schüreir³, iii. p. 468 f.

³ See Mr I. Abrahams in *J.Q.R.* xiv. 2, pp. 321 ff., *Recent Criticisms of the Letter of Aristæus*.

⁴ Tertullian exaggerates his literary merits (*apol.* 18 Ptolemaeorum eruditissimus...et omnis litteraturae sagacissimus).

⁵ Cf. Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 164 ff. On the character of Philadelphus see also Droysen, iii., p. 254 f.

⁶ Mahaffy, pp. 163 f., 170.

Manetho's Greek history of Egyptian institutions may well have yielded also a translation into Greek of the Hebrew sacred books. The presence of a large Jewish colony at Alexandria could hardly have failed to awaken in the King and his scholars of the Museum an interest in the ancient laws and literature of the Jewish race. For these reasons modern scholars have for the most part shewn no desire to disturb the tradition which assigns the Alexandrian version of the Law to the days of Philadelphus.

One exception must be noted. The late Professor Grätz maintained with much ingenuity that the Greek Pentateuch was a work of the reign of Philometor, thus transferring the inception of the LXX. from the middle of the third century to the middle of the second¹.

His opinion was based partly on the fact that the Jewish colony at Alexandria touched the zenith of its influence under Philometor, partly on internal grounds. Under the latter head he insisted on the translation in Lev. xxiii. 11 of the phrase תִּקְרָא לַיהוָה by τῆ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης. The Pharisees understood the word תִּקְרָא in that context to refer to the day after the Paschal Sabbath i.e. Nisan 15, while the Sadducees adhered to the usual meaning. Grätz argued with much force that, since the rendering of the LXX. shews evident signs of Pharisaic influence, the version itself must have been later than the rise of the Pharisees². But v. 15 renders the same words by ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαύριον τοῦ σαββάτου, and as it is not likely that a translator who had of set purpose written τῆς πρώτης in v. 11 would have let τοῦ σαββάτου escape him a little further down, we must suppose that τοῦ σ. stood originally in both verses and that τῆς πρ. is due to a Pharisaic corrector who left his work incomplete. But a partial correction of the passage in the interests of Pharisaism points to the version being pre-Maccabean, a conclusion quite opposite to that which Dr Grätz desired to draw³.

There is, moreover, positive evidence that the Alexandrian version of Genesis at least was in existence considerably before the beginning of Philometor's reign. It was used by the Hellenist Demetrius, fragments of whose treatise Περὶ τῶν ἐν

¹ *Gesch. Juden*³, iii. p. 615 ff.

² He also notes the rendering ἀρχων in Deut. xvii. 14—20.

³ See *Expository Times*, ii. pp. 209, 277 f.

τῆ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων are preserved by Clement (*strom.* i. 21) and Eusebius (*praep. ev.* ix. 21, 29). The following specimens may suffice to prove this assertion.

Demetrius.

ἀντὶ τῶν μῆλων τοῦ μανδρα-
γόρου.

ἄγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ παλαῖσαι
καὶ ἄψασθαι τοῦ πλάτους τοῦ
μηροῦ τοῦ Ἰακώβ.

λέγειν κτηνοτρόφους αὐτοὺς
εἶναι.

Genesis (LXX.).

εὗρεν μῆλα μανδραγόρου...
ἀντὶ τῶν μανδραγορῶν (xxx.
14 f.).

ἐπάλαιεν...καὶ ἤψατο τοῦ
πλάτους τοῦ μηροῦ Ἰακώβ
(xxxii. 25).

ἐρεῖτε Ἄνδρες κτηνοτρόφοι
ἐσμέν (xlv. 34).

As Demetrius carries his chronology no further than the reign of Philopator, it may be assumed that he lived under the fourth Ptolemy¹. He is thus the earliest of the Alexandrian Hellenistic writers; yet equally with the latest he draws his quotations of the Book of Genesis from the LXX. It may fairly be argued that a version, which at the end of the third century B.C. had won its way to acceptance among the literary Jews of Alexandria, probably saw the light not later than the reign of Philadelphus.

13. Both 'Aristeas' and Aristobulus associate with the inception of the LXX. the name of Demetrius Phalereus². Aristobulus merely represents Demetrius as having 'negotiated the matter' (*πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων*), but Aristeas states that he did so (1) in the capacity of head of the royal library (*κατασταθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως βιβλιοθήκης*), and (2) in the days of Philadelphus, with whom he appears to be on intimate terms. Both these particulars are certainly unhistorical. Busch³ has shewn that the office of librarian was

¹ Cf. Freudenthal, *hellen. Studien*, p. 41.

² The *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* strangely says: ἦν δὲ οὗτος ὁ Δημήτριος τῷ γένει Ἑβραῖος.

³ *De bibliothecariis Alexandrinis* (1884), p. 1 ff.; cf. Droysen, iii. p. 256; Mahaffy, p. 115.

filled under Philadelphus by Zenodotus of Ephesus, and on the decease of Zenodotus by Eratosthenes. Moreover Demetrius, so far from being intimate with Philadelphus, was sent into exile soon after the accession of that monarch, and died a little later on from the bite of an asp, probably administered at the King's instigation (c. B.C. 283)¹. Thus, if Demetrius took part in the inception of the LXX., he must have done so during the reign of Soter. This is not in itself improbable. He had taken refuge in Egypt as early as B.C. 307, and for many years had been a trusted adviser of the first Ptolemy; and it is not unlikely that the project of translating the Jewish Law was discussed between him and the royal founder of the Alexandrian library, and that the work was really due to his suggestion², though his words did not bear fruit until after his death. The point is of importance to the student of the LXX. only in so far as it has to do with the question whether the version was made under official guidance. The breakdown of the chronology of this part of the story of Aristeeas leaves us free to abandon the hypothesis of direct intervention on the part of the King, and internal evidence certainly justifies us in doing so. An official version would assuredly have avoided such barbarisms as *γειώρας*, *εἶν*, *σάββατα*³, when such Greek equivalents as *προσῆλυτος*, *δέχουν*, *ανάπαυσις*, were available. The whole style of the version is alien from the purpose of a book intended for literary use, nor is it conceivable that under such circumstances Jewish translators, Palestinian or Alexandrian, would have been left without the advice and help of experts in the Greek tongue.

Thus everything points to the conclusion that the version

¹ Diog. Laert. v. 78. The statement rests on the authority of Hermippus Callimachus (*temp.* Ptolemy III.).

² Cf. Plutarch, *Απορήθηγημ.* viii. Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ βασιλεὶ παρήκει τὰ περὶ βασιλείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας βιβλία κτᾶσθαι καὶ ἀναγνώσκειν.

³ Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 8f.

arose out of the needs of the Alexandrian Jews. Whilst in Palestine the Aramaic-speaking Jews were content with the interpretation of the *Methurgeman*, at Alexandria the Hebrew lesson was gladly exchanged for a lesson read from a Greek translation, and the work of the interpreter was limited to exegesis¹. In the closing paragraphs of the letter of Aristeas which describe the joy with which the work of the LXXII. was welcomed by the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria, the writer unconsciously reveals the true history of the version, when he represents the Jews as having heard and welcomed the Greek Pentateuch before it was presented to the King². But it is not improbable that the King encouraged the work of translation with the view of promoting the use of the Greek language by the settlers³ as well as for the purpose of gratifying his own curiosity.

14. The Greek of the Alexandrian Pentateuch is Egyptian, and, as far as we can judge, not such as Palestinian translators would have written. Instances are not indeed wanting of translations executed in Egypt by Palestinians; the most noteworthy⁴ is the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, which, as the prologue tells us, was turned into Greek by the grandson of the writer after a prolonged visit to the banks of the Nile (*παραγενηθείς εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ συγχρονίσας*); but the clumsy Greek of the prologue, and the stiff artificiality of the book, offer a

¹ Cf. Philo *ap.* Eus. *praef. ev.* viii. 7 τῶν ἱερέων δὲ τις παρών, ἢ τῶν γερόντων εἷς, ἀναγινώσκει τοὺς ἱεροὺς νόμους αὐτοῖς καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐξηγεῖται. But ἐξηγεῖται is ambiguous.

² The hope of winning converts may have been among the motives which inspired the translators and gained a ready welcome for their work; cf. the prolog. to Sirach: οὐ μόνον αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας δέον ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμονας γίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἔκτος δύνασθαι τοὺς φιλομαθοῦντας χρησίμους εἶναι καὶ λέγοντας καὶ γράφοντας—where however the influence of the Jewish Scriptures on pagans is regarded as indirect, and not immediate.

³ Cf. Mommsen, *Provinces*, ii. p. 164.

⁴ Another example is offered by the Greek Esther, if the note at the end of the book is to be trusted (*ἔφασαν...ἐρμηνευκέναι Λυσίμαχον Πτολεμαίου τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*).

marked contrast to the simple style of the Pentateuch. That the latter is mainly the work of Alexandrian Jews appears from more than one consideration. An older generation of Biblical scholars pointed to the occurrence in the LXX., and especially in the Pentateuch, of such words of Egyptian origin as ἄχει (Gen. xli. 2 ff.), κόνδν (Gen. xliv. 2 ff.), ἰβις (Lev. xi. 17; Deut. xiv. 16), βύσσος (Exod. xxv.—xxxix. *passim*) and such characteristically Egyptian terms as δίδραχμον, ἀλήθεια (= ⲁⲗⲏⲏⲥ), ἀρχιμάγειρος, ἀρχιουνοχόος and the like. The argument is not conclusive, since after the time of Alexander the *κοινή* contained elements drawn from various localities¹. But recent discoveries in Egypt have yielded a criterion of Egyptian Greek which has been applied to the LXX. with definite results. In 1892 Prof. Mahaffy was able to write: "in the vocabulary of the papyri we find a closer likeness to the Greek of the LXX. than to any other book I could name²." This statement has been abundantly justified by the publication of Deissmann's *Bibelstudien* (Marburg, 1895), and *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897), where a number of the peculiar or characteristic words and forms of the LXX. are shewn to have been in common use among Egyptian Greeks of the third and second centuries B.C.³ The vocabulary and style of the LXX. will be treated in a later chapter; for the present it is enough to say that they are such as to discredit the attribution of the Greek Pentateuch to a company consisting exclusively or chiefly of Palestinian Jews. The LXX. as a whole, or at any rate the earlier part of the collection, is a monument of Alexandrian Greek as it was spoken by the Jewish colony in the Delta under the rule of the Ptolemies⁴.

¹ See Hody, ii. 4; Eichhorn, p. 472; H. A. A. Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 24 f.; on the other hand, cf. Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 40 ff.

² *Exp. Times*, iii. p. 291; cf. Mahaffy, *Greek life*, p. 198 f.

³ Evidence of this kind will doubtless accumulate as new volumes of papyri are issued. The verbal indices which usually accompany such collections offer a rich field for the Biblical student who will be at the pains to explore them.

⁴ See however Buhl, p. 124.

The story of the rolls being written in letters of gold and sent to the King by the High Priest may be dismissed at once; it belongs to the picturesque setting of the romance. But there is nothing improbable in the statement that the Hebrew rolls were freshly brought from Jeruſalem¹, for communication between Jerusalem and Alexandria was frequent during the reigns of the earlier Ptolemies. Yet the legend may be intended to represent the loyalty of the colony towards the *μητρόπολις*, and the conviction of the Alexandrian Jews that in their Greek version they possessed the same sacred texts which their brethren in Judaea read in Hebrew. Nothing was further from their intention than to create an Alexandrian canon, or an Alexandrian type of text. The point is one which it is important to remember.

The welcome accorded to the Greek version by the Jews of Alexandria was doubtless, as Aristeas represents, both cordial and permanent; nor need we doubt that Philadelphus and his scholars approved what had been done. Insignificant and even intolerable as a literary work, the version promised to supply the Greek scholars of Alexandria with a trustworthy account of Hebrew origins. There is however little or no trace of the use of the LXX. by pagan writers²; the style was probably enough to deter them from studying it, and the Hellenistic Jews of a somewhat later date rendered the task unnecessary by presenting the history of their country in more attractive forms. As to the preservation of the original in the Alexandrian libraries, we have no evidence beyond Tertullian's scarcely trustworthy statement, "Hodie apud Serapeum Ptolemaei bibliothecae cum ipsis Hebraicis litteris exhibentur³."

¹ According to Epiphanius (*de mens. et pond.* 10 f.) the rolls only were sent in the first instance, and the interpreters followed in consequence of a second application from Philadelphus. This form of the story suggests that the desire for a translation may have been stimulated by the arrival of MSS. from Jerusalem.

² See, however, Mahaffy, *Hist. of Gk. class. literature*, 1. ii. p. 195.

³ *Apol.* 18; cf. Justin, *apol.* i. 31, Chrys. *or.* 1 *adv. Jud.*, and Epiph.

15. It has been stated (p. 11) that the letter of Aristeas does not profess to describe the origin of any part of the Alexandrian Bible except the Pentateuch¹. This was evident to Josephus : *ant. i. prooem. 3* οὐδὲ γὰρ πᾶσαν ἐκείνος (sc. Πτολεμαῖος ὁ δεύτερος) ἔφθη λαβεῖν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ τοῦ νόμου παρέδοσαν οἱ πεμφθέντες ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξήγησιν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. Christian writers, however, failed to notice this limitation; the whole Greek Bible was familiarly known as the version of the LXX., and no misgivings were felt upon the matter except by Jerome, whose intercourse with the Rabbis had opened his eyes on this and other matters about which the Jews were better informed : “*tota schola Judaeorum (he writes) quinque tantum libros Moysis a LXX. translatos asserunt*”². Epiphanius goes so far as to apportion the books of the Hebrew canon among thirty-six pairs of translators³. Nevertheless the Jews were unquestionably right; Aristeas has nothing to say about the translation of any books beyond the first five. His silence as to the Prophets and the Hagiographa is entirely consistent with the conditions of the period in which he fixes his story. The canon of the Prophets seems to have scarcely reached completion before the High-Priesthood of Simon II. (219—199 B.C.)⁴. If this was so in Palestine, at Alexandria certainly there would be no recognised body of Prophetic writings in the reign of the second Ptolemy. The Torah alone was ready for translation, for it was complete, and its position as a collection of sacred books was absolutely secure.

16. But when the example had once been set of rendering sacred books into Greek, it would assuredly be followed as often as fresh rolls arrived from Jerusalem which bore the stamp

de mens. et pond. § 11. The library in the Brucheion perished in the time of Julius Caesar; that of the Serapeion is said to have been destroyed by Omar, A.D. 640.

¹ See, e.g., §§ 3, 10, 46, 171, 176.

² *In Ezech. v.*; cf. *in Gen. xxxi.*, *in Mich. ii.* See the Talmudical passages cited by Hody, p. 296.

³ *de mens. et pond.* 3 sq.

⁴ Ryle, *Canon of the O. T.*, p. 113. Cf. Buhl, p. 12.

of Palestinian recognition, if a bilingual Jew was found ready to undertake the task. A happy accident enables us to estimate roughly the extent to which this process had gone by the sixth or seventh decade of the second century. The writer of the prologue to Sirach, who arrived in Egypt in the 38th year of Euergetes—i.e. in the year 132 B.C. if, as is probable, the Euergetes intended was the second of that name—incidentally uses words which imply that “the Law, the Prophets, and the rest of the books” were already current in a translation (οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα, καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῆ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν· οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν τὴν διαφορὰν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα). This sentence reveals the progress which had been made in the work of translation between the second Ptolemy and the ninth. Under Euergetes II. the Alexandrian Jews possessed, in addition to the original Greek Pentateuch, a collection of prophetic books, and a number of other writings belonging to their national literature¹ which had not as yet formed themselves into a complete group. The latter are doubtless the books which are known as *דְּבָרֵי חַיִּים* or Hagiographa. Since the author of the prologue was a Palestinian Jew, we may perhaps assume that under *αἱ προφητεῖαι* and *τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων* he includes such books of both classes as were already in circulation in Palestine. If this inference is a safe one, it will follow that all the ‘Prophets’ of the Hebrew canon, ‘former’ and ‘latter,’ had been translated before B.C. 132.

With regard to the Hagiographa, in some cases we have data which lead to a more definite conclusion. Eupolemus, who, if identical with the person of that name mentioned in 1 Macc. viii. 17, wrote about the middle of the second century, makes use of the Greek Chronicles, as Freudenthal has

¹ Cf. *prol. supra*: τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων.

clearly shewn¹. Ezra-Nehemiah, originally continuous with Chronicles, was probably translated at the same time as that book. Aristeas (not the pseudonymous author of the letter, but the writer of a treatise *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*) quotes the book of Job according to the LXX., and has been suspected² of being the author of the remarkable codicil attached to it (Job xlii. 17 *b-e*). The footnote to the Greek Esther, which states that that book was brought to Egypt in the 4th year of "Ptolemy and Cleopatra" (probably i.e. of Ptolemy Philometor), may have been written with the purpose of giving Palestinian sanction to the Greek version of that book; but it vouches for the fact that the version was in circulation before the end of the second century B.C.³ The Psalter of the LXX. appears to be quoted in 1 Macc. vii. 17 (Ps. lxxviii. = lxxix. 2), and the Greek version of 1 Maccabees probably belongs to the first century B.C. At what time the Greek Psalter assumed its present form there is no evidence to shew, but it is reasonable to suppose that the great Palestinian collections of sacred song did not long remain unknown to the Alexandrian Jews⁴; and even on the hypothesis of certain Psalms being Maccabean, the later books of the Greek Psalter may be assigned to the second half of the second century.

17. On the whole, though the direct evidence is fragmentary, it is probable that before the Christian era Alexandria possessed the whole, or nearly the whole, of the Hebrew Scriptures in a Greek translation. For the first century A.D. we have the very important evidence of Philo, who uses the LXX. and quotes largely from many of the books. There are indeed some books of the Hebrew canon to which he does not seem to refer, i.e. Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel⁴. But, as Professor Ryle points out,

¹ Pp. 108, 119; cf. p. 185.

² *Ib.* p. 138 f.

³ Cf. Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 12, 83.

⁴ Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture*, p. xxxi. f.

“it may be safely assumed that Ruth and Lamentations were, in Philo’s time, already united to Judges and Jeremiah in the Greek Scriptures”; and Ezekiel, as one of the greater Prophets, had assuredly found its way to Alexandria before A.D. I. Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, Daniel, which “seem to have been among the latest books to be received into the Sacred Canon¹,” may have been purposely neglected by Philo, as not possessing canonical authority. But it would be precarious to conclude that they had not been as yet translated into Greek; the Book of Esther, as we have seen, was probably current at Alexandria during the second century B.C. Two other Jewish, but not Alexandrian, authorities assist us to ascertain the contents of the Greek Bible in the first century A.D. (a) The New Testament shews a knowledge of the LXX. version in most of the books which it quotes, and it quotes all the books of the Old Testament except Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, and certain of the Minor Prophets². As in the case of Philo, it is possible, though scarcely probable, that Esther, Ecclesiastes and the Song were passed by as not having received the stamp of canonicity; but the silence of the Apostolic writers about them does not in any case prove that Greek translations of these books were not yet in circulation among Palestinian Jews. (b) Josephus, who knew and used the LXX., unfortunately has no explicit statement as to the extent of the Greek version; but his list of the Hebrew books is practically identical with our own, and, as it occurs in a treatise intended for Gentile readers, it is perhaps safe to assume that he speaks of books accessible in a translation; “in other words, that he writes with the LXX. version before him³.”

Thus while the testimony of the first century A.D. does not absolutely require us to believe that all the books of the

¹ Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture*, p. xxxiii.

² Ryle, *Canon*, p. 151.

³ *Ib.* p. 163.

Hebrew canon had been translated and were circulated in a Greek version during the Apostolic age, such a view is not improbable; and it is confirmed by the fact that they are all contained in the canon of the Greek Bible which the Christian Church received from its Jewish predecessors. It is another question whether the versions were all of Alexandrian origin, or the only Greek translations which claimed to represent the corresponding Hebrew books. In a few cases there were certainly rival interpretations or recensions of the same book (e.g. in Judges, Daniel, Tobit). But as a whole the work of translation was doubtless carried out at Alexandria, where it was begun; and the Greek Bible of the Hellenistic Jews and the Catholic Church may rightly be styled the Alexandrian Greek version of the Old Testament.

LITERATURE. The following list embraces a mere fraction of the vast literature of the Alexandrian Version. The selection has been made with the purpose of representing the progress of knowledge since the middle of the seventeenth century.

L. Cappellus, *critica sacra*, 1651; J. Pearson, *praefatio paraenetica*, 1655; Ussher, *Syntagma*, 1655; Walton, *prolegomena*, 1657; Hottinger, *disertationum fasciculus*, 1660; I. Voss, *de LXX. interpretibus*, 1661—1663; J. Morinus, *Exercitationes*, 1669; R. Simon, *histoire critique du Vieux Testament*², 1685; H. Hody, *de Bibl. textibus originalibus*, 1705; H. Owen, *Enquiry into the text of the LXX.*, 1769; *Brief account of the LXX.*, 1787; Stroth, in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, v. ff., 1779 ff.; White, *Letter to the Bp of London*, 1779; Fabricius-Harles, iii. 658 ff., 1793; R. Holmes, *Episcopo Dunelm. epistola*, 1795; *praefatio ad Pentateuchum*, 1798; Schleusner, *opuscula critica*, 1812; Töpler, *de Pentateuchi interpretat. Alex. indole*, 1830; Dähne, *jüd.-alexandr. Philosophie*, 1834; Grinfield, *Apology for the LXX.*, 1850; Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der LXX.*, 1841; *über den Einfluss d. paläst. Exegese auf die alexandr. Hermeneutik*, 1851; do., *über paläst. u. alexandr. Schriftforschung*, 1854; Thiersch, *de Pentateuchi vers. Alexandr.*, 1841; Constantinus Oeconomus, *περὶ τῶν ὁ ἐρμηνευτῶν*, 1849; Churton, *The Influence of the LXX. upon the progress of Christianity*, 1861; Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*³, 1868; E. Nestle, *Septuaginta-Studien*, i. 1886, ii. 1896, iii. 1899, iv. 1903, v. 1907; S. R. Driver, *Notes on Samuel (Introd. § 3f.)*, 1890; P. de Lagarde, *Septuaginta-Studien*,

i. 1891, ii. 1892; A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, i. 1904, ii. 1907, iii. 1911; Buhl, *Kanon u. Text der A. T.*, 1891; A. Loisy, *histoire critique du texte et des versions de la Bible*, 1892; Hatch, *Essays on Biblical Greek*, 1892; W. Robertson Smith, *O. T. in the Jewish Church*², 1892; E. Klostermann, *Analecta zur LXX^{ta}*, 1895; Nestle, *Urtext u. Übersetzungen der Bibel*, 1897. Monographs on special books or particular aspects of the subject will be enumerated elsewhere.

The student should also consult the best Introductions to the O.T., especially those of Eichhorn (1777 ff.), De Wette-Schrader (1869), Bleek-Wellhausen⁶ (1893), König (1893); and the Encyclopedias and Bible Dictionaries, especially the articles on the Septuagint in Smith's *D. B.* iii. (Selwyn), the *Encyclopædia Britannica*² (Wellhausen), the *Real-Encykl. f. prot. Theologie u. Kirche*³ (Nestle; also published in a separate form, under the title *Urtext u. Übersetzungen, &c.*), and Nestle's art. *Septuagint* in Hastings' *D.B.* iv.; the arts. *Septuaginta* (Hoberg) in Wetzter-Welte's *Encyklopaedie*² xi. (1899), 147—159, and *Text and Versions* (Burkitt) in Cheyne and Black's *Encyclop. Biblica*.

CHAPTER II.

LATER GREEK VERSIONS.

I. AT Alexandria and in Egypt generally the Alexandrian version was regarded, as Philo plainly says, with a reverence scarcely less than that which belonged to the original. It was the Bible of the Egyptian Jews, even of those who belonged to the educated and literary class. This feeling was shared by the rest of the Hellenistic world. In Palestine indeed the version seems to have been received with less enthusiasm, and whether it was used in the synagogues is still uncertain. But elsewhere its acceptance by Greek-speaking Jews was universal during the Apostolic age and in the next generation.

On the question of the use of the LXX. in the synagogues see Hody iii. 1. 1, Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 56 ff., König, *Einleitung*, p. 105 ff.; the negative is stoutly maintained by J. Lightfoot, *hor. Hebr.* (add. to 1 Cor. xiv.). If the Ep. to the Hebrews was addressed to the Church of Jerusalem, the preponderating use of the LXX. in its quotations from the O. T. is strong evidence, so far as it goes, for the acceptance of the LXX. by Palestinian Hellenists. Its use by St Paul vouches for the practice of the Hellenists of Asia Minor and Europe; no rival version had gained circulation at Antioch, Ephesus, or Rome. In the next century we have the evidence of Justin (*apol.* i. 31 ἔμειναν αἱ βίβλοι [the translated books] καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίους μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο καὶ πανταχοῦ παρὰ πᾶσιν εἰσιν Ἰουδαίους: *dial.* 72 αὐτὴ ἢ περικοπὴ ἢ ἐκ τῶν λόγων τοῦ Ἱερεμίου ἔτι ἐστὶν ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις τῶν ἐν συναγωγαῖς Ἰουδαίων), Tertullian (*apol.* 18 "Judaci palam lectitant"), Pseudo-Justin (*cohort. ad Gr.* 13 τὸ δὲ παρ' Ἰουδαίους ἔτι καὶ νῦν τὰς τῆ ἡμετέρα θεοσεβεία

διαφερούσας σώζεσθαι βίβλους, θείας προνοίας ἔργον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γέγονεν... ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῆς ταύτας ἀξιούμεν προκομίζεσθαι).

2. When the LXX. passed into the hands of the Church and was used in controversy with Jewish antagonists, the Jews not unnaturally began to doubt the accuracy of the Alexandrian version (Justin, *dial.* 68 *τολμῶσι λέγειν τὴν ἐξήγησιν ἣν ἐξηγήσαντο οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα ὑμῶν πρεσβύτεροι παρὰ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεῖ γενόμενοι μὴ εἶναι ἕν τισιν ἀληθῆ*). The crucial instance was the rendering of פָּרְזֵל by παρθένος in Isa. vii. 14, where νεᾶνις, it was contended, would have given the true meaning of the Hebrew word (*ib.* 71, 84; *Iren.* iii. 21. 1). But the dissatisfaction with which the LXX. was regarded by the Jewish leaders of the second century was perhaps not altogether due to polemical causes. The LXX. "did not suit the newer school of [Jewish] interpretation, it did not correspond with the received text¹." An official text differing considerably from the text accepted in earlier times had received the approval of the Rabbis, and the Alexandrian version, which represented the older text, began to be suspected and to pass into disuse. Attempts were made to provide something better for Greek-speaking Israelites (Justin, *dial.* 71 *αὐτοῖς ἐξηγεῖσθαι πειρῶνται*). Of two such fresh translations Irenaeus speaks in terms of reprehension (*l. c.* *οὐχ ὡς ἐνιοὶ φασιν τῶν ἰν μεθερμηνεύειν τολμώντων τὴν γραφήν... ὡς Θεοδοτίων... ὁ Ἐφέσιος καὶ Ἀκύλας ὁ Ποντικός, ἀμφότεροι Ἰουδαῖοι προσήλυτοι*). Origen, who realised the importance of these translations, was able to add to those of Aquila and Theodotion the version of Symmachus and three others which were anonymous². Of the anonymous versions little remains, but Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus are represented by numerous and in some cases important fragments.

¹ Robertson Smith, *The O. T. in the J. Ch.*, p. 64; cf. *ib.* p. 87 f.; Kirkpatrick, *Divine Library*, p. 63 ff.; cf. Buhl, p. 118 f.

² Eus. *H. E.* vi. 16.

3. AQUILA. The name had been borne in the Apostolic age by a native of Pontus who was of Jewish birth (Acts xviii. 2 Ἰουδαῖον ὀνόματι Ἀκύλαν, Ποντικὸν τῷ γένει). Aquila the translator was also of Pontus, from the famous sea-port¹ Sinope, which had been constituted by Julius Caesar a Roman colony; but he was of Gentile origin. He lived in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117—138), and was a connexion of the Emperor (πενθερίδης, Epiph., *Dial. of Timothy and Aquila*; πενθερός, Ps.-Ath., *Chron. Pasch.*). Hadrian employed his relative to superintend the building of Aelia Capitolina on the site of Jerusalem, and while there Aquila was converted to Christianity by Christians who had returned from Pella. Refusing, however, to abandon the pagan practice of astrology, he was excommunicated; upon which he shewed his resentment by submitting to circumcision and attaching himself to the teaching of the Jewish Rabbis. The purpose of his translation was to set aside the interpretation of the LXX., in so far as it appeared to support the views of the Christian Church.

This is the story of Epiphanius (*de mens. et pond.* 14 sq. : λαβὼν [sc. ὁ Ἀδριανὸς] τὸν Ἀκύλαν τοῦτον... Ἑλληνα ὄντα καὶ αὐτοῦ πενθερίδην, ἀπὸ Σινώπης δὲ τῆς Πόντου ὀρμώμενον, καθίστησιν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖσε ἐπιστατεῖν τοῖς ἔργοις κτλ.... πικρανθεὶς δὲ... προσηλυτεύει καὶ περιτέμνεται Ἰουδαῖος* καὶ ἐπιπόνως φιλοτιμησάμενος ἐξέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν μαθεῖν τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν στοιχεῖα. ταύτην δὲ ἀκρότατα παιδευθεὶς ἠρμήνευσεν οὐκ ὀρθῶ λογισμῶ χρησάμενος, ἀλλ' ὅπως διαστρέψῃ τινὰ τῶν ῥητῶν, ἐνσκήψας τῇ τῶν οὐβ' ἔρμηνείᾳ ἵνα τὰ περὶ Χριστοῦ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς μεμαρτυρημένα ἄλλως ἐκδώσει). The same tale is told in substance by the Pseudo-Athanasian author of *Synopsis script. sacr.*, c. 77, and in the *Dialogue between Timothy and Aquila* printed in *Anecdota Oxon.*, class. ser. pt viii. According to the writer of the *Dialogue* Aquila learned Hebrew in his 40th year, and there are other features peculiar to this form of the story which have led the editor, Mr F. C. Conybeare, to conjecture that it is independent of the Epiphanian narrative, though derived from the same source,

¹ Ramsay, *Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, p. 27 f.; cf. Hort, *Commentary on 1 Peter*, p. 172 ff.

which he believes to have been ultimately the history of Ariston of Pella (*op. cit.* p. xxvi. ff.). An Aquila figures in the Clementine romance (*hom.* ii. sqq., *recogn.* ii. sqq.); the name and character were perhaps suggested by some floating memories of the translator. Cf. Lagarde, *Clementina*, p. 12 f.

That Aquila was a proselyte to Judaism is attested by the Jewish tradition (Jer. Talm. *Meg.* i. 11, *Kiddush.* i. 1), in which he appears as אַקִּילָא, ὁ προσήλυτος¹. After his conversion to Judaism, Aquila became a pupil of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua (*Meg.* f. 71 c) or, according to another authority, of R. Akiba (*Kiddush.* f. 59 a). The latter statement seems to have been current among the Jews of Palestine in Jerome's time (Hieron. *in Isa.* viii. 14 "scribae et Pharisei quorum suscepit scholam Akybas, quem magistrum Aquilae proselyti autumant"), and it derives some confirmation from the character of the version.

According to Epiphanius the *floruit* of Aquila is to be placed in the 12th year of Hadrian (Epiph. *de mens. et pond.* 13 Ἀδριανὸς ἔτη κα', οὐτινος τῷ δωδεκάτῳ ἔτει Ἀκύλας ἐγνωρίζετο...ὡς εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῶν οὐβ' ἐρμηνευτῶν ἕως Ἀκύλα τοῦ ἐρμηνευτοῦ, ἧγγον ἕως δωδεκάτου ἔτους Ἀδριανοῦ, ἔτη υλ' καὶ μῆνας δ'. The 12th year of Hadrian was A.D. 128—9, the year in which the Emperor began to rebuild Aelia. This date is doubtless approximately correct, if Aquila was a pupil of R. Akiba, who taught from A.D. 95 to A.D. 135², or even of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, who immediately preceded Akiba. It must have taken the Greek proselyte many years to acquire an adequate knowledge of Hebrew and of the Rabbinical methods of interpretation, and under these circumstances his great work could hardly have been completed before the fourth decade of the second century. When Irenaeus wrote his third book, in

¹ The name is written עקילם, אקילם, קילם, or עקיעלם, and in the Bab. Talmud, אַנקלום. On the identity of Aquila with Onkelos see Anger *de Onkelo Chaldaico* (before 1845), Friedmann *Onkelos u. Akylas* (Wien, 1896); or the brief statement in Buhl, p. 173.

² Field, *Hexapla*, prolegg. p. xviii.

the ninth decade, Aquila's translation might still be regarded as comparatively recent (τῶν νῦν μεθερμηνεύειν τολμώντων τὴν γραφὴν...ὡς... Ἀκύλας).

4. It was natural that the version of Aquila should be received with acclamation by his co-religionists. His teachers congratulated him in the words of Ps. xlv. 3, $\text{דָּרַשׁ יְהוָה וְיַפְיֹאֵל יְהוָה}$. The Talmud quotes or refers to his translation of not a few passages (Gen. xvii. 1; Lev. xix. 20, 23, 40; Esth. i. 6; Prov. xviii. 21, xxv. 11; Isa. iii. 20; Ezek. xvi. 10, xxiii. 43; Dan. v. 5, viii. 13). In Origen's time he was trusted implicitly in Jewish circles, and used by all Jews who did not understand Hebrew (*ep. ad African.* 2 φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις...ὃ μάλιστα εἰώθασιν οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον χρῆσθαι, ὡς πάντων μᾶλλον ἐπιτετευγμένῳ); and the same preference for Aquila seems to have been characteristic of the Jews in the fourth and fifth centuries (cf. Jerome on Ezek. iii. 5, and Augustine *de civ. Dei* xv. 23), and at a still later period, for even Justinian, when regulating the public reading of the Scriptures in the synagogues, thought it expedient to permit the use of Aquila (*novell.* 146: "at vero ii qui Graeca lingua legunt LXX. interpretum utentur translatione...verum...licentiam concedimus etiam Aquilae versione utendi"). It was equally natural that the proselyte's version should be regarded with distrust by Christians, who saw in it the work of a champion of Rabbinitism as well as a bold attempt to displace the Septuagint². Yet the few Christian writers who were students of the Hebrew Bible learnt to recognise the fidelity of Aquila's work. He was 'a slave to the letter' (δουλεύων τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ λέξει); whatever was wanting in the Hebrew text was not to be

¹ *Megilla* I. 9: in וְיַפְיֹאֵל there is a play upon וְיַפְיֹאֵל (cf. Gen. ix. 27).

² See Dr C. Taylor in the preface to Prof. Burkitt's *Fragments of Aquila*, p. vi.: "Aquila in a sense was not the sole or independent author of the version, its uncompromising literalism being the necessary outcome of his Jewish teachers' system of exegesis."

found in Aquila (οὐ κείται παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις, διόπερ οὐδὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἀκύλῳ). So Origen confesses¹; and Jerome, though when in a censorious mood he does not spare the proselyte (e.g. *praef. in Job, ep. ad Pammach.*), elsewhere admits his honesty and diligence (*ep. ad Damas.* 12 “non contentiosius, ut quidam putant, sed studiosius verbum interpretatur ad verbum”; *ep. ad Marcell.* “iamdudum cum voluminibus Hebraeorum editionem Aquilae confero, ne quid forsitan propter odium Christi synagoga mutaverit, et—ut amicae menti fatear—quae ad nostram fidem pertineant roborandam plura reperio”). After these testimonies from the two most competent witnesses in the ancient Church, we need not stop to consider the invective of Epiphanius².

5. Until the summer of 1897 Aquila's version was known to students only from the description of ancient writers, chiefly Christian, and the fragments of the Hexapla (c. iii.), which when complete contained the entire work. These sources were used with admirable skill by Dr Field (*prolegomena in Hexapla*, p. xix. ff.) and Dr C. Taylor (*D. C. B.* art. *Hexapla*) to illustrate the purpose and style of Aquila's work. But an unexpected discovery has since placed at our disposal several larger fragments of the version, emanating from a Jewish source. Among the *débris* of the Genizah of the Cairo synagogue brought to Cambridge in 1897 through the efforts of Dr Taylor and Dr Schechter, Professor Burkitt was so fortunate as to discover some palimpsest scraps which under later Hebrew writing contain in a good uncial hand of the sixth century Aquila's translation of 1 Kings xx. 9—17 and 2 Kings xxiii. 12—27³. From the same treasure Dr Taylor recovered portions of Pss. xc.—ciii., and a Hexaplar fragment of Ps. xxii.⁴

¹ *Ep. ad Afric.* 3. Cf. *Aug. l.c.*

² See p. 31.

³ *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila* (Cambridge, 1897).

⁴ *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests* (Camb. 1900). See also *Amherst Papyri*, i. p. 30f. (London, 1900).

The student will find below specimens of these discoveries, placed for the purpose of comparison in parallel columns with the version of the LXX.

3 Regn. xxi. (1 Kings xx.) 10—13.

LXX. (Cod. B¹).

¹⁰καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν υἱὸς Ἀδὲρ λέγων Τάδε ποιήσαι μοι ὁ θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείη, εἰ ἐκποιήσῃ ὁ χοῦς Σαμαρείας ταῖς ἀλώπεξιν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ τοῖς πεζοῖς μου. ¹¹καὶ ἀπεκρίθη βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἶπεν Ἰκανούσθω· μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ κυρτὸς ὡς ὁ ὀρθός. ¹²καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, πίνων ἦν αὐτὸς καὶ πάντες βασιλεῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν σκηναῖς· καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ Οἰκοδομήσατε χάρακα· καὶ ἔθεντο χάρακα ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν. ¹³καὶ ἰδοὺ προφήτης εἰς προσῆλθεν τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε λέγει Κύριος Εἰ ἐόρακας τὸν ὄχλον τὸν μέγαν τοῦτον; ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτὸν σήμερον εἰς χεῖρας σás, καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι ἐγὼ Κύριος.

AQUILA.

¹⁰καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν υἱὸς Ἀδὰδ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε ποιήσαι· σάν μοι θεοὶ καὶ τάδε προσθείησαν, εἰ ἐξαρκέσει χοῦς Σαμαρίας τοῖς λιχάσιν² τοῦ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ὃς ἐν ποσίν μου. ¹¹καὶ ἀπεκρίθη βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἶπεν Λαλήσατε Μὴ καυχάσθω ζωννύμενος ὡς ὁ περιλυόμενος. ¹²καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσεν σὺν τὸ ῥήμα τοῦτο, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔπινεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐν συσκιασμοῖς· καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς δούλους αὐτοῦ Ἐτέτε· καὶ ἔθηκαν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν. ¹³καὶ ἰδοὺ προφήτης εἰς προσῆγγισεν πρὸς Ἀὰβ βασιλέα Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε λέγει **ΞΞΞΞ** Εἶδες σὺν πάντα τὸν ὄχλον τὸν μέγαν τοῦτον; ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτὸν εἰς χεῖρά σου σήμερον, καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι ἐγὼ **ΞΞΞΞ**.

¹ Cod. A is nearer to Aquila, as the following variants shew: 10 ποιήσαι· σαν μοι οι θεοι και ταδε προσθειησαν A 12 οτε] ws A | παντες οι β. A 13 τω βασ.] pr τω Αχααβ A | τον οχλον] pr παντα A | εις χ. σας σημερον A.

² MS. χε[ιλι]αc[ιν]; see Burkitt, *op. cit.* p. 2.

4 Regn. (2 Kings) xxiii. 21—24.

LXX. (Cod. B¹).

²¹ καὶ ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεὺς παντὶ τῷ λαῷ λέγων Ποιήσατε πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ ἡμῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίου τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης. ²² ὅτι οὐκ ἐγενήθη τὸ πάσχα τοῦτο ἀφ' ἡμερῶν τῶν κριτῶν οἱ ἔκρινον τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας βασιλέων Ἰσραὴλ καὶ βασιλέων Ἰούδα· ²³ ὅτι ἀλλ' ἢ τῷ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰωσεία ἐγενήθη τὸ πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. ²⁴ καὶ γε τοὺς θελητὰς καὶ τοὺς γνωριστὰς καὶ τὰ θεραφεῖν καὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα καὶ πάντα τὰ προσοχθίσματα τὰ γεγονότα ἐν γῆ Ἰούδα καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐξῆρεν Ἰωσείας, ἵνα στήσῃ τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τοὺς γεγραμμένους ἐπὶ τῷ βιβλίῳ οὗ εὔρεν Χελκείας ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐν οἴκῳ Κυρίου.

AQUILA.

²¹ καὶ ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεὺς σὺν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ τῷ λέγειν Ποιήσατε φέσα τῷ **ΞΞΞΞ** θεῷ ὑμῶν κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ βιβλίου τῆς συνθήκης ταύτης. ²² ὅτι οὐκ ἐποιήθη κατὰ τὸ φέσα τοῦτο ἀπὸ ἡμερῶν τῶν κριτῶν οἱ ἔκριναν τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ πασῶν ἡμερῶν βασιλέων Ἰσραὴλ καὶ βασιλέων Ἰούδα· ²³ ὅτι ἀλλὰ ἐν ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰωσιαοῦ ἐποιήθη τὸ φέσα τοῦτο τῷ **ΞΞΞΞ** ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. ²⁴ καὶ καὶ γε σὺν τοὺς μάγους καὶ σὺν τοὺς γνωριστὰς καὶ σὺν τὰ μορφώματα καὶ σὺν τὰ καθάρματα καὶ σὺν πάντα προσοχθίσματα ἃ ὠράθησαν ἐν γῆ Ἰούδα καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπέλεξεν Ἰωσιαοῦ, ὅπως ἀναστήσῃ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ τοῦ βιβλίου [οὗ εὔρεν] Ἐλκισαοῦ ὁ ἱερεὺς οἴκῳ Κυρίου².

¹ The following variants in Cod. A agree with Aquila: ²² πασων ημερων A ²³ το πασχα] + τουτο A

² MS. κγ, at the end of a line: see Burkitt, p. 16.

Ps. xc. (xci.) 6b—13.

LXX. (Cod. B).

- ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ.
⁷ πεσεῖται ἐκ τοῦ κλίτους σου
 χιλιάς,
 καὶ μυριάς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου,
 πρὸς σὲ δὲ οὐκ ἐγγιεῖ.
⁸ πλὴν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου κατανοήσεις,
 καὶ ἀνταπόδοσιν ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄψῃ.
⁹ ὅτι σύ, Κύριε, ἡ ἐλπίς μου·
 τὸν ὕψιστον ἔθου καταφυγὴν σου.
¹⁰ οὐ προσελεύσεται πρὸς σὲ κακά,
 καὶ μάλιστα οὐκ ἐγγιεῖ τῷ σκηνώματί σου·
¹¹ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελείται περὶ σοῦ,
 τοῦ φυλάξαι σε ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς¹ σου.
¹² ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀρουσίν σε,
 μή ποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου·
¹³ ἐπ' ἀσπίδα καὶ βασιλίσκον ἐπιβήσῃ.

AQUILA.

- ἀπὸ δηγμοῦ δαιμ[ονίζοντος μεσημβρίας].
⁷ πεσεῖται ἀπὸ πλαγίου σ[ου χιλιάς],
 καὶ μυριάς ἀπὸ δεξι[ῶν σου].
 πρὸς σὲ οὐ προσεγγ[ίσει].
⁸ ἔκτος ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς [σου ἐπιβλέ]ψεις,
 καὶ ἀπότισιν ἀσεβῶν ὄψῃ.
⁹ ἵτι σύ, **Ⲫⲉⲛⲉ**, ἐλπίς μου·
 ὕψιστον ἔθηκας οἰκητήριόν σου.
¹⁰ οὐ μεταθήσεται πρὸς σὲ κακία,
 καὶ ἀφή οὐκ ἐγγίσει ἐν σκέπη σου·
¹¹ ὅτι ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελείται σε,
 τοῦ φυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις ὁδοῖς σου·
¹² ἐπὶ ταρσῶν ἀρουσίν σε,
 μή ποτε προσκόψῃ ἐν λίθῳ [πούς σου].
¹³ ἐπὶ λέαινα[ν]² καὶ ἀσπίδα πατήσεις.

¹ 11 ταις οδοις] πρ̄ πασαις A(R)T

² MS. λεινα.

Ps. xci. (xcii.) 5—10.

LXX (Cod. B¹).

AQUILA.

⁵ ὅτι εὐφρανάς με, Κύριε, ἐν τῷ
ποιήματί σου,
καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν
σου ἀγαλλιάσομαι.

⁶ ὡς ἐμεγαλύνθη τὰ ἔργα σου,
Κύριε,
σφόδρα ἐβαρύνθησαν οἱ δια-
λογισμοί σου.

⁷ ἀνὴρ ἄφρων οὐ γνώσεται,
καὶ ἀσύνετος οὐ συνήσει ταῦτα.

⁸ ἐν τῷ ἀνατεῖλαι τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς
ὡς χόρτον
καὶ διέκνυσαν πάντες οἱ ἔργα-
ζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν,
ὅπως ἂν ἐξολεθρευθῶσιν εἰς
τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος.

⁹ σὺ δὲ Ὑψιστος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,
Κύριε.

¹⁰ ὅτι ἰδοὺ οἱ ἐχθροί σου ἀπο-
λοῦνται,
καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται πάν-
τες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν
ἀνομίαν.

⁵ [ὅτι ηὐφρανάς με, **ΞΞ**] **ΞΞ**, ἐν
κατέργω σου,
[ἐν ποιήμασι] χειρῶν σου
αἰνέσω.

⁶ [ὡς ἐμεγαλύνθη] ποιήματά σου,
ΞΞΞΞ,
σφόδρα [ἐβαθύνθη]σαν λογι-
σμοί σου.

⁷ [ἀνὴρ] ἀσύνετος οὐ γνώσεται,
καὶ ἀνόητος οὐ συνήσει σὺ
ταύτην.

⁸ ἐν τῷ βλαστῆσαι ἀσεβεῖς ὁμοίως
χλόη
καὶ ἤνθησαν πάντες κατεργα-
ζόμενοι ἀνωφελές,
ἐκτριβῆναι αὐτοὺς ἕως ἔτι.

⁹ καὶ σὺ Ὑψιστος εἰς αἰῶνα,
ΞΞΞΞ.

¹⁰ ἰδοὺ οἱ ἐχθροί σου, **ΞΞΞΞ**, ἰδοὺ
οἱ ἐχθροί σου ἀπολοῦν-
ται,
[σκορπι]σθήσονται πάντες κατ-
εργαζόμενοι ἀνωφελές].

6. If the student examines these specimens of Aquila's work and compares them with the Hebrew and LXX., the greater literalness of the later version and several of its most

¹ The following variants deserve attention: 6 *εβαθυνθ*. Bab^bΣ^c.^aRT
10 *pr* *στι ἰδου οι εχθροι σου κε* ΣΑ^aRT

striking peculiarities will at once be apparent. He will notice especially the following. (1) There are frequent instances of an absolutely literal rendering of the original, e.g. 1 Kings xx. 10 $\delta\varsigma \epsilon\nu \pi\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu \mu\omicron\upsilon = \text{לְרִנְיָיִךְ} \text{שָׂרָה} \text{(LXX. τοῖς πεζοῖς μου)}$; 12 $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \xi\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu = \text{וַיִּשְׂמוּ וַיִּשְׂמוּ} \text{(LXX. οἰκοδομήσατε χάρακα, καὶ ἔθεντο χάρακα)}$; 2 Kings xxiii. 21 $\tau\hat{\omega} \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu = \text{לֵאמֹר} \text{(LXX. λέγων)}$; 24 $\acute{\alpha} \acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu = \text{וַיִּשְׂרָה} \text{(LXX. τὰ γεγονότα)}$. (2) Under certain circumstances¹ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ is employed to represent the Hebrew סָנַן , when it is the sign of the accusative²; e.g. 1 Kings xx. 12 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu \tau\acute{o} \rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha = \text{סָנַן בְּרִיבְרִיבָה}$, 13 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \tau\acute{o}\nu \delta\acute{\alpha}\chi\lambda\omicron\nu = \text{וַיִּסְנַן בְּרִיבְרִיבָה}$, 2 Kings xxiii. 21 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu \pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \tau\hat{\omega} \lambda\alpha\hat{\omega}$ (where the dat. is governed by the preceding verb), 24 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \mu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \kappa\tau\lambda$. (3) The same Hebrew words are scrupulously rendered by the same Greek, e.g. $\kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\epsilon = \text{כָּל}$ occurs thrice in one context (2 Kings xxiii. 15, 19, 24); and in Ps. xcii. 8, 10 $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota \acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ twice represents וַיִּשְׁלַח . (4) The transliterations adhere with greater closeness to the Hebrew than in the LXX.³; thus פֶּסַח becomes $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha$, יְהוֹשֻׁעַ 'Iωσσιαού, יְהוֹלְקֵי 'Ελκκιαού. (5) The Tetragrammaton is not transliterated, but written in Hebrew letters, and the characters are of the archaic type (יהוה , not יהויה); cf. Orig. in Ps. ii., $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\beta\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon} \tau\hat{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega\nu$ 'Εβραίοις χαρακτηῆρσιν κείται τὸ ὄνομα, 'Εβραικοῖς δὲ οὐ τοῖς νῦν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀρχαιοτάτοις—where the 'most exact copies' are doubtless those of Aquila's version, for there is no reason to suppose that any copyists of the Alexandrian version hesitated to write $\omicron \bar{\kappa}\varsigma$ or $\bar{\kappa}\acute{\epsilon}$ for יהוה ⁴. (6) That the crudities of Aquila's

¹ For these see Burkitt, *Aquila*, p. 12.

² This singular use of $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ appears also in the LXX., but only in Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs, which Freudenthal is disposed to assign to Aquila (p. 65); cf. König, *Einleitung*, p. 108 n., and McNeile, *Introd. to Ecclesiastes*. ³ Aq. does not transliterate סָנַן (see Burkitt, p. 14).

⁴ In a few Hexaplaric MSS. (e.g. Q, 86, 88, 243^m, 264) the Greek letters ΠΠΠ are written for יהוה , but (with the exception of the Genizah Palimpsest, Taylor, p. 27) the Greek MSS. use it solely in their excerpts from the non-Septuagintal columns of the Hexapla, and only the Hexaplaric Syriac admits ΠΠΠ into the text of the LXX., using it freely for $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, even with a preposition (as لحم). Oxyrh. Pap. 1007 (vol. VII.), late 3rd cent.,

style are not due to an insufficient vocabulary¹ is clear from his ready use of words belonging to the classical or the literary type when they appear to him to correspond to the Hebrew more closely than the colloquialisms of the LXX. The following are specimens; 1 Kings xx. 10 LXX. ἐκποιήσει, Aq. ἐξαρκέσει; LXX. ἀλώπεξιν, Aq. λιχάσιν²; 12 LXX. σκηναῖς, Aq. συσκιασμοῖς; 2 Kings xxiii. 21 LXX. διαθήκης, Aq. συνθήκης; 24 LXX. θεραφεῖν, Aq. μορφώματα; LXX. εἶδωλα, Aq. καθάρματα; Ps. xc. 8 LXX. ἀνταπόδοσιν, Aq. ἀπότισιν; *ib.* 10 LXX. προσελεύσεται, Aq. μεταχθήσεται; LXX. μάλιστα, Aq. ἀφή; xci. 5 LXX. ποιήματι, Aq. κατέργω.

From the fragments which survive in the margins of hexaplaric MSS. it is possible to illustrate certain other characteristic features of Aquila which arise out of his extreme loyalty to the letter of his Hebrew text. (1) Jerome remarks upon his endeavour to represent even the etymological meaning of the Hebrew words (*ad Pammach.* 11 “non solum verba sed etymologias quoque verborum transferre conatus est,”) and by way of example he cites the rendering of Deut. vii. 13, where Aquila substituted χεῦμα, ὄπωρισμόν, στιλπνότητα for σῖτον, οἶνον, ἔλαιον in order to reflect more exactly the Hebrew כֶּמֶן, שִׁירִי, יָדָה—as though, adds Jerome humorously, we were to use in Latin *fusio, pomatio, splendentia*. Similarly,

has ΖΖ, representing doubled *yoδ*, in Gen. ii. iii. Ceriani expresses the opinion that the use of ΙΙΙΙΙΙ is due either to Origen or Eusebius, i.e. one of those fathers substituted ΙΙΙΙΙΙ for $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ in the non-Septuagintal columns, using the letters to represent the Hebrew characters which were familiar to them. On the whole subject the student may consult Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, ii. p. 106 ff.; Schleusner, *s.v.* $\pi\iota\pi\iota$, Field, *Hexapla ad Esa.* i. 2; Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, p. 1135; Driver in *Studia Biblica*, i. p. 12, n. 3; *Z. D. M. G.* (1878), 465 ff., 501, 506. Prof. Burkitt acutely points out (p. 16) that $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ (and doubtless also ΙΙΙΙΙΙ) was read as Κύριος, since in one place in the Aquila fragments where there was no room to write the Hebrew characters “instead of οἶκω $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ we find οἶκω $\kappa\upsilon$.” On the orthography see Burkitt, p. 15, par. 4.

¹ Even Jerome speaks of Aquila as “eruditissimus linguæ Græcæ” (in Isa. xlix. 5).

² See Prof. Burkitt’s note (p. 26).

Aquila represented דָּבַר by ὀστέουν , and לִיבְשֵׁהָ by ἐπιστημονίζεν or ἐπιστημονοῦν , and even coined the impossible form ἀφημένος to correspond with אָנָה . (2) An attempt is made to represent Hebrew particles, even such as defy translation; thus ה local becomes the enclitic δε (e.g. $\text{וָתוֹנוּ דֵּה} = \text{הָתָנוּהָ}$, Gen. xii. 9, $\text{קִרְיָהֶנָּדֵּה} = \text{הָרָדָה}$, 2 Kings xvi. 9); and similarly prepositions are accumulated in a manner quite alien from Greek usage (e.g. $\text{עַד אֶל־מִן} = \text{ῥὶν ἄρῃς}$, 2 Kings xix. 25). (3) Other devices are adopted for the purpose of bringing the version into close conformity with the original; a word of complex meaning or form is represented by two Greek words (e.g. לְיָמָיו is converted into $\text{τράγος ἀπολυόμενος}$ and לְיָמָיו into σκιά σκιά ; a Hebrew word is replaced by a Greek word somewhat similar in sound, e.g. for לֵלֶךְ (Deut. xi. 30) Aquila gives αὐλών , and for רִפְיָה (1 Sam. xv. 23) θεραπεία ¹.

Enough has been said to shew the absurdity of Aquila's method when it is regarded from the standpoint of the modern translator. Even in ancient times such a translation could never have attained to the popularity which belonged to the LXX.; that it was widely accepted by the Greek synagogues of the Empire can only have been due to the prejudice created in its favour by its known adherence to the standard text and the traditional exegesis². The version of Aquila emanated from a famous school of Jewish teachers; it was issued with the full approval of the Synagogue, and its affectation of preserving at all costs the idiom of the original recommended it to orthodox Jews whose loyalty to their faith was stronger than their sense of the niceties of the Greek tongue. For ourselves the work of

¹ The student who wishes to pursue the subject may refer to Field, *Prolegg.* p. xxi. sqq., and Dr Taylor's article *Hexapla* in Smith and Wace's *Dict. Chr. Biog.* iii. p. 17 ff. Jerome speaks more than once of a second edition of Aquila "quam Hebraei *κατ' ἀκριβείαν* nominant." The question is discussed by Field (*prolegg.* xxiv. ff.).

² See Prof. Burkitt's article *Aquila* in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1898, p. 211 ff.

Aquila possesses a value which arises from another consideration. His "high standard of exactitude and rigid consistency give his translation, with all its imperfections, unique worth for the critic¹." Its importance for the criticism of the Old Testament was fully recognised by the two greatest scholars of ancient Christendom, and there are few things more to be desired by the modern student of Scripture than the complete recovery of this monument of the text and methods of interpretation approved by the chief Jewish teachers of the generation which followed the close of the Apostolic age.

7. THEODOTIION. With Aquila Irenaeus couples Theodotion of Ephesus, as another Jewish proselyte who translated the Old Testament into Greek (Θεοδοτίων ἠρμήνευσεν ὁ Ἐφέσιος καὶ Ἀκύλας... ἀμφότεροι Ἰουδαῖοι προσήλυτοι). Himself of Asiatic origin, and probably a junior contemporary of Theodotion, Irenaeus may be trusted when he assigns this translator to Ephesus, and describes him as a convert to Judaism. Later writers, however, depart more or less widely from this statement. According to Epiphanius, Theodotion was a native of Pontus, who had been a disciple of Marcion of Sinope before he espoused Judaism. According to Jerome, he was an Ebionite, probably a Jew who had embraced Ebionitic Christianity. His *floruit* is fixed by Epiphanius in the reign of the second Commodus, i.e. of the Emperor Commodus, so called to distinguish him from L. Ceionius Commodus, better known as L. Aurelius Verus.

Epiph. *de mens. et pond.* 17 περὶ τὴν τοῦ δευτέρου Κομόδου βασιλείαν τοῦ βασιλεύσαντος μετὰ τὸν προειρημένον Κόμοδον Λούκιον Αὐρήλιον ἔτη γ', Θεοδοτίων τις Ποντικὸς ἀπὸ τῆς διαδοχῆς Μαρκίωνος τοῦ αἰρεσιάρχου τοῦ Σινοπίτου, μηνίων καὶ αὐτὸς τῇ αὐτοῦ αἰρέσει καὶ εἰς Ἰουδαισμὸν ἀποκλίνας καὶ περιτμηθεὶς καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἑβραίων φωνὴν καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν στοιχεῖα παιδευθεὶς, ἰδίως καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε. Hieron. *ep. ad Augustin.*: "hominis Judaei atque blasphemi";

¹ Dr Taylor, pref. to *Fragments of Aquila*, p. vii.

praef. in Job: "Iudaeus Aquila, et Symmachus et Theodotio Judaizantes haeretici"; *de virr. ill.* 54 "editiones...Aquilae... Pontici proselyti et Theodotionis Hebionaei"; *praef. ad Daniel.*: "Theodotionem, qui utique post adventum Christi incredulus fuit, licet eum quidam dicant Hebionitam qui altero genere Iudaus est¹."

The date assigned to Theodotion by Epiphanius is obviously too late, in view of the statement of Irenaeus, and the whole account suspiciously resembles the story of Aquila. That within the same century two natives of Pontus learnt Hebrew as adults, and used their knowledge to produce independent translations of the Hebrew Bible, is scarcely credible. But it is not unlikely that Theodotion was an Ephesian Jew or Jewish Ebionite. The attitude of a Hellenist towards the Alexandrian version would naturally be one of respectful consideration, and his view of the office of a translator widely different from that of Aquila, who had been trained by the strictest Rabbis of the Palestinian school. And these expectations are justified by what we know of Theodotion's work. "Inter veteres medius incedit" (*Hieron. praef. ad evang.*); "simplicitate sermonis a LXX. interpretibus non discordat" (*praef. in Pss.*); "Septuaginta et Theodotio...in plurimis locis concordant" (*in Eccl. ii.*)—such is Jerome's judgement; and Epiphanius agrees with this estimate (*de mens. et pond.* 17: τὰ πλείστα τοῖς οὐβ συναδόντως ἐξέδωκεν). Theodotion seems to have produced a free revision of the LXX. rather than an independent version. The revision was made on the whole upon the basis of the standard Hebrew text; thus the Job of Theodotion was longer than the Job of the LXX. by a sixth part of the whole (*Orig. ep. ad Afric.* 3 sqq., *Hieron. praef. ad Job*)², and in Daniel, on

¹ Marcion flourished c. A.D. 150; Commodus was Emperor from 180—192. The Paschal Chronicle, following Epiphanius, dates the work of Theodotion A.D. 184.

² See Field, *Hexapla*, p. xxxix.; Hatch, *Essays*, p. 215; Margoliouth, art. 'Job' in *Smith's Bible Dict.* (ed. 2).

the other hand, the Midrashic expansions which characterise the LXX. version disappear in Theodotion. His practice with regard to apocryphal books or additional matter appears not to have been uniform; he followed the LXX. in accepting the additions to Daniel and the supplementary verses in Job¹, but there is no evidence that he admitted the non-canonical books in general².

8. Specimens of Theodotion's style and manner may be obtained from the large and important fragments of his work which were used by Origen to fill up the *lacunae* in Jeremiah (LXX.). The following passage, preserved in the margin of Codex Marchalianus, will serve as an example³.

Jeremiah xl. (xxxiii.) 14—26.

¹⁴ Ἴδου ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, φησὶ Κύριος, καὶ ἀναστήσω τὸν λόγον μου τὸν ἀγαθὸν ὃν ἐλάλησα ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα. ¹⁵ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀνατελῶ τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀνατολήν δικαίαν, ποιῶν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν τῇ γῇ. ¹⁶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις σωθήσεται ἡ Ἰουδαία καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ κατασκηνώσει πεποιθυῖα· καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα ὃ καλέσει αὐτὴν ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΗΜῶΝ. ¹⁷ ὅτι τὰδε λέγει Κύριος, Οὐκ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀνὴρ καθήμενος ἐπὶ θρόνον οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ. ¹⁸ καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῖς Δευίταις οὐκ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἀνὴρ ἐκ προσώπου μου, ἀναφέρων ὄλοκαυτώματα καὶ θύων θυσίαν. ¹⁹ καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς Ἱερεμίαν λέγων ²⁰ Τὰδε λέγει Κύριος Εἰ διασκεδάσετε τὴν διαθήκην μου τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν διαθήκην μου τὴν νύκτα, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα ἐν καιρῷ αὐτῶν· ²¹ καί γε ἡ διαθήκη μου διασκεδασθήσεται μετὰ Δαυὶδ τοῦ δούλου μου, τοῦ μὴ

¹ Orig. *ep. ad Afric.* 3.

² On Baruch see Nestle's remarks in Hastings' *D. B.* iv. (art. *Septuagint*).

³ *O. T. in Greek*, iii. pp. vii. ff., 320 f.

εἶναι αὐτῷ υἱὸν βασιλεύοντα ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς Δευίτας τοὺς ἱερεῖς τοὺς λειτουργοῦντάς μοι. ²² ὡς οὐκ ἐξαριθμηθήσεται ἡ δύναμις τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐδὲ ἐκμετρηθήσεται ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, οὕτως πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα Δαυὶδ τοῦ δούλου μου καὶ τοὺς Δευίτας τοὺς λειτουργοῦντάς μοι. ²³ καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς Ἱερεμίαν λέγων ²⁴ Ἄρά γε οὐκ ἴδες τί ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἐλάλησαν λέγοντες Αἱ δύο πατριαὶ ἃς ἐξελέξατο Κύριος ἐν αὐταῖς, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀπόσωτο αὐτούς; καὶ τὸν λαόν μου παρώξυναν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἔτι ἔθνος ἐνώπιόν μου. ²⁵ τάδε λέγει Κύριος Εἰ μὴ τὴν διαθήκην μου ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, ἀκριβάσματα οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, οὐκ ἔταξα, ²⁶ καί γε τὸ σπέρμα Ἰακώβ καὶ Δαυὶδ τοῦ δούλου μου ἀποδοκιμῶ, τοῦ μὴ λαβεῖν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ ἄρχοντα πρὸς τὸ σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ· ὅτι ἐπιστρέψω τὴν ἐπιστροφήν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω αὐτούς¹.

Unfortunately there is no other Greek version which can be compared with Theodotion in this passage, for the LXX. is wanting, and only a few shreds of Aquila and Symmachus have reached us. But the student will probably agree with Field that the style is on the whole not wanting in simple dignity, and that it is scarcely to be distinguished from the best manner of the LXX.² With his Hebrew Bible open at the place, he will observe that the rendering is faithful to the original, while it escapes the crudities and absurdities which beset the excessive fidelity of Aquila. Now and again we meet with a word unknown to the LXX. (e.g. ἀκριβάσματα = לִּיבְרָה)³, or a reminiscence of Aquila; on the other hand Theodotion agrees with the LXX. against Aquila in translating לִּיבְרָה by διαθήκη. If in one place

¹ Another considerable fragment of Theodotion may be found in Jer. xlvi. (xxxix.) 4—13, see *O. T. in Greek*, p. 534 f.

² *Hexapla, prolegg.* p. xxxix. "Theodotionis stylus simplex et gravis est." LXX. of Jer. xxiii. 5, 6 may be set beside Θ of xl. 14, 15.

³ Cod. A employs ἀκριβασμός in this sense (Jud. v. 15, 3 Regn. xi. 34, 4 Regn. xvii. 15), but under the influence of Theodotion, at least in the last two passages; see Field *ad loc.*

Theodotion is more obscure than Aquila (τὴν διαθήκην τὴν ἡμέραν...τὴν νύκτα, Aq. τῆς ἡμέρας...τῆς νυκτός), yet the passage as a whole is a singularly clear and unaffected rendering. His chief defect does not reveal itself in this context; it is a habit of transliterating Hebrew words which could have presented no difficulty to a person moderately acquainted with both languages. Field gives a list of 90 words which are treated by Theodotion in this way without any apparent cause¹. When among these we find such a word as לֵיָּ (which is represented by ἦλ in Mal. ii. 11), we are compelled to absolve him from the charge of incompetence, for, as has been pertinently asked, how could a man who was unacquainted with so ordinary a word or with its Greek equivalent have produced a version at all? Probably an explanation should be sought in the cautious and conservative temperament of this translator². Field's judgement is here sounder than Montfaucon's; Theodotion is not to be pronounced *indoctior*, or *indiligentior*, but only "scrupuliosior quam operis sui instituto fortasse conveniret"³.

9. The relation of the two extant Greek versions of Daniel is a perplexing problem which calls for further consideration. In his lost *Stromata* Origen, it appears⁴, announced his intention of using Theodotion's version of Daniel; and an examination of Origen's extant works shews that his citations of Daniel "agree almost *verbatim* with the text of Theodotion now current⁵." The action of Origen in this matter was generally endorsed by the Church, as we learn from Jerome (*praef. in Dan.*: "Danielem prophetam iuxta LXX. interpretes ecclesiae

¹ *Op. cit.* p. xl. sq.

² *D. C. B.* art. *Hexapla* (iii. p. 22). Cf. *ib.* iv. p. 978.

³ Thus in Mal. *l. c.* he was perhaps unwilling to use *θεός* in connexion with the phrase לֵיָּ.

⁴ Jerome on Dan. iv.: "Origenes in nono *Stromatum* volumine asserit se quae sequuntur ab hoc loco in propheta Daniele non iuxta LXX. interpretes...sed iuxta Theodotionis editionem disserere."

⁵ Dr Gwynn in *D. C. B.* (iv. p. 974).

non legunt, utentes Theodotionis editione"; cf. *c. Rufin.* ii. 33). Jerome did not know how this happened, but his own words supply a sufficient explanation: "hoc unum affirmare possum quod multum a veritate discordet et recto iudicio repudiata sit." So universal was the rejection of the LXX. version of Daniel that, though Origen loyally gave it a place in his Hexapla, only one Greek copy has survived¹, Theodotion's version having been substituted in all other extant Greek MSS. of Daniel.

But the use of Theodotion's Daniel in preference to the version which was attributed to the LXX. did not begin with Origen. Clement of Alexandria (as edited) uses Theodotion, with a sprinkling of LXX. readings, in the few places where he quotes Daniel (*paed.* ii. 8, iii. 3, *strom.* i. 4, 21). In North Africa both versions seem to have influenced the Latin text of Daniel. The subject has been carefully investigated by Prof. F. C. Burkitt², who shews that Tertullian used "a form of the LXX. differing slightly from Origen's edition," whilst Cyprian quotes from a mixed text, in which Theodotion sometimes predominates. Irenaeus, notwithstanding his reverence for the LXX. and distrust of the later versions, cites Daniel after Theodotion's version³. Further, Theodotion's Daniel appears to be used by writers anterior to the date usually assigned to this translator. Thus Hermas (*vis.* iv. 2, 4) has a clear reference to Theodotion's rendering of Dan. vi. 22⁴. Justin (*dial.* 31) gives a long extract from Dan. vii. in which characteristic readings from the two versions occur in almost equal proportions⁵. Clement of Rome (1 Cor. 34) cites a part of the same context,

¹ The Chigi MS. known as Cod. 87 (H. P. 88); see *O. T. in Greek*, iii. pp. vi., xii., and cf. the subscription printed *ib.* p. 574.

² *Old Latin and Itala*, p. 18 ff.

³ An exception in i. 19. 2 (Dan. xii. 9 f.) is due to a Marcosian source.

⁴ See Salmon, *Intr. to the N. T.*⁷ p. 639.

⁵ On the trustworthiness of Justin's text here see Burkitt, *op. cit.* p. 25 n. (against Hatch, *Essays*, p. 190).

with a Theodotonic reading (ἐλειτούργουν, LXX. ἐθεράπευον). Barnabas (*ep.* iv. 5) also refers to Dan. vii., and, though his citation is too loose to be pressed, the words ἐξαναστήσονται ὀπισθεν αὐτῶν are more likely to be a reminiscence of ὀπίσω αὐτῶν ἀναστήσεται (Th.) than of μετὰ τούτους στήσεται (LXX.). The Greek version of Baruch (i. 15—18, ii. 11—19) undoubtedly supports Theodotion against the LXX. Still more remarkable is the appearance of Theodotonic renderings in the New Testament. A writer so faithful to the LXX. as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in his only reference to Daniel (Heb. xi. 33 = Dan. vi. 23) agrees with Theodotion against the Chigi version¹. The Apocalypse, which makes frequent use of Daniel, supports Theodotion on the whole; cf. Apoc. ix. 20 (Dan. v. 23), x. 6 (Dan. xii. 7), xii. 7 (Dan. x. 20), xiii. 7 (Dan. vii. 21), xix. 6 (Dan. x. 6), xx. 4 (Dan. vii. 9), xx. 11 (Dan. ii. 35)². Even in the Synoptic Gospels Theodotion's rendering in Dan. vii. 13 (μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν) occurs as well as the LXX. ἐπὶ τῶν ν.; comp. Mc. xiv. 62 with Mt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64³.

From these premisses the inference has been drawn that there were two pre-Christian versions of Daniel, both passing as 'LXX.', one of which is preserved in the Chigi MS., whilst the other formed the basis of Theodotion's revision⁴. It has been urged by Dr Gwynn with much acuteness that the two Septuagintal Books of Esdras offer an analogy to the two versions of Daniel, and the appearance of the phrase ἀπηρείσατο αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ εἰδωλείῳ αὐτοῦ in 1 Esdr. ii. 9 and Dan. i. 2 (LXX.)

¹ Heb. *l. c.* ἐφράξαν στόματα λεόντων (Dan. Th., ἐνέφραξεν τὰ στόματα τῶν λεόντων; LXX., σέσωκέ με ἀπὸ τῶν λεόντων).

² The references are from Dr Salmon's *Intr.* p. 548 f. He adds: "I actually find in the Apocalypse no clear evidence that St John had ever seen the so-called LXX. version." See Bludau in *Th. Q.* 1897 (p. 1 ff.).

³ The N. T. occasionally inclines to Theodotion in citations which are not from Daniel; cf. Jo. xix. 37 (Zech. xii. 10), 1 Cor. xv. 54 (Is. xxv. 8); see Schürer⁸, iii. p. 324, "entweder Th. selbst ist älter als die Apostel, oder es hat einen 'Th.' vor Th. gegeben."

⁴ *D. C. B.* art. *Theodotion* iv. p. 970 ff. Dr Salmon (*Intr.* p. 547) is disposed to accept this view.

has been regarded as an indication that the Greek Esdras and the Chigi Daniel were the work of the same translator¹. An obvious objection to the hypothesis of two Septuagintal or Alexandrian versions is the entire disappearance of the version which was used *ex hypothesi* not only by the authors of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, but by Theodotion and other writers of the second century. But Theodotion's revision of Daniel may have differed so little from the stricter Alexandrian version as to have taken its place without remark².

10. SYMMACHUS. Of this translator Irenaeus says nothing, and it has been inferred, perhaps too hastily, that he was unknown to the Bishop of Lyons, and of later date. Origen knew and used Symmachus, and had received a copy of his commentary on St Matthew from a wealthy Christian woman named Juliana, to whom it had been given by the author. According to Eusebius, Symmachus was an Ebionite, and this is confirmed by Jerome; a less probable tradition in Epiphanius represents him as a Samaritan who had become a convert to Judaism³.

Eus. *H. E.* vi. 17 τῶν γε μὴν ἑρμηνευτῶν αὐτῶν δὴ τούτων ἰστέον Ἐβιωναῖον τὸν Σύμμαχον γεγονέναι...καὶ ὑπομνήματα δὲ τοῦ Συμμάχου εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται ἐν οἷς δοκεῖ πρὸς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἀποτεινόμενος εὐαγγέλιον τὴν δεδηλωμένην αἵρεσιν κρατύνειν. ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ὀριγένης μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων εἰς τὰς γραφὰς ἑρμηνειῶν τοῦ Συμμάχου σημαίνει παρὰ Ἰουλιανῆς τινος εἰληφέναι, ἣν καὶ φησι παρ' αὐτοῦ Συμμάχου τὰς βίβλους διαδέξασθαι. Hieron. *de virr. ill.* 54 "Theodotionis Hebionaei et Symmachi eiusdem dogmatis" (cf. *in Hab.* iii. 13); *praef. in Job*: "Symmachus et Theodotion Iudaizantes haeretici." Epiph. *de mens. et pond.* 15 ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Σευήρου χρόνοις Σύμμαχος τις Σαμαρείτης τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς σοφῶν μὴ τιμηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκείου ἔθνους...προσηλυτεύει καὶ περιτέμνεται δευτέραν περιτομὴν...οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ Σύμμαχος πρὸς διαστροφὴν τῶν

¹ *D. C. B.* iv. p. 977 n.; cf. Hastings' *D. B.*, i. p. 761.

² On the whole question of the date of Theodotion, see Schürer, *G. J.* V.³ iii. 323 f., where the literature of the subject is given.

³ The name $\Delta\iota\omicron\mu\omicron\delta$ occurs in the Talmud as that of a disciple of R. Meir, who flourished towards the end of the second or beginning of the third century. Geiger desires to identify our translator with this Symmachus; see Field, *prolegg. ad Hex.* p. xxix.

παρὰ Σαμαρείταις ἑρμηνειῶν ἑρμηνεύσας τὴν τρίτην ἐξέδωκεν ἑρμηνείαν.

That Symmachus, even if of Jewish or Samaritan birth, became an Ebionite leader is scarcely doubtful, since an Ebionitic commentary on St Matthew bearing his name was still extant in the fourth century¹; the Symmachians, an Ebionite sect probably named after him, are mentioned by Ambrosiaster (*comm. in Gal., prolegg.*) and Augustine (*c. Faust.* xix. 4, *c. Crescon.* i. 36)². His *floruit* is open to some question. Dr Gwynn has shewn³ that Epiphanius, who makes Theodotion follow Symmachus, probably placed Symmachus in the reign of Verus, i.e. Marcus Aurelius. Now in the *Historia Lausiaca*, c. 147, Palladius says that Juliana sheltered Origen during a persecution, i.e. probably during the persecution of the Emperor Maximius (A.D. 238—241). If this was so, the literary activity of Symmachus must have belonged, at the earliest, to the last years of M. Aurelius, and it may be questioned whether Epiphanius has not inverted the order of the two translators, i.e. whether Theodotion ought not to be placed under M. Aurelius and Symmachus under Commodus (A.D. 180—192)⁴. The version of Symmachus was in the hands of Origen when he wrote his earliest commentaries, i.e. about A.D. 228⁵; but the interval is long enough to admit of its having reached Alexandria.

II. The aim of Symmachus, as Jerome perceived, was to express the sense of his Hebrew text rather than to attempt

¹ Euseb. *l. c.*

² Philastrius, who represents the *Symmachiani* as holding other views, says (c. 145): "sunt haeretici alii qui Theodotionis et Symmachi itidem interpretationem diverso modo expositam sequuntur." See Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.*, I. i. p. 212.

³ *D. C. B.* iv. p. 971 ff. Σενήρον in *de pond. et mens.* 16 is on this hypothesis a corruption of Οὐήρον. Cf. Lagarde's *Symmicta*, ii. p. 168.

⁴ The Gospel of Peter, which cannot be much later than A.D. 170, and may be fifteen or twenty years earlier, shews some verbal coincidences with Symmachus (*Akhmim fragment*, pp. xxxiv. 18, 20), but they are not decisive.

⁵ Cf. *D. C. B.* iv. p. 103.

a verbal rendering: "non solet verborum *κακοζηλίαν* sed intelligentiae ordinem sequi" (*in Am.* iii. 11). While Aquila endeavoured "verbum de verbo exprimere," Symmachus made it his business "sensum potius sequi" (*praef. in Chron. Eus.*, cf. *praef. in Job*). Epiphanius, who believed Symmachus to have been a Samaritan proselyte to Judaism, jumped to the conclusion that his purpose was polemical (*πρὸς διαστροφήν τῶν παρὰ Σαμαρείταις ἐρμηνειῶν ἐρμηνεύσας*). But if Symmachus had any antagonist in view, it was probably the literalism and violation of the Greek idiom which made the work of Aquila unacceptable to non-Jewish readers. So far as we can judge from the fragments of his version which survive in Hexaplaric MSS., he wrote with Aquila's version before him, and in his efforts to recast it made free use of both the LXX. and Theodotion. The following extracts will serve to illustrate this view of his relation to his predecessors.

MALACHI II. 13¹.

LXX.

καὶ ταῦτα ἃ ἐμίσουν
ἐποιεῖτε· ἐκαλύπτετε
δάκρυσιν τὸ θυσια-
στήριον Κυρίου καὶ
κλαυθμῶ καὶ στεναγμῶ
ἐκ κόπων. ἔτι ἄξιον
ἐπιβλέψαι εἰς θυσίαν
ἢ λαβεῖν δεκτὸν ἐκ
τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν;

TH.

καὶ τοῦτο δεύτερον
ἐποιήσατε· ἐκαλύπτετε
δάκρυσιν τὸ θυσια-
στήριον,
κλαίοντες καὶ στένοντες,
ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἔτι
προσεγγίζοντα τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα
καὶ λαβεῖν τέλειον
ἐκ χειρῶν ὑμῶν.

AQ.

καὶ τοῦτο δεύτερον
ἐποιεῖτε· ἐκαλύπτετε
δακρύω τὸ θυσια-
στήριον
κλαυθμῶ καὶ οἰμωγῇ,
ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἔτι
νεῦσαι πρὸς τὸ δῶρον
καὶ λαβεῖν εὐδοκίαν
ἀπὸ χειρὸς ὑμῶν.

SYMM.

καὶ ταῦτα δεύτερον
ἐποιεῖτε, καλύπτοντες
ἐν δάκρυσιν τὸ θυσια-
στήριον,
κλαίοντες καὶ οἰμώσσοντες,
ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἔτι
νεύοντα πρὸς τὸ δῶρον
καὶ δέξασθαι τὸ εὐδοκημένον
ἀπὸ χειρὸς ὑμῶν.

¹ The Hexaplaric renderings are from Cod. 86 (Cod. Barberinus): Field, *Hexapla*, ii. p. 1033.

But it must not be supposed that Symmachus is a mere reviser of earlier versions, or that he follows the lead of Aquila as Theodotion follows the LXX. Again and again he goes his own way in absolute independence of earlier versions, and sometimes at least, it must be confessed, of the original. This is due partly to his desire to produce a good Greek rendering, more or less after the current literary style; partly, as it seems, to dogmatic reasons. The following may serve as specimens of the Greek style of Symmachus when he breaks loose from the influence of his predecessors: Gen. xviii. 25 ὁ πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἀπαιτῶν δικαιοπραγεῖν, ἀκρίτως μὴ ποιήσης τοῦτο; Job xxvi. 14 τί δὲ ψιθύρισμα τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ ἀκούσομεν, ὅπου βροντὴν δυναστείας αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς ἐννοήσει; Ps. xliii. 16 δι' ὅλης ἡμέρας ἡ ἀσχημόνησίς μου ἄντικρύς μου, καὶ ὁ καταισχυμμός τοῦ προσώπου μου καλύπτει με. Ps. lxviii. 3 ἐβαπτίσθην εἰς ἀπεράντους καταδύσεις, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν στάσις· εἰσηλθὼν εἰς τὰ βάθη τῶν ὑδάτων, καὶ ῥεῖθρον ἐπέκλυσέν με. Eccl. iv. 9 εἰσὶν ἀμείνους δύο ἐνός· ἔχουσιν γὰρ κέρδος ἀγαθόν. Isa. xxix. 4 ὑπὸ γῆν ἑδαφισθήσεται ἡ λαλιά σου, καὶ ἔσται ὡς ἐγγαστρίμυθος ἡ φωνή σου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ λαλιά σου ῥοίσειται.

It cannot be said that these renderings approach to excellence, but a comparison with the corresponding LXX. will shew that Symmachus has at least attempted to set himself free from the trammels of the Hebrew idiom and to clothe the thoughts of the Old Testament in the richer drapery of the Greek tongue. It is his custom to use compounds to represent ideas which in Hebrew can be expressed only by two or more words (e.g. עֲשֶׂה לְךָ, Symm. ἀναίτιως, וְעָשָׂה וְעָשָׂה, Symm. ὀφθαλμοφανῶς, הִבְרִיתִי וְשָׁרַחְתִּי, Symm. ἀκρογωνιαίος); he converts into a participle the first of two finite verbs connected by a copula (Exod. v. 7 ἀπερχόμενοι καλαμάσθωσαν, 4 Regn. i. 2 σφαλέντες ἔπεσον); he has at his command a large supply of Greek particles (e.g. he renders וְאֵל by ἄρα, οὐτως, ἴσως, δι' ὅλου, μόνον, οὕτως, ἀλλ'

ὄμωσ)¹. More interesting and important is the tendency which Symmachus manifests to soften the anthropomorphic expressions of the Old Testament; e.g. Gen. i. 27, ἐκτισεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν εἰκόνι διαφόρῳ². ὄρθιον ὁ θεὸς ἐκτισεν αὐτόν. Exod. xxiv. 10, εἶδον ὀράματι τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ. Jud. ix. 13 τὸν οἶνον...τὴν εὐφροσύνην τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Ps. xliii. 24 ἵνα τί ὡς ὑπῶν εἶ, Δέσποτα; In these and other instances Symmachus seems to shew a knowledge of current Jewish exegesis³ which agrees with the story of his Jewish origin or training.

LITERATURE. On Aquila the student may consult R. Anger *de Onkelo Chaldaico*, 1845; art. in *D. C. B.* (W. J. Dickson); M. Friedmann, *Onkelos u. Akylas*, 1896; Lagarde, *Clementina*, p. 12 ff.; Krauss, *Akylas der Proselyt* (Festschrift), 1896; F. C. Burkitt, *Fragments of Aquila*, 1897; C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*², 1897 (p. viii.); Schürer³, iii. p. 317 ff. On Symmachus, C. H. Thieme, *pro puritate Symmachi dissert.*, 1755; art. in *D. C. B.* (J. Gwynn); Giov. Mercati, *l'età di Simmaco interprete*, 1892. On Theodotion, Credner, *Beiträge*, ii. p. 253 ff.; art. in *D. C. B.* (J. Gwynn); G. Salmon, *Intr. to the N. T.*⁷, p. 538 ff.; Schürer³, iii. p. 323 ff. Works which deal with the ancient non-Septuagintal versions in general will be mentioned in c. iii., under *Literature of the Hexapla*.

12. OTHER ANCIENT GREEK VERSIONS. The researches of Origen (A.D. 185—253) brought to light three anonymous versions besides those of Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus; from their relative position in the columns of his great collection (see c. iii.) they are known as the *Quinta* (ε'), *Sexta* (ς'), and *Septima* (ζ') respectively. The following are the chief authorities:

Eus. *H. E.* vi. 16 τοσαύτη δὲ εἰσήγετο τῷ Ὀριγένει τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπηκριβωμένη ἐξέτασις ὡς...καὶ τινὰς ἐτέρας παρὰ τὰς καθημαξυμένας ἑρμηνείας ἐναλλαπτούσας..., ἐφευρεῖν, ἀς οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν ἔκ τινων μυθῶν τὸν πάλαι λανθανούσας χρόνον εἰς φῶς ἀνιχνεύσας προήγαγεν...τίνος ἄρ' εἶεν οὐκ εἶδὼς αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον ἐπεσημήνατο

¹ For other examples see Field, *prolegg.* p. xxx. ff.; *D. C. B.* iv. p. 19 f.

² Reading, perhaps, בצלם ובצלם אלהים ; cf. Nestle, *Marginalien*, pp. 3, 15.

³ See *D. C. B.* iii. p. 20.

ὡς ἄρα τὴν μὲν εὖροι ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀκτίῳ Νικοπόλει... ἐπὶ μῆς αὐθις
 σεσημειῶται ὡς ἐν Ἱεριχοῖ εὐρημένης ἐν πίθῳ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους
 Ἀντωνίνου τοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβήρου. Epiph. *de mens. et pond.* 18 μετὰ
 τὸν διωγμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως Σευήρου ἠῤῥέθη ἡ πέμπτη ἐν πίθοις ἐν
 Ἱεριχῶ κεκρυμμένη ἐν χρόνοις τοῦ υἱοῦ Σευήρου τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος
 Καρακάλλου τε καὶ Γέτα... ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐβδόμῳ αὐτοῦ ἔτει ἠῤῥέθησαν καὶ
 βίβλοι τῆς πέμπτης ἐκδόσεως ἐν πίθοις ἐν Ἱεριχῶ κεκρυμμένης μετὰ
 ἄλλων βιβλίων Ἑβραϊκῶν καὶ Ἑλληνικῶν. τὸν δὲ Καρακάλλον
 διαδέχεται Ἀντωνῖνος ἕτερος... μετὰ τούτου ἐβασίλευσεν Ἀλέξανδρος...
 ἔτη ιγ' ἐν μέσῳ τῶν χρόνων τούτων ἠῤῥέθη ἕκτη ἔκδοσις, καὶ αὕτη
 ἐν πίθοις κεκρυμμένη, ἐν Νικοπόλει τῇ πρὸς Ἀκτίῳ. Pseudo-Ath.
syn. scr. sacr. 77 πέμπτη ἐρμηνεία ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν πίθοις εὐρεθεῖσα κε-
 κρυμμένη ἐπὶ Ἀντωνίνου βασιλείῳ τοῦ Καρακάλλα ἐν Ἱεριχῶ παρά
 τινος τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις σπουδαίων. ἕκτη ἐρμηνεία ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν
 πίθοις εὐρεθεῖσα, καὶ αὕτη κεκρυμμένη, ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μαμαίας
 παδὸς ἐν Νικοπόλει τῇ πρὸς Ἀκτίον ὑπὸ Ὀριγένους γνωρίμων.
 Hieron. *de virr. ill.* 54 "quintam et sextam et septimam edi-
 tionem, quas etiam nos de eius bibliotheca habemus, miro labore
 reperit et cum ceteris editionibus comparavit": *in ep. ad Tit.*
 "nonnulli vero libri, et maxime hi qui apud Hebraeos versu
 compositi sunt, tres alias editiones additas habent quam 'quin-
 tam' et 'sêxtam' et 'septimam' translationem vocant, auctori-
 tatem sine nominibus interpretum consecutas." Cf. *in Hab.* ii. 11,
 iii. 13.

It appears from the statement of Eusebius¹ that Origen found the *Quinta* at Nicopolis near Actium, and that either the *Sexta* or the *Septima* was discovered in the reign of Caracalla (A.D. 211—217) at Jericho; while Epiphanius, reversing this order, says that the *Quinta* was found at Jericho c. A.D. 217, and the *Sexta* at Nicopolis under Severus Alexander (A.D. 222—235)². According to Epiphanius both the *Quinta* and the *Sexta*, according to Eusebius the *Sexta* only, lay buried in a *πίθος* (*dolium*), one of the earthenware jars, pitched internally, and partly sunk in the ground, in which the *mustum* was usually stored while it underwent the process of fermentation³. Since

¹ Jerome (*prol. in Orig. exp. Cant.*) confirms Eusebius, on whose words see Dr Mercati, *Studi e Testi* 5, v. p. 47 (1901).

² The *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* identifies Nicopolis with Emmaus Nicopolis in Palestine.

³ *D. of Gk and Lat. Ant.* p. 1202. These *πίθοι* are said to have been sometimes used instead of *cistae* or *capsae* for preserving books. In 1906 five Greek documents were found in an earthenware jar at Elephantine; see Dr F. G. Kenyon in *Egypt Exploration Fund Archaeological Report* for 1907-8, p. 50.

Origen was in Palestine A.D. 217, and in Greece A.D. 231, it is natural to connect his discoveries with those years. How long the versions had been buried cannot be determined, for it is impossible to attach any importance to the vague statements of Eusebius (τὸν πάλαι λανθανούσας χρόνον). The version found at or near Nicopolis may have been a relic of the early Christianity of Epirus, to which there is an indirect allusion in the Pastoral Epistles¹. The Jericho find, on the other hand, was very possibly a Palestinian work, deposited in the wine jar for the sake of safety during the persecution of Septimius Severus, who was in Palestine A.D. 202, and issued edicts against both the Synagogue and the Church². Of *Septima* nothing is known, beyond what Eusebius tells us, and the very sparing use of it in the Psalter of some Hexaplaric MSS.; the few instances are so dubious that Field was disposed to conclude either that this version never existed, or that all traces of it have been lost³.

There is no conclusive evidence to shew that any of these versions covered the whole of the Old Testament⁴. Renderings from *Quinta*⁵ are more or less abundant in 2 Kings, Job, Psalms, Canticles, and the Minor Prophets, and a few traces have been observed in the Pentateuch. *Sexta* is well represented in the Psalms and in Canticles, and has left indications of its existence in Exodus, 1 Kings, and the Minor Prophets.

With regard to the literary character of *Quinta* and *Sexta*, the style of *Quinta* is characterised by Field as "omnium elegantissimus...cum optimis Graecis suae aetatis scriptoribus comparandus." *Sexta* also shews some command of Greek,

¹ Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 432.

² Cf. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 7; Spartian. *in Sev.* 17.

³ *Prolegg. ad Hexapla*, p. xlvi; see however R. Sinkler, *Psalm of Habakkuk* (Camb. 1890), p. 42. Ps.-Athanasius calls Lucian the seventh version: ἐβδόμη πάλιν καὶ τελευτάτα ἐρμηνεῖα ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου Λουκιανοῦ.

⁴ According to Harnack-Preuschen (i. p. 340) the opposite is implied by Eusebius' use of ἐναλλατρούσας in reference to these versions: "d. h. die eine war nur für diese, die andere nur für jene Bücher vorhanden."

⁵ On *Quinta* see Mercati, *Studi e Testi* 5, IV. p. 28; and Burkitt in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Archaeology*, June 1902.

but is said to be disposed to paraphrase; Field, while he regards that charge as on the whole 'not proven,' cites a remarkable example of the tendency from Ps. xxxvi. 35, which σ' renders, Εἶδον ἀσεβῆ καὶ ἀναιδῆ ἀντιποιούμενον ἐν σκληρότητι καὶ λέγοντα Εἰμὶ ὡς αὐτόχθων περιπατῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνη. Jerome¹ attributes both versions to 'Jewish translators,' but the Christian origin of *Sexta* betrays itself² at Hab. iii. 13 ἐξήλθες τοῦ σῶσαι τὸν λαόν σου διὰ Ἰησοῦν τὸν χριστόν σου³.

The Greek fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries quotes non-Septuagintal renderings from an interpreter who is styled ὁ Ἑβραῖος. Ὁ Σύρος is also cited, frequently as agreeing with ὁ Ἑβραῖος. Nothing is known of these translators (if such they were), but an elaborate discussion of all the facts may be seen in Field⁴.

13. The 'GRAECUS VENETUS.' This is a version of the Pentateuch, together with the books of Ruth, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, and Daniel, preserved in St Mark's Library at Venice in a single MS. of cent. xiv.—xv. (*cod. Gr. vii.*)⁵. It was first given to the world by de Villoison (Strassburg, 1784) and C. F. Ammon (Erlangen, 1790—1); a new edition with valuable prolegomena by O. von Gebhardt appeared at Leipzig in 1875⁶. This translation has been made directly from the M. T., but the author appears to have occasionally availed himself of earlier Greek versions (LXX.,

¹ *adv. Rufin.*

² "Prodens manifestissime sacramentum," as Jerome himself remarks. No doubt the primary reference is to Joshua (Field), but the purport of the gloss is unmistakable.

³ *leg. fors.* Ἰησοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ σου.

⁴ *Prolegg.* pp. lxxv.—lxxxii. See also Lagarde, *Ueber den Hebräer Ephraims von Edessa*. On τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν see Field, p. lxxii. ff., and Nestle, *Urtext*, p. 206. For some ambiguous references to other(?) versions see Philostr. *haer.* cc. 143, 144.

⁵ See Eichhorn, p. 421 ff.; De Wette-Schrader, p. 122 f.

⁶ *Graecus Venetus Pentateuchi &c. versio Graeca. Ex unico biblioth. S. Marci Venetae codici nunc primum uno volumine comprehensam atque apparatus critico et philologico instructam edidit O. G. Praefatus est Fr. Delitzsch.*

νεφέλαις τῶν πόλων ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπῳ ἀφικνούμενος ἔην, μέχρι
 τε τῷ παλαιῷ ταῖς ἀμέραις ἔφθασε κἀνώπιον τήνῳ προσήγαγόν
 ἔ. ²⁴ τήνῳ τ' ἐδόθη ἀρχὰ τιμὰ τε καὶ βασιλεία, πάντες τε λαοὶ
 ἔθνεα καὶ γλῶτται τήνῳ λατρουσεῖοντι ἃ ἀρχὰ εὖ ἀρχὰ αἰῶνος
 ὅς οὐ παρελευσείηται, ἃ τε βασιλεία εὖ ἅπερ οὐκ οἰχησείηται.

The student will not fail to notice the translator's desire to render his text faithfully, and, on the other hand, his curiously infelicitous attempt to reproduce it in Attic Greek; and lastly his use of the Doric dialect in Daniel to distinguish the Aramaic passages from the rest of the book. The result reminds us of a schoolboy's exercise, and the reader turns from it with pleasure to the less ambitious diction of the LXX., which, with its many imperfections, is at least the natural outgrowth of historical surroundings.

Klostermann (*Analecta* p. 30) mentions a MS. Psalter (Vat. Gr. 343), bearing the date 22 April, 1450, which professes to be a translation into the Greek of the fifteenth century (κατὰ τὴν νῦν κοινὴν τῶν Γραικῶν φωνήν). A version of the Pentateuch into modern Greek in Hebrew characters was printed at Constantinople in 1547, forming the left-hand column of a Polyglott (Hebrew, Chaldee, Spanish, Greek). It is described in Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, ii. p. 355, and more fully in *La version Neo-grecque du Pentateuque Polyglotte...remarques du Dr Lazare Belléli* (Paris, 1897). This Greek version has recently been transliterated and published in a separate form with an introduction and glossary by D. C. Hesselning (Leide, 1897). A Greek version of Job (1576) is mentioned by Neubauer in *J. Q. R.* iv. p. 18 f.

CHAPTER III.

THE HEXAPLA, AND THE HEXAPLARIC AND OTHER RECENSIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

I. THE century which produced the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus saw also the birth of the great Christian scholar who conceived the idea of using them for the revision of the Alexandrian Greek Bible.

Origen was in his 17th year when his father suffered martyrdom (A.D. 202)¹; at eighteen he was already head of the catechetical school of Alexandria². The Old Testament from the first engaged his attention, and, rightly judging that it could not be fruitfully studied without a knowledge of the original, he applied himself at once to the study of Hebrew.

Eus. *H. E.* vi. 16 τσαύτη δὲ εἰσήγετο τῷ Ὀριγένει τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπηκριβωμένη ἐξέτασις, ὡς καὶ τὴν Ἑβραϊδα γλῶτταν ἐκμαθεῖν τὰς τε παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐμφερομένας πρωτοτύπους αὐτοῖς Ἑβραίων στοιχείοις γραφὰς κτῆμα ἴδιον ποιήσασθαι. Hieron. *de virr. ill.* 54 "quis autem ignorat quod tantum in scripturis divinis habuerit studii ut etiam Hebraeam linguam contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam edisceret³?"

The feat was perhaps without precedent, in the third century, among Christian scholars not of Jewish origin⁴; in one so

¹ Eus. *H. E.* vi. 2.

² Hieron. *de virr. ill.* 54.

³ Cf. *ep. ad Paulam.*

⁴ See *D. C. B.* art. *Hebrew Learning* (ii. p. 351 ff.).

young it seemed prodigious to a veteran like Jerome. These studies, begun in Egypt, were continued in Palestine at Caesarea, where Origen sought shelter during the storm of persecution which burst upon Alexandria in the reign of Caracalla (A.D. 216—219). On his return to Egypt Origen's period of literary productivity began, and between the years 220 and 250 he gave to the world a succession of commentaries, homilies, or notes on nearly all the books of the Old Testament¹. In the course of these labours, perhaps from the moment that he began to read the Old Testament in the original, he was impressed with the importance of providing the Church with materials for ascertaining the true text and meaning of the original. The method which he adopted is described by himself in his famous letter to Africanus (c. A.D. 240), and more fully in his commentary on St Matthew (c. A.D. 245)².

Orig. *ad Afric.* 5: καὶ ταῦτα δὲ φημι οὐχὶ ὄκνω τοῦ ἐρευνᾶν καὶ τὰς κατὰ Ἰουδαίους γραφὰς καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμετέρας ταῖς ἐκείνων συγκρίνειν καὶ ὄραν τὰς ἐν αὐταῖς διαφοράς, εἰ μὴ φορτικὸν γοῦν εἶπεῖν, ἐπὶ πολὺ τοῦτο (ὅση δύναμις) πεποιήκαμεν, γυμνάζοντες αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκδόσεσι καὶ ταῖς διαφοραῖς αὐτῶν μετὰ τοῦ πόσως μᾶλλον ἀσκεῖν τὴν ἐρμηνείαν τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα... ἀσκοῦμεν δὲ μὴ ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὰς παρ' ἐκείνοις, ἵνα πρὸς Ἰουδαίους διαλεγόμενοι μὴ προσφέρωμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μὴ κείμενα ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἵνα συγχρησώμεθα τοῖς φερομένοις παρ' ἐκείνοις, εἰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις οὐ κείται βιβλίους. *In Matt.* xv. 14: τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν, θεοῦ διδόντος, εὗρομεν ἴασασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεσιν· τῶν γὰρ ἀμφιβαλλομένων παρὰ τοῖς ὀ' διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφωνίαν, τὴν κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων, τὸ συνᾶδον ἐκείναις ἐφυλάξαμεν· καὶ τινα μὲν ὠβελίσσαμεν ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα, οὐ τολμῶντες αὐτὰ πάντῃ περιελεῖν, τινα δὲ μετ' ἀστερίσκων προσεθήκαμεν· ἵνα δῆλον ᾖ ὅτι μὴ κείμενα παρὰ τοῖς ὀ' ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων συμφώνως τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ προσεθήκαμεν, καὶ ὁ μὲν βουλόμενος προῆται αὐτά· ᾧ δὲ προσκόπτει τὸ τοιοῦτον, ὃ βούλεται περὶ τῆς παραδοχῆς αὐτῶν ἢ μὴ ποιήσῃ.

¹ See *D. C. B.* art. *Origenes*, iv. p. 129 ff.

² Cf. Bp Westcott in *D. C. B.* iv. p. 99: "it was during this period (i.e. before A.D. 215) in all probability that he formed and partly executed his plan of a comparative view of the LXX. in connexion with the other Greek versions."

2. To attempt a new version was impracticable. It may be doubted whether Origen possessed the requisite knowledge of Hebrew; it is certain that he would have regarded the task as almost impious. Writing to Africanus he defends the apocryphal additions to Daniel and other Septuagintal departures from the Hebrew text on the ground that the Alexandrian Bible had received the sanction of the Church, and that to reject its testimony would be to revolutionise her canon of the Old Testament, and to play into the hands of her Jewish adversaries (*ἀθετεῖν τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερόμενα ἀντίγραφα καὶ νομοθετῆσαι τῇ ἀδελφότητι ἀποθέσθαι μὲν τὰς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιφερομένας βίβλους, κολακεύειν δὲ Ἰουδαίους καὶ πείθειν ἵνα μεταδώσω ἡμῖν τῶν καθαρῶν*). In this matter it was well, he urged, to bear in mind the precept of Prov. xxii. 28, "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set." The same reasons prevented him from adopting any of the other versions in place of the Septuagint. On the other hand, Origen held that Christians must be taught frankly to recognise the divergences between the LXX. and the current Hebrew text, and the superiority of Aquila and the other later versions, in so far as they were more faithful to the original; it was unfair to the Jew to quote against him passages from the LXX. which were wanting in his own Bible, and injurious to the Church herself to withhold from her anything in the Hebrew Bible which the LXX. did not represent. Acting under these convictions Origen's first step was to collect all existing Greek versions of the Old Testament. He then proceeded to transcribe the versions in parallel columns, and to indicate in the column devoted to the Septuagint the relation in which the old Alexandrian version stood to the current Hebrew text.

3. The following specimen, taken from a fragment lately discovered at Milan, will assist the reader to understand the arrangement of the columns, and to realise the general appearance of the Hexapla.

Ps. xlv. (xlv. i.) 1—3¹.

HEBREW.	HEB. TRANSLITERATED.	AQUILA.
ולמנצח	λαμανασση	τῷ νικοποιῷ·
לבני קרח	[λ]αβνηκορ	τῶν υἱῶν Κόρε
על עלמות	אל· אלμωθ	ἐπὶ νεανιοτήτων
שיר	סיר	ἄσμα.
אלהים לנו	ελωειμ· λανου*	[ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν (?)]
מחסה ועז	μασε· ουοζ	ἐλπίς καὶ κράτος,
עזרה	εζρ	βοήθεια
בצרות	βσαρῶθ	ἐν θλίψεσιν
נמצא מאד	νεμσα μωδ	εὐρέθη* σφόδρα.
על כן	אל· χεν·	ἐπὶ τούτῳ
לא נירא	λω· νира	οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα
בהמיר	βααμיר	ἐν τῷ ἀνταλλάσσεσθαι
ארץ	ααρς	γῆν,
ובמוט	ουβαμωτ	καὶ ἐν τῷ σφάλλεσθαι
הרים	αριμ	ὄρη
בלב	βλεβ	ἐν καρδίᾳ
ימים	יאμιμ	θαλασσῶν.

* In the MS. λανου appears in the third column, where it has displaced Aquila's rendering.

* MS. εὐρέθης.

¹ Cf. *Un palimpsesto Ambrosiano dei Salmi Esapli* (Giov. Mercati) in *Atti d. R. Accademia d. Scienze di Torino*, 10 Apr. 1896; and E. Klostermann, *die Mailänder Fragmente der Hexapla*. The MS. does not supply the Hebrew column.

Ps. xlv. (xlvī.) 1—3.

SYMMACHUS.	LXX.	THEODOTION ¹ .
ἐπινίκιος·	εἰς τὸ τέλος·	τῷ νικοποιῶ*·
τῶν νιῶν Κόρε	ὑπὲρ τῶν νιῶν* Κόρε	τοῖς υἱοῖς Κόρε
ὑπὲρ τῶν αἰωνίων	ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων	ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων
ᾧδῆ.	ψαλμός.	ᾧδῆ*·
ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν	ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν †	ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν
πεποιθήσεις καὶ ἰσχύς,	καταφυγὴ καὶ δύναμις,	καταφυγὴ καὶ δύναμις,
βοήθεια	βοηθός	βοηθός
ἐν θλίψεσιν	ἐν θλίψεσι	ἐν θλίψεσιν
εὐρισκόμενος σφόδρα.	ταῖς εὐρούσαις ἡμᾶς † σφόδρα.	εὐρέθη † σφόδρα.
διὰ τοῦτο	διὰ τοῦτο	διὰ τοῦτο
οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα	οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα	οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα
ἐν τῷ* συγχεῖσθαι	ἐν τῷ ταρασσέσθαι	ἐν τῷ ταρασσέσθαι
γῆν	τὴν γῆν	τὴν γῆν
καὶ κλίνεσθαι	καὶ μετατίθεσθαι	καὶ σαλεύεσθαι †
ὄρη	ὄρη	ὄρη
ἐν καρδίᾳ	ἐν καρδίᾳ	ἐν καρδίᾳ
θαλασσῶν.	θαλασσῶν.	θαλασσῶν.
* MS. ταῖς.	* With interlinear variant τοῖς υἱοῖς (Th.). † MS. 1 ^a <i>μανι</i> ἡμῖν (?Aq. Sym.). ‡ With interlinear variant εὐρεθήσεται ἡμῖν.	* With marginal variants, <i>εἰς τὸ τέλος</i> , ψαλμός (LXX.). † With interlinear variant ταῖς εὐρούσαις ἡμᾶς (LXX.). ‡ With interlinear variant μετατίθεσθαι (LXX.).

¹ Or Quinta? Cf. H. Lietzmann in *G. G. A.* 1902, v., p. 332: "die letzte Columne ist nicht, wie man anfangs glaubte, Theodotion, sondern die Quinta mit Interlinearvarianten."

The process as a whole is minutely described by Eusebius and Jerome, who had seen the work, and by Epiphanius, whose account is still more explicit but less trustworthy.

Eus. *H. E.* vi. 16: ταύτας δὲ ἀπάσας [sc. τὰς ἐκδόσεις] ἐπὶ ταῦτὸν συναγαγὼν διελὼν τε πρὸς κῶλον καὶ ἀντιπαραθεῖς ἀλλήλαις μετὰ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς Ἑβραίων σημειώσεως τὰ τῶν λεγομένων Ἑξαπλῶν ἡμῖν ἀντίγραφα καταλέλοιπεν, ἰδίως τὴν Ἀκύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος ἕκδοσιν ἅμα τῇ τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα ἐν τοῖς Τετραπλοῖς ἐπι κατασκευάσας. Hieron. *in ep. ad Tit.* iii. 9: "nobis curae fuit omnes veteris legis libros quos vir doctus Adamantius in Hexapla digesserat de Caesariensi bibliotheca descriptos ex ipsis authenticis emendare, in quibus et ipsa Hebraea propriis sunt caracteribus verba descripta et Graecis literis tramite expressa vicino; Aquila et Symmachus, LXX. quoque et Theodotio suum ordinem tenent; nonnulli vero libri et maxime hi qui apud Hebraeos versu compositi sunt tres alias editiones additas habuit." Cf. his letter to Sunnias and Fretela (*ep.* 106) and to Augustine (*ep.* 112) and the preface to the Book of Chronicles. Epiph. *de mens. et pond.* 7: τὰς γὰρ ἐξ ἑρμηνείας καὶ τὴν Ἑβραϊκὴν γραφὴν Ἑβραϊκοῖς στοιχείοις καὶ ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς ἐν σελίδι¹ μιᾷ συντεθεικῶς, ἄλλην σελίδα ἀντιπαραθέτον δι' Ἑλληνικῶν μὲν γραμμάτων Ἑβραϊκῶν δὲ λέξεων πρὸς κατάληψιν τῶν μὴ εἰδῶτων Ἑβραϊκὰ στοιχεῖα...καὶ οὕτως τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἑξαπλοῖς ἢ ὀκταπλοῖς τὰς μὲν δύο Ἑβραϊκὰς σελίδας καὶ τὰς ἐξ τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐκ παραλλήλου ἀντιπαραθεῖς μεγάλῃν ὠφέλειαν γνώσεως ἔδωκε τοῖς φιλοκάλοις. *Ib.* 19 τὰς δύο Ἑβραϊκὰς πρώτας κειμένας, μετὰ ταύτας δὲ τὴν τοῦ Ἀκύλα τεταγαμένην, μεθ' ἣν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Συμμάχου, ἔπειτα τὴν τῶν οὐβ' μεθ' ἧς ἡ τοῦ Θεοδοτίωνος συντέτακται, καὶ ἐξῆς ἢ πέμπτη τε καὶ ἕκτη².

It will be seen that the specimen corroborates ancient testimony in reference to the relative order of the four Greek versions (Aq., Symm., LXX., Theod.), and illustrates the method of division into corresponding κῶλα³ which made comparison easy. With regard to the order, it is clear that Origen did not mean it to be chronological. Epiphanius seeks to account for the position of the LXX. in the fifth column by the not less

¹ On σελίς, cf. Sir E. Maunde Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography*, p. 58.

² See also *ib.* 18 sq.; Hieron. *Praef. in Paral.*, and *in ep. ad Tit.*, c. iii.

³ Used here loosely as = κόμματα, the κῶλον being properly a line consisting of a complete clause, and of 8—17 syllables: cf. E. M. Thompson, *Gk and Lat. Palaeography*, p. 81 f.; J. R. Harris, *Stichometry*, p. 23 f.

untenable hypothesis that Origen regarded the LXX. as the standard of accuracy (*de mens. et pond.* 19: Ὁριγένης πυθόμενος τὴν τῶν οὐβ' ἔκδοσιν ἀκριβῆ εἶναι μέσσην ταύτην συνέθηκεν, ὅπως τὰς ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἐρμηνείας διελέγῃ). As we have learned from Origen himself, the fact was the reverse; the other Greek versions were intended to check and correct the LXX. But the remark, though futile in itself, suggests a probable explanation. Aquila is placed next to the Hebrew text because his translation is the most verbally exact, and Symmachus and Theodotion follow Aquila and the LXX. respectively, because Symmachus on the whole is a revision of Aquila, and Theodotion of the LXX. As to the κῶλα, it was of course necessary that the lines should be as short as possible when six or more columns had to be presented on each opening; and it will be seen that in the Psalms at least not more than two Hebrew words were included in a line, the corresponding Greek words being at the most three or four¹. But the claims of the sense are not neglected; indeed it will appear upon inspection that the method adopted serves in a remarkable degree to accentuate the successive steps in the movement of the thought.

4. Besides the Hexapla, Origen compiled a Tetrapla, i.e. a minor edition from which he omitted the first two columns containing the Hebrew text in Hebrew and Greek characters; cf. Eus. *l.c.* ἰδίως τὴν Ἀκύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος ἔκδοσιν ἅμα τῇ τῶν ὀ ἐν τοῖς τετραπλοῖς ἐπικατασκευάσας². Eriph. *de mens. et pond.* 19 τετραπλᾶ γάρ εἰσι τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ ὅταν αἱ τοῦ Ἀκύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ τῶν οὐβ' καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος ἐρμηνεῖαι συντεταγμέναι ᾧσι. The Tetrapla is occasionally mentioned along with the Hexapla in scholia attached to MSS. of the LXX. Thus in the

¹ In the earlier Cairo palimpsest even such words as $\lambda\sigma$ and $\mu\eta$ had each a line to itself; see Nestle in Hastings' *D.B.* iv. 443.

² Ἐπικατασκευάζειν is *insuper vel postea concinnare* (Field, *prolegg.* p. xii.); cf. Dio Cass. l. 23 τὰ σκάφη κατεσκεύασε...καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὰ πύργους ἐπεκατεσκεύασε. Oeconomus (iv. 873), who regards the Tetrapla as the earlier work, understands Eusebius to mean only that Origen added to the LXX. the three columns containing Α' Σ' Θ'.

Syro-Hexaplaric version at the end of Joshua it is stated that the Greek codex on which the version was based had the note : ἐγράφη ἐκ τοῦ ἑξαπλοῦ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ παρετέθη· ἀντεβλήθη δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν τετραπλοῦν. Cod. Q still contains two similar references to the Tetrapla (*O. T. in Greek*, iii., p. viii., notes). Mention is also made in the MSS. of an Octapla (cf. the Syro-Hexaplar in Job v. 23, vi. 28, and the Hexaplaric MSS. of the Psalter in Ps. lxxv. 1, lxxxvi. 5, lxxxviii. 43, cxxxi. 4, cxxxvi. 1)¹. The question arises whether the Octapla was a distinct work, or merely another name for the Hexapla in books where the columns were increased to eight by the addition of the *Quinta* and *Sexta*. Eusebius appears to support the latter view, for he speaks of the Hexapla of the Psalms as including the *Quinta* and *Sexta* (*H. E.* vi. 16 ἔν γε μὴν τοῖς ἑξαπλοῖς τῶν Ψαλμῶν μετὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους τέσσαρας ἐκδόσεις οὐ μόνον πέμπτην ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕκτην καὶ ἑβδόμην παραθεῖς ἑρμηνείαν). Eriphanius, on the other hand, seems to limit the Hexapla to the six columns (*l. c.* τῶν τεσσάρων δὲ τούτων σελίδων ταῖς δυσὶ ταῖς Ἑβραϊκαῖς συναφθειςῶν ἑξαπλᾶ καλεῖται· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἡ πέμπτη καὶ ἡ ἕκτη ἑρμηνεία συναφθῶσιν...ὄκταπλᾶ καλεῖται). But it has been observed that when the scholia in Hexaplaric MSS. mention the Octapla they are silent as to the Hexapla, although the Octapla and the Tetrapla are mentioned together; e.g. in Ps. lxxxvi. 5 we find the following note: ΜΗΤΗΡ ΣΙΩΝ· τὸ ρ κατὰ προσθήκην ἕκειτο εἰς τὴν τῶν ὀ' ἐν τῷ τετρασελίδῳ (the Tetrapla), ἐν δὲ τῷ ὄκτασελίδῳ (the Octapla), ΜΗ ΤΗ ΣΙΩΝ, ἡγοῦν δίχα τοῦ ρ. The inference is that the name 'Octapla' sometimes superseded that of 'Hexapla' in the Psalms, because in the Psalter of the Hexapla there were two additional columns which received the *Quinta* and *Sexta*. Similarly the term 'Heptapla' was occasionally used in reference to portions of the Hexapla where a seventh column appeared, but not an eighth².

¹ Field, *Hexapla*, ii. *ad loc.*; cf. Hieron. *in Psalmos* (ed. Morin.), p. 66.

² It occurs (e.g.) in the Hexaplaric Syriac at 2 Kings xvi. 2.

'Pentapla' is cited by J. Curterius from cod. Q at Isa. iii. 24, and Field's suspicion that Curterius had read his MS. incorrectly is not confirmed by a reference to the photograph, which exhibits ἐν τῷ πεντασελίδῳ. Origen's work, then, existed (as Eusebius implies) in two forms: (1) the Hexapla, which contained, as a rule, six columns, but sometimes five or seven or eight, when it was more accurately denominated the Pentapla, Heptapla, or Octapla; and (2) the Tetrapla, which contained only four columns answering to the four great Greek versions, excluding the Hebrew and Greek-Hebrew texts on the one hand, and the *Quinta* and *Sexta* on the other.

5. The Hebrew text of the Hexapla was of course that which was current among Origen's Jewish teachers in the third century, and which he took to be truly representative of the original. Portions of the second column, which have been preserved, are of interest as shewing the pronunciation of the Hebrew consonants and the vocalisation which was then in use. From the specimen already given it will be seen that כ=χ, פ=κ, and ד, ז, ש=σ, and that ץ ן ף ם are without equivalent¹. The divergences of the vocalisation from that which is represented by the pointing of the M. T. are more important; see Dr Taylor's remarks in *D. C. B.* ii. p. 15 f.

In regard to Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and the minor Greek versions, Origen's task was limited to transcription under the conditions imposed by the plan of his work. But the fifth column, which contained the Hexaplaric LXX., called for the full exercise of his critical powers. If his first idea had been, as his own words almost suggest, merely to transcribe the LXX. in its proper place, without making material alterations in the text, a closer comparison of the LXX. with the current Hebrew text and the versions based upon it must soon have

¹ Cf. the practice of Aquila (Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings acc. to Aquila*, p. 14).

convinced him that this was impracticable. Let us suppose that there lay before him an Alexandrian or Palestinian MS., containing the 'common' text of the LXX. (*ἡ κοινή*, or *vulgata editio*, as Jerome calls it¹), i.e. the text of the Greek Bible as it was read by the Church of the third century. As the transcription proceeded, it would be seen that every column of the Greek contained clauses which were not in the Hebrew, and omitted clauses which the Hebrew contained. Further, in many places the order of the Greek would be found to depart from that of the Hebrew, the divergence being sometimes limited to a clause or a verse or two, but occasionally extending to several chapters. Lastly, in innumerable places the LXX. would be seen to yield a sense more or less at variance with the current Hebrew, either through misapprehension on the part of the translators or through a difference in the underlying text. These causes combined to render the co-ordination of the Alexandrian Greek with the existing Hebrew text a task of no ordinary difficulty, and the solution to which Origen was led appeared to him to be little short of an inspiration (*θεοῦ διδόντος εὐρομεν*).

Origen began by assuming (1) the purity of the Hebrew text, and (2) the corruption of the *κοινή* where it departed from the Hebrew². The problem before him was to restore the LXX. to its original purity, i.e. to the *Hebraica veritas* as he understood it, and thus to put the Church in possession of an adequate Greek version of the Old Testament without disturbing its general allegiance to the time-honoured work of the Alexandrian translators. Some of the elements in this complex process were comparatively simple. (1) Differences of order were met by transposition, the Greek order making way for the

¹ *Ep. ad Sunn. et Fret.*

² See Driver, *Samuel*, p. xlvi.: "he assumed that the original Septuagint was that which agreed most closely with the Hebrew text as he knew it...a step in the wrong direction."

Hebrew. In this manner whole sections changed places in the LXX. text of Exodus, 1 Kings, and Jeremiah; in Proverbs only, for some reason not easy to determine, the two texts were allowed to follow their respective courses, and the divergence of the Greek order from the Hebrew was indicated by certain marks¹ prefixed to the *stichi* of the LXX. column.

(2) Corruptions in the *κοινή*, real or supposed, were tacitly corrected in the Hexapla, whether from better MSS. of the LXX., or from the renderings of other translators, or, in the case of proper names, by a simple adaptation of the Alexandrian Greek form to that which was found in the current Hebrew².

(3) The additions and omissions in the LXX. presented greater difficulty. Origen was unwilling to remove the former, for they belonged to the version which the Church had sanctioned, and which many Christians regarded as inspired Scripture; but he was equally unwilling to leave them without some mark of editorial disapprobation. Omissions were readily supplied from one of the other versions, namely Aquila or Theodotion; but the new matter interpolated into the LXX. needed to be carefully distinguished from the genuine work of the Alexandrian translators³. See Add. Notes.

6. Here the genius of Origen found an ally in the system of critical signs which had its origin among the older scholars of Alexandria, dating almost from the century which produced the earlier books of the LXX. The *Ἀριστάρχεια σήματα* took their name from the prince of Alexandrian grammarians, Aristarchus, who flourished in the reign of Philopator (A.D.

¹ A combination of the asterisk and obelus; see below, p. 71.

² E.g. at Exod. vi. 16, *Γηρῶν* was substituted by Origen for *Γεδῶν*. Whether his practice in this respect was uniform has not been definitely ascertained.

³ Hieron. *Praef. ad Chron.*: "quod maioris audaciae est, in editione LXX. Theodotionis editionem miscuit, asteriscis designans quae minus ante fuerant, et virgulis quae ex superfluo videbantur apposita." The Book of Job offered the largest field for interpolation: a scholion in cod. 161 says, *Ἰὼβ στίχοι, ἀχ' χωρὶς ἀστερῶν, μετὰ δὲ τῶν ἀστερῶν, β5'*.

222—205), and they appear to have been first employed in connexion with his great edition of Homer¹. Origen selected two of these signs known as the obelus and the asterisk, and adapted them to the use of his edition of the Septuagint. In the Homeric poems, as edited by Aristarchus, the obelus marked passages which the critic wished to censure, while the asterisk was affixed to those which seemed to him to be worthy of special attention; cf. the *anecdoton* printed by Gardthausen: ὁ δὲ ὀβελὸς πρὸς τὰ ἀθετούμενα ἐπὶ τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἤγγουν νενοθευμένα ἢ ὑποβεβλημένα· ὁ δὲ ἀστερίσκος...ὡς καλῶν εἰρημένων τῶν ἐπῶν. Similarly, in connexion with Platonic *dicta*, Diogenes Laertius (*platon.* iii. 657) used the obelus πρὸς τὴν ἀθέτησιν and the asterisk πρὸς τὴν συμφωνίαν τῶν δογμάτων. As employed by Origen in the fifth column of the Hexapla, the obelus was prefixed to words or lines which were wanting in the Hebrew, and therefore, from Origen's point of view, of doubtful authority², whilst the asterisk called attention to words or lines wanting in the LXX., but present in the Hebrew. The close of the context to which the obelus or asterisk was intended to apply was marked by another sign known as the *metobelus*. When the passage exceeded the length of a single line, the asterisk or obelus was repeated at the beginning of each subsequent line until the metobelus was reached.

Eriph. *de mens. et pond.* 2, 3 ὁ ἀστερίσκος...σημαίνει τὸ ἐμφερόμενον ῥῆμα ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ κείσθαι...οἱ δὲ οὐβ' ἐρμηνευταὶ παρήκαν καὶ οὐχ ἠρμήνευκαν...ὀβελὸς δὲ...παρετίθη...ταῖς τῆς θείας γραφῆς λέξεσιν ταῖς παρὰ τοῖς οὐβ' ἐρμηνευταῖς κειμένας, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς περὶ Ἀκύλαν καὶ Σύμμαχον μὴ ἐμφερομένας. Schol. ap. Tisch. *not. ed. cod. Sin.* p. 76 ὅσοις οἱ ὀβελοὶ πρόσκεινται ῥητοῖς, οὗτοι οὐκ ἔκειντο οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐρμηνευταῖς οὔτε ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ μόνοις τοῖς οὐβ'· καὶ ὅσοις οἱ ἀστερίσκοι πρόσκεινται ῥητοῖς, οὗτοι ἐν μὲν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐρμηνευταῖς ἐφέροντο, ἐν δὲ τοῖς οὐβ' οὐκέτι.

¹ See a complete list of these in Gardthausen, *Griech. Paläographie*, p. 288 f.

² On an exceptional case in which he obelised words which stood in the Hebrew text, see Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 386 (on xxxii. 17).

Occasionally Origen used asterisk and obelus together, as Aristarchus had done, to denote that the order of the Greek was at fault (*anecd.* ap. Gardthausen: ὁ δὲ ἀστερίσκος μετὰ ὀβελού, ὡς ὄντα μὲν τὰ ἔπη τοῦ ποιητοῦ, μὴ καλῶς δὲ κείμενα: *schol.* ap. Tisch. *not. ed. Sin.* l. c. φέρονται μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ὀ, φέρονται δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐρμηνευταῖς, τὴν θέσιν δὲ μόνην παραλλάσσουσιν οἱ λοιποὶ καὶ τὸ Ἑβραϊκὸν παρὰ τοὺς ὀ· ὅθεν ὠβελίσται ἐν ταύτῳ καὶ ἡστέρισται, ὡς παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν φερόμενα, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ τόποις: also ap. *mon. sacr. ined.* iii. p. xvii. τὰ δὲ ἡστερισμένα ἐν ταύτῳ καὶ ὠβελισμένα ῥητὰ...ὡς παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν φερόμενα, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ τόποις). The Aristarchian (or as they are usually called by students of the Old Testament, the Hexaplaric) signs are also used by Origen when he attempts to place before the reader of his LXX. column an exact version of the Hebrew without displacing the LXX. rendering. Where the LXX. and the current Hebrew are hopelessly at issue, he occasionally gives two versions, that of one of the later translators distinguished by an asterisk, and that of the LXX. under an obelus¹.

The form of the asterisk, obelus, and metobelus varies slightly. The first consists of the letter x, usually surrounded by four dots (✱, the χῖ περιεστιγμένον); the form ≠ occurs but seldom, and only, as it seems, in the Syro-Hexaplar. The ὀβελός, 'spit' or 'spear,' is represented in Epiphanius by ✎, but in the MSS. of the LXX. a horizontal straight line (—)² has taken the place of the original form, with or without occupying dot or dots (÷ ÷ ÷); the form ÷ was known as a *lemniscus*, and the form — as a *hypolemniscus*. Epiphanius indeed (*op. cit.*, c. 8) fancies that each dot represents a pair of translators, so that the *lemniscus* means that the word or clause which the LXX. adds to the Hebrew had the support of two out of the thirty-six pairs which composed the whole body, whilst the *hypolemniscus*

¹ A somewhat different view of Origen's practice is suggested by H. Lietzmann (*Gött. gel. Anz.* 1902, 5) and G. Mercati (*Atti d. R. Acc. d. Sci. di Torino*, 10 Apr. 1896: vol. 31, p. 656 ff.

² This sometimes becomes a hook (↵).

claims for it the support of only one pair. This explanation, it is scarcely necessary to say, is as baseless as the fiction of the cells on which, in the later Epiphianian form, it rests. Other attempts to assign distinct values to the various forms of the obelus have been shewn by Field to be untenable¹. The *metobelus* is usually represented by two dots arranged perpendicularly (:), like a colon; other forms are a sloping line with a dot before it or on either side (/., ·/.), and in the Syro-Hexaplar and other Syriac versions a mallet (♣). The latter form, as the least ambiguous, is used in Field's great edition of the Hexapla, and in the apparatus which is printed under the text of the LXX. version of Daniel in the Cambridge manual Septuagint.

Certain other signs found in Hexaplaric MSS. are mentioned in the following scholion (Εὐαγγλίον σχ., one of the σχόλια εἰς τὰς παροιμίας printed in the *Notitia ed. cod. Sin.*, p. 76, from a Patmos MS.; see Robinson, *Philocalia*, pp. xiii., xvii. ff.): εἰσὶν² ὅσα προτεταγμένον ἔχουσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὧδε· ὅσα Ὁριγένην ἐπιγεγραμμένον ἔχει τούτῳ τῷ μονοσυλλάβῳ, φ... ὅσα δὲ περὶ διαφωρίας ῥητῶν τινῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ ἑδαφίῳ ἢ ἐκδόσεων ἔστιν σχόλια, ἅπερ καὶ κάτω νενευκίαν περιεστιγμένην ἔχει προτεταγμένην, τῶν ἀντιβεβληκότων τὸ βιβλίον ἐστίν· ὅσα δὲ ἀμφιβόλως ἔξω κείμενα ῥητὰ ἔξω νενευκίαν περιεστιγμένην ἔχει προτεταγμένην, διὰ τὰ σχόλια προσετέθησαν κατ' αὐτὰ τοῦ μεγάλου εἰρηκότος διδασκάλου, ἵνα μὴ δόξη κατὰ κενοῦ τὸ σχόλιον φέρεσθαι, ἐν πολλοῖς μὲν τῶν ἀντιγράφων τῶν ῥητῶν οὕτως ἐχόντων, ἐν τούτῳ δὲ μὴ οὕτως κειμένων ἢ μηδ' ὄλων φερομένων, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο προστεθέντων.

The following extract from the great Hexaplaric MS. known as G will enable the student, to whom the subject may be new, to practise himself in the interpretation of the signs. He will find it instructive to compare the extract with his Hebrew Bible on the one hand and the text of Cod. B (printed in the Cambridge LXX.) on the other³.

¹ *Prolegg.* p. lix. sq.

² Lietzmann proposes to read: Εὐαγγλίον σχόλια εἰσὶν, ὅσα... ἀριθμὸν, Ὁρ. δέ, ὅσα Ὁριγένην κ.τ.λ.

³ The vertical bars denote, of course, the length of the lines of Cod. G. The lines of the LXX. column of the Hexapla, if we may judge by the specimen (p. 62 f.), varied in length according to the sense.

Joshua xi. 10—14 (Cod. Sarravianus).

και επεστρεψεν ις εν | τω καιρω εκεινω κ | καταβετο * την
 : ασωρ | και τον βασιλεια αυτης | * απεκτεινεν εν ρομ | * φαια :
 ην δε ασωρ το προ|τερον αρχουσα πασω | των βασιλειων του|των και
 απεκτεινα | παν ενπνεον * ο : εν | αυτη εν στοματι ξιφους | και
 εξωλεθρευσαν : | —παντας : και ου κατελι|φθη εν αυτη ενπνε|ον και
 την ασωρ εν|πρησεν εν πυρι και πα|σας τας πολεις των | βασιλειων *
 τουτω | και * παντας : τους βασιλεις αυτων ελαβεν ις | και
 ανειλεν αυτους | εν στοματι ξιφους κ | εξωλεθρευσεν αυτους | ον
 τροπον συνεταξ|ε | Μωσης ο παις κυ· αλλα | πασας τας πολεις τας ||
 κευωματισμενας | * αυτων : ουκ ενεπρη|σεν ιηλ πλην * την : α|σωρ
 μονην ; αυτην : ενεπρησεν ις και πα|τα τα σκυλα αυτης * κ | * τα
 κτηνη : επρονομευ|σαν εαυτοις οι υιοι ιηλ | * κατα το ρημα κυ ο ενε|
 * τειλατο τω ιω : αυτους | δε παντας εξωλεθρευ|σεν εν στοματι ξιφους |
 εως απωλεσεν αυτους | ου κατιλιπον ; αυτω : | ουδε εν ενπνεον * * *

7. The Hexapla was completed, as we have seen, by A.D. 240 or 245; the Tetrapla, which was a copy of four columns of the Hexapla, followed, perhaps during Origen's last years at Tyre¹. A large part of the labour of transcription may have been borne by the copyists who were in constant attendance on the great scholar, but he was doubtless his own διορθωτής, and the two Hebrew columns and the LXX. column of the Hexapla were probably written by his own hand.

Eusebius in a well-known passage describes the costly and laborious process by which Origen's commentaries on Scripture were given to the world: *H. E.* vi. 23 ταχυγράφοι γὰρ αὐτῷ πλείους ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν παρήσαν ὑπαγορεύοντι, χρόνους τεταγμένους ἀλλήλους ἀμείβοντες, βιβλιογράφοι τε οὐχ ἥττους ἅμα καὶ κόραις ἐπὶ τὸ καλλιγραφεῖν ἡσκημέναις· ὧν ἀπάντων τὴν δέουσαν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἄφθονον περιουσίαν ὁ Ἀμβρόσιος παρεστήσατο. Two of these classes of workers, the βιβλιογράφοι and καλλιγράφοι (cf. Gardthausen, *Gr. Palaeographie*, p. 297), must have found ample employment in the preparation of the Hexapla. The material used was possibly papyrus. Although there are extant fragments of writing on vellum which may be attributed to the second century, "there is every reason to suppose that to the end of the third century papyrus held its own, at any rate in Egypt, as the

¹ See the confused and inexact statement of Epiphanius, *de mens. et pond.* 18.

material on which literary works were written" (Kenyon, *Palaeography of Gk papyri*, p. 113 f.; on the size of existing papyrus rolls, see p. 16 ff.). This view receives some confirmation from Jerome's statement (*ep.* 141) that Acacius and Evagrius endeavoured to replace with copies on parchment some of the books in the library at Caesarea which were in a damaged condition ("bibliothecam...ex parte corruptam...in membranis instaurare conati sunt")¹. According to Tischendorf (*prolegg. in cod. Frid. Aug.* § 1) cod. \aleph was written on skins of antelopes, each of which supplied only two leaves of the MS. The Hexapla, if copied in so costly a way, would have taxed the resources even of Origen's generous ἐργοδιώκτης.

It is difficult to conceive of a codex or series of codices so gigantic as the Hexapla. Like the great Vatican MS., it would have exhibited at each opening at least six columns, and in certain books, like the Sinaitic MS., eight. Its bulk, even when allowance has been made for the absence in it of the uncanonical books, would have been nearly five times as great as that of the Vatican or the Sinaitic Old Testament. The Vatican MS. contains 759 leaves, of which 617 belong to the Old Testament; when complete, the O. T. must have occupied 650 leaves, more or less. From these data it may be roughly calculated that the Hexapla, if written in the form of a codex, would have filled 3250 leaves or 6500 pages²; and these figures are exclusive of the *Quinta* and *Sexta*, which may have swelled the total considerably. Even the Tetrapla would have exceeded 2000 leaves. So immense a work must have been the despair of copyists, and it is improbable that any attempt was made to reproduce either of the editions as a whole. The originals, however, were long preserved at Caesarea in Palestine, where they were deposited, perhaps by Origen himself, in the library of Pamphilus. There they were studied by Jerome in the fourth century (*in Psalmos comm.* ed. Morin., p. 5: "ἐξαπλοῦς Origenis in Caesariensi bibliotheca relegens"; *ib.* p. 12: "cum vetustum Origenis hexaplum psalterium revolverem, quod ipsius manu

¹ See Birt, *das antike Buchwesen*, pp. 100, 107 ff.

² If the Hexapla was written in lines consisting of only one word like the Cairo palimpsest, this estimate is far too low; see Nestle in Hastings, *D. B.* iv. p. 443.

fuerat emendatum"; in *ep. ad Tit.*: "nobis curae fuit omnes veteris legis libros quos v. d. Adamantius in Hexapla digesserat de Caesariensi bibliotheca descriptos ex ipsis authenticis emendare." There also they were consulted by the writers and owners of Biblical MSS.; compare the interesting note attached by a hand of the seventh century to the book of Esther in cod. \aleph : ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιότατον λίαν ἀντίγραφον δεδιорθωμένον χειρὶ τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Παμφίλου· πρὸς δὲ τῷ τέλει τοῦ αὐτοῦ παλαιοτάτου βιβλίου...ὑποσημείωσις τοῦ αὐτοῦ μάρτυρος ὑπέκειτο ἔχουσα οὕτως· Μετελήμφθη καὶ διορθώθη πρὸς τὰ ἑξαπλὰ Ὀριγενοῦς ἕπ' αὐτοῦ διορθωμένα (*O. T. in Greek*, ii. p. 780); and the notes prefixed to Isaiah and Ezekiel in Cod. Marchalianus (Q); the second of these notes claims that the copy from which Ezekiel was transcribed bore the subscription Τὰ ἑξάπλῳ μετελήμφθη ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἐκδόσεις ἑξαπλῶν, καὶ διορθώθη ἀπὸ τῶν Ὀριγενοῦς αὐτοῦ τετραπλῶν ἄτινα καὶ αὐτοῦ χειρὶ διορθώτο καὶ ἐσκολιογράφητο (*ib.* iii. p. viii.)¹. The library of Pamphilus was in existence in the 6th century, for Montfaucon (*biblioth. Coisl.* p. 262) quotes from *Coisl.* 202², a MS. of that century, a colophon which runs: ἀντεβλήθη δὲ ἡ βίβλος πρὸς τὸ ἐν Καισαρίᾳ ἀντίγραφον τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ ἁγίου Παμφίλου χειρὶ γεγραμμένον αὐτοῦ. But in 638 Caesarea fell into the hands of the Saracens, and from that time the Library was heard of no more. Even if not destroyed at the moment, it is probable that every vestige of the collection perished during the vicissitudes through which the town passed between the 7th century and the 12th³. Had the Hexapla been buried in Egypt, she might have preserved it in her sands; it can scarcely be hoped that the sea-washed and storm-beaten ruins of Kaisariyeh cover a single leaf.

¹ See also the note at the end of the Scholia on Proverbs printed in the *Notitia l. c.*: μετελήφθησαν ἀφ' ὧν εὔρομεν ἑξαπλῶν, καὶ πάλιν αὐτοχειρὶ Παμφίλου καὶ Εὐσέβιου διορθώσαντο.

² = H^{paul}, Gregory, p. 449, Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 183 f.

³ See G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geogr. of Palestine*, p. 143 l.

LITERATURE. Fragments of the Hexapla were printed by Peter Morinus in his notes to the Roman edition of the Septuagint (1587). Separate collections have since been published by J. Drusius (*Vet. interpretum Graecorum... fragmenta collecta... a Jo. Drusio*, Arnheim, 1622), Bernard Montfaucon (*Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, Paris, 1713), and F. Field (Oxford, 1875), whose work has superseded all earlier attempts to recover the Hexapla. A fuller list may be seen in Fabricius-Harles, iii. 701 ff. Materials for an enlarged edition of Field are already beginning to accumulate; such may be found in Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, iii. (Venice, 1883), p. 551 ff.; E. Klostermann, *Analecta zur... Hexapla* (Leipzig, 1895), G. Morin, *Anecdota Maredsolana* iii. 1 (Mareds., 1895; cf. *Expositor*, June 1895, p. 424 ff.), and the Oxford Concordance. Among helps to the study of the Hexapla, besides the introductions already specified, the following may be mentioned: the Prolegomena in Field's *Hexapla*, the art. *Hexapla* in *D. C. B.* by Dr C. Taylor; the introduction to Dr Driver's *Notes on Samuel* (p. xliii. ff.), and Harnack-Preuschen, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Litt.* i. p. 339 ff. For the literature of the Syro-Hexaplaric version see c. iv.

8. The Hexapla as a whole was perhaps too vast to be copied¹, and copies even of particular books were rarely attempted; yet there was nothing to forbid the separate publication of the fifth column, which contained the revised Septuagint. This idea presented itself to Pamphilus and his friend Eusebius, and the result was the wide circulation in Palestine during the fourth century of the Hexaplaric LXX., detached from the Hebrew text and the other Greek versions, but retaining, more or less exactly, the corrections and additions adopted by Origen with the accompanying Hexaplaric signs. "Provinciae Palestinae," writes Jerome in his preface to *Chronicles*, "codices legunt quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt." Elsewhere² he warns his correspondents "aliam esse editionem quam Origenes et Caesariensis Eusebius omnesque Graeciae tractatores κοινήν (id est communem) appellant atque vulgatam..., aliam LXX. interpretum quae in ἐξαπλοῖς codicibus reperitur.. et Ierosoly-

¹ Hieron. *praef. in Jos.*: "et sumptu et labore maximo indigent."

² *Ep. ad Sunn. et Fret.* 2.

mae atque in orientis ecclesia decantatur." The Hexaplaric text receives his unhesitating support: "ea autem quae habetur in ἑξαπλοῖς... ipsa est quae in eruditorum libris incorrupta et immaculata LXX. interpretum translatio reservatur¹." This edition, sometimes described as τὸ Εὐσεβίου or τὸ Παλαστιναῖον, or simply Ὁρ[ιγένης], is mentioned with great respect in the scholia of MSS. which do not on the whole follow its text. Specimens of such notes have already been given; they usually quote the words in which Pamphilus describes the part borne by himself and his friends respectively in the production of the book. Thus a note quoted by an early hand in cod. \aleph at the end of 2 Esdras says, Ἀντωνῖνος ἀντέβαλεν, Πάμφιλος διόρθωσα. The subscription to Esther ends Ἀντωνῖνος ὁμολογητῆς ἀντέβαλεν, Πάμφιλος διορθώσατο [τὸ] τεῦχος ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. The scholion prefixed to Ezekiel in Q introduces the name of Eusebius, assigning him another function: Εὐσέβιος ἐγὼ τὰ σχόλια παρέθηκα· Πάμφιλος καὶ Εὐσέβιος διορθώσαντο. In its subscription to 1 Kings the Syro-Hexaplar quotes a note which runs: Εὐσέβιος διορθωσάμην ὡς ἀκριβῶς ἠδυνάμην. It would seem as though the work of comparing the copy with the original was committed to the otherwise unknown² Antoninus, whilst the more responsible task of making corrections was reserved for Pamphilus and Eusebius³. Part of the work at least was done while Pamphilus lay in prison, i.e. between A.D. 307 and 309, but it was probably continued and completed by Eusebius after the martyr's death.

The separate publication of the Hexaplaric LXX. was undertaken in absolute good faith; Pamphilus and Eusebius believed (as did even Jerome nearly a century afterwards) that Origen had succeeded in restoring the old Greek version to its primitive purity, and they were moved by the desire to communicate this treasure to the whole Church. It was impos-

¹ *Adv. Rufin.* ii. 27.

² Identified by some with an Antoninus martyred three months before Pamphilus (Lake).

³ On ἀντιβάλλειν and διορθοῦσθαι, see Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 55.

sible for them to foresee that the actual result of their labours would be to create a recension of the LXX. which was a mischievous mixture of the Alexandrian version with the versions of Aquila and Theodotion. The Hexaplaric signs, intended for the use of scholars, lost their meaning when copied into a text which was no longer confronted with the Hebrew or the later versions based upon it; and there was a natural tendency on the part of scribes to omit them, when their purpose was no longer manifest.

When we consider that the Hexaplaric Septuagint claimed to be the work of Origen, and was issued under the authority of the martyr Pamphilus and the yet greater Bishop of Caesarea, we can but wonder that its circulation was generally limited to Palestine¹. Not one of our uncial Bibles gives the Hexaplaric text as a whole, and it is presented in a relatively pure form by very few MSS., the uncials G and M, which contain only the Pentateuch and some of the historical books, and the cursives 86 and 88 (Holmes and Parsons), which contain the Prophets. But a considerable number of so-called Hexaplaric codices exist, from which it is possible to collect fragments not only of the fifth column, but of all the Greek columns of the Hexapla; and a still larger number of our MSS. offer a mixed text in which the influence of the Hexaplaric LXX., or of the edition published by Pamphilus and Eusebius, has been more or less extensively at work². The problems presented by this and other causes of mixture will come under consideration in the later chapters of this book.

9. While the Hexaplaric Septuagint was being copied at Caesarea for the use of Palestine, Hesychius was engaged in correcting the common Egyptian text.

¹ Jerome says indeed (*ep. ad Aug.* ii.): "quod si feceris (i.e. if you refuse Origen's recension) omnino ecclesiae bibliothecas damnare cogeris; vix enim unus vel alter inveniatur liber qui ista non habeat." But he is drawing a hasty inference from experiences gathered in Palestine.

² See c. v.

Hieron. *in praeſ. ad Paralipſ.*: "Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta ſuis Heſychium laudat auctorem"; cf. *adv. Ruſſn.* ii. where the ſtatement is repeated¹, and *praeſ. in Evangelia*, where the reviſion of Heſychius is repreſented as having included both Teſtaments, and his O. T. work is condemned as infelicitous ("nec in V.T. poſt LXX. interpretes emendare quod licuit"); the Heſychian reviſion of the Gospels is cenſured by the *Decretum Gelasii*, which even denounces them as apocryphal ("evangelia quae falſavit Heſychius, apocrypha").

It is not eaſy to aſcertain who this Heſychius was. The moſt conſpicious perſon of that name is the lexicographer, and he has been identified with the reviſer of the Greek Bible². But later reſearches ſhew that Heſychius the lexicographer was a pagan who lived in the ſecond half of the fourth century. The author of the Egyptian reviſion was more probably³ the martyr Biſhop who is mentioned by Eusebius in connexion with Phileas Biſhop of Thmuis, Pachymius, and Theodorus (*H. E.* viii. 13 Φιλίας τε καὶ Ἡσύχιος καὶ Παχύμιος καὶ Θεόδωρος τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοποι). The four names appear together again in a letter addreſſed to Meletius (Routh, *rell. ſacr.* iv. p. 91 ff.); and Eusebius has preſerved a paſtoral written by Phileas in priſon in view of his approaching martyrdom (*H. E.* viii. 10). Phileas was a diſtinguiſhed ſcholar (*H. E.* viii. 9 διαπρέψας . . ἐν . . τοῖς κατὰ φιλοſοφίαν λόγοις, *ib.* 10 τῶν ἐξῶθεν μαθημάτων ἕνεκα πολλοῦ λόγον ἄξιον . . τοῦ ὡς ἀληθῶς φιλοſόφου . . μάρτυρος), and the aſſociation of his name with that of Heſychius ſuggeſts that he may have ſhared in the work of Biblical reviſion. It is pleaſant to think of the two episcopal confeſſors employing their enforced leiſure in their Egyptian priſon by reviſing the Scriptures for the uſe of their flocks, nearly at the ſame time that Pamphilus and Eusebius

¹ Jerome ſpeaks elſewhere (*in Eſa.* lviii. 11) of "exemplaria Alexandria."

² Fabricius-Harles, vii. p. 547 (cf. vi. p. 205).

³ This is however mere conjecture; ſee Harnack-Preuſchen, i. p. 442: "daſſ dieſer Heſychius . . identisch iſt mit dem etwa gleichzeitigen Bibelkritiker gleichen Namens, iſt nicht zu erweiſen."

and Antoninus were working under similar conditions at Caesarea. It is easy to account for the acceptance of the Hesychian revision at Alexandria and in Egypt generally, if it was produced under such circumstances.

To what extent the Hesychian recension of the Old Testament is still accessible in MSS. and versions of the LXX. is uncertain. As far back as 1786 Münter threw out the very natural suggestion that the Egyptian recension might be found in the Egyptian versions. In his great monograph on the Codex Marchalianus Ceriani takes note that in the Prophets, with the exception perhaps of Ezekiel, the original text of that great Egyptian MS. agrees closely with the text presupposed by the Egyptian versions and in the works of Cyril of Alexandria, and that it is supported by the cursive MSS. 26, 106, 198, 306; other cursives of the same type are mentioned by Cornill¹ as yielding an Hesychian text in Ezekiel. For the remaining books of the LXX. we have as yet no published list of MSS. containing a probably Hesychian text, but the investigations now being pursued by the editors of the larger Cambridge LXX. may be expected to yield important help in this direction².

10. Meanwhile the rising school of Antioch was not inactive in the field of Biblical revision. An Antiochian recension of the *κοινή* had in Jerome's time come to be known by the name of its supposed author, the martyr Lucian³.

Hieron. *praef. in Paralip.*: "Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat." Cf. (Ep. cvi.) *ad Sunn. et Fret.* 2 "[ἡ κοινή]...a plerisque nunc Λουκιανός dicitur." Ps.-Athanas. *syn. sacr. script.* ἐβδόμη πάλιν καὶ τελευταία ἐρμηνεία τοῦ ἁγίου Λουκιανοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀσκητοῦ καὶ μάρτυρος, ὅστις καὶ αὐτὸς ταῖς προγεγραμμέναις ἐκδόσεσι καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραϊκοῖς ἐντυχῶν καὶ ἐποπτεύσας μετ' ἀκριβείας τὰ λείποντα ἢ καὶ περιττὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ῥήματα

¹ *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, p. 66 ff.; the Hesychian group in Ezekiel is β5 κλμψ, i.e. codd. 49, 68, 87, 90, 91, 228, 238 (Parsons). See also Ceriani in *Rendiconti* (Feb. 18, 1886).

² For the Octateuch Mr M^cLean (*J. Th. St.* ii. 306) quotes as Hesychian or Egyptian MSS. H.-P. 44, 74, 76, 84, 106, 134, &c.

³ Cf. the scholion in cod. M at 3 Regn. iii. 46 ἐντεῦθεν διαφόρως ἔχει τὰ ἀνατολικά βιβλία. The Lucianic text was also known as the ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἔκδοσις (Oeconomus, iv. 548).

καὶ διορθωσάμενος ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις τῶν γραφῶν τόποις ἐξέδοτο τοῖς χριστιανοῖς ἀδελφοῖς· ἦτις δὴ καὶ ἐρμηνεία μετὰ τὴν ἄθλησιν καὶ μαρτυρίαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀγίου Δουκιανοῦ τὴν γεγонуῖαν ἐπὶ Διοκλητιανοῦ καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τῶν τυράννων, ἤγουν τὸ ἰδιόχειρον αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐκδόσεως βιβλίον, εὐρέθη ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίνου βασιλέως τοῦ μεγάλου παρὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐν τοίχῳ πυργίσκῳ περικεχρισμένῳ κονιάματι εἰς διαφύλαξιν (cf. the Acts of Lucian in Bolland. i. p. 363). Suidas s.v. οὗτος τὰς ἱερὰς βίβλους θεασάμενος πολὺ τὸ νόθον εἰσδεξαμένης, τοῦ γε χρόνου λυμνηαμένου πολλὰ τῶν ἐν αὐταῖς καὶ τῆς συννεχοῦς ἀφ' ἐτέρων εἰς ἕτερα μεταθέσεως...αὐτὸς ἀπάσας ἀναλαβὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊδος ἐπανενέωσατο γλώσσης. Cf. also Cyr. Alex. *in Psalmos p̄raef.*

Lucian, who was born at Samosata, began his studies at Edessa, whence he passed to Antioch at a time when Malchion was master of the Greek School (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 29, Hieron. *de virr. ill.* 71). At Antioch Lucian acquired a great reputation for Biblical learning (Eus. *H. E.* ix. 6 τοῖς ἱεροῖς μαθήμασι συγκεκροτημένος, Suid. s.v. αὐτὴν [sc. τὴν Ἑβραΐδα γλώσσαν] ὡς τὰ μάλιστα ἦν ἠκριβωκῶς). From some cause not clearly explained Lucian was under a cloud for several years between A.D. 270 and 299 (Theodoret¹, *H. E.* i. 3 ἀποσυναγωγὸς ἔμεινε τριῶν ἐπισκόπων πολυετοῦς χρόνου). On his restoration to communion he was associated with Dorotheus, who was a Hebrew scholar, as well as a student of Greek literature (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 32 φιλόκαλος δ' οὗτος περὶ τὰ θεῖα γράμματα καὶ τῆς Ἑβραίων ἐπεμελήθη γλώττης, ὡς καὶ αὐταῖς ταῖς Ἑβραϊκαῖς γραφαῖς ἐπιστημόνως ἐντυγχάνειν· ἦν δὲ οὗτος τῶν μάλιστα ἐλευθερίων, προπαιδείας τε τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνας οὐκ ἄμοιρος). As Pamphilus was assisted by Eusebius, as Phileas and others were probably associated with Hesychius, so (the conjecture may be hazarded) Dorotheus and Lucian worked together at the Antiochian revision of the Greek Bible. If, as Dr Hort thought, "of known names Lucian's has a better claim than any other to be associated with the early Syrian revision of the New Testament²," the

¹ Oeconomus refuses to identify this person with the martyr and saint (iv. p. 498 n.).

² *Introduction to the N. T. in Greek*, p. 138; c. the *Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the N. T.*, p. 29.

Syrian revision of the Old Testament, which called for a knowledge of Hebrew, may have been due more especially to the Hebraist Dorotheus. Lucian, however, has the exclusive credit of the latter, and possibly was the originator of the entire work. If we may believe certain later writers, his revision of the LXX. was on a great scale, and equivalent to a new version of the Hebrew Bible; Pseudo-Athanasius goes so far as to call it the *ἑβδόμη ἑρμηνεία*, placing it on a level with the Greek versions of the Hexapla. But Jerome's identification of 'Lucian' with the *κοινή* presents quite another view of its character and one which is probably nearer to the truth. It was doubtless an attempt to revise the *κοινή* in accordance with the principles of criticism which were accepted at Antioch. In the New Testament (to use the words of Dr Hort) "the qualities which the authors of the Syrian text seem to have most desired to impress on it are lucidity and completeness... both in matter and in diction the Syrian text is conspicuously a full text." If the Lucianic revision of the LXX. was made under the influences which guided the Antiochian revision of the New Testament, we may expect to find the same general principles at work², modified to some extent by the relation of the LXX. to a Hebrew original, and by the circumstance that the Hebrew text current in Syria in the third century A.D. differed considerably from the text which lay before the Alexandrian translators.

We are not left entirely to conjectures. During his work upon the Hexapla³ Field noticed that in an epistle prefixed to the Arabic Syro-Hexaplar⁴, the marginal letter Δ (L) was said

¹ *Introduction*, p. 134 f.

² Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Old Latin and Itala*, p. 91, "Lucian's recension in fact corresponds in a way to the Antiochian text of the N. T. Both are texts composed out of ancient elements welded together and polished down."

³ *Prolegg.* p. lxxxiv. f.

⁴ See c. v.

to indicate Lucianic readings. Turning to the Syro-Hexaplar itself, he found this letter in the margin of 2 Kings (= 4 Regn.) at cc. ix. 9, 28, x. 24, 25, xi. 1, xxiii. 33, 35. But the readings thus marked as Lucianic occur also in the cursive Greek MSS. 19, 82, 93, 108; and further examination shewed that these four MSS. in the Books of Kings, Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehe-miah agree with the text of the LXX. offered by the Antiochian fathers Chrysostom and Theodoret, who might have been expected to cite from 'Lucian.' Similar reasoning led Field to regard codd. 22, 36, 48, 51, 62, 90, 93, 144, 147, 233, 308 as presenting a more or less Lucianic text in the Prophets. Meanwhile, Lagarde had independently¹ reached nearly the same result, so far as regards the historical books. He satisfied himself that codd. 19, 82, 93, 108, 118², had sprung from a common archetype, the text of which was practically identical with that of the LXX. as quoted by Chrysostom, i.e., with the Antiochian text of the fourth century, which presumably was Lucianic. Lagarde proceeded to construct from these and other sources a provisional text of Lucian, but his lamented death intercepted the work, and only the first volume of his Lucianic LXX. has appeared (Genesis—2 Esdr., Esther).

The following specimen will serve to shew the character of Lucian's revision, as edited by Lagarde; an apparatus is added which exhibits the readings of codd. B and A.

3 Regn. xviii. 22—28.

²² καὶ εἶπεν Ἡλίας πρὸς τὸν λαὸν Ἐγὼ ὑπολέλειμμα προφήτης κυρίου, προφήτης μονώτατος, καὶ οἱ προφήται τοῦ Βααλ τετρακόσιοι καὶ πενήκοντα ἄνδρες, καὶ οἱ προφήται τῶν ἀλσῶν τετρακόσιοι. ²³ δότωσαν οὖν ἡμῖν δύο βόας, καὶ ἐκλεξάσθωσαν ἑαυτοῖς τὸν ἓνα καὶ μελισάτωσαν καὶ ἐπιθέτωσαν ἐπὶ ξύλα καὶ πῦρ μὴ ἐπιθέτωσαν· καὶ ἐγὼ ποιήσω τὸν βοῦν τὸν ἄλλον, καὶ πῦρ οὐ μὴ ἐπιθῶ. ²⁴ καὶ βοᾶτε ἐν ὀνόματι θεῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπικαλέσομαι ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου τοῦ

¹ Cf. his *Prolegomena to Librorum V. T. Canon*. Pars prior graece (Gotting. 1883), p. xiv.

² Or, as he denotes them, *h, f, m, d, p*.

θεοῦ μου, καὶ ἔσται ὁ θεὸς ὃς ἂν ἐπακούσῃ σήμερον ἐν πυρί, οὗτός ἐστι θεός. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ εἶπεν Ἄγαθος ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησας. ²⁵ καὶ εἶπεν Ἥλιος τοῖς προφήταις τῆς αἰσχύνῃς Ἐκλέξασθε ἑαυτοὺς τὸν βοῦν τὸν ἕνα, ὅτι ὑμεῖς πολλοί, καὶ ποιήσατε πρῶτοι, καὶ ἐπικαλείσθε ἐν ὀνόματι θεῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ πῦρ μὴ ἐπιθῆτε. ²⁶ καὶ ἔλαβον τὸν βοῦν καὶ ἐποίησαν, καὶ ἐπεκαλοῦντο ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Βααλ καὶ εἶπον Ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν, ὁ Βααλ, ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν. καὶ οὐκ ἦν φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἀκρόασις. καὶ διέτρεχον ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου οὐδ' ἐποίησαν. ²⁷ καὶ ἐγένετο μεσημβρία, καὶ ἐμκλήρισεν αὐτοὺς Ἥλιος ὁ Θεσβίτης καὶ προσέθετο λέγων Ἐπικαλείσθε ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλη ἅμα, μήποτε ἀδολεσχία τις ἔστιν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἅμα μήποτε χρηματίζει αὐτὸς ἢ μήποτε καθεύδει, καὶ ἐξαναστήσεται. ²⁸ καὶ ἐπεκαλοῦντο ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ κατετέμνοντο κατὰ τὸν ἐθισμόν αὐτῶν ἐν μαχαίραις καὶ ἐν σειρομάσταις ἕως ἐκχύσεως αἵματος ἐπ' αὐτούς.

22 Ηλειου BA | κυριου] ρι του BA | om προφητης 2⁰ BA | οι προφηται 2⁰] om οι A | του αλσους BA | om τετρακοσιοι 2⁰ A
 23 om ουν BA | om και επιθ. επι ξυλα A | ξυλα] των ξυλων B | τὸν αλλον]+ και δωσω επι τα ξυλα A 24 θεων] θεου A | εαν BA | om σημερον BA | om εστι BA | απεκριθησαν BA | ειπον B ειπαν A | αγαθος ο λογος ον] καλον το ρημα ο BA 25 Ηλειου BA | βουν] μοσχον BA | και ποι. πρωτοι οτι πολλοι υμεις BA | επικαλεσασθε B | θεων] θεου BA 26 ελαβεν A | βουν] μοσχον BA + ον εδωκεν αυτοις A | Βααλ 1⁰]+ εκ πρωιθεν εως μεσημβριας BA 27 Ηλειου BA | προσεθετο λεγων] ειπεν BA | αμα] οτι θεος εστιν BA | μηποτε 1⁰] οτι BA | τις εστιν αυτω] αυτω εστιν BA | καθευδει]+αυτος BA 28 κατα τον εθισμον αυτων] om B κατα το κριμα αυτων A | μαχαυρα B | om εν 3⁰ B

A comparison of 'Lucian' in this passage with the two great uncials of the LXX. reveals two classes of variants in the former. (1) Some of the changes appear to be due to a desire to render the version smoother or fuller, e.g. Ἥλιος for Ἡλειού, the repetition of προφήτης before μονώτατος, the substitution of τῶν ἀλσῶν for τοῦ ἄλσους, of ἀπεκρίθη for ἀπεκρίθησαν, and of ἀγαθὸς ὁ λόγος for καλὸν τὸ ῥῆμα, and the addition of σήμερον. (2) Others seem to indicate an attempt to get nearer to the Hebrew, e.g. δότωσαν οὖν (דָּוָוּ), βοῦν (בָּוּן); or an adherence to an older reading which the Hexaplaric LXX. had set aside, e.g. the omission of ὃν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς¹ and ἐκ πρωιθεν ἕως μεσημβρίας. On the other hand Lucian follows the current Hebrew in κατὰ τὸν ἐθισμόν αὐτῶν, though he substitutes the easier ἐθισμός for Aquila's κρίμα, which cod. A has taken over from the Hexapla.

Professor Driver, as the result of a wider examination, points out² that the Lucianic recension is distinguished by (1) the sub-

¹ A Hexaplaric reading due to Aquila; see Field *ad loc.*

² *Notes on the Heb. text of the Books of Samuel*, p. li. f.

stitution of synonyms for the words employed by the LXX.; (2) the occurrence of double renderings; (3) the occurrence of renderings "which presuppose a Hebrew original self-evidently superior in the passages concerned to the existing Massoretic text." The last of these peculiarities renders it of great importance for the criticism of the Hebrew Bible.

Lucian suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia under Maximin in the year 311 or 312¹. According to the Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis, his recension of the LXX. was subsequently discovered at Nicomedia, bricked up in a wall. The story may have arisen from a desire to invest the *ἑβδόμη* (as 'Lucian' is called by the author of the Synopsis) with the same air of romance that belonged to the *Quinta* and *Sexta*, both of which were found, as he asserts, *ἐν πύθοις*. It is more probable that copies were circulated from Antioch in the ordinary way, and that some of these after the persecution reached Nicomedia and Constantinople. The name of Lucian would be enough to guarantee the general acceptance of the work. He died in the peace of the Church, and a martyr; on the other hand his name was in high repute with the Arian leaders, who boasted of being *συλλουκιανισταί*². Moreover, a revision which emanated from Antioch, the "ecclesiastical parent of Constantinople³," would naturally take root in the soil of the Greek East. In all dioceses which felt the influences of those two great sees, the Lucianic LXX. doubtless furnished during the fourth and fifth centuries the prevalent text of the Greek Old Testament⁴.

11. The result of these multiplied labours of Christian scholars upon the text of the LXX. was not altogether satisfactory. Before the time of Jerome much of the original text of the Alexandrian Bible had disappeared. Men read their Old Testament in the recension of Lucian, if they lived in North Syria, Asia Minor, or Greece; in that of Hesychius, if they belonged

¹ Mason, *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 324.

² Newman, *Arians*, p. 6 f.; Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 31 n.

³ Hort, *Introd.* p. 143.

⁴ On Lucian's work see the art. *Lucianic Recension of the LXX.* in *Ch. Q. R.* (Jan. 1901); E. Hautsch, *Der Lukiantext des Oktateuch* (in *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta Unternehmens*, Heft i., Berlin, 1910.

to the Delta or the valley of the Nile; in Origen's Hexaplaric edition, if they were residents at Jerusalem or Caesarea. Thus, as the scholar of Bethlehem complains, the Christian world was divided between three opposing texts ("totus...orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat¹"). To Jerome, as a Palestinian and an admirer of Origen's critical principles, the remedy was simple; the Hexaplaric text, which had been assimilated to the *Hebraica veritas*, ought everywhere to take the place of the *κωνή* represented by Hesychius or Lucian. Fortunately the task was beyond his strength, and MSS. and versions still survive which represent more or less fully the three recensions of the fourth century. But the *trifaria varietas* did not continue to perplex the Church; a fusion of texts arose which affected the greater part of the copies in varying proportions. No one of the rival recensions became dominant and traditional, as in the case of the New Testament²; among the later MSS. groups may be discerned which answer more or less certainly to this recension or to that, but the greater number of the cursives present a text which appears to be the result of mixture rather than of any conscious attempt to decide between the contending types.

¹ *Praef. in Paralipp.*

² Cf. Hort, *Introd.* p. 142.

CHAPTER IV.

ANCIENT VERSIONS BASED UPON THE SEPTUAGINT.

THE Christian Churches of Greek-speaking countries throughout the Empire read the Old Testament in the Alexandrian Version. Few of the provinces were wholly non-Hellenic; Greek was spoken not only in Egypt and Cyrenaica, in Western Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Achaia, but to a great extent in the West, in Italy and at Rome. Roman satirists of the first century complained that the capital had become a Greek city; the upper classes acquired Greek; the freedmen and slaves in many cases spoke it as their mother tongue¹. Official letters addressed to the Roman Church or proceeding from her during the first two centuries were written in Greek; only three or at the most four of the Bishops of Rome during the same period bear Latin names¹. In Gaul the Greek tongue had spread up the valley of the Rhone from Marseilles to Vienne and Lyons; the Viennese confessors of A.D. 177 used it in their correspondence both with the Roman Bishops and with their brethren in Asia Minor; the Bishop of Lyons wrote in the same language his great work against the false *gnosis* of the age. The Old Testament as known to Clement of Rome and Irenaeus of Lyons is substantially the Greek version of

¹ The evidence is collected by Caspari, *Quellen zur Gesch. d. Tauf-symbols*, iii. 267 f., and summarised by Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. lii. ff.

the Seventy. To the Church of North Africa, on the other hand, the Greek Bible was a sealed book; for Carthage, colonised from Rome before the capital had been flooded by Greek residents, retained the Latin tongue as the language of common life. It was at Carthage, probably, that the earliest daughter-version of the Septuagint, the Old Latin Bible, first saw the light¹; certainly it is there that the oldest form of the Old Latin Bible first meets us in the writings of Cyprian. Other versions followed as the result of missionary enterprise; and to this latter source we owe the translations of the Old Testament which were made between the second century and the ninth into Egyptian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Gothic, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic. All these versions rest either wholly or in part upon the Septuagint, and therefore possess a special interest for the student of the Greek Bible. One other group has a claim upon his consideration. The earliest of the Syriac versions of the Old Testament is on the whole a translation from the Hebrew, but it shews the influence of the Septuagint in certain books. The rest, which belong to post-Nicene times, are based directly upon the Alexandrian Greek, and one of them forms the most important of extant witnesses to the text of the Hexaplaric recension.

I. LATIN VERSIONS FROM THE SEPTUAGINT.

(1) The Latin Bible before Jerome.

With the exception of Jerome himself, our earliest authority upon the origin of the Old Latin Bible is Augustine of Hippo, and it may be well to begin by collecting his statements upon the subject.

¹ On the other hand reasons have been produced for suspecting that the Latin version had its origin at Antioch; see *Guardian*, May 25, 1892, p. 786 ff., and Dr H. A. A. Kennedy in *Hastings' D. B.* iii p. 54 ff. [This chapter was already in type when Dr Kennedy's article came into my hands. I regret that for this reason I have been unable to make full use of his exhaustive treatment of the Latin versions.]

Aug. *de civ. Dei* xviii. 43 ex hac LXX. interpretatione etiam in Latinam linguam interpretatum est quod ecclesiae Latinae tenent. *De doctr. Christ.* ii. 16 [after a reference to the "Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas"] "qui enim scripturas ex Hebraea lingua in Graecam verterunt, numerari possunt, Latini interpretes nullo modo; ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Graecus et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur ausus est interpretari." *Ib.* 22: "in ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala ceteris praeferatur." *Ep.* ii. 82 (*ad Hieronymum*): "ideo autem desidero interpretationem tuam de LXX. ut... tanta Latinorum interpretum qui qualescunque hoc ausi sunt quantum possumus imperitia careamus."

This is African testimony, but it belongs to the end of the fourth century, and needs to be verified before it can be unhesitatingly received. Many of the discrepancies to which Augustine refers may be due to the carelessness or officiousness of correctors or transcribers; if, as Jerome tells us, there were towards the end of the fourth century as many types of text as there were MSS. of the Latin Bible ("tot exemplaria quot codices"), it is clearly out of the question to ascribe each of these to a separate translator. A few specimens, taken from Cyprian and extant MSS. of the O. L., will enable the student to form some idea of the extent to which these differences are found in extant texts¹.

Genesis xlviii. 17 f.

CYPRIAN, *testimonia* i. 21².

LYONS MS.

¹⁷ubi vidit autem Ioseph quoniam superposuit pater suus manum dexteram super caput Effraim, grave illi visum est, et adprehendit Ioseph manum patris sui auferre eam a capite Effraim ad caput Manasse. ¹⁸dixit autem Ioseph ad patrem suum Non sic, pater; hic est primitivus meus; superpone dexteram tuam super caput suum.

¹⁷videns autem Ioseph quod misisset pater ipsius dexteram suam super caput Ephrem, grave ei visum est, et adprehendit Ioseph manum patris sui ut auferret eam a capite Ephrem super caput Manassis. ¹⁸dixit autem Ioseph patri suo Non sicut, pater; hic enim primitivus est; impone dextram tuam super caput huius.

¹ To facilitate comparison obvious errors of the MSS. and orthographical peculiarities have been removed.

² On the MSS. of the *Testimonia* cf. *O. L. Texts*, ii. p. 123 ff.

Exod. xxxii. 21—24.

LYONS MS

²¹et dixit Moyses ad Aron Quid fecit tibi populus hic quia induxisti super eos peccatum magnum? ²²et dixit Aron ad Moysen Noli irasci, domine; tu enim scis impetum populi huius. ²³dixerunt enim mihi Fac nobis deos qui praeceant nos; nam Moyses hic homo qui eduxit nos de Aegypto, nescimus quid factum sit ei. ²⁴et dixi eis Quicumque habet aurum demat sibi. et dederunt mihi, et misi illud in ignem, et exiit vitulus.

WÜRZBURG
FRAGMENTS.

²¹et dixit Moyses ad Aron Quid fecit populus hic quia induxisti super eos peccatum magnum? ²²et dixit Aron ad Moysen Noli irasci, domine; tu enim scis impetum populi huius. ²³dixerunt enim mihi Fac nobis deos qui praecedant nos; nam Moyses hic homo qui eduxit nos ex terra Aegypti, nescimus quid factum sit ei. ²⁴et dixi illis Quicumque habet aurum, demat; et dempserunt*, et dederunt mihi, et misi illud in ignem, et exiit vitulus.

* cod. *demiserunt*MUNICH
FRAGMENTS.

²¹et dixit Moyses ad Aron Quid fecit tibi populus hic quoniam immisisti eis delictum maximum? ²²et dixit Aron ad Moysen Ne irascaris, domine; tu enim scis impetum populi huius impetum. ²³dixerunt enim mihi Fac nobis deos qui praecedant nos; Moyses enim hic homo qui nos eiecit de terra Aegypti, nescimus quid acciderit ei. ²⁴et dixi eis Si qui habet aurum† tollat ad me; et dederunt mihi, et proieci in ignem, et exivit vitulus.

† hiat cod.

Leviticus iv. 27—29.

LYONS MS.

²⁷si autem anima deliquerit imprudenter de populo terrae in faciendo vel unum ex omnibus praeceptis Dei quod non faciet, et neglexerit, ²⁸et cognitum ei fuerit delictum in quo deliquit* in eo, et adferet † primitivum de ovibus feminum immaculatum quod deliquit; ²⁹et imponet manum supra caput eius et occident primitivum delicti in loco in quo occidunt holocausta.

* cod. *delinquit* † cod. *adfert*

WÜRZBURG FRAGMENTS.

²⁷si autem anima una deliquerit invita de populo in terra eo quod fecit unum ab omnibus praeceptis Domini, quod fieri non debet, et neglexerit, ²⁸et cognitum fuerit peccatum eius quod peccavit in ipso, et adferet hedillam de capris feminam sine vitio propter delictum quod deliquit; ²⁹et superponet manum super caput delicti sui et victimabunt hedillam quae est delicti in loco ubi victimabunt holocausta.

Micah v. 2.

CYPRIAN, *testimonia* ii. 12.

et tu, Bethleem, domus illius Ephratha, num exigua es ut constitueris in milibus Iuda? ex te mihi procedet ut sit princeps apud Israel, et processiones eius a principio, a diebus saeculi.

WEINGARTEN FRAGMENTS.

et tu, Be[thleem,] domus [habita]tionis¹ Efra[ta, nu[mquid] mini[ma es] ut sis [in milibus] Iuda? [ex te mi]hi pro[diet qui] sit prin[ceps in] Istra[hel, et eg]ressus ip[sius ab] initi[o, ex diebus] saec[uli].

Isaiah xxix. 11, 18.

CYPRIAN, *testimonia* i. 4.

"et erunt vobis hi omnes sermones sicut sermones libri qui signatus est, quem si dederis homini scienti litteras ad legendum dicit Non possum legere, signatus est enim...¹⁸sed in illa die audient surdi sermones libri, et qui in tenebris et qui in nebula sunt; oculi caecorum videbunt.

WÜRZBURG FRAGMENTS.

"et erunt verba haec omnia sicut verba libri huius signati, quem si dederint homini scienti litteras dicentes ex lege haec, et dicit Non possum legere, signatum est enim...¹⁸et audient in die illa surdi verba libri, et qui in tenebris et qui in nebula; oculi caecorum videbunt.

It is clearly unsafe to generalise from a few specimens, but the student will not fail to observe that the variations in these extracts may, perhaps without exception, be attributed either to the ordinary accidents of transcription or to the recensions of the original text. In the case of the New Testament Dr Hort² held that there was "some justification for the alternative view that Italy had an indigenous version of her own, not less original than the African," and where both types of text existed, he distinguished them by the designations 'African Latin' and 'European Latin,' applying the term 'Italian'³ to later revisions of the European text. The classification of the Old Latin authorities for the O. T. is less advanced, and owing to the fragmentary character of most of

¹ Burkitt (*O. L. and Itala*, p. 93) proposes *rejectionis*.

² *Introduction*, p. 78 ff. Cf. Westcott, *Canon*, p. 252 ff.; Wordsworth, *O. L. Biblical Texts*, i., p. xxx. ff.

³ On Augustine's use of this term see F. C. Burkitt, *O. L. and Itala*, p. 55 ff.

the MSS. it is more difficult ; but we may assume that it will proceed on the same general lines, and that the pre-Hieronymian types of text in the Old Testament as in the New will be found to be mainly two, i.e. the African, and the European, with a possible sub-division of the latter class¹. In pursuing this enquiry use must be made not only of the surviving fragments of O. L. MSS., but of the numerous quotations of the Latin versions which occur in writings anterior to the final triumph of the Vulgate. As Dr Hort has pointed out², certain of the Latin fathers "constitute a not less important province of Old Latin evidence than the extant MSS., not only furnishing landmarks for the investigation of the history of the version, but preserving numerous verses and passages in texts belonging to various ages and in various stages of modification." These patristic materials were collected with great care and fulness by Sabatier (*Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae... opera et studio D. Petri Sabatier O. S. B.*, Reims, 1743, '49, Paris, 1751 ; vols. i. ii. contain the O. T.) ; but after the lapse of a century and a half his quotations can no longer be accepted without being compared with more recent editions of the Latin fathers³, and they often need to be supplemented from sources which were not at his command⁴.

These researches are important to the student of the Septuagint in so far as they throw light on the condition of the Greek text in the second and third centuries after Christ. The Latin translation of the Old Testament which is largely quoted by Cyprian was probably made in the second century, and certainly represents the text of MSS. earlier than

¹ Cf. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 6 ; Kennedy, in Hastings' *D. B.* p. 58 ff.

² *Introduction*, p. 83.

³ For this purpose the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* is the best collection available ; but it is still far from complete.

⁴ A revised Sabatier is promised by the Munich Academy (*Archiv*, viii. 2, p. 311 ff.).

the time of Origen. What Mr Burkitt has pointed out¹ in reference to the prophetic books is doubtless true in general; "no...passage [to which the asterisk is prefixed in Hexaplaric MSS.] is found in any form of the African Latin." Thus, as he remarks, "the Old Latin brings us the best independent proof we have that the Hexaplar signs introduced by Origen can be relied on for the reconstruction of the LXX." Again, M. Berger² has called attention to the prominence of Lucianic readings in certain Old Latin texts; and the fact that a Lucianic element is widely distributed in Old Latin MSS. and quotations has also been recognised by Vercellone³ and Ceriani⁴. This element is found even in the African text⁵, and its occurrence there suggests that the Antiochian recension, though it was made at the beginning of the fourth century, has preserved ancient readings which existed also in the African copies of the LXX., though they found no place in our oldest codices.

We proceed to give a list of the extant remains of the Old Latin Version of the LXX., and the editions in which they are accessible.

OLD LATIN FRAGMENTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

i. PENTATEUCH.

Cod. Lugdunensis, vi. (Ulysse Robert, *Pentateuchi e Codice Lugdunensi versio Latina antiquissima*, Paris, 1881; *Librorum Leviticis et Numerorum versio antiqua Itala e cod. perantiquo in bibliotheca Ashburnhamiensi conservato*, London, 1868; Delisle, *Découverte d'une très ancienne version latine de deux livres de la Bible* in the *Journal des Savants*, Nov. 1895, p. 702 ff.; U. Robert, *Heptateuchi partis post. versio Lat. antiquissima e cod. Lugd.*, Lyons, 1900⁶).

¹ *Rules of Tyconius*, p. cxvi. f.

² *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 6. Cf. Driver, *Samuel*, p. lxxvii. f.

³ *Variae lectiones*, ii., p. 426.

⁴ *Monumenta sacra et profana*, I. i., p. xvi.; *Le recension dei LXX e la versione latina detta Itala* (*Rendiconti*, Feb. 18, 1886). See also Driver, *Notes on Samuel*, p. lxxviii. f.; Kennedy, in *Hastings' D.B.*, l.c.; Nestle, *Einführung*², pp. 148 note, 280 [E. Tr., p. 182 f.]; Wordsworth-White. p. 654.

⁵ Burkitt, *Rules of Tyconius*, p. cxvii.

⁶ Cf. N. McLean in *J. Th. St.* ii. 305 ff.

Containing Gen. xvi. 9—xvii. 18, xix. 5—29, xxvi. 33—xxxiii. 15, xxxvii. 7—xxxviii. 22, xlii. 36—l. 26; Exod. i. 1—vii. 19, xxi. 9—36, xxv. 25—xxvi. 13, xxvii. 6—xl. 32; Leviticus¹ i. 1—xviii. 30, xxv. 16—xxvii. 34; Numbers¹; Deuteronomy².

Fragmenta Wirceburgensia palimpsesta, ? vi. (E. Ranke, *Palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium*³, Vienna, 1871).

Containing Gen. xxxvi. 2—7, 14—24, xl. 12—20, xli. 4—5; Exod. xxii. 7—28, xxv. 30—xxvi. 12, xxxii. 15—33, xxxiii. 13—27, xxxv. 13—xxxvi. 1, xxxix. 2—xl. 30; Lev. iv. 23—vi. 1, vii. 2, 11, 16—17, 22—27, viii. 1—3, 6—13, xi. 7—9, 12—15, 22—25, 27—47, xvii. 14—xviii. 21, xix. 31—xx. 3, xx. 12, 20—xxi. 2, xxii. 19—29; Deut. xxviii. 42—53, xxxi. 11—26.

Fragmenta Monacensia, v.—vi. (L. Ziegler, *Bruchstücke einer vorhieronymianischen Übersetzung des Pentateuchs*, Munich, 1883).

Containing Exod. ix. 15—x. 24, xii. 28—xiv. 4, xvi. 10—xx. 5, xxxi. 15—xxxiii. 7, xxxvi. 13—xl. 32; Lev. iii. 17—iv. 25, xi. 12—xiii. 6, xiv. 17—xv. 10, xviii. 18—xx. 3; Num. iii. 34—iv. 8, iv. 31—v. 8, vii. 37—73, xi. 20—xii. 14, xxix. 6—xxx. 3, xxxi. 14—xxxv. 6, xxxvi. 4—13; Deut. viii. 19—x. 12, xxii. 7—xxiii. 4, xxviii. 1—31, xxx. 16—xxxii. 29.

Lectiones ap. Cod. Ottobonian., viii. (C. Vercellone, *variae lectiones*, Rome, 1860, i. p. 183 ff.).

Containing Gen. xxxvii. 27—35, xxxviii. 6—14, xli. 1—4, 14—20, xlvi. 15—20, xlviii. 13, 20—22, xlix. 11—32, l. 1—25; Exod. x. 13—14, xi. 7—10, xvi. 16—36, xvii. 1—10, xxiii. 12—30, xxiv. 1—18, xxv. 1—37, xxvi. 1—27, xxvii. 1—5.

Fragmenta Philonea (F. C. Conybeare, in *Expositor* IV. iv. p. 63 ff.).

Consisting of Gen. xxv. 20—xxviii. 8 in a Latin version of Philo, *quaest.*

Fragmenta Vindobonensia (J. Belsheim, *Palimpsestus Vindob.*, 1885).

Containing Gen. xii. 17—xiii. 14, xv. 2—12.

¹ Leviticus and Numbers formed until recently a separate codex, see Robert, p. vi. f.

² Deut. xi. 4—xxxiv. 12 belongs to the fragment announced by Delisle and published by Robert in 1900.

³ Belonging to the Library of the University of Würzburg.

ii. HISTORICAL BOOKS.

Joshua, Judges i. 1—xx. 31.

Cod. Lugdunensis (in the portion published by Robert in 1900).

Ruth.

Cod. Complutensis, ix., Madrid, Univ. Libr. (S. Berger in *Notices et Extraits*, xxxiv. 2, p. 119 ff.).

1—4 Regn.

Fragments of Corbie and St Germain MSS. (Sabatier); fragments from a Verona MS. and a Vatican MS. in Bianchini (*Vindiciae*, p. cccxli. ff.), from a Vienna MS. in Haupt's *vet. antehieron. vers. fragmenta Vindobonensia*, 1877, from an Einsiedeln MS. in *Notices et Extraits* xxxiv. 2, p. 127 ff., and from leaves found at Magdeburg and Quedlinburg¹ printed by W. Schum, 1876, Weissbrodt, 1887, and A. Düning, 1888. Fragments of 2 Regn. at Vienna published by J. Haupt, 1877. A Vienna palimpsest containing considerable fragments of 1—2 Regn. (J. Belsheim, *Palimpsestus Vind.*, 1885). Readings from the margin of Cod. Goth. Legionensis² printed by C. Vercellone, ii. p. 179 ff.; cf. *Archiv*, viii. 2. (The Verona and Vatican fragments should perhaps be classed as Vulgate.)

1 Esdras.

An O. L. text is to be found in the Paris MS. Bibl. Nat. lat. 111, the Madrid MS. E. R. 8, and another in a Lucca MS. ap. Lagarde, *Septuagintastudien*, 1892.

Judith, Tobit.

Cod. Complutensis.

Cod. Goth. Legionensis.

Cod. Vatic. regin. (Bianchini, *Vindiciae*, p. cccl. f.; Tobit only).

O. L. texts are also to be found in the Paris MSS. Bibl. Nat. lat. 6, 93, 161 (Tobit), 11505, 11549 (Judith), 11553, in the Munich MS. 6239, the Milan MS. Amb. E 26 infr. (Tobit), and the Oxford MS. Bodl. auct. E. infr. 2 (Judith). See *Notices et Extraits* xxxiv. 2, p. 142 ff. Of these texts some were printed by Sabatier, and Munich 6239 is in Belsheim's *Libr. Tobiae*, &c. (1893).

Esther.

Cod. Pechianus (Sabatier).

Cod. Vallicellanus (Bianchini, *Vindiciae*, p. ccxciv. ff.).

¹ See V. Schultze, *die Quedlinburger Itala-Miniaturen der k. Bibliothek in Berlin* (Munich, 1898).

² On these see Berger, *Hist. de la Vulgate*, p. 18 f., and the caution in *O. L. and Itala*, p. 9 f.

Cod. Complutensis (see above under Ruth).

An O. L. text of Esther is found also in the Paris MS. Bibl. Nat. lat. 11549 (= Corb. 7), the Lyons MS. 356, the Munich MSS. 6225, 6239, the Monte Casino MS. 35 (*Biblioth. Casin. i.*, 1873), the Milan MS. Amb. E. 26 infr. (see S. Berger *op. cit.*).

I, 2 Maccabees.

O. L. texts are to be found in the Paris MS. Bibl. Nat. lat. 11553 (Sabatier) and the Milan MS. Amb. E. 26 inf. (A. Peyron, *Cic. fragmm. i.* 70 ff. (1824).

(See Berger, *op. cit.*)

• Psalms.

iii. POETICAL BOOKS.

Cod. Veronensis (in Bianchini).

Cod. Sangermanensis (in Sabatier).

A Reichenau palimpsest described by Mone, *l. u. gr. Messen*, p. 40.

Fragments of the $\phi\delta\alpha\iota$ edited by F. F. Fleck (Leipzig, 1837), and L. F. Hamann (Jena, 1874).

Job.

Fragment. Floriacense (Sabatier). Containing c. xl. 3—9.

Readings from the margin of Cod. Goth. Legionensis (*Notices et Extraits*, p. 111 ff.).

Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles.

Readings in a St Gallen MS., see *Notices et Extraits*, p. 137 ff. Fragments published by Sabatier, Vogel, Mone, Berger (Hastings' *D. B.* iii. p. 50).

Wisdom, Sirach.

See Lagarde, *Mittheilungen i.* (Göttingen, 1884). C. Donais, *Une ancienne Version latine de l'Écclésiastique* (Paris, 1895).

iv. PROPHETS.

Fragmenta Wirceburgensia, vi. (?) (E. Ranke, *Par palimp. Wirceb.* p. 49 sqq.).

Containing Hos. i. 1—ii. 13, iv. 13—vii. 1; Jon. iii. 10—iv. 11; Isa. xxix. 1—xxx. 6, xlv. 20—xlvi. 11; Jer. xii. 12—xiii. 12, xiv. 15—xvii. 10, xviii. 16—xxiii. 39, xxxv. 15—19, xxxvi. 2—xxxvii. 11, xxxviii. 23—xl. 5, xli. 1—17; Lam. ii. 16—iii. 40; Ezek. xxiv. 4—21, xxvi. 10—xxvii. 4, xxxiv. 16—xxxv. 5, xxxvii. 19—28, xxxviii. 8—20, xl. 3—xlii. 18, xlv. 1—xlvi. 9, xlvi. 28—35; Dan. i. 2—ii. 9, iii. 15—(26), viii. 5—ix. 10, x. 3—xi. 4, 20—42, and Bel.

Fragmenta Fuldensia, v. (E. Ranke, *Fragm. versionis ante-Hieronymianae*, Marburg, 1868).

Containing Hos. vii. 6—ix. 1, Amos viii. 1—ix. 1, ix. 5—9, Mic. ii. 3—iii. 3.

Fragmenta Weingartensia, v. (E. Ranke, *Fragm. v. ante-H.*, Vienna, 1868; P. Corssen, *Zwei neue Fragmente d. Weingartener Prophetenhandschrift*, Berlin, 1899).

Containing Hos. iv. 13 f., v. 5, 7, vii. 16, viii. 1—6, 13 f., ix. 1—17, xii. 3, 7, 9, 12, xiii. 1, 3—xiv. 2; Amos v. 24—vi. 8; Mic. i. 5—iii. 3, iv. 3—vii. 20; Joel i. 1—14, ii. 3—5, iv. 2—4, 15—17; Jon. i. 14—iv. 8; Ezek. xvi. 52—xvii. 6, 19—xviii. 9, xxiv. 25—xxv. 14, xxvi. 10—xxvii. 7, 17—19, xxviii. 1—17, xxxiii. 7—11, xlii. 5, 6, 14, xliii. 22—xliv. 5, 19—xlv. 2, xlvi. 9—23, xlvii. 2—15, xlviii. 22—30; Dan. ii. 18—33, ix. 25—x. 11, xi. 18—23.

Fragmenta Stutgardiana (E. Ranke, *Antiquissima V. T. versionis Latinae fragmenta*, Marburg, 1888).

Containing Amos vii. 13—viii. 10; Ezek. xviii. 9—17, xx. 18—21, xxvii. 7—17, xxxiii. 26—30, xxxiv. 6—12; Dan. xi. 35—39.

Fragmenta monast. S. Pauli Carinthiaci (A. Vogel, *Beiträge zur Herstellung der A. L. Bibelübersetzung*, Vienna, 1868).

Containing Ezek. xlii. 5, 6, 14, xliv. 19—xlv. 2, xlvi. 9—23, xlvii. 2—15.

Fragmenta palimpsesta Vaticana (F. Gustafsson, *Fragmenta V. T. in Latinum conversi a palimpsesto Vaticano eruta*, Helsingfors, 1881)¹.

Containing Hosea iv. 6, 7; Joel ii. 5—7; Amos v. 16—18, vii. 2—7, ix. 5—8; Jon. iii. 7—iv. 2; Hab. i. 16—ii. 3; Zeph. iii. 13—20; Zech. vii. 11—14, viii. 16—21.

Fragmenta palimpsesta Sangallensia (F. C. Burkitt, *O. L. and Itala*, Camb. 1896).

Containing Jer. xvii. 10—17, xxix. 13—19.

Codex Vallicellanus B. vii. (Bianchini, *Vindiciae*, p. ccxiii.).

Containing Baruch.

O. L. texts of Baruch are also to be found in the Paris MSS. Bibl. Nat. lat. 11, 161, 11951, and Arsenal. 65, 70; and in the Monte Casino MS. 35, and the Reims MS. 1.

Copious extracts from most of the books of the O. L. Bible are given in the anonymous *Liber de divinis scripturis sive Speculum*, wrongly attributed to St Augustine (ed. F. Wehrich in the Vienna *Corpus*, vol. xii.). Two other patristic collections of O. L. excerpts may also be mentioned here—the *Testimonia* of St Cyprian (ed. Hartel, *Corpus*, vol. iii. 1), and the *liber regularum Tyconii* (ed. F. C. Burkitt, in *Texts and Studies*, iii. 1). See also the *Collatio Carthaginiensis* printed in Dupin's *Optatus* (Paris, 1700), p. 379 ff.

¹ These fragments, as I am informed by Dr W. O. E. Oesterley, contain an almost purely Vulgate text, and should perhaps disappear from this list.

(2) Latin versions of the LXX. revised or taken over by Jerome.

The great Pannonian scholar, Eusebius Hieronymus (A.D. 329—420), began his “useful labours¹” upon the Old Testament at Rome about the year 383, probably (as in the case of his revision of the Gospels) at the suggestion of the Roman Bishop Damasus († 384). His first attempt was limited to a revision of the Latin Psalter and conducted on lines which afterwards seemed to him inadequate. A few years later—but before 390—1, when he began to translate from the Hebrew—a fresh revision of the Psalter from the LXX. was undertaken at the desire of Paula and Eustochium; its immediate purpose was to remove errors which had already found their way into the copies of the earlier work, but the opportunity was seized of remodelling the Latin Psalter after the example of the Hexapla.

Praef. in libr. Psalmorum: “psalterium Romae dudum positum emendaram et iuxta LXX. interpretes, licet cursim, magna illud ex parte correxeram. quod quia rursus videtis, o Paula et Eustochium, scriptorum vitio depravatum, plusque antiquum errorem quam novam emendationem valere, cogitis ut...renascentes spinas eradicem.....notet sibi unusquisque vel iacentem lineam vel signa radiantia, id est vel obelos (÷) vel asteriscos (*); et ubicunque viderit virgulam praecedentem (÷), ab ea usque ad duo puncta (:); quae impressimus, sciat in LXX. translatoribus plus haberi; ubi autem stellae (*) similitudinem perspexerit, de Hebraeis voluminibus additum noverit aequae usque ad duo puncta, iuxta Theodotionis dumtaxat editionem qui simplicitate sermonis a LXX. interpretibus non discordat.”

These two revised Latin Psalters were afterwards known as *Psalterium Romanum* and *Psalterium Gallicanum* respectively. Both recensions established themselves in the use of the Latin Church², the former in the *cursus psallendi*, the latter in the *bibliotheca* or Church Bible. At length Pius V. († 1572)

¹ Aug. *ep.* 82 (*ad Hieronymum*): “hi qui me invidere putant utilibus laboribus tuis.”

² Cf. *adv. Rufin.* ii. 30 “psalterium...certe emendatissimum iuxta LXX. interpretes nostro labore dudum Roma suscepit”; where, as Westcott says (Smith’s *D. B.* iii. 1698 n.), he seems to include both revisions.

ordered the Gallican Psalter to be sung in the daily offices, an exception being made in favour of St Peter's at Rome, St Mark's at Venice, and the churches of the Archdiocese of Milan, which retained the 'Roman' Psalter'. In MSS. of the Vulgate a triple Psalter not infrequently appears, shewing Jerome's two Septuagintal revisions side by side with the *Psalterium Hebraicum*, his later translation from the Hebrew; but the 'Hebrew' Psalter never succeeded in displacing the Hieronymian revisions of the Old Latin, and the Latin Church still sings and reads a version of the Psalms which is based on the Septuagint. The liturgical Psalter of the Anglican Church "followeth...the Translation of the Great English Bible, set forth and used in the time of King *Henry* the Eighth, and *Edward* the Sixth"; i.e. it is based on Coverdale's version, which was "translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe"; and many of its peculiarities may be traced to the LXX. through the Gallican Psalter incorporated in the Vulgate².

The following specimen (Ps. lxxvii.=lxxviii. 12—14, 18—22) will enable the reader to form an idea of the relation between Jerome's two revisions of the Old Latin and his 'Hebrew'³ Psalter.

ROMAN.	GALLICAN.	HEBREW.
<p>¹²Dominus dabit verbum evangelizantibus virtute multa; ¹³rex virtutum dilecti, et speciei domus dividere spolia. ¹⁴si dormiatis in medios cleros, pennae columbae deargentatae, et posteriora dorsi eius in specie auri. [<i>diapsalma</i>].....¹⁸currus Dei decem milium multiplex, milia laetantium. Dominus</p>	<p>¹²Dominus dabit verbum evangelizantibus virtute multa; ¹³rex virtutum * dilecti: et speciei domus dividere spolia. ¹⁴si dormiatis inter medios cleros pennae columbae deargentatae et posteriora * dorsi eius in pallore auri. <i>diapsalma</i>.....¹⁸currus Dei decem milibus multiplex, milia lae-</p>	<p>¹²Domine, dabis sermonem adnuntiatrix virtutinis plurimae, ¹³reges exercituum foederabuntur, foederabuntur et pulcritudo domus dividet spolia. ¹⁴si dormieritis inter medios terminos, pennae columbae deargentatae et posteriora eius in virore auri.....¹⁸currus Dei innumerabiles, milia</p>

¹ Martène, *de ant. rit.* i. p. 18 f.

² Cf. Bp Westcott, *History of the English Bible*, pp. 206 ff., 351 ff.; Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, Intr. p. lxxiii f.

³ Editions published in 1874 by Baer and Tischendorf (*Lib. Psalm. Heb. atque Lat.*) and by Lagarde (*Psalm. iuxta Hebraeos*).

ROMAN.	GALLICAN.	HEBREW.
in illis in Sina in sancto. ¹⁹ ascendens in altum captivam duxit captivitatem, dedit dona hominibus. etenim non credunt inhabitare. ²⁰ Dominus Deus benedictus; benedictus Dominus de die in diem. prosperum iter faciet nobis Deus salutaris noster. <i>diapsalma.</i> ²¹ Deus noster deus salvos facienti, et Domini exitus mortis. ²² verumtamen Deus conquasabit capita inimicorum suorum, verticem capilli perambulantium in delictis suis.	tantium; Dominus in eis ✕ in : Sina in sancto. ¹⁹ ascendisti in altum: cepisti captivitatem, accepisti dona in hominibus. etenim non credentes inhabitare Dominum Deum. ²⁰ benedictus Dominus die quotidie; prosperum iter faciet nobis Deus salutarium nostrorum. <i>diapsalma.</i> ²¹ Deus noster, Deus salvos ÷ facienti: et Domini ✕ Domini: exitus mortis. ²² verumtamen Deus confringet capita inimicorum suorum, verticem capilli ÷ perambulantium in delictis suis.	abundantium; Dominus in eis in Sina, in sancto. ¹⁹ ascendisti in excelsum, captivam duxisti captivitatem, accepisti dona in hominibus; insuper et non credentes habitare Dominum Deum. ²⁰ benedictus Dominus per singulos dies; portabit nos Deus salutis nostrae. <i>semper.</i> ²¹ Deus noster deus salutis, et Domini Dei mortis egressus. ²² verumtamen Deus confringet capita inimicorum suorum, verticem crinis ambulantium in delictis suis.

The book of Job offered a still more promising field for the labours of the Hexaplarising reviser, for the Greek text as known to Origen fell greatly short of the current Hebrew, and it was this defective text which formed the basis of the Latin versions used by Cyprian and Lucifer and in the *Speculum*¹. Jerome, who had access to the Hexapla at Caesarea, took advantage of Origen's revision, in which the lacunae of the Greek Job were filled up from Theodotion, and sent his friends, Paula and Eustochium, a Latin version of Job at once corrected and supplemented from the Hexaplaric LXX. The result gave him for the time profound satisfaction; he had lifted up Job from the dunghill², and restored him to his pristine state³;

¹ Burkitt, *O. L. and Itala*, pp. 8, 32 1.

² *Praef. in libr. Job*: "qui adhuc apud Latinos iacebat in stercore et vermibus scatebat errorum."

³ *ibid.* "integrum immaculatumque gaudete."

the difference between the Old Latin version and the new seemed to him to be nothing short of that which separates falsehood from truth¹. The asterisks shewed that from 700 to 800 lines had been restored to this long mutilated book².

A few brief specimens from Lagarde's text³ will suffice to shew the character of the work.

x. 4 aut sicut homo perspicit, perspicis? * aut sicut videt homo, videbis? < aut humana est vita tua? aut anni tui sunt tanquam * dies < hominis?

xix. 17 et rogabam uxorem meam < invocabam ÷ blandiens filios * uteri mei <; at illi in perpetuum despexerunt me; cum surrexero, locuntur ad me.

xlii. 7 et defunctus est Job senex plenus dierum. ÷ scriptum est autem resurrecturum cum his quos Dominus suscitabit.

Jerome also revised from the Hexaplaric Septuagint, for the benefit of Paula and Eustochium, the 'books of Solomon' (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles), treating the Greek text after the manner of Origen; but his work has perished, the preface alone surviving. A like fate has overtaken a translation of Chronicles, undertaken at the desire of Domnio and Rogatianus. This version of Chronicles appears from the preface to have been influenced by Jerome's Hebrew studies, which were now sufficiently matured to enable him to form an independent judgement in reference to the merits of his Greek text, though he still clung to his old belief in the inspiration of the original Septuagint.

Praef. in libros Salomonis: "tres libros Salomonis, id est, Proverbia, Ecclesiasten, Canticum canticorum, veteri LXX. auctoritati reddidi, vel antepositis lineis (÷) superflua quaeque

¹ *Ad Pammach.:* "veterem editionem nostrae translationi compara, et liquido providebitis quantum distet inter veritatem et mendacium." Jerome's satisfaction with his original revision of Job was continued even after he had produced a new version from the Hebrew; in the preface to the latter he leaves the student free to choose between the two ("eligit unusquisque quod vult").

² *Praef. in Job ed. Heb.* See below, pt II., c. ii.

³ In *Mittheilungen*, ii.

designans, vel stellis (✱) titulo(?) praenotatis ea quae minus habebantur interserens...et ubi praepostero ordine atque per-verso sententiarum fuerat lumen ereptum suis locis restituens feci intellegi quod latebat." *Praef. in libr. Paralipomenon*: "cum a me nuper litteris flagitassetis ut vobis librum Paralipomenon Latino sermone transferrem, de Tiberiade legis quondam doctorem qui apud Hebraeos admirationi habebatur assumpsisti... et sic confirmatus ausus sum facere quod iubebatis. libere enim vobis loquor, ita et in Graecis et Latinis codicibus hic nominum liber vitiosus est ut non tam Hebraea quam barbara quaedam... arbitrandum sit. nec hoc LXX. interpretibus qui Spiritu sancto pleni ea quae vera fuerant transtulerunt, sed scriptorum culpa adscribendum....ubicunque ergo asteriscos...videritis ibi sciatis de Hebraeo additum...ubi vero obelus, transversa scilicet virga, praeposita est, illic signatur quid LXX. interpretes addiderint."

Whether Jerome dealt with the rest of the canonical books of the Old Latin in the same manner must remain an open question. No trace remains either of such revised versions or of prefaces which once belonged to them, nor does he refer to them in the prefaces of his translations from the Hebrew. On the other hand his letters occasionally speak of his revision of the Old Latin in terms which seem to imply that it was complete, and in one of them there is a passage which suggests that the disappearance of the other books was due to the dishonesty of some person whose name is not given.

Adv. Rufin. ii. 24: "egone contra LXX. interpretes aliquid sum locutus quos ante annos plurimos diligentissime emendatos meae linguae studiosis dedi?" *Ep.* 71 (*ad Lucinium*): "LXX. editionem et te habere non dubito." *Ep.* 106 (*ad Sunn. et Fret.*): "editionem LXX. interpretum quae et in *ἐξαπλοῖς* codicibus reperitur et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est." Cf. *Ep. Augustini ad Hieron.* (116), (c. 405): "mittas obsecro interpretationem tuam de LXX. quam te edidisse nesciebam." At a later time (c. 416) Jerome excuses himself from doing as Augustine had desired, since "pleraque prioris laboris fraude cuiusdam amisimus" (*Ep.* 134).

In any case Jerome's Hexaplarised version had little or no influence on the text of the Latin Bible, except in the Psalter. Even his translations from the Hebrew did not easily supersede the Old Latin. The familiar version died hard and,

as the list of MSS. will have shewn, parts of it were copied as late as the seventh century. Even at Rome the old version long held its ground by the side of the new; in the last years of the sixth century, Gregory the Great, while basing his great commentary on Job upon the Vulgate, claimed a right to cite the Old Latin when it served his purpose, "quia sedes apostolica utrique nititur¹."

The coexistence of the two versions naturally produced mixture in the MSS.², which was not altogether removed by the revisions of the sixth and ninth centuries. Moreover, the Old Latin version continued to hold its place in those books of the Church Bible which had no Semitic original, or of which the Semitic original was no longer current. In the preface to the Salomonic Books Jerome says explicitly: "porro in eo libro qui a plerisque *Sapientia Salomonis* inscribitur et in Ecclesiastico...calamo temperavi, tantummodo canonicas scripturas vobis emendare desiderans." The books of Tobit and Judith³ were afterwards translated by him from the Aramaic (*praef. in librum Tobiae, in librum Judith*), and these versions have been incorporated in the Vulgate, but the Vulgate Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1, 2 Maccabees are supplied from ante-Hieronymian sources. Thus to this day a considerable part of the Latin Bible is in greater or less degree an echo of the Septuagint.

LITERATURE. Besides the editions already mentioned the student may consult with advantage Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, i. 321; N. Wiseman, *Essays*, i. (London, 1853)—a reprint of his *Two letters on some parts of the controversy concerning 1 Joh. v. 7*; B. F. Westcott, art. *Vulgate* in Smith's *D. B.* iii.; H. Rönsch, *Itala u. Vulgata* (Marburg, 1869); F. Kaulen, *Handbuch zur Vulgata* (Mainz, 1870); Ziegler, *Die lat. Bibelübersetzungen vor*

¹ *Praef. ad Moralia in Job.*

² Cf. e.g. Berger, *op. cit.* p. xi: "les textes des anciennes versions et de la nouvelle sont constamment mêlés et enchevêtrés dans les manuscrits."

³ On the relation of Jerome's Latin Judith to the Septuagint see C. J. Ball in *Speaker's Commentary*, Apocrypha, p. 257 ff.

Hieronymus (Munich, 1879); Lagarde, *Probe einer neuen Ausgabe der lat. Übersetzungen des A. T.* (1870); A. Ceriani, *Le recensioni dei LXX e la versione latina detta Itala*, 1886; L. Salembier, *Une page inédite de l'histoire de la Vulgate*, Amiens, 1890; Bleek-Wellhausen (1893), p. 553 ff.; Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 191 ff.; Gregory, p. 949 ff.; F. C. Burkitt, *The Old Latin and the Itala*, in *Texts and Studies* (Cambridge, 1896); E. Nestle, *Urtext*, pp. 84 ff. [specially valuable for the bibliography of the Latin versions]; H. A. A. Kennedy, *The Old Latin Versions*, in *Hastings' D. B.* iii. pp. 47—62; Corssen in *Jahresb. f. d. class. Altertumswissensch* (1899); *Latin Versions of the O. T.*, art. in *Ch. Q. R.* (Apr. 1901); W. O. Oesterley in *J. Th. Stud.* v. vi. (text of Min. Proph.).

2. THE EGYPTIAN VERSIONS.

The tradition of St Mark's episcopate at Alexandria¹ may be taken as evidence, so far as it goes, of the early planting of the Church in that city. The first converts were doubtless, as at Rome, Greek-speaking Jews, descendants of the old Jewish settlers², and their Greek proselytes; and the first extension of the movement was probably amongst the Greek population of the towns on the sea-coast of the Mediterranean. As it spread to the interior, to the villages of the Delta, to Memphis, Oxyrhynchus, Panopolis, and eventually to Thebes, it encountered native Egyptians who spoke dialects of the Egyptian tongue³. How soon they were evangelised there is no direct evidence to shew, but the process may have begun shortly after the Gospel reached Alexandria. The native Church retained its own tongue, and in the fourth and fifth centuries Greek was still unknown to many of the monks and ecclesiastics of Egypt. Christianity however is probably responsible for either introducing or spreading the use of a new system of

¹ See *Gospel acc. to St Mark*, p. xiv. f. The Clementine Homilies (i. 8 ff.) attribute the foundation of the Alexandrian Church to Barnabas. But a yet earlier beginning is possible. In Acts xviii. 24 cod. D reads 'Ἀλεξανδρεὺς...ὁς ἦν κατηχημένος ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, on which Blass (*Acta app.* p. 201) remarks: "itaque iam tum (id quod sine testimonio suspicandum erat) in Aegyptum quoque nova religio permanerat."

² Acts ii. 9 f. οἱ κατοικοῦντες...Ἀἴγυπτον. *Ib.* vi. 9 τινὲς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης...Ἀλεξανδρέων. Cf. *Report of the Egypt Exploration Fund*, 1899—1900, p. 54.

³ Cf. what is said of St Anthony in the *Vita Antonii* (Migne, *P. G.* xxvi. 944 sq.).

writing with characters which are chiefly of Greek origin¹. This writing, known as Coptic—a corruption of *Αἰγύπτιος*—is found with some variations in all MS. fragments of the Egyptian versions of the Old and New Testaments.

The analogy of the Old Latin would lead us to suppose (as Bp Lightfoot remarks²) that no long interval passed between the acceptance of Christianity by any large number of native Egyptians, and the first attempts to translate the Scriptures into the Egyptian tongue. “We should probably not be exaggerating if we placed one or both of the principal Egyptian versions, the Bohairic and the Sahidic, or at least parts of them, before the close of the second century.” The Bishop is writing with only the New Testament in view, but his argument applies equally to the Old. His view is on the whole supported by Dr Hort³, Ciasca⁴, and Mr A. C. Headlam⁵: but Mr Forbes Robinson, following Guidi, produces reasons for regarding it as ‘not proven,’ and prefers to say that “historical evidence...on the whole, points to the third century as the period when the first Coptic translation was made.” “But this view,” he adds, “can only be regarded as tentative. In the light of future discoveries it may have to be modified⁶.”

The plurality of the Egyptian versions is well ascertained. Perhaps the geographical form of Egypt gave special opportunities for the growth of popular dialects; certain it is that increased knowledge of the language has added to the dialectic complications with which the Coptic scholar has to struggle⁷.

¹ Of the 31 letters of the Coptic alphabet 7 only (ϣ, ϣ, Ϛ, ϛ, Ϙ, ϙ, Ϡ) are not from the Greek. On the pre-Christian systems see Clem. *strom.* v. 4 οἱ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις παιδευόμενοι πρώτον μὲν πάντων...ἐκμανθάνουσι τὴν ἐπιστολογραφικὴν καλουμένην (the Demotic), δευτέραν δὲ τὴν ἱερατικὴν... ὑστέρτην δὲ καὶ τελευταίαν τὴν ἱερογλυφικὴν.

² Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 97.

³ *Intr. to N. T. in Greek*, p. 85.

⁴ *Sacr. bibl. fragmenta Copto-Sahidica*, i. p. viii.

⁵ Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 105 f.

⁶ Hastings' *D. B.* i. p. 672. Cf. Γ. E. Brightman in *J. Th. St.* i. 254.

⁷ The Demotic, as it is known to us, appears to present no dialectic

It was in these popular dialects that the translations of the Bible were made. "Christianity...was in Egypt a great popular movement...the Scriptures were translated, not into the literary language, but into that of the people; and the copies of these translations in each locality reflected the local peculiarities of speech." Fragments of Biblical versions have been found in the Bohairic¹, Sahidic, and Middle Egyptian dialects. The Bohairic dialect was spoken in Lower, the Sahidic in Upper, Egypt, and the Middle Egyptian in the intermediate province of Memphis. Some authorities speak of two other dialects, the Fayumic and Akhmimic, assigning to them certain Biblical fragments which are regarded by others as belonging to the Middle Egyptian.

Translations of books of the Old Testament into these Egyptian dialects were naturally made from the Alexandrian Greek version, and, if we may judge from the extensive use of the Old Testament in early Christian teaching, there is no reason to doubt that they were translated at as early a date as the Gospels and Epistles, if not indeed before them. Portions of the Old Testament exist in each of the Egyptian dialects. Hyvernat mentions fragments of Isaiah, Lamentations and Ep. of Jeremiah in Fayumic and Middle Egyptian, and of Exodus, Sirach, 2 Macc., and each of the Minor Prophets in Akhmimic²; in Bohairic he enumerates 6 MSS. of the Pentateuch, 14 of the Psalms, 5 of Proverbs, 3 of Job, 4 of the Minor Prophets, 5 of Isaiah, 3 of Jeremiah, 4 of Daniel, and

variation, perhaps because the specimens which have reached us were all the work of the single class—the scribes: see Hyvernat, *Étude sur les versions Coptes* in *Revue Biblique*, v. 3, p. 429; A. C. Headlam in Scrivener-Miller, p. 105.

¹ Formerly known as the Memphitic, a name which might be more appropriately applied to the form of Middle Egyptian current at Memphis. 'Bohairic' is derived from *el-Bohairah*, a district S. of Alexandria. 'Sahidic,' also called Thebaic, is from *es-sa'id*=Upper Egypt. On some characteristics of the several dialects see Hyvernat, p. 431.

² Cf. Steindorff, *Die Apokalypse des Elias*, p. 2.

one MS. of Ezekiel; in Sahidic, though few complete MSS. of any Biblical book have survived, there is a large number of extant fragments representing most of the canonical books and certain of the non-canonical (the two Wisdoms, the Ep. of Jeremiah, and the Greek additions to Daniel).

The following list gives the more important publications which contain portions of the Old Testament in the Egyptian versions.

BOHAIRIC. D. Wilkins, *Quinque libri Moysis*, 1731; Fallet, *La version Cophte du pentateuque*, 1854; Lagarde, *Der Pentateuch koptisch*, 1867; *Bruchstücke der kopt. Übersetzungen des A. T. in Orientalia* i. 1879. The Psalter has been edited by R. Tuki, 1744, J. L. Ideler, 1837, Schwartze, 1848, Lagarde, *Psalterii versio Memphitica*, Göttingen, 1875, F. Rossi, *Cinque manoscritti* &c., 1894; Job by H. Tattam, 1846; the Prophets by Tattam (*Prophetæ minores*, 1836, *Proph. maiores*, 1852).

SAHIDIC. Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca*, 1883; Ciasca, *Sacr. bibl. fragm. Coptosahidica Musei Borgiani*, 1885—9; Amélineau, *Fragments coptes in Recueil* v. (1884), and *Fragments de la version thébaine*, ib. vii.—x. (1886—9); the same scholar has edited Job in *Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Arch.*, 1887; O. v. Lemm, *Bruchstücke*, 1885, *Sahidische Bibelfragmente*, 1890; Krall, *Mittheilungen*, 1887; F. Rossi, *Papiri Copti*, 1889, *Un nuovo codice*, 1893; Maspéro, *Fragments de l'Ancien Testament in Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission arch. française au Caire*, vi., 1892; E. A. T. W. Budge, *The earliest known Coptic Psalter*, 1898¹; *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, 1912; N. Peters, *Die sahidisch-koptische Übersetzung d. Buches Ecclesiasticus... untersucht*, 1898; P. Lacau, *Textes de l'A. T. en copte sahidique*, 1901; Sir H. Thompson, *The Coptic Version of certain books of the O. T.*, 1908; *A Coptic Palimpsest*, 1911.

MIDDLE EGYPTIAN, &c. Tuki, *Rudimenta linguae Coptae*, 1778; Quatremère, *Recherches sur la langue et la littérature de l'Égypte*, 1808; Zoega, *Catal. codd. Copt.*, 1810; Engelbreth, *Fragmenta Basmurico-Coptica V. et N. T.*, 1811; Von Lemm, *Mittelägyptische Fragmente*, 1885; Krall, *Mittheilungen*, 1887; Bouriant in *Mémoires de l'Institut égyptien* ii., 1889, and in *Mémoires publiés par* &c. vi. 1; Steindorff, *die Apokalypse des Elias*, p. 2 ff. (Leipzig, 1899).

It may reasonably be expected that the Egyptian versions of the Old Testament, when they have been more fully recovered and submitted to examination by experts, will prove

¹ On the correspondence of this Psalter with cod. U see below, p. 143.

to be of much importance for the criticism of the text of the LXX. Ceriani¹ has shewn that the Greek text of Cod. Marchalianus agrees generally with that which underlies the Bohairic version of the Prophets, whilst both are in harmony with the text which is quoted by Cyril of Alexandria. A German scholar², starting with the Bohairic Prophets, finds that their text is similar to that of the Codex Alexandrinus, the Codex Marchalianus, a series of cursive Greek MSS., some of which had been recognised by Cornill³ as Hesychian (22, 23, 26, 36, 40, 42, 49, 51, 62, 86, 91, 95, 97, 106, 114, 130, 147, 153, 185, 228, 233, 238, 240, 310, 311), and the Greek columns of the Complutensian Polyglott. Of the Sahidic fragments, Job is perhaps "a translation of Origen's revised text, *with the passages under asterisk omitted*"⁴, whilst Isaiah is distinctly Hexaplaric, and traces of the influence of the Hexapla are also to be found in Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Ezekiel, although in varying degrees. On the whole it is natural to expect the Hesychian recension to be specially reflected in Egyptian versions. But other influences may have been at work⁵, and much remains to be done before these versions can be securely used in the work of reconstructing the text of the Greek Old Testament⁶.

LITERATURE. Quatremère, *Recherches*; Zoega, *Catalogus*; L. Stern, *Koptische Grammatik*, 1880; *Kopten, Koptische Sprache u. Litteratur*, 1886; Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 91 ff. (J. B. Lightfoot and A. C. Headlam); Gregory, *prolegg.*, p. 859 ff.; J. P. P. Martin, *Intr.*, partie théor., p. 310 ff.; H. Hyvernat, *Étude sur les versions coptes de la Bible* in *Revue biblique*, v. 3, 4, vi. 1; E. Nestle, *Urtext*, p. 144 ff.; W. E. Crum, *Coptic Studies*, 1897-8; *Catalogue of Coptic MSS. in Brit. Museum*, 1905; A. E. Brooke in *J. Th. St.* iii.

¹ See *O. T. in Greek*, iii. p. ix.

² A. Schulte in *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1894-5; see Hyvernat, p. 69.

³ *Ezechiel*, p. 66 ff.

⁴ Burkitt in *Encycl. Brit.* iv. 5027; cf. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 215 ff.; Dillmann, *Textkritisches zum Buche Ijob*, p. 4; Burkitt, *O. L. and Itala*, p. 8; Kenyon, *Our Bible and the ancient MSS.*, p. 751.

⁵ Hyvernat, p. 71.

⁶ See the remarks of F. Robinson in *Hastings' Dict. of the Bible* i. 673a.

3. THE ETHIOPIC VERSION.

Ethiopia is said to have been evangelised in the fourth century from Tyre. The Tyrian missionaries were probably of Greek speech¹, and brought with them the Greek Bible. But apart from this, the contiguity of Ethiopia to Egypt, and the circumstance that the first Bishop of Auxume received consecration at Alexandria, create an *a priori* probability that any early translations from the Old Testament into Ethiopic were based upon the Septuagint, whether immediately or through the Coptic versions.

Dillmann, who at one time had explained the numerous transliterations and other approaches to the Hebrew in the existing Ethiopic version by assuming that the translators worked upon a Hexaplaric text, ultimately found cause to classify the MSS. under three heads, (1) those which on the whole represent the text of the LXX. on which he supposed the version to have been based; (2) those of a later recension—the most numerous class—corrected by other MSS. of the LXX.; (3) those in which the original version has been revised from the Hebrew². Lagarde, on the other hand, suggested that the version was translated from the Arabic, as late as the fourteenth century, and maintained that in any case the printed texts of the Ethiopic Old Testament depend upon MSS. which are too late and too bad to furnish a secure basis for the employment of this version in the reconstruction of the Septuagint³. “These suggestions are not however supported by a closer examination of the Ethiopic version of the Octateuch. The text as printed by Dillmann, and especially the readings of the oldest MS. he used, which is supported by a dated thirteenth century MS. brought from Abyssinia to Paris since

¹ Charles (art. *Ethiopic Version*, in Hastings' *D. B.* i. p. 792) states that “the Abyssinians first received Christianity through Aramaean missionaries.” But Tyre in the fourth century was as Greek as Alexandria and Antioch.

² Nestle, *Urtext*, p. 148. Loisy, *Histoire critique*, i. ii. p. 231.

³ *Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der gr. Übersetzung d. A. T.*, p. 28; cf. *Materialen*, i. p. iii.

his edition was published, betray direct descent from a Septuagint text of a somewhat interesting type, which had apparently undergone less Hebrew or hexaplar revision than the Greek ancestors of the Armenian and Syro-hexaplar versions. We are safe in concluding with Charles, 'It is unquestionable that our version was made in the main from the Greek¹.'

The Ethiopic version of the Old Testament contains all the books of the Alexandrian canon except 1—4 Maccabees, together with certain apocrypha which are not found in MSS. of the LXX. (Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, 4 Esdras, &c.). A considerable part of it has appeared in print. Dillmann edited the Octateuch and the four books of Kingdoms (1853—71), and the deuterocanonical books (1894); the book of Joel appeared in Merx, *Die Prophetie des Joels*, the book of Jonah in W. Wright's *Jonah in four Semitic versions* (London, 1857). The Psalms were printed by Ludolf (1701), Rödiger (1815), Dorn (1825), and Jeremiah, Lamentations and Malachi by Bachmann (1893); Bachmann also edited the Dodecapropheton, and part of Isaiah.

Lists of the MSS. may be seen in Wright, *Ethiopic MSS. of the British Museum* (London, 1878); Zotenberg, *Catalogue des MSS. éthiopiens de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1877); D'Abbadie, *Catalogue raisonné de MSS. éthiopiens* (Paris, 1859); Dillmann, *Catalogus MSS. Aethiop. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* (Oxford, 1848), and *Abessinische Handschr. d. k. Biblioth. zu Berlin*; Müller, *Aethiop. Handschr. der k. Hofbiblioth. in Wien* (*ZDMG.* xvi. p. 554). For fuller information as to this Version see F. Prætorius, *Urtext*, p. 147 ff.

4. THE ARABIC VERSION.

The Arabic Old Testament printed in the Paris and London Polyglotts is a composite work, the Hexateuch being a translation from the Hebrew, and the books of Judges, Ruth, 1 Regn. i.—2 Regn. xii. 17, Nehemiah i.—ix. 27, and Job from the Peshitta; the Septuagint has supplied the basis for

¹ This criticism of Lagarde's view is due to Mr N. McLean, who has recently examined the Ethiopic Genesis for the larger Cambridge Septuagint.

the other poetical books and for the Prophets¹. Some of the MSS. exhibit in certain books a translation which has come from the LXX. through the Coptic; the book of Job in this version has been published by Lagarde (*Psalterium Job Proverbia arabice*, Göttingen, 1876)².

The Arabic version directly derived from the LXX. is said to exhibit in the Prophets a text akin to that of Cod. A (Ryssel, in *ZAW.* 1885, p. 102 ff., 158). It shews traces of Hexaplaric influence (H. Hyvernat, in Vigouroux, *D. B.* i. p. 846).

EDITIONS of Arabic versions of the Septuagint. Besides the Polyglotts (Paris, 1645; London, 1652), mention may be made of the Psalters published at Genoa, 1516; Rome, 1614 and 1619; Aleppo, 1706; London (S.P.C.K.), 1725. In W. Wright's Book of Jonah the Arabic is from a MS. in the Bodleian (see p. vii.). Cf. H. Hyvernat, *op. cit.*

MSS. Lists of MSS. of the Arabic versions of the Old Testament will be found in the Preface to Holmes and Parsons, vol. i.; Slane's *Catalogue des MSS. Arabes de la Bibl. nat.*; Mrs M. D. Gibson's *Studia Sinaitica*, iii. (London, 1894), *Catalogue of Arabic MSS. at Sinai* (codd. 1—67). Cf. Hyvernat, *op. cit.*

LITERATURE. Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, 1780; H. E. G. Paulus, *Bodleiana specimina versionum Pent. Arab.*, 1789; Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, § 275 ff.; R. Holmes, *Praef. ad Pent.*; Rödiger, *De origine et indole Arab. libr. V. T. interpretationis* (Halle, 1829). Among more recent works reference may be made to Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 49 f.; Loisy, *Hist. crit.* i. ii. p. 238; Nestle in *Urtext*, p. 150 ff.; F. C. Burkitt, art. *Arabic Versions*, in Hastings' *D. B.* i. p. 136 ff.; H. Hyvernat, *op. cit.*

5. THE SYRIAC VERSIONS.

According to Moses bar-Cephas († 913), there are two Syriac versions of the Old Testament—the Peshitta, translated

¹ Loisy, *Hist. crit.*, i. ii. p. 239. Mr Burkitt in Hastings' *D. B.* (i. p. 137) writes "J(udges), S(amuël), K(ings), and Ch(ronicles), are all from the Peshitta."

² Lagarde gives for the Psalter four texts, viz. those published at Rome (1614), Paris (1645), Quzhayya (1612), Aleppo (1706); for Job, besides the versions mentioned in the text, that of the Paris Polyglott.

from the Hebrew in the time of King Abgar, and the version made from the Septuagint by Paul, Bishop of Tella. This statement is neither complete nor altogether to be trusted, but it may serve as a convenient point of departure for a summary of the subject.

(1) The origin of the Peshitta is still as obscure as when Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote: ἡρμῆνεται δὲ ταῦτα εἰς μὲν τὴν τῶν Σύρων παρ' οὗτου δήποτε, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔγνωσται μέχρι τῆς τήμερον ὅστις ποτὲ οὗτός ἐστιν¹. That the translation on the whole was made from the Hebrew is the verdict of modern scholars as it was that of Moses bar-Cephas. Yet certain books display the influence of the LXX. While "the Pentateuch follows the Hebrew text and the Jewish exegesis, Isaiah and the twelve Minor Prophets contain much which is from the LXX., and the influence of the Greek version appears to have been felt also in the Psalter²." From the first the Peshitta seems to have included the non-canonical books of the Alexandrian Bible except 1 Esdras and Tobit, "and their diction agrees with that of the canonical books among which they are inserted³."

(2) The Syriac version ascribed to Paul, Bishop of Tella-dhe-Mauzelath (Constantine) in Mesopotamia, was a literal translation of the LXX. of the Hexapla, in which the Origenic signs were scrupulously retained. A note in one of the rolls of this version assigns it to the year 616—7; the work is said to have been produced at Alexandria under the auspices of Athanasius, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, who with five of his suffragans had gone thither to visit the Alexandrian Patriarch. Paul of Tella and Thomas of Harkel appear to have been of the party, and their visit in Alexandria led to

¹ Migne, *P. G.*, lxvi. 241; cf. *ib.* 252 f., 263, 466 ff., 492 ff.

² Nestle in *Urtext*, p. 230; cf. Bleek-Wellhausen, pp. 558—560; W. E. Barnes in *J. Th. St.* ii. 186 ff.

³ Gwynn, *D. C. B.*, iv. p. 434.

the translation of the entire Greek Bible into Syriac, the New Testament having been undertaken by Thomas, while Paul worked upon the Old¹.

The version of Paul of Tella, usually called the Syro Hexaplar, was first made known to Europe by Andreas Masius (Andrew Du Maes, † 1573). In editing the Greek text of Joshua he used a Syriac MS. which contained part of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Esther, Judith, and part of Tobit, in this translation. The codex which he employed has disappeared, but the Ambrosian library at Milan possesses another, possibly a second volume of the lost MS., which contains the poetical and prophetic books, in the order Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, the two Wisdoms, the twelve Prophets, Jeremiah (with Baruch, Lamentations, and the Epistle), Daniel (with Susanna and Bel), Ezekiel, Isaiah. Portions of the historical books of the Syro-Hexaplar² have been discovered among the Nitrian MSS. of the British Museum, and a catena, also at the Museum, contains fragments of Chronicles and the books of Esdras, while the Paris Library contributes 4 Kingdoms. Norberg edited Jeremiah and Ezekiel in 1787; Daniel was published by Bugati in 1788 and the Psalms in 1820; Middeldorpf completed the prophetic and poetical books in his edition of 1835, and in 1861 Ceriani added Baruch, Lamentations, and the Ep. of Jeremiah. Of the historical books Judges and Ruth were published by Skat Rördam in 1861, and Genesis and Exodus (i.—xxxiii. 2) by Ceriani (*Mon. sacr. et prof.* ii.), who has also given to the world the Milan fragments in *Mon.* vol. vii.

The Hexapla, Tetrapla, and occasionally the Heptapla, are

¹ Gwynn, *Paulus Tellensis* and *Thomas Harklensis*, in *D. C. B.*, iv. pp. 266 ff., 1014 ff.

² Viz., parts of Genesis and Joshua, half of Numbers, nearly the whole of Judges, Ruth, and 3 Kingdoms, and Exodus complete.

mentioned as the sources of the text in the subscriptions to the books of the Syro-Hexaplar. These subscriptions were doubtless translated with the rest of the Greek archetypes, but they shew the character of the copies employed by the translators. The version is servile to such an extent as sometimes to violate the Syriac idiom¹. It is obvious that this extreme fidelity to the Greek, while it must have hindered the use of the version in the Monophysite churches of Syria, is of vast advantage to the Biblical critic. It places in his hands an exact reflexion of the Hexaplaric LXX. as it was read at Alexandria at the beginning of the 7th century, derived ultimately from the Hexapla and Tetrapla through the recension of Eusebius. Thus it supplements our scanty stock of Greek Hexaplaric MSS., and indeed forms our chief authority for the text of Origen's revision. In the case of one of the canonical books the version of Paul of Tella renders even greater service. One of the Greek texts of Daniel—that which Origen regarded as the true Septuagintal text—has survived only in a single and relatively late MS. The Syro-Hexaplar here supplies another and earlier authority, which enables us to check the testimony of the Chigi Greek.

(3) Other Syriac versions made from the Greek.

(a) Fragments of a Syriac version in the Palestinian dialect have been printed by Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, iv. (Leyden, 1875), J. R. Harris, *Biblical Fragments from Mt Sinai* (London, 1890), G. H. Gwilliam, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Semitic Series, I. v., ix. (Oxford, 1893—6), G. Margoliouth, *Liturgy of the Nile* (London, 1897), and Mrs Lewis, *Studia Sinaitica*, vi. (London, 1897)². This version has been made from the LXX.; in the Books of Kings the text is now known not to be Lucianic, as it was at first supposed to be (*Anecd.*

¹ Field, *Prolegg. in Hex.*, p. lxi., where many instances are produced.

² The fragments in *Studia Sinaitica* are accompanied by critical notes, the work of Dr Nestle, in which they are carefully compared with the Greek text (pp. xl.—lxxiv.).

Oxon. ix. p. 32); in the Greater Prophets, it is in part at least Origenic (*Studia Sinaitica*, pp. xvi., lxiii.); Job seems to have contained the interpolations from Theodotus which are found in the extant Greek texts of that book¹.

The following is a complete list of the Palestinian fragments included in the publications mentioned above: Gen. i. 1—iii. 24, vi. 9—ix. 19, xviii. 1—5, 18—xix. 30, xxii. 1—19; Ex. viii. 22^b—xi. 10, xxviii. 1—12^a; Num. iv. 46 f., 49—v. 2 f., 4, 6, 8; Deut. vi. 4—16, vii. 25—26^a, x. 12—xi. 28, xii. 28—xiv. 3; 2 Regn. ii. 19—22; 3 Regn. ii. 10^b—15^a, ix. 4—5^a; Pss. viii. 2 f., xxi. 2, 19, xxii. 1, 5, xxiv. 1 f., xxix. 2, 4, xxx. 2, 6, xxxiv. 1, 11, xxxvii. 2, 18, xl. 2, 5, 7, xliii. 12—27, xliv.—xlv., xlviii. 15 ff., xlix. 1—9, liv. 2, 22, lv. 7 ff., lvi. 1—7, lxiv. 2, 6, lxviii. 2, 3, 22, lxxvi. 2, 21, lxxvii. 52—65, lxxx. 1, lxxxii. 1—10, lxxxiv. 2, 8, lxxxv. 1, 15 f., lxxxvii. 2, 5—7, 18, lxxxix. 1—xc. 12, xcvi. 1, 8 f., ci. 2 f.; Prov. i. 1—19, ix. 1—11; Job xvi. 1—xvii. 16, xxi. 1—34, xxii. 3—12; Sap. ix. 8—11, 14—x. 2; Amos ix. 5—14^a, viii. 9—12; Mic. v. 2—5; Joel i. 14—ii. 27, iii. 9—21; Jonah; Zech. ix. 9—15, xi. 11^b—14; Isa. iii. 9^b—15, vii. 10—16, viii. 8—xi. 16, xii. 1—6, xiv. 28—32, xv. 1—5, xxv. 1—3^a, xxxv. 1—10, xl. 1—17, xlii. 5—10, 17—xliii. 21, xliv. 2—7, l. 4—9, lii. 13—liii. 12, lx. 1—22, lxi. 1—11, lxiii. 1—7; Jer. xi. 18—20².

(b) Mention is made³ of a version of the Greek Old Testament attempted by the Nestorian Patriarch Mar Abbas (A.D. 552). But notwithstanding the declared preference of Theodore for the LXX., the Nestorians have always used the Peshitta, and there is no extant Nestorian version from the Greek.

(c) Of Jacobite versions from the LXX. there were several. (1) Polycarp the chorepiscopus, who in the fifth century laboured upon a translation of the New Testament under the auspices of Philoxenus, the Monophysite Bishop of Mabug, is known to have rendered the Greek Psalter into Syriac. The margin of the Syro-Hexaplar⁴ mentions a Philoxenian 'edition' of Isaiah,

¹ Burkitt in *Anecd. Oxon.*, Semitic ser., i. ix. p. 44, and cf. Nestle's notes to *Studia Sinaitica*, vi.

² See *Studia Sin.*, vi. p. xiv. f. For recent additions see Nestle in Hastings' *D. B.* iv. 447.

³ Bickell, *Conspectus rei Syr. lit.*, p. 9; cf. Ebedjesu in Assemani, iii. 71.

⁴ Field, *Hexapla*, ii. p. 448.

to which two fragments printed by Ceriani¹ from the British Museum MS. Add. 17106 are believed to belong. The text of these fragments agrees on the whole with that of the Lucianic MSS. of the Prophets. (2) Another Monophysite, Jacob of Edessa, applied himself in 704—5 to the revision of the Syriac Old Testament, using for the purpose the Hexaplaric LXX.², and the fragments of the other Greek translations. Some books of this revised version exist in MS. at London and Paris³, and a few specimens have been printed⁴.

(d) From Melito downwards the Greek fathers refer occasionally to the Greek renderings of an interpreter who is called ὁ Σίπος. The student will find in Field's *prolegomena* a full and learned discussion of the question who this Syrian interpreter was. Field inclines to the opinion that he was a bilingual Syrian, of Greek origin, who translated into Greek from the Peshitta⁵.

EDITIONS. PESHITTA. Lee, *V. T. Syriace* (London, 1823); *O. and N. T.*, 1826. A complete Syriac Bible has recently been published by the Dominicans of Mosul (⁽¹⁾1887—91, ⁽²⁾1888—92).

SYRO-HEXAPLAR. A. Masius, *Josuae-historia illustrata* (1574); M. Norberg, *Codex Syriaco-Hexaplaris* (1787); C. Bugati, *Daniel* (1788), *Psalmi* (1820); H. Middeldorpf, *cod. Syrohexapl.*, lib. IV. Reg. e cod. Paris. Iesaias & c. e cod. Mediol. (1835); Skat Rördam, *libri Iudicum et Ruth sec. Syrohexapl.* (1861); P. de Lagarde, *V. T. ab Origene recensiti fragmenta ap. Syros servata v.* (1880), and *V. T. Graeci in sermonem Syrorum versi fragm. viii.* (in his last work *Bibliothecae Syriacae ... quae ad philologiam sacram pertinent*, 1892); G. Kerber, *Syrohexaplarische Fragmente* (ZATW., 1896). Ceriani has published

¹ *Mon. sacr. et prof. v.*; cf. Gwynn in *D. C. B.* iv. p. 433.

² Gwynn, *D. C. B.* iii.

³ 1 Regn. i. 1—3 Regn. ii. 11, and Isaiah are in the London MSS. lx., lxi. (Wright, *Catalogue*, p. 37 ff.), and the Pentateuch and Daniel are preserved at Paris.

⁴ See Ladvocat, *Journal des savants*, for 1765; Eichhorn, *Bibliothek*, ii. p. 270; De Sacy, *Notices et extraits*, iv. p. 648 ff.; Ceriani, *Mon. sacr. et prof. v. i. 1.*

⁵ On the other hand see Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 7, note; and Bleek Wellhausen (1893), p. 560.

the contents of the London MS. in *Monumenta sacra et profana*, ii., and those of the Milan MS. in vol. vii. (1874) of the same series¹.

LITERATURE. G. Bickell, *Conspectus rei Syrorum literariae* (1871); Field, *Hexapla*, i. p. lxxvii. sqq. (1875); W. Wright, *Syriac literature* in *Encycl. Britannica*, xxii. (1887); E. Nestle, *Litteratura Syriaca* (1888), and *Urtext* (1897), p. 227 ff.; Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 6 ff.; Gregory, p. 807 ff.; J. P. P. Martin, *Introduction* (p. théor.), p. 97 ff.; Loisy, *Histoire critique* i. ii. p. 234 f.; E. Nestle, *Syriac Versions* (in Hastings' *D. B.* iv.).

6. THE GOTHIC VERSION.

About the year 350 a translation of the Bible into the Gothic tongue was made by Ulfilas (Wulfila)², the descendant of a Cappadocian captive who had been brought up among the Goths in Dacia, and was in 341 consecrated Bishop of the Gothic nation, which was then beginning to embrace Arian Christianity. According to Philostorgius he translated the whole of the Old Testament except the books of Kingdoms, which he omitted as likely to inflame the military temper of the Gothic race by their records of wars and conquests (Philostorg. *loc. cit.*: μετέφρασεν εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν φωνὴν τὰς γραφὰς ἀπάσας πλὴν γε δὴ τῶν Βασιλειῶν ἅτε τῶν μὲν πολέμων ἱστορίαν ἐχουσῶν, τοῦδε ἔθνους ὄντος φιλοπολέμου). Unfortunately only a few scanty fragments of the Gothic Old Testament have been preserved, i.e., some words from Gen. v. 3—30, Ps. lii. 2—3, 2 Esdr. xv. 13—16, xvi. 14—xvii. 3, xvii. 13—45. With the exception of the scrap from Genesis, they are derived from palimpsest fragments belonging to the Ambrosian Library which were discovered by Mai in 1817 and subsequently published at Milan by Mai and Castiglione; and they are printed in the great collection of Gabelentz and Loebe (*Ulfilas: V. et N. Testamenti... fragmenta*, Lipsiae, 1843) and in Migne *P. L.* xviii.; more recent editions are those of Uppstrom, Upsala, 1854—7; Massmann, Stuttgart 1855—7; Stamm, Paderborn, 1865; Bernhardt, Halle, 1875, 1884; G. H. Balg, *The First Germanic Bible*, Milwaukee, 1891; Stamm-Hejne, 1896.

¹ For the Apocryphal books see Lagarde, *Libri V. T. apocr. Syriace*, and Bensly-Barnes, *The fourth book of Maccabees in Syriac* (Camb. 1895).

² Socr. ii. 11, iv. 33, Theodoret iv. 37, Philostorg. ii. 5.

Lagarde (*Librorum V. T. canonicorum pars i.*, p. xiv., 1883) shews by an examination of the Esdras fragments that Ulfilas probably used MSS. of the Lucianic recension, and the same view is held by A. Kisch, *Der Septuaginta-Codex des Ulfilas* (*Monatschrift f. Gesch. u. W. des Judenthums*, 1873), and F. Kauffmann, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik d. gothischen Bibel-übersetzung* (*Z. f. d. Phil.* 1896). Ulfilas was in Constantinople for some time about 340, and his MSS. of the LXX. were doubtless obtained in that city, which according to Jerome was one of the headquarters of the Lucianic LXX. ("Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat").

7. THE ARMENIAN VERSION.

Armenian writers of the fifth century ascribe the inception of the Armenian Bible to Mesrop (354—441) and his associates. The book of Proverbs was the first translated, whether because it stood first in the volume¹ on which the translators worked, or because its gnomic character gave it a special importance in their eyes. The work is said to have been begun at Edessa, but MSS. were afterwards obtained from Constantinople; and Moses of Khoren, a nephew and pupil of Mesrop, was despatched to Alexandria to study Greek in order to secure "a more accurate articulation and division"² of the text. Moses indeed affirms that the earliest translations of the O.T. into Armenian were from the Syriac, and his statement receives some confirmation from the mention of Edessa as the place of origin, and from the circumstance that Syriac was the Church-language of Armenia before the introduction of the Armenian alphabet³. On the other hand the existing Armenian version

¹ So F. C. Conybeare (*Hastings*, i. p. 152). In Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 151, he suggests that the earlier books had been rendered previously.

² On this see Conybeare, Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 153.

³ See Dr Salmon in *D. C. B.*, iii. p. 908.

is clearly Septuagintal. It fits the Greek of the LXX. "as a glove the hand that wears it"; keeping so close to the Greek that it "has almost the same value for us as the Greek text itself from which (the translator) worked would possess¹." But, as Lagarde has pointed out², the printed text is untrustworthy, and the collation made for Holmes and Parsons cannot be regarded as satisfactory. A fresh collation will be made for the larger edition of the Cambridge Septuagint³.

The order of the books of the O.T. in Armenian MSS., as given by Conybeare⁴ (Octateuch, 1—4 Regn., 1—2 Paralipp., 1 and 2 Esdr., Esther, Judith, Tobit, 1—3 Macc., Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, Job⁵, Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, with Baruch and Lamentations, Daniel, Ezekiel) is on the whole consistent with the grouping found in the oldest Greek authorities⁶, and seems to point to the use by the translators of good early codices.

MSS. Few codices of the entire Bible are earlier than the 13th century; one at Edschmiazin belongs to the year 1151. Holmes assigns his Arm. 3 to A.D. 1063, but according to Conybeare it is a MS. of the eighteenth century.

EDITIONS. Venice (Psalter), 1565; Amsterdam, 1666; Constantinople, 1705; Venice, 1805 (the first edition which is of any critical value, by J. Zohrab); Venice, 1859—60 (by the Mechitarist fathers of San Lazzaro).

LITERATURE R. Holmes, *Praef. ad Pent.*; F. C. Conybeare in Scrivener-Miller, ii. 148 ff. and in Hastings' *D. B.*, *l. c.*;

¹ Conybeare, *op. cit.*, p. 151 f. He attributes the composite character of the Armenian text (of which he gives instances) to Hexaplaric influences.

² *Genesis Gr.*, p. 18.

³ Mr McLean, who has collated the greater part of the Octateuch, informs me that "the Armenian shews a typical hexaplar text in Genesis and Exodus, agreeing closely with the Syriaco-hexaplar version, and in varying degrees with the MSS. that compose the hexaplar group." "The hexaplar element (he adds) is much less in evidence in Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, but again appears strongly in Joshua, Judges, and Ruth."

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 152 f.

⁵ In some MSS. Job precedes the Psalter.

⁶ See Part II. c. i.

H. Hyvernat, in Vigouroux' *D. B.*; C. R. Gregory, *Prolegg.* p. 912 ff.; J. P. P. Martin, *Introd.* (p. théor.), p. 323 ff.; E. Nestle in *Urtext*, p. 155, where fuller bibliographical information will be found.

8. THE GEORGIAN VERSION.

The origin of this version is obscure. According to Moses of Khoren, the Georgian as well as the Armenian version was the work of Mesrop. Iberia seems to have received the Gospel early in the fourth century, if not before; but it may have possessed no translation of the Scriptures until the movement initiated in Armenia by Mesrop had communicated itself to the neighbouring region. That the Georgian Old Testament was based upon the Greek is said to be manifest from the transliteration of Greek words which it contains.

MSS. A Psalter of cent. vii.—viii. is preserved at the monastery of St Catherine's, Mt Sinai, and at Athos there is a MS., dated 978, which originally contained the whole Bible, but has lost Lev. xii.—Joshua. Both the Sinai library and the Patriarchal library at Jerusalem are rich in Georgian MSS.

EDITIONS. The Georgian Bible was printed at Moscow in 1743 and at St Petersburg in 1816 and 1818; the Moscow edition is said to have been adapted to the Russian Church Bible.

LITERATURE. F. C. Alter, *über Georgianische Litteratur* (Vienna, 1798); A. A. Tsagarelli, *An account of the monuments of Georgian Literature* [in Russian], St Petersburg, 1886—94; A. Khakhanow, *Les MSS. Georgiens de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris* (without place or date, ? 1898).

9. THE SLAVONIC VERSION.

The Greek Bible was translated into Slavonic by the brothers Cyril and Methodius, from whom in the ninth century the Slavs received the faith. Of the Old Testament the Psalter alone was finished before the death of Cyril, but according to contemporary testimony Methodius brought the work to completion. As a whole this original version no

longer exists, the codices having perished in the Tartar invasion of the thirteenth century; and the fragments of the Old Testament of Cyril and Methodius which are embedded in the present Slavonic Bible are "so mixed up with later versions as to be indistinguishable¹." The existing version has not been made uniformly from the Greek. Esther was translated from the Hebrew, while Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and certain other books, were rendered from the Latin Vulgate in the fifteenth century. On the other hand the Octateuch, the books of Kingdoms, and the poetical books are from the Greek, and some of them, especially the Octateuch, contain old materials probably due, at least in part, to the work of Cyril and Methodius.

A Psalter in the Glagolitic script, preserved at Sinai, has been edited by Geitler (Agram, 1883); and there is a critical edition of the Slavonic Psalter by Amphilochius (Moscow, 1874—9).

So far as the Slavonic Old Testament is based on the LXX., its text is doubtless Lucianic; cf. Lagarde, *Praef. in Libr. V. T. can.* i. p. xv. "ni omnia fallunt Slavus nihil aliud vertit nisi Luciani recensionem," and Leskien in *Urtext*, p. 215, "dass im allgemeinen der Kirchenslavischen Übersetzung der griech. Text der Lucianischen (Antiochenisch-Konstantinopolitischen) Rezension zu Grunde liegt ist sicher."

LITERATURE. The Russian authorities are given by Mr Bebb in *Scrivener-Miller*, ii. p. 158. See also Gregory, *Prolegg.* p. 1112 ff.; Professor Leskien of Leipzig in *Urtext*, p. 211 ff.; the article in *Ch. Quarterly Review* cited above; and *Th. Literaturzeitung*, 1901, col. 571.

¹ *The Russian Bible*, in *Ch. Quart. Review*, xli. 81 (Oct. 1895), p. 219.

CHAPTER V.

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

THE great edition of the Septuagint published by Holmes and Parsons ends with a complete list of the MSS. employed (vol. v. ad fin., addenda). It enumerates 311 codices (I.—XIII., 14—311), of which I.—XIII., 23, 27, 39, 43, 156, 188, 190, 258, 262, are written in uncial letters, or partly so, while the rest are in minuscule or cursive hands. Since 1827, the date of the publication of the last volume of the Oxford edition, the list of available codices or fragments has been largely increased, owing partly to the researches and publications of Tischendorf, partly to the progress which has recently been made in the examination and cataloguing of Eastern libraries, and the discovery in Egypt of fragments of papyrus bearing Biblical texts. In this chapter an effort has been made to present the student with a complete list of all the MSS. which have been or are being used by editors of the LXX., and of the important fragments so far as they are known to us. It is, however, impossible to guarantee either the exhaustiveness or the correctness in regard to minor details of information which has been brought together from many sources and cannot be verified by enquiry at first hand.

SYSTEMS OF NOTATION. Two systems have been used to denote the uncial MSS. Holmes employed Roman numerals; Lagarde, the capitals of the Roman alphabet¹. For the cursive MSS. Holmes used Arabic numerals, beginning with 14; but, as we have seen, several uncials were allowed to take rank among them. Later scholars have for the most part retained

¹ Lagarde's CEHKRSUYZ were unknown to the Oxford editors. Greek capitals have been used in the Cambridge manual LXX. for a few uncials not mentioned by Lagarde.

this method of notation for the cursives, excepting in the case of a few groups which are supposed to represent a particular recension; thus Lagarde adopted the symbols *f h m p z* for the Lucianic MSS. 82, 93, 118, 44¹, whilst Cornill with a similar object substituted the small letters of the Greek alphabet for the Arabic numerals². Uniformity in this matter can scarcely be expected until the cursive codices have been thoroughly examined and catalogued; meanwhile it is sufficient to call attention to the variety of practice which exists.

Manuscripts of the LXX., whether uncial or cursive, rarely contain the whole of the Greek Old Testament. There are some notable exceptions to the general rule (e.g. A, B, C, S = \aleph , 64, 68, 106, 122, 131), and the number of these exceptions may be increased by adding MSS. which have been broken up into two or more separate codices (e.g. G, N+V). But the majority of the copies seem never to have included more than a particular book (as Genesis, or the Psalms, with or without the liturgical $\psi\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}$), or a particular group of books such as the Pentateuch ($\eta\ \pi\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma$ ³) or the Octateuch ($\eta\ \omicron\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma$ = Gen. — Ruth), the Historical Books (1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Esth., Judith, Tobit), the three or five books ascribed to Solomon, the Minor Prophets ($\tau\omicron\ \delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\phi\eta\tau\omicron\nu$), the Major Prophets ($\omicron\iota\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$), or the Prophets complete ($\tau\omicron\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\phi\eta\tau\omicron\nu$). Larger combinations are also found, e.g. Genesis—Tobit, the Poetical Books as a whole, or the Poetical Books with the Prophets.

In reference to the date of their execution, the uncial MSS. of the LXX. range from the third century to the tenth, and the cursives from the ninth to the sixteenth. Their present distribution may be seen from the descriptions; an analysis of the list of Holmes and Parsons gives the following general results: Italy, 129; Great Britain and Ireland, 54; France, 36; Austria, 26; Russia, 23; Germany, 13; Spain, 7; Holland, 6; Switzerland, 6; Denmark, 4. This summary conveys a general

¹ *Libr. V. T. can. pars i.*, p. v. sq.

² *Ezechiel*, p. 19 ff.

³ Cf. *Orig. in Ioann.* t. xiii. 26, *Epiph. de mens. et pond.* 4. *Pentateuchus* occurs in *Tertullian adv. Marc.* i. 10.

idea of the proportion in which the MSS. of the LXX. were distributed among European countries, Greece excepted, at the beginning of the nineteenth century. But the balance will be considerably disturbed if we add the acquisitions of Tischendorf and other discoverers, and the treasures of the libraries at Athens, Athos, Patmos, Smyrna, Jerusalem, and Mount Sinai, which are now within the reach of the critical student.

I. UNCIAL MSS.

The following table of the Uncial MSS. may be found convenient. A detailed account of each will follow.

	Symbols. H.-P. Lagarde.	Name of Codex.	Century.	Present locality.
	III A	Alexandrinus	v	London
	II B	Vaticanus	iv	Rome
	C	Ephraemi	v	Paris
	I D	Cottonianus	v	London
	E	Bodleianus	ix—x	Oxford
	VII F	Ambrosianus	v	Milan
	IV+V G	Sarravianus	v	Leyden, Paris, St Petersburg
	H	Petropolitanus	vi	St Petersburg
XIII = 13	I	Bodleianus	ix	Oxford
	K	Lipsiensis	vii	Leipzig
VI	L	Vindobonensis	v—vi	Vienna
X	M	Coislinianus	vii	Paris
XI	N	Basilianus	viii—ix	Rome
VIII	O ¹	Dublinensis	vi	Dublin
XII	Q	Marchalianus	vi	Rome
	R	Veronensis	vi	Verona
	S = \aleph	Sinaiticus	iv	Leipzig, St Petersburg
262	T	Turicensis	vii	Zurich
	U	Londinensis	vii	London
23	V	Venetus	viii—ix	Venice
43	W	Parisiensis	ix	Paris
258	X	Vaticanus	ix	Rome
	Y ²	Taurinensis	ix	Turin
	Z ^{a-c}	Fragmenta Tischendorfiana		
	Γ	Cryptoferratensis	viii—ix	Grotta ferrata
	Δ	Bodleianus	iv—v	Oxford
	Θ	Washingtoniensis	v—vi	Detroit
	Π	Petropolitanus	viii—ix	St Petersburg

¹ For IX = P see under Cursive MSS. (H.-P. 294).

² This MS. ought to take rank among the cursives; see below, p. 145.

(A) *Complete Bibles.*

A (III). CODEx ALEXANDRINUS. British Museum, Royal,
I. D. v.—viii.

A MS. of the O. and N. Testaments, with lacunae. The O. T. is defective in the following places: Gen. xiv. 14—17, xv. 1—5, 16—19, xvi. 6—9 (leaf torn across and the lower portion lost); 1 Regn. xii. 18—xiv. 9 (leaf missing); Ps. xlix. 19—lxxix. 10 (nine leaves missing). Slighter defects, due to the tearing of leaves, occur in Gen. i. 20—25, 29—ii. 3; Lev. viii. 6, 7, 16; Sirach l. 21, 22, li. 5.

The codex now consists of four volumes, of which the first three contain the O. T. in 639 leaves. The books are thus distributed: vol. i. Genesis—2 Chronicles; vol. ii. Hosea—4 Maccabees; vol. iii. Psalms—Sirach¹. The first volume begins with a table of the Books, in a hand somewhat later than the body of the MS. The Psalter, which contains the *ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος* (cli.) and the liturgical canticles, is preceded by the Epistle of Athanasius to Marcellinus, the *ὑποθέσεις* of Eusebius, a table, and the canons of the Morning and Evening Psalms. The books of vol. iii. are written *στιχηρῶς*.

The covers of the volumes bear the arms of Charles I. The codex had been sent to James I. by Cyril Lucar, patriarch successively of Alexandria and Constantinople, but did not reach England till after the succession of Charles. It had previously belonged to the Patriarchate of Alexandria, as we learn from an Arabic note at the beginning. Another but later Arabic note states that the MS. was the work of 'the martyr Thecla,' and Cyril Lucar has written on a leaf prefixed to vol. i.: "Liber iste ...prout ego traditione habebam, est scriptus manu Theclae nobilis faeminae Aegyptiae ante MCCC annos circiter, paulo post concilium Nicaenum." But, apart from palaeographical considerations², this date is discredited by the occurrence in the MS. of excerpts from the works of Athanasius and Eusebius, and the liturgical matter connected with the Psalter. It has been proposed to identify Thecla with a correspondent of Gregory of Nazianzus (see THECLA (10), *D. C. B.* iv., p. 897); but this later Thecla seems to have belonged to Cappadocia, not to Egypt. Portions of the text of cod. A were printed by Patrick Young, 1637 (Job), Ussher, 1655 (Judges vi., xviii.), Walton in the polyglott of 1657 (facsimile of Ps. i.), Gale, 1678 (Psalter); and the MS. was used by Grabe as the basis of his great edition

¹ For the order of the books see Part II. c. i.

² As to these see Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.*, p. 129.

of the LXX. (1707—1720¹). Baber in 1812 published the Psalter and in 1816—1821 the whole of the O. T. in facsimile type. Finally, an autotype facsimile, which, as Gregory well says, leaves nothing to be desired, was issued in 1881—3 by order of the Trustees of the British Museum under the editorship of Mr (now Sir) E. Maunde Thompson, who has added brief but valuable prolegomena.

The codex is written on leaves of fine vellum, arranged in quires usually of eight. The writing “varies in different parts of the MS., though sufficient uniformity is maintained to make it difficult to decide the exact place where a new hand begins...the style of writing in vol. iii. is for the most part different from that of the other volumes².” In a few of the superscriptions and colophons the occurrence of Egyptian forms of the Greek letters has been noted, “proving that the MS., if not absolutely written in Egypt, must have been immediately afterwards removed thither³.” The leaves measure about 32 centimetres by 26.3; each leaf contains two columns of 49—51 lines, the lines usually consisting of 23—25 letters. Except in the third volume, the commencement of a new section or paragraph is marked by a large initial letter in the margin as well as by paragraph-marks. There are no breathings or accents by the first hand; an apostrophe occasionally separates words or consonants; here and there an asterisk is placed in the margin (e.g. Gen. xli. 19). Punctuation is limited to a single point, generally high. The abbreviations which occur are $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$, $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$, $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$, $\overline{\pi\eta\rho}$, $\overline{\mu\eta\rho}$, $\overline{\gamma\varsigma}$, $\overline{\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma}$, $\overline{\omicron\gamma\nu\omicron\varsigma}$, $\overline{\delta\alpha\delta}$, $\overline{\iota\eta\lambda}$, $\overline{\iota\lambda\eta\mu}$, $\overline{\pi\eta\alpha}$, and ζ , $\overset{\circ}{\mu}$, $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$, ν , τ , (*καί, μου, σου, -ναι, -ται*). There are numerous and lengthy erasures, over which a corrector has written the text which he preferred. The earliest corrector (A¹) was contemporary with the scribe or nearly so; the second corrector (A²) may have lived a century later; a third and still later hand (A³) has also been at work. But the question of the ‘hands’ in this MS. remains to be worked out, and calls for the knowledge of an expert in palaeography.

B (II). CODEX VATICANUS (Vatican Library, Gr. 1209).

A MS. of the Old and New Testaments, defective at the beginning and in some other places. The O. T. has lost its first 31 leaves, the original hand beginning at Gen. xlvi. 28 (with the words *πόλιν εἰς γῆν Ῥαμεσσή*). Through the tearing of fol. 178 2 Regn. ii. 5—7, 10—13, has also disappeared, and the loss of

¹ See c. vi.

² *Prolegg.* i. p. 358.

³ E. Maunde Thompson, *Cod. Alex.* i. p. 8 ff. *Ibid.*

10 leaves after fol. 348 involves a *lacuna* which extends from Ps. cv. (cvi.) 27 to Ps. cxxxvii. (cxxxviii.) 6^b. The longer gaps have been filled by a recent hand.

The present codex is a quarto volume containing 759 leaves, of which 617 belong to the O. T. Every book of the Greek O. T. is included, except 1—4 Maccabees, which never found a place in the MS. The order of the books differs from that which is followed in cod. A, the poetical books being placed between the canonical histories and the Prophets; and there are variations also in the internal arrangement of the groups.

Of the history of this MS. before the sixteenth century nothing is certainly known. A Vatican collection of Greek MSS. was already in existence in the middle of the fifteenth century, and the greatest treasure in the present library was among its earliest acquisitions. It finds a place in the early catalogues of the Vatican¹; reference is made to this MS. in letters addressed by the librarian of the Vatican to Erasmus in 1521 and 1533², and it formed the chief authority for the Roman edition of the LXX. in 1587. By this time its importance was already recognised, and it is amazing that an interval of nearly 300 years should have been allowed to pass before the actual text of the MS. was given to the world. A collation of B with the Aldine text was made by Bartolucci in 1669, and is still preserved at Paris in the Bibliothèque Nationale (*MS. gr. suppl.* 53). With other treasures of the Vatican the codex was carried to Paris by Napoleon, and there it was inspected in 1809 by Hug, whose book *De antiquitate codicis Vaticani* (Freiburg, 1810) aroused fresh interest in its text. On the restoration of the MS. to the Vatican it was guarded with a natural but unfortunate jealousy which for more than half a century baffled the efforts of Biblical scholars. Neither Tischendorf in 1843 and 1866 nor Tregelles in 1845 was permitted to make a full examination of the codex. Meanwhile the Roman authorities were not unmindful of the duty of publishing these treasures, but the process was slow, and the first results were disappointing. An edition printed by Mai in 1828—38 did not see the light till 1857. It was followed in 1881 by Cozza's more accurate but far from satisfactory volumes in facsimile type. At length in 1890 under the auspices of Leo XIII. the Vatican Press issued a photographic reproduction worthy of this most important of Biblical MSS.³

¹ This has been proved by Nestle (*Academy*, May 30, 1891) against Batiffol (*La Vaticane de Paul III. à Paul V.*, Paris, 1890, p. 82. Cf. Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, ii. p. 11, note i.

² *La Vaticane de Paul III. à Paul V.* (Paris, 1890). Gregory, *Prolegg.* p. 360.

³ On this work see Nestle, *Septuagintast.* iii. p. 13 ff.

The codex is written on the finest vellum in a singularly beautiful hand¹ which "may be attributed to the fourth century," and probably to the middle of the century², and bears a resemblance to the hand which is found in papyri of the best Roman period³. The leaves are arranged in quinions (gatherings of ten pages); each page exhibits three columns of 42 lines with 16—18 letters in each line. There are no breathings or accents in the first hand; a point occurs but rarely; initial letters do not project into the margin. The text is written in two contemporary hands, the transition being made at p. 335. The MS. has been corrected more than once; besides the scribe or contemporary *diorthotes* (B¹), we may mention an early corrector denoted as B^a, and a late *instaurator*, who has gone over the whole text, spoiling its original beauty, and preserving oftentimes the corrections of B^a rather than the original text.

C. CODEX EPHRAEMI SYRI RESCRIPTUS PARISIENSIS.
Bibliothèque Nationale, Gr. 9 (formerly Reg. 1905, Colbert. 3769).

A folio consisting at present of 209 leaves, of which 64 contain portions of the O. T. The fragments are as follows: Prov. i. 2 νοῆσαι—ii. 8, xv. 29 κρείσσων—xvii. 1, xviii. 11 ἡ δὲ δόξα—xix. 23, xxii. 17 τὴν δὲ σὴν—xxiii. 25, xxiv. 22 εὖ ὥστε ἄβρωτα—56 ἡ γῆ, xxvi. 23 χεῖλη λεῖα—xxviii. 2, xxix. 48—end of book; Eccl. i. 2 ματαιότης—14, ii. 18 ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον—end of book; Cant. i. 3—iii. 9 Σαλωμών; Job ii. 12 ῥῆξαντες—iv. 12 ἐν λόγοις σου, v. 27 σὺ δὲ γνῶθι—vii. 7, x. 9—xii. 2 ἄνθρωποι, xiii. 18 οἶδα ἐγώ—xviii. 9 παγίδες, xix. 27 ἃ ὁ ὀφθαλμός—xxii. 14 νεφέλη, xxiv. 7 γυμνοὺς πολλούς—xxx. 1 ἐν μέρει, xxxi. 6—xxxv. 15 ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ, xxxvii. 5—xxxviii. 17 θανάτου, xl. 20 περιθήσεις—end of book; Sap. viii. 5 ἐργαζόμενος—xii. 10 τόπον μετανοίας, xiv. 19—xvii. 18 εὐμελῆς, xviii. 24 ἐπὶ γάρ—end of book; Sir. prol. 1—vii. 14 πρεσβυτέρων, viii. 15 αὐτὸς γάρ—xi. 17 εὐσεβέσω, xii. 16 καὶ εἶν—xvi. 1 ἀχρηστων, xvii. 12—xx. 5 σοφός, xxi. 12—xxii. 19, xxvii. 19—xxviii. 25 σταθμόν, xxx. 8—xxxiv. 22 οὐ μὴ σοι, xxx. 25—xxxi. 6, xxxii. 22 καὶ ὁ κύριος—xxxiii. 13 Ἰακώβ, xxxvii. 11—xxxviii. 15, xxxix. 7—xliv. 27 ἀφικώμεθα, xlv. 24 ἵνα αὐτῷ—xlvii. 23 Ῥοβοάμ, xlviii. 11—xlix. 12 Ἰησοῦς υἱός. The distribution of the leaves is Proverbs 6, Ecclesiastes 8, Cant. 1, Job 19, Wisdom 7, Sirach 23.

¹ Specimens are given in Sir E. Maunde Thompson's *Greek and Latin Palaeography*, p. 150; and F. G. Kenyon's *Our Bible &c.*, p. 136; E. Nestle, *Einführung*², Tafel 4.

² Sir E. M. Thompson, *op. cit.* p. 159; WH., Intr. p. 75.

³ F. G. Kenyon, *Palaeography of Greek papyri*, p. 120. See A. Rahlfs, *Alter u. Heimath der Vat. Bibelhandschrift*, in *G. G. N.*, 1899, i. p. 72 ff.

The copy of the Greek Bible of which these fragments have survived unfortunately fell during the middle ages into the hands of a scribe in want of writing materials. Originally, as it seems, a complete Bible, written probably in the fifth century and, as Tischendorf believed, in Egypt, in the twelfth century it was taken to pieces, sponged, and used for other writings¹. What became of the missing leaves we do not know; those of the Paris volume are covered with the Greek text of certain works of Ephrem the Syrian². The book was probably brought to Florence early in the 16th century by Andreas Lascaris, the agent of Lorenzo de' Medici, and passing into the possession of Catharine de' Medici, accompanied her to France, where it found its way into the Royal Library. Here the value of the underlying text was recognised by Montfaucon, who called attention to it in his *Palaeographia Graeca*, and gave a specimen from the fragments of the N. T. (p. 213 f.). The O. T. fragments were partly examined by Wetstein and Thilo³, but were not given to the world until in 1845 Tischendorf, who had published the N. T. portion in 1843, completed his task by printing the LXX. text.

This once noble MS. was written in single columns from 40 to 46 lines in length, each line containing about 40 letters⁴. The writing of the O. T. differs, according to Tischendorf, from that of the N. T.; it is more delicate, some of the letters (Α, Δ, Β, Κ, Ξ, Χ, Φ) assume different forms in the two portions of the codex, and there are other palaeographical indications that the hand which wrote the earlier books did not write the later. Nevertheless Tischendorf regarded the two hands as contemporary, and believed the codex to have been originally one. A seventh century corrector has left traces of his work, but his corrections are not numerous except in Sirach. As to the order of the books nothing can be ascertained, the scribe who converted the MS. into a palimpsest having used the leaves for his new text without regard to their original arrangement⁵.

S = Σ. CODEX SINAITICUS. Leipzig and St Petersburg.

The remains of this great uncial Bible contain the following portions of the O. T.: Gen. xxiii. 19 αὐτῆ—xxiv. 4 πορεύσῃ, xxiv.

¹ On palimpsest MSS. see Sir E. M. Thompson, *Greek and Latin Palaeography*, p. 75 ff.

² For a list of these see Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs*, p. 2.

³ Tischendorf, *Cod. Ephraemi rescriptus, prolegg.* p. 9.

⁴ See a photographic facsimile in *Facsimilés des plus anciens manuscrits grecs de la Bibl. Nat.* (H. Omont, Paris, 1892).

⁵ See Tischendorf, *op. cit.*, *prolegg.* p. 5.

5 εἰς τὴν γῆν—8, 9 ῥήματος—14 καμήλους, 17 καὶ εἶπεν—19 ἕως ἄν, 25 αὐτῶ—27 τὴν, 30 ἄνθρωπον—33 λαλήσαι, 36 αὐτῶ (1^o)—41 ἐκ τῆς, 41 ὄρκισμου—46 ἀφ’; Num. v. 26 αὐτῆς—30 ποιήσει, vi. 5 ἅγιος—6 τετελευτηκία, 11 κεφαλὴν—12 αἱ (2^o), 17 κανῶ—18 μαρτυρίου, 22, 23, 27 Κύριος, vii. 4 Μωσῆν—5 Λευίταις, 12 Ναασσών—13 ἔν, 15 ἕνα (2^o)—20 θυμάματος, 1 Par. ix. 27 τὸ πρῶν—xix. 17, 2 Esdr. ix. 9 Κύριος—end of book; Psalms—Sirach; Esther; Tobit; Judith; Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lam. i. 1—ii. 20; 1 and 4 Maccabees.

The forty-three leaves containing 1 Par. xi. 22—xix. 17, 2 Esdras ix. 9—end, Esther, Tobit i. 1—ii. 2, Jer. x. 25—end, and Lam. i. 1—ii. 20 were found by Tischendorf in a waste-paper basket at the Convent of St Catharine’s, Mount Sinai, in 1844, and published by him in a lithographed facsimile under the name of *Codex Friderico-Augustanus*¹ (Leipzig, 1846); to these in *Mon. sacr. ined., nov. coll.* i. (1855) he was able to add Isa. lxvi. 12—Jer. i. 7 from a copy made during the same visit to Sinai. A second visit in 1853 enabled him to print in the next volume of the *Monumenta* (1857) two short fragments of Genesis (xxiv. 9, 10, 41—43). During a third visit to the Convent in 1859, he was permitted to see the rest of the codex, including 156 leaves of the Old Testament, and ultimately succeeded in carrying the whole to St Petersburg for presentation to the Czar Alexander II. This final success led to the publication in 1862 of the *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*, containing a facsimile of the St Petersburg portion of the Sinaitic MS. Lastly in 1867 Tischendorf completed his task by printing in his *Appendix Codicum* certain fragments of Genesis and Numbers which had been discovered by the Archimandrite Porfirius in the bindings of other Sinai MSS.²

This great Bible was written on leaves which originally measured 15 × 13½ inches, and were gathered, with two exceptions, into quires of four. Each column contains 48 lines, with 12—14 letters in a line; and in all but the poetical books each page exhibits four columns, so that eight lie open at a time³; in the poetical books, where the lines are longer, two columns appear on each page, or four at an opening. The characters are assigned to the fourth century; they are well-formed and somewhat square, written without break, except when an apostrophe or a single point intervenes; a breathing *prima manu* has been

¹ So called in honour of Frederick Augustus, King of Saxony.

² Cf. Tischendorf’s remarks in *Litt. C.-Blatt*, 1867 (27).

³ “They have much of the appearance of the successive columns in a papyrus roll, and it is not at all impossible that it [the MS.] was actually copied from such a roll.” Kenyon, p. 124; cf. Scrivener-Miller, p. 95.

noticed at Tobit vi. 9, but with this exception neither breathings nor accents occur. Tischendorf distinguished four hands in the codex (A, B, C, D), and assigned to A the fragments of Chronicles, 1 Macc., and the last $4\frac{1}{2}$ leaves of 4 Macc., as well as the whole of the N. T.; the fragments of Numbers and the Prophets are ascribed to B; the poetical books to C; Tobit and Judith and the rest of 4 Macc. to D, who is identified with the scribe to whom we owe the N. T. of Codex Vaticanus. He also detected traces of five stages in the correction of the MS., which he represented by the symbols \aleph^a , $\aleph^{c.a}$, $\aleph^{c.b}$, $\aleph^{c.c}$, \aleph^d . The first symbol covers the work of the diorthotes and other nearly contemporary correctors; $\aleph^{c.a}$, $c.b$, $c.c$ are three seventh century hands, of which the last appears chiefly in the Book of Job, whilst the later \aleph^d has occupied itself with retracing faded writing in the Prophets.

After 1 Chron. xix. 17 cod. \aleph (FA) passes without break to 2 Esdr. ix. 9, but the place is marked by the corrector $\aleph^{c.a}$ with three crosses and the note μέχρι τούτου [του] σημείου τῶν τριῶν σταυρῶν ἐστὶν τὸ τέλος τῶν ἑπτὰ φύλλων τῶν περισσοῶν καὶ μὴ ὄντων τοῦ Ἑσδρα. Five of these leaves remain, and the two which preceded them probably contained 1 Chron. vi. 50—ix. 27^a (H. St J. Thackeray in Hastings' *D.B.*, i. p. 762). Westcott (*Bible in the Church*, p. 307) supposes that the insertion of this fragment of 1 Chron. in the heart of 2 Esdras is due to a mistake in the binding of the copy from which the MS. was transcribed; comp. the similar error in the archetype of all our Greek copies of Sirach¹. Whether 1 Esdras formed a part of cod. \aleph is uncertain, the heading Ἑσδρας β' does not prove this, since cod. \aleph contains 4 Maccabees under the heading Μακκαβαίων δ' although it certainly did not give the second and third books (Thackeray, *l. c.*).

No uniform edition or photographic reproduction of this most important MS. has yet appeared². The student is still under the necessity of extracting the text of \aleph from the five works of Tischendorf mentioned above. A homogeneous edition of the remains of the codex or a photographic reproduction of the text is one of our most urgent needs in the field of Biblical palaeography. (The N. T. has now appeared in collotype; H. and K. Lake, introd. by K. Lake, Oxford, 1911.)

N (XI). CODEX BASILIANO-VATICANUS. Vatican Library, Gr. 2106, formerly Basil. 145³.

¹ Another explanation (suggested by Dr Gwynn) is given by Dr Lupton in Wace's *Apocrypha*, i., p. 2.

² A facsimile of 2 Esdr. xviii. 15—xix. 15 may be seen in Stade, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, ii. p. 192.

³ Cf. Weistein, *N. T.* i. p. 133; Lagarde, *Septuagintastudien*, p. 48.

V (23). CODEX VENETUS. St Mark's Library, Venice, cod. Gr. 1¹.

Dr E. Klostermann (*Analecta*, pp. 9 f., 33 f.) has produced good reasons for believing that these two codices originally formed portions of a complete copy of the Greek Old Testament.

The Vatican portion now contains Lev. xiii. 59—Num. xxi. 34, Num. xxii. 19—Deut. xxviii. 40, Deut. xxx. 16—Jud. xiv. 16, Jud. xviii. 2—1 Regn. xvii. 12, 1 Regn. xvii. 31—3 Regn. viii. 8, 3 Regn. xi. 17—end of 2 Paralip., 2 Esdr. v. 10—xvii. 3, Esther. The Venice MS. yields Job xxx. 8 to end, Prov., Eccl., Cant., Sap., Sirach, the Minor Prophets (in the order Hos., Am., Joel, Ob., Jon., Mic., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal.), Isa., Jer., Bar., Lam., Ezek., Daniel, Tobit, Judith, 1—4 Macc.

The Venice folio measures $16\frac{1}{2} \times 11\frac{3}{8}$ inches, the Vatican to present a little less, but the breadth and length of the columns is identical in the two codices; in both there are two columns of 60 lines. The Venice MS. contains 164 leaves, the Vatican 132. The first leaf of the Venice book begins the 27th quire of the original MS., and on computation it appears that, if to the Vatican leaves were added those which would be required to fill the lacunae of the earlier books and of Job, the entire number would make up 26 quires of the same size². As regards the history of the separated portions, it appears that the Vatican MS. was originally brought to Rome from Calabria by a Basilian monk³; the Venice book was once the property of Cardinal Bessarion, by whom it was presented to St Mark's⁴.

The handwriting of N and V is in the sloping uncials of cent. viii.—ix. Some use was made of V in the Roman edition of 1587, where it seems to have supplied the text of Maccabees; both codices were collated for Holmes and Parsons, who numbered V as a cursive.

(B) *Octateuch and Historical Books.*

D (I). CODEX COTTONIANUS. British Museum, Cotton MSS., Otho B. vi. 5—6.

A collection of fragments, the largest of which measures no more than $7 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ inches, containing portions of the Book of Genesis with vestiges of pictures executed in a semi-classical style.

¹ Cf. *Deutsche Lit.-Zeit.* 1897, p. 1475 f.

² Klostermann, p. 9.

³ Holmes, *Praef. ad Pentateuch.*

⁴ It was the eighth of Bessarion's MSS.; see Schott in Eichhorn's *Repert.*, viii. 181.

No other uncial codex of the LXX., of which any portion remains, has suffered so lamentable a fate. Brought to England from Philippi¹ in the reign of Henry VIII. by two Orthodox Bishops², and presented to the English monarch, it remained in the Royal Library till the reign of Elizabeth, who gave it to her Greek tutor Sir John Fortescue, and from his hands after several vicissitudes it found its way into the Cotton collection. In 1731, while the codex was at Ashburnham House with the rest of that collection, it was reduced by fire to a heap of charred and shrivelled leaves. Even before the fire it had been imperfect³; the beginning and end of the book had disappeared, and other leaves were defective here and there; yet 165 or 166 leaves remained and 250 miniatures. The existing remains at the British Museum, though collected with the most scrupulous care, consist only of 150 mutilated fragments; to these must be added a smaller series preserved at the Baptist College, Bristol, to which institution they were bequeathed by Dr A. Gifford, formerly an Assistant Librarian at the Museum.

Most of the London fragments were deciphered and published by Tischendorf in 1857 (*Mon. sacr. ined., nov. coll. ii.*); the rest, together with the Bristol fragments, are now accessible in Dr F. W. Gotch's *Supplement to Tischendorf's Reliquiae cod. Cotton.* (London, 1881).

Happily we have means of ascertaining with some approach to completeness the text of this codex as it existed before the fire. Although no transcript had been made, the MS. was more than once collated—by Patrick Young and Ussher for Walton's Polyglott, and afterwards by Gale, Crusius, and Grabe; and Grabe's collation, which is preserved in the Bodleian, was published by Dr H. Owen (*Collatio cod. Cotton. Geneseos cum Editione Romana...*, Londini, 1778). Some assistance can also be obtained from the *Vetusta Monumenta* published by the London Society of Antiquaries (vol. i. 1747), where two plates are given depicting some of the miniatures, together with portions of the text of fragments which have since disappeared.

Lastly, among the Peiresc papers in the Bibliothèque Nationale, transcripts have been found of Gen. i. 13, 14, xviii. 24—26, xliii. 16, which were made from the MS. in 1606. They are printed in *Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France*, liii. pp. 163—172⁴. As this discovery was overlooked

¹ Still an episcopal see in the time of Le Quien; see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 64, note.

² They stated that it had once been the property of Origen.

³ Walton's statement that Cod. D at one time contained the Pentateuch is however groundless; in the Cotton catalogue of 1621 it is described as "Genesis only."

⁴ I owe the reference to Dr Nestle (*Urtext*, p. 71).

when the second edition of *The Old Testament in Greek*, vol. i., passed through the press in 1895, it may be convenient to the student to have the new fragments placed before him *in extenso*.

Gen. i. 13, 14...¹³ ἔσπερα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα τρίτη. ¹⁴ καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Γενηθήτωσαν φωστῆρες ἐν τῷ στερεώματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς φαῦσιν τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀρχέτωσαν τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς τοῦ διαχω[ρίζειν]...

II. xviii. 24—26. ²⁴ εἰάν ὧσιν πεντήκοντα δίκαιοι ἐν τῇ πόλει, ἀπολέσεις αὐτούς; οὐκ ἀνήσεις πάντα τὸν τόπον ἐκείνον ἕνεκα τῶν πεντήκοντα δικαίων, εἰάν ὧσιν ἐν αὐτῇ; ²⁵ μηδαμῶς σὺ ποιήσεις ὡς τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, τοῦ ἀποκτείνειν δίκαιον μετὰ ἀσεβοῦς, καὶ ἔσται ὁ δίκαιος ὡς ὁ ἀσεβής· μηδαμῶς. ὁ κρίνων πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, οὐ ποιήσεις κρίσιν; ²⁶ εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος Ἐάν εὕρω ἐν Σο[δόμοις]...

16. xliii. 16...θύματα καὶ ἐτοίμασον· μετ' ἐμοῦ γὰ[ρ] φάγονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι ἄρτου[ς] τὴν μεσημβρίαν...

The vellum of the MS. is fine, but not so thin as in some other early uncials. The leaves were arranged in quires of four. Each page, where the writing was not broken by an illustration, contained from 26 to 28 lines of 27 to 30 letters. The uncials are well formed, but vary to some extent in thickness and size. Initial letters are used, and the point is sometimes high, sometimes middle or low. On the whole the codex may probably be assigned to cent. v.—vi. The hands of three scribes have been traced in the fragments, and there appear to have been two correctors after the *diorthotes*; the earlier of the two, who seems to have lived in the eighth century, has retraced the faded letters.

E. CODEx BODLEIANUS. Bodleian Library, Oxford. Auct. T. infr. ii. 1.

The Bodleian volume contains the following fragments of Genesis: i. 1—xiv. 6, xviii. 24 δικαίων—xx. 14 καὶ ἀπέδωκεν, xxiv. 54 ἐκπέμφατε—xlii. 18 εἶπεν δὲ αὐ[τοῖς]. Another leaf, now at the Cambridge University Library, contains xlii. 18 [αὐ]τοῖς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ—xliv. 13 τὸν ἕνα καί, but the *verso*, to which xlii. 31—xliv. 13 belongs, is written in (?) contemporary minuscules. It is now known that this text is carried on by more than one cursive MS. The St Petersburg cod. lxii. begins where the Cambridge fragment leaves off (at Gen. xliv. 13 Βενιαμίν· ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ), and proceeds, with some lacunae, as far as 3 Regn. xvi. 28 (τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν συμπλοκῶν). The largest of the lacunae (Jos. xxiv. 27—Ruth, inclusive) is supplied by the British Museum MS. Add. 20002, which once belonged to the same codex as E, the Cambridge fragment, and St Petersburg cod. lxii.

The recent history of this MS. is both curious and instructive. The portions now at Oxford and London were brought from the East by Tischendorf in 1853; the Cambridge leaf and the St Petersburg portion followed in 1859. Tischendorf published the contents of the Bodleian volume in *Monumenta sacra inedita*, n. c. ii. (1857); the Cambridge leaf remained in his possession till his death in 1874, when it was purchased by the Syndics of the University Library. In 1891 it was recognised by the present writer and Mr H. A. Redpath as a continuation of the Bodleian Genesis¹; and its contents were at once communicated to the *Academy* (June 6, 1891), and were afterwards incorporated in the apparatus of the Cambridge manual LXX. (vol. i., ed. 2, 1895). Finally, in 1898, Dr A. Rahlfs of Göttingen² proved that the Petersburg and London volumes originally formed a part of the codex to which the Oxford Genesis and the Cambridge leaf belonged. The entire MS. will be used for the apparatus of the larger Cambridge LXX.; a description by the Editors (Messrs Brooke and M^cLean) may be found in the *Classical Review* for May, 1899 (vol. xiii., pp. 209—11).

The Bodleian Genesis is written in large sloping uncials of a late form on 29 leaves of stout vellum; each page carries two columns of 37—44 lines; in the earlier pages the letters are closely packed and there are sometimes as many as 28 in a line, but as the book advances the number seldom exceeds and sometimes fall below 20. Tischendorf was disposed to assign the writing to the 9th, or at the earliest the 8th century; but the debased character of the uncials, as well as the readiness of the scribe to pass from the uncial to the cursive script, point to a still later date³. According to the same authority the uncial leaves of the codex have passed through the hands of a nearly contemporary corrector, and also of another whose writing is more recent.

F (VII). CODEX AMBROSIANUS. Ambrosian Library, Milan. A. 147 infr.

The remains of this important Codex consist of the following

¹ Mr Bradshaw, I now learn, had previously noticed this, but he does not appear to have published the fact, or to have left any written statement about it.

² In his paper *über eine von Tischendorf aus dem Orient mit-gebrachte, in Oxford, Cambridge, London, u. Petersburg liegende Handschrift der Septuaginta*, reprinted from *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1898; cf. *Th. L.-Z.*, Feb. 4, 1899, p. 74. See also E. Klostermann, *G. G. A.*, 1895, p. 257.

³ "The date of the whole MS., including the uncial part, may very well be the tenth century" (*Class. Review*, l.c.).

fragments of the Octateuch: Gen. xxxi. 15 [ἀλλοτρί]α—37 ἡράν-
νησας, xlii. 14 ὅτι κατὰσκοποῖ—21 εἰσηκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ, 28 ἐπαρά-
χθησαν—xlvi. 6 τὴν κτῆσιω, xlvii. 16 εἰ ἐκκλέλοιπεν—xlviii. 3 ὁ θεός
μοι ᾤφθη, xlviii. 21 τῶν πατέρων—li. 14 οἱ ἀδελφοί. Exod. i. 10
γῆς—viii. 19 τῷ [Φαραῶ], xii. 31 οἱ υἱοί—xxx. 29 ὁ ἀπτ. αὐτῶν, xxxi.
18 ἐν τῷ ὄρει—xxxii. 6 θυσ[ίαν], xxxii. 13 [πολυπλη]θυνῶ—xxxvi. 3
προσ[εδέχοντο], xxxvii. 10 αἱ βάσεις—end of book. Lev. i. 1—ix.
18 κύκλω, x. 14 [ἀφαιρέμα]τος—end of book. Num. (without
lacuna). Deut. i. 1—xxviii. 63 ἡφ'εὐράν[θη], xxix. 14 καὶ τὴν ἡράν
—end of book. Jos. i. 1—ii. 9 ἐφ' [ἡ]μᾶς, ii. 15 αὐτῆς ἐν τῷ τ[ε]ίχει
—iv. 5 ἔμπροσθεν, iv. 10 [συ]νετέλεσεν—v. 1 Ἰορδάνην, v. 7 Ἰησοῦς
—vi. 23 ἀδελφούς αὐτῆς, vii. 1 Ζαμβρί—ix. 27 τῆς σήμερον ἡμ[έρας],
x. 37 ἦν ἐν αὐτῇ—xii. 12 βασ. Ἑγλῶν¹.

An inscription on a blank page states that the fragments were
“ex Macedonia Corcyram advecta, ibique Ill. Card. Fed. Borro-
maei Bibliothecae Ambrosianae Fundatoris iussu empta eidem-
que Bibliothecae transmissa sunt.” They attracted the notice of
Montfaucon (*Diar. Ital.*, p. 11, *Pal. sacr.* pp. 27, 186), and were
collated for Holmes, but in an unsatisfactory manner. Ceriani's
transcript (*Mon. sacr. et prof.* iii., Mediol. 1864) supplies the text,
for the accuracy of which the name of the Editor is a sufficient
guarantee, and a learned preface, but the full prolegomena
which were reserved for another volume have not appeared. A
photograph is needed not only for palaeographical purposes, but
to shew the marginal readings, many of which are Hexaplaric.

The MS. is written on the finest and whitest vellum, the
leaves of which are gathered in fours²; three columns of writing
stand on each page, and 35 lines in each column. The char-
acters are those of cent. iv.—v.; initial letters are used, which
project to half their breadth into the margin. Punctuation is fre-
quent, and there is much variety in the use of the points; accents
and breathings are freely added *prima manu*, a feature in which
this MS. stands alone amongst early Uncials³. The colour of the
ink changes after Deuteronomy, and the rest of the fragments
seem to have been written by another scribe; but the work is
contemporary, for the quire numbers have been added by the
first scribe throughout. The MS. has passed through the hands
of two early correctors, and the margins contain various read-
ings, notes, and scholia.

¹ The fragments of Malachi and Isaiah, attributed to F in Holmes,
followed by Tischendorf *V. T.*², and Kenyon (p. 62), belong to a MS. of
cent. xi.; see Ceriani, *Mon. sacr. et prof.*, *praef.* p. ix.

² See Sir E. Maunde Thompson, *Greek and Latin Pal.*, p. 62.

³ Cf. Thompson, *op. cit.* p. 72, “they were not systematically applied
to Greek texts before the 7th century.”

G (IV, V). CODEX COLBERTO-SARRAVIANUS. (1) Leyden, University Library, Voss. Gr. Q. 8. (2) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, cod. Gr. 17, formerly Colbert. 3084. (3) St Petersburg, Imperial Library, v. 5.

Of this codex Leyden possesses 130 leaves and Paris 22, while one leaf has strayed to St Petersburg. When brought together the surviving leaves yield the following portions of the Octateuch: Gen. xxxi. 53 αὐτῶν—xxxvi. 18 *θυγατρὸς Ἀνά. 1*Exod. xxxvi. 8—29, *xxxvii. 3 ὕφαντοῦ—6, *xxxviii. 1—18, *xxxix. 1 [κατ]εργάσθη—11, *16 σκεύη—19, xl. 2 ἐκεῖ τὴν κιβωτὸν to end of book, *Lev. i. 1—iv. 26 ἐξ(ε)ιάσεται περὶ, iv. 27 λαοῦ τῆς γῆς—xiii. 17 καὶ ἰδοῦ, *xiii. 49 ἱματίῳ—xiv. 6 λήμψεται αὐτὸ καί, *xiv. 33—49 ἀφαγνί[σαι], *xv. 24 κοιμηθῆ—xvii. 10 προσ- [ηλύτων], *xviii. 28 [ἐ]θνεσιν—xix. 36 στάθμια δίκαια καί, xxiv. 9 καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς—xxvii. 16 ἄνθρωπος τῷ. Num. i. 1—vii. 85 τῶν σκευῶν, xi. 18 τίς ψωμιεῖ—xxviii. 2 φυλῆν, xviii. 30 ἐρείς—xx. 22 παρεγένοντο οἱ, *xxv. 2 αὐτῶν καί—xxvi. 3, *xxix. 12 ἐορτάσετε—33 σύγκρισιν, 34 καὶ χ(ε)ίμαρ(ρ)ον—end of book. Deut. iv. 11 * [καρ]δίας: τοῦ οὐρανοῦ—26 ἐκεῖ κλη[ρονομησαι], vii. 13 τὸν σίτον—xvii. 14 κατακληρονομή[σης], xviii. 8—xix. 4 τὸν πλη[σίον], xxviii. 12 [ἐθνε]σιν—xxx. 11. Jos. ix. 33 [ἐκλέξη]ται—xix. 23 αὕτη ἡ κληρονομία. †Jud. ix. 48 αὐτὸς καὶ πᾶς—x. 6 Ἀσσορῶθ * καὶ σὺν τοῖς, xv. 3 [Σαμ]ψῶν—xviii. 16 οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν, xix. 25 αὐτῆ ὄλην—xxi. 12 τετρακοσίοις.

The Leyden leaves of this MS. are known to have been in the possession of Claude Sarrave, of Paris, who died in 1651. After his death they passed into the hands successively of Jacques Mentel, a Paris physician, who has left his name on the first page, and of Isaac Voss († 1681), from whose heirs they were purchased by the University of Leyden. The Paris leaves had been separated from the rest of the MS. before the end of the 16th century, for they were once in the library of Henri Memme, who died in 1596. With a large part of that collection they were presented to J. B. Colbert in 1732, and thus found their way into the Royal Library at Paris. Among earlier owners of the St Petersburg leaf were F. Pithaeus, Desmarez, Montfaucon², and Dubrowsky. The text of the Leyden leaves and the St Petersburg leaf was printed in facsimile type by Tischendorf in the third volume of his *Monumenta sacra* (Leipzig, 1860); a splendid photographic reproduction of all the known leaves of the codex appeared at Leyden in 1897³.

¹ Fragments marked * are at Paris; that marked † is at St Petersburg.

² Montfaucon, *Pal. sacr.* p. 186 f.; Tischendorf, *Mon. sacr. ined. n. c.* iii. *prolegg.* p. xviii.

³ *V. T. gr. cod. Sarraviani-Colbertini quae supersunt in bibliothecis Leidensi Parisiensi Petropolitana phototypice edita.* Praefatus est H. Omont.

The leaves measure $9\frac{3}{8} \times 8\frac{7}{8}$ inches; the writing is in two columns of 27 lines, each line being made up of 13—15 letters. In Tischendorf's judgement the hand belongs to the end of the fourth or the first years of the fifth century. There are no initial letters; the writing is continuous excepting where it is broken by a point or sign; points, single or double, occur but rarely; a breathing is occasionally added by the first hand, more frequently by an early corrector. Of the seven correctors noticed by Tischendorf three only need be mentioned here,—(A) a contemporary hand, (B) another fifth century hand which has revised Deuteronomy and Judges, and (C) a hand of the sixth century which has been busy in the text of Numbers.

In one respect this codex holds an unique position among uncial MSS. of the Octateuch. It exhibits an Origenic text which retains many of the Hexaplaric signs. Besides the asterisk (*) and various forms of the obelus (⚭, ⚮, ⚯, ⚰, and in the margin, —), the metobelus frequently occurs (:, ·/, /·, ·/·). The importance of Cod. Sarravianus as a guide in the recovery of the Hexaplaric text has been recognised from the time of Montfaucon (comp. Field, *Hexapla*, i., p. 5); and it is a matter for no little congratulation that we now possess a complete and admirable photograph of the remains of this great MS.

H. CODEX PETROPOLITANUS. In the Imperial Library at St Petersburg.

This palimpsest consists at present of 88 leaves in octavo; in its original form there were 44, arranged in quaternions. Under the patristic matter which is now in possession of the vellum, Tischendorf detected a large part of the Septuagint text of Numbers. The fragments recovered contain chh. i. 1—30, 40—ii. 14, ii. 30—iii. 26, v. 13—23, vi. 6—vii. 7, vii. 41—78, viii. 2—16, xi. 3—xiii. 11, xiii. 28—xiv. 34, xv. 3—20, 22—28, 32—xvi. 31, xvi. 44—xviii. 4, xviii. 15—26, xxi. 15—22, xxii. 30—41, xxiii. 12—27, xxvi. 54—xxvii. 15, xxviii. 7—xxix. 36, xxx. 9—xxxi. 48, xxxii. 7—xxxiv. 17, xxxvi. 1—end of book. They are printed in *Monumenta sacr. ined., nov. coll.* i. (Leipzig, 1855).

In Tischendorf's judgement the upper writing is not later than the ninth century; the lower writing he ascribes to the sixth; for though the characters are generally such as are found in fifth century MSS., yet there are several indications of a later date, e.g. the numerous *compendia scribendi* and superscribed letters, and the occasional use of oblong forms. Chapters and arguments are noted in the margin—the chapters of Numbers are 207—and at the end of the book the number of *stichi* is

specified ($\gamma\phi\lambda\epsilon' = 3535$); the scribe appends his name—'ΙΩΑΝ-
ΝΟΥ ΜΟΝΑΧΟΥ ΣΕΡΓΙΟΥ.

K. FRAGMENTA LIPSIENSIA. Leipzig, University Library
(cod. Tisch. ii.).

Twenty-two leaves discovered by Tischendorf in 1844, of which seventeen contain under Arabic writing of the ninth century fragments of Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges (Num. v. 17—18, 24—25; vii. 18—19, 30—31, 35—36, 37—40, 42—43, 46—47; xv. 11—17, 19—24; xxvii. 1—xxviii. 5, xxviii. 10—xxix. 2, xxxv. 19—22, 28—31. Deut. ii. 8—10, 15—19, ix. 1—10, xviii. 21—xix. 1, xix. 6—9; xxi. 8—12, 17—19. Jos. x. 39—xi. 16, xii. 2—15, xxii. 7—9, 10—23; Jud. xi. 24—34, xviii. 2—20¹).

The Greek writing is not later than cent. vii. The fragments are printed in the first volume of *Monumenta sacra inedita*, n. c.

L (VI). CODEx PURPUREUS VINDOBONENSIS. Vienna, Imperial Library.

This MS. consists of 24 leaves of Genesis, with which are bound up two leaves of St Luke belonging to Codex N of the Gospels².

The Genesis leaves contain Gen. iii. 4—24, vii. 19—viii. 20, ix. 8—15, 20—27; xiv. 17—20, xv. 1—5, xix. 12—26, 29—35; xxii. 15—19, xxiv. 1—11, 15—20; xxiv. 22—31, xxv. 27—34, xxvi. 6—11, xxx. 30—37; xxxi. 25—34; xxxii. 1—18, 22—32; xxxv. 1—4, 8, 16—20, 28—29, xxxvii. 1—19, xxxix. 9—18, xl. 14—xli. 2, xli. 21—32, xlii. 21—38, xliii. 2—21, xlvi. 16—xlix. 3, xlix. 28—33, l. 1—4.

Like the great Cotton MS. the Vienna purple Genesis is an illustrated text, each page exhibiting a miniature painted in water-colours. The writing belongs to the fifth or sixth century; the provenance of the MS. is uncertain, but there are notes in the codex which shew that it was at one time in North Italy. Engravings of the miniatures with a description of the contents may be found in P. Lambecii *Comm. de bibliotheca Vindobonensi*, lib. iii. (ed. Kollar., 1776), and a transcript of the text in R. Holmes's Letter to Shute Barrington, Bishop of Durham (Oxford, 1795); but both these earlier authorities have been superseded by the splendid photographic edition lately published at Vienna (*die Wiener Genesis herausgegeben von Wilhelm Ritter v. Hartel u. Franz Wickhoff*, Wien, 1895).

¹ On the fragments of Judges see Moore, *Judges*, p. xlv.

² On the latter see H. S. Cronin, *Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus*, p. xxiii.

M (X). CODEX COISLINIANUS. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Coisl. Gr. I.

A MS. of the Octateuch and the Historical Books, with lacunae; the 227 remaining leaves contain Gen. i. 1—xxxiv. 2, xxxviii. 24—Num. xxix. 23, xxxi. 4—Jos. x. 6, Jos. xxii. 34—Ruth iv. 19, 1 Regn. i. 1—iv. 19, x. 19—xiv. 26, xxv. 33—3 Regn. viii. 40.

This great codex was purchased in the East for M. Segurier, and brought to Paris about the middle of the seventeenth century. It was first described by Montfaucon, who devotes the first 31½ pages of his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana* to a careful description of the contents, dealing specially with the capitulation and the letters prefixed to the sentences. Facsimiles were given by Montfaucon, Bianchini (*Evangelium quadruplex*), Tischendorf (*Monumenta sacr. ined.*, 1846), and Silvester, and a photograph of f. 125 r., containing Num. xxxv. 33—xxxvi. 13, may be seen in H. Omont's *Facsimilés*, planche vi. Montfaucon gives a partial collation of the codex with the Roman edition of the LXX., and a collation of the whole was made for Holmes; an edition is now being prepared by Mr H. S. Cronin.

The leaves, which measure 13 × 9 inches, exhibit on each page two columns of 49 or 50 lines, each line containing 18—23 letters. According to Montfaucon, the codex was written in the sixth or at latest in the seventh century ("sexto vel cum tardissime septimo saeculo exaratus"), but the later date is now usually accepted. The margins contain a large number of notes *prima manu*¹, among which are the excerpts from the N. T. printed by Tischendorf in the *Monumenta* and now quoted as cod. F^a of the Gospels². The MS. is said by Montfaucon to agree frequently with the text of cod. A, and this is confirmed by Holmes as far as regards the Pentateuch. Lagarde (*Genesis graece*, p. 12) styles it Hexaplaric; hexaplaric signs and matter abound in the margins, and of these use has been made by Field so far as he was able to collect them from Montfaucon and from Griesbach's excerpts printed in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*.

Z^a. d. FRAGMENTA TISCHENDORFIANA. Two of a series of fragments of various MSS. discovered by Tischendorf and printed in the first and second volumes of *Monumenta sacra inedita, nov. coll.* i. ii. (1855, 1857).

Z^a. Three palimpsest leaves containing fragments of 2—3 Regn. (2 Regn. xxii. 38—42, 46—49; xxiii. 2—5, 8—10; 3 Regn.

¹ Other notes occur in a hand of the ninth century and in a late cursive hand.

² Gregory, i. p. 375; Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 134.

xiii. 4—6, 8—11, 13—17, 20—23, xvi. 31—33, xvii. 1—5, 9—12, 14—17). The upper writing is Armenian, the lower an Egyptian-Greek hand of the 7th century, resembling that of cod. Q (v. *infra*).

Z^d. Palimpsest fragment containing 3 Regn. viii. 58—ix. 1, also from the Nitrian MSS. There are two texts over the Greek of which the lower is Coptic, the upper Syriac; the Greek hand belongs to cent. v.

Ⓞ. CODEX WASHINGTONIENSIS. See Additional Notes.

II. FRAGMENTA TISCHENDORFIANA.

Four leaves taken from the binding of Cod. Porfirianus Chiovensis (P of the Acts and Catholic Epistles¹), and published by Tischendorf in *Mon. sacr. ined., nov. coll.* vi. p. 339 ff. They yield an interesting text of portions of 4 Maccabees (viii. 6, 12, 15, 29; ix. 28—30, 31—32). The writing appears to belong to cent. ix.

(C) *Poetical Books.*

I (13). CODEX BODLEIANUS. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 4. 1.

A Psalter, including the Old Testament Canticles and a *catena*. Described by Bruns in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, xiii. p. 177; cf. Lagarde's *Genesis graece*, p. 11, and *Nov. Psalt. Gr. edit. Specimen*, p. 3. Parsons, who reckons it among the cursives, is content to say "de saeculo quo exaratus fuerit nihil dicitur"; according to Coxe (*Catalogus codd. Biblioth. Bodl. i.* 621), it belongs to the 9th century.

R. CODEX VERONENSIS. Verona, Chapter Library.

A MS. of the Psalter in Greek and Latin, both texts written in Roman characters. A few *lacunae* (Ps. i. 1—ii. 7, lxxv. 20—lxviii. 3, lxxviii. 26—33, cv. 43—cvi. 2) have been supplied by a later hand, which has also added the ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος (Ps. cli.). The Psalms are followed *prima manu* by eight canticles (Exod. xv. 1—21, Deut. xxxii. 1—44, 1 Regn. ii. 1—10, Isa. v. 1—9, Jon. ii. 3—10, Hab. iii. 1—10, *Magnificat*, Dan. iii. 23 ff.).

Printed by Bianchini in his *Vindiciae canonicarum scripturarum*, i. (Rome, 1740), and used by Lagarde in the apparatus of his *Specimen* and *Psalterii Gr. quinquagena prima*, and in the Cambridge manual *Septuagint* (1891). A new collation was made in 1892 by H. A. Redpath, which has been employed in

¹ See Gregory, i. p. 447, Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 172 f.

the second edition of *The O. T. in Greek* (1896); but it is much to be wished that the Verona Chapter may find it possible to have this important Psalter photographed.

The codex consists of 405 leaves, measuring $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ inches; each page contains 26 lines. The Greek text appears at each opening on the left-hand page, and the Latin on the right.

T (262). CODEX TURICENSIS. Zurich, Municipal Library.

A purple MS. which contained originally 288 leaves; of these 223 remain. The text now begins at xxvi. (xxvii.) 1, and there are lacunae in the body of the MS. which involve the loss of Pss. xxx. 2—xxxvi. 20, xli. 6—xlili. 3, lviii. 24—lix. 3, lix. 9—10, 13—lx. 1, lxiv. 12—lxxi. 4, xcii. 3—xciii. 7, xcvi. 12—xcvii. 8. The first five Canticles and a part of the sixth have also disappeared; those which remain are 1 Regn. ii. 6—10 (the rest of the sixth), the *Magnificat*, Isa. xxxviii. 10—20, the Prayer of Manasses¹, Dan. iii. 23 ff., *Benedictus*, *Nunc Dimittis*.

Like Cod. R this MS. is of Western origin. It was intended for Western use, as appears from the renderings of the Latin (Gallican) version which have been copied into the margins by a contemporary hand, and also from the liturgical divisions of the Psalter. The archetype, however, was a Psalter written for use in the East—a fact which is revealed by the survival in the copy of occasional traces of the Greek *σάδεις*.

The characters are written in silver, gold, or vermilion, according as they belong to the body of the text, the headings and initial letters of the Psalms, or the marginal Latin readings. Tischendorf, who published the text in the fourth volume of his *nova collectio* (1869), ascribes the handwriting to the seventh century.

The text of T agrees generally with that of cod. A, and still more closely with the hand in cod. S known as S^{c-a}.

U. FRAGMENTA LONDINENSIA. London, British Museum, pap. xxxvii.

Thirty leaves of papyrus which contain Ps. x. (xi.) 2 [ε]ἰς φαρῆτραν—xviii. (xix.) 6, xx. (xxi.) 14 ἐν ταῖς δυναστείαις σου—xxxiv. (xxxv.) 6 καρδιῶκ[ω]ν.

These fragments of a papyrus Psalter were purchased in 1836 from a traveller who had bought them at Thebes in Egypt, where they had been found, it was said, among the ruins of a convent. Tischendorf assigned to them a high antiquity (*Pro-*

¹ Cf. Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, iii. p. 17 ff.

legg. ad V. T. Gr., p. ix., "quo nullus codicum sacrorum antiquior videtur"), and he was followed by Lagarde, who as late as 1887 described the London codex as "bibliorum omnium quos noverim antiquissimus" (*Specimen*, p. 4). But a wider acquaintance with the palaeography of papyri has corrected their estimate, and the fragments are now ascribed by experts to cent. vi.—vii.¹

The writing slopes, and the characters are irregularly formed; the scribe uses breathings and accents freely; on the other hand he writes continuously, not even breaking off at the end of a Psalm or distinguishing the title from the rest of the text. The hand is not that of a learned scribe or of the literary type².

It has been pointed out that the text of U corresponds closely with that of the Sahidic Psalter published by Dr Budge³.

X (258). CODEX VATICANUS IOBI. Rome, Vatican Library, Gr. 749.

A MS. of Job with occasional lacunae; the remaining portions are i. 1—xvii. 13, xvii. 17—xxx. 9, xxx. 23—xxx. 31, 35, xxxi. 24—xxxiv. 35. There are miniatures, and a catena in an uncial hand surrounding the text. At the beginning of the book Hexaplaric scholia are frequent⁴.

The text is written in a hand of the ninth century. It was used by Parsons, and its Hexaplaric materials are borrowed by Field⁵.

W (43). CODEX PARISIENSIS. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Gr. 20.

A portion of an uncial Psalter containing in 40 leaves Ps. xci. 14—cxxxvi. 1, with *lacunae* extending from Ps. cx. 7 to cxii. 10, and from Ps. cxvii. 16—cxxvi. 4. So Omont (*Inventaire sommaire des mss. grecs*, p. 4); according to Parsons (*Praef. ad libr. Pss.*), followed generally by Lagarde (*Genesis gr.* 15), the omissions are Ps. c. 4—ci. 7, cx. 6—cx. 10, cxvii. 16—cxviii. 4, cxviii. 176—cxxvi. 4.

The codex was written by a hand of the ninth or tenth century, and contains paintings which, as Parsons had been informed, are of some merit.

¹ See *Catalogue of Ancient MSS. in the British Museum*, i. (1881), where there is a photograph of Ps. xxiii. 10 ff., and Dr Kenyon's *Palaeography of papyri*, p. 116 f.

² Kenyon, *loc. cit.*

³ Cf. F. E. Brightman in *J. Th. St.* ii. 275 f.

⁴ See E. Klostermann, *Analecta zur Septuaginta*, &c., p. 63.

⁵ *Hexapla*, ii. p. 2.

Z^c. See above under (B), p. 140.

Fragments of the fourth or fifth cent. (Tisch.), containing Pss. cxli. (cxlii.) 7—8, cxlii. (cxliii.) 1—3, cxliv. (cxlv.) 7—13.

(D) *Prophets.*

O (VIII). FRAGMENTA DUBLINENSIA. Dublin, Trinity College Library, K. 3. 4.

Eight palimpsest leaves—in the original MS. folded as four—which are now bound up with Codex Z of the Gospels¹ and yield Isa. xxx. 2—xxxi. 7, xxxvi. 19—xxxviii. 2.

The original leaves of the Codex measured about 12×9 inches, and each contained 36 lines of 14—17 letters. The writing, which belongs to the early part of the sixth century, appears to be that of an Egyptian scribe, and Ceriani is disposed to connect the text of the fragments with the Hesychian recension². They have been printed in facsimile type by Professor T. K. Abbott (*Par palimpsestorum Dublinensium*, Dublin, 1880), and are used in the apparatus of the Cambridge manual Septuagint.

Q (XII). CODEX MARCHALIANUS. Rome, Vatican Library, Gr. 2125.

A magnificent codex of the Prophets, complete, and in the order of cod. B (Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; Isaiah, Jeremiah with Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle, Ezekiel, Daniel (Theod.) with Susanna and Bel).

This MS. was written in Egypt not later than the sixth century. It seems to have remained there till the ninth, since the uncial corrections and annotations as well as the text exhibit letters of characteristically Egyptian form. From Egypt it was carried before the 12th century to South Italy, and thence into France, where it became the property of the Abbey of St Denys near Paris, and afterwards of René Marchal, from whom it has acquired its name. From the library of R. Marchal it passed into the hands of Cardinal F. Rochefoucauld, who in turn presented it to the Jesuits of Clermont. Finally, in 1785 it was purchased for the Vatican, where it now reposes.

The codex was used by J. Morinus, Wetstein and Montfaucon, collated for Parsons, and printed in part by Tischendorf in the

¹ See Gregory, i. p. 399 f.; Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 153.

² *Recensioni dei LXX.*, p. 6.

ninth volume of his *Nova Collectio* (1870). Field followed Montfaucon in making large use of the Hexaplaric matter with which the margins of the MS. abound, but was compelled to depend on earlier collations and a partial transcript. The liberality of the Vatican has now placed within the reach of all O.T. students a magnificent heliotype of the entire MS., accompanied (in a separate volume) by a commentary from the pen of Ceriani (1890). This gift is only second in importance to that of the photograph of Codex B, completed in the same year.

Codex Marchalianus at present consists of 416 leaves, but the first twelve contain patristic matter, and did not form a part of the original MS. The leaves measure $11\frac{3}{8} \times 7$ inches; the writing is in single columns of 29 lines, each line containing 24—30 letters. The text of the Prophets belongs, according to Ceriani, to the Hesychian recension; but Hexaplaric signs have been freely added, and the margins supply copious extracts from Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the LXX. of the Hexapla. These marginal annotations were added by a hand not much later than that which wrote the text, and to the same hand are due the patristic texts already mentioned, and two important notes¹ from which we learn the sources of the Hexaplaric matter in the margins. The result of its labours has been to render this codex a principal authority for the Hexapla in the Prophetic Books.

Y. CODEX TAURINENSIS. Turin, Royal Library, cod. 9.

This codex consists of 135 leaves in quarto, and contains the *δωδεκαπρόφητων*. The MS. is difficult to read, and there are many lacunae. The text, written according to Stroth² in the ninth century, is surrounded by scholia, and prefaced by Theodoret's *ὑποθέσεις* to the various books.

The Turin MS. does not appear to have been used hitherto for any edition of the LXX., nor has any transcript or collation been published³.

Z^{b, c}. See above, under (B), p. 140.

Z^b. Palimpsest fragments of Isaiah (iii. 8—14, v. 2—14, xxix. 11—23, xlv. 26—xlv. 5). As in Z^a, the upper writing is Armenian; the Greek hand belongs apparently to cent. viii.—ix.

Z^c. Palimpsest fragment of Ezekiel (iv. 16—v. 4) found among the Nitrian leaves at the British Museum. The Greek hand resembles that of Z^a, and is probably contemporary with it.

¹ Printed in *O. T. in Greek*, iii.², p. 8 f.

² In Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, viii. p. 202 f.

³ The specimens and descriptions in the Turin catalogue (p. 74 ff.) seem to shew that the headings only are written in uncials.

F. CODEX CRYPTOFERRATENSIS. Basilian Monastery of Grotta Ferrata, cod. E. β. vii.

This volume consists partly of palimpsest leaves which once belonged to a great codex of the Prophets. A scribe of the 13th century has written over the Biblical text liturgical matter accompanied by musical notation. Some portions of the book are doubly palimpsest, having been used by an earlier scribe for a work of St John of Damascus. About 130 leaves in the present liturgical codex were taken from the Biblical MS., and the Biblical text of 85 of these leaves has been transcribed and published (with many lacunae where the lower writing could not be deciphered) in Cozza-Luzi's *Sacrorum bibliorum vetustissima fragmenta*, vol. i (Rome 1867) and iii. (1877).

The original codex seems to have contained 432 leaves gathered in quires of eight; and the leaves appear to have measured about $10\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ inches. The writing, which is in sloping uncials of the eighth or ninth century, was arranged in double columns, and each column contained 25—28 lines of 13—20 letters.

It cannot be said that Cozza's transcript, much as Biblical students are indebted to him for it, satisfies our needs. Uncial codices of the Prophets are so few that we desiderate a photographic edition, or at least a fresh examination and more complete collation of this interesting palimpsest.

Δ. FRAGMENTUM BODLEIANUM. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Gr. bibl. d. 2 (P).

A fragment of Bel in the version of Theodotion (21 γυναικῶν—41 Δαυήλ). A vellum leaf brought from Egypt and purchased for the Bodleian in 1888.

Written in an uncial hand of the fifth (?) century, partly over a portion of a homily in a hand perhaps a century earlier.

The following uncial fragments have not been used for any edition of the LXX., and remain for the present without a symbolical letter or number.

(1) A scrap of papyrus (B. M., *pap.* ccxii.) yielding the text of Gen. xiv. 17. See Catalogue of Additions to the MSS., 1888—93, p. 410. Cent. iii. (?).

(2) The vellum fragment containing Lev. xxii. 3—xxiii. 22, originally published by Brugsch (*Neue Bruchstücke des Cod. Sin.*, Leipzig, 1875), who believed it to be a portion of Codex Sinaiticus; a more accurate transcription is given by J. R. Harris, *Biblical Fragments*, no. 15 (cf. Mrs Lewis's *Studia Sin.* i. p. 97 f.). Cent. iv.

(3) Another Sinaitic fragment, containing Num. xxxii. 29, 30 (J. R. Harris, *op. cit.*, no. 1). Cent. vii.

(4) Another Sinaitic fragment, containing a few words of Jud. xx. 24—28 (J. R. Harris, *op. cit.*, no. 2). Cent. iv.

(5) Another Sinaitic fragment, containing Ruth ii. 19—iii. 1, iii. 4—7 (J. R. Harris, *op. cit.*, no. 3). Cent. iv.

(6) Part of a Psalter on papyrus (B. M., *pap.* ccxxx.), containing Ps. xii. 7—xv. 4; see *Athenaeum*, Sept. 8, 1894, and Kenyon, *Palaeography of Greek Papyri*, pp. 109, 131. Cent. iii.

(7) Part of a Psalter on a Berlin papyrus, containing Ps. xl. 26—xli. 4; see Blass in *Z. f. ägypt. Sprache*, 1881 (Kenyon, *op. cit.*, p. 131).

(8) Nine fragments of a MS. written in columns of about 25 lines, one on each page. The fragments give the text of Ps. ci. 3, 4, cii. 5—8, cv. 34—43, cvi. 17—34, cviii. 15—21, cxiii. 18—26, cxiv. 3—cxv. 2. J. R. Harris, *op. cit.*, no. 4. Cent. iv.

(9) A vellum MS. in the Royal Library at Berlin (MS. Gr. oct. 2), containing Ps. cxi.—cl., followed by the first four canticles and parts of Ps. cv. and cant. v. See E. Klostermann, *Z. f. A. T. W.*, 1897, p. 339 ff.

(10) Fragments discovered by H. A. Redpath at St Mark's, Venice, in the binding of cod. gr. 23, containing the text of Prov. xxiii. 21—xxiv. 35. Published in the *Academy*, Oct. 22, 1892. A fuller transcript is given by E. Klostermann, *Analecta*, pp. 34 ff.

(11) Portion of a leaf of a papyrus book, written in large uncials of cent. vii.—viii., exhibiting Cant. i. 6—9. This scrap came from the Fayûm and is now in the Bodleian, where it is numbered MS. Gr. bibl. g. 1 (P); see Grenfell, *Greek papyri* (Oxford, 1896), pp. 12 f.

(12) Palimpsest fragments of Wisdom and Sirach (cent. vi.—vii.), carried by Tischendorf to St Petersburg and intended for publication in the 8th volume of his *Monumenta*, which never appeared. See Nestle, *Urtext*, p. 74.

(13) Two palimpsest leaves of Sirach belonging to cod. 2 in the Patriarchal Library at Jerusalem: cf. Papadopoulos, *Ἱεροσ. Βιβλ.*, i. p. 14: τὰ ἀναπληρωτικά φύλλα 27 καὶ 56 εἰς τὴν παλίμψηστα ὄν ἡ ἀρχικὴ γραφὴ ἀνήκει εἰς τὸν ἐ' αἰῶνα... τὸ παλαιὸν δὲ αὐτῶν κείμενόν ἐστι δίσηλον, καὶ ἐν φυλ. 56 διακρίνεται ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ σοφία ἰησοῦ γιόου σιράχ. The leaves contain Sir. prol. 1—i. 14, i. 29—iii. 11. Printed by J. R. Harris, *op. cit.*, no. 5.

(14) Part of a Papyrus book which seems to have contained the Minor Prophets. The discovery of this fragment was announced in 1892 by W. H. Hechler, who gave a facsimile of Zach. xii. 2, 3 ('Times,' Sept. 7, 1892; *Transactions of the Congress of Orientalists*, 1892, ii., p. 331 f.). Mr Hechler

claimed for this papyrus an extravagantly early date, but the hand appears to belong to the seventh century; see Kenyon, *Palaeography of papyri*, p. 118. This MS., which contains Zech. iv.—xiv., Mal. i.—iv., is now the property of the University of Heidelberg¹.

(15) Two leaves of a small vellum book, from the Fayûm, now Bodl. MS. Gr. bibl. e. 4 (P); the handwriting, "in small, fine uncials," yields the text of Zach. xii. 10—12, xiii. 3—5. "About the fifth century" (Grenfell, *Greek papyri*, p. 11 f.).

(16) A Rainer papyrus, assigned to the third century and containing Isa. xxxviii. 3—5, 13—16; see Nestle, *Urtext*, p. 74.

(17) A portion of a leaf of a papyrus book, bearing the Greek text of Ezech. v. 12—vi. 3 (Bodl. MS. Gr. bibl. d. 4 (P)); see Grenfell, *Greek papyri*, pp. 9 ff. The text shews Hexaplaric signs; the writing is said to belong to the third century (Kenyon, *Palaeography of papyri*, p. 107).

(18) A fragment of a lead roll on which is engraved Ps. lxxix (lxxx). 1—16, found at Rhodes in 1898. See *Sitzungsberichte d. königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1898 (xxxvii.)².

II. CURSIVE MSS.

The following are the cursive MSS. used by Holmes and Parsons, with the addition of others recently examined or collated by the editors of the larger Cambridge Septuagint³.

(A) *The Octateuch.*

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 14. Gen., Ex., <i>ep.</i> | Rome, Vat. Palat. Gr. | Klostermann, <i>Anal.</i> |
| <i>Arist., cat.</i> (xi) | 203 | p. 11 n. |
| 15. Octateuch (ix—x) | Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. | Hexaplaric in early books |
| | 2 | |
| 16. Octateuch (xi) | Florence, Laur. v. 38 | Batiffol, <i>Vat.</i> , p. 91 |
| 17. Genesis, <i>cat.</i> (x) | Moscow, Syn. 5, Vlad. | |
| | 28 | |
| 18. Octateuch (x—xi) | Florence, Laur. Med. Pal. 242 (formerly at Fiesole) | |

¹ Edited (1905) by Prof. G. Deissmann.

² The *Amherst Papyri*, pt. i. (1900), adds some small uncial fragments from Gen. (i. 1—5) and Job (i. 21 f., ii. 3) and portions of Pss. v., lviii., lix., cviii., cxviii., cxxxv., cxxxviii.—cxl. Finally, Mrs Lewis (*Exp. Times*, Nov. 1901) announces the discovery of a palimpsest from Mt Sinai containing Gen. xl. 3, 4, 7 in an uncial hand of the sixth or seventh century.

³ The arabic numerals are the symbols employed by H. and P. For descriptions of the unnumbered MSS., the writer is indebted to Messrs Brooke and McLean, and Mr Brooke has also assisted him in verifying and correcting the earlier lists.

19. Octateuch.....¹ Rome, Chigi R. vi. 38 Bianchini, *Vind.*, p. 279 ff.
(? x) Lucianic, Lagarde's *h*
20. Genesis (ix) [Cod. Dorothei i.]
25. Gen., Ex., *ep.* Munich, Staatsbibl. Field, ii. Auct. p. 3.
Arist., cat. (xi) Gr. 9 Lag.'s *m* (*Gen. gr.*)
28. Num., Deut., Rome, Vat. Gr. 2122
Jos., *imperf.*(xi) (formerly Basil. 161)
29. Octateuch (inc. Venice, St Mark's, Cf. Lagarde *Genesis*,
Gen. xliii. 15) Gr. 2 p. 6, *Septuagintast.*
...(x) i. p. 11. Lag.'s *x*
30. Octateuch (inc. Rome, Casan. 1444
Gen. xxiv. 13)
(xi)
31. Genesis, *cat.*(xvi) Vienna, Imp. Lib. ? Copied from Ald.
Theol. Gr. 4 (Lamb.) (Nestle.) Lag.'s *w*
32. Pentateuch (xii) [Cod. Eugenii i.] Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 224
37. Lectionary (A.D. Moscow, Syn. 31,
1116) Vlad. 8
38. Octateuch...(xv) Escorial, Y. 11. 5 Hexaplaric, cf. Field,
i. p. 398
44. Octateuch...(xv) Zittau, A. 1. 1 Lagarde's *sz*: see *Gene-*
sis gr., p. 7 ff. and
Libr. V. T. can. i.
p. vi.; Scrivener-
Miller, i. p. 261;
Redpath, *Exp. T.*,
May 1897
45. Num. (*lect.*), (xi) Escorial
46. Octateuch...(xiv) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. 4 O.T. exc. Psalter
47. Fragment of lec- Oxford, Bodl. Baron.
tionary 201
50. Lectionary (xiii) Oxford, Bodl. Seld. 30
52. Octateuch..., *ep.* Florence, Laur. Acq.
Arist., cat. (x) 44
53. Octateuch (A.D. Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr.
1439) 17^A
54. Octateuch, *ep. A-* Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. Field, i. p. 223. La-
rist. (xiii—xiv) 5 garde's *k*
55. Octateuch...(xi) Rome, Vat. Regin. Part of a complete
Gr. 1 Bible, cf. Kloster-
mann, p. 12
56. Octateuch...(A.D. Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr.
1093) 3
57. Octateuch, *ep.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 747 Field, i. pp. 5, 78
Arist., cat. (xi)

¹ Dots in this position shew that the MS. extends beyond the Octateuch.

58. Pentateuch Rome, Vat. Reg. Hexaplaric. Field, i.
(xiii) Gr. 10 p. 78
59. Octateuch (xv) Glasgow, Univ. BE.
7^b. 10 (formerly at
C.C.C., Oxford)
61. Lectionary (xi) Oxford, Bodl. Laud. Scrivener-Miller, i. p.
36 329
63. Jos., Jud., Ruth Rome, Vat. 1252 Klostermann, p. 12
(*imperf.*) (x)
64. Octateuch ... (x Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. Field, i. p. 5
—xi) 2 O. and N.T.
68. Octateuch...(xv) Venice, St Mark's, O. and N.T. Scrive-
Gr. 5 ner-Miller, i. p. 219
70. Jos., Jud., Ruth Munich, Gr. 372 (for-
... (xi) merly at Augsburg)
71. Octateuch...(xiii) Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 1
72. Octateuch (xiii) Oxford, Bodl. Canon. Hexaplaric. Tischen-
Gr. 35 (formerly at dorf in *L. C.-Bl.*,
Venice; see H. P.) 1867 (27)
73. Octateuch, *ep.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 746 Field, i. p. 78
Arist. (part),
cat. (xiii)
74. Octateuch...(xiv) Florence, Laur. Acq. Hesychian
700 (49)
75. Octateuch (A.D. Oxford, Univ. Coll. lii. Lagarde's *o.* Horne-
1126) Enquiry, p. 90
76. Octateuch...(xiii) Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 4 Hesychian
77. Octateuch, *cat.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 748
78. Gen., Ex., *cat.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 383 Field, i. p. 78
(xiii)
79. Gen., *ep. Arist.*, Rome, Vat. Gr. 1668
cat. (xiii)
82. Octateuch...(xii) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. Lucianic (in part).
3 Rahlfs, *Sept.-St.* i.
5ff. (Lagarde's *f*)
83. Pentateuch, *cat.* Lisbon, Archivio da ? Copied from Ald.
(xvi) Torre da Tombo (Nestle)
540 &c. (formerly
at Evora)
84. Heptateuch (*im- Rome, Vat. Gr. 1901 Hesychian*
perf.) (x)
85. Heptateuch (*im- Rome, Vat. Gr. 2058 Field, i. pp. 78, 397*
perf.) (xi) (formerly Basil. 97) ("praestantissimi
codicis")
93. Ruth... (xiii) London, B. M. Reg. Lucianic (Lagarde's
i. D. 2 *m* in "Lucian")

- 94=131
105. Exod. xiv. 6—26 London, B. M. Bur-
&c. (xiii—xiv) ney
106. Octateuch...(xiv) Ferrara, Bibl. Comm. Hesychian. O. T.,
Gr. 187 N. T. (582 Greg.,
451 Scr.). Lagarde,
Ank. p. 27
107. Octateuch...(A.D. Ferrara, Bibl. Comm. Lagarde, *ib.*
1334) Gr. 188
108. Octateuch...(xiv) Rome, Vat. Gr. 330 Field, i. p. 5. Luci-
anic (Lagarde's *d*)
118. Octateuch (*im-* Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. Lucianic (Lagarde's
perf.) (xiii) 6 *ϕ*)
120. Octateuch...(xi) Venice, St Mark's,
Gr. 4
121. Octateuch... (x) Venice, St Mark's,
Gr. 3
122. Octateuch...(xv) Venice, St Mark's, O. and N. T. (Ev.
Gr. 6 206) in Latin order.
Copy of 68. Lag.'s *y*
125. Octateuch...(xv) Moscow, Syn. 30,
Vlad. 3
126. Heptateuch..... Moscow, Syn. 19,
cat. in Gen., Ex. Vlad. 38
(A.D. 1475)
127. Octateuch... (x) Moscow, Syn. 31 a, Field, i. p. 5. La-
Vlad. 1 garde, *Ank.* p. 3
128. Octateuch (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1657, Field, i. pp. 168, 224
formerly Grotta fer-
rata
129. Octateuch (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1252 See note to 63
130. Octateuch(?xiii) Vienna, Th. Gr. 3 Field, i. p. 6. La-
(Nessel 57) garde's *t*: *Ank.* p.
26. See note to 131
131. Octateuch Vienna, Th. Gr. 1 Field, i. p. 5: "in
(x—xi) (Nessel 23) enumeratione Hol-
mesiana [cod. 130]
perverse designatur
131, et vice versa.'
O. and N. T.
132. Lectionary (pa- Oxford, Bodl. Selden.
limpsest, xi— 9
xii)
133. Excerpts from Leyden, Univ.
MSS. by I. Voss
134. Octateuch... (xi) Florence, Laur. v. 1 Hesychian

135. Gen., Ex. i. 1— Basle, A. N. iii. 13 Field, i. p. 6. La-
xii. 4, *cat.* (xi) (Omont 1) garde's *r* (*Genesis*,
p. 6). Hexaplaric
136. Excerpts from Oxford, Bodl. Barocc.
Pentateuch 196
(A.D. 1043)
209. Jos., Jud., Ruth, [Cod. Dorothei iv]
cat. (xii)
236. Jos., Jud., Ruth Rome, Vat. Gr. 331 Klostermann, p. 78
... (xii)
- 237 = 73
241. Jos., Jud., Ruth London, B. M. Harl. P. Young's copy of
... (xvii) 7522 Cod. A
246. Octateuch Rome, Vat. Gr. 1238 Cf. Batiffol, *d'un im-
(xiii)* portant MS. des
Septante, in *Bul-
letin Critique*, 1889,
pp. 112 ff.
-
- Josh.—Ruth (x London, B.M. Add. Continuation of E (p.
—xi) 20002 134) with Peters-
burg lxii. See next
page
- Octateuch, *cat.* London, B.M. Add.
(xii—xiii) 35123
- Lev.—Ruth, *cat.* Lambeth, 1214
(A.D. 1104)
- Lev.—Ruth, *cat.* Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
(A.D. 1264) 5
- Jos.—Ruth Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
cat. (xii) 7
- Octateuch Paris, Arsenal 8415 Hexaplaric readings
schol.
- Heptateuch (*im- Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. Lucianic (?)
perf.*) (xiii) 184
- Lev.—Ruth, *cat.* Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
(xiii) 6
- Octateuch...(xiv) Paris, Nat. Suppl. Hesychian (?)
Gr. 609
- Octateuch, *ep.* Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr.
Arist., cat. (xii) 128
- Ex.—Ruth, *cat.* Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. Hexaplaric readings
(xv) 132
- Octateuch, *ep.* Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. Hexaplaric readings
Arist., cat. (xiii) 129
- Gen.—Ex. (*im- Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr.
perf.*), *ep. Arist.,
cat.* (xv) 130

Ex.(<i>imperf.</i>), <i>cat.</i> (xvi)	Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 131	Hexaplaric readings (interlinear)
Gen. i.—iii.(?), <i>comm.</i> (palim.) (xiii)	Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 161	
Gen., Ex., <i>ep.</i> <i>Arist.</i> , <i>cat.</i> (A.D. 1586)	Escorial Σ. i. 16	Hexaplaric readings
Octateuch...(<i>im- perf.</i>) (xi)	Escorial Ω. i. 13	
Octateuch, <i>cat.</i> (xiii)	Leyden, 13 (belongs to Voss collection)	
Exod. — Deut. (<i>imperf.</i>) (xi)...	Leipzig, Univ. Libr. Gr. 361	Hexaplaric readings. Published by Fis- cher in 1767 = Lips. (H. P.)
Gen., Ex., <i>ep.</i> <i>Arist.</i> , <i>cat.</i> (xvi)	Munich, Gr. 82	
Jos.—Ruth... (x)	Munich, Gr. 454 (for- merly at Augsburg)	
Octateuch, <i>ep.</i> <i>Arist.</i> , <i>cat.</i> (xiii)	Zurich, Bibl. de la ville, c. 11	Hexaplaric matter
Gen. iv.—v., Ex. xii. — xxviii., <i>comm.</i> (xi)	Basle, O. ii. 17	
Octateuch, <i>cat.</i> (? xii)	Rome, Barb. Gr. iv. 56	
Gen., <i>cat.</i> (xvi)	Rome, Barb. Gr. vi. 8	
Num.—Ruth ... (xiv—xv)	Rome, Vat. Gr. 332	
Hexateuch... (x)	Grotta Ferrata Y. γ. 1	
Gen.—Jos. (<i>im- perf.</i>)... (x—xi)	St Petersburg, Imp. Libr. lxii	Continuation of E (p. 134)
Gen., <i>comm.</i> <i>Chrys.</i>	Moscow, Syn. Vlad. 35	
Joshua—Ruth... <i>cat.</i> (xii)	Athos, Ivér. 15	
Octateuch (x)	Athos, Pantocr. 24	Hexaplaric readings
Octateuch... (x —xi)	Athos, Vatop. 511	
Octateuch (A.D. 1021)	Athos, Vatop. 513	
Lev.—Ruth, <i>cat.</i> (xi—xii)	Athos, Vatop. 515	
Ex.—Ruth (xiv)	Athos, Vatop. 516	Hexaplaric readings, much faded

- Pentateuch (*im-* Athos, Protat. 53 Hexaplaric readings
perf.), (A.D. 1327)
- Octateuch (A.D. Athos, Laur. γ. 112 Hexaplaric readings
1013) (a few)
- Genesis, *cat.* (?xi) Constantinople, 224
(formerly 372)
- Octateuch... *cat.* Athens, Bibl. Nat. 43
(xi)
- Octateuch... (xiii) Athens, Bibl. Nat. 44 Lucianic (?)
- Octateuch, *cat.* Smyrna, σχολή ἐνάγγ.
Niceph. (xii) I
- Pentateuch, *cat.* Patmos, 216
(xi)
- Num. — Ruth, Patmos, 217
cat. (xi)
- Heptateuch (*im-* Patmos, 410
perf.) (xiii)
- Pentateuch, *test.* Patmos, 411
xii. patr. (xv)
- Octateuch... (x) Sinai, 1
—xi)
- Pentateuch, *cat.* Sinai, 2
(? x)
- Octateuch... (ix) Jerusalem, H. Sepul-
med.) chre 2
- Genesis, *cat.* (xii) Jerusalem, H. Sepul-
—xiii) chre 3
- Octateuch, *cat.* Venice, Gr. 534: see
(xi) below, p. 508
- (B) *Historical Books.*
- 19¹... I Regn., 2 Esdr., Rome, Chigi R. vi. 38
Judith, Esth.,
1—3 Macc., &c.
(x)
- 29... I—4 Regn., I— Venice, St Mark's,
3 Macc. (*im-* Gr. 2
perf.), &c. (x)
- 38... I Regn., 2 Regn. Escorial, Y. II. 5
i. 1—xx. 18 (xv)
- 44... I Regn., 2 Esdr., Zittau, A. I. I
1—4 Macc.,
Esth., Judith,
Tob., (N. T.)
&c. (xv)

¹ Dots before the name of the first book quoted indicate that the MS. has already appeared under (A), where fuller information may be sought. This note applies *mutatis mutandis* to (C) and (D).

- 46...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
 Esth., Judith, 4
 1—4 Macc.,
 Tob....
- 52...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Florence, Laur. Acq.
 Esth., Judith, 44
 1—4 Macc.,
 Tob., *schol.* (x)
- 55...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Rome, Vat. Regin.
 Judith, Esth., Gr. 1
 Tob., 1—4
 Macc. (xi)
- 56...1—4 Regn., 1— Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 3
 2 Chron., 1—2
 Macc. (xii)
- 58...1—4 Regn., 1— Rome, Vat. Regin.
 2 Chron., 1—2 Gr. 10
 Esdr., Jud.,
 Tob., Esth.,
 &c. (xiii)
60. 1—2 Chron. (?xii) Cambridge, Univ. Walton, *Polygl. vi.*
 Libr. Ff. i. 24 121 ff.; J. R. Harris,
Origin of Leicester
Cod., p. 21
- 64...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr.
 Esth., Tob., 2
 1—2 Macc. (x)
- 68...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Venice, St Mark's,
 Esth., Judith, Gr. 5
 Tob., 1—3
 Macc.... (xv)
- 70...1—4 Regn., parts Munich, Gr. 372 (for-
 of Chron., Tob. merly at Augsburg)
 (xi)
- 71...2 Esdr., 1—3 Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 1
 Macc., Esth.,
 Judith, Tob.
 (xiii)
- 74...1—2 Esdr., 1—4 Florence, St Mark's
 Macc., Esth.,
 Judith, Tob.
 (xiv)
- 76...Esth., Judith, Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 4
 Tob. (xiii)
- 82...1—4 Regn. (xii Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
 —xiii) 3
92. 1—4 Regn. (x) Paris, Nat. Gr. 8 Field, i. p. 486

- 93...1-2 Esdr., Esth., London, B. M. Reg. Facsimile in Kenyon.
1-3 Macc. (xiii) i. D. 2 Two texts of Esther
98. 1-4 Regn., 1-2 Escorial, Σ. 2. 19
Chron., *cat.*
- 106...1 Regn.-2 Esdr., Ferrara, Bibl. Comm.
Judith, Esth., Gr. 187
1-2 Macc.
- Missing? 107...1 Regn.-2 Esdr., Ferrara, Bibl. Comm.
1-3 Macc., Gr. 188
Esth., Judith,
Tob. (A.D. 1334)
- 108...1 Regn.-2 Esdr., Rome, Vat. Gr. 330 Cf. Field, i. p. 702
Judith, Tob.,
Esth. (xiv)
119. 1-4 Regn., 1-2 Paris, Nat. Gr. 7
Chron., 1-2
Esdr. (x)
- 120...1 Regn.-2 Esdr., Venice, St Mark's,
1-4 Macc., Gr. 4
Esth. (xi)
- 121...1 Regn.-2 Esdr. Venice, St Mark's,
(x) Gr. 3
- 122...Historical Bks., Venice, St Mark's,
... (xv) Gr. 6
123. 1-4 Regn. (xi) [Cod. Dorothei v.]
- 125...Historical Bks., Moscow, Syn. 30,
... (xv) Vlad. 3
- 126...Judith, Tob. (xv) Moscow, Syn. 19,
Vlad. 38
- 127...1-4 Regn., 1- Moscow, Syn. 31 a,
2 Chron. xxxvi. Vlad. 1
(x)
- 131...Historical Bks. Vienna, Th. Gr. 1
(exc. 4 Macc.) (Nessel 23)
(?xii)
- 134...1 Regn.-2 Esdr., Florence, Laur. v. 1
1 Macc. (x)
158. 1-4 Regn., 1-2 Basle, B. 6. 22 Wetstein, *N. T.* i. p.
Chron. 132
- 236...1 Regn.-2 Esdr., Rome, Vat. Gr. 331
Esth., Judith,
Tob., 1-4
Macc., *cat.* (xii)
- 241...1-4 Regn., 1-2 London, B. M. Harl.
Chron. 7522
242. 1-4 Regn. Vienna, Th. Gr. 5
243. 1-4 Regn., *cat.* Paris, Nat. Coisl. 8 Field, i. p. 486

- 243*. 1—4 Regn. (*cat.*), Venice, St Mark's, Field, i. p. 486
 1 Chron.—2 cod. 16
 Esdr., Esth.,
 Tob., Jud., 1—4
 Macc.
244. 1—4 Regn. (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 333
245. 1 Regn. (ix—x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 334 Lucianic (Field)
- 246... 1 Regn. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1238
247. 1—4 Regn. (4 Rome, Vat. Gr. Urb. 1
 Regn. imperf.)
- 248... 1—2 Esdr., Tob., Rome, Vat. Gr. 346 Nestle, *Marg.* p. 58
 Judith, Esth.,
 &c. (xiv)
- 311... Historical Bks. Moscow, Syn. 341
 (xi)
-
- ... 1 Regn.—2 Esdr.,
 Esth., Tob.
- ... Judith, 1—3 Escorial, Ω. 1. 13
 Macc. (3 M.
 imperf.) (xi)
- ... 1 Regn.—2 Chron. Munich, Gr. 454 (?for-
 merly at Augsburg)
- ... 1 Regn.—3 Regn. St Petersburg, Imp.
 xvi. 28 (x or xi) Libr. lxii.
- ... Tob., Judith, Grotta Ferrata, A. γ. 1
 Esth., Ruth (x) (catal., 29)
- ... Tobit (xiv or xv) Rome, Vat. Gr. 332
- ... 1 Esdr., Tobit Leipzig, Univ. Libr. Hexaplaric readings
 (fragments) (x Gr. 361
 or xi)
- ... Esth., Judith, Athos, Vatop. 511
 Tob., 1—4 Regn.
 (x or xi)
- ... Esth., Tob., Athos, Vatop. 513
 Judith (A.D.
 1021)
- ... 1—2 Chron. (xiv) Athos, Vatop. 516
- ... 1—4 Regn., *cat.* Athens, Bibl. Nat. 43
 (xi)
- ... 1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Athens, Bibl. Nat. 44
 Esth., Judith,
 Tob. (xiii)
- ... 1—4 Regn., 1— Paris, Arsenal 8415
 2 Chron. (xiv)
- ... 1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Paris, Nat. Suppl. Gr.
 1—4 Macc., 609
 Esth., Judith,
 Tob. (xiv)

...I—4 Regn. (xii) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.

7

(C) *Poetical Books.*

13. =I (see under
Uncial MSS.)
21. Psalms, *schol.* [Cod. Eugenii iv.]
(xiii—xiv)
27. Psalms i—lxx Gotha, formerly Loth-
ringen An uncial MS., La-
garde's M⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ (*Spe-*
cimen, p. 27)
39. Psalms (*imperf.*) [Cod. Dorothei ii.] An uncial MS., La-
(ix) garde's E⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ (*Spe-*
cimen, p. 2)
43. =W (see under
Uncial MSS.) Lagarde's F⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ (*Spe-*
cimen, p. 2)
- 46...Prov., Eccl., Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
Cant., Job, 4
Sap., Sir., ὕμ-
νος τῶν πατ.
ἡμῶν (xiv)
- 55...Job, Psalms Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr.
(? xi) I
65. Psalms, *cant.*, Leipzig
Lat. (xii)
66. Psalms, *cant.* Eton Coll.
(xiv)
67. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, C.C.C. 19 Harris, *Leicester Co-*
(xvi) dex, p. 20
- 68...Poetical Books Venice, St Mark's,
(xv) Gr. 5
69. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Magd. Coll. 9
(? x)
80. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. A
(xiii—xiv)
81. Psalms (xi) Oxford, Christ Ch. 2
99. Psalms, *schol.*, Oxford, Trin. Coll. 78
cat. (xii—xiii)
100. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. 3
(xi—xii)
101. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. 20
(xiii)
102. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. 1
(xiii)
103. Prov. i.—xix. Vienna, Th. Gr. 25 Klostermann, pp. 6,
(xv) 18

104. Psalms i.-x. (xvi) Vienna, Th. Gr. 27
(Nessel 229)
- 106... Job, Prov., Eccl., Ferrara, Bibl. Comm.
Cant., Sap., Sir. Gr. 187
...Psalms (xiv)
109. Proverbs... (xiii) Vienna, Th. Gr. 26
110. Job, *schol.* (ix) Vienna, Th. Gr. 9 Klostermann, p. 18
111. Psalms (ix). Milan, Ambr. P. 65
112. Psalms, *cat.* (A.D. Milan, Ambr. F. 12
961)
113. Psalms, *cat.* (A.D. Milan, Ambr. B. 106
967)
- 114... Psalms, *comm.* Evora, Carthus. 2
115. Psalms, *comm.* Evora, Carthus. 3
- 122... Poetical Books Venice, St Mark's,
(xv) Gr. 6
124. Psalms, *cant.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 21
- 125... Proverbs (*comm.* Moscow, Syn. 30,
Chrys.), Eccl., Vlad. 3
Cant., Sap. (xv)
- 131... Poetical Books, Vienna, Th. Gr. 23
&c. (? xii)
137. Job, *cat.* (xi—xii) Milan, Ambr. B. 73 Field, ii. p. 2, and
Auct. p. 5
138. Job (x) Milan, Ambr. M. 65 Field, ii. p. 2
139. Proverbs — Job, Milan, Ambr. A. 148 Field, ii. p. 2
cat. (x)
140. Psalms Basle, B. 10. 33
141. Psalms (A.D. Turin, B. 2. 42
1344)
142. Psalms, *comm.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 10
(Nessel 8)
143. Psalms, *proem.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 19
- 144 = 131
145. Psalms, *cant.* (x) Velletri, Borg.
146. Psalms (x) [Cod. Fr. Xavier] In Capitular Lib.
Toledo
147. Prov.—Job, *cat.* Oxford, Bodl. Laud. Klostermann, p. 51
... (xiii) 30
149. Job, Prov., Eccl., Vienna, Th. Gr. 7 = 308* H. P. See Geb-
Cant., Sap., hardt, *Die Psalmen*
Pss. Sal., *comm.* Salomo's, p. 15
(xi)
150. Psalms (? xiv) Ferrara, Carmelit. 3
151. Psalms (*imperf.*) Venice, Bibl. Zen.
152. Psalms (xi) (Cod. Nan. 25) A Graeco-Latin MS.
Now in St Mark's
Lib. Venice
154. Psalms, *cant.* (Cod. Meermannii I)
(xiii)

155. Psalms (xii— (Cod. Meermannii II) Now Bodl. Misc. Gr.
xiii) 204
156. Psalms, *interlin.* Basle, A. 7. 3 An uncial MS. Lagarde's D^(ps) (*Specimen*, p. 2, cf. *Ank.*
Lat. p. 27)¹
157. Job, Prov., Eccl., Basle, B. 6. 23 Wetstein, *N. T.* i. 132
Cant., Sap.
159. Eccl., Prov. (part), Dresden, 1 Klostermann, p. 39
Cant., *schol.* (xi)
160. Job (xiv) Dresden, 2
161. Job, Prov., Eccl., Dresden, 3
Cant. (xiv) Field, ii. p. 2; cf. 6,
309, and Auct. 22.
Cf. Klostermann,
pp. 16, 39
- Job, *comm.* (xv) Turin, Royal Library,
330
162. Psalms, *interlin.* Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr.
Latin (xi) 24
163. Psalms (xii) Paris, Nat. Colbert.
Gr. 26
164. Psalms (xiv) London, B. M. Harl.
5533
165. Psalms (xiv) London, B. M. Harl.
5534
166. Psalms, *cant.* London, B. M. Harl.
(A.D. 1283) 5535
167. Psalms, *cant.* London, B. M. Harl.
(xiv) 5553
168. Psalms (*imperf.*) London, B. M. Harl.
(xi—xii) 5570
169. Psalms (xii— London, B. M. Harl.
xiii) 5571
170. Psalms, *cant.* London, B. M. Harl.
(xii) 5582
171. Psalms, *cant.* London, B. M. Harl.
(xiv) 5653
172. Psalms, *cant.* London, B. M. Harl.
(A.D. 1488) 5737
173. Psalms, *cant.* London, B. M. Harl.
5738
174. Psalms (*Latin,* London, B. M. Harl.
Arabic) (A.D. 5786
1153)
175. Psalms (xi) London, B. M. 2. A. vi.
176. Psalms, *cant.* London, B. M. Harl.
5563

¹ The only Greek MS. which in Ps. xcvi (xcvi) 10 adds *απο τω ξυλω* (sic); see below, p. 467.

177. Psalms (*imperf.*) Paris, Nat. Gr. 27
cant. (xiii)
178. Psalms, *cant.* Paris, Nat. Gr. 40
 (A.D. 1059)
179. Psalms, *cant.* Paris, Nat. Gr. 41
 (xii)
180. Psalms, *cant.* (xii) Paris, Nat. Gr. 42
181. Psalms, *cat.* (xii) Cod. Ducis Saxo-Goth.
182. Psalms, *cant.* (xi) Rome, Chigi 4
183. Psalms, *cant.* (xii) Rome, Chigi 5
184. Psalms, *comm.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 17
 (ix—x)
185. Psalms, *comm.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 18
 (xi)
186. Psalms, *comm.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 13
 (xi)
187. Psalms (*imperf.*) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
 10
188. Psalms (*imperf.*) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. 186 An uncial MS. Lagarde's H^(ps) (*Specimen*, p. 3). Often agrees with 156
189. Psalms, *cant.* Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
 13
190. Psalms (*imperf.*) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. 187 An uncial MS. Lagarde's K^(ps) (*Specimen*, p. 3)
cant.
191. Psalms, *cant.* Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
 188
192. Psalms (*imperf.*) Paris, Nat. Gr. 13
cant. (xiii)
193. Psalms, *cant.* Paris, Nat. Gr. 21
 (xii)
194. Psalms, *cant.* Paris, Nat. Gr. 22
 (xii)
195. Psalms, *cant.* Paris, Nat. Gr. 23
 (xii)
196. Psalms (inc. ii. Paris, Nat. Gr. 25
 3), *cant.* (xii)
197. Psalms, *cant.* Paris, Nat. Gr. 29
 (xiv)
199. Psalms (xi) Modena, Est. 37
200. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Bodl. Barocc. 15 Cf. Nestle, *Septuagintastud.* iii. p. 14
201. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Bodl. Barocc. 107
202. Psalms, *cant.*, Oxford, Bodl. Cromw. 110
comm.

203. Psalms, *cant.*, Oxford, Bodl. Laud.
prayers (A.D. C. 41
1336)
204. Psalms (*imperf.*) Oxford, Bodl. Laud.
schol., prayers C. 38
205. Psalms, *cant.* Cambridge, Trin.
Coll.
206. Psalms, *cant.* Cambridge, Gonville Facsimile in Harris,
(xiv) & Caius Coll. 348 *Leicester codex*
208. Psalms (*imperf.*), Tübingen, (cod.
cant. Schnurrer)
210. Psalms (xiv) [Cod. Demetrii v.]
211. Psalms, *cant.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 1541
(xiii)
212. Psalms (*imperf.*) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1542
(xii)
213. Psalms (*imperf.*) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1848
(xiii)
214. Psalms, *cant.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 1870
(xiii)
215. Psalms, *cant.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 1873 Klostermann, p. 13
(A.D. 1011)
216. Psalms, *cant.* (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1927
217. Psalms, *cant.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 341
(A.D. 1029)
218. Psalms, li.—liiii. ?
(xiii—xiv)
219. Psalms, *cant.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 20
- 220=186 Vienna, Th. Gr. 13
221. Psalms, ix.—cl., Vienna, Th. Gr. 16
comm.
222. Psalms, *cant.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 21
223. Psalms, *cant.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 22
225. Psalms, *cant.* Bologna, 720
(xi)
226. Psalms, *cant.*, Rome, Barber. 1 (Gr.
prayers (x) 372)
227. Psalms (*imperf.*) Rome, Barber. 2 (Gr.
cant., prayers 322)
(x)
228. Job, &c. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1764
- 241...Prov., Eccl., London, B. M. Harl.
Cant. 7522
- 248...Prov., Eccl., Rome, Vat. Gr. 346 Hexaplaric readings
Cant., Job, Field, ii. p. 2
Sap., Sir., &c.
(xiv)

249. Job, Sap., Sir., Rome, Vat. Pius I &c. Field, *l. c.*
250. Job (xiv) Munich, Elect. 148 Field, *l. c.*
251. Job, *cat.*, Psalms Florence, Laur. v. 27
(xiv)
252. Job, Prov., Eccl., Florence, Laur. viii. Field, *l. c.*; cf. p. 309
Cant. (ix—x) 27 and Auct. p. 2
253. Job, Prov., Sir. Rome, Vat. Gr. 336 Klostermann, p. 17
(xi—xiv) ff. Gebhardt, *Die Psalmen Salomo's*
p. 25 ff.
254. Job, Prov. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 337
255. Job (ix) Rome, Vat. Gr. 338 Field, ii. p. 2. Klostermann, p. 69 ff.
256. Job, *schol.* (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 697 Field, *l. c.*
257. Job, *comm.* (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 743
258. Job, *cat.*, *pict.* (ix) Rome, Vat. Gr. 749 Field, *l. c.* Klostermann, p. 68
259. Job, *schol.* (x) Rome, Vat. Pal. Gr. 230 Field, *l. c.* Klostermann, p. 11
260. Job, *cat.*, Prov. Copenhagen, Royal Libr.
261. Job, Prov., Eccl., Florence, Laur. vii. 30
Sap. (xiv)
263. Psalms Copenhagen, Royal Libr.
264. Psalms, *cat.* Rome, Vat. Ottob. Gr. 398 Cf. Field, ii. p. 84 f.,
and Auct. p. 11
265. Psalms, *cant.*, Rome, Vat. Gr. 381
pict. (xiv)
266. Psalms (imperf.) Rome, Vat. Gr. 2101
(xiii)
267. Psalms, *cant.* Rome, Vat. Ottob. Gr. 294
(xiv)
268. Psalms, *cat.*, Rome, Vat. Gr. 2057 Cf. Field, ii. p. 84
cant.
269. Psalms, *comm.* Rome, Vat. Pal. Gr.
Athen. (A.D. 44
897)
270. Psalms, *cant.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 1864
(xii)
271. Psalms, *comm.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 1747
(xi)
272. Psalms (imperf.) Rome, Vat. Pal. Gr.
cat. (xiii) 247
273. Psalms, *cat.* (xiv) Rome, Vat. Regin. Gr. 40 Cf. Field, ii. p. 84

274. Psalms (*imperf.*) Rome, Vat. Ottob.
comm. (xiii) Gr. 343
275. Psalms, *cant.* (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1874
- 276 = 221
277. Psalms, *cant.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 24
278. Psalms (xii—
 xiii) Florence, Laur. v. 23
279. Psalms, *cant.* Florence, Laur. v. 35
 (xiii—xiv)
280. Psalms (xi) Florence, Laur. v. 5
281. Psalms (xi) Florence, Laur. v. 18
282. Psalms (xv) Florence, Laur. v. 25
283. Psalms (xii) Florence, Laur. vi. 36
284. Psalms, *cant.* Florence, Laur. v. 17
 (xiv)
285. Psalms, *cant.* Florence, Laur. v. 34
 (xiii)
286. Psalms, *comm.* Florence, Laur. v. 30
 (xii)
287. Psalms (*imperf.*) Florence, Laur. v. 14
comm. (xii)
288. Psalms, *comm.* Florence, Laur. xi. 5
Thdt. (xii)
289. Psalms, *comm.* Florence, Laur. ix. 2
Euth.-Zig.
 (xiii)
290. Psalms, *cant.* Florence, Laur.
291. Psalms (xi—xii) Florence, Laur. v. 39
292. Psalms, *cat.* (xi) Florence, Laur. vi. 3
293. Psalms, *metr.* Florence, Laur. v. 37
paraphr. (xv)
294. Psalms, lxxi. 14, Cambridge, Emma- Lagarde calls it P in
 -lxxxix. 7, cxxvii. nuel College *Genesis graece*, but
 3 — cxxix. 6, N^(ps) in the *Speci-*
 cxxxv. II — *men*. Apparently a
 cxxxvi. I, copy in a Western
 cxxxvii. 4—cxli. hand of an early
 21 (? xiii) cursive Psalter; see
 M. R. James in
Proceedings of the
Cambridge Anti-
quarian Society,
 1892—3, p. 168 ff.¹

¹ Other Psalters used by Lagarde (*Specimen*, p. 3 f.) are St Gall 17 (ix) = G^(ps); Munich 251 = L^(ps); a Bamberg Graeco-Latin MS. and a Cologne MS. closely related to it, which he calls W and Z respectively. Cf. Rahlfs, *Sept.-St.* ii. pp. 7, 8.

295. Prov., *comm.* Rome, Vat. Ottob.
Procop. (xiv) Gr. 56
296. Prov.—Sir. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Palat. Gr.
 337
297. Prov., *cat.* (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1802
298. Eccl., *comm.* (xii) [Cod. Eugenii 3]
299. Eccl., *Comm.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 1694 Klostermann, p. 29 f.
Greg. Nyss., al.
 (xiii)
300. Cant., *comm.* [Cod. Eugenii 3]
 (xii)
302. Prov....(ix)=109
- Psalms, A.D. 1066 London, B. M. Add.
 19,352
- Psalms Rome, Vat. Gr. 754

(D) *Prophetical Books.*

22. Prophets (xi— London, B. M. Reg. Cod. Pachomianus.
 xii) i. B. 2 Lucianic ; Field, ii.
 p. 428 f. Cornill's ξ
24. Isaiah, *cat.* (xii) [Cod. Demetrii i.]
26. Prophets (? xi) Rome, Vat. Gr. 556 Hesychian (Cornill,
 Ceriani): cf. Klos-
 termann, p. 10 f.
33. Dan., Jer., *cat.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 1154 Originally belonged
 (x) to same codex as
 Vat. gr. 1153: see
 Klostermann, p. 11.
 Cf. 87, 97, 238
34. Dan. (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 803 Klostermann, p. 11 n.
35. Dan. (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 866
36. Prophets (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 347 Lucianic (Field).
 Cornill's o
40. Dodecaprophe- [Cod. Dorothei iii.]
 ton (xii)
41. Isa., Jer. (ix—x) [Cod. Demetrii ii.]
42. Ezek., Dan., Min. [Cod. Demetrii iii.] Lucianic (Field)
 Proph. (xi—xii)
- 46...Isa., Jer., Bar., Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.
 Lam., Ep. 4
 Ezek., Dan.,
 Minor Pro-
 phets... (xiv)
48. Prophets (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1794 Lucianic (Field), Cor-
 nill's η. Kloster-
 mann, pp. 11, 14
49. Prophets (xi) Florence, Laur. xi. 4 Hesychius, Cornill's κ
51. Prophets (xi) Florence, Laur. x. 8 Lucianic (Field).
 Cornill's θ

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| 58...Prophets (xiii) | Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr. 10 | On the text of Daniel in this MS. see Klostermann, p. 12 |
| 62. Prophets (xiii) | Oxford, New Coll. | Lucianic (Field). Field, ii. p. 907; Burkitt, <i>Tyconius</i> , p. cviii; Klostermann, p. 51 |
| 68...Ezek., Dodecapr. (xv) | Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 5 | Hesychian. Cornill's ψ |
| 70...Prophets (x—xi) | Munich, Gr. 372 (formerly at Augsburg) | |
| 86. Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dodecapr. (? ix) | Rome, Barber. v. 45 | Field, ii. p. 939. Walton, vi. 131 f.; Klostermann, p. 50 |
| 87. Prophets (? ix) | Rome, Chigi 2 | Hesychian. Cornill's β . For the relation of 87 to 91 and 96 see Faulhaber <i>Die Propheten - catenen</i> . 33, 97, 238 are copied from 87 |
| 88. Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dan. (LXX.) (? xi) | Rome, Chigi 3 | 87 in Field (ii. p. 766). <i>O.T. in Greek</i> (iii. p. xiii.). Cf. Klostermann, p. 31 |
| 89. Daniel (xi) = 239 | | |
| 90. Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dan., <i>cat.</i> (xi) | Florence, Laur. v. 9 | Lucianic (Field); in Ezekiel, Hesychian acc. to Cornill: Cornill's λ |
| 91. Prophets, <i>cat.</i> (xi) | Rome, Vat. Ottob. Gr. 452 | Hesychian (Cornill). Cornill's μ . See note on 87 |
| 93...Isa. (xiv) | London, B. M. Reg. i. D. 2 | Lucianic (Field) |
| 95. Dodecaproph., <i>comm. Theod. Mops.</i> | Vienna, Th. Gr. 163 | Lucianic (Cornill) |
| 96. Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dan. | Copenhagen | See note on 87 |
| 97. Dodecapr., Isa., <i>cat.</i> (x) | Rome, Vat. Gr. 1153 | See notes on 33, 87 |
| 104...Isa. v.—lxii. | Vienna, Th. Bib. 27 (Nessel 229) | |
| 105...Fragments of Prophets, &c. (xiii—xiv) | London, B. M. Burney | |

- | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|
| 106...Isa., Jer., Ezek.,
Dan., Minor
Prophets to
Micah (xiv) | Ferrara, Gr. 187 | Hesychian |
| 109...Isaiah, <i>cat.</i> = 302 | Vienna, Th. Gr. 26 | |
| 114. Dodecaproph.,
<i>comm. Theod.</i>
<i>Mops...</i> | Evora, Carthus. 2 | |
| 122...Prophets (xv) | Venice, St Mark's,
Gr. 6 | |
| 131...Prophets (? xii) | Vienna, Th. Gr. 1
(Nessel 23) | |
| 147...Isa., Jer., Ezek.,
Dan. (imperf.),
Dodecaproph. | Oxford, Bodl. Laud.
30 | Lucianic (cf. Field, ii.
p. 907) |
| 148. Daniel (xii) | Rome, Vat. Gr. 2025 | |
| 153. Prophets (exc.
Zech.), <i>comm.</i>
(x) | Rome, Vat. Pal. Gr.
273 | Lucianic (Cornill) |
| 185...Dodecaproph.
(xi) | Vienna, Th. Gr. 18 | Lucianic (Cornill) |
| 198. Prophets (im-
perf.) (ix) | Paris, Nat. Gr. 14 | = Ev. 33. Burkitt,
<i>Tyconius</i> , p. cviii |
| 228...Prophets (xiii) | Rome, Vat. Gr. 1764 | Hesychian (Cornill,
but cf. Kloster-
mann, p. 13f. Cor-
nill's ϕ) |
| 229. Jer., Dan., <i>comm.</i>
(xiv) | Rome, Vat. Gr. 673 | |
| 230. Daniel (xiii) | Rome, Vat. Gr. 1641 | |
| 231. Jer. with Baruch
&c. (xi) | Rome, Vat. Gr. 1670 | From Grotta Ferrata.
Lucianic, Cornill's ι .
Cp. Klostermann.
p. 14 |
| 232. Daniel (xii) | Rome, Vat. Gr. 2000 | A Basilian MS., cp.
Klostermann, p. 15 |
| 233. Prophets (xiii) | Rome, Vat. Gr. 2067 | Lucianic (Field) |
| 234. Susanna | Moscow, Syn. 341 | |
| 235. Susanna | Rome, Vat. Gr. 2048 | |
| 238. Ezekiel, <i>cat.</i> (x) | Rome, Vat. Gr. 1153 | Hesychian (Cornill).
Cornill's ς . See
notes on 33, 87, 97 |
| 239. Prophets (A.D.
1046) = 89 | | |
| 240. Dodecapr., <i>cat.</i>
(A.D. 1286) | Florence, Laur. vi. 22 | |
| 301. Isaiah (ix) | Vienna, Th. Gr. 158 | |
| 302...Isaiah, <i>cat.</i> (xiii)
= 109 | | |

303. Isaiah, *comm.* Vienna, Th. Gr. 100
Cyrii.
304. Isaiah i.—xxv. Florence, Laur. iv. 2
comm. Basil.
(xi)
305. Isaiah (imperf.), Copenhagen, Reg.
cat.
306. Isa., Ezek. (xi) Paris, Nat. Gr. 16
307. Isaiah, *comm.* Rome, Vat. Ottob.
Basil. (xi) Gr. 430
308. Isaiah, *comm.* Rome, Vat. Gr. 1509 Lucianic (Field)
Basil. and
Thdt. (xiii)
309. Isaiah, *cat.* (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 755 Cf. Klostermann, p.
11
310. Dodecapr., *schol.* Moscow, Syn. 209
(xi)
- 311...Prophets (xi) =
234
...Prophets (ix, Jerusalem, H. Sepul-
med.) chre 2

III. LECTONARIES.

From the second century the Greek-speaking Churches, following the example of the Hellenistic Synagogue, read the Greek Old Testament in their public assemblies.

Justin, *Apol.* i. 67 τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκειται.
Const. ap. ii. 57 μέσος δὲ ὁ ἀναγνώστης ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ τινος ἐστὼς ἀναγινωσκέτω τὰ Μωσέως καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῆ, τὰ τῶν Κριτῶν καὶ τῶν Βασιλειῶν κ.τ.λ. *Ibid.* viii. 5 μετὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. Chrys. *in Rom.* xxiv. 3 ὁ μάτην ἐνταῦθα εἰσελθὼν, εἰπέ τις προφήτης, τις ἀπόστολος σήμερον διελέχθη.

At a later time the ἀναγνώσεις or ἀναγνώσματα were copied consecutively for ecclesiastical use. The lectionaries or fragments of lectionaries which survive, although frequently written in large and showy uncials¹, are rarely earlier than the tenth or eleventh century; but a thorough investigation of their contents would doubtless be of interest, not only from a liturgical

¹ Specimens are given by H. Omont, *Facsimilés des plus anciens MSS. Grecs* (Paris, 1892), nos. xx.—xxii.

point of view, but for the light which it would throw on the ecclesiastical distribution of various types of text. Little has been done as yet in this direction, and our information, such as it is, relates chiefly to the N.T.

See Matthaei, *N. T. Gr.*, ad fin. vol. i.; Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, General Intr., p. 369 ff.; Burgon, *Last twelve verses of St Mark*, p. 191 ff.; Scudamore, art. *Lectionary*, D. C. A. ii.; Nitzsch, art. *Lectionarium*, Herzog-Plitt, viii.; Gregory, *prolegg.* i. p. 161 ff., 687 ff.; Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 74 ff.; E. Nestle, *Urtext*, p. 76; M. Faulhaber, *Die Propheten-catenen nach röm. Handschriften* (Freiburg i. B., 1899).

The following list of MSS.¹ containing lections from the Old Testament has been drawn up from materials previously supplied by Dr E. Nestle. It will be seen that with few exceptions they are limited to those which are bound up with N.T. lections and have been catalogued under the head of N.T. lectionaries by Dr C. F. Gregory and Scrivener-Miller.

London, Sion College, Arc. i. 1 (vi or vii)	Gr. p. 720 (234, Scr. 227)
„ B. M. Add. 11841 (? xi)	Gr. p. 783 (79, Scr. 75)
„ B. M. Add. 18212 (xi)	Gr. p. 715 (191, Scr. 263)
„ B. M. Add. 22744 (xiii)	Gr. p. 731 (324, Scr. 272)
„ Burdett-Coutts, iii. 42 (xiv)	Gr. p. 730 (315, Scr. 253)
„ Burdett-Coutts, iii. 44 (xv)	Gr. p. 749 (476, Scr. 290)
„ Burdett-Coutts, iii. 46 (xiii)	Gr. p. 719 (226, Scr. 249)
„ Burdett-Coutts, iii. 53 (xv)	
Oxford, Christ Church, Wake 14 (xii)	Gr. p. 717 (207, Scr. 214)
„ Christ Church, Wake 15 (A.D. 1068)	Gr. p. 717 (208, Scr. 215)
Cambridge, Univ. Libr. Add. 1879 (? xi)	(Gen. xi. 4—9, Prov. xiii. 19—xiv. 6, Sir. xxxvii. 13—xxxviii. 6): a fragment purchased from the executors of Tischendorf
„ Christ's College, F. i. 8 (xi)	Gr. p. 714 (185, Scr. 222) = Z ^{scr} , WH. 59
Ashburnham, 205 (xii)	Gr. p. 720 (237, Scr. 237—8)
Paris, Nat. Gr. 308 (xiii)	Gr. p. 779 (24)
„ Nat. Gr. 243 (A.D. 1133)	Omout, <i>MSS. Græcs datés</i> , no. xlvi.

¹ A few lectionaries have already been mentioned among the H.P. MSS. (37, 61, 132).

Paris, Nat. suppl. Gr. 32 (xiii)	Gr. p. 704 (84)
Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr. 59 (xii)	Gr. p. 757 (573, Scr. 395)
„ Vat. Gr. 168 (xiii or xiv)	Gr. p. 786 (188, Scr. 116)
„ Vat. Gr. 2012 (xv)	Gr. p. 756 (556, Scr. 387)
„ Barb. 18 (xiv)	Gr. p. 780 (40)
Grotta Ferrata, A' δ' 2 (x)	Gr. p. 748 (473, Scr. 323)
„ A' δ' 4 (xiii)	Gr. p. 748 (475, Scr. 325)
„ Δ' β' 22 (xviii)	Gr. p. 751 (506, Scr. 358)
Venice, St Mark's, i. 42 (xii)	Gr. p. 724 (268, Scr. 173) ¹
Trèves, Bibl. Cath. 143 F (x or xi)	Gr. p. 713 (179)
Athens, Nat. 86 (xiii)	Gr. d. 745 (443)
Salonica, 'Ελληνικοῦ γυμνασίου ιδ' (xv or xvi)	Gr. p. 771 (837)
Cairo, Patr. Alex. 927 (xv)	Gr. p. 776 (759, Scr. 140)
Sinai, 748 (xv or xvi)	Gr. p. 775 (900)
„ 943 (A.D. 1697)	Gr. p. 775 (908)
St Saba, in tower, 16 (xii)	Gr. p. 770 (829, Scr. 364)
Jerusalem, H. Sepulchre (xiii)	Harris, p. 13

LITERATURE (on the general subject of this chapter). Stroth, in Eichhorn's *Repertorium* (vi., viii., xi.); the prolegomena to Grabe, Holmes and Parsons, Tischendorf, and *The Old Testament in Greek*; the prefaces to Lagarde's *Genesis graece, Libr. V. T. Canon.*, p. i., *Psalterii specimen*; Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.*; Madan, *Summary*, p. 615 ff. (Holmes MSS., A.D. 1789—1805); Nestle, *Urtext*, p. 71 ff.; H. Omont, *Inventaire Sommaire des MSS. Grecs de la Bibl. Nationale*; S. Berger, *Hist. de la Vulgate*.

The lists of MSS. given in this chapter must be regarded as tentative and incomplete. The student may supplement them to some extent by referring to recently published catalogues of MS. libraries, especially the following: V. Gardthausen, *Catalogus codd. Graecorum Sinaiticorum* (Oxford, 1886); Papadopoulos Kerameus, 'Ιεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη i.—iv. (St Petersburg, 1891—1899); Sp. P. Lambros, *Catalogue of the Greek MSS. on Mount Athos* (Cambridge, vol. i., 1895; vol. ii., with index, 1900). He may also consult with advantage J. B. Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, iii. (1883), p. 551 ff.; H. A. Redpath, in *Academy*, Oct. 22, 1893; E. Klostermann's *Analecta zur Septuaginta* (1895); Mrs Lewis, in *Exp. Times*, xiii. 2, p. 55 ff.; H. Omont, in *Lit. C. Blatt*; A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, ii. (1907).

¹ At Messina, as Mr Brightman informs me, there are six lectionaries of cents. xii, xiii. Mr T. W. Allen (*Notes on Greek MSS. in Italy*, 1890) mentions two at Bologna (xi) and one at Lucerne (xv).

CHAPTER VI.

PRINTED TEXTS OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

THE printed texts of the Septuagint fall naturally into two classes, viz. (1) those which contain or were intended to exhibit the whole of the Greek Old Testament; (2) those which are limited to a single book or to a group of books.

I. COMPLETE EDITIONS.

1. The first printed text of the whole Septuagint is that which forms the third column in the Old Testament of the great Complutensian Polyglott. This great Bible was printed at Alcalà (*Complutum*) in Spain under the auspices of Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros, Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo. Ximenes, who, in addition to his ecclesiastical offices, was Regent of Castile, began this undertaking in 1502 in honour of the birth of Charles V. (1500—1558), and lived to see the whole of the sheets pass through the press. He died Nov. 8, 1517, and the fourth volume, which completes the Old Testament and was the last to be printed, bears the date July 10, 1517. But the publication of the Polyglott was delayed for more than four years: the papal sanction attached to the N.T. volume is dated May 22, 1520, and the copy which was intended for the Pope seems not to have found its way into the Vatican Library until Dec. 5, 1521. The title of the complete work (6 vols. folio) is as follows: "Biblia sacra Polyglotta complectentia V.T.

Hebraico Graeco et Latino idiomate, N.T. Graecum et Latinum, et vocabularium Hebraicum et Chaldaicum V.T. cum grammatica Hebraica necnon Dictionario Graeco. Studio opera et impensis Cardinalis Fr. Ximenes de Cisneros. Industria Arnoldi Gulielmi de Brocario artis impressorie magistri. Compluti, 1514[—15,—17].”

The O.T. volumes of the Complutensian Bible contain in three columns (1) the Hebrew text, with the Targum of Onkelos at the foot of the page, (2) the Latin Vulgate, (3) the Septuagint, with an interlinear Latin version—an order which is explained by the editors as intended to give the place of honour to the authorised version of the Western Church¹. The prejudice which their words reveal does not augur well for the character of the Complutensian LXX. Nevertheless we have the assurance of Ximenes that the greatest care was taken in the selection of the MSS. on which his texts were based². Of his own MSS. few remain, and among those which are preserved at Madrid there are only two which contain portions of the Greek Old Testament (Judges—Macc., and a Psalter). But he speaks of Greek MSS. of both Testaments which had been sent to him by the Pope from the Vatican Library³, and it has been shewn that at least two MSS. now in that Library (cod. Vat. gr. 330 = H.P. 108, and cod. Vat. gr. 346 = H.P. 248) were used in the construction of the Complutensian text of the LXX.⁴ There is

¹ Their words are: “mediam autem inter has Latinam B. Hieronymi translationem velut inter Synagogam et orientalem ecclesiam posuimus, tanquam duos hinc et inde latrones, medium autem Iesum, hoc est Romanam sive Latinam ecclesiam, collocantes.”

² In the dedication to Leo X. he says: “testari possumus...maximi laboris nostri partum in eo praecipue fuisse versatum ut...castigatissima omni ex parte vetustissimaque exemplaria pro archetypis haberemus.”

³ “Ex ista apostolica bibliotheca antiquissimos tum V. tum N. Testamenti codices perquam humane ad nos misisti.”

⁴ See Vercellone, in *V. et N.T.* ed. Mai, i. p. v. n.; *Var. lectt.* ii. p. 436; *Dissertazioni Accademiche*, 1864, p. 407 ff.; Tregelles, *An account of the printed text of the Greek N.T.* (London, 1854), p. 2 ff.; Delitzsch, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Polyglotten Bibel des Cardinals Ximenes*

reason to suppose that a Venice MS. (S. Marc. 5 = H.P. 68) was also employed; a copy of this MS. still exists at Madrid.

The editors of the Complutensian Polyglott were the Spaniard Antonio de Nebrija, Professor of Rhetoric at Alcalá, and his pupil Ferdinando Núñez de Guzman (Pincianus); Diego Lopez de Zuñiga (Stunica); Juan de Vergara, Professor of Philosophy at Alcalá; a Greek from Crete, by name Demetrius; and three converts from Judaism, to whom the Hebrew text and the Targum were entrusted. The editing of the Greek LXX. text seems to have been left chiefly in the hands of Pincianus, Stunica and Demetrius.

The Complutensian text is followed on the whole in the Septuagint columns of the four great Polyglotts edited by Arias Montanus, Antwerp, 1569—72; B. C. Bertram, Heidelberg, 1586—7, 1599, 1616; D. Wolder, Hamburg, 1596; Michael Le Jay, Paris, 1645

2. In February 15 $\frac{18}{19}$, after the printing of the Complutensian Polyglott but before its publication, Andreas Asolanus¹, father-in-law of the elder Aldus, issued from the Aldine press a complete edition of the Greek Bible bearing the title: Πάντα τὰ κατ' ἐξοχὴν καλούμενα βιβλία, θείας δηλαδὴ γραφῆς παλαιᾶς τε καὶ νέας. Sacrae scripturae veteris novaeque omnia. *Colophon*: Venetiis in aedib[us] Aldi et Andreae soceri. mdxviii., mense Februario.

Like Ximenes, Andreas made it his business to examine the best MSS. within his reach. In the dedication he writes: "ego multis vetustissimis exemplaribus collatis biblia (ut vulgo appellant) graece cuncta descripsi." His words, however, do not suggest an extended search for MSS., such as was instituted by the Spanish Cardinal; and it is probable enough that he was content to use Bessarion's collection of codices, which is still preserved in St Mark's Library at Venice². Traces have

(Leipzig, 1871); Lagarde, *Libr. V. T. can.* i., p. iii.; E. Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, i., pp. 2, 13; E. Klostermann, *Analecta*, p. 15 f.

¹ On the orthography see Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, ii., p. 11, note b.

² Cf. Lagarde, *Genesis graece*, p. 6; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 79; Nestle,

been found in his text of three at least of those MSS. (cod. ii = H.P. 29; cod. iii = H.P. 121; cod. v = H.P. 68).

The Aldine text of the LXX. was followed on the whole in the editions of (1) Joh. Lonicerus, Strassburg, 1524, 1526; (2)? with a preface by Philip Melanchthon, Basle, 1545; (3) H. Guntius, Basle, 1550, 1582; (4) Draconites, in *Biblia Pentapla*, Wittenburg, 1562—5; (5) Francis du Jon (Fr. Junius) or (?) Fr. Sylburg, Frankfort, 1597; (6) Nic. Glykas, Venice, 1687.

3. In 1587 a third great edition of the Greek Old Testament was published at Rome under the auspices of Sixtus V. (*editio Sixtina, Romana*). It bears the title: Η ΠΑΛΑΙΑ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ | ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑ | ΔΙ ΑΥΘΕΝΤΙΑΣ | ΞΥΣΤΟΥ Ε' ΑΚΡΟΥ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΩΣ | ΕΚΔΟΘΕΙΣΑ | VETVS TESTAMENTVM | IVXTA SEPTVAGINTA | EX AVCTORITATE | SIXTI V. PONT. MAX. | EDITVM | ROMAE | EX TYPOGRAPHIA FRANCISCI ZANETTI. M.D.LXXXVI(1)¹ | CVM PRIVILEGIO GEORGIO FERRARIO CONCESSO.

The volume consists of 783 pages of text, followed by a page of addenda and corrigenda, and preceded by three (un-numbered) leaves which contain (1) a dedicatory letter addressed to Sixtus V. by Cardinal Antonio Carafa, (2) a preface to the reader², and (3) the papal authorisation of the book. These documents are so important for the history of the printed text that they must be given in full.

(1) SIXTO QUINTO PONTIF. MAX. ANTONIUS CARAFA
CARDINALIS SANCTAE SEDIS APOSTOLICAE BIBLIOTHECARIUS

Annus agitur iam fere octavus ex quo Sanctitas vestra pro singulari suo de sacris litteris benemerendi studio auctor fuit beatæ memoriæ Gregorio XIII. Pont. Max. ut sacrosancta Sep-

Urtext, p. 65. On the source of the Psalms in this edition see Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, iii., p. 32.

¹ The second i has been added in many copies with the pen. The impression was worked off in 1586, but the work was not published until May 1587.

² "Elle n'est point signée, mais on sait qu'elle fut redigée par Fulvio Orsini. Elle est d'ailleurs très inférieure à la lettre de Carafa." (P. Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul III. à Paul V.*, p. 89).

tuaginta Interpretum Biblia, quibus Ecclesia tum Graeca tum Latina iam inde ab Apostolorum temporibus usa est, ad fidem probatissimorum codicum emendarentur. Quod enim Sanctitas V. pro accurata sua in perlegendis divinis scripturis diligentia animadvertisset, infinitos pene locos ex iis non eodem modo ab antiquis sacris scriptoribus afferri quo in vulgatis Bibliorum Graecis editionibus circumferrentur, existimassetque non aliunde eam lectionum varietatem quam e multiplici eaque confusa veterum interpretatione fluxisse; rectissime censuit ad optimae notae exemplaria provocandum esse, ex quibus, quoad fieri posset, ea quae vera et sincera esset Septuaginta Interpretum scriptura eliceretur. Ex quo fit ut vestram non solum pietatem sed etiam sapientiam magnopere admirer; cum videam S. V. de Graecis Bibliis expoliendis idem multos post annos in mentem venisse quod sanctos illos Patres Tridenti congregatos auctoritate ac reverentia ductos verae ac purae Septuaginta interpretationis olim cogitasse cognovi ex actis eius Concilii nondum pervulgatis. Huius autem expolitionis constituendae munus cum mihi demandatum esset a Gregorio XIII., cuius cogitationes eo maxime spectabant ut Christiana Religio quam latissime propagaretur, operam dedi ut in celebrioribus Italiae bibliothecis optima quaeque exemplaria perquirerentur atque ex iis lectionum varietates descriptae ad me mitterentur¹. Quibus sane doctorum hominum quos ad id delegeram industria et iudicio clarae memoriae Gulielmi Cardinalis Sirleti (quem propter excellentem doctrinam et multiplicem linguarum peritiam in locis obscurioribus mihi consulendum proposueram) persaepe examinatis et cum vestro Vaticanae bibliothecae (cui me benignitas vestra nuper praefecit) exemplari diligenter collatis; intelleximus cum ex ipsa collatione tum e sacrorum veterum scriptorum consensione, Vaticanum codicem non solum vetustate verum etiam bonitate caeteris anteire; quodque caput est, ad ipsam quam quaerebamus Septuaginta interpretationem, si non toto libro, maiori certe ex parte, quam proxime accedere. Quod mihi cum multis aliis argumentis constaret, vel ipso etiam libri titulo, qui est *κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα*, curavi de consilio et sententia eorum quos supra nominavi, huius libri editionem ad Vaticanum exemplar emendandam; vel potius exemplar ipsum, quod eius valde probaretur auctoritas, de verbo ad verbum repraesentandum, accurate prius sicubi opus fuit recognitum et notationibus etiam auctum. Factum est autem providentia sane divina, ut quod Sanctitate vestra suadente sui Cardinalatus tempore inchoatum est, id variis de causis aliquoties intermissum per ipsa fere initia Pontificatus sui

¹ On the genesis of the Sixtine edition the curious reader may consult Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, i., ii., where the particulars are collected with the utmost care and fulness.

fuerit absolutum; scilicet ut hoc praeclarum opus, vestro Sanctissimo nomini dicatum, quasi monumentum quoddam perpetuum esset futurum apud omnes bonos et vestrae erga Rempublicam Christianam voluntatis et meae erga Sanctitatem vestram observantiae.

(2) PRAEFATIO AD LECTOREM

Qui sunt in sacrosanctis scripturis accuratius versati, fatentur omnes Graecam Septuaginta Interpretum editionem longe aliis omnibus quibus Graeci usi sunt et antiquiorem esse et probatiorem. Constat enim eos Interpretes, natione quidem Iudaeos, doctos vero Graece, trecentis uno plus annis ante Christi adventum, cum in Aegypto regnaret Ptolemaeus Philadelphus, Spiritu sancto plenos sacra Biblia interpretatos esse, eamque interpretationem a primis Ecclesiae nascentis temporibus tum publice in Ecclesiis ad legendum propositam fuisse, tum privatim receptam et explanatam ab Ecclesiasticis scriptoribus qui vixerunt ante B. Hieronymum, Latinae vulgatae editionis auctorem. Nam Aquila quidem Sinopensis, qui secundus post Septuaginta eosdem libros ex Hebraeo in Graecum convertit et multo post tempore sub Hadriano principe floruit, et eius interpretatio, (quod ea quae de Christo in scripturis praedicta fuerant, ut a Iudaeis gratiam iniret aliter quam Septuaginta vertendo, subdola obscuritate involverit) iamdiu est cum a recte sentientibus, licet in hexaplis haberetur, aliquibus locis non est probata. Hunc vero qui subsequuti sunt, Symmachus et Theodotio, alter Samaritanus sub L. Vero, alter Ephesius sub Imp. Commodio, uterque (quamvis et ipsi in hexaplis circumferrentur) parum fides interpres habitus est: Symmachus, quod Samaritanis offensus, ut placeret Iudaeis, non unum sanctae scripturae locum perturbato sensu corruperit; Theodotio, quod Marcionis haeretici sectator nonnullis locis perverterit potius quam converterit sacros libros. Fuerunt praeter has apud Graecos aliae duae editiones incertae auctoritatis: altera Antonio Caracalla Imp. apud Hierichuntem, altera apud Nicopolim sub Alexandro Severo in doliis repertae. quae quod in octaplis inter Graecas editiones quintum et sextum locum obtinerent, quintae et sextae editionis nomen retinuerunt. Sed nec hae satis fidae interpretationes habitae sunt. His additur alia quaedam editio sancti Luciani martyris, qui vixit sub Diocletiano et Maximiano Impp., valde illa quidem probata, sed quae cum Septuaginta Interpretibus comparari nullo modo possit, vel ipsis etiam Graecis scriptoribus testantibus et Niceta confirmante his plane verbis in commentario Psalmorum: ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην ἔκδοσιν σεβαζόμενοι, τῆ τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα προσκείμεθα μάλιστα, ὅτι διηρημένως τὴν τῆς

διαλέκτου μεταβολὴν ποιησάμενοι μίαν ἐν ἐκάστοις ἔννοιαν καὶ λέξιν ἀποδεδώκασιν.

Adeo Septuaginta Interpretum editio magni nominis apud omnes fuit; nimirum quae instinctu quodam divinitatis elaborata bono generis humani prodierit in lucem. Sed haec etiam ipsa, quod in hexaplis ita primum ab Origene collocata fuerit ut eius e regione aliae editiones quo inter se comparari commodius possent ad legendum propositae essent, deinde vero varietates tantum ex iis ad illam sub obelis et asteriscis notari essent coepae, factum est ut vetustate notis oblitteratis insincera nimis et valde sui dissimilis ad nos pervenerit: quippe quae insertis ubique aliorum interpretationibus, aliquibus autem locis duplici atque etiam triplici eiusdem sententiae interpretatione intrusa, male praeterea a librariis accepta, suum ob id nitorem integritatemque amiserit. Hinc illae lectionum penitus inter se dissidentes varietates et, quod doctissimorum hominum ingenia mentesque diu torsit, ipsae exemplarium non solum inter se sed a veteribus etiam scriptoribus dissensiones. Quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam hausit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quodque in hoc libro cum veterum scriptis conferendo singularem quandam diligentiam adhibuerit, vidit primus qua ratione huic malo medendum esset; nec vidit solum, sed auctoritate etiam sua effecit ut summus Pontifex Gregorius XIII. Graeca Septuaginta Interpretum Biblia, adhibita diligenti castigatione, in pristinum splendorem restituenda curaret. Quam rem exequendam cum ille demandasset Antonio Carafae Cardinali, viro veteris sanctitatis et omnium honestarum artium cultori, nulla is interposita mora delectum habuit doctissimorum hominum qui domi suae statis diebus exemplaria manuscripta, quae permulta undique conquisierat, conferrent et ex iis optimas quasque lectiones elicerent; quibus deinde cum codice Vaticanae bibliothecae saepe ac diligenter comparatis intellectum est, eum codicem omnium qui extant longe optimum esse, ac operae pretium fore si ad eius fidem nova haec editio pararetur.

Sed emendationis consilio iam explicato, ipsa quoque ratio quae in emendando adhibita est nunc erit aperienda, in primisque Vaticanus liber describendus, ad cuius praescriptum haec editio expolita est. Codex is, quantum ex forma characterum conici potest, cum sit maioribus litteris quas vere antiquas vocant exaratus, ante millesimum ducesimum annum, hoc est ante tempora B. Hieronymi et non infra, scriptus videtur. Ex

omnibus autem libris qui in manibus fuerunt unus hic prae aliis, quia ex editione Septuaginta si non toto libro certe maiorem partem constare visus est, mirum in modum institutam emendationem adiuvit; post eum vero alii duo qui ad eius vetustatem proximi quidem sed longo proximi intervallo accedunt, unus Venetus ex bibliotheca Bessarionis Cardinalis, et is quoque grandioribus litteris scriptus; alter qui ex Magna Graecia ad-ductus nunc est Carafae Cardinalis: qui liber cum Vaticano codice ita in omnibus consentit ut credi possit ex eodem archetypo descriptus esse. Praeter hos magno etiam usui fuerunt libri ex Medicea bibliotheca Florentiae collati, qui Vaticanas lectiones multis locis aut confirmarunt aut illustrarunt. Sed libri Vaticani bonitas non tam ex horum codicum miro consensu perspecta est, quam ex iis locis qui partim adducuntur partim explicantur ab antiquis sacris scriptoribus; qui fere nusquam huius exemplaris lectiones non exhibent ac reponunt, nisi ubi aliorum Interpretum locum aliquem afferunt, non Septuaginta. quorum editio cum esset nova emendatione perpolienda, recte ad huius libri normam, qui longe omnium antiquissimus, solus iuxta Septuaginta inscribitur, perpolita est; vel potius rectissime liber ipse ad litteram, quoad fieri potuit per antiquam orthographiam aut per librarii lapsus, est expressus. Nam vetus illa et iam obsoleta eius aetatis scriptura aliquibus locis repraesentata non est; cum tamen in aliis omnibus, nisi ubi manifestus apparebat librarii lapsus, ne latum quidem unguem, ut aiunt, ab huius libri auctoritate discessum sit, ne in iis quidem quae si minus mendo, certe suspitione mendii videbantur non carere. satius enim visum est locos vel aliquo modo suspectos (nec enim fieri potest ut in quantumvis expurgato exemplari non aliqua supersit macula) quemadmodum habentur in archetypo relinqui quam eos ex alicuius ingenio aut coniectura emendari: quod multa quae postea cum aliis libris collata in hoc codice videbantur, ea postea cum aliis libris collata vera et sincera reperirentur. Nam in libris Prophetarum, qui maxime in hoc exemplari (uno excepto Daniele) puram Septuaginta editionem resipiunt, mirum quam multa non habeantur; quae tamen recte abesse et eorum Interpretum non esse, intellectum est tum ex commentariis veterum scriptorum Graecis et Latinis, tum ex libris manuscriptis in quibus illa addita sunt sub asteriscis.

Atque haec ratio in notationibus quoque servata est, in quibus cum multa sint ex commentariis Graecis petita quae in codicibus manuscriptis partim mutilata partim varie scripta aliquibus locis circumferuntur, ea non aliter atque in archetypis exemplaribus reperiuntur descripta sunt, quo uniuscuiusque arbitrato adiuvantibus libris restitui possint. Nec vero illud omittendum, quod item pertinet ad notationes; non omnia

in iis repraesentata esse quae aut ad confirmandas lectiones Vaticanas e scriptoribus vulgatis, aut ad explenda quae in Septuaginta non habentur, ex aliorum editionibus afferri potuissent, quod in communibus libris cum legantur, inde sibi unusquisque nullo negotio ea parare possit. Quae vero in libris manuscriptis reperta, vel ad indicandas antiquarum tum lectionum tum interpretationum varietates (sub scholii illas nomine, quod ipsarum incerta esset auctoritas, nonnunquam relatas) vel ad stabiliendam scripturam Vaticanam et eius obscuriores locos illustrandos pertinere visa sunt, ea certe non sunt praetermissa.

Ordo autem librorum in Vaticano exemplari cum idem fere sit cum eo qui apud Graecos circumfertur, a vulgatis tamen editionibus variat in hoc quod primo habet duodecim Prophetas et hos ipsos aliter dispositos; deinde reliquos quatuor, quemadmodum vulgo editi sunt. Atque hunc ordinem verum esse intelligimus ex eo quod illum agnoscunt et probant veteres Ecclesiastici scriptores. Et cum toto exemplari nulla capitum divisio sit, (nam in nova editione consultum est legentium commoditati) in libro tamen quattuor Prophetarum distinctio quaedam apparet subobscura, illi paene similis quam describit sanctus Dorotheus martyr, qui vixit sub Magno Constantino.

Maccabaeorum libri absunt ab hoc exemplari, atque item liber Genesis fere totus; nam longo aevo consumptis membranis mutilatus est ab initio libri usque ad caput XLVII. et liber item Psalmorum, qui a Psalmo CV. usque ad CXXXVIII. nimia vetustate mancus est. Sed haec ex aliorum codicum collatione emendata sunt.

Quod si aliqua videbuntur in hac editione, ut ait B. Hieronymus, vel lacerata vel inversa, quod ea sub obelis et asteriscis ab Origene suppleta et distincta non sint; vel obscura et perturbata, quod cum Latina vulgata non consentiant, et in aliquibus aliis editionibus apertius et expressius habeantur; eris lector admonendus, non eo spectasse huius expolitionis industriam ut haec editio ex permixtis eorum qui supra nominati sunt interpretationibus (instar eius quam scribit B. Hieronymus a Graecis *κοινήν*, a nostris appellatam Communem) concinnata, Latinae vulgatae editioni, hoc est Hebraeo, ad verbum respondeat; sed ut ad eam quam Septuaginta Interpretes Spiritus sancti auctoritatem sequuti ediderunt, quantum per veteres libros fieri potest, quam proxime accedat. Quam nunc novis emendationibus illustratam et aliorum Interpretum reliquiis quae supersunt auctam, non parum profuturam ad Latinae vulgatae intelligentiam, dubitabit nemo qui hanc cum illa accurate comparaverit.

Quae si doctis viris et pie sentientibus, ut aequum est, probantur, reliquam erit ut Sixto V. Pont. Max. huius boni auctori gratias agant, et ab omnipotenti Deo publicis votis poscant,

optimum Principem nobis florentem quam diutissime servet. qui cum omnes curas cogitationesque suas in amplificandam ornandamque Ecclesiae dignitatem contulerit, dubitandum non est quin Rep. Christiana optimis legibus et sanctissimis institutis per eum reformata, religione ac pietate, revocatis antiquis ritibus, in suum splendorem restituta, in hoc quoque publicam causam sit adiuturus ut sacri veteres libri, hominum incuria vel improbitate corrupti, pro sua eximia benignitate ab omni labe vindicati, quam emendatissimi pervulgentur.

(3) SIXTUS PAPA V.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Cupientes, quantum in nobis est, commissi nobis gregis saluti quacunque ratione ac via prospicere, ad pastorem nostram curam pertinere vehementer arbitramur Sacrae Scripturae libros, quibus salutaris doctrina continetur, ab omnibus maculis expurgatos integros purosque pervulgari. Id nos in inferiori gradu constituti, quantum potuimus, studio et diligentia nostra praestitimus, et in hac altissima specula a Deo collocati assidue mentis nostrae oculis spectare non desistimus. Cum itaque superioribus annis piae recordationis Gregorius Papa XIII. praedecessor noster, nobis suggerentibus, Graecum Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta Interpretum editionem, qua ipsi etiam Apostoli nonnumquam usi fuerunt, ad emendatissimorum codicum fidem expoliendum mandaverit; eius rei cura dilecto filio nostro Antonio Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Presbytero Cardinali Carafae, et ad id per eum delectis eruditibus aliquot viris demandata, et iam expolitio huiusmodi, permultis exemplaribus ex diversis Italiae bibliothecis et praecipue ex nostra Vaticana diligenter collatis matureque examinatis, absoluta sit: Volumus et sancimus ad Dei gloriam et Ecclesiae utilitatem, ut Vetus Graecum Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta ita recognitum et expolitum ab omnibus recipiatur ac retineatur, quo potissimum ad Latinae vulgatae editionis et veterum Sanctorum Patrum intelligentiam utantur. Prohibentes ne quis de hac nova Graeca editione audeat in posterum vel addendo vel demendo quicquam immutare. Si quis autem aliter fecerit quam hac nostra sanctione comprehensum est, noverit se in Dei Omnipotentis beatorumque Apostolorum Petri et Pauli indignationem incursum.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Marcum sub Anulo Piscatoris. Die viii Octobris M.D.LXXXVI, Pontificatus nostri anno secundo.
Tho. Thom. Gualterutius.

The reader will not fail to note the intelligent appreciation of the LXX., and the wide outlook over the history of the Greek

versions which are implied by these documents¹. They shew that the Vatican had already learnt the true value of the Alexandrian Old Testament and, as a consequence, had resolved to place in the hands of the scholars of Europe as pure a text as could be obtained of the version which was used by the ancient Church, and was now felt to be essential to a right understanding of the Fathers and of the Latin Vulgate. The inception of the work was due to Pope Sixtus himself, who had suggested it to his predecessor Gregory XIII. in 1578; but the execution was entrusted to Cardinal Antonio Carafa and a little band of Roman scholars including Cardinal Sirleto, Antonio Agelli, and Petrus Morinus. Search was made in the libraries of Italy as well as in the Vatican for MSS. of the LXX., but the result of these enquiries satisfied the editors of the superiority of the great Vatican Codex (B = cod. Vat. gr. 1209) over all other known codices, and it was accordingly taken as the basis of the new edition. Use was made, however, of other MSS., among which were a Venice MS. which has been identified with S. Marc. cod. gr. 1 (H. P. 23, Lag. V); a MS. belonging to Carafa, possibly cod. Vat. gr. 1252 (H. P. 63 + 129, cf. Klostermann, p. 12 f., and Batiffol, *Bulletin critique*, 15 Mars 1889), and certain Laurentian MSS. of which collations are still preserved in the Vatican Library (Vat. gr. 1241, 1242, 1244; see Batiffol, *La Vaticane*, p. 90 f.). From these and other sources the editors supplied the large lacunae of Cod. B². But they did not limit themselves to the filling up of gaps or even to the correction of errors, as will appear from a comparison of the Sixtine text with the photographic representation of the Vatican MS. The edition of 1587 is not an exact reproduction of a single codex, even where the selected MS. was available; but it is based as a whole on a great uncial

¹ Cf. Tregelles, *An account of the printed text, &c.*, p. 185.

² According to Nestle (*Septuagintastudien*, i. p. 9, ii. p. 12) Genesis i. 1—xlvi. 28 in cod. B are supplied from cod. Chis. R. vi. 38 (H.P. 19, Lag. 4).

MS., and it is the first edition of the LXX. which possesses this character. Moreover, criticism has confirmed the judgement of the Roman editors in regard to the selection of their basal MS. It is a fortunate circumstance that the authority of the Vatican was given before the end of the sixteenth century to a text of the LXX. which is approximately pure.

Besides the text the Roman edition contained considerable materials for the criticism of the Greek Old Testament, collected by the labours of Morinus, Agelli, Nobilius, and others. These include readings and scholia from MSS. of the LXX., renderings from Aquila and the other non-Septuagintal Greek versions, and a large assortment of patristic citations.

Editions based upon the Sixtine are very numerous. The following list is abridged from Nestle's *Urtext* (p. 65 ff.):

1. Jo. Morinus, Paris, 1628, 1641.
2. R. Daniel, London, 4to and 8vo, 1653; Cambridge, 1653.
3. B. Walton, London, 1657 (the third column of his Polyglott).
4. Field, Cambridge, 1665 (with the *praefatio paraenetica* of J. Pearson¹, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, afterwards Bp of Chester).
5. J. Leusden, Amsterdam, 1683.
6. Leipzig, 1697 (with prolegomena by J. Frick).
7. L. Bos, Frankfort, 1709.
8. D. Mill, Amsterdam, 1725.
9. C. Reineccius, Leipzig, 1730.
10. Halle, 1759—62 (with a preface by J. G. Kirchner).
11. Holmes and Parsons, Oxford, 1798—1827.
12. Oxford, 1817 (with introduction by J. [G.]² Carpzow).
13. F. Valpy, London, 1819.
14. London, 1821, 26, 31, 51, 69, 78 (the LXX. column of Bagster's Polyglott).
15. Venice, 1822.
16. Glasgow and London, 1822, 31, 43.
17. L. Van Ess, Leipzig, 1824, 35, 55, 68, 79, 87 (prolegomena and epilegomena separately in 1887).
18. London, 1837.
19. Didot, Paris, 1839, 40, 48, 55, 78, 82.
20. Oxford, 1848, 75.
21. A. F. C. von Tischendorf, Leipzig, 1850, 56, 60, 69, 75, 80, 87.

Of the above some are derived from the Sixtine indirectly, whilst others present a Sixtine text more or less modified, or accompanied by variants from other MSS.

4. The example of Rome was followed in the 18th century by England, which had meanwhile acquired an uncial Bible

¹ The *praefatio* was reprinted with Archd. Churton's notes by Prof. W. Selwyn (Cambridge, 1855). The 1665 edition was reissued by John Hayes, 1684.

² See Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, iii., p. 32, note p.

only less ancient, and in the view of some scholars textually more important than the great Vatican MS. The variants of Codex Alexandrinus had been given in Walton's Polyglott under the Sixtine text¹, but the honour of producing an edition on the basis of the English codex belongs to a Prussian scholar, John Ernest Grabe, an adopted son of the University of Oxford. This edition appeared ultimately in four folio volumes (1707—20), but only the first and fourth had been published when Grabe died (1712); the second and third were undertaken after his decease by Francis Lee, M.D., and William Wigan, D.D. respectively. Vol. i. (1707) contains the Octateuch, Vol. ii. (1719) the Historical Books, Vol. iii. (1720) the Prophets, Vol. iv. (1709) the Poetical Books. The title to the first volume runs: "Septuaginta | interpretum | tomus I | continens Octateuchum | quem | ex antiquissimo codice Alexandrino | accurate descriptum | et ope aliorum exemplarium, ac priscorum scriptorum | praesertim vero Hexaplaris editionis Origenianae | emendatum atque suppletum | additis saepe asteriscorum et obelorum signis | summa cura edidit | Joannes Ernestus Grabe S.T.P. | Oxonii, e theatro Sheldoniano | ...MDCCVII."

This title sufficiently indicates the general principles upon which this great undertaking was based. Like the Sixtine edition, Grabe's is in the main a presentation of the text exhibited in a single uncial codex; like the Sixtine, but to a greater extent, its text is in fact eclectic and mixed. On the other hand the mixture in Grabe's Alexandrian text is overt and can be checked at every point. He deals with his codex as Origen dealt with the *κοινῆ*, marking with an obelus the words, clauses, or paragraphs in the MS. for which he found no equivalent in the Massoretic Hebrew, and placing an aste-

¹ Patrick Young had projected a complete edition of cod. A (Walton's *Prolegomena*, ed. Wrangham, ii. p. 124). His transcript of the MS. is still preserved at the British Museum (Harl. 7522 = Holmes 241; see above, p. 152).

risk before such as he believed to have been derived from Theodotion or some other non-Septuagintal source. If he constantly adds to his MS. or relegates its readings to the margin, such additions and substituted words are distinguished from the text of cod. A by being printed in a smaller type. So far as it professes to reproduce the text of the MS., his edition is substantially accurate. The prolegomena by which each volume is introduced are full and serviceable; and the work as a whole, whatever may be thought of the method adopted by the editors, is creditable to the Biblical scholarship of the age.

Grabe's text was reproduced by Breiting (Zurich, 1730—2), and Reineccius (in his *Biblia sacra quadrilingua*, Leipzig, 1750—1); also in a Greek Bible issued at Moscow in 1821 under the authority of the Holy Synod. A more important work based upon this edition is the Septuagint published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge under the care of Dr Field (*Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX. interpretes. Recensionem Grabianam ad fidem codicis Alexandrini aliorumque denuo recognovit...F. Field*, Oxonii, 1859). But the purpose which the Society had in view forbade a critical treatment of the materials, and whilst the learned editor has removed many of the imperfections of Grabe's work, the text remains arbitrary and mixed, and the arrangement is alien from that of all LXX. MSS. the non-canonical books being relegated to an appendix as ἀπόκρυφα.

5. Each of the four great editions of the Septuagint already described (the Complutensian, Aldine, Sixtine, and Grabian) endeavoured to supply a text approximately representing either a group of MSS., or a single uncial of high antiquity. No attempt had been made as yet to offer an exact reproduction of a codex, or to provide a full *apparatus criticus*, the purpose of the editors in each case being practical rather than critical. This want was met in some degree in certain of the secondary editions; thus the Basle reprint of the Aldine text (1545) gave a short list of variants and conjectural emendations; in the London Polyglott the readings of Codex Alexandrinus

were printed underneath the Sixtine text, and those of Codex Sarravianus were exhibited in the Septuagint of Lambert Bos. But the first comprehensive effort in this direction was made by Robert Holmes (1748—1805), Professor of Poetry at Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church, and, from 1804, Dean of Winchester. The preparations for his great work were begun in 1788. An appeal was made to the liberality of public bodies and private patrons of learning, and the task of collating MSS. was committed to a large number of scholars at home and on the continent, whose names are honourably mentioned in the opening pages of the first volume. From 1789 to 1805 an annual account was printed of the progress of the work¹, and the Bodleian Library contains 164 volumes of MS. collations (Holmes MSS. A.D. 1789—1805, nos. 16455—16617)² which were deposited there during those seventeen years. In 1795 a specimen of the forthcoming work was published together with a transcript of the Vienna Genesis in a letter to the Bishop of Durham (Shute Barrington). Genesis appeared separately in 1798, followed in the same year by the first volume bearing the title: *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus. Edidit Robertus Holmes, S.T.P., R.S.S., Aedis Christi Canonici. Tomus primus. Oxonii: e typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCXCVIII.* This volume, which contains the Pentateuch, with a preface and appendix, was the only one which Holmes lived to complete. He died Nov. 12, 1805, and two years later the editorship was entrusted to James Parsons³, under whose care the remaining volumes were issued (Vol. ii., Joshua—2 Chronicles, 1810; Vol. iii., 2 Esdras—Canticles, 1823; Vol. iv., Prophets, 1827; Vol. v., the non-canonical books, 1 Esdras—3 Maccabees, 1827). At the end of Vol. v. there is a list of the Greek MSS. collated

¹ Cf. *Ch. Q. R.*, April 1899, p. 102.

² Cf. Madan's *Summary catalogue of MSS. in the Bodleian: Eighteenth century collections*, pp. 614—641.

³ On Holmes' less distinguished coadjutor see *Ch. Q. R.* p. 104. Parsons died in 1847 at the age of 85.

for the work. Three hundred and eleven are enumerated (i.—xiii., 14—311); a corrected estimate gives a total of 297 separate codices, of which 20 are uncial. Besides the readings of this large number of Greek MSS., the apparatus of Holmes and Parsons exhibits the evidence of the Old Latin versions so far as it had been collected by Sabatier, and of the Coptic (Memphitic and Sahidic), Arabic, Slavonic, Armenian and Georgian versions, obtained partly from MSS., partly from printed texts. Use was also made of patristic citations and of the four great editions of the Septuagint, the Sixtine supplying the text, while the Aldine, Complutensian and Alexandrine (Grabian) are cited in the notes. In addition to these, Holmes employed the printed text of the catena of Nicephorus (Leipzig, 1772—3), and J. F. Fischer's edition of cod. Lips. 361 (Leipzig, 1767—8)¹.

The great work of Holmes and Parsons has been severely criticised by later scholars, especially by Hatch² and Lagarde³. A vigorous defence of the Oxford editors will be found in a recent article in the *Church Quarterly Review* (already quoted). It appears to be certain that every effort was made by Holmes to secure the services of the best scholars who were available for the work of collation.

Among the collators of Greek MSS. employed by the Oxford editors were Bandini (Florence), C. F. Matthäi (Moscow), F. C. Alter (Vienna), Schnurrer (Tübingen), Moldenhawer (Copenhagen). "The Armenian Version was chiefly collated by Hermannus Breden-Kemp (1793) and F. C. Alter (1795—1804), the latter also taking the Georgian..the Slavonic..Coptic..and Bohemian Versions. The Arabic Versions were undertaken by Paulus and Prof. Ford, and the Syriac quotations in the *Horreum mysteriorum* of Gregorius Bar-Hebraeus.. by Dr Holmes" (F. C. Madan, *Summary catalogue*, p. 640).

But in so vast an accumulation of the labours of many workers it was impossible to maintain an uniform standard of merit; nor are the methods adopted by Holmes and his con-

¹ See above, p. 153.

² *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 132.

³ *Libr. V. T. Canon. p. i.* p. xv.

tinuator altogether such as would commend themselves at the present day. The work is an almost unequalled monument of industry and learning, and will perhaps never be superseded as a storehouse of materials; but it left abundant room for investigations conducted on other lines and among materials which were not accessible to Holmes and his associates.

6. The next step was taken by A. F. C. von Tischendorf (1815—1874), who in the midst of his researches in Eastern libraries and his work upon the text of the New Testament found leisure to project and carry through four editions (1850, 1856, 1860, 1869) a manual text of the Septuagint. Its plan was simple, but suggestive. His text was a revised Sixtine; underneath it he placed an apparatus limited to the variants of a few great uncials: “eam viam ingressus sum (he writes¹) ut textum per tria fere secula probatissimum repeterem, mutatis tantummodo quibus mutatione maxime opus esset, addita vero plena lectionis varietate ex tribus codicibus antiquissimis quos fere solos utpote editos confidenter adhibere licebat.” The three MSS. employed by Tischendorf in his first edition (1850) were A (from Baber’s facsimile), C (from his own facsimile), and FA, the portion of Cod. Sinaiticus which was published in 1846; in the third and fourth editions he was able to make further use of Cod. Sinaiticus, and to take into account Mai’s edition of Cod. B.

Since Tischendorf’s death three more editions of his Septuagint have appeared—a fifth in 1875, a sixth and a seventh in 1880 and 1887 respectively, the last two under the supervision of Dr Eberhard Nestle. Nestle added a *Supplementum editionum quae Sixtinam sequuntur omnium in primis Tischendorffianarum*, consisting of a collation of the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. with the Sixtine text, the Vatican text being obtained from Vercellone and Cozza’s facsimile, and the Sinaitic from Tischendorf’s edition of \aleph ; an appendix contained a collation of Daniel (LXX.) from Cozza’s edition of the Chigi MS. The *Supplementum* was reissued in 1887 with various enrichments, of which the most important

¹ *Prolegg.* § viii.

was a collation of cod. A from the London photograph which appeared in 1882—3. With these helps the reader of Tischendorf's Septuagint is able to correct and supplement the apparatus, and to compare the text with that of cod. B so far as it could be ascertained before the publication of the photograph.

7. Another of the great Biblical scholars of the nineteenth century, Paul de Lagarde, commenced an edition of the Greek Old Testament, which was intended to be a definite step towards the reconstruction of the text. Lagarde's general plan was announced in *Symmicta* ii. (1880), p. 137 ff., and in a modified and simpler form by a pamphlet published two years later (*Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griechischen übersetzung des A.T.*, Göttingen, 1882). A beginning was made by the appearance of the first half of the text of the Lucianic recension (*Librorum V.T. canonicorum pars prior Graece Pauli de Lagarde studio et sumptibus edita*, Göttingen, 1883). Lagarde's untimely death in 1891 left this work incomplete, and though his papers are preserved at Göttingen, it is understood that no steps will be taken to carry out the scheme, at least on the same lines. The published volume contains the Octateuch and the Historical Books as far as Esther: Of the last named book two texts are given, with an apparatus, but with this exception the text stands alone, and the reader knows only that it is an attempted reconstruction of Lucian, based upon six MSS. which are denoted *afhm pz* (H. P. 108, 82, 19, 93, 118, 44). This is not the place to discuss Lagarde's critical principles, but it may be mentioned here that his attempt to reconstruct the text of Lucian's recension was but one of a series of projected reconstructions through which he hoped ultimately to arrive at a pure text of the Alexandrian version. The conception was a magnificent one, worthy of the great scholar who originated it; but it was beset with practical difficulties, and there is reason to hope that the desired end may be attained by means less complicated and more direct.

8. In the spring of 1883 the Syndics of the Cambridge

University Press issued a notice that they had undertaken "an edition of the Septuagint and Apocrypha with an ample *apparatus criticus* intended to provide material for a critical determination of the text," in which it was "proposed to give the variations of all the Greek uncial MSS., of select Greek cursive MSS., of the more important versions, and of the quotations made by Philo and the earlier and more important ecclesiastical writers." As a preliminary step they announced the preparation of "a portable text...taken from the Vatican MS., where this MS. is not defective, with the variations of two or three other early uncial MSS." The suggestion was originally due to Dr Scrivener, who submitted it to the Syndics of the Press in the year 1875, but was ultimately prevented by many preoccupations and failing health from carrying his project into execution. After undergoing various modifications it was committed in 1883 to the present writer, instructed by a committee consisting of Professors Westcott, Hort, Kirkpatrick, and Bensly; to Dr Hort in particular the editor was largely indebted for counsel in matters of detail. The first edition of the portable text was completed in 1894 (*The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, vol. i., Genesis—4 Regn., 1887; vol. ii., 1 Chron.—Tobit, 1891; vol. iii., Hosea—4 Macc., 1894); the second and third revised editions² followed (vol. i., 1895, 1901; vol. ii., 1896, 1907; vol. iii., 1899, 1905³). The larger Cambridge Septuagint has been entrusted to the joint editorship of Dr A. E. Brooke, Fellow of King's College, and Mr N. McLean, Fellow of Christ's College; and of the Octateuch, which will form the first volume, Genesis appeared in 1906, Exod., Lev. 1909, Numb., Deut. 1911. It reproduces the text of the manual Septuagint, but the apparatus embraces, according to the original purpose of the Syndics,

¹ *Cambridge University Reporter*, March 13, 1883.

² Much of the labour of revision was generously undertaken by Dr Nestle, and valuable assistance was also rendered by several English scholars; see i. p. xxxiii., ii. p. xiv., iii. p. xviii. f.

³ The fourth edition is in progress (i. 1909).

the evidence of all the uncial MSS., and of a considerable number of cursives "selected after careful investigation with the view of representing the different types of text"; the Old Latin, Egyptian, Syro-Hexaplar, and Armenian versions are also represented, whilst use is made of the quotations in Josephus as well as those in Philo and the more important Christian fathers. Such an apparatus falls far short of that presented by Holmes and Parsons, in regard to the quantity of evidence amassed; but efforts are being made to secure a relatively high degree of accuracy, and the materials are selected and arranged in such a manner as to enable the reader to study the grouping of the MSS. and other authorities. Thus the work proceeds upon the principle formulated by Lagarde: "editionem Veteris Testamenti Graeci...collatis integris codicum familiis esse curandam, nam familiis non accedere auctoritatem e codicibus, sed codicibus e familiis¹."

A word may be added with regard to the text which will be common to the manual and the larger edition of the Cambridge Septuagint. It is that of the great Vatican MS., with its lacunae supplied from the uncial MS. which occupies the next place in point of age or importance. For a text formed in this way no more can be claimed than that it represents on the whole the oldest form of the Septuagint to be found in any one of our extant MSS. But it supplies at least an excellent standard of comparison, and until a critical text has been produced², it may fairly be regarded as the most trustworthy presentation of the Septuagint version regarded as a whole.

II. EDITIONS OF PARTICULAR BOOKS, OR OF GROUPS OR PORTIONS OF BOOKS.

THE PENTATEUCH.

G. A. Schumann, 1829; *Pentateuchus hebraice et graece*, I (Genesis only published).

¹ *V. T. Libr. can.* praef. p. xvi.

² Cf. E. Nestle, *Zur Rekonstruktion der Septuaginta*, in *Philologus*, N. F. xii. (1899), p. 121 ff.

GENESIS.

P. A. de Lagarde, Leipzig, 1868: *Genesis graece e fide editionis Sixtinae addita scripturae discrepantia e libris manu scriptis a se collatis et edd. Complutensi et Aldina adcuratissime enotata.* The MSS. employed are ADEFGS, 25, 29, 31, 44, 122, 130, 135. The text is preceded by useful lists of the available uncial MSS. and VSS. of the LXX.

DEUTERONOMY.

C. L. F. Hamann, Jena, 1874: *Canticum Moysi ex Psalterio quadruplici... manu scripto quod Bambergae asservatur.*

JOSHUA.

A. Masius, Antwerp, 1574: *Iosuae imperatoris historia.* Readings are given from the Codex Syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus.

JUDGES.

J. Ussher, 1655 (in his *Syntagma*, Works, vol. vii.). Two texts in parallel columns (1) "ex codice Romano," (2) "ex codice Alexandrino."

O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich, 1867: *liber Iudicum secundum lxx. interpretet.* A specimen had previously appeared (in 1866).

P. A. de Lagarde, 1891 (in his *Septuaginta-studien*, I. c. i.—v.). Two texts.

A. E. Brooke and N. M^cLean, Cambridge, 1897: *The Book of Judges in Greek, acc. to the text of Codex Alexandrinus.*

[G. F. Moore, Andover, Mass. (in his *Critical and exegetical Commentary on Judges*, p. xlv.), promises an edition of the recension of the book exhibited by K, 54, 59, 75, 82, and Theodoret.]

RUTH.

Drusius, 1586, 1632.

L. Bos, Jena, 1788: *Ruth ex versione lxx. interpretum secundum exemplar Vaticanum.*

O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich, 1867: 'Ρούθ κατὰ τοὺς ο'.

PSALMS.

Separate editions of the Greek Psalter were published at Milan, 1481; Venice, 1486; Venice, not later than 1498 (Aldus Manutius); Basle, 1516 (in *Hieronymi Opera*, t. viii., ed. Pellicanus); Genoa, 1516 (*Octaplum Psalterium Justiniani*); Cologne, 1518 (*Psalterium in iv. linguis cura Iohannis Potken*). Other known editions bear the dates 1524, 1530 (*Ps. sextuplex*),

1533, 1541, 1543, 1549, 1557, 1559, 1571, 1584, 1602, 1618, 1627, 1632, 1643, 1678 (the Psalter of cod. A), 1737, 1757, 1825, 1852, 1857, 1879 (*Ps. tetraglotton*, ed. Nestle), 1880, 1887 (Lagarde, *Novae psalterii gr. editionis specimen*), 1889 (Swete, *The Psalms in Greek acc. to the LXX., with the Canticles*; 2nd ed. 1896), 1892 (Lagarde, *Ps. gr. quinquagena prima*¹).

JOB.

Patrick Young, 1637 (in the *Catena* of Nicetas).
J. Terrentius, Franeker, 1663.

ESTHER.

J. Ussher, 1655 (in his *Syntagma*, Works, vol. vii.). Two texts, one Hexaplaric from an Arundel MS. (H. P. 93). A second edition, Leipzig, 1696.

O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich, 1848: Ἑσθήρ. *Duplicem libri textum ad opt. Codd. emendavit et cum selecta lectionis varietate edidit*. The Greek additions appear also in his *Libri apocryphi V. T.* (see below).

MINOR PROPHETS.

W. O. E. Oesterley, *Codex Taurinensis*, 1908 (with apparatus).

HOSEA.

J. Philippeaux, Paris, 1636; Hos. i.—iv., after Cod. Q.
D. Pareus, Heidelberg, 1605: *Hoseas commentariis illustratus*.

AMOS.

Vater, Halle, 1810.
W. O. E. Oesterley, Cambridge, 1902 (parallel texts of Q, 22).

JONAH.

S. Münster, 1524, 1543.

ISAIAH.

S. Münster, 1540 (in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin).
J. Curter, Paris, 1580 (in *Procopii commentarii in Iesaiam*—text based on Cod. Q).
R. R. Ottley, Cambridge, 1906 (text of Cod. A).

JEREMIAH.

S. Münster, 1540.
G. L. Spohn, Leipzig, 1794: *Jeremias vates e vers. Judaeorum Aelx. ac reliquorum interpretum Gr.*; 2nd ed., 1824.

LAMENTATIONS.

Kyper, Basle, 1552: *Libri tres de re gramm. Hebr. ling.* (Hebr Gr., Lat.).

¹ See also Nestle in Hastings, *D. B.* iv. 441.

EZEKIEL.

Ἰεζεκιήλ κατὰ τοὺς ὀ', Rome, 1840.

DANIEL (Theod.).

Ph. Melanchthon, 1546.

Wells, 1716.

DANIEL (LXX.).

S. de Magistris (?), Rome, 1772. *Daniel secundum lxx. ex tetraplīs Origenis nunc primum editus e singulari Chisiano codice.* Reprinted at Göttingen, 1773, 1774 (Michaelis); at Utrecht, 1775 (Segaar); at Milan, 1788 (Bugati); and at Leipzig, 1845 (Hahn). Cozza, 1877. The LXX. text is also given in the editions of Holmes and Parsons, Oxf. ed. of 1848, 1875, Tischendorf, and Swete.

NON-CANONICAL BOOKS (in general)¹.

J. A. Fabricius, Frankfort and Leipzig, 1691: *Liber Tobias, Judith, oratio Manasse, Sapientia, et Ecclesiasticus, gr. et lat., cum prolegomenis.* Other complete editions were published at Frankfort on the Main, 1694, and at Leipzig, 1804 and 1837; the best recent edition is that by

O. F. Fritzsche, Leipzig, 1871: *Libri apocryphi V. T. gr... accedunt libri V. T. pseudepigraphi selecti* [Psalms of Solomon, 4—5 Esdras, Apocalypse of Baruch, Assumption of Moses]. This edition, besides the usual books, gives 4 Maccabees, and exhibits Esther in two texts, and Tobit in three; there is a serviceable preface and an extensive apparatus criticus.

WISDOM OF SOLOMON.

Older editions: 1586, 1601, 1733, 1827.

Reusch, Freiburg, 1858; *Liber Sapientiae sec. exemplar Vaticanum.*

W. J. Deane, Oxford, 1881: *The Book of Wisdom, the Greek text, the Latin Vulgate, and the A. V.; with an introduction, critical apparatus, and commentary.*

WISDOM OF SIRACH.

D. Hoeschel, Augsburg, 1604: *Sapientia Sirachi s. Ecclesiasticus, collatis lectionibus var...cum notis.*

Linde, Dantzig, 1795: *Sententiae Iesu Siracidae ad fidem codd. et versionum.*

Bretschneider, Regensburg, 1806: *Liber Iesu Siracidae.*

Cowley-Neubauer, *Original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus*, &c. (Oxford, 1897); Schechter-Taylor, *Wisdom of Ben Sira* (Cambridge, 1899)².

J. H. A. Hart, Cambridge, 1910 (text of Cod. 248).

¹ A fuller list is given by Nestle in Hastings, *D.B.* iv. 441.

² See Nestle's art. *Sirach* in Hastings, iv.

TOBIT.

Reusch, Bonn, 1870 : *Libellus Tobit e cod. Sinaitico*.

BARUCH.

Kneucker, Leipzig, 1879.

I MACCABEES.

Drusius, Frankfort, 1600; Bruns, Helmstadt, 1784.

PSALMS OF SOLOMON.

J. L. de la Cerda, in an appendix to his *Adversaria Sacra*, Lyons, 1626.

J. A. Fabricius, in *Codex pseudepigraphus V. T.*, Hamburg and Leipzig, 1715.

A. Hilgenfeld, in *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Th.* xi., and in *Messias Iudaeorum*, Leipzig, 1869.

E. E. Geiger, Augsburg, 1871 : *Der Psalter Salomo's herausgegeben*.

O. F. Fritzsche in *Libri apocryphi V. T. gr.*

B. Pick, Alleghany, Pens., in the *Presbyterian Review*, 1883.

H. E. Ryle and M. R. James, Cambridge, 1891 : *Psalms of the Pharisees commonly called the Psalms of Solomon*; the Greek text with an apparatus, notes, indices, and an introduction.

H. B. Swete in *O. T. in Greek*, vol. iii., Cambridge, 1894; 2nd ed. 1899.

O. von Gebhardt, Leipzig, 1895 : *Die Psalmen Salomo's*.

ENOCH (the Greek version of).

The fragments [in Ep. Jud. 14, 15; the Chronography of G. Syncellus (ed. W. Dindorf, in *Corpus hist. Byzant.*, Bonn, 1829); *ZDMG.* ix. p. 621 ff. (a scrap printed by Gildemeister); the *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire*, ix., Paris, 1892] have been collected by Dillmann, *über den neufundenen gr. Text des Henoch-buches* (1893); Lods, *Livre d'Enoch* (1893); Charles, *Book of Enoch*, (1893), and are printed with an apparatus in the *O. T. in Greek*, vol. iii., 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1899).

LITERATURE (upon the general subject of this chapter).

Le Long-Masch, ii. p. 262 ff., Fabricius-Harles, p. 673 ff., Rosenmüller, *Handbuch*, i. p. 47 ff., Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 242 ff., Tischendorf, *V. T. Gr., prolegomena* § vii. sqq., Van Ess [Nestle], *epilegomena* § 1 sqq., Loisy, *Histoire critique*, i. ii. p. 65 ff., Nestle, *Septuaginta-studien*, i. 1886, ii. 1896, iii. 1899; *Urtext*, p. 64 ff.

PART II.

*THE CONTENTS OF THE ALEXANDRIAN
OLD TESTAMENT.*

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

TITLES, GROUPING, NUMBER, AND ORDER OF
THE BOOKS.

THE Greek Old Testament, as known to us through the few codices which contain it as a whole, and from the lists which appear in the Biblical MSS. or in ancient ecclesiastical writings, differs from the Hebrew Bible in regard to the titles of the books which are common to both, and the principle upon which the books are grouped. The two collections differ yet more materially in the number of the books, the Greek Bible containing several entire writings of which there is no vestige in the Hebrew canon, besides large additions to the contents of more than one of the Hebrew books. These differences are of much interest to the Biblical student, since they express a tradition which, inherited by the Church from the Alexandrian synagogue, has widely influenced Christian opinion upon the extent of the Old Testament Canon, and the character and purpose of the several books.

1. The following tables shew (A) the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin titles of the canonical books of the Old Testament; (B) the order and grouping of the books in (1) lists of Jewish origin, (2) the great uncial MSS. of the Greek Bible, (3) patristic and synodical lists of the (a) Eastern, (b) Western Church.

A. TITLES OF THE BOOKS.

Hebrew	Transliteration ¹	Septuagint	Vulgate Latin
בְּרֵאשִׁית	<i>Bρησιθ</i>	<i>Γένεσις</i>	Genesis
וְאַתָּה יְצַמֹּחַ	<i>Οὐέλε σμώθ</i>	<i>Ἔξοδος</i>	Exodus
וַיִּקְרָא	<i>Οὐικρά</i>	<i>Λευ[ε]ιτικόν</i>	Leviticus
וַיְבַר	<i>Ἄμμες φεκωδείμ²</i>	<i>Ἀριθμοί</i>	Numeri
אַתָּה הַדְּבָרִים	<i>Ἔλε ἀδδεβαρείμ</i>	<i>Δευτερονόμιον</i>	Deuteronomium
יְהוֹשֻׁעַ	<i>Ἰωσοῦε βέν Νούν</i>	<i>Ἰησοῦς</i>	Iosue
שׁוֹפְטִים	<i>Σαφατείμ</i>	<i>Κριταί</i>	Iudices
שְׁמוֹנָה	<i>Σαμουήλ</i>	<i>Βασιλειῶν</i> { α', β' γ', δ'	Regum { 1, 2 3, 4
מְלָכִים	<i>Οὐαμμέλλχ Δαβιδ³</i>		
יִשְׁעָהוּ, יִשְׁעָהוּ	<i>Ἰεσσιά</i>	<i>Ἡσαίας</i>	Isaias
יִרְמְיָהּ, יִרְמְיָהוּ	<i>Ἰερεμιά</i>	<i>Ἰερεμίας</i>	Ieremias
יְחֵזְקֵאל	<i>Ἰεζεκιήλ</i>	<i>Ἰεζεκιήλ</i>	Ezechiel
הוֹשֵׁעַ		<i>Ὠσῆε</i>	Osee
יוֹאֵל		<i>Ἰωήλ</i>	Ioel
עָמוֹס		<i>Ἄμώς</i>	Amos
עֲבֹדִיָּה		<i>Ὁβδειού, Ἀβδ[ε]ιοῦ</i>	Abdias

¹ As given by Origen ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25.

² I.e. the Mishnaic title *הַמִּיט פְּקוּדִים* 'fifth of the precepts'; cf. the Mishnaic title *פְּקוּדִים* (Ryle, *Canon of the O. T.*, p. 294). Jerome transliterates the initial word, *vayedabber*; cf. Epiph. (Lagarde, *Symmicta* ii. 178), *οὐαῖδαβήρ, ἢ ἔστιν Ἀριθμῶν*. The book is also known as *בְּמִדְבָּר*.

³ I.e. *וְהַפְּלֵף דָּר דָּר* (first two words of 1 Kings i.), *Malachim*, Jerome; *δμαλαχέμ*, Epiphanius.

Hebrew	Transliteration	Septuagint	Vulgate Latin
יונה		Ἰωνᾶς	Jonas
מיכה		M[ε]ιχαίας	Michaeas
נחום, נחום		Ναούμ	Nahum
חֲבַקּוּק		Ἀμβακούμ	Habacuc
צְפַנְיָה		Σοφονίας	Sophonias
חגי		Ἀγγαῖος	Aggaeus
זְכַרְיָה		Ζαχαρίας	Zacharias
מלאכי		Μαλαχίας	Malachias
תהלים	Σφᾶρ θελλειμ	Ψαλμοί, Ψαλτήριον	Psalmi
משלי	Μελώθ ¹	Παροιμιαί	Proverbia
איוב	Ἰώβ	Ἰώβ	Iob
שיר השירים	Σὶρ ἄσσιρίμ	Ἄσμα, ᾠσματα [ᾠσμάτων]	Canticum canticorum
רות ²		Ῥούθ	Ruth
איכה ³		Θρήνοι	Threni, Lamentationes
קהלת	Κωέλθ	Ἐκκλησιαστής	Ecclesiastes
אסתר	Ἔσθήρ	Ἔσθήρ	Esther
דניאל	Δανιήλ	Δανιήλ	Daniel
עזרא	Ἐζρά	Ἔσδρας	Esdras 1, 2
דברי הימים	Δαβρή λαμείν	Παραλειπομένων α', β'	Paralipomenon 1, 2

¹ With variants Μεσλώθ, Μισλώθ (leg. for. Μσλώθ). *Masaloth*, Jerome; *δμεθαλώθ*, Epiphanius.

² Origen includes Ruth with Judges under *Σαφατείμ*.

³ Eriph. *l.c.*: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλη μικρὰ βίβλος ἣ καλεῖται Κωώθ [Mishn. קינות], ἣτις ἐρμηνεύεται Θρήνος Ἰερεμίου.

B (I). ORDER OF THE BOOKS IN JEWISH LISTS¹.

TALMUDIC	SPANISH MSS.	GERMAN & FRENCH MSS.	MASSORETIC MSS.	PRINTED BIBLES
I <i>Torah</i>	"	"	"	"
II <i>Nebiim</i>	"	"	"	"
Joshua	Joshua	Joshua	Joshua	Joshua
Judges	Judges	Judges	Judges	Judges
Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	1, 2 Samuel
Kings	Kings	Kings	Kings	1, 2 Kings
Jeremiah	Isaiah	Jeremiah	Isaiah	Isaiah
Ezekiel	Jeremiah	Isaiah	Jeremiah	Jeremiah
Isaiah	Ezekiel	Ezekiel	Ezekiel	Ezekiel
xii Prophets	xii Prophets	xii Prophets	xii Prophets	Hosea Joel Amos Obadiah Jonah Micah Nahum Habakkuk Zephaniah Haggai Zachariah Malachi
III <i>Kethubim</i>	"	"	"	"
Ruth	Chronicles	Psalms	Chronicles	Psalms
Psalms	Psalms	Proverbs	Psalms	Proverbs
Job	Job	Job	Job	Job
Proverbs	Proverbs	Song of Songs	Proverbs	Song of Songs
Ecclesiastes	Ruth	Ruth	Ruth	Ruth
Song of Songs	Song of Songs	Lamentations	Song of Songs	Lamentations
Lamentations	Ecclesiastes	Ecclesiastes	Ecclesiastes	Ecclesiastes
Daniel	Lamentations	Esther	Lamentations	Esther
Esther	Esther	Daniel	Esther	Daniel
Ezra-Neh.	Daniel	Ezra-Neh.	Daniel	Ezra-Neh.
Chronicles	Ezra-Neh.	Chronicles	Ezra-Neh.	1, 2 Chronicles

¹ This list has been adapted from Ryle, *Canon of the O.T.* (table following p. 280).

B (2). ORDER OF THE BOOKS IN UNCIAL MS. BIBLES.

Codex Vaticanus (B)	Codex Sinaiticus (S)
Γένεσις	Γένεσις
Ἔξοδος	*
Λευιτικόν	*
Ἄριθμοί	Ἄριθμοί
Δευτερονόμιον	*
Ἰησοῦς	*
Κριταί	*
Ῥούθ	*
Βασιλειῶν α'—δ'	*
Παραλειπομένων α', β'	Παραλειπομένων α', [β']
Ἔσδρας α', β'	Ἔσδρας [α'], β'
Ψαλμοί	Ἔσθήρ
Παροιμιαί	Τωβείθ
Ἐκκλησιαστής	Ἰουδαίθ
Ἄσμα	Μακκαβαίων α', δ'
Ἰώβ	Ἡσαίας
Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος	Ἰερεμίας
Σοφία Σειράχ	Θρήνοι Ἰερεμίου
Ἔσθήρ	*
Ἰουδαίθ	*
Τωβείθ	*
Ὡση	*
Ἀμώς	*
Μειχαίας	*
Ἰωήλ	Ἰωήλ
Ὀβδείου	Ἄβδειού
Ἰωνᾶς	Ἰωνᾶς
Ναούμ	Ναούμ
Ἀμβακούμ	Ἀμβακούμ
Σοφονίας	Σοφονίας
Ἀγγαῖος	Ἀγγαῖος
Ζαχαρίας	Ζαχαρίας
Μαλαχίας	Μαλαχίας
Ἡσαίας	Ψαλμοί Δαδ ρνα' (<i>subscr.</i>)
Ἰερεμίας	Παροιμιαί [+ Σολομῶντος <i>subscr.</i>]
Βαρούχ	Ἐκκλησιαστής
Θρήνοι	Ἄσμα ᾠσμάτων
Ἐπιστολή Ἰερεμίου	Σοφία Σαλωμῶντος
Ἰεζεκιήλ	Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ
Δαυιήλ	Ἰώβ

Codex Alexandrinus (A)	Codex Basiliano-Venetus (N+V)
Γένεσις κόσμου	*
Ἔξοδος Αἰγύπτου	*
Λευιτικόν	(N) Λευιτικόν
Ἀριθμοί	Ἀριθμοί
Δευτερονόμιον	Δευτερονόμιον
Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Ναυῆ	Ἰησοῦς
Κριταί	Ῥούθ
Ῥούθ [ὁμοῦ βιβλία ἡ']	Κριταί
Βασιλειῶν α'—δ'	Βασιλειῶν α'—δ'
Παραλειπομένων α', β' [ὁμοῦ βιβλία 5']	Παραλειπομένων α', β'
Προφήται ις'	Ἔσδρας [α'], β'
Ἔσθῃ α	Ἔσθῃρ
Ἀμώς β'	*
Μιχαίας γ'	*
Ἰωήλ δ'	*
Ἀβδείου ε'	(V) Ἰώβ (<i>subscr.</i>)
Ἰωνᾶς 5'	Παροιμιαί
Ναούμ ζ'	Ἐκκλησιαστής
Ἀμβακούμ η'	Ἄσμα ἁσμάτων
Σοφίας θ'	Σοφία Σολομώντος
Ἀγγαῖος ι'	Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιράχ
Ζαχαρίας ια'	Ἔσθῃ
Μαλαχίας ιβ'	Ἀμώς
Ἡσαίας προφήτης ιγ'	Ἰωήλ
Ἰερεμίας προφήτης ιδ'	Ἀβδείου
Βαρούχ	Ἰωνᾶς
Θρήνος [+ Ἰερεμίου, <i>subscr.</i>]	Μιχαίας
Ἐπιστολὴ Ἰερεμίου	Ναούμ
Ἰεζεκιήλ προφήτης ιε'	Ἀμβακούμ
Δανιήλ [+ προφήτης ις', <i>catalog.</i>]	Σοφίας
Ἔσθῃρ	Ἀγγαῖος
Τωβίτ (Τωβείτ, <i>subscr.</i>)	Ζαχαρίας
Ἰουδαίθ	Μαλαχίας
Ἔζρας α' ὁ ἱερεὺς (Ἔσζρας α' ἱερεὺς, <i>catalog.</i>)	Ἡσαίας
Ἔζρας β' ἱερεὺς (Ἔσζρας β' ἱερεὺς, <i>catalog.</i>)	Ἰερεμίας
Μακκαβαίων α'—δ'	Βαρούχ
Ψαλτήριον (Ψαλμοὶ ῥν' καὶ ἰδιόγραφος α' <i>subscr.</i> , <i>seq.</i> ᾠδαὶ ιδ'). Ψαλτήριον μετ' ᾠδῶν <i>catalog.</i>)	Θρήνοι
Ἰώβ	Ἰεζεκιήλ
Παροιμιαί Σολομώντος	Δανιήλ
Ἐκκλησιαστής	Τωβίτ
Ἄσματα (Ἄσμα <i>subscr.</i>) ἁσμάτων	Ἰουδαίθ
Σοφία Σολομώντος (Σ. Σολομώντος <i>subscr.</i> ; + ἡ Πανάρετος, <i>catalog.</i>)	Μακκαβαίων α'—δ'
Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιράχ (Σειράχ, <i>subscr.</i>)	
Ψαλμοὶ Σολομώντος, <i>catalog.</i>	

B (3) (a). ORDER OF THE BOOKS IN PATRISTIC AND
SYNODICAL LISTS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH.

1. Melito (*ap. Eus. H. E.* iv. 26).

Μωυσέως πέντε
Γένεσις
Ἔξοδος
Ἀριθμοί
Λευιτικόν
Δευτερονόμιον
Ἰησοῦς Ναυή
Κριταί
Ῥούθ
Βασιλειῶν τέσσαρα
Παραλειπομένων δύο
Ψαλμῶν Δαβίδ
Σαλομῶνος Παροιμιαί, ἧ καὶ Σοφία¹
Ἐκκλησιαστής
Ἄσμα ἄσματων
Ἰώβ
Προφητῶν
Ἡσαίου
Ἰερειῶν
Τῶν δώδεκα ἐν μονοβίβλῳ
Δανιήλ
Ἰεζεκιήλ
Ἔσδρας

2. Origen (*ap. Eus. H. E.* vi. 25).

Γένεσις
Ἔξοδος
Λευιτικόν
Ἀριθμοί
Δευτερονόμιον
Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Ναυή
Κριταί
Ῥούθ
Βασιλειῶν α'—δ'
Παραλειπομένων α', β'
Ἔσδρας α', β'
Βίβλος Ψαλμῶν
Σολομῶντος Παροιμιαί
Ἐκκλησιαστής
Ἄσμα ἄσματων
Ἡσαίας
Ἰερεμίας σὺν Θρήνοις καὶ τῇ Ἐπι-
στολῇ ἐν ἐνί
Δανιήλ
Ἰεζεκιήλ
Ἰώβ
Ἔσθθρ
Ἔξω δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ
Τὰ Μακκαβαϊκὰ

3. Athanasius (*ep. fest.* 39,
Migne, P.G. xxvi. 1436).

Γένεσις
Ἔξοδος
Λευιτικόν
Ἀριθμοί
Δευτερονόμιον
Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυή
Κριταί
Ῥούθ
Βασιλειῶν τέσσαρα βιβλία
Παραλειπομένων α', β'
Ἔσδρας, α', β'
Βίβλος Ψαλμῶν
Παροιμιαί
Ἐκκλησιαστής

4. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* iv. 35).

Αἱ Μωσέως πρῶται πέντε βιβλίοι
Γένεσις
Ἔξοδος
Λευιτικόν
Ἀριθμοί
Δευτερονόμιον
Ἐξῆς δέ
Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Ναυή
Τῶν Κριτῶν βιβλίον μετὰ τῆς Ῥούθ
Τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἱστορικῶν βιβλίων
Βασιλειῶν α'—δ'
Παραλειπομένων α', β'
Τοῦ Ἔσδρα α', β'
Ἔσθθρ (δωδεκάτη)

¹ Cf. *Eus. H. E.* iv. 22 ὁ πᾶς τῶν ἀρχαίων χορὸς Πανάρετον Σοφίαν τὰς Σολομῶνος παροιμίας ἐκάλουν.

* Ἄσμα ἁσμάτων

Ἰώβ

Προφήται

Οἱ δώδεκα

Ἡσαίας

Ἰερεμίας καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Βαρούχ,
Θρήνοι, Ἐπιστολή

Ἰεζεκιήλ

Δανιήλ

* Ἔστι καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν,
οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν τετυπωμένα δὲ
παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι
τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις...

Σοφία Σολομῶντος

Σοφία Σιράχ

Ἐσθήρ

Ἰουδίθ

Τωβίας

Τὰ δὲ στιχηρὰ τύγχανει πέντε

Ἰώβ

Βίβλος Ψαλμῶν

Παροιμίας

Ἐκκλησιαστής

* Ἄσμα ἁσμάτων (ἑπτακαίδεκατον
βιβλίον)

* Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις τὰ προφητικά πέντε

Τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν μία βίβλος

Ἡσαίου μία

Ἰερεμίου [μία] μετὰ Βαρούχ καὶ
Θρήνων καὶ Ἐπιστολῆς

Ἰεζεκιήλ

Δανιήλ (εἰκοστὴ δευτέρα βίβλος)

Τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἔξω κείσθω ἐν δευ-
τέρῳ

5^a. Eriphanus (*haer.* i. i. 6).

α'. Γένεσις

β'. Ἐξοδος

γ'. Λευιτικόν

δ'. Ἀριθμοί

ε'. Δευτερονόμιον

ς'. Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῆ

ζ'. Τῶν Κριτῶν

η'. Τῆς Ῥούθ

θ'. Τοῦ Ἰώβ

ι'. Τὸ Ψαλτήριον

ια'. Παροιμίας Σολομῶντος

ιβ'. Ἐκκλησιαστής

ιγ'. Τὸ Ἄσμα τῶν ἁσμάτων

ιδ'-ιζ'. Βασιλειῶν α'-δ'

ιη', ιθ'. Παραλειπομένων α', β'

κ'. Τὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον

κα'. Ἡσαίας ὁ προφήτης

κβ'. Ἰερεμίας ὁ προφήτης, μετὰ τῶν
Θρήνων καὶ Ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ

τε καὶ Βαρούχ

κγ'. Ἰεζεκιήλ ὁ προφήτης

κδ'. Δανιήλ ὁ προφήτης

κε', κς'. Ἐσθήρ α', β'

κζ'. Ἐσθήρ

Ἡ Σοφία τοῦ Σιράχ

Ἡ [Σοφία] τοῦ Σολομῶντος

5^b. Eriphanus (*de mens. et pond.* 4).

Ἰέντε νομικαὶ (ἡ πεντάτευχος ἡ καὶ
νομοθεσία)

(Γένεσις—Δευτερονόμιον)

Ἰέντε στιχηραὶς

(Ἰώβ, Ψαλτήριον, Παροιμίας Σα-
λομῶντος, Ἐκκλησιαστής, Ἄσμα
ἁσμάτων)

* Ἄλλη πεντάτευχος, τὰ καλούμενα Γρα-
φεία, παρὰ τισὶ δὲ Ἁγίογραφα λε-
γόμενα (Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῆ, βίβλος
Κριτῶν μετὰ τῆς Ῥούθ, Παραλει-
πομένων α', β', Βασιλειῶν α', β',
Βασιλειῶν γ', δ')

* Ἡ προφητικὴ πεντάτευχος (τὸ δωδεκα-
πρόφητον, Ἡσαίας, Ἰερεμίας, Ἰεζε-
κιήλ, Δανιήλ)

* Ἄλλαι δύο (τοῦ Ἐσθήρ δύο, μία λογι-
ζομένη, τῆς Ἐσθήρ)

Ἡ τοῦ Σολομῶντος ἡ Πανάρετος
λεγομένη

Ἡ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ

5^c. Eriphanius (*de mens. et pond.* 23).
 Γένεσις κόσμου
 Ἐξοδος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου
 Λευιτικόν
 Ἀριθμῶν
 Τὸ Δευτερονόμιον
 Ἡ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῆ
 Ἡ τοῦ Ἰώβ
 Ἡ τῶν Κριτῶν
 Ἡ τῆς Ρούθ
 Τὸ Ψαλτήριον
 Τῶν Παραλειπομένων α', β'
 Βασιλειῶν α'—δ'
 Ἡ Παροιμιῶν
 Ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής
 Τὸ Ἄσμα τῶν ψμμάτων
 Τὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον
 Τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαίου
 Τοῦ Ἱερεμίου
 Τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ
 Τοῦ Δανιήλ
 Τοῦ Ἐσδρα α', β'
 Τῆς Ἐσθῆρ

6. Gregory of Nazianzus (*carm.* i. xii. 5 ff.).
 Βίβλοι ἱστορικαὶ ιβ'
 (Γένεσις, Ἐξοδος, Λευιτικόν, Ἀριθ-
 μοί, Δεύτερος νόμος, Ἰησοῦς, Κρι-
 ται, Ρούθ, Πράξεις βασιλῶν,
 Παραλειπόμενα, Ἐσδρας)
 Βίβλοι στιχηραὶ ε'
 (Ἰώβ, Δαυίδ, τρεῖς Σολομωνταί,
 Ἐκκλησιαστής, Ἄσμα, Παροι-
 μίαι)
 Βίβλοι προφητικαὶ ε'
 (Οἱ δώδεκα—Ὡσηε, Ἀμώς, Μιχαίας,
 Ἰωήλ, Ἰωνᾶς, Ἀβδίας, Ναούμ,
 Ἀββακούμ, Σοφονίας, Ἀγγαῖος,
 Ζαχαρίας, Μαλαχίας—Ἡσαίας,
 Ἱερεμίας, Ἐζεκιήλ, Δανιήλος)

7. Amphilochius (*ad Seleuc.* ap. Greg. Naz. *carm.* ii. vii., Migne, P.G. xxxvii. 1593).
 Ἡ πεντάτευχος
 (Κτίσις, Ἐξοδος, Λευιτικόν, Ἀριθ-
 μοί, Δευτερονόμιον)
 Ἰησοῦς
 Οἱ Κριταί
 Ἡ Ρούθ
 Βασιλειῶν α'—δ'
 Παραλειπομένων α', β'
 Ἐσδρας α', β'
 Στιχηραὶ βίβλοι ε'
 (Ἰώβ, Ψαλμοί, τρεῖς Σολομώντος—
 Παροιμίαι, Ἐκκλησιαστής, Ἄσμα
 ψμμάτων)
 Προφήται οἱ δώδεκα
 (Ὡσηε, Ἀμώς, Μιχαίας, Ἰωήλ,
 Ἀβδίας, Ἰωνᾶς, Ναούμ, Ἀμβα-
 κούμ, Σοφονίας, Ἀγγαῖος, Ζαχα-
 ρίας, Μαλαχίας)
 Προφήται οἱ τέσσαρες
 (Ἡσαίας, Ἱερεμίας, Ἰεζεκιήλ, Δα-
 νιήλ)
 Τούτοις προσεγρύνουσι τὴν Ἐσθῆρ
 τινες

8. Pseudo-Chrysostom (*syn. script. sacr.* praef.). Migne, P.G. lvi. 513 sqq.
 Τὸ ἱστορικόν, ὡς
 Ἡ Γένεσις
 Ἡ Ἐξοδος
 Τὸ Λευιτικόν
 Οἱ Ἀριθμοί
 Τὸ Δευτερονόμιον
 Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ
 Οἱ Κριταί
 Ρούθ
 Αἱ Βασιλείαι α'—δ'
 Ἐσδρας
 Τὸ συμβουλευτικόν, ὡς
 Αἱ Παροιμίαι
 Ἡ τοῦ Σιραχ Σοφία
 Ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής
 Τὰ ἄσματα τῶν ἁσμάτων
 Τὸ προφητικόν, ὡς
 Οἱ δεκαεξὶ προφηταί
 Ρούθ (?)
 Δαυεὶδ

(ἡ ὀκτάτευχος)

9. Σύνοψις ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ ἀφ. Lagarde, *Septuagintast.*, ii. p. 60 f.¹
- Τὰ Μωσαϊκά
- α'. Γένεσις
β'. Ἐξοδος
γ'. Λευιτικόν
δ'. Ἀριθμοί
ε'. Δευτερονόμιον
- Τὰ ἕτερα
- ς'. Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυή
ζ'. Κριταί
η'. Ῥούθ
Τέλος τῆς ὀκτατεύχου
- Τὸ τετραβασιλειον
- θ'. Βασιλειῶν α'
ι'. Βασιλειῶν β'
ια'. Βασιλειῶν γ'
ιβ'. Βασιλειῶν δ'
ιγ'. Παραλειπόμενα α'
ιδ'. Παραλειπόμενα β'
ιε'. Ἐσδρα α'
ισ'. Ἐσδρα β'
ις'. Ἐσθήρ
ιη'. Τωβίτ
ιθ'. Ἰουδήθ
κ'. Ἰώβ
- Τοῦ Σολομῶντος
- κα'. Σοφία
κβ'. Παροιμιαί
κγ'. Ἐκκλησιαστής
κδ'. Ἄσμα ἁσμάτων
- Οἱ ιβ' προφῆται
- κε'. Ὡσηέ
κς'. Ἀμώς
κζ'. Μιχαίας
κη'. Ἰωήλ
κθ'. Ἀβδίου
λ'. Ἰωνᾶς
λα'. Ναούμ
λβ'. Ἀββακούμ
λγ'. Σοφονίας
λδ'. Ἀγγαίος
λε'. Ζαχαρίας
λς'. Μαλαχίας
- Οἱ δ' μεγάλοι προφῆται
- λζ'. Ἡσαίας
λη'. Ἰερεμίας
λθ'. Ἰεζεκιήλ
μ'. Δανιήλ
Τέλος τῶν ἑξ καὶ δέκα προφητῶν
- μα'. Σοφία Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Σιράχ
10. Anonymi dial. *Timothei et Aquilae.*
- α'. Γένεσις
β'. Ἐξοδος
γ'. Τὸ Λευιτικόν
δ'. Οἱ Ἀριθμοί
ε'. Τὸ Δευτερονόμιον
ς'. Ὁ τοῦ Ναυή
ζ'. Οἱ Κριταί, μετὰ τῆς Ῥούθ
η'. Τὰ Παραλειπόμενα α', β'
θ'. Τῶν βασιλειῶν α', β'
ι'. Τῶν βασιλειῶν γ', δ'
ια'. Ἰώβ
ιβ'. Τὸ Ψαλτήριον τοῦ Δαυίδ
ιγ'. Αἱ Παροιμιαί Σολομῶντος
ιδ'. Ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής, σὺν τοῖς Ἄσ-
μασιν
ιε'. Τὸ δωδεκαπρόφητον· Ἡσαίας,
Ἰερεμίας, Ἰεζεκιήλ, Δανιήλ,
Ἐσδρας
κα'. Ἰουδίθ
κβ'. Ἐσθήρ
Ἀπόκρυφα
Τοβίας
Ἡ Σοφία Σολομῶντος
Ἡ Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιράχ

¹ Lagarde, *l.c.*: "ich wiederhole sie, von mir redigiert."

11. Junilius *de inst. reg. div. legis* i. 3 ff.
(ed. Kihn).

Historia (xvii)

Genesis
Exodus
Leviticus
Numeri
Deuteronomium
Iesu Nave
Iudicum
Ruth
Regnn. i—iv

[Adiungunt plures Paralipomenon ii, Iob i, Tobiae i, Esdrae ii, Iudith i, Hester i, Macchabaeorum ii]

Prophetia (xvii)

Psalmorum cl
Osee
Esaiae
Ioel
Amos
Abdiae
Ionae
Michaeae
Naum
Habacuc
Sophoniae
Hieremiae
Ezechiel
Daniel
Aggaei
Zachariae
Malachiae

Proverbia (ii)

Salomonis Proverbiorum
Iesu filii Sirach

[Adiungunt quidam libr. Sapientiae et Cantica Canticorum]

Dogmatica (i)

Ecclesiastes

13. Leontius (*de Sectis* ii.).

Τὰ ἱστορικὰ βιβλία (ιβ')

(Γένεσις, Ἔξοδος, Ἀριθμοί, Λευιτικόν, Δευτερονόμιον Ἰησοῦς τοῦ Ναυῆ, Κριταί, Ῥούθ, Λόγοι τῶν βασιλειῶν α'—δ', Παραλειπέμεναι, Ἔσδρας)

12. Pseudo-Athanasii *syn. scr. sacr.*
(Migne, *P.G.* xxviii. 283 ff.).

Γένεσις

Ἔξοδος

Λευιτικόν

Ἀριθμοί

Δευτερονόμιον

Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ

Κριταί

Ῥούθ

Βασιλειῶν α', β'

Βασιλειῶν γ', δ'

Παραλειπομένων α', β'

Ἔσδρας α', β'

Ψαλτήριον Δαβιτικόν

Παροιμῖαι Σολομώντος

Ἐκκλησιαστής τοῦ αὐτοῦ

Ἄσμα ἁσμάτων

Ἰώβ

Προφῆται δώδεκα εἰς ἓν ἀριθμούμενοι

Ἔσθῃ, Ἀμώς, Μιχαίας, Ἰωήλ, Ἀβδίου, Ἰωνᾶς, Ναούμ, Ἀμβρακούμ, Σοφωνίας, Ἀγγαῖος, Ζαχαρίας, Μαλαχίας

Ἐξῆς δὲ ἕτεροι τέσσαρες

Ἡσαίας

Ἰερεμίας

Ἐζεκιήλ

Δανιήλ

Ἐκτὸς δὲ τούτων εἰσι πάλιν ἕτερα βιβλία κ.τ.λ. (as in Athanasius, but adding

Μακκαβαϊκά βιβλία δ'

Πτολεμαϊκά

Ψαλμοὶ καὶ ὧδῃ Σολομώντος

Σωσάννα)

14. John of Damascus (*de fide orthodox.* iv. 17).

Πρώτη πεντάτευχος, ἧ καὶ νομοθεσία (Γένεσις, Ἔξοδος, Λευιτικόν, Ἀριθμοί, Δευτερονόμιον)

Δευτέρα πεντάτευχος, τὰ καλούμενα Γραφεῖα, παρὰ τισὶ δὲ Ἀγιογράφα (Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ, Κριταὶ μετὰ

Τὰ προφητικά (ε΄)
(Ἡσαίας, Ἱερεμίας, Ἱεζεκιήλ, Δα-
νιήλ, τὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον)
Τὰ παραινετικά (δ΄)
(Ἰώβ, Παροιμιαὶ Σολομῶντος, Ἐκ-
κλησιαστής, τὸ Ἄσμα τῶν ἁσμά-
των, τὸ Ψαλτήριον)

τῆς Ῥούθ, Βασιλειῶν α΄, β΄, Βασι-
λειῶν γ΄, δ΄, τῶν Παραλειπομένων
α΄, β΄)

Τρίτη πεντάτευχος, αἱ στιχηραὶ βίβλοι
(τοῦ Ἰώβ, τὸ Ψαλτήριον, Παροι-
μιαὶ Σολομῶντος, Ἐκκλησιαστής,
τοῦ αὐτοῦ, τὰ Ἄσματα τῶν ἁσμά-
των τοῦ αὐτοῦ)

Τετάρτη πεντάτευχος ἢ προφητικὴ
(τὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον, Ἡσαίας, Ἱε-
ρεμίας, Ἱεζεκιήλ, Δανιήλ)

Ἄλλα δύο
(τοῦ Ἐσδρα α΄, β΄, ἢ Ἐσθήρ)

Ἡ Πανάρετος τ. ἐ. ἢ Σοφία τοῦ Σολο-
μῶντος

Ἡ Σοφία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ

16. Ebedjesu (*catal. libr. Eccl.*, Assemani,
Bibl. Or. iii. 5 f.).

15. Nicephorus, *Stichometria*.

A. Ὅσαι εἰσὶ γραφαὶ ἐκκλησιαζόμεναι
καὶ κεκανονισμέναι
α΄. Γένεσις στίχ. ,δτ΄
β΄. Ἐξοδος στίχ. ,βω΄
γ΄. Λευιτικὸν στίχ. ,βψ΄
δ΄. Ἀριθμοὶ στίχ. ,γφλ΄
ε΄. Δευτερονόμιον στίχ. ,γρ΄
ς΄. Ἰησοῦς στίχ. ,βρ΄
ζ΄. Κριταὶ καὶ Ῥούθ στίχ. ,βυν΄
η΄. Βασιλειῶν α΄, β΄ στίχ. ,βσμ΄
θ΄. Βασιλειῶν γ΄, δ΄ στίχ. ,βσγ΄
ι΄. Παραλειπόμενα α΄, β΄ στίχ. ,εφ΄
ια΄. Ἐσδρας α΄, β΄ στίχ. ,εφ΄
ιβ΄. Βίβλος Ψαλμῶν στίχ. ,ερ΄
ιγ΄. Παροιμιαὶ Σολομῶντος στίχ.
,αψ΄
ιδ΄. Ἐκκλησιαστής στίχ. ,ψν΄
ιε΄. Ἄσμα ἁσμάτων στίχ. ,σπ΄
ιες΄. Ἰώβ στίχ. ,αω΄
ις΄. Ἡσαίας προφήτης στίχ. ,γω΄
ιη΄. Ἱερεμίας προφήτης στίχ. ,δ΄
ιθ΄. Βαρούχ στίχ. ,ψ΄
κ΄. Ἱεζεκιήλ στίχ. ,δ΄
κα΄. Δανιήλ στίχ. ,β΄
κβ΄. Οἱ δώδεκα προφῆται στίχ. ,γ΄
Ὁμοῦ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης
βίβλοι κβ΄.

Genesis
Exodus
Liber sacerdotum
Numeri
Deuteronomii
Josue filii Nun
Iudicum
Samuel
Regum
Liber Dabariamin
Ruth
Psalmi David Regis
Proverbia Salomonis
Cohélet
Sirat Sirin
Bar-Sira
Sapientia Magna
Iob
Isaias
Hosee
Ioel
Amos
Abdias
Ionas
Michaeas
Nahum
Habacuc
Sophonias

B. "Όσαι ἀντιλέγονται καὶ οὐκ ἐκκλη-
σιάζονται

- α'. Μακκαβαϊκὰ γ' στίχ. ζτ'
β'. Σοφία Σολομώντος στίχ. αρ'
γ'. Σοφία υἱοῦ τοῦ Σιράχ στίχ.
βω'
δ'. Ψαλμοὶ καὶ ᾠδαὶ Σολομώντος
στίχ. βρ'
ε'. Ἐσθῆρ στίχ. τν'
ς'. Ἰουδίθ στίχ. αψ'
ζ'. Σωάννα στίχ. φ'
η'. Τωβίτ, ὁ καὶ Τωβίας στίχ. ψ'

Aggaeus
Zacharias
Malachias
Hieremias
Ezechiel
Daniel
Iudith
Esther
Susanna
Esdras
Daniel Minor
Epistola Baruch
Liber traditionis Seniorum
Josephi proverbialia
Historia filiorum Samonae [i. e.
Maccab. iv]
Liber Maccabaeorum (i—iii)

17. Laodicene Canons (lx.).

- α'. Γένεσις κόσμου
β'. Ἐξοδος ἐξ Αἰγύπτου
γ'. Λευιτικόν
δ'. Ἄριθμοί
ε'. Δευτερονόμιον
ς'. Ἰησοῦς Ναυή
ζ'. Κριταί, Ῥούθ
η'. Ἐσθῆρ
θ'. Βασιλειῶν α', β'
ι'. Βασιλειῶν γ', δ'
ια'. Παραλειπομένων α', β'
ιβ'. Ἐσδρας α', β'
ιγ'. Βίβλος Ψαλμῶν ρν'
ιδ'. Παροιμίαι Σολομώντος
ιε'. Ἐκκλησιαστής
ισ'. Ἄσμα ἁσμάτων
ιζ'. Ἰώβ
ιη'. Δώδεκα προφήται
ιθ'. Ἡσαίας
κ'. Ἱερεμίας καὶ Βαρούχ, Θρήνοι καὶ
Ἐπιστολαί
κα'. Ἰεζεκιήλ
κβ'. Δαυιήλ

18. Apostolic Canons (lxxxiv.).

Μωυσέως πέντε
(Γένεσις, Ἐξοδος, Λευιτικόν, Ἄ-
ριθμοί, Δευτερονόμιον)
Ἰησοῦς Ναυή
Ῥούθ
Βασιλειῶν τέσσαρα
Παραλειπομένων δύο
Ἐσδρα δύο
Ἐσθῆρ
Μακκαβαίων τρία
Ἰώβ
Ψαλτήριον
Σολομώντος τρία
(Παροιμίαι, Ἐκκλησιαστής,
Ἄσμα ἁσμάτων)
Προφητῶν δεκάδυο ἔν
Ἡσαίου ἔν
Ἱερεμίου ἔν
Ἰεζεκιήλ ἔν
Δαυιήλ ἔν
Ἐξῶθεν δὲ προσιστορεῖσθω μανθά-
νειν ὑμῶν τοὺς νέους τὴν Σοφίαν
τοῦ πολυμαθοῦς Σιράχ

19. List in *Codd. Barocc.* 206; *B.M. Add.* 17469; *Coisl.* 120.

Περὶ τῶν ξ' βιβλίων, καὶ ὅσα τούτων
ἐκτός
α'. Γένεσις
β'. Ἐξοδος
γ'. Λευιτικόν
δ'. Ἄριθμοί

ε'. Δευτερονόμιον
ς'. Ἰησοῦς
ζ'. Κριταὶ καὶ Ῥούθ
η'—ια'. Βασιλειῶν α'—δ'
ιβ'. Παραλειπόμενα α', β'
ιγ'. Ἰώβ

ιδ'. Ψαλτήριον
 ιε'. Παροιμίαι
 ις'. Ἐκκλησιαστής
 ιζ'. Ἄσμα ἁσμάτων
 ιη'. Ἔσδρας
 ιθ'. Ὡσῆε
 κ'. Ἀμώς
 κα'. Μιχαίας
 κβ'. Ἰωήλ
 κγ'. Ἰωνᾶς
 κδ'. Ἀβδίου
 κε'. Ναούμ
 κς'. Ἀμβρακάμ
 κζ'. Σοφονίας
 κη'. Ἀγγαίος

κθ'. Ζαχαρίας
 λ'. Μαλαχίας
 λα'. Ἡσαίας
 λβ'. Ἰερεμίας
 λγ'. Ἰεζεκιήλ
 λδ'. Δανιήλ¹

*
 *

Καὶ ὅσα ἐξω τῶν ξ'
 α'. Σοφία Σολομῶντος
 β'. Σοφία Σιράχ
 γ'-ς'. Μακκαβαίων [α'-δ']
 ζ'. Ἔσθῆρ
 η'. Ἰουδῆθ
 θ'. Τωβίτ

B (3) (b). ORDER OF THE BOOKS IN PATRISTIC AND SYNODICAL LISTS OF THE WESTERN CHURCH.

1. Hilary, *prol. in libr. Psalm.*

i—v. Moysi[s] libri quinque
 vi. Iesu Naue
 vii. Iudicum et Ruth
 viii. Regnorum i, ii
 ix. Regnorum iii, iv
 x. Paralipomenon i, ii
 xi. Sermones dierum Esdrae
 xii. Liber Psalmorum
 xiii—xv. Salomonis Proverbia, Ec-
 clesiastes, Canticum Canticorum
 xvi. Duodecim Prophetae
 xvii—xxii. Esaias, Jeremias cum
 Lamentatione et Epistola, Daniel,
 Ezekiel, Job, Hester

[xxiii—xxiv. Tobias, Judith]²

2. Rufinus (*Comm. in symb.* 36).

Moysi[s] quinque libri
 (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Nu-
 meri, Deuteronomium)
 Iesus Naue
 Iudicum, simul cum Ruth
 Regnorum iv
 Paralipomenon (= Dierum liber)
 Esdrae ii
 Hester
 Prophetarum
 (Esaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel,
 xii Prophetarum liber i)
 Iob
 Psalmi David
 Salomon[is] iii
 (Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Cantica
 Canticorum)

Sapientia Salomonis
 Sapientia Sirach (= Ecclesiasticus)
 Tobias
 Iudith
 Maccabaeorum libri

¹ The B.M. MS. counts Ruth as a separate book and after Daniel places the numeral λε'.

² "Quibusdam autem visum est additis Tobia et Judith xxiv libros secundum numerum Graecarum literarum connumerare."

3. Augustine (*de doct. Chr.* ii. 13).
 [Historiae:]
 Quinque Moyses [libri]
 (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus,
 Numeri, Deuteronomium)
 Iesu Naue
 Iudicum
 Ruth
 Regnorum libri iv
 Paralipomenon libri ii
 Iob
 Tobias
 Esther
 Iudith
 Machabaeorum libri ii
 Esdrae libri ii
 Prophetæ:
 David liber Psalmorum
 Salomonis libri iii
 (Proverbiorum, Canticum Can-
 ticorum, Ecclesiastes)
 Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus ¹
 Prophetarum xii
 (Osee, Ioel, Amos, Ab-
 dias, Ionas, Michaeas,
 Nahum, Habacuc, So-
 phonias, Aggaeus, Za-
 charias, Malachias)
 Prophetæ iv maiorum volu-
 minum
 (Isaias, Ieremias, Daniel,
 Ezechiel)

4. Innocent I. (*ep. ad Exsuperium*).
 Moysi[s] libri quinque
 (Genesis, Exodi, Levitici, Nu-
 meri, Deuteronomii)
 Iesu Naue
 Iudicum
 Regnorum libri iv
 Ruth
 Prophetarum libri xvi
 Salomonis libri v
 Psalterium
 Historiarum:
 Iob
 Tobias
 Hester
 Iudith
 Machabaeorum libri ii
 Esdrae libri ii
 Paralipomenon libri ii

} proprie prophetæ

5. Pseudo-Gelasius *decret. de libr.*
 Moyses v libri:
 Genesis
 Exodus
 Leviticus
 Numeri
 Deuteronomium
 Iesu Naue
 Iudicum
 Ruth
 Regum i—iv

6. Cassiodorus (*de inst. Div. litt.* 14).
 Genesis
 Exodus
 Leviticus
 Numeri
 Deuteronomium
 Iesu Nave
 Regum i—iv
 Paralipomenon i, ii
 Psalterium

¹ Of the canonicity of these two books Augustine speaks with some reserve: "de quadam similitudine Salomonis esse dicuntur...qui tamen quoniam in auctoritatem recipi meruerunt inter propheticos numerandi sunt."

Item libri prophetarum numero xvi: (Isaias, Ieremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Amos, Michas, Iohel, Abdias, Ionas, Naum, Abacu, Sofonias, Agaeus, Zacharias, Maleachias) Paralipomena i, ii Psalmorum cl Salomonis libri iii (Proverbiorum, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum) Liber Sapientiae filii Siracis Alius subsequens liber Sapientiae	Salomonis libri v (Proverbia, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, Canticum canticorum) Prophetae (Isaias, Hieremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Amos, Michaeas, Joel, Abdias, Jonas, Naum, Abbacuc, Sofonias, Aggaeus, Zacharias, Malachias, qui et Angelus) Job Tobi[as] Esther Iudith Esdrae [libri] ii Machabaeorum libri ii
Item historiarum: Iob Tobias Hester Iudith Macchabaeorum libri ii	

7. *Isidorus (de ord. libr. s. scr.).*

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Quinque libri Moyseos | 4. Prophetae: Psalmorum liber i,
Salomonis libri iii (Proverbiorum, Ecclesiastes, Cantica Canticorum), Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, libri xvi Prophetarum |
| 2. Iesu Nave, Iudicum, Ruth | |
| 3. Regum i—iv, Paralipomenon i, ii, Tobiae, Esther, Iudith, Esdrae, Machabaeorum libri duo | |

8. Mommsen's List, cited by Zahn, *Gesch. d. N. T. Kanons*, ii. p. 143 f.; Sanday, *Studia Biblica*, iii. p. 222 f.; Preuschen, *Analecta*, p. 138¹.

Libri canonici	Regnorum liber ii $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{IICC}}$
Genesis versus $\overline{\text{IIIDCC}}$	Regnorum liber iii $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{IIDL}}$
Exodus $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{III}}$	Regnorum liber iv $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{IICCL}}$
Numeri $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{III}}$	Fiunt versus $\overline{\text{VIIIID}}$
Leviticus $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{IICCC}}$	Paralipomenon liber i $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{IIXL}}$
Deuteronomium $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{IIDCC}}$	liber ii $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{IIC}}$
Hiesu Nave $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{MDCCL}}$	Machabeorum liber i $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{IICCC}}$
Iudicum $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{MDCCL}}$	liber ii $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{MDCCC}}$
Fiunt libri vii $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{XVIIIC}}$	Iob $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{MDCC}}$
Rut $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{CCL}}$	Tobias $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{DCCCC}}$
Regnorum liber i $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{IICCC}}$	Hester $\overline{\text{ver}} \overline{\text{DCC}}$

¹ The text of Preuschen has been followed; it is based on a St Gall MS. which appears to be less corrupt than the Cheltenham MS. used by Mommsen and others.

Iudit $\overline{\text{ver}}$ MC
 Psalmi Davitici cli $\overline{\text{ver}}$ V
 Salomonis $\overline{\text{ver}}$ $\overline{\text{VID}}$
 Prophetæ maiores $\overline{\text{ver}}$ $\overline{\text{XVCCCLXX}}$
 numero IIII
 Esaias $\overline{\text{ver}}$ IIIDLXXX

Ieremias $\overline{\text{ver}}$ IIIICCCCL
 Daniel $\overline{\text{ver}}$ MCCCL
 Ezechiel $\overline{\text{ver}}$ IIIICCCXL
 Prophetæ xii $\overline{\text{ver}}$ IIIDCCC
 Erunt omnes versus numero
 $\overline{\text{LXVIIIID}}$

9. List in *Cod. Claromontanus*.

Versus scribaturarum sanctarum
 ita Genesis versus IIIID
 Exodus versus IIIIDCC
 Leviticum versus IIIDCCC
 Numeri versus IIIIDCL
 Deuteronomium ver. IIIICCC
 Iesu Naue ver. II
 Iudicum ver. II
 Rud ver. CCL
 Regnorum ver.
 primus liber ver. IIID
 secundus lib. ver. II
 tertius lib. ver. IIIDC
 quartus lib. ver. IIICCCC
 Psalmi Davitici ver. $\overline{\text{V}}$
 Proverbia ver. $\overline{\text{IDC}}$
 Aeclesiastes DC
 Cantica canticorum CCC
 Sapientia vers. $\overline{\text{I}}$
 Sapientia IHU ver. IIID
 XII Profetae ver. IIIICX
 Ossee ver. DXXX
 Amos ver. CCCCX
 Micheas ver. CCCX
 Ioel ver. XC
 Abdias ver. LXX
 Ionas ver. CL
 Naum ver. CXL
 Ambacum ver. CLX
 Sophonias ver. CXL
 Aggeus vers. CX
 Zacharias ver. DCLX
 Malachiel ver. CC
 Esaias ver. IIIDC
 Ieremias ver. IIIILXX

10. *Liber sacramentorum* (Bobbio, cent. vi, vii).

Liber Genesis
 Exodum
 Leviticum
 Numeri
 Deuteronomium
 Josue
 Iudicum
 Libri mulierum
 Ruth
 Hester
 Judith
 Maccabeorum libri duo
 Job
 Thobias
 Regum quattuor
 Prophetarum libri xvi
 Daviticum v
 Solomonis iii
 Esdra i
 Fiunt libri Veteris numero
 xliiii

Ezechiel ver. III DC
 Daniel ver. I DC
 Maccabeorum sic.
 lib. primus ver. III CCC
 lib. secundus ver. III CCC
 lib. quartus ver. I
 Iudit ver. I CCC
 Hesdra I D
 Ester ver. I
 Iob ver. I DC
 Tobias ver. I

11. Council of Carthage, A.D. 397 (can. 47 = 39).

Genesis
 Exodus
 Leviticus
 Numeri
 Deuteronomium
 Iesu Naue
 Iudicum
 Ruth
 Regnorum libri iv
 Paralipomenon libri ii
 Job
 Psalterium Davidicum
 Salomonis libri v
 xii libri Prophetarum
 Isaias
 Ieremias
 Ezechiel
 Daniel
 Tobias
 Iudith
 Hester
 Hesdrae libri ii
 Machabaeorum libri ii¹

2. We may now proceed to consider the chief points which these tables illustrate.

(1) THE TITLES OF THE BOOKS. It will be seen that the Hebrew titles fall into three classes. They consist of either (1) the first word or words of the book (Genesis—Deuteronomy, Proverbs, Lamentations); or (2) the name of the hero or supposed author (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah and the other Prophets, Job, Ruth, Esther, Daniel, Ezra); or (3) a description of the contents (Psalms, Song of Songs, Chronicles). Titles of the second and third class are generally reproduced in the Greek; there are some variations, as when Samuel and Kings become ‘Kingdoms,’ and ‘Diaries’ (דְּבָרֵי יָמִים) is changed into ‘Omissions’ (Παραλειπόμενα²), but the system of nomenclature is the same. But titles of the first class disappear in the Greek, and in their place we find descriptive names, suggested in almost every case by words in the ver-

¹ See also the Latin list printed by Mr C. H. Turner in *J. Th. St.* i. 557 ff.

² Or less correctly Παραλειπόμενοι, ‘omitted books,’ as in some lists.

sion itself. Thus *Genesis* appears to come from Gen. ii. 4 αὐτῆ ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, *Exodus* from Ex. xix. 1 τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, *Numbers* from Num. i. 2 κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἐξ ὀνόματος, *Deuteronomy* from Deut. xvii. 18 γράψει αὐτῷ τὸ δευτερονόμιον τοῦτο εἰς βιβλίον¹, *Ecclesiastes* from Eccl. i. 1 ῥήματα ἐκκλησιαστοῦ.

The Greek titles are probably of Alexandrian origin and pre-Christian use. Not only were they familiar to Origen (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25), but they are used in Melito's list, although it came from Palestine. Some of them at least appear to have been known to the writers of the New Testament; cf. Acts ii. 30 ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν, xiii. 33 ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ, Rom. ix. 25 ἐν τῷ Ὡσηε λέγει². Philo³ uses Γένεσις, Δευτικὸν or Δευτικὴ βίβλος, Δευτερονόμιον, Βασιλείαι, Παροιμίαι, but his practice is not quite constant; e.g. he calls *Exodus* ἡ Ἐξαγωγή⁴; *Deuteronomy* is sometimes ἡ Ἐπινομίς, and *Judges* ἡ τῶν Κριμάτων⁵ βίβλος. Similar titles occur in the Mishna⁶, whether suggested by the Alexandrian Greek, or independently coined by the Palestinian Jews; thus *Genesis* is גֵּנְזִיךְ בְּרָאשִׁית, *Numbers* מִסְפָּרֵי מִדְּבָרִים, *Proverbs* מִסְפָּרֵי הַחַכְמָה, *Lamentations* קִינּוֹת.

Through the Old Latin version the Greek titles passed into the Latin Bible⁷, and from the Latin Bible into the later versions of Western Christendom. In three instances, however, the influence of Jerome restored the Hebrew titles; 1, 2 King-

¹ On this rendering see Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. i. The Massora calls the book כְּתוּבֵי הַתּוֹרָה.

² See also Acts xiii. 20, 33, Rom. x. 16, xv. 11, Heb. xi. 22.

³ See Prof. Ryle's *Philo and Holy Scripture*, p. xx. ff.

⁴ So in Cohn-Wendland's edition (iii. 4, 57, 230); in ii. 271 this title is ascribed to Moses, although ἐξαγωγή does not like ἐξόδος occur in the Alexandrian version of the book. Ἡ Ἐξαγωγή was also the title of the Hellenist Ezekiel's poem on the Exodus (see below, p. 371).

⁵ Cf. the change from מִסְפָּרֵי מִדְּבָרִים to Βασιλείαι.

⁶ See Ryle, *Canon of the O.T.*, p. 294.

⁷ Sometimes in a simple transliteration, as *Genesis* &c. Tertullian has *Arithmi*, but in Cyprian the Latin *Numeri* is already used; see Burkitt, *O. L. and Itala*, p. 4.

doms have become 1, 2 Samuel, and 3, 4 Kingdoms, 1, 2 Kings, whilst 'Chronicles,' representing the Hebrew כְּרֻמִים, has taken the place of *Paralipomenon*.

Cf. Hieron. *Prol. Gal.*: "tertius sequitur *Samuel*, quem nos *Regnorum* primum et secundum dicimus; quartus *Malachim*, id est *Regum*, qui tertio et quarto *Regnorum* volumine continetur... septimus *Dabre aianim*, id est 'Verba dierum,' quod significantius *Chronicon* totius divinae historiae possumus appellare."

The Greek titles vary slightly in different codices and lists. Besides the variations of cod. A which appear in Table B (2), the following are mentioned in the apparatus of Holmes and Parsons. *Joshua*: Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναυή, ὁ τοῦ Ναυή, *Judges*: Κριταὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, αἱ τῶν κριτῶν πράξεις. *Chronicles*: Παραλειπομένων τῶν βασιλειῶν Ἰούδα. *Psalms*: Δαυὶδ προφήτου καὶ βασιλέως μέλος. When Nehemiah is separated from Ezra its title is: τὰ περὶ Νεεμίου ἢ λόγοι Ν. υἱοῦ Ἀχαλῖα. A few further forms may be gleaned from the patristic lists. As an alternative for *Παραλειπομένων* the Apostolic Canons give τοῦ βιβλίου τῶν ἡμερῶν, while Ezra is known to Hilary as *sermones dierum Esdrae*. The Psalter is sometimes βιβλος Ψαλμῶν, *liber Psalmorum*, or Ψαλτήριον Δαβιθικόν, *Psalmi David regis, Psalterium Davithicum*. For ἄσμα ἁσμάτων we have occasionally ἄσματα ἁσμάτων—a form rejected by Origen (*ap. Eus. H.E.* vi. 25 οὐ γάρ, ὡς ὑπολαμβάνουσί τινες, ἄσματα ἁσμάτων), but used by Pseudo-Chrysostom and John of Damascus, and found in cod. A and in several of the Latin lists¹; cf. the English Article vi. "*Cantica, or Songs of Solomon*." The lesser Prophets are οἱ δώδεκα ἢ δεκαδύο, τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν μία βιβλος, τὸ δωδεκαπρόφητον, *prophetæ xii*; the greater, οἱ τέσσαρες, *prophetæ iv, prophetæ iv maiorum voluminum*, or simply *maiores*; when the two collections are merged into one they become οἱ δεκαεξή ἢ οἱ ἑκκαίδεκα, τὸ ἑκκαίδεκαπρόφητον, *prophetæ xvi*.

(2) THE GROUPING OF THE BOOKS. The methods of grouping adopted in the Hebrew and Alexandrian Greek Bibles differ not less widely than the nomenclature of the books. The Hebrew canon is uniformly tripartite, and "the books belonging to one division are never (by the Jews) transferred to another²." Its three groups are known as the Law

¹ The official Vulgate had *Canticum*, until the plural was adopted by Sixtus V.; see Nestle, *ein Jubiläum der Lat. Bibel*, p. 18.

² Driver, *Introd.*, p. xxvii.

(תּוֹרָה), the Prophets (נְבִיאִים), and the Writings (כְּתוּבִים). The Massora recognised, however, certain subdivisions within the second and third groups; the Prophets were classed as *Former* (רִאשׁוֹנִים), i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings; and *Latter* (אַחֲרֹנִים), and among the 'Latter' the Twelve minor Prophets formed a single collection¹. Similarly 'the five Rolls' (כְּנֻלּוֹת), i.e. Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, made a subsection among the Kethubim. The tripartite division of the canon was known at Alexandria in the second century B.C., for the writer of the prologue to Sirach refers to it more than once (1 f. τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ' αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων : 6 f. τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατριῶν βιβλίων : 14 f. ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων). It is also recognised in the New Testament, where the Law and the Prophets are mentioned as authoritative collections, and in one passage the 'Writings' are represented by the Psalter (Lc. xxiv. 44 πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς). But the New Testament has no comprehensive name for the third group, and even Josephus (*c. Ap.* i. 8) speaks of four poetical books (probably Psalms, Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes) as forming with the Law and the Prophets the entire series of sacred books; the rest of the Hagiographa seem to have been counted by him among the Prophets². At Alexandria the later books were probably attached to the canon by a looser bond. The writer of the *De vita contemplativa* appears to recognise four groups³ (§ 3 νόμους, καὶ λόγια θεοπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν, καὶ ὕμνους, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα οἷς ἐπιστήμη καὶ εὐσέβεια συναύξονται καὶ τελειοῦνται).

Only the first of the three Palestinian groups remains undis-

¹ So already in Sir. xlix. 10 τῶν ἑβ' προφητῶν.

² See Ryle, *Canon of the O.T.*, p. 165 f.

³ Unless we omit the comma after ὕμνους and regard ὅ. καὶ τὰ ἄλλα as = the Hagiographa; cf. Joseph. *c. Ap.* as quoted below, p. 220.

turbed¹ in the Alexandrian Greek Bible, as it is preserved to us in MSS. and described in Christian lists. When the Law was translated into Greek, it was already a complete collection, hedged round with special sanctions, and in all forms of the Greek Bible it retains its precedence and has resisted any extensive intrusion of foreign matter. It is otherwise with the Prophets and the Hagiographa. Neither of these groups escaped decomposition when it passed into the Greek Bible. The Former Prophets are usually separated from the Latter, the poetical books coming between. The Hagiographa are entirely broken up, the non-poetical books being divided between the histories and the prophets. This distribution is clearly due to the characteristically Alexandrian desire to arrange the books according to their literary character or contents, or their supposed authorship. Histories were made to consort with histories, prophetic and poetical writings with others of their respective kinds. On this principle Daniel is in all Greek codices and catalogues one of the Greater Prophets, while Ruth attaches itself to Judges, and Canticles to Ecclesiastes.

In many of the Greek patristic lists the Alexandrian principle of grouping receives express recognition. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Leontius, divide the books of the Old Testament into (1) historical—12, including the Mosaic Pentateuch; (2) poetical—5; (3) prophetic—5. Epiphanius, followed by John of Damascus, endeavours to combine this grouping with a system of pentateuchs²—(1) legal, (2) poetical, (3) historical³, (4) pro-

¹ Yet even the Torah was not always kept apart in the Greek Bible, as the names Octateuch and Heptateuch witness.

² Dr Sanday (in *Studia Biblica*, iii. p. 240) regards this as Palestinian, identifying it with Cyril's method. But Cyril begins with a dodecad (δωδεκάτη ἢ Ἑσθῆρ' καὶ τὰ μὲν Ἱστορικὰ ταῦτα).

³ The term γραφεῖα (בְּתוּרָיִם) or ἀγύγραφα is transferred to this group.

phetical—an end which he attains by relegating Ezra and Esther to an appendix. Pseudo-Chrysostom's arrangement is similar, though slightly different in some of its details; according to his view the Bible began with an Octateuch, and the *στιχηρά* are broken up, the Psalter being placed with the Prophets, and the Salomonic books described as 'hortatory'¹ (*τὸ συμβουλευτικόν*). Even in the eccentric arrangement of Junilius² the Greek method of grouping is clearly dominant.

The relative order of the groups in the Greek Bible, being of literary and not historical origin, is to some extent liable to variation. The 'five books of Moses' always claim precedence, and the 'rest of the histories' follow, but the position of the poetical and prophetic books is less certain. Codex B places the poetical books first, whilst in Codd. \aleph and A the prophets precede. But the order of cod. B is supported by the great majority of authorities both Eastern and Western (Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius (1, 3), Gregory, Amphilochius, the Laodicene and 'Apostolic' canons, Nicephorus, Pseudo-Chrysostom, the Cheltenham list, the African canons of 397, and Augustine). Two reasons may have combined to favour this arrangement. 'David' and 'Solomon' were higher up the stream of time than Hosea and Isaiah. Moreover, it may have seemed fitting that the Prophets should immediately precede the Evangelists.

(3) THE NUMBER OF THE BOOKS. In our printed Hebrew Bibles the books of the Old Testament are 39 (Law, 5; Former Prophets (Joshua—2 Kings), 6; Latter Prophets, 15; Hagiographa, 13). But Samuel, Kings, Ezra-Nehemiah, and

¹ So Leontius (*τὰ παραινετικά*), but he classed the Psalter among them.

² See Kihn, *Theodor v. Mopsuestia u. Junilius*, p. 356 f.

Chronicles¹, were originally single books², and the Minor Prophets were also counted as a single book. Thus the number is reduced to 24 (Law, 5; Former Prophets, 4; Latter Prophets, 4; Hagiographa, 11), and this answers to the prevalent Jewish tradition. On the other hand Josephus expressly limits the books to 22 (Law, 5; Prophets, 13; Hymns and moral pieces, 4). He has probably included the historical Hagiographa among the Prophets, and treated Ruth and Lamentations as appendices to Judges and Jeremiah respectively.

Both traditions were inherited by the Church, but the latter was predominant, especially in the East. In some lists indeed the twenty-two books became twenty-seven, the 'double books' being broken up into their parts (Epiph. 1)³; in some a similar treatment of the Dodecapropheton raised the number to 34 (the 'Sixty Books'), and there are other eccentricities of numeration which need not be mentioned here.

Josephus, *c. Ap. i. 8*: οὐ μυριάδες βιβλίων εἰσὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀσυμφώνων καὶ μαχομένων, δύο δὲ μόνα πρὸς τοῖς ἑξήκοσι βιβλία...καὶ τούτων πέντε μὲν ἐστὶ Μωυσέως...οἱ μετὰ Μωυσὴν προφήται...συνέγραψαν ἐν τρισὶ καὶ δέκα βιβλίοις· αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ τέσσαρες ὕμνους εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποθήκας τοῦ βίου περιέχουσιν. He is followed by Origen *ap. Eus. l.c.* οὐκ ἀγνοητέον δ' εἶναι τὰς ἐνδιαθήκους βίβλους ὡς Ἑβραῖοι παραδιδόασιν, ὅσος ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς στοιχείων ἐστίν· and Cyril. Hier. *catech. iv. 33* ἀναγίνωσκε τὰς θείας γραφάς, τὰς ἑξήκοσι δύο βίβλους τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. Similarly Athanasius, *ep. fest. 39* (Migne, *P.G.* xxvi. col. 1437). When another numeration was adopted, efforts were

¹ Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah appears to have been originally a single book. But while Ezra and Nehemiah are still joined in the Greek Bible, Chronicles stands by itself both in **Ⲙ** and **Ⲛ**, and in **Ⲙ** it follows Nehemiah and forms the last book of the Canon (cf. Mt. xxiii. 35, and see Barnes, *Chronicles*, in the *Cambridge Bible*, pp. x.—xiii.).

² The division probably began in the LXX.

³ Jerome, *Prol. Gal.*: "quinque a plerisque libri duplices aestimantur." As the twenty-two books answered to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, so these 'double books' were thought to correspond to the 'double letters,' i.e. those which had two forms (**Ⲫ**, **ⲫ**, **Ⲛ**, **ⲛ**, **Ⲟ**). The 'double books' were not always identical in different lists; see Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 239.

made to shew that it did not involve a real departure from the canon of twenty-two; cf. Epiph. *haer.* i. 1. 8, αὐταὶ εἰσὶν αἱ εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ βιβλοὶ αἱ ἐκ θεοῦ δοθεῖσαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, εἴκοσι δὲ ὡς τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς στοιχεῖα τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν γραμμάτων ἀριθμοῦμεν διὰ τὸ διπλοῦσθαι δέκα βιβλοὺς εἰς πέντε λεγομένας. *dial. Tim. et Ag.* (ed. Conybeare, p. 66), αὐταὶ αἱ βιβλοὶ αἱ θεόπνευστοι καὶ ἐνδιάθετοι, κς' μὲν οὖσαι, κβ' δὲ ἀριθμοῦμεν διὰ τὸ...ἐξ αὐτῶν διπλοῦσθαι.

On the other hand the numeration in 4 Esdr. xiv. 44 rests, if *nongenti quatuor* be the true reading, on a tradition which makes the Hebrew books 24. This tradition is supported by the testimony of the Talmud and the Rabbinical literature¹, and the Canon is known in Jewish writings by the name כ"ד ספרים, "the Twenty-Four Books." It finds a place in certain Western Christian writers, e.g. Victorinus of Petau *comm. in Apoc.*: "sunt autem libri V.T. qui accipiuntur viginti quatuor quos in epitome Theodori invenies²." Victorinus compares the 24 books to the 24 Elders of Apoc. iv., and the same fancy finds a place in the Cheltenham list ("ut in apocalypsi Iohannis dictum est *Vidi XXIII seniores mittentes coronas suas ante thronum*, maiores nostri probant hoc libros esse canonicos"). Jerome knows both traditions, though he favours the former (*Prol. Gal.* "quomodo igitur viginti duo elementa sunt...ita viginti duo volumina supputantur...quamquam nonnulli Ruth et Cinoth inter Hagio-grapha scriptitent et libros hos in suo putent numero supputandos et per hoc esse priscae legis libros viginti quatuor").

Let us now turn to the ecclesiastical lists and see how far the Hebrew Canon was maintained.

Our earliest Christian list was obtained from Palestine³, and probably represents the contents of the Palestinian Greek Bible. It is an attempt to answer the question, What is the true number and order of the books of the Old Testament? Both the titles and the grouping are obviously Greek, but the books are exclusively those of the Hebrew canon. Esther does not appear, but the number of the books is twenty-two, if we are intended to count 1—4 Regn. as two.

¹ Cf. Ryle, *Canon*, pp. 157 f., 222, 292; Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 236 ff.

² Zahn offers a suggestion, to which Sanday inclines, that the writer refers to the *Excerpta ex Theodoto* which are partly preserved in the works of Clement of Alexandria.

³ Melito *ap. Eus. H. E.* iv. 26 ἐπειδὴ μαθεῖν τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλίων ἐβουλήθη ἀκριβείαν, πόσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν καὶ ὅποια τὴν τάξιν εἶεν...ἀνελθὼν εἰς τὴν ἀνατολήν καὶ ἕως τοῦ τόπου ἔνθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη...ἐπεμψά σοι.

The next list comes from Origen. It belongs to his commentary on the first Psalm, which was written at Alexandria¹, i.e. before A.D. 231. The books included in it are expressly said to be the twenty-two of the Hebrew canon (εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ εἰκοσι δύο βίβλοι καθ' Ἑβραίων ἀζδε). Yet among them are the first book of Esdras² and the Epistle of Jeremiah, which the Jews never recognised. With the addition of Baruch, Origen's list is repeated by Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius (1), and in the Laodicean canon; Amphilochius mentions two books of Esdras, and it is at least possible that the Esdras of Gregory of Nazianzus is intended to include both books, and that the Epistle, or Baruch and the Epistle, are to be understood as forming part of Jeremiah in the lists both of Gregory and Amphilochius. Thus it appears that an expansion of the Hebrew canon, which involved no addition to the number of the books, was predominant in the East during the fourth century.

The Eastern lists contain other books, but they are definitely placed outside the Canon. This practice seems to have begun with Origen, who after enumerating the twenty-two books adds, ἔξω δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά. Athanasius takes up the expression, but names other books—the two Wisdoms, Esther³, Judith, and Tobit⁴. Palestine was perhaps naturally conservative in this matter; Cyril will not allow his catechumens to go beyond the Canon, and Epiphanius mentions only, and that with some hesitation, the two books of Wisdom (εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι παρ' αὐτοῖς βίβλοι ἐν ἀμφιλέκτῳ⁵...

¹ Eus. *H.E.* vi. 24.

² Already cited freely by Josephus as an authority for the history of the period. Origen, it should be added, regards 1, 2 Esdras as a single volume (Ἑσδρας πρώτη, δευτέρα ἐν ἐνί).

³ Cf. Melito's omission of Esther, and the note appended to the list of Amphilochius.

⁴ The N.T. members of the same class are the *Teaching* and the *Shepherd*.

⁵ *Haer.* i. i. 1.

αὐταὶ χρήσιμοι μὲν εἰσι καὶ ὠφέλιμοι, ἀλλ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν ῥητῶν οὐκ ἀναφέρονται)¹. And this was the prevalent attitude of the East even at a later time. There are exceptions; Pseudo-Chrysostom places Sirach among the Hortatory books of the canon; the Apostolic canons, while excluding Sirach, include three books of Maccabees. But John of Damascus reflects the general opinion of the Greek fathers when, while reckoning both books of Esdras² as canonical, he repeats the verdict of Epiphanius upon the two Wisdoms, Ἐνάρετοι μὲν καὶ καλαί, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀριθμοῦνται³.

On the other hand the West, further from the home of the Hebrew canon, and knowing the Old Testament chiefly through the Latin version of the LXX., did not scruple to mingle non-canonical books with the canonical. Hilary and Ruffinus⁴ were doubtless checked, the one by the influence of Eastern theologians, the other by the scholarship of Jerome; but Hilary mentions that there were those who wished to raise the number of the canonical books to twenty-four by including Tobit and Judith in the canon. From the end of the fourth century the inclusion of the non-canonical books in Western lists is a matter of course. Even Augustine has no scruples on the subject; he makes the books of the Old Testament forty-four (*de doctr. Chr.* ii. 13 "his xlv libris Testamenti Veteris terminatur auctoritas⁵"), and among them Tobit, Judith, and two books of Maccabees take rank with the histories; and the two Wisdoms, although he confesses that they were not the work of Solomon, are classed with the

¹ *De mens. et pond.* 4.

² Like Origen, he explains that they form together but a single book (τοῦ Ἐσδρα αἱ δύο εἰς μίαν συναπτόμεναι βιβλον).

³ The non-canonical books (τὰ ἕξω) are however carefully distinguished from real *apocrypha* when the latter are mentioned; e.g. in the stichometry of Nicephorus, and in the list of the 'Sixty Books.'

⁴ *In symb.* 38 "alii libri sunt qui non canonici sed ecclesiastici a maioribus appellati sunt."

⁵ Cf. *Retract.* ii. 4.

Prophets. His judgement was that of his Church (Conc. Carth. iii. *can.* xlvii. "sunt canonicae scripturae Salomonis libri quinque... Tobias, Judith... Machabaeorum libri duo"). The African Church had probably never known any other canon, and its belief prevailed wherever the Latin Bible was read.

There can be little doubt that, notwithstanding the strict adherence of the Eastern lists to the number of the Hebrew books, the Old Latin canon truly represents the collection of Greek sacred books which came into the hands of the early Christian communities at Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome. When Origen and the Greek fathers who follow him fix the number of the books at twenty-two or twenty-four, they follow, not the earlier tradition of the Church, but the corrected estimate of Christian scholars who had learned it from Jewish teachers. An earlier tradition is represented by the line of Christian writers, beginning with Clement of Rome, who quoted the 'Apocryphal' books apparently without suspecting that they were not part of the Canon. Thus Clement of Rome¹ places the story of Judith side by side with that of Esther; the Wisdom of Sirach is cited by Barnabas² and the *Didache*³, and Tobit by Polycarp⁴; Clement of Alexandria⁵ and Origen appeal to Tobit and both the Wisdoms, to which Origen adds Judith⁶. Our earliest MSS. of the Greek Bible confirm the impression derived from the quotations of the earliest Christian writers. Their canon corresponds not with that of the great writers of the age when they were written, but with that of the Old Latin version of the LXX. Codd. B & A contain the two Wisdoms, Tobit, and Judith; 1—2 Maccabees are added in B, and 1—4 Maccabees in A; cod. C still exhibits the two Wisdoms, and when complete may have contained other books of the same class.

¹ 1 *Cor.* 55.

² c. 19. 9.

³ c. 4.

⁴ *Philipp.* 10.

⁵ *Strom.* i. 10, v. 14.

⁶ Cf. Westcott in *D. C. B.* iv. p. 130.

Moreover, the position of the books shews that the scribes of these MSS. or of their archetypes lacked either the power or the will to distinguish them from the books of the Hebrew canon. In the light of the facts already produced, it is clear that the presence of the non-canonical books in Greek Bibles cannot be attributed to the skilled writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. They have but perpetuated an older tradition—a tradition probably inherited from the Alexandrian Jews.

An explanation of the early mixture of non-canonical books with canonical may be found in the form under which the Greek Bible passed into the keeping of the Church. In the first century the material used for literary purposes was still almost exclusively papyrus, and the form was that of the roll¹. But rolls of papyrus seldom contained more than a single work, and writings of any length, especially if divided into books, were often transcribed into two or more separate rolls². The rolls were kept in boxes (*κιβωτοί, κίσται, capsae, cistae*)³, which served not only to preserve them, but to collect them in sets. Now while the sanctity of the five books of Moses would protect the *cistae* which contained them from the intrusion of foreign rolls, no scruple of this kind would deter the owner of a roll of Esther from placing it in the same box with Judith and Tobit; the Wisdoms in like manner naturally found their way into a Salomonic collection; while in a still larger number of instances the two Greek recensions of Esdras consorted together, and Baruch and the Epistle seemed rightly to claim a place with the roll of Jeremiah. More rarely such a writing as the Psalms of Solomon may have found its way into the company of kindred books of the canon. It is not a serious objection to this hypothesis

¹ See Kenyon, *Palaeography of Greek papyri*, pp. 24, 113 ff.

² *Ib.* p. 122: "no papyrus roll of Homer hitherto discovered contains more than two books of the Iliad. Three short orations fill the largest roll of Hyperides."

³ E. M. Thompson, *Greek and Latin Palaeography*, p. 57.

that Philo does not quote the Apocrypha, and has no certain allusion to it¹. A great scholar would not be deceived by the mixture of heterogeneous rolls, which might nevertheless seriously mislead ordinary readers, and start a false tradition in an unlettered community such as the Christian society of the first century.

(4) THE INTERNAL ORDER OF THE GROUPS. Even in Jewish lists of the Hebrew Canon there are variations in the internal order of the Prophets and the Hagiographa. The 'Great Prophets' occur in each of the three orders (1) Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; (2) Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah; (3) Jeremiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel². The order of the Hagiographa varies more extensively. In the printed Bibles they are arranged in three subdivisions: (1) Psalms, Proverbs, Job; (2) Canticles, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther (the five Megilloth); (3) Daniel, Ezra, Chronicles. The Talmudic order is as follows: Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Chronicles. The MSS. vary, many agreeing with the printed Bibles; others, especially those of Spanish *provenance*, following the order: Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra³.

In the lists of the Greek Bible and the sequence of its MSS. the Law and the 'Former Prophets' generally retain their Hebrew order, with the noteworthy exception that Ruth is always attached to Judges. But there are also minor exceptions which are of some interest. Even in the Pentateuch Melito, Leontius, and the Cheltenham list reverse the common order of Leviticus and Numbers⁴. The sequence is broken in some lists after Ruth (Laod., Epiph. 1), or even after Joshua

¹ Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture*, p. xxxiii.

² See Ryle, *Canon*, p. 225 ff.

³ Ryle, *ib.*, pp. 229 ff., 281 f.

⁴ On this see Sanday, *Studia Biblica*, iii. p. 241.

(Epiph. 3¹) or Deuteronomy (Epiph. 2). Occasionally Chronicles, which is an intruder from the Hagiographa, precedes 1—4 Regn. (Epiph. 2, *Dial. Tim. et Aq.*), or drops out altogether (Ps.-Chrys., Junilius, Cod. Clarom.). All these disturbances of the normal order may be ascribed to local or individual influences, and find no support in the uncial MSS. of the Greek Bible. But it is otherwise when we come to the 'Latter Prophets' and the Hagiographa. With regard to the Prophets, three questions of order arise. (1) There is the relative order of the Twelve and the Four. In the majority of patristic lists the Twelve precede (Ath., Cyr., Epiph., Greg., Amph., &c.), and this is also the order of Codd. A, B, N-V. But Cod. \aleph begins with the Four, and it is supported by other authorities, chiefly Western (Ruff., Chelt., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius, Nicephorus); whilst in a few the subdivisions are mixed (Melito, Junilius, Ebedjesu²). (2) The internal order of the δωδεκαπρόφητον in most of the MSS. and catalogues³ where it is stated differs from the Hebrew order in regard to the relative positions of the prophets in the first half of the group; the Hebrew order being Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, but the Greek, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah. The dominant Greek order may perhaps be due to "an attempt to secure greater accuracy in the chronological arrangement⁴." (3) The

¹ Ruth is attached to 1 Regn. in the Cheltenham list, and Augustine inclines to this arrangement (see Sanday, *l.c.*, p. 242). The result was to create a *Heptateuch*; for the word cf. J. E. B. Mayor, *The Latin Heptateuch*, p. xxxvi. R. Peiper's text of the *Heptateuchos*, to which Prof. Mayor refers (p. xxxiv.), appeared in the Vienna *Corpus scr. eccl. lat.* vol. xxiii. (1895).

² For statements by early Mohammedan writers as to the extent of the Jewish and Christian Canons see Margoliouth in *Exp. Times*, Nov. 1899, p. 91.

³ The chief exceptions are: Cod. v, Hosea, Amos, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah; Greg. Naz. and Cod. Barocc., Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Jonah, Obadiah; Junilius, Ebedjesu, Augustine, the Hebrew order.

⁴ Ryle, *Canon*, p. 229.

Greek order of the Greater Prophets follows the oldest Hebrew tradition (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel), but it appends Lamentations to Jeremiah, and enlarges the group by placing Daniel either before (Melito, Origen, Hilary, Chelt., Augustine), or, more usually, after Ezekiel.

The relative order of the Hagiographa in the LXX. is more perplexing. For Ruth, Lamentations, and Daniel we have already accounted; there remain Chronicles, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, and Ezra. Chronicles, in accordance with the theory enshrined in its Greek name, usually follows Kings. Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, for the most part hold together in that order, as a group of poetical books; but there are many exceptions. 'David' sometimes goes with the Prophets (Ps.-Chrys., Junilius, Augustine, Isidorus), and the group is then regarded as 'Salomonic,' or 'hortatory.' Lists which admit the two books of Wisdom usually join them to this subdivision (Ebedjesu, Carth., Augustine, Innocent, Cod. Clarom., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius, Isidorus). The internal order of the Salomonic books varies (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles; Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Proverbs; Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes); the Wisdoms usually follow, but sometimes break the sequence of the three canonical books. Much difficulty seems to have been felt as to the place of Job; the book normally appears in connexion with the poetical books, either last or first, but it is sometimes placed among the histories (Augustine, Innocent, Cod. Clarom., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius), or after the Prophets (Origen). The position of Esdras is not less uncertain; its normal place is after Chronicles, but it is also found before or after the Prophets (Melito, Epiph., John of Damascus, Cod. Barocc.), or in connexion with a group of the apocryphal histories (cod. A, Carth., Augustine, &c.). Esther is still more erratic; sometimes it follows the poetical books, sometimes the Prophets, sometimes the

histories; not a few lists place it among the antilegomena, or omit it altogether. When admitted to a place in the Canon, it is usually to be found at or near the end (Origen, Epiphanius, Amphilochius, John of Damascus, Hilary, Carth., Cod. Clarom., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius), and in company with apocryphal books, especially Judith¹ and Tobit (codd. B&A, Chelt., Carth., Augustine, and the later Latin lists²). It seems as if the doubt which the Jewish authorities felt with regard to this book was inherited by many Christians. On the other hand Cyril, who represents the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem, makes it the twelfth of the canonical books, and in the Laodicene list it stands eighth.

Except in cases where an old or well-defined tradition fixed the internal order of groups of books, there was clearly room for every possible variation so long as the books were written on separate rolls. The *cista* might serve to keep a group together, but it offered no means of fixing the relative order of its contents. In the codex, on the other hand, when it contained more than one writing, the order was necessarily fixed³, and the scribe unconsciously created a tradition which was followed by later copyists. The 'transition to vellum,' and the consequent transition from the roll to the codex, does not seem to have been general before the fourth century, although in the case of Biblical MSS. it may have begun a century earlier⁴; and thus we may regard our earliest uncial codices as prototypes of the variations in order which mark the mass of later MSS. A single instance may suffice. It has been stated that Esther is frequently found in company

¹ The proximity of Esther to Judith in many lists is perhaps due to the circumstance that in both books the central figure is a woman; cf. p. 213 (right-hand column).

² Cf. Ryle, *Canon*, p. 199 ff.

³ Cf. Sanday, *Studia Biblica*, iii. p. 233 ff.

⁴ See Kenyon, *Palaeography of papyri*, p. 119 f.; Sanday, *l.c.* Papyrus was freely used for codices in Egypt during the third century; cf. Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, ii. p. 2.

with Judith and Tobit. But these books occur in varying order in the oldest MSS.; in B we have Esther, Judith, Tobit, but in \aleph A, Esther, Tobit, Judith; a favourite Western order is Tobit, Esther, Judith (Chelt., Augustine, Innocent, Gelasius, Cassiodorus, Isidorus); another, sanctioned at Carthage in 397, is apparently more common in MSS. of the Vulgate, viz., Tobit, Judith, Esther¹. Such variations, resting on no obvious principle, are doubtless ultimately due to the judgement or caprice of a few scribes, whose copies supplied the archetypes of the later Greek MSS. and the daughter-versions of the Septuagint.

LITERATURE. On the general subject of this chapter the student may consult C. A. Credner, *Gesch. d. N.T. Kanons* (ed. Volkmar, Berlin, 1860); Th. Zahn, *Gesch. d. N.T. Kanons*, ii., p. 143 ff. (Erlangen, 1890); B. F. Westcott, *Hist. of the Canon of the N.T.*⁶ (Cambridge, 1891); W. Sanday, *The Cheltenham List*, in *Studia Biblica*, iii., pp. 226—243 (Oxford, 1891); Buhl, *Kanon u. Text des A.T.* (Leipzig, 1891); H. E. Ryle, *Canon of the O.T.* (London, 1892); E. Preuschen, *Analecta* (Leipzig, 1893); H. L. Strack, art. *Kanon des Alten Testamentes* in *P.R.E.*³ ix. 741—767.

¹ For the order of the books in Latin MS. Bibles see S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, pp. 301—6, 331—9.

CHAPTER II.

BOOKS OF THE HEBREW CANON.

THE books which are common to the Hebrew Bible and the Alexandrian Version¹ differ in regard to their contents as well as in their titles and order. Differences of contents may conveniently be considered under two heads, as they affect the sequence or the subject-matter.

(A) DIFFERENCES OF SEQUENCE.

I. The following table shews the principal instances in which the Greek and the Hebrew books are at variance in reference to the order of the contents. The chapters and verses in the left-hand column are those of the Cambridge Septuagint; the right-hand column follows the numeration of the printed Hebrew Bibles.

GREEK.	HEBREW.
Gen. xxxi. 46 ^b —52	Gen. xxxi. 48 ^a , 47, 51, 52 ^a , 48 ^b , 49, 50 ^a , 52 ^b
„ xxxv. 16—21	„ xxxv. 16+21, 17—20, 22 ^a
Exod. xx. 13—15	Exod. xx. 14, 15, 13
„ xxxv. 8—11, 12, 15--16, 17, 18, 19 ^b	„ xxxv. 9—12, 17, 13—14, 16, 19, 15

¹ Following the order of *The Old Testament in Greek*, these are Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1—4 Kingdoms (vol. i.), 1—2 Paralipomena, 2 Esdras, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Job, Esther (vol. ii.), the Twelve Minor Prophets, the Four Greater Prophets (vol. iii.)—37 in all.

GREEK.	HEBREW.
Exod. xxxvi. 8 ^b —40	Exod. xxxix. 1—31
„ xxxvii. 1—2	„ xxxvi. 8—9
„ „ 8—6	„ „ 35—38
„ „ 7—21	„ xxxviii. 9—23
„ xxxviii. 1—17	„ xxxvii. 1—24
„ „ 18—20	„ xxxvi. 20—34
„ „ 21—24	„ xxxviii. 1—7
„ „ 25	„ xxxvii. 29
„ „ 26	„ xxxviii. 8
„ „ 27	„ xl. 30—32
„ xxxix. 1—10	„ xxxviii. 24—31
„ „ 11	„ xxxix. 32
„ „ 13—23	„ „ 33—43
„ xl. 6 ^b —8, 10—25, 26, 27	„ xl. 8—10, 12—27, 29, 33,
—32	38
Num. i. 24—37	Num. i. 26—37, 24—25
„ vi. 22—26	„ vi. 22, 23, 27, 24, 25, 26
„ xxvi. 15—47	„ xxvi. 19—27, 15—18, 44—
	47, 28—43
Josh. ix. 3—33	Josh. viii. 30—33, ix. 3—27
„ xix. 47—48	„ xix. 48, 47
3 Regn. iv. 17, 18, 19	1 Kings iv. 18, 19, 17
„ „ 20—21, 22—24	„ „ 7—8, 2—4, 9—14
25—30	
„ v. 1—16, 17	„ v. 15—30, 32 ^b
„ vi. 2—3	„ v. 31—32 ^a
„ vi. 4—5, 6—7, 8, 9—15,	„ vi. 37—38, 2—3, 14, 4
16—34	—10, 15—36
„ vii. 1—6, 7, 8—9, 10—	„ vii. 13—18, 21, 19—20,
11, 12—13	23—24, 26, 25
„ vii. 14—37, 38—50	„ vii. 27—51, 1—12
„ x. 23—24 ^a , 24 ^b , 25	„ ix. 15, 17—19, 20—22
„ „ 26—29	„ x. 23—26
30	„ v. 1 ^a
„ „ 31—33	„ x. 27—29
„ xi. 3—8	„ xi. 4, 3, 7, 5, 8, 6
„ xx. xxi	„ xxi. xx
Psalms ix. 22—39	Psalms x. 1—18
„ x.—cxii	„ xi.—cxiii
„ cxiii. 1—8	„ cxiv. 1—8
„ cxiii. 9—12	„ cxv. 1—4
„ cxiv	„ cxvi. 1—9
„ cxv	„ cxvi. 10—19
„ cxvi.—cxlvi	„ cxvii.—cxlvii. 11
„ cxlvii. 1—9	„ cxlvii. 12—20

GREEK.	HEBREW.
Prov. xv. 27 ^b —xvi. 4, 6, 9	Prov. xvi. 6, xv. 28, xvi. 7, xv 29
	„ xvi. 8—9, xv. 30—33 ^a
	„ xvi. 5, 4 ^a
„ xx. 10 ^a —12, 13 ^b —16, 17	„ xx. 20—22, 10—13, 23—
—24	30
„ xxiv. 24—37, 38—49, 50—	„ xxx. 1—14, xxiv. 23—34,
68, 69—77, xxix. 28—	xxx. 15—33, xxxi. 1—9, 10
49	—31
Jer. xxv. 14—19	Jer. xlix. 34 ^a —39
„ xxvi. 1	„ „ 36 ^b
„ „ 2—28	„ xlv. 2—28
„ xxvii	„ l
„ xxviii	„ li
„ xxix. 1—7	„ xlvii. 1—7
„ „ 8—23	„ xlix. 7—22
„ xxx. 1—5, 6—11, 12—27	„ „ 1—5, 28—33, 23—27
„ xxxi	„ xlviii
„ xxxii. 1—24	„ xxv. 15—38
„ xxxiii	„ xxvi
„ xxxiv. 1—18	„ xxvii. 2—22
„ xxxv	„ xxviii
„ xxxvi	„ xxix
„ xxxvii	„ xxx
„ xxxviii. 1—34, 35—37, 38—	„ xxxi. 1—34, 37, 35, 36, 38—
40	40
„ xxxix	„ xxxii
„ xl	„ xxxiii
„ xli	„ xxxiv
„ xlii	„ xxxv
„ xliii	„ xxxvi
„ xlv	„ xxxvii
„ xlv	„ xxxviii
„ xlv	„ xxxix
„ xlv	„ xl
„ xlv	„ xli
„ xlv	„ xlii
„ xlv	„ xliii
„ xlv	„ xlv. 1—30, xlv. 1—5
„ li. 1—30, 31—35	Ezek. vii. 6—9, 3—5
Ezech. vii. 3—9	

2. Each of these contexts must be separately examined with the view of discovering the extent and the cause of the divergence. This can be done but briefly here; for further

particulars the student is referred to the commentaries which deal with the several books.

In the following pages \mathfrak{G} = the Greek text, and $\mathfrak{G}^{A, B, \text{etc.}}$ = the Greek text as given in cod. A, cod. B, or as the case may be; \mathfrak{M} = the Massoretic text as printed in the Hebrew Bibles.

GEN. xxxi. 46 ff. The passage is in some confusion; “*vv.* 45, 47, 51—54 appear to embody E’s account...*vv.* 46, 48—50 the account given by J¹.” \mathfrak{M} is loosely put together, and *v.* 50^b, which \mathfrak{G} omits, is hardly consistent with *vv.* 48, 52. In \mathfrak{G} the materials seem to have been re-arranged with the view of giving greater consistency to the narrative.

GEN. xxxv. 16 ff. The transposition in \mathfrak{G} appears to be due to a desire to locate Eder ($\Gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\rho$) between Bethel and Bethlehem; see art. EDER in Hastings’ *D. B.* (i. p. 644).

EXOD. xx. 13—15. \mathfrak{G}^B and \mathfrak{M} represent here two distinct traditions with regard to the order of the Decalogue. For the order followed by \mathfrak{G}^B see Lc. xviii. 20, Rom. xiii. 9, Jas. ii. 11, Philo *de x. orac.* 10, *de spec. legg.* iii. 2; that of $\mathfrak{G}^{AF}\mathfrak{M}$ is supported by Mt., Mc., and Josephus. In Deut. v. 17—19 cod. B wavers between the two, but cod. A consistently agrees with \mathfrak{M}^2 .

EXOD. xxxv.—xl. is “the sequel to c. xxv.—xxxi., relating the execution of the instructions there communicated to Moses,” the correspondence being so close that “in the main, the narrative is repeated *verbatim*—with the single substitution of past tenses for future³.” But whilst in c. xxv. ff. the LXX. generally follows the Massoretic order, in the corresponding sections at the end of the book “extraordinary variations occur in the Greek, some verses being omitted altogether, while others are transposed and knocked about with a freedom very unlike the usual manner of the translators of the Pentateuch⁴.”

¹ Driver, *Intr.* p. 15.

² The Nash (Heb.) Papyrus agrees generally with \mathfrak{G} ; see S. A. Cook, *A Unique Biblical Papyrus*, *Exp. T.* xiv. 200; Burkitt, in *J. Q. R.* xvi. 559.

³ Driver, *Intr.* pp. 37, 38.

⁴ Robertson Smith, *O. T. in the J. Ch.* p. 124 f.

The passage deals with the building and furniture of the Tabernacle, and the attire of the Priesthood. The following rough table will enable the student to see how the details are arranged in the LXX. and Heb. severally.

Ⓔ	Ⓕ
<i>Ornaments of the Ministers.</i>	<i>Structure of the Tabernacle.</i>
Ephod (xxxvi. 9—12).	Hangings (xxxvi. 8—19).
Onyx stones (xxxvi. 13—14).	Boards (xxxvi. 20—34).
Breastplate (xxxvi. 15—29).	Veils (xxxvi. 35—38).
Robe of Ephod (xxxvi. 30—34).	<i>Furniture of the Tabernacle and its Court.</i>
Linen vestments (xxxvi. 35—37).	Ark (xxxvii. 1—9).
Crown plate (xxxvi. 38—40).	Table (xxxvii. 10—16).
<i>Structure of the Tabernacle and Court.</i>	Candlestick (xxxvii. 17—24).
Hangings (xxxvii. 1—2).	Altar of incense (xxxvii. 25—29).
Veils (xxxvii. 3—6).	Altar of Burnt-offering (xxxviii. 1—7).
Court (xxxvii. 7—18).	Laver (xxxviii. 8).
<i>Furniture of the Tabernacle, &c.</i>	Court (xxxviii. 9—20).
Ark (xxxviii. 1—8).	<i>Ornaments of the Ministers.</i>
Table (xxxviii. 9—12).	Ephod (xxxix. 2—5).
Candlestick (xxxviii. 13—17).	Onyx stones (xxxix. 6—7).
Altar of Burnt-offering (xxxviii. 22—24).	Breastplate (xxxix. 8—21).
Oil and Incense (xxxviii. 25— 26).	Robe of the Ephod (xxxix. 22— 26).
Laver (xxxviii. 27).	Linen vestments (xxxix. 27—29).
	Crown plate (xxxix. 30—31).

It is clear from this comparison that both Ⓔ and Ⓕ follow a system, i.e. that the difference of sequence is due to a deliberate rearrangement of the groups. Either the Alexandrian translator has purposely changed their relative order, giving precedence to the ornaments of the priesthood which are subordinated in the M. T. of cc. xxxv.—xl., as well as in both texts of cc. xxv.—xxx.; or he had before him in c. xxxv. ff. another Hebrew text in which the present Greek order was observed. Many O. T. scholars (e.g. Kuenen, Wellhausen, Dillmann) regard cc. xxxv.—xl. as belonging to a “secondary

and posterior stratum of P¹." Thus it is permissible to suppose that the Hebrew text before the original translators of Exodus did not contain this section, and that it was supplied afterwards from a longer Hebrew recension of the book in which the last six chapters had not yet reached their final form. That the translation of these chapters was not made by the same hand as the rest of Exodus has been gathered from the fact that the Hebrew technical terms which are common to xxv.—xxx. and xxxv.—xl. are in certain cases differently rendered in the two contexts².

NUMBERS i. 24 ff., xxvi. 15 ff. Each of these passages contains a census of the tribes, and in each the order of the tribes is slightly different in **G** and **M**. In both lists **M** places Gad third, and Asher eleventh; whereas according to **G** Gad is ninth in the first of the two lists, and sixth in the second, and in the second Asher is seventh. The effect of the sequence presented by **G** is to bring Gad into close proximity to Asher, a position which this tribe occupies in i. 5—15 (**G** and **M**). For this there may have been genealogical reasons; see Gen. xxx. 10 ff., xlix. 19.

C. vi. 22 ff. Here **M** obviously has the simpler and more natural order, and λέγοντες αὐτοῖς at the end of v. 23 seems to shew that the Greek order, though supported by **BAN***, is the result of an early accidental displacement in the Greek text.

JOSHUA ix. 3 ff. In the present Hebrew text the ceremony at Ebal and Gerizim follows immediately upon the taking of Ai, but in **G** it is separated from the latter incident by the hostile gathering of the western kings (ix. 1, 2) and placed immediately before the story of the Gibeonites. **M** "involves a geographical difficulty, for Ebal lies considerably to the north

¹ See Driver, *Intr.* pp. 35, 39; Addis, *Documents of the Hexateuch*, ii. p. 276 f.

² Robertson Smith, *O. T. in the J. Ch.* p. 125. Mr H. St J. Thackeray notes, however, that "the same technical terms are sometimes differently rendered in adjacent verses."

of Ai, and until the intervening territory was conquered...it is difficult to understand how Joshua could have advanced thither¹." The situation however is scarcely improved if we adopt the order of **G**, unless the gathering of the kings is taken to imply a further victory on the Israelite side which opened the way to central Palestine. Dillmann suggests that ix. 2 was once followed by the details of a battle. If so, it is possible that **G** still preserves the original order, though in common with **M** it has lost this record.

C. xix. 47—48. On these verses, which exchange places in the Greek, see under (B)².

3 REGN. iv. 17 ff.

The change of order in *vv.* 17—19 needs no discussion; the transposition may be due to an accident of transcription in the archetype of Cod. B, or, like the variations in Num. i., xxvi., to some consideration connected with the placing of the tribes. The real problem of the passage begins at iv. 20. Its nature may best be understood from a table of the contents. These consist of the details of Solomon's personal greatness and public works; the facts are arranged by **G**^B and **M** respectively as follows:

G ^B	M
Provision for the royal table (iv. 20—23).	Solomon's marriage (iii. 1).
Solomon's power (iv. 24).	Provision for the royal table (v. 2 f., 7 f.).
His wisdom (iv. 25—30).	The King's power (v. 4).
His marriage (iv. 31).	His wisdom (v. 9—14).
His wife's dowry (iv. 32 ff.).	His negotiations with King Hiram (v. 15—25).
His negotiations with King Hiram (v. 1—12).	His corvée of workmen (v. 27—32).
His corvée of workmen (v. 13—17).	Foundations of the Temple laid (vi. 1).
Foundations of the Temple laid (vi. 1—5).	Dimensions of the Temple (vi. 6).
Dimensions of the Temple (vi. 6 f.).	Details of the building (vi. 2, 7, 36).

¹ Driver, *Intr.* p. 100.

² Cf. *infra*, p. 244.

G ^B	M
Details of the building (vi. 8—34).	Building of the royal palaces (vii. 1—12).
Work of Hiram the artist (vii. 1—37).	Work of Hiram the artist (vii. 12—51).
Building of the royal palaces (vii. 38—50).	Solomon's wife's dowry (ix. 16 f.).

As in the disturbed section at the end of Exodus, it is easy to see that each order follows a system: (1) Whilst **M** places the marriage of Solomon to Pharaoh's daughter, and the use made by the king of his wife's marriage portion, in their historical settings, **G^B** brings the two incidents together, as the finishing strokes to the picture of Solomon's power. Again, whilst **M** deals with the whole of Solomon's public works before it describes the skill of Hiram, **G^B** completes the history of the building of the Temple with the account of Hiram's labours before it describes the construction of the royal palaces.

The above comparison is necessarily rough; it does not shew the minor differences of order, or the omissions and additions of the Greek text. A closer examination leaves little doubt that **G^B** has been translated from a recension of the book earlier than that which is preserved in the Massoretic text¹.

C. x. 23—33. The text of **G^{B, Luc.}** here admits two passages which it had passed over in the earlier contexts, where they stand in **M** (c. ix. 15, 17—22, v. 1). Of ix. 10—28 Prof. Driver remarks that it "consists of a series of notices imperfectly connected together," and that its "literary form ... is, for some reason, less complete than that of any other portion of the Books of Kings²." Under these circumstances it is not surprising that some of these notices occupied another

¹ Cf. Driver, *Intr.* p. 182, and note; C. F. Burney, in Hastings' *D. B.* p. 862 ff.

² *Intr.* p. 181.

place in the text which was before the Alexandrian translator. C. v. 1^a, which in the Greek order is x. 30, belongs in **℣** to another similar collection of loosely-connected paragraphs. The arrangement followed by **℣**^B is perhaps not materially better, but it probably represents an earlier stage in the formation of the book.

C. xi. 3—8. Here **℣**^{B, Luc.} presents a text which differs from **℣**^A and **℣** both in order and in form. A comparison of **℣**^B with **℣**^A and **℣** will be found to be instructive; the latter is diffuse and repeats itself unnecessarily (3 *ἐκκλιαν γυναῖκες αὐτοῦ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ...4 αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτοῦ ἐξέκκλιαν τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ...5 ἐπορεύθη Σαλωμών ὀπίσω τῆς Ἀστάρτης...7 τότε ᾠκοδόμησεν Σ. ὑψηλὸν...τῆ Ἀστάρτη*); the former presents the facts¹ briefly and in a logical sequence. Here as elsewhere in this book Cod. A represents the Hexaplaric Greek, and not the original LXX.²

Cc. xx., xxi. The relative order of these chapters is reversed in **℣**, which justifies the change by prefacing the story of Naboth with the words *וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה*. “The dislocation may have been due to the desire to bring the prophecy of Ahab’s death nearer to the account of its occurrence³.” Obviously wrong as the present Hebrew order is, Cod. A has adopted it, interpolating the inapposite *ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα*, which Origen had borrowed from Aquila; and even Lucian (if he is here rightly represented by Lagarde) has been led into the same error, though he seems to retain the true sequence of the chapters.

PSALMS ix.—cxlvii.

Throughout the greater part of the Psalter **℣** and **℣**

¹ B however omits the important statement of v. 3^a, which comes “from the older narrative” (Driver).

² See Field *ad loc.*, and cf. Silberstein, *über den Ursprung der im cod. Alex. u. Vat. des dritten Königsbuches...überlieferten Textgestalt* (Giessen, 1893).

³ C. F. Burney, *l.c.*

follow different systems of numeration. This is due to certain consecutive Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter being counted as one in the Greek (ix. + x. Heb. = ix. LXX. ; cxiv. + cxv. Heb. = cxiii. LXX.), and certain of the Hebrew Psalms being *vice versa* divided in the Greek into two (cxvi. Heb. = cxiv. + cxv. LXX. ; cxlvii. Heb. = cxlvi. + cxlvii. LXX.).

In the Heb. Psalms ix. and x. there are traces of an acrostic system which have been taken to indicate that the two Psalms were originally one¹. Many Hebrew MSS. join Psalms cxiv., cxv.², as in the LXX. For the division of Psalms cxvi. and cxlvii. it is less easy to account, but it may have been due to a desire to make up the number of the Psalms to 150³.

PROVERBS xxiv.—xxxi.

In the first great section of this book (cc. i.—ix.) there is no important difference of order, nor does the second section (x.—xxii. 1^b) or the third (xxii. 17—xxiv. 22) offer more than an occasional variation in the grouping of proverbs, combined with omissions and additions on either side. But at c. xxiv. 23 we enter upon a series of collections which seem at one time to have formed distinct books or cycles of proverbial teaching, and here **G** and **M** differ widely, as a comparison of the contents will shew.

G

Words of Agur (xxiv. 24—37).
Sayings of the Wise (xxiv. 38—49).
Rest of the Words of Agur (xxiv. 50—68).

M

Sayings of the Wise (xxiv. 23—34).
Proverbs of Solomon (xxv. 1—xxix. 21).
Words of Agur (xxx. 1—33).

¹ See Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*, p. 228 ; Bleek-Wellhausen, p. 471. Prof. Kirkpatrick (*Psalms*, l. p. 41) speaks with less confidence.

² See Kennicott, ii. p. 410. It should be added that in the MSS. Pss. cxvi., cxvii., cxviii. are also often written continuously.

³ "Both in Palestine and in Alexandria great importance seems to have been attached to this number. In Palestine, however, there were some who counted only 147 Psalms" (Cheyne *op. cit.* p. xiv.). See also Lagarde, *nov. Ps. gr. spec.*, p. 8.

Ⓔ	Ⓙ
Words of Lemuel (xxiv. 69—77).	Words of Lemuel (xxxii. 1—9).
Proverbs of Solomon (xxv. 1—xxix. 27).	Praise of the Virtuous Woman (xxxii. 10—31).
Praise of the Virtuous Woman (xxix. 28—49).	

Evidently the order of this portion of the book had not been finally settled when the Alexandrian translator did his work¹. Moreover he has failed to understand the headings of the two sections attributed to Agur and Lemuel², and has broken up Agur's collection, the unity of which he seems not to have recognised, placing the Sayings of the Wise between the fragments; unless, indeed, he found them divided in his Hebrew archetype.

JEREMIAH xxv.—li. A glance at the table which stands near the beginning of this chapter will shew that the section c. xxv. 15—xlvi. 5 (Ⓙ) answers in a general way to c. xxxii. 1—li. 35 (Ⓔ), whilst c. xlvi. 1—li. 64 (Ⓙ) is represented, though not without considerable interruptions of the present Hebrew order, by c. xxv. 14—xxxii. 44 (Ⓔ). Speaking roughly these two sections have exchanged places in the Greek text³. In Ⓔ the prophecies against the nations precede the parable of the intoxicating cup (xxv. 15 ff. = xxxii. 1 ff.); in Ⓙ they form the final section of the book, coming immediately before the historical appendix (c. lii.). If these prophecies were circulated in a separate form, the words of c. xxv. 13 might naturally have led an Alexandrian collector to place them where they stand in the LXX., whereas in Palestine they were treated as a postscript to the earlier collections and placed

¹ Cf. Robertson Smith, *O.T. in J. Ch.* p. 111; Toy, *Proverbs*, p. xxxiii.

² See Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griech. Übersetzung d. Proverbien*, pp. 90, 91.

³ Cf. Origen *ad Afric.* 4 πολλά δὲ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἱερεμίᾳ κατενοήσαμεν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πολλὴν μετέθεσιν καὶ ἐναλλαγὴν τῆς λέξεως τῶν προφητευόμενων εὔρομεν.

after xlv. 5. The two texts differ however not only in regard to the place which they assign to the section as a whole, but in the relative order of the prophecies. The order of the nations denounced is in **Gr** Elam, Egypt, Babylon, Philistia, Edom, Ammon, Kedar, Damascus, Moab; but in **Ms**, Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, Elam, Babylon. The prophecies had apparently been grouped in the Alexandrian collection after one manner, and after another in the collection which was current in Palestine.

EZEKIEL vii. 3—9. Here the divergence of the LXX. from the Hebrew text was noticed by Jerome, who writes: “in hoc capitulo iuxta LXX. interpretes ordo mutatus est et confusus, ita ut prima novissima sint et novissima vel prima vel media, ipsaque media nunc ad extrema nunc ad principia transferantur.” The transposition, to whichever side it is to be ascribed, may be explained by the genius of the passage which is in “a lyric strain such as is unwonted in Ezekiel¹.” A full examination of the context may be seen in Cornill², who justly describes it as “eine stark verderbte Stelle,” and finds a solution in the hypothesis of a doublet (cf. *vv.* 3—4, 7—8).

(B) DIFFERENCES OF SUBJECT-MATTER.

I. A further comparison of the LXX. with the Massoretic Hebrew reveals the presence in each text of a considerable number of passages which are not to be found in the other. This fact was known to Origen, and frankly recognised by him (*ep. ad African.* § 3 καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ πολλοῖς ἁγίοις βιβλίοις εὗρομεν πῆ μὲν πλείονα παρ’ ἡμῖν κείμενα ἢ παρ’ Ἑβραίοις, πῆ δὲ λείποντα); and the Hexapla, as we have seen³, was the result of a mistaken endeavour to assimilate the LXX. to the current

¹ Driver, *Intr.* p. 263.

² *Ezekiel*, p. 212.

³ Pt. I. c. iii.

Hebrew text. Its remains are still invaluable as bearing witness to the condition of both texts in the second and third centuries after Christ. The student who would grasp the nature and extent of the problem must examine them in Field's great edition; in this place we will content ourselves with some notice of additions and omissions which extend to entire verses or paragraphs.

PENTATEUCH. As a whole, the Law has escaped material changes in either direction. But there are a few important exceptions. In Gen. iv 8 the LXX. supplies the words of Cain (*διέλωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον*), which are wanting in the Hebrew Bible. The supplementary chapters of Exodus are on the whole shorter in \mathfrak{G} than in \mathfrak{M} ; the former has nothing to answer to c. xxxv. 8, xxxvii. 25—28, xl. 6—8, 11, and exhibits c. xxxvi. 8—34 in an abridged form. In the Song of Moses the last four distichs are expanded in \mathfrak{G} into eight, thus:

[*εὐφράνθητε, οὐρανοί, ἅμα αὐτῷ,
καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ υἱοὶ θεοῦ.*]
εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ,
[*καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ.*]
ὅτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν νιῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικᾶται,
[*καὶ ἐκδικήσει*] καὶ ἀνταποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἐχθροῖς,
[*καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἀνταποδώσει,*]
καὶ ἐκκαθαριεῖ [Κύριος] τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ.

There is nothing in \mathfrak{M} which corresponds with the bracketed words of the version. Yet they are present in all uncial MSS. of the LXX., and were probably in the earlier copies of Deuteronomy which passed into the possession of the Christian Church. Possibly the Song was circulated in a separate form in more than one translation. The present Greek text seems to be the result of conflation, lines 1 and 3, 2 and 4, 6 and 7, being doublets; line 2 = 4 appears to be an adaptation of Ps. xcvi. (xcvii.) 7.

JOSHUA. Besides innumerable smaller variations in this book which shew that it was not regarded by the translators as sharing the peculiar sanctity of the Torah¹, there are in the last four chapters several important contexts in which **G** and **M** differ by defect or excess².

C. xix. 47—48 (**M**). The order of these verses is reversed in **G**, so as to bring the words *αὐτῆ ἡ κληρονομία κτλ.* into juxtaposition with the list of the Danite towns (*vv.* 41—46); and to each of the verses which have thus exchanged places the LXX. attaches a rider, based apparently upon Judges ii. 34 f., and describing the relations between the new settlers and the Amorites.

C. xx. 4—6. Omitted in **G**. "It is probable that the ch. in its original form (P) has been enlarged by additions from the law of homicide in Dt. (c. 19) at a comparatively late date, so that they were still wanting in the MSS. used by the LXX. translators³."

C. xxi. 36—37, 42 a—d. The printed Hebrew Bibles omit *vv.* 36—37, which contain the names of the Levitical cities in the territory of Reuben, and they seem to have been obelised in the Greek by Origen. They are found, however, in the majority of Hebrew MSS.⁴, and are necessary to the completeness of the narrative. *Vv.* 42 a—c are little more than a doublet of c. xix. 50, 51 b; 42 d appears to be based upon c. v. 3.

C. xxiv. 30 a—33 b. *V.* 30 a continues the story of the flint knives (*v.* 7, xxi. 42 d). **G**, which omits *v.* 31, a doublet of Judges ii. 7, adds to the book a postscript, *v.* 33 a—b, based on *v.* 33, 1 Sam. iv. 3 ff., Judges ii. 6, 11 ff., iii. 14⁵.

¹ See G. A. Smith in Hastings' *D. B.* ii. p. 784.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 781 ff.

³ Driver, *Intr.* p. 105.

⁴ See Kennicott, i. p. 474, De Rossi, i. p. 96 ff.; and cf. Field, *Hexapla*, i. p. 387, Addis, *Documents of the Hexateuch*, ii. p. 472 ff.

⁵ See Knobel in *Kurzgef. exeg. Handbuch zum A. T.*, p. 488.

I SAMUEL (I REGN.).

C. ii. 9, 10. The closing stanza of this hymn, like that of the Song of Moses, is presented by \mathfrak{G} in a modified and expanded form. *Vv.* 8 c, 9 a are omitted in \mathfrak{G} , which substitutes διδούς εὐχὴν...δικαίου ("apparently an attempt to accommodate the Song more closely to Hannah's position¹"), and inserts in the heart of *v.* 10 a passage from Jerem. ix. 23, 24, taken from the Greek version, but with variations which form an instructive study:—

I Regn. ii.

ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει...ὁ
δυνατὸς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει...τὸν Κύ-
ριον, καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιο-
σύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς.

Jer. ix.

ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ...ὁ ἰσχυρὸς
ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ...ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ
ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιο-
σύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

It has been noticed that I Regn. ii. 11 a (καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου) probably corresponds to I Sam. i. 28 b (הִיָּחַד עִמּוֹ עַל פְּנֵי יְהוָה). If so, the Song has been inserted in \mathfrak{G} and \mathfrak{M} at different points in the narrative²; and it seems to be a reasonable inference that it was not in the original draft of the book. Such a hypothesis will account for the freedom with which it has been treated in \mathfrak{G} .

Cc. xvii—xviii. This is the most important of the contexts in which \mathfrak{G}^b differs from \mathfrak{G}^a \mathfrak{M} in the way of defect. The omitted verses contain the story of David's visit to the camp of Israel (xvii. 12—31); David's interview with Saul and Jonathan (xvii. 55—xviii. 5); Saul's attempts upon David's life (xviii. 10—11, 17—19); besides occasional details of less importance (xvii. 41, 50; xviii. 30).

These omissions have been variously explained. According to Wellhausen and Kuenen³, the Greek translator, or the scribe of the archetype followed by Cod. B, has deliberately

¹ Driver, *Samuel*, p. 20.

² See Wellhausen, *der Text d. B. Samuelis*, p. 42; Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 18, 21; H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, p. 13.

³ Driver, *Intr.*, p. 170; *Samuel*, p. 116 f.

removed the missing verses, from a desire to harmonise. Certainly the result of their absence is to reduce, if not altogether to remove, the conflict between c. xvi. 14 ff., which represents David as an experienced warrior with whose reputation Saul is already acquainted, and cc. xvii., xviii., where on a later occasion he appears as a shepherd lad of whom the king has as yet heard nothing. But, as Robertson Smith has pointed out, it is difficult to believe that simple omissions made without changing a word of what was left could produce a complete and consecutive narrative such as we find in G. He concludes that the verses omitted by G are "interpolations in the Hebrew text, extracts from a lost biography of David...not found in the text which lay before the LXX. translators¹." Driver² doubts whether the verses can have been interpolated in a strict sense, "for an interpolation would not insert anything at variance with the narrative interpolated." "We seem therefore (he adds) shut up to the conclusion that the verses omitted in the Vat. MS. belong to an independent narrative, which was in parts incorporated with the older account, but not in all MSS. existing when the LXX. translated the book."

The omissions are supplied in G^A, Luc., but probably from a non-Septuagintal source; the passages are marked with an asterisk in the Hexaplaric MSS. 64, 92³.

C. xxiii. 11—12. Here G^B omits by homoeoteleuton the Heb. from יָרַר (v. 11) to יִמְגִּירֵי (v. 12). But it also omits בְּעֵלֵי בְּיָרֹד קָשִׁילָה (v. 11), and Wellhausen conjectures with probability that εἰ ἀποκλεισθήσεται was wanting in the original form of the LXX.⁴

I KINGS (3 REGN.).

In this book G^B contains a large quantity of additional matter, of varying character and worth⁵.

¹ *O. T. in J. Ch.*, pp. 121, 431 ff.; cf. Kirkpatrick, *I Samuel*, p. 241 ff.

² *I Samuel*, p. 117.

³ Cf. Field *ad loc.*

⁴ See H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, p. 212.

⁵ See C. F. Burney, *Notes on Heb. Text of Books of Kings*, esp. pp. xix-xxx.

C. ii. 35 a—n, 46 a—l, are summaries of Solomon's personal history, which have been attached, probably by the accidents of transcription, to the verses which they severally follow. On examination each of these passages proves to be made up partly of translations from verses which are not represented in the true LXX., partly of fragments of the LXX. which occur elsewhere in their true order, partly of brief descriptions gathered from other parts of the book.

Thus ii. 35 a—b=iv. 25—26, c=iv. 31, d=v. 15, e=vii. 10 ff., f—g=ix. 24—25 (fH), h=v. 16, i—k=x. 23 ff., l—o=ii. 8—9. Similarly, ii. 46 a=iv. 20 (fH), b=v. 2 (fH), c=iii. 1 (fH), d=ix. 18 (fH), e=iv. 22—23, f=iv. 24, g=v. 5 (fH), h=2 ff., i—k=x. 29—30.

C. viii. 53a is an addition of quite another character and of the highest interest. The true LXX. (C^B) omits viii. 12, 13, which in cod. A are thus supplied from Aquila¹: τότε εἶπεν Σαλωμών Κύριος εἶπεν τοῦ σκηνώσαι ἐν γνώφῳ. οἰκοδόμησα οἶκον κατοικητηρίου σοι, ἔδρασμα τῆς καθέδρας σου αἰῶνος. But after v. 53 C gives the substance of these words in a poetical form which is expressly attributed to an older source :

τότε ἐλάλησεν Σ. ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου ὡς συνετέλεσεν τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτόν Ἥλιον ἐγνώρισεν (Luc., ἔστησεν) ἐν οὐρανῷ Κύριος· | εἶπεν τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐκ γνώφου (A, ἐν γνώφῳ)· | οἰκοδόμησον οἶκόν μου, οἶκον ἐκπρεπῆ (A, εὐπρεπῆ) σαντῶ, | τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος. | οὐκ ἰδοῦ αὕτη γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς ᾠδῆς;

Though this occurs in cod. A and Lucian, it was wanting in the Hebrew text which was before the translators of the second century A.D., for in the Hexapla it appeared only in the LXX. column². But (as its very errors shew) it is a translation of a Hebrew original, and the βιβλίον τῆς ᾠδῆς from which it came is doubtless none other than the Book of Jashar (יָשָׁר הַיְשִׁירִי, read as יְשִׁיר ה' D)³. Here C has preserved

¹ Cf. Field *ad loc.*

² See Field *ad loc.*, who quotes from cod. 243, ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἑξαπλῷ παρὰ μόνους φέρεται τοῖς σ'.

³ Cf. Driver, *Intr.*, p. 182. See Appendix on Thackeray's examination of this passage in *J. Th. St.* xi. 44.

for us a precious relic, which in **M** has been first misplaced and then partly lost¹.

C. xii. 24 a—z. The longest interpolation in the book, partly similar to the Greek additions in c. ii., but presenting greater difficulties. After rehearsing the facts connected with the death of Solomon, and summarising the reign of Rehoboam, the interpolator tells the story of the rise of Jeroboam and the revolt of Israel, going over the ground already covered in cc. xi—xii., and anticipating c. xiv. (**M**).

The parallels are xii. 24 a=xi. 43, xiv. 21—22; b=xi. 26—28; c=xi. 40; d—f=xi. 43^b; xii. 2—5 (**M**); g—n^a=xiv. 1—20 (**M**); n^b—z=xii. 3—24.

But the passage is no mere cento of verses to be found elsewhere either in **G** or **M**; it is a second and distinct recension of the story, resting equally with the first upon a Hebrew original. So different and indeed in some respects contradictory are the accounts that they “cannot possibly have stood from the first in the same volume.” The same action is ascribed in the one “to Shemaiah, at Shechem, in the days of Rehoboam”; and in the other “to Ahijah, at Jerusalem, in the days of Solomon².” In fact, the present Greek version of 1 Kings has preserved two ancient accounts of the dismemberment of the Kingdom of David and Solomon, and though one of these survives also in **M** there is no *a priori* ground for deciding which of the two is the more trustworthy. It is worthy of notice that cod. B omits the reference to Jeroboam’s residence in Egypt in xii. 2, and the visit of Jeroboam’s wife to Ahijah as it is told in c. xiv. 1—20, though it gives the two irreconcilable accounts of the meeting of Jeroboam with the prophet (xi. 29 ff., xii. 24 0). The whole of the narrative, so far as it exists only in the Greek, is omitted by A and

¹ See the passage discussed in Robertson Smith, *O. T. in J. Ch.*, p. 433.

² Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

the Syro-hexaplar, but it seems to have been retained by Lucian¹.

C. xvi. 28 a—h consists of another recension of the summary of Jehoshaphat's reign which occurs in c. xxii. 41—44, 47—50, where the last four verses are omitted altogether in \mathbb{G}^B . Lucian, who agrees with \mathbb{G}^B in the interpolation at xvi. 28, omits xxii. 40 b—52.

2 KINGS (4 REGN.).

C. i. 18 a—d. An addition similar in character to that which follows 3 Regn. xvi. 28. The summary of Joram's reign has attached itself to the beginning as well as to the end of the story of Elijah's ascension, whilst in \mathbb{M} it finds a place only at the end (iii. 1—3). In this instance, however, \mathbb{G}^A , LUC. agrees with \mathbb{G}^B in repeating the summary, though with some variations. The student will find a comparison instructive.

1 CHRONICLES i. 10—16, 17 b—23 are wanting in \mathbb{G}^B , which thus shortens the genealogy by omitting (1) the posterity of Ham, except the Cushites, (2) the longer of two lists of the posterity of Shem. Both passages are supplied (from Gen. x. 13—18, 22—29) by cod. A, in a version which came from Hexaplaric sources (see Field, i. p. 704).

2 CHRONICLES xxxv. 19 a—d, xxxvi. 2 a—c, 5 a—d, are versions of 2 Kings xxiii. 24—27, 31 b—33, xxiv. 1—4, based apparently upon a recension of the Hebrew which differs from \mathbb{M} , and only in part assimilated to \mathbb{G} .

2 ESDRAS xxi, xxii. (Neh. xi, xii.). The lists of princes and Levites are much shortened in \mathbb{G}^B , which omits altogether xxi. 16, 20, 21, 28, 29, 32—35; xxii. 4—6, 9, 15—21, 38, 40, 41.

¹ Lagarde, *V.T. Gr.* i. *ad loc.* For a careful treatment of the differences between \mathbb{G} and \mathbb{M} in 3 Regn. see Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, ii.

PSALMS.

In **G** many of the Psalms receive titles, or additions to their titles, which are wanting in **M**. The following is a list of those which occur in the uncial MSS.

x. (xi.) + ψαλμός. So xiii. (xiv.), xxiv. (xxv.), xliii. (xliv.), lxxx. (lxxxī.).

xxiii. (xxiv.) + τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου.

xxvi. (xxvii.) + πρὸ τοῦ χρισθῆναι.

xxviii. (xxix.) + ἐξοδίου σκηνηῆς.

xxix. (xxx.) pr. εἰς τὸ τέλος.

xxx. (xxxi.) + ἐκστάσεως.

xxxii. (xxxiii.). Τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

xxxvii. (xxxviii.) + περὶ σαββάτου.

xli. (xlii.) + ψαλμός τῷ Δαυεῖδ (cod. A.).

xlii. (xliii.). Ψαλμός τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

xlvi. (xlvii.) + δευτέρα σαββάτου.

lxv. (lxvi.) + ἀναστάσεως.

lxvi. (lxvii.) + τῷ Δαυεῖδ (om. ᾠδῆς).

lxix. (lxx.) + εἰς τὸ Σῶσαί με Κύριον.

lxx. (lxxi.). Τῷ Δαυεῖδ, υἱῶν Ἰωναθάβ καὶ τῶν πρώτων αἰχμαλωτισθέντων.

lxxv. (lxxvi.) + πρὸς τὸν Ἀσσύριον.

lxxix. (lxxx.) + ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου.

xc. (xci.). Αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

xcii. (xciii.). Εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου, ὅτι κατῴκιστα ἡ γῆ αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

xciii. (xciv.). Ψαλμός τῷ Δαυεῖδ, τετράδι σαββάτου.

xciv. (xcv.). Αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

xcv. (xcvi.). Ὅτι ὁ οἶκος οἰκοδομεῖται μετὰ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν ᾠδῆ τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

xcvi. (xcvii.). Τῷ Δαυεῖδ, ὅτε ἡ γῆ αὐτοῦ καθίσταται.

xcvii. (xcviii.) + τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

xcviii. (xcix.). Ψαλμός τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

ciii. (civ.). Τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

civ. (cv.). Ἀλληλουία: so cv., cvi. (cvi., cvii.), cxiii. (cxiv., cxv.), cxiv. (cxvi.) I—9, cxvi. (cxvii.), cxvii. (cxviii.), cxxxv. (cxxxvi.), [but in each of these cases the Greek title is the equivalent of a final הַלְלוּ in the M.T. of the preceding Psalm].

cx. (cxī.). Ἀλληλουία: so cxī., cxii. (cxii., cxiii.), cxxxiv. (cxxxv.), [but in each of these cases the Greek title is the equivalent of an opening הַלְלוּ in the M.T. of the Psalm].

cxv. (cxvi. 10—19). Ἀλληλουία. So cxviii. (cxix.).

cxxxvi. (cxxxvii.). Τῷ Δαυεῖδ.

cxxxvii. (cxxxxviii.) + Ζαχαρίου Α (-ρίας Τ).

cxxxxviii. (cxxxxix.) + Ζαχαρίου (cod. A.) + ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ (A^a Τ).

cxlii. (cxliiii.) + ὅτε αὐτὸν ὁ υἱὸς καταδιώκει (κατεδίωξεν Α).

cxliiii. (cxliv.) + πρὸς τὸν Γολιάδ.

cxlv. (cxlvi.). Ἀλληλουιά· Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου (Heb. הַלְלוּ
יְיָ).
יְיָ).

cxlvi. (cxlvii. 1—11). Ἀλληλουιά· Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου (where Ἀλλ. answers to the first word of the Psalm in פּס as in cx. (cxī.)).

cxlvii. (cxlvii. 10—20). As cxlvi., except that Ἀλλ. is not in פּס.

cxlviii. As cxlvi. but Ἀλλ. is here represented in פּס both at the end of the preceding Psalm and at the beginning of Ps. cxlviii.

cxlix. Ἀλληλουιά. In פּס at the end of cxlviii. and the beginning of cxlix.

cl. Ἀλληλουιά. As in cxlix.

On the questions raised by the Greek titles see Neubauer in *Studia Bibl.* ii. p. 1 ff., Driver, *Intr.* p. 348 ff., the commentaries, e.g. those of Perowne, Kirkpatrick, and Cheyne, and the last-named author's *Origin of the Psalter*. Valuable traditions are probably embodied in the liturgical notes which assign certain Psalms to particular days of the week (τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτου, δευτέρα σ., τετράδι σ.¹, εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου (cf. Mc. xv. 42)), and in those which attribute others to the time of the Return (Ζαχαρίου, Ἀγγαίου) or to the Dispersion (ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ). On the other hand some of the Greek titles appear to be fanciful (πρὸ τοῦ χρισθῆναι, πρὸς τὸν Γολιάδ), whilst others are obscure (ἐκστάσεως, ἀναστάσεως).

For the Christian (mystical) interpretation of the Greek titles see Athan. *de titulis Psalmorum* (Migne, *P. G.* xxvii. 591 sqq.), the *variorum prolegomena* in Pitra's *Analecta sacra* ii. p. 411 sqq., and Corderii *exp. patr. Gr. in Psalmos*, passim.

Ps. xiii. (xiv.) 3 a—c. This, the only long interpolation in the Greek Psalter, is found upon examination to be made up of Pss. v. 10b, cxxxix. (cxl.) 4b, ix. (x.) 17a, Isa. lix. 7, 8, Ps. xxxv. (xxxvi.) 1a, all taken or abridged from the LXX. version with slight variations. That it never formed a part of the

¹ Cf. πέμπτη σαββάτου prefixed to Ps. lxxxii. in the cursive MS. 156 (*Urtext*, p. 75).

Hebrew Psalm may be safely affirmed, yet it is quoted continuously in Rom. iii. 13—18, where it follows without break upon an abridgement of Ps. xiii. (xiv.) 1—3.

The Greek addition had a place in the *κοινή*, according to Jerome *praef. in Isa.*; cf. Field, *ad loc.* Whether it was brought into the text of the LXX. from the Epistle¹, or was already in the Greek Psalm as known to St Paul, cannot perhaps now be ascertained. But it doubtless had its origin in the Rabbinical practice of stringing together passages excerpted from various books of the Old Testament (Sanday and Headlam on Romans, *l.c.*), and it may have existed under this form in a collection of *testimonia* used by the Apostle (on such collections see Hatch, *Essays*, p. 203, Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 476 ff.).

Ps. cli. (*ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος*)². The MSS. of the LXX. contain after Ps. cl. a Psalm which bears the title Οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυεὶδ καὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ, ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιάδ, O. L., *hic psalmus sibi proprie scriptus est David, extra numerum, cum pugnavit cum Golia[th]*. The letter of Athanasius to Marcellinus, which is incorporated in cod. A, speaks freely of this Psalm as the work of David, and as Ps. cli. (§ 14 οἱ μὲν καυχῆσεως τῆς ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀπαγγέλλοντες λόγους εἰσὶ κβ' καὶ κς', λή...ρνα': § 25 τῷ ἐκλεξαμένῳ κυρίῳ διδοῦς δόξαν ψάλλε καὶ σὺ τὸν ρνα' ἴδιον ὄντα τοῦ Δαυεὶδ); and it is quoted as a Psalm of David by the author of the pseudonymous letter of Mary to Ignatius (cent. iv.; Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, iii. 144, φησὶν γάρ πού αὐτὸς ὅτι Μικρὸς ἤμην, κτλ.). Moreover the scribe of Cod. B regarded it as a part of the Psalter, for his subscription runs ψαλμοὶ Δαδ ρνα'. In cod. A, however, it is carefully excluded from the Psalter proper (subscr. ψαλμοὶ ρν και ἰδιογραφος α), and the judgement of the Laodicene canon (*βίβλος ψαλμῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα*) is upheld by the title which in all the MSS.

¹ Cf. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 209 ff.

² Cf. Oeconomus, iii. p. 634 f.

pronounces this 'autograph' (ιδιόγραφος) work of David to be ἔξωθεν οἱ ἐκτὸς τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ, *i.e.* τῶν ρν' ψαλμῶν.

This Psalm is clearly based on 1 Kings xvi. 7, 11, 26, 43, 51; 2 Kings vi. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 26; Ps. lxxviii. 70, lxxxix. 20. Its resemblance to the LXX. of those passages is not so close as to suggest a Greek original, but on the other hand there is no evidence that it ever existed in Hebrew. Whether it had a Hebrew or a Greek original, it was probably added to the Greek Psalter after the translation of the fifth book was complete.

For the literature of Ps. cli. see Fabricius-Harles, iii. p. 749, and Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* v. 7², p. 905 ff.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL CANTICLES.

In certain uncial MSS. and a large proportion of the cursives the Psalms are followed by a collection of liturgical ᾠδαί (*cantica*). The following table shews the sources and order of those which are given by codd. A, R, T.

A	R	T
1. Exod. xv. 1—19.	Exod. xv. 1—21.	
2. Deut. xxxii. 1—43.	Deut. xxxii. 1—44.	
3. 1 Regn. ii. 1—10.	1 Regn. ii. 1—10.	
4. Isa. xxvi. 9—20.	Isa. v. 1—9.	
5. Ion. ii. 3—10.	Ion. ii. 3—10.	
6. Hab. iñ. 1—19.	Hab. iii. 1—19.	
7. Isa. xxxviii. 10—20.	<i>Magnificat.</i>	[6] 1 Regn. ii. [1]—10.
8. <i>Prayer of Manasseh</i> ¹ .	Dan. iii. 52—90.	7. <i>Magnificat.</i>
9. Dan. iii. 26—45.		8. Isa. xxxviii. 10—20.
10. „ „ 52—88.		9. <i>Prayer of Manasseh</i> ¹ .
11. <i>Magnificat.</i>		10. Dan. iii. 26—45.
12. <i>Nunc dimittis.</i>		11. „ „ 52—56.
13. <i>Benedictus.</i>		12. „ „ 57—90.
14. <i>Morning Hymn.</i>		13. <i>Benedictus.</i>
		14. <i>Nunc dimittis.</i>
		15. <i>Morning Hymn.</i>

¹ The προσευχή Μαννασῆ (so Cod. A; Cod. T. πρ. Μανασῆ υιοῦ Ἐζεκιῶ) is usually regarded as an attempt by a Hellenistic Jew to reconstruct the prayer mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18; see, however Ball

The nine Odes now sung at Lauds in the Orthodox Church are (following the order of cod. A) nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11+13; the Roman Church uses at Lauds on successive days of the week 10, Isa. xii., Isa. xxxviii. 10—20, 3, 1, 6, 2, whilst 13, 11, 12 are recited daily at Lauds, Vespers, and Compline respectively¹. The Mozarabic Breviary, as printed, provides no fewer than 76 scriptural canticles. Little has been done as yet to examine either the Greek or the Latin Psalters with the view of determining the local distribution of these canticles; but the student may refer to art. *Canticles* in *DCA.*, and also to Martene, *de ant. rit. eccl.*, p. 25, Neale, *Hist. of the H. Eastern Church*, ii. p. 834 f., Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, i. p. 124 f.; on the Canticles of the Latin Church he may consult with advantage Thomasius, *opp.* ii. pp. xv. sqq., 295 sqq.

The text of the O. T. canticles in the Psalter of cod. A differs in places from that which is given by the same MS. where the canticles appear with their context in the books to which they severally belong. Thus we find the following variants: Exod. xv. 14 ὠργίσθησαν, *cant.* ἐφοβήθησαν: Deut. xxxii. 7 γενεῶν γενεαῖς, *cant.* γενεᾶς γενεῶν: 18 γεννήσαντα, *cant.* ποιήσαντα: 1 Regn. ii. 10^a φρονήσει, *cant.* σοφία: 10^b ἄκρα γῆς, *cant.* + δίκαιος ὦν. But the deviations are not numerous, and the text of the canticles appears on the whole to belong to the same family as that of the body of the MS.

The division of the Psalter into books² seems to have been already made when it was translated into Greek, for though the Greek codices have nothing to answer to the headings מספר ראשון, etc., which appear in the printed Hebrew Bible, the Doxologies at the end of the first four books appear in the

in *Speaker's Comm.* (Apocr. ii. 362 ff.). The Greek text appears in *Const. Apost.* ii. 22 and in the *Didascalia*, where it follows a reference to Chron. *l. c.*; in MSS. of the LXX. it finds a place only among the canticles. See Fabricius-Harles, iii. 732, Westcott in Smith's *D. B.* ii. 226, Schürer³, iii. 337 f.: and for the text with an *apparatus*, Fritzsche, *V. T. Gr. libr. Apocr.*, pp. xiv. sq., 92 sq. A detailed account of the editions, MSS., and versions and a discussion of the origin of the Prayer will be found in Dr Nestle's *Septuagintastudien* iii. (Stuttgart, 1899), p. 6 ff.; see also Ryssel in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen u. Pseudepigraphen*.

¹ For some other orders see Dom Morin in *Revue Bénédictine* (cited by A. E. Burn, *Creeeds*, p. 262).

² A pre-Christian arrangement, as Hippolytus already knew (*hypoth.* in *Psalmos*, τὸ ψαλτήριον εἰς πέντε διεῖλον βιβλία οἱ Ἑβραῖοι). Cf. Robertson Smith, *O. T. in Jewish Ch.*, p. 194 n. In the lists of the Canon "the mention of five Books of Psalms is peculiar to Codex Amiatinus" (Sanday, in *Studia Biblica* iii. p. 242 ff.).

Greek as well as in the M. T. (Ps. xl. (xli.) 14, lxxi. (lxxii.) 18—20, lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 5, cv. (cvi.) 48).

PROVERBS. The variations of **G** and **M** in this book are treated by Lagarde in his early book *Anmerkungen zur griech. Übersetzung der Proverbien*. There is a considerable number of Greek verses for which **M** offers no Hebrew equivalent, and there are some Hebrew verses or half-verses for which there is no Greek. Of the Greek verses not in **M** some (e.g. iv. 27 a—b, vi. 8 a—c) appear to be of Greek, perhaps early Christian, origin; others have been collected from various contexts (e.g. iii. 16 = Isa. xlv. 23 a + Prov. xxxi. 26; xxvi. 11 = Sir. iv. 21), or are fragments of the book which have been accidentally inserted twice (iii. 22 a = iii. 8, 28 c = xxvii. 1); others, again, seem to have arisen from the fusion of two renderings (xv. 18 a, xvi. 17); but there remain not a few which probably represent genuine portions of the original collections, though wanting in the present Hebrew text, e.g. vii. 1 a, viii. 21 a, ix. 12 a—c, 18 a—c, xii. 11 a, 13 a, xvii. 6 a, xviii. 22 a, xxii. 8 a (cited in 2 Cor. ix. 7), xxiv. 22 a—e, xxvii. 20 a, 21 a.

JOB. The LXX. text of Job current in Origen's time is known to have been very much shorter than the Greek text preserved in extant MSS. and the M. T.

Ad African. 4 πλείστά τε ὅσα διὰ μέσου ὄλου τοῦ Ἰωβ παρ' Ἑβραίοις μὲν κείται παρ' ἡμῖν δὲ οὐχί, καὶ πολλάκις μὲν ἔπη τέσσαρα ἢ τρία· ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ δεκατέσσαρα καὶ δεκαεννέα καὶ δεκαεξί (for leg. ἐννέα καὶ ἑξί). Cf. Hieron. *praef. in Hiob*: "cui [sc. libro Iob], si ea quae sub asteriscis addita sunt subtraxeris, pars maxima voluminis detruncabitur, et hoc duntaxat apud Graecos. ceterum apud Latinos...septingenti ferme aut octingenti versus desunt."

The asterisks are preserved in certain cursive MSS. of the

¹ For this correction see a note by Dr Nestle in *Exp. Times*, Aug. 1899 (p. 523).

Greek Job¹ and in MSS. of Jerome's version, while the shorter form is represented by the earliest form of the O.L. and in the Sahidic version. Most of the extant Greek MSS., including the best uncials, offer a text in which the lacunae are supplied (chiefly from Theodotion), but which still falls short of the fulness of the Hexaplaric LXX. and of \mathfrak{M}^2 .

Dr Hatch³ in his *Essay On Origen's revision of the LXX. text of Job* advocates the theory that the LXX. represents a shorter Hebrew text which was afterwards expanded into the longer form. Bickell, in his early book *De indole ac ratione versionis Alexandrinae* (p. 42), maintained that the omissions were chiefly due to the translator, and this view is supported by recent critics. The evident desire of the translator to follow classical models suggests that he was an Alexandrian Hellenist⁴ who intended his version for general reading, rather than for use in the synagogue⁵. Under such circumstances he may have been tempted to reduce the length of his original, especially in passages where it did not lend itself readily to his treatment. On the other hand he has not scrupled here and there to add to the original. Thus in c. ii. 9 he seeks to heighten the effect and at the same time to soften the harshness of the words uttered by Job's wife (χρόνου ... πολλοῦ προβεβηκότος... λέγων Ἴδου ἀναμένω κτλ.)⁶.

The two notes at the end of the Greek Job (xlii. 17a, b—e) scarcely profess to belong to the book. The first (γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι μεθ' ὧν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν) may be either a Pharisaic or a Christian gloss, intended to balance the ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰώβ of the previous hemistich, and arising out of

¹ Cf. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 216; Field, *Hexapla*, ii. p. 1 f.; E. Klostermann, *Analecta*, p. 63 f.

² Burkitt, *O. L. and Itala*, p. 8.

³ *Essays*, p. 214 ff.

⁴ On the translator's date cf. Schürer³, iii. pp. 311, 356 f.

⁵ Cf. Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 219: "It was made after Judaism had come into contact with Greek philosophy. It may be presumed to have been intended not only for Greek-speaking Jews, but also for aliens." The version shews some knowledge of Homer and Aeschylus (cf. Smith, *D. B.*², vol. i. pt. ii. p. 1723).

⁶ Cf. *Testament of Job* (ed. M. R. James, *Apocr. anecd.* ii. p. 117).

xix. 26 ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναστήσαι (*v. l.* ἀναστήσει) τὸ δέρμα μου, to which passage γέγραπται seems to refer. The second note, which professes to come from an Aramaic source (οὗτος ἐρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου¹), confuses Job (יֹב) with the Edomite king Jobab (יֹבָב) (Gen. xxxvi. 33 f. = 1 Chron. i. 44 f.), and bases on this identification a pedigree of the patriarch, according to which he was 'fifth from Abraham,' and a descendant of Esau. Similar statements occur in a fragment of the Hellenistic writer Aristeas quoted by Polyhistor, and from Polyhistor by Eusebius (*praef. ev.* ix. 25). From a comparison of this extract with the note attached to Job, Freudenthal was led to ascribe the note to Aristeas². Beyond the geographical description of Uz (ἐπὶ τοῖς ὄρειοις τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας), and the statements that Job's wife was an Arab woman and that her son's name was Ennon or Enon (*v. l.*), the note contains nothing new: 17c—d rests upon Gen. xxxvi. 32—35 (LXX.), and 17e on Job ii. 11 (LXX.).

ESTHER. In the Greek Esther we reach the maximum of interpolation. Of 270 verses, 107 are wanting in the present Hebrew text, and probably at no time formed a part of the Hebrew book³. The Greek additions are distributed through the book in contexts as long as average chapters⁴. In the Latin Bible they are collected at the end of the canonical book, where they fill several consecutive chapters (x. 4—xi. 5 = F, xi. 2—xii. 6 = A, xiii. 1—7 = B, xiii. 8—xiv. 19 = C, xv. 4—19 = D, xvi. 1—24 = E). This arrangement is due to Jerome, who relegated the Greek interpolations to the end of the canonical book; but it has had the effect of making them unintelligible. In their Greek sequence they form part of a consecutive history; A, which precedes c. i., introduces the story by describing the events which led to the first advancement of Mordecai at the court of Artaxerxes; B and E, which

¹ "Ἐκ τῆς Σ. β. weist doch auf einen Midrasch oder ein Targum hin" (Dillmann, *Hjob*, p. 361).

² Schürer³, iii. p. 311.

³ Cf. Origen, *ad Afric.* 3 ἐκ τῆς Ἑσθῆρ οὕτε ἡ τοῦ Μαρδοχαίου εὐχὴ οὕτε ἡ τῆς Ἑσθῆρ...παρ' Ἑβραίοις φέρονται· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αἱ ἐπιστολαί· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἡ τῷ Ἀμμάν ἐπὶ καθαιρέσει τοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους γεγραμμένη, οὐδὲ ἡ τοῦ Μαρδοχαίου.

⁴ In the Cambridge LXX. they are distinguished by the Roman capitals A—F, a notation suggested by Dr Hort.

follow iii. 13 and viii. 12, profess to give copies of the letters of Artaxerxes referred to in those verses; C and D, which come between c. iv. and c. v., contain the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, and a description of Esther's approach to the King; F is an epilogue, which completes the story by relating the institution of the feast of Purim. Such Haggadic accretions will not create surprise if it be remembered that Esther was among the latest of the Kethubim, and that its canonicity was matter of dispute in Jewish circles even in the last years of the first century A.D.¹

A note attached to the last of the Greek additions professes to relate the circumstances under which the book was brought to Egypt: "in the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said that he was a priest and Levite, and his son Ptolemy, brought the above Letter of Purim², as they called it, which had been translated (so they said) by one Lysimachus, son of Ptolemy, a resident at Jerusalem." As Fritzsche remarks³, no fewer than four Ptolemies married a Cleopatra (Epiphanes, Philometor, Physcon, and Lathyrus), so that the date intended by the fourth year of Ptolemy and Cleopatra is by no means certain, though it is perhaps most naturally interpreted as = B.C. 178-7 (? 166-5), the fourth year of Philometor⁴. But the historical value of the note is more than doubtful⁵.

The Greek text of Esther exists in two recensions (1) that of NABN 55, 93 b, 108 a, 249 al., (2) that of 19, 93 a, 108 b; both are exhibited by Ussher (*Syntagma*), Fritzsche (*Εσθήρ*, 1848; *libri apocryphi*, 1871), and Lagarde (*libr. canon. V. T. i.*, 1883). The

¹ See Ryle, *Canon*, p. 139 f., 203 ff.; and cf. *supra*, p. 228 f.

² Φρουράλ (Φρουραία Ν*, Φρουριμ Ν^{c.a}), cf. c. ix. 26, and *Jos. ant.* vi. 13 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὰς προειρημένους ἡμέρας ἐορτάζουσιν προσαγορεύσαντες αὐτὰς φρουρέας (v. l. φρουραίας, Lat. *conservatores*). The 'Letter of Purim' seems to be the book of Esther as a whole; cf. c. ix. 20.

³ *Handbuch zu d. Apocrypha*, i. p. 73.

⁴ Ryssel (in Kautzsch, *Apokr.*, p. 212) inclines to B.C. 114, the fourth year of Soter ii (Lathyrus), and Willrich to B.C. 48-7, that of Ptolemy xiv.

⁵ See above, p. 25.

recensions differ considerably in the Greek additions as well as in the version. On the date of the Greek Esther the student may consult Jacob, *Das Buch Esther bei dem LXX.* in *ZATW.*, 1890 (p. 241 ff.).

JEREMIAH. Besides the extensive transpositions already noticed, the LXX. text of Jeremiah differs widely from M.T. in the way of excess and defect. The subject has received careful treatment from Dr A. W. Streane (*Double Text of Jeremiah*, Cambridge, 1896), whose verdict is on the whole in favour of the LXX. text, especially with regard to its omissions. He points out that "the tendency to diffuseness, characteristic of later Judaism...[and] likely specially to affect the writing of Jeremiah, as a prophet whose memory was of marked interest to the post-exilic Jews...operated much more slightly among Egyptian Jews than with their brethren elsewhere¹"; and concludes that "the 'omissions' to be observed in the LXX. of Jeremiah, speaking generally, exist only in consequence of its nearer approximation to the original form of the Hebrew text."

The Greek additions, in Jeremiah, rarely exceed a few words in a verse (see the list in Streane, p. 19). Omissions are more numerous, and sometimes extend over several consecutive verses of ff ; the following are the most noteworthy: viii. 10^b—12, x. 6, 8, 10, xvii. 1—5^a, xxix. (xxxvi., LXX.) 16—20, xxxiii. (xl., LXX.) 14—26, xxxix. (=xli., LXX.) 4—13, lii. 28—30. Of these passages viii. 10^b—12 seems to be based on vi. 12—15, and xxix. 16—20 on xxiv. 8—10; x. 6, 8, 10, xxxix. 4—13 and lii. 28—30 are probably interpolations in the M.T. On the other hand it is possible that the omission of xvii. 1—5^a was due to homœoteleuton, the eye of the translator or the scribe of his archetype having passed from יהוה (xvi. 21) to יהוה (xvii. 5^a). It is more difficult to account for the absence from G of the Messianic passage xxxiii. 14—26. Dr Streane thinks that it must have been wanting in the Hebrew text which lay before the translators. Possibly the Messianic hope which it emphasises had less interest for a subject of the Ptolemies than for the Jews of Palestine.

LAMENTATIONS. The Greek translator has prefixed a heading which connects the book with Jeremiah (*καὶ ἐγένετο... ἐκάθισεν Ἱερεμίας κλαίων κτλ.*),

¹ P. 24 f. Cf. A. B. Davidson in Hastings' *D.B.* ii. 573 ff. Thackeray, on the other hand, instances the large Alexandrian additions to Esther and Daniel.

DANIEL. Like Esther the Book of Daniel in both its Greek forms¹ contains large contexts which have no equivalent in **℣℥**. There are three such passages in the Greek Daniel: (1) the story of Susanna (Σουσάννα, Σωσάννα), which in the version of Theodotion² as given by the great uncials precedes Dan. i. 1; (2) the story of Bel and the Dragon (Βήλ καὶ Δράκων) which follows Dan. xii. 13; (3) after Dan. iii. 23 a digression of 67 verses (iii. 24—90, LXX., Th.), consisting of (a) the prayer of Azarias (24—45), (b) details as to the heating of the furnace and the preservation of Azarias and his friends (46—51), (c) the Song of the Three (52—90). In the Greek MSS. no break or separate title divides these Greek additions from the rest of the text, except that when Daniel is divided into "visions," the first vision is made to begin at i. 1, Susanna being thus excluded from the number; Bel, on the other hand, is treated as the last of the visions (ὄρασις ιβ' AQ). Internal evidence appears to shew that both these stories originally had a separate circulation; Susanna does not form a suitable prologue to Dan. i.³, for v. 6 introduces Daniel as a person hitherto unknown to the reader; and the position of Bel as an epilogue to the prophetic portion of the book is still less appropriate. From the Fathers, however, it is clear that in the earliest Christian copies of the LXX. both Susanna and Bel formed a part of Daniel, to which they are ascribed by Irenaeus and Tertullian, and implicitly by Hippolytus. The remarkable letter of Julius Africanus to Origen which throws doubt on the genuineness of Susanna, calling attention to indications of its Greek origin, forms a solitary exception to the general view; even Origen labours to maintain their canonicity.

Iren. iv. 26. 3 "et audient eas quae sunt a Daniele propheta voces" (*Sus.* 56, 52 ff.), iv. 5. 2 "quem et Daniel propheta...annuntiavit" (*Bel* 4 f., 25). Tert. *de idololatria*, 18 (*Bel* 4 f.). Hippol. *in*

¹ Vide *supra*, p. 46 ff.

² On Theodotion's Bel, see Gaster in *℣. of Bibl. Archaeology*, xvi. 289, 290, 312 ff., xvii. 71 ff.

³ Susanna is perhaps made to precede Daniel because it describes events which belong to his early life; cf. v. 44 ff. and v. 62 in a, b (LXX.).

Sus. (Lagarde, p. 145) αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ ἱστορία γεγίνηται ὕστερον, προεγράφη δὲ τῆς βίβλου πρώτης. Africanus, *ep. ad Orig.* θαυμάζω δὲ πῶς ἔλαθέ σε τὸ μέρος τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτο κίβδηλον ὄν κτλ. *Orig. ad African.* παρ' ἀμφοτέροις (LXX. and Theodotion) ἔκειτο τὸ περὶ τὴν Σωσάνναν (ὡς σὺ φῆς) πλάσμα, καὶ αἱ τελευταῖαι ἐν τῷ Δανιὴλ περικοπαί. It will be noticed that the extracts from Hippolytus and Origen shew that Susanna and Bel occupied in MSS. of the second and third centuries the same relative positions which they occupy in extant MSS. of the fourth and fifth.

Notwithstanding the objection shrewdly based by Africanus on the paronomasia (σχῖνος, σχίζειν) in *Sus.* 54 f., Ball (*Speaker's Comm.*, Apocrypha, ii. p. 330 f.) has given reasons for believing that both Susanna and Bel once existed in an Aramaic or a new-Hebrew original¹. The LXX. version represents Bel as a fragment of Habakkuk (cod. 87, Syro-Hex., tit. ἐκ προφητείας Ἀμβρακίου υἱοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευί), an attribution evidently due to v. 33 ff., but inconsistent with the place of the story in the Gk. MSS.

The addition to Dan. iii. 23 is clearly Midrashic and probably had a Semitic original². The two hymns contained in it found a place, as we have seen, among the Greek ecclesiastical Canticles, where they appear as the προσευχὴ Ἀζαρίου and the ὕμνος τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν (cod. A) or ὕ. τῶν τριῶν παιδῶν (cod. T).

Besides these additions, which are common to both texts of Daniel, the text of the LXX. contains a large number of shorter interpolations, especially in c. iii.—vi. where "the original thread of the narrative is often lost in a chaos of accretions, alterations, and displacements"³. The student can easily test this statement by comparing the two versions as they stand face to face in the Cambridge LXX., especially in c. iii. 1—3, 46, iv. 14 (17), 19 (22), 29—34 (32—37), v. 13—23, vi. 2—5

¹ Cf. J. T. Marshall in Hastings, *D. B.* iv. 632; on the other hand, see Kamphausen in *Encycl. Biblica*, i. 1013, and comp. Rothstein, *Apokr.*, p. 173 ff. On the Aramaic version of the additions from Theodotion's Greek cf. Schürer³, iii. p. 333.

² Ball, *l. c.*, p. 308. See Nestle, *Exp. T.* xii. 527, and Daubney, *Exp. T.* xviii. 287.

³ Bevan, *Daniel*, p. 46.

(3—6), 12—14 (13—15), 22 (23). But the whole of this section of the book in the LXX. may be regarded as a paraphrase rather than a translation of a Hebrew text. In Susanna Theodotion has here and there a much longer text than the LXX. (cf. Sus. 14—27, 42—50), and both in Susanna and Bel the two Greek versions sometimes diverge so widely as to exhibit the story in distinct forms which appear to represent different traditions.

LITERATURE upon the canonical books (considered separately or in groups).

PENTATEUCH. Amersfoort, *Dissert. philol. de variis lectionibus Holmes. Pentateuchi* (1815). Hug, *de Pentateuchi vers. Alexandrina commentatio* (1818). Töpler, *de Pentateuchi interpretationis Alexandrinae indole* (1830). Thiersch, *de Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina, libri iii* (1841). Frankel, *über den Einfluss der paläst. Exegese auf die alex. Hermeneutik* (1851). Howorth, *the LXX. and Samaritan v. the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch* (Academy, 1894).

GENESIS. Lagarde, *Genesis Graece* (1868). Deutsch, *exeg. Analecten zur Genesisübersetzung der LXX.* (in *Jüd. Litt. Blatt*, 1879). Spurrell, *Genesis*, ed. 2 (1898).

EXODUS. Selwyn, *Notae criticae in Versionem LXXviralem, Exod. i—xxiv* (1856).

NUMBERS. Selwyn, *Notae, &c., Liber Numerorum* (1857). Howard, *Numbers and Deuteronomy acc. to the LXX. translated into English* (1887).

DEUTERONOMY. Selwyn, *Notae, &c., Liber Deuteronomii* (1858). Howard, *op. cit.* (1887). Driver, *critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deut.* (1895).

JOSHUA. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alex. Übersetzung des Buches Josua* (1876).

JUDGES. Fritzsche, *Liber Iudicum sec. LXX. interpretes* (1867). Schulte, *de restitutione atque indole genuinae versionis graece Iudicum* (1889). Lagarde, *Septuagintast. i.* (1891), (Jud. i—v., texts of A and B). Moore, *critical and Exegetical Comm. on Judges* (1895).

RUTH. Fritzsche, *Ῥούθ κατὰ τοὺς ο΄* (1867).

- 1, 2 KINGDOMS. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht* (1871). Woods, *the light thrown by the LXX. on the Books of Samuel* (in *Studia Biblica*, i. 21, 1885). Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (1890). Steinthal, *zur Geschichte Sauls u. Davids* (1891). Kerber, *Syrohex. Fragmente zu den beiden Samuelisbüchern* (ZATW., 1898). J. Méritan, *la Version Grecque des livres de Samuel, précédée d'une introduction sur la critique textuelle* (1898). H. P. Smith, *Critical and exeg. comm. on the Books of Samuel* (1899).
- 3, 4 KINGDOMS. Silberstein, *Über den Ursprung der im Codex Alex. u. Vat. des dritten Königsbuches der Alex. Übersetzung überlieferten Textgestalt* (in ZATW., 1893). C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Heb. Text of the Books of Kings* (1903).
- 1, 2 CHRONICLES, EZRA-NEHEMIAH. Howorth, *The true LXX. version of Chr.-Ezra-Neh.* (in *Academy*, 1893). Nestle, *Marginalien* (1893), p. 29 ff.
- PSALMS. Sinker, *Some remarks on the LXX. version of the Psalms* (1879). Baethgen, *der text-kritisches Werth des alten Übersetz. zu d. Psalmen* (1882). Lagarde, *psalteri graeci specimen* (1887); *psalorum quinquagena prima* (1892). Mercati, *un palimpsesto Ambrosiano dei Salmi Esapli* (1896). Jacob, *Beiträge zu einer Einleitung in die Psalmen* (I. Exc. v.), (1896).
- PROVERBS. Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griech. Übersetz. der Proverbien* (1863). Pinkuss, *die syr. Übersetzung des Proverbien...in ihrem Verhältniss zu dem Mass. Text, den LXX. u. dem Targ. untersucht* (ZATW., 1894).
- ECCLESIASTES. Wright, *The book of Koheleth* (1883). Grätz, *Koheleth* (1884). Klostermann (E.), *de libri Coheleth versione Alexandrina* (1892). Dillmann, *über die Gr. Übersetzung des Koheleth* (1892). Köhl, *observ. ad interpr. Gr. et Lat. vet. libri Job* (1834).
- JOB. Bickell, *De indole ac ratione versionis Alexandrinae Jobi* (1862); *der ursprüngliche Septuaginta-text des Buches Hiob* (1886). Hatch, *on Origen's revision of the Book of Job* (in *Essays*, 1889). Dillmann, *Text-kritisches zum B. Ijob* (1890). Maude, *die Peschittha zu Hiob nebst einem Anhang über ihr Verhältniss zu LXX. u. Targ.* (1892). Beer, *der Text des B. Hiob* (1895). Driver, in *Cont. Review* (Feb. 1896). Cheyne, in *Enc. Bibl.*, 2489 f. (1901).
- ESTHER. Jacob, *Esther bei dem LXX.* (ZATW., 1890). On the Greek additions see Ryssel in Kautzsch, *Apokr.*, p. 193 ff.

- DODECAPROPHETON. Vollers, *Das Dod. der Alexandriner* (1880), continued in *ZATW.*, 1883-4. Stekhoven, *de alex. Vertaling van het Dod.* (1887).
- HOSEA. Treitel, *Die alex. Übersetzung des Buches Hosea* (1888).
- MICAH. Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt des B. Micha* (1887). Taylor, *the Mass. text and the ancient versions of Micah* (1891).
- OBADIAH. Seydel, *Vaticinium Obadae.....ratione habita transl. Alex.* (1869).
- NAHUM. Reinke, *Zur Kritik der ält. Vers. d. Proph. Nahum* (1867).
- HABAKKUK. Sinker, *Psalm of Habakkuk* (1890).
- ZECHARIAH. Lowe, *Comm. on Zech.* (1882).
- ISAIAH. Scholz, *Die Masor. Text u. alex. Übersetzung des B. Jesaias* (1880). Weiss, *Peschitta zu Deuteroseia u. ihr Verhältniss zu M.T., LXX. u. Targ.* (1893).
- JEREMIAH. Movers, *De utriusque recens. Feremiae indole et origine* (1837). Wichelhaus, *de Feremiae vers. Alexandr. indole* (1847). Schulz, *de Ieremiae textus Hebr. et Gr. discrepantia* (1861). Scholz, *der Masor. Text u. die LXX. Übersetz. des B. Feremias* (1875). Kühl, *das Verhältniss der Massora zur Septuaginta in Feremia* (1882). Workman, *the text of Feremiah* (1889). Coste, *die Weissagungen der Propheten Ieremias* (1895). Streane, *the double text of Feremiah* (1896). The question of the two recensions is dealt with at length in Bleek-Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, § 158 ff.
- LAMENTATIONS. Goldwitzer, *Übersetzung mit Vergleichung d. LXX.* (1828).
- EZEKIEL. Merx, *Der Werth der LXX. für die Textkritik der AT am Ezechiel aufgezeigt* (*Jb. pr. Th.*, 1883). Cornill, *das Buch des Proph. Ezechiel* (1886); cf. Lagarde in *Gött. gelehrte Anzeigen* (1 June, 1886).
- DANIEL. Bludau, *De alex. interprete libri Daniel indole* (1891); *die alex. Übersetzung des B. Daniel* (1897). Bevan, *the Book of Daniel* (1892). Löhr, *textkrit. Vorarbeiten zu einer Erklärung des Buches Daniel* (*ZATW.*, 1895). On the Greek additions see Rothstein in Kautzsch, *Apokr.*, p. 172 ff.

CHAPTER III.

BOOKS NOT INCLUDED IN THE HEBREW CANON.

THE MSS. and many of the lists of the Greek Old Testament include certain books which find no place in the Hebrew Canon. The number of these books varies, as we have seen; but the fullest collections contain the following: 1 Esdras, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach, Judith, Tobit, Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah, i.—iv. Maccabees. We may add the Psalms of Solomon, a book which was sometimes included in MSS. of the Salomonic books, or, in complete Bibles, at the end of the Canon; and the Greek version of Enoch, although by some accident it has been excluded from the Greek Bible, on other grounds claims the attention of every Biblical student. There is also a long list of *pseudepigrapha* and other *apocrypha* which lie outside both the Hebrew and the Greek Canons, and of which in many cases only the titles have survived. The present chapter will be occupied by a brief examination of these non-canonical writings of the Greek Old Testament.

1. 1 ESDRAS. In MSS. of the LXX. the canonical book Ezra-Nehemiah appears under the title "Εσδρας β', "Εσδρας α' being appropriated by another recension of the history of the Captivity and Return. The 'Greek Esdras' consists of an

independent and somewhat free version of portions of 2 Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, broken by a long context which has no parallel in the Hebrew Bible.

Thus 1 Esdr. i. = 2 Chron. xxxv. 1—xxxvi. 21; ii. 1—14 = Ezra i.; ii. 15—25 = Ezra iv. 7—24; iii. 1—v. 6 is original; v. 7—70 = Ezra ii. 1—iv. 5; vi., vii. = Ezra v., vi.; viii. 1—ix. 36 = Ezra vii. 1—x. 44; ix. 37—55 = Neh. vii. 73^b—viii. 13^a. The Greek book ends abruptly, in a manner which suggests that something has been lost; cf. ix. 55 καὶ ἐπισυνήχθησαν with 2 Esdr. xviii. 13 συνήχθησαν οἱ ἄρχοντες κτλ. The student may compare the ending of the Second Gospel (Mc. xvi. 8).

The context 1 Esdr. iii. 1—v. 6 is perhaps the most interesting of the contributions made by the Greek Bible to the legendary history of the Captivity and Return. We owe to it the immortal proverb *Magna est veritas et praevallet* (iv. 41¹), and the story which forms the setting of the proverb is worthy of the occasion. But in its present form it is certainly unhistorical; Zerubbabel (iv. 13) belonged to the age of Cyrus, and it was Cyrus and not Darius (iv. 47 f.) who decreed the rebuilding of Jerusalem. It has been suggested that "this story is perhaps the nucleus of the whole (book), round which the rest is grouped²." In the grouping chronological order has been to some extent set aside; the displacement of Ezra iv. 7—24 (= 1 Esdr. ii. 15—25) has thrown the sequence of events into confusion, and the scene is shifted from the court of Artaxerxes to that of Darius, and from Darius back again to Cyrus, with whose reign the history had started. Yet Josephus³, attracted perhaps by the superiority of the Greek style, uses 1 Esdras in preference to the Greek version of the canonical Ezra-Nehemiah, even embodying in his narrative the legend of Zerubbabel⁴. He evades the difficulty

¹ The future (*praevalēbit*) is without authority. In *v.* 38 Cod. A gives *ισχύσει*, but in *v.* 41 *ὑπερισχύει* is unchallenged. The Latin texts have the present in both verses.

² H. St J. Thackeray, in Hastings' *D. B.* i. p. 76.

³ *ant.* x. 4. 4—xi.

⁴ *ant.* xi. 3. 2 sqq.

arising out of the premature reference to Artaxerxes by substituting Cambyses¹. In the early Church the Greek Esdras was accepted without suspicion; cf. e.g. Clem. Alex. *strom.* i. 21; Origen, in *Joann.* t. vi. 1, in *Jos. hom.* ix. 10; Cyprian, *ep.* 74. 9. Jerome, however (*praef. in Ezr.*), discarded the book, and modern editions of the Vulgate relegate it to an appendix where it appears as 3 Esdras, the titles 1 Esdras and 2 Esdras being given to the two parts of the canonical book Ezra-Nehemiah².

The relation of the two Greek recensions of Ezra to one another is a problem analogous to that which is presented by the two 'versions' of Daniel, and scarcely less perplexing. It has been stated with great care in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (i. p. 759 ff.), by Mr H. St J. Thackeray. He distinguishes three views, (1) that 1 Esdras is a compilation from the LXX. version of 2 Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, (2) that it is based on an earlier Greek version of those books, and (3) that it is an independent translation of an earlier Hebrew text; and while refusing to regard any solution as final, he inclines to the second. The third has recently found a champion in Sir H. H. Howorth³, who adds to it the suggestion that 1 Esdras is the true Septuagintal (i.e. the Alexandrian) version, whilst 2 Esdras is later, and probably that of Theodotion. Mr Thackeray is disposed to regard this contention as "so far correct that [1 Esdras] represents the first attempt to present the story of the Return in a Gr[ee]k dress," 2 Esdras being "a more accurate rendering of the Heb[rew]" which was "subsequently...required and...supplied by what is now called the LXX. version⁴."

2. WISDOM OF SOLOMON. The Greek title is *Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος* (*Σαλομῶντος*, *Σολομῶντος*, *Σαλωμῶν*). But the book

¹ *ant.* xi. 2. 1 sqq. ² The English Article (vi) follows this numeration.

³ In the *Academy* for 1893.

⁴ And possibly the work of Theod. (*Gramm. of O. T. in Gk.*, p. 13. (In Cod. N, 1 Chron. xi. 22—xix. 17 goes on without a break to Esd. β. ix. 9, the whole being headed Εσδ. β.))

was often cited as ἡ Σοφία, ἡ πανάρετος Σοφία, a name which it shared with Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus; see Lightfoot on Clem. 1 *Cor.* 55. In the Muratorian fragment it is described as “Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta.” The Latin versions and fathers called the book *Sapientia* or *Sophia Salomonis* (Cyprian, *O. L.*), but also simply *liber Sapientiae* (Lactantius, *Vulg.*).

No other book in the Greek Bible is so manifestly Alexandrian in tone and style. Some early Christian writers attributed it to Philo (Hieron. *praef. in libros Salomonis*: “nonnulli scriptorum veterum hunc esse Iudaei Philonis affirmant”), and it has been ingeniously conjectured that this view found a place in the Greek archetype of the Muratorian fragment¹. But though Wisdom has strong points of likeness to the works of Philo, it is free from the allegorizing spirit of that writer, and its conception of the Logos is less developed than his². On the other hand it clearly belongs to a period when the Jewish scholars of Alexandria were abreast of the philosophic doctrines and the literary standards of their Greek contemporaries. The author is acquainted with the Platonic doctrine of the four cardinal virtues³ (c. viii. 7 εἰ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷ τις, οἱ πόνοι ταύτης εἰσὶν ἀρεταί· σωφροσύνην γὰρ καὶ φρόνησιν ἐκδιδάσκει, δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν), and with the Platonic sense of ὕλη (c. xi. 17 κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης· cf. Philo, *de victim.* 13, *de mund. orif.* 12). His ideas on the subject of preexistence (c. viii. 20), of the relation of the body to the spirit (c. ix. 15), of Wisdom as the soul of the world (vii. 24), are doubtless due to the same source. His language is no less distinctly shaped upon Greek models; “no existing work represents perhaps more completely the style of compo-

¹ *Ab amicis* suggests ὑπὸ φίλων, and ὑπὸ φίλων has been thought to be a corruption of ὑπὸ Φίλωνος. See Tregelles *can. Mur.*, p. 53, and cf. Zahn, *Gesch. d. N. T. Kanons*, ii. p. 100.

² See this worked out by W. J. Deane, *Book of Wisdom*, p. 33 f.; C. J. Bigg, *Christian Platonists*, p. 14 ff.

³ See *Kep.* 427—439, 442, &c.

sition which would be produced by the sophistic school of rhetoric¹," as it existed under the conditions of Greek life at Alexandria. This remark may be illustrated by the peculiar vocabulary of the book. Unusual words abound, e.g. ἀκηλίδωτος, ἀμβρόσιος, ἕξαλλος, ζωτικός, ἰοβόλος, κακόμοχθος, κινητικός, κρυσταλλοειδής, ὁμοιοπαθής, παντεπίσκοπος, πολυμερής, πρωτόπλαστος· ἀγερωχία, ἀπαύγασμα, ἀπόρροια, εἰδέχθεια, ἐνέργεια, εὐδράνεια, ῥεμβασμός, συλλογισμός· μετακιρνᾶν, μεταλλεύειν, προφεστάναι². In some of these we can trace the influence of philosophical thought, in others the laboured effort of the writer to use words in harmony with the literary instincts of the age and place to which he belonged.

The object of the book is to protect Hellenistic Jews from the insidious influences of surrounding ungodliness and idolatry, but while its tone is apologetic and even polemical, the point of view is one which would commend itself to non-Jewish readers. The philosophical tendencies and the literary style of *Wisdom* favour the view that it is earlier than Philo, but not earlier than the middle of the second century B.C. As to the author, the words in which Origen dismissed the question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews may be applied to this pre-Christian writing—τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας...τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν. It is the solitary survival from the wreck of the earlier works of the philosophical school of Alexandria which culminated in Philo, the contemporary of our Lord.

3. WISDOM OF JESUS, SON OF SIRACH. In cod. B the title of this book is simply Σοφία Σειράχ³, but codd. AC give the fuller and more accurate form Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ (cf. c. l. 27 παιδείαν...ἐχάραξα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς

¹ Westcott in Smith's *B. D.* iii. 1780. Cf. Jerome, *l. c.* "ipse stylus Graecam eloquentiam redolet."

² See Deane, p. 27, Westcott, p. 178, Ryle, Smith's *B. D.* i. p. 185.

³ Σειράχ = סֵירָאֵךְ. "In the Hebrew Josippon (Pseudo-Josephus) the form יְרִיֵשׁ is a transliteration from the Latin" (Cowley and Neubauer, *Original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus*, p. ix. n.).

Σειράχ¹). Jerome had seen a Hebrew Sirach which shared with the canonical book the title of Proverbs (*praef. in libros Salom.*: "Hebraicum reperi...Parabolas (משלים) praenotatum"). The later name, *Ecclesiasticus*, which appears in Cyprian (e.g. *testim.* ii. 1 "apud Salomonem...in Ecclesiastico"), marks the book as the most important or the most popular of the *libri ecclesiastici*—the books which the Church used for the purpose of instruction, although they were not included in the Jewish canon.

Cf. Rufin. *in symb.* 38: "alii libri sunt qui non canonici sed ecclesiastici a maioribus appellati sunt, id est, Sapientia quae dicitur Salomonis, et alia Sapientia quae dicitur filii Sirach, qui liber apud Latinos hoc ipso generali vocabulo *Ecclesiasticus* appellatur, quo vocabulo non auctor libelli sed scripturae qualitas cognominata est."

The Wisdom of the Son of Sirach was the work of a Palestinian (c. L. 27 Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ἱεροσολυμείτης), and written in Hebrew; the Greek version was made by the grandson of the writer during a visit to Alexandria (*prolog.*, ll. 5, 18 ff.). This visit is said to have begun ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλείῳ—words which, simple as they seem, are involved in a double ambiguity, since there were two Ptolemies who bore the name Euergetes, and it is not clear whether the 38th year is to be reckoned from the commencement of the reign of Euergetes or from some other point of departure. But, assuming that the Euergetes intended is Euergetes II., i.e. Physcon², and that the translator is counting from the time when Physcon was associated in the government with his brother and predecessor Philometor, we arrive at B.C. 132 as the *terminus a quo* of the Greek version, and the original may have been composed some fifty years earlier.

Fragments of the original are preserved in Rabbinic

¹ On Ἐλεάζαρ (which follows Σειράχ in the Greek) see Ryssel in Kautzsch, *Apokr.*, p. 253. The newly-discovered Hebrew reads שמעון בן סירא, on which see Schechter, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, p. 65; Nestle in Hastings' *D. B.* iv. p. 541 f.

² Cf. Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (E. Tr.), p. 339 ff.

literature. These are in the dialect of the Talmud; but recent discoveries have brought to light a large part of the book in classical Hebrew. A comparison of the Greek version with the Hebrew text, so far as it has been printed, reveals considerable differences, especially when the Greek text employed is that of cod. B, which was unfortunately chosen for the purpose by the Oxford editors of the Hebrew fragments. It must be remembered that these fragments come from a MS. of the 11th or 12th century, which may present a corrupt form of the Hebrew text; and on the other hand, that there are considerable variations in the Greek text of Sirach, cod. B differing widely from the majority of the MSS.¹ Much remains to be done before the text of Sirach can be settled with any confidence. Meanwhile Professor Margoliouth has thrown doubt upon the originality of the Hebrew fragments, which he regards as belonging to an eleventh century version made from the Syriac with the help of a Persian translation from the Greek². At present few experts accept this theory, but the question must perhaps be regarded as *sub iudice*.

In all the known MSS. of the Greek Sirach³, there is a remarkable disturbance of the sequence. They pass from c. xxx. 34 to c. xxxiii. 13 b, returning to the omitted passage after xxxvi. 16 a. The error seems to have arisen from a transposition in the common archetype of the pairs of leaves on which these two nearly equal sections were severally written⁴—a fact which is specially instructive in view of the large divergences in the Greek MSS. to which reference has

¹ Cf. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 281. A group of MSS. headed by V=23 contains a considerable number of verses or stichi omitted by the rest of our Greek authorities; see Smith, *D. B.* I. i. p. 842.

² *Origin of the original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus*, 1899. See on this a letter by Prof. Driver in the *Guardian*, June 28, 1899, and Dr Taylor's remarks in *Ben Sira*, p. lxx ff.

³ It now appears that even H-P. 248 is no exception, so that Fritzsche's "uno fortasse cod. 248 excepto" (*Libri apocr.* p. 462) must be deleted. On this MS. see Fritzsche, p. xxiii; Zenner in *Z. K. Th.*, 1895. The text of Sirach after 248 has been edited by J. H. A. Hart, for the Cambridge University Press (1909).

⁴ See Fritzsche in *exeg. Handbuch*, v. p. 169 f.

been made. The true order is preserved in the Old Latin¹, Syriac, and Armenian versions.

4. JUDITH (Ἰουδείθ, -δίθ, -δήθ, = תִּיָּהָה, cf. Gen. xxvi. 34, where the same spellings are found in the cursives, though the uncials exhibit Ἰουδείν, Ἰουδίν), an historical romance, of which the scene is laid in the days of Nebuchadnezzar (c. i. 2). The date of its composition is uncertain. A *terminus ad quem* is provided by the fact that Clement of Rome knew the story (1 *Cor.* 55 Ἰουδίθ ἡ μακαρία...παρέδωκεν Κύριος Ὀλοφέρνην ἐν χειρὶ θηλείας)²; and the name of Judith's enemy has suggested a *terminus a quo*, for Olophernes³ appears to be a softened form of Orophernes, the name of a Cappadocian king, c. B.C. 158, who may have been regarded as an enemy of the Jews⁴. The religious attitude of the author of *Judith* is that of the devout Pharisee (cf. e.g. viii. 6, x. 2 ff., xi. 13, xii. 7), and the work may have been a fruit of the patriotic feeling called forth by the Maccabean wars.

Origen's Jewish teachers knew nothing of a Semitic original (cf. *ad African.* 13: Ἐβραῖοι τῷ Τωβία οὐ χρώνται οὐδὲ τῇ Ἰουδήθ, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ ἐν ἀποκρύφοις Ἐβραϊστί, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἐγνώκαμεν). Jerome, on the other hand, not only says expressly (*praef. in Iudith*): "apud Hebraeos liber Iudith inter apocrypha (*v.l.* hagiographa) legitur," but he produced a version or paraphrase from an Aramaic source ("ea quae intellegentia integra ex verbis Chaldaeis invenire potui, Latinis expressi")⁵. The relation of this Aramaic text to the original of the Greek book remains uncertain.

¹ On the O.L. of the Wisdoms see above, pt. i. c. IV (pp. 96, 103).

² See Lightfoot's note *ad loc.* and his remarks in *Clement* i. p. 313 ff.

³ Not Ὀλοφέρνης, as is presupposed by the Latin.

⁴ Cf. art. *Holofernes* in Hastings' *D. B.* ii. p. 402. There were, however, earlier kings of the same name (*op. cit.* p. 823; cf. Schürer³, iii. p. 169 f., n. 19).

⁵ See however Ball in *Speaker's Comm.* Apocr. i. pp. 243, 259 ff.; and F. C. Porter in Hastings' *B. D.* ii. p. 822^b.

The Greek Judith is said by Fritzsche¹ to exist in three recensions: (1) that of the Uncials and the majority of the cursives, (2) that of codd. 19, 108, and (3) that which is represented by cod. 58, and is in general agreement with the Old Latin and Syriac versions, which are based upon a Greek text.

5. ΤΟΒΙΤ (Τωβείτ (-βίτ, -βήτ), Τωβείθ, *Tobias, liber Tobiae, utriusque Tobiae*), a tale of family life, the scene of which is laid at Nineveh and Ecbatana, the hero being an Israelite of the tribe of Naphtali, who had been carried into captivity by Shalmanezer. The book appears to have been written for Jewish readers, and in Hebrew or Aramaic. The Jews of Origen's time, however, refused to recognise its authority (*Orig. de orat.* 14 τῆ δὲ τοῦ Τωβήτ βίβλω ἀντιλέγουσιν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, ὡς μὴ ἐνδιαθήκῳ), or even to include it among their apocrypha (see above, under JUDITH); but it was accepted by the Church (*ep. ad African. l. c.* χρῶνται τῷ Τωβία αἱ ἐκκλησίαι), and there is abundant evidence of its popularity among Christians (cf. *Ps. Clem. 2 Cor.* 16. 4, *Polyc. ad Smyrn.* 10. 2, *Clem. Alex. strom.* ii. 23, vi. 12, *Orig. de orat.* 11, *in Rom.* viii. 11, *c. Cels.* v. 19, *Cypr. testim.* iii. 1, 6, 62). Gnostics shared this feeling with Catholics; the Ophites placed Tobit among their prophetic books (*Iren.* i. 30. 11).

Jerome translated Tobit as he translated Judith, from a 'Chaldee,' i.e. Aramaic, copy, but with such haste that the whole was completed in a single day (*praef. in Tob.* "exigitis ut librum Chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad latinum stylum tradam...feci satis desiderio vestro...et quia vicina est Chaldaeorum lingua sermoni Hebraico, utriusque linguae peritissimum loquacem reperiens unius diei laborem arripui, et quidquid ille mihi Hebraicis verbis expressit, hoc ego

¹ Fritzsche, *libri apocr.* p. xviii sq.; Schürer³, iii. p. 172. The text in codd. 19, 108, is said to be Lucianic (Max Löhner in Kautzsch, *Apokr.*, p. 147).

accito notario sermonibus Latinis exposui¹). Thus, as in the case of Judith, we have two Latin versions, the Old Latin, based upon the Greek, and Jerome's rough and ready version of the Aramaic.

The Greek text itself exists in two principal recensions, represented by the two great uncials B and \aleph . In c. vi. 9—xiii. 18 Fritzsche adds a third text supplied by the cursives 44, 106, 107². The relation of the two principal texts to each other has recently been discussed by Nestle (*Septuagintastudien*, iii.) and by J. Rendel Harris (in the *American Journal of Theology*, iii. p. 541 ff.). Both, though on different grounds, give preference to the text of \aleph . Harris, however, points out that while \aleph is probably nearer to the original Hebrew, B may exhibit the more trustworthy text of the Alexandrian version of the book.

6. BARUCH and THE EPISTLE OF JEREMIAH (Βαρούχ, Ἐπιστολή Ἱερεμίου, [*prophetia*] *Baruch*) were regarded by the Church as adjuncts of Jeremiah, much in the same way as Susanna and Bel were attached to Daniel. Baruch and the Epistle occur in lists which rigorously exclude the non-canonical books; they are cited as 'Jeremiah' (Iren. v. 35. 1, Tert. *scorp.* 8, Clem. Alex. *paed.* i. 10, Cypr. *testim.* ii. 6); with Lamentations they form a kind of trilogy supplementary to the prophecy (Athan. *ep.* 39 Ἱερεμίας καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Βαρούχ, Θρήνοι, Ἐπιστολή, Cyril. Hier. *catech.* iv. 33 Ἱερεμίου μετὰ Βαρούχ καὶ Θρήνων καὶ Ἐπιστολῆς³). In some Greek MSS. the Epistle follows Baruch without break, and in the Latin and English Bibles it forms the sixth and last chapter of that book.

¹ A Chaldee text, corresponding in some respects to Jerome's Latin, is preserved in the Bodleian, and has been edited by Neubauer (Oxford, 1878).

² An Oxyrh. Pap. 1076 (vol. viii) gives a new recension of c. ii. 2, 3, 4, 8.

³ Origen, while omitting Baruch, includes the Epistle in a formal list of the Hebrew canon (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25 Ἱερεμίας σὺν Θρήνοις καὶ τῇ Ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἐνί).

The Epistle (ἀντίγραφον ἐπιστολῆς ἧς ἀπέστειλεν Ἰερεμίας πρὸς τοὺς ἀχθισομένους [v. l. ἀπαχθέντας] αἰχμαλώτους εἰς Βαβυλῶνα) seems to have been suggested by Jer. xxxvi. (xxix.) 1 (cf. 2 Kings xxv. 20 ff.). It is generally recognised that this little work was written in Greek by a Hellenist who was perhaps anterior to the writer of 2 Maccabees (cf. 2 Macc. ii. 1 ff.)¹.

The problem presented by Baruch is less simple. This book is evidently a complex work consisting of two main sections (i. i.—iii. 8, iii. 9—v. 9)², each of which may be subdivided (i. 1—14, historical preface; i. 15—iii. 8, confession and prayer; iii. 9—iv. 4, exhortation; iv. 5—v. 9, encouragement). Of these subsections the first two shew traces of a Hebrew original; cf. e.g. i. 10 μάννα = מַן, ii. 3 ἄνθρωπον = אָדָם, iii. 4 τῶν τεθνηκότων = מֵתִים (for מֵתִים)³; the third has been held⁴ to rest on an Aramaic document, whilst the fourth is manifestly Hellenistic.

An investigation by Professor Ryle and Dr James⁵ into the relation between the Greek version of the Psalms of Solomon and the Greek Baruch, led them to the conclusion that Baruch was reduced to its present form after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; and the tone of Bar. iv. 30 seems certainly to point to that period. On the other hand it is difficult to understand the unhesitating acceptance of the book by Christian writers from Athenagoras (*suppl.* 9) until the time of

¹ On the first point see J. T. Marshall in Hastings' *D. B.* ii. p. 579, and on the other hand Schürer³, iii. p. 344. Cf. Nestle, *Marginalien*, p. 42 f.

² In the first section the Divine Name is Κύριος or Κ. ὁ θεός, while in the second it is either [ὁ] θεός or ὁ αἰώνιος, ὁ ἅγιος. See Dr Gifford in *Speaker's Comm.*, *Apoc.*, ii. f. 253. Thackeray holds that "the first half of Baruch is, beyond a doubt, the production of the translator of Jer. β." *Gramm. of O. T. in Gk.* i. pp. 12, 13; *J. Th. St.* iv. 261 ff.

³ "On the margin of the Syro-hexaplar text of Baruch there are three notes by a scribe stating that certain words in i. 17 and ii. 3 are 'not found in the Hebrew.'" (A. A. Bevan in *Encycl. Biblica*, i. 494.)

⁴ E.g. by J. T. Marshall in Hastings' *D. B.* i. p. 251.

⁵ *Psalms of the Pharisees*, pref., esp. p. lxxvii.

Jerome, and its practical inclusion in the canon, if the Greek version in its present form proceeded from a Palestinian Jew, and was the work of the last quarter of the first century A.D.¹ As to its use by the Jews there are contradictory statements in early Christian writers, for while the *Apostolical Constitutions*² inform us that the Jews read Baruch publicly on the Day of Atonement, Jerome says expressly that they neither read it nor had it in their possession, and his statement is confirmed by Epiphanius.

Const. Ap. v. 20 καὶ γὰρ καὶ νῦν δεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς Γαρπιαίου συναθροισόμενοι τοὺς Θρήνους Ἰερεμίου ἀναγνώσκουσιν...καὶ τὸν Βαροῦχ. Hieron. *praef. comm. in Ierem.* "vulgo editioni Septuaginta copulatur, nec habetur apud Hebraeos"; *praef. vers. Ierem.* "apud Hebraeos nec legitur nec habetur." Epiph. *de mens. et pond.* 5 οὐ κείνται αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ [Βαροῦχ καὶ Ἰερεμίου] παρ' Ἑβραίοις.

7. BOOKS OF MACCABEES (Μακκαβαίων α', β', γ', δ', *Machaborum libri*; τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά, Hippol. *in Dan.* iv. 3; Orig. ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25). The four books differ widely in origin, character, and literary value; the bond which unites them is merely their common connexion with the events of the age which produced the heroes of the Hasmonaeon or Maccabean³ family.

1 MACCABEES. This book seems to have been used by Josephus (*ant.* xii. 6. 1 sqq.), but it is doubtful whether he was acquainted with its Greek form. On the other hand, the Greek 1 Macc. was undoubtedly known to the Christian school of Alexandria; cf. Clem. Alex. *strom.* i. § 123 τὸ τῶν

¹ Dr Nestle points out that Baruch and Jeremiah seem to have been translated by the same hand, unless the translator of Baruch deliberately copied the translator of Jeremiah. Certain unusual words are common to the two books in similar contexts, e.g. ἄβατος, ἀποστολή, δεσμώτης, πεινώσα. Cf. Thackeray, *l. c.*

² v. 20. But the reference to Baruch is wanting in the Syriac Didascalia (Smith, *D. B.*² i. p. 359).

³ For the name Μακκαβαῖος see Schürer, *E. T.* i. p. 212 f. n.; it belonged primarily to Judas, cf. 1 Macc. i. 4 ἀνέστη Ἰούδας ὁ καλούμενος Μ.; Joseph. *ant.* xii. 6 Ἰούδας ὁ καλ. Μ.

Μακκαβαϊκῶν, Origen ap. Eus. *l.c.* τὰ Μακκαβαϊκὰ ἄπερ ἐπιγέγραπται Σαρβῆθ σαβαναιέλ (*v.l.* Σ. σαβανὲ ἔλ). Whatever may be the meaning of this title¹, it is clearly Semitic, and may be taken as evidence that the book was circulated in a Semitic original. Jerome appears to have seen a copy of this Hebrew or Aramaic text (*prol. gal.* "Maccabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum repperi"), but it has long disappeared², and the book is now extant only in versions. The Latin and Syriac versions are based upon the Greek; the Old Latin exists in two recensions, one of which has taken its place in the Latin Bible, whilst the other is preserved in a St Germain's and a Madrid MS.; a Lyons MS. gives a text in which the two are mixed³.

The history of 1 Macc. covers about 40 years (B.C. 175—132). There are indications that the writer was removed by at least a generation from the end of his period (cf. c. xiii. 30, xvi. 23 f.). He was doubtless a Palestinian Jew, but his work would soon have found its way to Alexandria, and if it had not already been translated into Greek, it doubtless received its Greek dress there shortly after its arrival.

2 MACCABEES. The existence of a book bearing this title is implied by Hippolytus, who quotes 1 Macc. with the formula ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βίβλῳ τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἀναγέγραπται, and by Origen, if we may trust the Latin interpretation (*in ep. ad Rom.*, t. viii. 1 "in primo libro Machabaeorum scriptum est"); the title itself occurs in Eus. *praef. ev.* viii. 9 (ἡ δευτέρα τῶν Μακκαβαίων). But the evidence goes further back. Philo shews some knowledge of the book in *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 13, and the author of the Ep. to the Hebrews has a clear reminiscence of its Greek (Heb. xi. 31 ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κτλ., cf. 2 Macc. vi. 19, 30).

¹ For various attempts to interpret it see Ryle, *Canon*, p. 185; R. Kraetzschmar, in *Exp. T.*, xii. p. 93 ff.

² A Hebrew text is printed by A. Schweizer, *Über die Reste eines heb. Textes vom ersten Makkabäerbuch* (Berlin, 1901); but see Th. Nöldeke in *Lit. Centralblatt*, March 30, 1901.

³ Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, pp. 62, 68.

The writer is described by Clement of Alexandria (*strom.* v. 14) as ὁ συνταξάμενος τὴν τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἐπιτομὴν. This is precisely what he claims to do (c. ii. 23 ὑπὸ Ἰάσωνος τοῦ Κυρηναίου δεδηλωμένα διὰ πέντε βιβλίων, πειρασόμεθα δι' ἐνὸς συντάγματος ἐπιτεμεῖν). The work of the Cyrenian has perished, whilst the Alexandrian epitome survives. For Alexandrian the epitomist probably was; "the characteristics of the style and language are essentially Alexandrian...the form of the allusion to Jason shews clearly that the compiler was not his fellow countryman¹." "The style is extremely uneven; at times it is elaborately ornate (iii. 15—39, v. 20, vi. 12—16, 23—28, vii. &c.); and again, it is so rude and broken as to seem more like notes for an epitome than a finished composition" (xiii. 19—26); indeed it is difficult to believe that such a passage as the one last cited can have been intended to go forth in its present form. That the work never had a Semitic original was apparent to Jerome (*prol. gal.* "secundus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest"). The vocabulary is extraordinarily rich in words of the later literary Greek, and the book betrays scarcely any disposition to Hebraise².

The second book of Maccabees presents a striking contrast to the first. Covering a part of the same period (B.C. 175—160), it deals with the events in a manner wholly different. In 1 Maccabees we have a plain and usually trustworthy history; in 2 Maccabees a partly independent but rhetorical and inaccurate and to some extent mythical panegyric of the patriotic revolt³.

3 MACCABEES. A third book of Μακκαβαϊκά finds a place

¹ Westcott in Smith's *D. B.*¹ ii. p. 175.

² See the list of words given by Westcott, *l. c.* i. and in Smith's *D. B.*² i. and *Apocrypha*.

³ So Luther, in his preface to 2 Macc.: "so billig das erste Buch sollte in die Zahl der heiligen Schrift genommen sein, so billig ist dies andere Buch herausgeworfen, obwohl etwas Gutes darinnen steht."

in some Eastern lists (*can. Apost., Niceph. stichom.*). A Greek book under that title is found in codd. AV and a few cursives¹. There is a Syriac version, but no Latin, nor is the book mentioned in any Western list, although the stichometry of Cod. Claromontanus implies a knowledge of its existence, for it mentions a fourth book. Similarly cod. \aleph passes from the first book to the fourth, whether the omission of the second and third is due to the deliberate judgement of the scribe or to his want of an archetype.

A more exact description of 3 Maccabees would be that which it seems to have borne in some circles—the Ptolemaica². The story belongs to the reign of Ptolemy Philopator (B.C. 222—205), and the scene is laid at Alexandria. The king, infuriated by the refusal of the Jerusalem priesthood to admit him to the Holy of Holies, returns to Egypt with the intention of avenging himself on the Alexandrian Jews; but by the interposition of Providence his plans are defeated, and he becomes, like Darius in Daniel and Artaxerxes in Esther, the patron of the people he had purposed to destroy.

There are reasons for believing that this romance rests upon some historical basis. "The author...evidently has good knowledge of the king and his history...the feast kept by the Egyptian Jews at a fixed date [c. vii. 11] cannot be an invention...that Philopator in some way injured the condition of the Jews, and that they were concerned in the insurrection of the nation, seems very probable³." Moreover Josephus has a somewhat similar tale drawn from another source, and con-

¹ Fritzsche has used codd. 19, 44, 55, 62, 64, 71, 74, 93.

² In the Pseudo-Athanasian *synopsis* where the MSS. give Μακκαβαϊκὰ δ', Πτολεμαϊκά. Credner proposed to read Μ. καὶ (ς) Πτολ. An explanation of the existing reading attempted by Fabricius, *cod. pseud. epigr. V. T.* i. p. 1164, is hardly to be considered satisfactory. Zahn (*Gesch. d. NTlichen Kanons*, ii. p. 317) suggests πολεμικά, but this is more ingenious than convincing. But Wendland (*Aristeas*, p. 133) and Thackeray consider that Πτολεμαϊκὰ means the letter of Aristeas.

³ Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 267 ff.

nected with another reign' (*c. Ap.* ii. 5). The present book is doubtless Alexandrian, and of relatively late origin, as its inflated style, "loaded with rhetorical ornament²," sufficiently testifies. Some critics (Ewald, Hausrath, Reuss³) would place it in the reign of Caligula, but the knowledge of earlier Alexandrian life which it displays points to an earlier date, perhaps the first century B.C.⁴

4 MACCABEES. According to Eusebius and Jerome this book was the work of Josephus⁵.

Eus. *H. E.*, iii. 10 *πεπόνηται δὲ καὶ ἄλλο οὐκ ἀγεννὲς σπούδασμα τῷ ἀνδρὶ (sc. Ἰωσήφῳ) περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ, ὃ τινες Μακκαβαϊκὸν ἐπέγραψαν τῷ τοῦ ἀγῶνας τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὕτω καλουμένοις Μακκαβαϊκοῖς συγγράμμασιν ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείας ἀνδρῖσάμενων Ἑβραίων περιέχειν.* Hieron. *de virr. ill.* 13 "alio quoque libro eius qui inscribitur περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ valde elegans habetur, in quo et Maccabeorum digesta martyria" (*cf. c. Pelag.* ii. 5).

The book is a philosophical treatise upon the question, *εἰ αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστιν τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβῆς λογισμός.* But the greater part of it⁶ is occupied by a rhetorical panegyric upon the Jewish martyrs, Eleazar, and the seven brothers and their mother, who perished in the Maccabean troubles. This portion appears to be based on 2 Macc. vi. 18—vii. 42, which it amplifies with an extraordinary wealth of language and a terribly realistic picture of the martyrs' sufferings. The rhetoric of the writer, however, is subordinated to his passion for religious philosophy. In philosophy he is a pupil of the Stoics; like the author of the Wisdom of Solomon he holds fast by the doctrine of the four cardinal Virtues (i. 18 *τῆς δὲ σοφίας εἰδέαι καθιστᾶσιν φρόνησις καὶ δικαιοσύνη*

¹ That of Euergetes II. (Physcon); *cf.* Mahaffy, p. 381.

² Westcott in Smith's *D. B.* ii. p. 179.

³ Schürer³, iii. p. 365.

⁴ "The date is probably c. 80 B.C.," Thackeray thinks, "as shown by epistolary formulae and papyrus evidence."

⁵ The same belief is expressed by the fact that the book is found in some MSS. of Josephus. See Fabricius-Harles, v. 26 f.

⁶ *Viz.* c. iii. 19, to the end.

καὶ ἀνδρία καὶ σωφροσύνη), and he sternly demands that the πάθη shall be kept under restraint by the power of Reason. In religion he is a legalist with Pharisaic tendencies; he believes in future punishment (ix. 9, xiii. 15), in the eternal life which awaits the righteous (xv. 3, xvii. 5, xviii. 23), and in the atonement for sin which is made by voluntary sacrifice (vi. 29, xxii. 22).

The style of 4 Macc. abounds in false ornament and laboured periods. But on the whole it is "truly Greek¹," and approaches nearer than that of any other book in the Greek Bible to the models of Hellenic philosophy and rhetoric. It does not, however, resemble the style of Josephus, and is more probably a product of Alexandrian Judaism during the century before the fall of Jerusalem.

8. To the books of the Hebrew canon (τὰ ἐνδιάθηκα, τὰ εἰκοσιδύο) and the 'external' books (τὰ ἔξω), which on the authority of Jerome the reformed Churches of the West have been accustomed to call the Apocrypha, some of the ancient lists add certain *apocrypha* properly so named. Thus the catalogue of the 'Sixty Books,' after reciting the canonical books of the O. and N. Testaments, and τὰ περὶ (*leg. πέρα*) τούτων ἔξω (the two Wisdoms, 1—4 Maccabees, Esther, Judith, Tobit), continues: Καὶ ὅσα ἀπόκρυφα· Ἄδάμ, Ἐνώχ, Λάμεχ, Πατριάρχαι, Προσευχὴ Ἰωσήφ, Ἑλλάδ, Διαθήκη Μωυσέως, Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως, Ψαλμοὶ Σολομώντος, Ἡλίου ἀποκάλυψις, Ἡσαίου ὄρασις, Σοφονίου ἀποκάλυψις, Ζαχαρίου ἀποκάλυψις, Ἔσδρα ἀποκάλυψις. The Pseudo-Athanasian *Synopsis* and the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus count among the ἀπόκρυφα τῆς παλαιᾶς, together with certain of the above, Ἀβραάμ... Βαρούχ, Ἀββακούμ, Ἐζεκιήλ, καὶ Δανιήλ, ψευδεπίγραφα². Ebed Jesu mentions also a book called *Traditions of the Elders*, the *History of Asenath*, and

¹ Westcott in Smith's *D. B.*¹ ii. p. 181.

² On this list see Zahn, *Gesch. d. NTlichen Kanons*, ii. p. 289 ff. and M. R. James, *Testament of Abraham*, p. 7 ff. (in *Texts and Studies*, ii. 2).

even the Fables of Aesop disguised under the title *Proverbs of Josephus*. Besides these writings the following are censured in the Gelasian *notitia librorum apocryphorum*: *Liber de filiabus Adae Leptogenesis, Poenitentia Adae, Liber de Vegia nomine gigante, qui post diluuium cum dracone...pugnasse perhibetur, Testamentum Iob, Poenitentia Iambre et Mambre, Solomonis interdictio.*

Though the great majority of these writings at one time existed in Greek, they were not admitted into collections of canonical books. A partial exception was made in favour of the PSALMS OF SOLOMON. This book is mentioned among the ἀντιλεγόμενα of the O.T. in the Stichometry of Nicephorus and in the Pseudo-Athanasian *Synopsis*. An earlier authority, the compiler of the catalogue at the beginning of Codex Alexandrinus, allows it a place in his list, although after the final summary of the books of the Old and New Testaments¹. If the Codex itself contained these Psalms, they have perished together with a portion of Ps. Clem. *ad Cor. ii.*, the book which in the list immediately precedes them. It has been conjectured² that they once had a place in Cod. Sinaiticus, which like Cod. A has lost some leaves at the end of the N.T. Their absence from the other great uncials and from the earlier cursives may be due to the influence of the Laodicean canon (lix.), ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ιδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς³ λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐδὲ ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης. Happily the Psalms survived in private collections, and find a place in a few relatively

¹ The catalogue ends ΟΜΟΥ ΒΙΒΛΙΑ . . | and below, ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΩΜΩΝΤΟΣ | ΙΗ.

² By Dr J. R. Harris, who points out (*Johns Hopkins Univ. Circular*, March 1884) that the six missing leaves in 8 between Barnabas and Hermas correspond with fair accuracy to the space which would be required for the Psalms of Solomon. Dr Harris has since discovered a Syriac version of sixteen of these Psalms (out of eighty contained in the MS.).

³ Cf. Bals. *ap. Beveregii Synod.* p. 480 εὐρίσκονται τινες ψαλμοὶ πέρα τοὺς ἑν' ψαλμοὺς τοῦ Δαβὶδ λεγόμενοι τοῦ Σολομῶντος...τούτους οὖν ὀνομάσαντες οἱ πατέρες ιδιωτικούς.

late cursives of the poetical and the Sapiential books of the O.T., where they follow the Davidic Psalter or take their place among the writings attributed to Solomon¹.

The Psalms of Solomon are shewn by their teaching and spirit to be the work of the Pharisaic school, and internal evidence connects them with the age of Pompey, whose death appears to be described in Ps. ii. 30 ff.² The question of the date of the Greek version turns upon the nature of the relation which exists between the Greek Psalms and the Greek Book of Baruch. Bishop Ryle and Dr James, who regard Baruch iv. 36—v. 9 (Greek) as based on the Greek of Ps. Sol. xi., are disposed to assign the version of the Psalms to the last decade of the first century B.C.³ They observe that the Messianic passages contain “no trace of Christian influence at work.” On the other hand there are interesting coincidences between the Greek phraseology of the Psalter and that of the *Magnificat* and other Lucan canticles⁴.

One other *apocryphon* of the Greek Old Testament claims attention here. The BOOK OF ENOCH has since 1838 been in the hands of scholars in the form of an Ethiopic version based upon the Greek. But until 1892 the Greek version was known only through a few fragments—the verse quoted by St Jude (*cf.* 14 f.), a brief tachygraphic extract in cod. Vat. gr. 1809, published in facsimile by Mai (*patr. nov. biblioth.* ii.), and deciphered by Gildemeister (*ZDMG.*, 1855, p. 622 ff.), and the excerpts in the *Chronographia* of Georgius Syncellus⁵. But in 1886 a small vellum book was found in

¹ In the latter case they go with the two Wisdoms in the order Sap., Ps. Sol., Sir. or (in one instance) Sap., Sir., Ps. Sol.

² Ryle and James, *Psalms of the Pharisees*, p. xl ff., xlv ff. Schürer³, iii. p. 152 f.

³ Ryle and James, p. lxxii ff. On the date see W. Frankenberg, *die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos* (Giessen, 1896).

⁴ Ryle and James, p. xc ff.

⁵ These may be conveniently consulted in the *Corpus historiae Byzantinae*, t. 1, where they are edited by W. Dindorf.

a Christian grave in Akhmîm (Panopolis), in Upper Egypt, which contained *inter alia* the first thirty-two chapters of Enoch in Greek—nearly the whole of the first section of the book. This large fragment was published by M. Bouriant in the ninth volume of *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique Française au Caire* (Paris, 1^{er} fasc. 1892; 3^o fasc. 1893).

The newly recovered Greek belongs to the oldest part of Enoch, which may be regarded as in the main a Palestinian work of the second century B.C.¹ The Greek version is the parent of the Ethiopic, and of pre-Christian date, since it was in the hands of St Jude. Thus it possesses a strong claim upon the attention of the student of Biblical Greek, while the book itself possesses an almost unique value as an exposition of Jewish eschatology.

The Greek version of Enoch seems to have been circulated in the ancient Church; cf. Barn. 4. 16; Clem. Alex. *ed. proph.* 2; Orig. *de princ.* i. 3. 3, iv. 35, *hom. in Num.* 28. 2. The book was not accepted by authority (Orig. *c. Cels.* v. 54 *ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάντῃ φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνώχ βιβλία*: in Ioann. t. vi. 25 *εἶ τῷ φίλον παραδέχασθαι ὡς ἅγιον τὸ βιβλίον*. Hieron. *de virr. ill.* 4 “apocryphus est”), but opinion was divided, and Tertullian was prepared to admit the claims of a writing which had been quoted in a Catholic Epistle (*de cult. faem.* i. 3 “scio scripturam Enoch ...non recipi a quibusdam quia nec in armarium Iudaicum admittitur...a nobis quidem nihil omnino reiciendum est quod pertineat ad nos...eo accedit quod E. apud Iudam apostolum testimonium possidet.”) In the end, however, it appears to have been discredited both in East and West, and, if we may judge by the almost total disappearance of the Greek version, it was rarely copied by Catholics even for private

¹ See Schürer³, iii. p. 196 ff.

study. A mere chance has thrown into our hands an excerpt made in the eighth or ninth century, and it is significant that in the Akhmîm book Enoch is found in company with fragments of a pseudonymous Gospel and Apocalypse¹.

LITERATURE of the non-canonical Books.

The Variorum Apocrypha, edited by C. J. Ball (London, 1892).

1 ESDRAS. De Wette-Schrader, *Lehrbuch*, §§ 363—4; König, *Einleitung*, p. 146; Dähne, *Gesch. Darstellung*, iii. p. 116 ff.; Nestle, *Marginalien*, p. 23 f.; Bissell, *Apocrypha of the O. T.*, p. 62 ff.; H. St J. Thackeray, *art. 1 Esdras in Hastings' D. B.*, i.; Schürer³, iii. p. 326 ff.; Büchler, *das apokr. Ezra-Buchs (MGWf., 1897)*. Text and apparatus: Holmes and Parsons, t. v.; Fritzsche, *libri apocr. V. T. Gr.*, pp. viii.—x., 1—30; Lagarde, *libr. V. T. canon.*, p. i. (Lucianic); *O. T. in Greek*, ii. (text of B, with variants of A); W. J. Moulton, *über die Überlieferung u. d. textkrit. Werth des dritten Ezra-Buchs, ZATW.*, 1899, 2, 1900, 1. Commentaries: Fritzsche, *exeg. Handbuch z. d. Apokr.*, i.; Lupton, in *Speaker's Comm., Apocrypha*, i.; Guthe, in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen*, p. 1 ff.

WISDOM OF SOLOMON. Fabricius-Harles, iii. 727. De Wette-Schrader, *Lehrbuch*, §§ 378—382; König, *Einleitung*, p. 146; Dähne, *Darstellung*, ii. p. 152 ff.; Westcott, in Smith's *D. B.* iii. p. 1778 ff.; Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, i. p. 177 ff. Text and apparatus: Holmes and Parsons, v.; Fritzsche, *libr. apocr. V. T. Gr.*, pp. xxiv. f., 522 ff.; *O. T. in Greek*, ii. p. 604 ff. (text of B, variants of SAC). Commentaries: Bauermeister, *comm. in Sap. Sol.* (1828); Grimm, *exeg. Handbuch*, vi.; Reusch, *observationes Criticae in libr. Sapientiae* (Friburg, 1858); Deane, *the Book of Wisdom* (Oxf., 1881); Farrar, in *Speaker's Comm., Apocr.*, i.; Siegfried, in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen*, p. 476 ff. On the Latin version see Thielmann, *die lateinische Übersetzung des Buches der Weisheit* (Leipzig, 1872).

¹ A collection of Greek O. T. apocrypha might perhaps include, amongst other remains of this literature, the *Rest of the Words of Baruch* (ed. J. Rendel Harris), the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (ed. M. R. James), the *Testament of Abraham* (ed. M. R. James), parts of the *Oracula Sibyllina* (ed. A. Rzach), the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* (ed. Sinkler), the *Latin Ascension of Isaiah* (ed. O. von Gebhardt, with the new Greek fragments), and perhaps also the Latin versions of certain important books which no longer survive in the Greek, e.g. 4 Esdras (ed. R. L. Bensly), the *Assumption of Moses* (ed. R. H. Charles), the *Book of Jubilees*, ἡ λεπτὴ Ἐπέσις (ed. R. H. Charles).

WISDOM OF THE SON OF SIRACH. Fabricius-Harles, iii. 718; De Wette-Schrader, § 383 ff.; König, p. 145. Westcott and Margoliouth, *Ecclesiasticus*, in Smith's *D. B.*² i. 841; Schürer³, iii. p. 157 ff. (where a full list of recent monographs will be found). Text with apparatus: Holmes and Parsons, v.; Fritzsche; *O. T. in Greek*, ii. (text of B, variants of SAC); cf. J. K. Zenner, *Ecclesiasticus nach cod. Vat.* 346 (*Z. K. Th.*, 1895). Bretschneider, *liber Iesu Siracidae Gr.*, Ratisbon, 1806. Cf. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 296 ff. Nestle, *Marginalien* (1893), p. 48 ff. Klostermann, *Analecta*, p. 26 f. Commentaries: Bretschneider (*ut supra*); Fritzsche, *exeg. Handbuch*, v.; Edersheim in *Speaker's Comm.*, *Apocr.* ii.; Ryssel, in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen*, p. 230 ff.

On the newly discovered Hebrew text with relation to the versions see Cowley and Neubauer, *The original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus*, Oxford, 1897; Smend, *das hebr. Fragment der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, 1897; Halévy, *Étude sur la partie du texte hébreu de l'Écclesiastique* (Paris, 1897); Schlatter, *das neu gefundene hebr. Stück des Sirach* (Gütersloh, 1897), I. Lévi, *L'Écclesiastique*, Paris, 1898, 1901; C. Taylor, in *ḤQR.*, 1898; D. S. Margoliouth, *The origin of the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus*, Oxford, 1899; S. Schechter and C. Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, Cambridge, 1899; S. Schechter, in *ḤQR.* and *Cr. R.*, Oct. 1899; various articles in *Exp. Times*, 1899; A. A. Bevan in *ḤThSt.*, Oct. 1899; H. Herkenne, *De Veteris Latinae Ecclesiastici capp. i—xlili* (Leipzig, 1899); E. Nestle in Hastings, *D. B.* iv. 539 ff.

JUDITH. Fabricius-Harles, iii. p. 736; De Wette-Schrader, § 373 ff.; König, p. 145 f.; Nestle, *Marginalien*, p. 43 ff.; Westcott-Fuller in Smith's *D. B.*² i. ii. p. 1850 ff.; F. C. Porter in Hastings' *D. B.* ii. p. 822 ff.; Schürer³, iii. p. 167. Text and apparatus: Holmes and Parsons, v.; Fritzsche, p. xviii f., 165 ff.; *Old Testament in Greek*, ii. (text of B, variants of SA). Commentaries: Fritzsche, *exeg. Handbuch*, ii.; Wolff, *das Buch Judith...erklärt* (Leipzig, 1861); Scholz, *Commentar zum B. Judith* (1887, 1896); cf. Ball in *Speaker's Comm.*, *Apocr.*, i.; Löhr, in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen*, p. 147 ff.

TOBIT. Fabricius-Harles, iii. 738; De Wette-Schrader, § 375 ff.; König, p. 145 f.; Westcott in Smith's *D. B.* iii. p. 1523; Schürer³, iii. p. 174. Text and apparatus: Holmes and Parsons, v.; Fritzsche, pp. xvi ff., 108 ff.; *Old Testament in Greek*, ii. (texts of B and S, with variants of A); Reusch, *libellus Tobit e cod. Sin. editus* (Bonn, 1870); Neubauer, *the Book of Tobit: a Chaldee text* (Oxford, 1878). Commentaries: Fritzsche, *exeg. Handbuch*, *Apokr.*, ii.; Reusch, *das Buch Tobias übersetzt u. erklärt* (Friburg, 1857); Sengelmann, *das Buch Tobits erklärt* (Hamburg, 1857); Gutberlet, *das Buch Tobias übersetzt u. erklärt*

(Munster, 1877); Scholz, *Commentar z. Buche Tobias* (1889); Rosenmann, *Studien z. Buche Tobit* (Berlin, 1894); J. M. Fuller in *Speaker's Comm., Apocr.*, i.; Löhr, in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen*, p. 135 ff. Cf. E. Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, iii. (Stuttgart, 1899); J. R. Harris in *American Journal of Theology*, July, 1899.

BARUCH and EPISTLE. Fabricius-Harles, iii. p. 734 f.; De Wette-Schrader, § 389 ff.; König, p. 485 f.; Westcott-Ryle, in Smith's *D. B.*² i. p. 359 ff.; J. T. Marshall, in Hastings' *D. B.* i. p. 249 ff. ii. p. 579 ff.; Schürer³, iii. p. 338 ff.; A. A. Bevan, in *Encycl. Biblica*, i. 492 ff. Text and apparatus: Holmes and Parsons, v.; Fritzsche, pp. xv f., 93 ff.; *Old Testament in Greek*, iii. (text of B, with variants of AQT). Commentaries: Fritzsche, *exeg. Handbuch, Apokr.*, i.; Reusch, *Erklärung des Buchs Baruch* (Freiburg, 1853); Hävernick, *de libro Baruch* (Königsberg, 1861); Kneucker, *das Buch Baruch* (Leipzig, 1879); E. H. Gifford in *Speaker's Comm., Apocr.*, ii.; Rothstein, in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen*, p. 213 ff.

1—4 MACCABEES. Fabricius-Harles, iii. p. 745 ff.; De Wette-Schrader, § 365 ff.; König, p. 482 ff.; Westcott in Smith's *D. B.*¹ ii. p. 170 ff.; Schürer³, iii. pp. 139 ff., 359 ff., 393 ff.; Rosenthal, *das erste Makkabäerbuch* (Leipzig, 1867); Willrich, *Juden u. Griechen vor der makkab. Erhebung* (1895); Freudenthal, *die Fl. Josephus beigelegte Schrift*. (Breslau, 1869); Wolscht, *de Ps. Josephi oratione...* (Marburg, 1881). Text and apparatus: Holmes and Parsons, v. (books i.—iii.); Fritzsche, pp. xix ff., 203 ff.; *Old Testament in Greek*, iii. (text of A with variants of \aleph V in books i. and iv. and V in ii., iii.). Commentaries: Keil, *Komm. über die Bücher der Makk.* (Leipzig, 1875); Bensly-Barnes, *4 Maccabees in Syriac* (Cambridge, 1895)¹; Grimm in Fritzsche's *exeg. Handbuch, Apokr.*, iii., iv.; Bissell, in Lange-Schaff's *Comm.*; G. Rawlinson in *Speaker's Comm., Apocr.*, ii. (books i.—ii.); Fairweather and Black, *1 Maccabees* (Cambridge, 1897); Kautzsch and Kamphausen, in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen*, p. 24 ff.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA. The student will find fuller information on this subject in Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus V. T.* (Hamburg, 1722); Herzog-Plitt, xii. p. 341 ff. (art. by Dillmann on *Pseudepigrapha des A. T.*); Deane, *Pseudepigrapha* (Edinburgh, 1891); J. E. H. Thomson, *Books which influenced our Lord and His Apostles* (Edinburgh, 1891); Smith's and Hastings' *Bible Dictionaries*; Schürer³, iii. pp. 150 ff., 190 ff.; the works of Credner and Zahn; M. R. James, *Testament of Abraham* in *Texts and Studies* (II. ii. p. 7 ff.); *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, artt. Apo-

¹ A collation of the Syriac 4 Macc. with the Greek has been contributed by Dr Barnes to *O. T. in Greek*², vol. iii. (p. 900 ff.).

calyptic Literature and Apocrypha (i. 213-58). For the literature of the several writings he may refer to Strack, *Einleitung*, p. 230 ff. In Kautzsch's *Apokr. u. Pseudepigraphen* the following O. T. *pseudepigrapha* are included: *Martyrdom of Isaiah* (Beer), *Sibylline Oracles*, iii.—v., and *proem.* (Blass), *Ascension of Moses* (Clemen), *Apocalypse of Moses* (Fuchs), *Apocalypse of Esdras* (Gunkel), *Testament of Naphtali*, Heb. (Kautzsch), *Book of Jubilees* (Littmann), *Apocalypse of Baruch* (Ryssel), *Testaments of XII Patriarchs* (Schnapp). On the eschatology of this literature see Charles, *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian* (London, 1899).

PSALMS OF SOLOMON. Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. V.T.*, i. p. 914 ff.; Fritzsche, *libr. apocr. V. T. gr.*, pp. xxv ff., 569 ff.; Ryle and James, *Psalms of the Pharisees* (Cambridge, 1891); O. v. Gebhardt, *die Psalmen Salomo's* (Leipzig, 1895); *Old Testament in Greek*² (Cambridge, 1899¹). Ryle and James' edition is specially valuable for its full Introduction, and Gebhardt's for its investigation into the pedigree and relative value of the MSS. On the date see Frankenberg, *die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos* (Giessen, 1896). An introduction and German version by Dr R. Kittel will be found in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen*, p. 127 ff.

BOOK OF ENOCH. Laurence, *Libri Enoch versio aethiopica* (Oxford, 1838); Dillmann, *Liber Henoch aethiopice* (Leipzig, 1851); Bouriant, *Fragments du texte grec du livre d'Énoch...in Mémoires*, &c. (see above); Lods, *le livre d'Énoch* (Paris, 1892); Dillmann, *über den neugefundenen gr. Text des Henoch-Buches* (Berlin, 1892); Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1893), *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1906), and art. in Hastings' *D. B.* i. p. 705 ff.; *Old Testament in Greek*, iii.² (Cambridge, 1899). For a fragment of a Latin version see James, *Apocr. anecdota* in *Texts and Studies*, ii. 3, p. 146 ff. An introduction and German version by Dr G. Beer will be found in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen*, p. 217 ff.

¹ The text in the Cambridge manual LXX., which is that of cod. Vat. gr. 336, and is accompanied by an apparatus and a brief description of the MSS., can be had, together with the text of Enoch, in a separate form.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GREEK OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

1. No thorough treatment of the Greek idiom of the LXX. is known to exist. Two ancient treatises upon the dialect of Alexandria, by Irenaeus (Minutius Pacatus) and Demetrius Ixion¹, have unhappily disappeared. In modern times the ground has been broken by Sturz and Thiersch², and within the last few years Deissmann³ has used the recently discovered papyri of Egypt to illustrate the connotation or the form of a number of Septuagint nouns and verbs. Much has also been done by Dr H. A. A. Kennedy⁴ and the Abbé J. Viteau⁵ in the way of determining the relation of Septuagint Greek to the classical and later usage, and to the Greek of the N.T.; and the N.T. grammars of Winer-Moulton, Winer-Schmiedel, and Blass contain incidental references to the linguistic characteristics of the Alexandrian version. But a separate grammar of the Greek Old Testament was long a real want, and the time has now come for attempting to supply it. Biblical scholars have now at

¹ See Fabricius-Harles, vi. p. 193 f. Both writers lived in the time of Augustus.

² Sturz's treatment of the dialect of Alexandria and Egypt needs to be checked by more recent researches, but it is still the most complete work upon the subject. Thiersch deals directly with the Greek of the LXX., but he limits himself to the Pentateuch.

³ *Bibelstudien* (1895), and *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897).

⁴ *Sources of N.T. Greek* (1895).

⁵ *Étude sur le Grec du N.T.* (1896).

their disposal a store of trustworthy materials in the Oxford Concordance, and the larger Cambridge Septuagint will supply an accurate and sufficient textual guide. On the basis of these two works it ought to be possible for the workers of the twentieth century to prepare a satisfactory grammar and lexicon¹. Meanwhile in this chapter nothing more can be attempted than to set before the beginner some of the linguistic problems presented by the Greek of the Septuagint, and to point out the chief features which distinguish it from other forms of the language.

2. The student who enters upon this subject with some knowledge of the Greek New Testament must begin by reminding himself of the different conditions under which the two parts of the Greek Bible were produced. The Greek Old Testament was not like the New Testament the work of a single generation, nor are its books as homogeneous in their general character. The Septuagint is a collection of translations interspersed with original Greek works, the translations belonging partly to the third century B.C., partly to the second and first, and the original works chiefly to the end of this period. Even in the case of the Pentateuch we are not at liberty to assume that the translators worked at the same time or under the same circumstances. These considerations complicate our enquiry, and lead us to expect in the LXX. great varieties of manner and language. In the earlier work we shall meet with the colloquial Greek which the Jews learnt to speak shortly after their settlement in Egypt. Later translations will approximate to the literary style of the second century, except in cases where this tendency has been kept in check by a desire to follow the manner of the older

¹ A lexicon was planned in 1895 by a Cambridge Committee, but the work is suspended for the present. There have now appeared, dealing with the Accidence, R. Helbing's *Grammatik der Septuaginta*, i. *Laut- und Wortlehre*, Göttingen, 1907; and H. St J. Thackeray's *Grammar of the O. T. in Greek*, vol. I. *Introd. Orthography and Accidence*, Cambridge, 1909.

books. Lastly, in the original writings, many of which are relatively late, and in which the writers were free from the limitations that beset the translator, the Greek will be nearly identical with that which was written by the Jewish-Alexandrian historians and philosophers of the time.

3. We begin by investigating the literary conditions under which both the translators and the writers lived at Alexandria.

In the middle of the second century B.C. Polybius¹ found Alexandria inhabited by three races, the native Egyptians, who occupied the site of the old seaport Rhacôtis, the mercenary class (τὸ μισθοφορικόν), who may be roughly identified with the Jews, and the Greeks of the Brucheion, a mixed multitude claiming Hellenic descent and wedded to Hellenic traditions (εἰ μιγάδες, Ἕλληνες ὁμοῦ ἀνέκαθεν ἦσαν, καὶ ἐμέμνητο τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔθους). This fusion of various elements in the Greek population of the city must have existed from the first. The original colony was largely made up of the veterans of Alexander's Macedonian army, volunteers from every part of Greece, and mercenaries from the Greek colonies of Asia Minor, and from Syria. Even in the villages of the Fayûm, as we now know, by the side of the Macedonians there were settlers from Libya, Caria, Thrace, Illyria, and even Italy², and Alexandria presented without doubt a similar medley of Hellenic types. Each class brought with it a dialect or idiom of its own. The Macedonian dialect, e.g., is said to have been marked by certain phonetic changes³, and the use of barbarous terms such as

¹ *ap.* Strab. 797.

² Maliaffy in *Flinders Petrie Papyri*, i. p. 42. Cf. *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 178 f.

³ As the change of φ into β (Βερενίκη for Φερενίκη, &c.), cf. Sturz, *de dial. Mac.*, p. 51. n.

ἀδή = οὐρανός, βεθύ¹ = ἀήρ, δανός = θάνατος, and of Greek words in unusual senses, as παρεμβολή, 'camp,' ῥύμη, street². Some of these passed into the speech of Alexandria, and with them were echoes of the older dialects—Doric, Ionic, Aeolic—and other less known local varieties of Greek. A mongrel *ῥατοῖς*, ἡ Ἀλεξανδρέων διάλεκτος, as it was called in the title of the treatise of Demetrius Ixion, arose out of this confusion of tongues.

No monument of the Alexandrian 'dialect' remains, unless we may seek it in the earlier books of the Alexandrian Greek Bible. We have indeed another source from which light is thrown on the popular Greek of Egypt under the earlier Ptolemies. A series of epistolary and testamentary papyri has recently been recovered from the Fayûm, and given to the world under the auspices of the Royal Irish Academy³; similar collections have been published by Drs Grenfell and Hunt⁴. The Greek of these documents is singularly free from dialectic forms, owing perhaps to local circumstances, as Professor Mahaffy suggests; but the vocabulary has, in common with the LXX., many striking words and forms, some of which are rare elsewhere.

The following list has been formed from the indices to the Flinders Petrie collection: ἀναδενδράς, ἀναφάλακρος, ἀναφάλαντος, ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ, ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν, ἄχυρον, βασιλίσσα, γένημα, διῶρυξ, ἐπιγονή, ἐργοδιώκτης, εὐίλατος, ἐφιδεῖν, ἐφιορκεῖν, θέριστρον, ὀλιγοψυχεῖν, ὀχρωμα, ὄψωνιον, παιδίον, παραδείξαι, παρεπίδημος, περιδέξιον, περιοδεύειν, πρᾶκτωρ, πρεσβύτεροι, στενοχωρεῖν, χῶμα. The Berlin papyri yield many other such words, e.g. ἀναμέτρησις, γλύμμα, δικαίωμα, ἱεροψάλτης, ἱματισμός, καταλοχισμός, κτηνοτρόφος, μισοπονηρία, ὀλοσχερής, συμπλήρωσις, ὑπομνηματισμός.

¹ A list of these words, collected from Hesychius and other lexicographers, may be seen in Sturz, p. 34 ff.

² From Q. Curtius (*De rebus gestis Alexandri M.*, vi. 9. 36) it appears that the Macedonian and the native Greeks understood one another with difficulty.

³ In the *Cunningham Memoirs* for 1891, '93, edited by Prof. Mahaffy.

⁴ In *Fayûm Towns and their Papyri* (London, 1900), pp. 100—112. Further contemporary illustrations of Alexandrian Greek may be found in Wilcken's *Griechische Ostraka* (1899).

The following letter of the time of Philadelphus will serve to shew the style of these documents, and at the same time the use in them of certain Septuagint words. It is addressed by the foremen (δεκάταρχοι) of a gang engaged in a stone quarry to the engineer of the works (ἀρχιτέκτων):

Κλέωνι χαίρειν. οἱ δεκάταρχοι τῶν ἐλευθέρ[ων] λατόμων ἀδικού-
μεθα· τὰ γὰρ ὁμολογηθέντα ὑπὸ Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ διοικητοῦ οὐθὲν
γίνεται ἡμῖν, ἔχει δὲ τὴν γραφὴν Διότιμος. σπούδασον οὖν ἵνα καθὰ
ἐξείληφάμεν ἥδη, ὑπὸ Διονυσίου καὶ Διοτίμου χρηματισθῆ ἡμῖν, καὶ
μὴ τὰ ἔργα ἐνλειφθῆ, καθὰ καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐγένετο. ἐάν γὰρ αἰσθωνται
οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι οὐθὲν ἡμᾶς εἰληφότας τὸν σιδηρὸν ἐνέχυρα θήσουσιν¹.

4. Simultaneously with the growth of the colloquial mixed dialect, a deliberate attempt was made at Alexandria to revive the glories of classical Greek. The first Ptolemy, who had been the companion of Alexander's early days, retained throughout his life a passion for literature and learning. Prompted, perhaps, by Demetrius of Phalerum, Soter founded at Alexandria the famous Museum, with its cloisters and lecture rooms and dining hall where scholars lived a common life under a warden appointed by the King². To Soter is also attributed the establishment of the great library which is said to have contained 400,000 MSS³. Under his successor the Museum and Library became a centre of literary activity, and the age to which the inception of the Greek Bible is usually ascribed produced Aratus, Callimachus, Herondas, Lycophron, and Theocritus. There is however no reason to suppose that the Jewish translators were officially connected with the Museum, or that the classical revival under Soter and Philadelphus affected them directly. Such traces of a literary style as we find in the Greek Pentateuch are probably

¹ *Flinders Petrie Papyri*, II. xiii. (p. 33). The reader will notice several LXX. words (δεκάταρχος=LXX. δεκάδ., διοικητής, χρηματίζεσθαι, ἐνέχυρον). Sometimes these papyri afford illustrations of the LXX. which are not merely verbal; cf. II. xiv. 2 ἐς τὰ ἄχυρα πρὸς τὴν πλινθον.

² Strabo, 794; cf. Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 91 ff.

³ Joseph., *ant.* xii. 2. Seneca, *de tranquill. animae* 9. Cf. Susemihl, *Gesch. d. griech. Litteratur in d. Alexandrinerzeit*, I. 336.

due not to the influence of the scholars of the Royal Library, but to the traditions of Greek writing which had floated down from the classical period and were already shaping themselves under altered conditions into a type of Greek which became the common property of the new Hellenism.

5. The later Greek, the *κοινή* or 'Ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος—the dialect in general use among Greek-speaking peoples from the fourth century onwards¹—was based on Attic Greek, but embraced elements drawn from all Hellenic dialects. It was the literary language of the cosmopolitan Hellas created by the genius of Alexander. The change had begun indeed before Alexander. Even Xenophon allows himself to make free use of words of provincial origin, and to employ Attic words with a new connotation; and the writings of Aristotle mark the opening of a new era in the history of the Greek language². But the golden age of the *κοινή* begins in the second century with Polybius (c. B.C. 145), and extends a century or two beyond the Christian era, producing such writers as Diodorus Siculus (B.C. 40), Strabo (A.D. 10), Plutarch (A.D. 90), and Pausanias (A.D. 160). The language used by the writers of the Greek Diaspora may be regarded as belonging to a subsection of an early stage of the *κοινή*, although, since the time of Scaliger, it has been distinguished from the latter by the term 'Hellenistic'³. A 'Hellenist'⁴ is properly a foreigner who affects Greek manners and speaks the Greek tongue. Thus the Jewish Greek spoken in Palestine was 'Hellenistic' in the strictest sense. The word is often used to describe the Greek of such thoroughly Hellen-

¹ See Professor Jebb in Vincent and Dickson's *Handbook to modern Greek*, p. 290.

² Mullach, *Gramm. d. Vulgarsprache*, p. 48. H. A. A. Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 11 ff.

³ See Winer-Moulton, p. 29.

⁴ Acts vi. 1, xi. 20.

ised writers as Philo and Josephus, and the post-apostolic teachers of the ancient Church; but it is applied with special appropriateness to the Alexandrian Bible and the writings of the New Testament, which approach most nearly to the colloquial Greek of Alexandria and Palestine.

6. Such were the local types of Greek upon which the Jewish translators of the O.T. would naturally mould their work. While the colloquial Greek of Alexandria was their chief resource, they were also influenced, in a less degree, by the rise of the later literary style which was afterwards known as the *κοινή*.

We are now prepared to begin our examination of the vocabulary and grammar of the Alexandrian Bible, and we may commence by testing the vocabulary in the translated books. Let us select for this purpose the first three chapters of Exodus, 1 Kingdoms, 2 Chronicles, Proverbs, and Jeremiah, books which are, perhaps, fairly representative of the translation as a whole. Reading these contexts in the Cambridge manual edition, and underlining words which are not to be found in the Greek prose of the best period, we obtain the following results. In Exod. i.—iii. there are 19 such words; in 1 Regn. i.—iii., 39; in 2 Chron. i.—iii., 27; in Prov. i.—iii., 16; in Jer. i.—iii., 34; making a total of 135 later words in 15 chapters, or nine to a chapter. Of these words 52—considerably more than a third—appear to be peculiar to the LXX., or to have been used there for the first time in extant literature.

The following are the Septuagintal words observed in the above-named passages. *Verbs*: ἀνδριοῦν, δευτεροῦν, διοδοεῖν, ἐνευλογεῖσθαι, ἐξολεθρεύειν, ἐξουθενεῖ¹, εὐοδοῦν, κατακληρονομεῖν, κατασκοπεύειν, κατεμβλέπειν, κατοδυνᾶν, ὀλεθρεύειν, ὀρθοτομεῖν, ὀρθρίζειν, πνευματοφορεῖσθαι, πτωχίζειν, σκοπεύειν, συνεδριάζειν, τριετίζειν, τροφεύειν, φιλεχθρᾶν. *Nouns*: ἀγάπη, ἀσυνθεσία, ἀσφαλτόπισσα, βδέλυγμα, γέννημα, δόμα, ἐργοδιώκτης, θλιμμός, καταπέτασμα, κρίμα, λατόμος, μέθυσμα, ὀλοκαύτωμα, ὀλοκαύτωσις, ὀρόφωμα, παντοκράτωρ,

¹ Or ἐξουθενοῦν, other forms being due to mixture; Thackeray, *Gr. O. T.* p. 105.

προσήλυτος, πρόσκομμα, ροίσκος, σύντριμμα. *Foreign words* (a) with Greek terminations: ἄβρα, θίβις, σίκλος· (b) transliterated: αἰλάμ, δαβείρ, ἐφουδ βάρ, νέβελ, ἔλωε σαβαώθ, οἶφι, σερσέρεθ, χερουβεΐμ.

A similar experiment has been made by Dr H. A. A. Kennedy in reference to one of the books of the Pentateuch. Of 110 late words and forms observed in Deut. i.—x. he found that 66 belonged to Biblical Greek, 16 of these being peculiar to the LXX.; of 313 such words in the entire book, 152 proved to be Biblical, and 36 peculiar to the Old Testament; nearly half belonged to the κοινή, and more than a fourth had been used by the writers of tragedy and comedy.

A complete list of the late words in the LXX. is still a *desideratum*. Lists which have been made for the N.T. shew that out of 950 post-Aristotelian words about 314—just under one third—occur also in the Greek O.T.¹ But the writers of the N.T. have taken over only a part—perhaps a relatively small part—of the vocabulary of the LXX. As Dr T. K. Abbott has pointed out², Psalm l. (li.) alone yields four important words (ἀγαθύνειν, ἀκουτίζειν, ἀνόμημα, ἀνταναιρέιν) which find no place in the N.T. This fact is suggestive, for the Psalm is doctrinally important, and the words are such as would have lent themselves readily to N.T. use.

The following LXX. words are condemned by Phrynichus as non-Attic: αἰχμαλωτίζεσθαι, ἀποτάσσεσθαι, βασιλισσα, βουνός, βρέχειν (in the sense of ὕειν), γηργορεῖν, ἐλεύσεσθαι, ἐξάδελφος, κατόρθωμα, μεγιστάν, μέθυσος, οἰκοδομή, παιδίσκη, πάπυρος, παρεμβολή, πεποιθήσις, πλῆξαι, ράπισμα, ρύμη, σκορπίζεσθαι, σύσσημον. Some of these words are said to be provincialisms; e.g. βουνός is Sicilian, σκορπίζεσθαι is Ionic, παρεμβολή and ρύμη are Macedonian³.

As our knowledge of Alexandrian Greek increases, it may be that the greater part of the words which have been regarded as peculiar to the LXX. will prove to belong to the usage of Egyptian Greek. Deissmann has already shewn that many well-known

¹ Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 62. Cf. the lists in the appendix to Grimm-Thayer's *Lexicon of N. T. Greek* (p. 691 ff.).

² *Essays*, p. 69.

³ See above, p. 292.

Septuagintal words find a place in the Greek papyri of the Ptolemaic period, and therefore presumably belonged to the language of business and conversation at Alexandria. Thus *γογγύζειν* occurs in a papyrus of 241—239 B.C.; *ἐργοδιώκτης*, 255 B.C.; *παρεπίδημος*, 225 B.C.; forms such as *ἦλθα*, *ἐπήλθοσαν*, *γέγοναν*, *οἶδες*, can be quoted from the papyri *passim*; *ἀναστρέφεισθαι* and *ἀναστροφή* in an ethical sense, *λειτουργεῖν* in reference to the service of a deity, *περιτέμνεσθαι* of circumcision, *πρεσβύτερος* of an official, are shewn to have been in use in Egypt under the Ptolemies. In many cases however words receive a new connotation, when they pass into Biblical Greek and come into contact with Hebrew associations. As examples the following may suffice: *ἄγγελος*, *γραμματεὺς*, *διάβολος*, *εἰδωλον*, *ἔθνη*, *ἐκκλησία*, *παντοκράτωρ*, *πεντηκοστή*, *προσήλυτος*, *χριστός*.

The forms of many words have undergone a change since the age of classical Greek. A few specimens may be given from the pages of Phrynichus :

Attic Greek.	Greek of the LXX.	Attic Greek.	Greek of the LXX.
ἀποκρίνασθαι	ἀποκριθῆναι	μιαρός	μειρός
ἀφείλετο	ἀφείλατο	μόχλος	μόκλος (MSS.)
ἄχρι, μέχρι	ἄχρισ, μέχρισ	νεοσσός, -σία	νοσσός, -σία
γενέσθαι	γενηθῆναι	νουμηνία	νεομηνία
γλωσσοκομείων	γλωσσόκομον	ὄρθριος	ὄρθρινός
διψῆν	διψῆν	οὐδέεις	οὐθεῖς ¹
δυοῖν	δυσί	πεινῆν	πεινᾶν
ἐδέετο	ἐδέετο	πήχεων	πηχῶν
εὔρημα	εὔρεμα	ποδαπός	ποταπός
καθῆ	καθώς	ταχύτερον	τάχιον
καταμύειν	καμμύειν		

7. But the vocabulary of the LXX. is not its most characteristic feature. With no other vocabulary than that of the Alexandrian translators, it might be possible to produce a fairly good piece of Greek prose in the style of the later prose writers. It is in its manner, in the construction of the sentences and the disposition of the words, that the Greek of the LXX. is unique, and not only or chiefly in its lexical eccentricities. This may perhaps be brought home to the student most effectually by a comparison of the Greek Bible with two great Hellenistic writers of the first century A.D. (a) In the

¹ *οὐθεῖς* began to yield again to *οὐδέεις* before the end of the second century B.C., and was obsolete at the date when the earliest extant MSS. of the LXX. were written. It is hence an archaism in them (Thackeray, *Gr. O. T.* pp. 58 ff.).

works of Philo we have a cultured Hellenist's commentary on the earlier books of the LXX., and as he quotes his text *verbatim*, the student can discern at a glance the gulf which divides its simple manner, half Semitic, half colloquial, from the easy command of idiomatic Greek manifested by the Alexandrian exegete. We will give two brief specimens.

Philo *de opif. mundi* 7 : φησὶ δ' ὡς ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, τὴν ἀρχὴν παραλαμβάνων, οὐχ ὡς οἴονται τινες τὴν κατὰ χρόνον. χρόνος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν πρὸ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἢ σὺν αὐτῷ γέγονεν ἢ μετ' αὐτόν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ διάστημα τῆς τοῦ κόσμου κινήσεώς ἐστίν ὁ χρόνος, προτέρα δὲ τοῦ κινουμένου κινήσις οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον αὐτὴν ἢ ὕστερον ἢ ἅμα συνίστασθαι, ἀναγκαῖον ἄρα καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἢ ἰσθλικά κόσμου γεγονέναι ἢ νεώτερον ἐκείνου. πρεσβύτερον δ' ἀποφαίνεσθαι τολμᾶν ἀφιλόσοφον. *De migr. Abrahami* 39: ἐὰν μέντοι σκοπούμενος μὴ ῥαδίως καταλαμβάνης ἀζητεῖς, ἐπίμενε μὴ κάμνων. . οὐ χάριν ὁ φιλομαθῆς τοῦ τόπου Συχέμ ἐνείληπται, μεταληφθὲν δὲ τοῦνομα Συχέμ ὠμίαςις καλεῖται, πόνου σύμβολον, ἐπειδὴ τοῖς μέρεσι τοῦτοις ἀχθοφορεῖν ἔθος, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐτέρωθι μὲνηται λέγων ἐπὶ τινος ἀθλητοῦ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον Ὑπέθηκε τὸν ὄμον εἰς τὸ πονεῖν, καὶ ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ γεωργός. ὥστε μηδέποτε, ὦ διάνοια, μαλακισθεῖσα ὀκλάσης, ἀλλὰ κἄν τι δοκῇ δυσθεώρητον εἶναι, τὸ ἐν σαυτῇ βλέπον διανοίξασα διάκυσσον εἴσω.

(b) Josephus is not a commentator, but a historian who uses the LXX. as an authority, and states the facts in his own words. We will contrast a few passages of the Greek Bible with the corresponding contexts in the *Antiquities*.

Exod. ii. 2—4.

ἐσκέπασαν αὐτὸ μῆνας τρεῖς
...ἔλαβεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ
θίζιν, καὶ κατέχρισεν αὐτὴν
ἀσφαλτοπίσση καὶ ἐνέβαλεν τὸ
παιδίον εἰς αὐτήν...καὶ κατεσκόπευεν
ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ μακρόθεν
μαθεῖν τί τὸ ἀποβησόμενον αὐτῷ.

1 Regn. i. 1—4.

ἄνθρωπος ἦν ἐξ Ἀρμαθίμ . .
ἐξ ὄρουσ' Ἐφράμ . . καὶ τούτω δύο
γυναῖκες ὄνομα τῇ μιᾷ Ἄννα καὶ
τῇ μιᾷ Φεννάνα. καὶ ἦν τῇ Φεν-
νάνα παιδία, καὶ τῇ Ἄννα οὐκ ἦν
παιδίον . . πλην ὅτι τὴν Ἄναν
ἠγάπα Ἐλκανὰ ὑπὲρ ταύτην.

Joseph. *ant.* ii. 9. 4.

τρῆς μὲν μῆνας παρ' αὐτοῖς
τρέφουσι λανθάνοντες...μηχανῶν-
ται πλέγμα βίβλινον . . ἔπειτα χρί-
σαντες ἀσφάλτῳ . . ἐντιθέασι τὸ
παιδίον...Μαριάμη δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς
ἀδελφῆ . . ἀντιπαρεξήει φερόμενον
ὅποι χωρήσει ὀψομένη τὸ πλέγμα.

Joseph. *ant.* v. 10. 2.

ἀνὴρ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ πολιτῶν τῆς
Ἐφράμου κληρουχίας Ῥαμαθᾶν
πόλιν κατοικῶν ἐγάμει δύο γυναῖκας
Ἄναν τε καὶ Φεννάναν. ἐκ δὲ
ταύτης καὶ παῖδες αὐτῷ γίνονται,
τὴν δὲ ἐτέραν ἀτεκνον οὔσαν
ἀγαπῶν διετέλει.

2 Chron. iii. 1—2.

καὶ ἤρξατο Σαλωμὸν τοῦ
οἰκοδομεῖν τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου..
καὶ ἤρξατο οἰκοδομῆ ἐν τῷ μηνὶ
τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ τετάρ-
τῳ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ.

Isa. xxxix. 6—7.

ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται καὶ
λήψονται πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ
σου καὶ...εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἦξει...
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων σου ὧν
γεννήσεις λήψονται, καὶ ποιή-
σουσιν σπάδοντας ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ
τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Βαβυλωνίων.

Joseph. ant. viii. 3. 1.

τῆς δὲ οἰκοδομίας τοῦ ναοῦ
Σολομὸν ἤρξατο τέταρτον ἔτος ἤδη
τῆς βασιλείας ἔχων μηνὶ δευτέρῳ.

Joseph. ant. x. 2. 2.

ἴσθι οὐ μετ' ὀλίγον χρόνον εἰς
Βαβυλῶνά σου τοῦτον μετατεθησό-
μενον τὸν πλοῦτον καὶ τοὺς ἐκ-
γόνους εὐνουχισθησομένους καὶ
ἀπολέσαντας τὸ ἄνδρας εἶναι, τῷ
Βαβυλωνίῳ δουλεύουσας βασιλεῖ.

Josephus, it will be seen, has rewritten each passage, and in doing so, has not only modified the vocabulary, but revolutionised the style. On turning from the left hand to the right hand column we pass from a literal translation of Semitic texts to an imitation of classical Greek. But the contrast is not entirely due to the circumstance that the passages taken from the Septuagint are translations, while the *Antiquities* is an original work. Translations, however faithful, may be in the manner of the language into which they render their original. But the manner of the LXX. is not Greek, and does not even aim at being so. It is that of a book written by men of Semitic descent, who have carried their habits of thought into their adopted tongue. The translators write Greek largely as they doubtless spoke it; they possess a plentiful vocabulary and are at no loss for a word, but they are almost indifferent to idiom, and seem to have no sense of rhythm. Hebrew constructions and Semitic arrangements of the words are at times employed, even when not directly suggested by the original. These remarks apply especially to the earlier books, but they are true to a great extent in regard to the translations of the second century; the manner of the older translations naturally became a standard to which

later translators thought it right to conform themselves. Thus the grandson of Jesus son of Sirach writes his prologue in the literary style of the Alexandrian Jews of the time of Euergetes, but in the body of the work he drops into the Biblical manner, and his translation differs little in general character from that of the Greek version of Proverbs.

8. From the general view of the subject we proceed to a detailed account of some of the more characteristic features of the language of the LXX. They fall under three heads—orthography, accident, syntax. Under the second head a full list of examples from the Pentateuch will be given, with the view of familiarising the beginner with the vocabulary of the earlier books.

I. ORTHOGRAPHY.

In the best MSS. of the LXX. as of the N.T. a large number of peculiar spellings occur, of which only a part can be assigned to itacism and other forms of clerical error. In many of the instances where the great uncial MSS. of the Greek Bible persistently depart from the ordinary orthography they have the support of inscriptions contemporary with the translators, and it is manifest that we have before us specimens of a system which was prevalent at Alexandria¹ and other centres of Greek life² during the third and second centuries before Christ.

To a considerable extent the orthography of the MSS. is the same in the LXX. and the N.T. The student may find ample information with regard to the N.T. in the *Notes on Orthography* appended to Westcott and Hort's Introduction, and in the best N. T. grammars (Ph. Buttmann, Winer-

¹ Cf. Sturz, *de dial. Maced.*, p. 111 ff.

² See (e.g.) K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften* (Berlin, 1885); Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1897. E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, 1. Teil, Leipzig, 1898 (Progr. des Gymn. Heilbronn).

Omission of a syllable consisting of ι, as in πείν, ταμείον. Prefixing of a vowel, as in ἐχθές.

Breathings. Rough breathing for smooth: e.g. οὐχ ὀλίγος, ἐφ' ἐλπίδι, ἐφίδε, οὐχ εἰσακούσομαι (Jer. vii. 16), καθ' ὀφθαλμούς (Ezech. xx. 14). Similarly we find ἄλλος, ἀλώπηξ, ἐνιαυτός Dt. xiv. 20 (Nestle, *Septuagintastudien* i. p. 19, ii. pp. 12, 13, 20 f.). Smooth breathing for rough: οὐκ ἔνεκεν (2 Regn. vii. 12), οὐκ ὑπάρχει (Job xxxviii. 26, A).

Abnormal spellings such as these occur on every page of an uncial MS. of the LXX. and sometimes cause great perplexity to an editor of the text. So far as they correctly represent the written or spoken Greek of the period, their retention is, generally speaking, desirable. In some cases the MSS. are unanimous, or each MS. is fairly persistent in its practice; in others, the spelling fluctuates considerably. The Cambridge manual LXX. usually adopts a spelling which is persistently given by the MS. whose text it prints, and on the same principle follows the fluctuations of its MS. where they are of any special interest. But the whole question of orthography is far from having reached a settlement.

II. ACCIDENCE. We will deal with (i.) the formation of words, (ii.) the declension of nouns, (iii.) the conjugation of verbs.

(i.) Formation of words.

(a) Words formed by termination:

Verbs. In -οῦν from nouns in -ος: ἀμαυροῦν, ἀποδεκατοῦν, ἀπολυτροῦν, ἀποτυφλοῦν, ἀσφαλτοῦν, διαβιοῦν, ἐκτυποῦν, ἐλαττονοῦν, ἐπιδιπλοῦν, ἐπιπεμπτοῦν, ἐρυθροδανοῦν, εὐοδοῦν, θανατοῦν, καταχρυσοῦν, κυροῦν, παλαιοῦν, παραζηλοῦν, περικυκλοῦν, συγκυροῦν. In -ίζειν, -άζειν, -ιάζειν, -ύζειν: ἀγιάζειν, αἰρετίζειν, ἀκουτίζειν, ἀναβιβάζειν, ἀναθεματίζειν, ἀπογαλακτίζειν, αὐγάζειν, ἀφαγνίζειν, ἀφανίζειν, ἀφορίζειν, βαδίζειν, γελοιάζειν, γρύζειν, δανίζειν, διαγογγύζειν, διασκεδάζειν, διασκορπίζειν, διαχωρίζειν, ἐκθερίζειν, ἐκκλησιάζειν, ἐκμελίζειν, ἐκσπερματίζειν, ἐκτοκίζειν, ἐνταφιάζειν, ἐνυπνιάζειν, ἐνωτίζεσθαι, ἐξεικονίζειν, ἐξετάζειν, ἐξοπλίζειν, ἐξορκίζειν, ἐπικλύζειν, ἐπιραντίζειν, ἐπισκιάζειν, ἐπιστοιβάζειν, ἐπιφημίζειν, θυσιάζειν, καταβιάζειν, κατασκιάζειν, κατασοφίζειν, κληδονίζειν, κομίζειν, κουφίζειν, λεπίζειν, λευκαθίζειν, μακαρίζειν, μελίζειν, οἰωνίζειν, ὄνυχίζειν, ὀπτάζειν, ὀρθρίζειν, παραδειγματίζειν, παραδοξάζειν, παραλογίζειν, περιασπί-

ζειν, περιονυχίζειν, περιραντίζειν, πλεονάζειν, πολυχρονίζειν, προσεγγίζειν, προσοχθίζειν, σαββατίζειν, σκεπάζειν, σπερματίζειν, στηρίζειν, στοχάζειν, συμποδίζειν, συναθροίζειν, συνοικίζειν, σφακελίζειν, σχολάζειν, τειχίζειν, φαυλίζειν, φλογίζειν, χλωρίζειν, χρονίζειν, ψωμίζειν.

In -εύειν: ἀγχιστεύειν, διοδοεύειν, ἐξολεθρεύειν, ἱερατεύειν, καταδυναστεύειν, κατακυριεύειν, καταφυτεύειν, κατοχεύειν, μεταλλεύειν, προφητεύειν, πρωτοτοκεύειν, στρατοπεδεύειν, τροφεύειν, ὑδρεύειν.

Nouns. In -μα, from verbs: ἀγίασμα, ἄγνισμα, ἀδικημα, αἰνισμα, ἀλλαγμα, ἀνάστημα, ἀνόμημα, ἀνταπόδομα, ἀπόδομα, ἀσέβημα, αὔγασμα, ἀφαίρεμα, βδέλυγμα, διήγημα, δικαίωμα, διόρυγμα, διχοτόμημα, δόμα, ἐγκατάλιμμα, ἔδесμα, ἐκκόλασμα, ἐκτύπωμα, ἐπίθεμα, ἐπικάλυμμα, ἐπιτήδευμα, ἔψημα, ἡμίσευμα, θήρευμα, θυμίαμα, θυσίασμα, ἱεράτευμα, κάρπωμα, κατάκαυμα, καταπέτασμα, καύχημα, κλέμμα, λέπισμα, ὀλοκαύτωμα, ὄραμα, ὀφείλημα, ὀχύρωμα, παράδειγμα, παράθεμα, παράρνημα, περίθεμα, περίψωμα, προσόχθισμα, πρόσταγμα, πρωτογένημα, στερέωμα, συνάντημα, συνκάλυμμα, σύστημα, τάγμα, τίμημα, τόξευμα, φαλάκρωμα, φύλαγμα, φύραμα, χόρτασμα, χώνευμα.

In -μός, from verbs: ἀφανισμός, γογγυσμός, ἐνδελεχισμός, ἐνπορισμός, ἐξίλασμός, ἐπισιτισμός, ἱματισμός, καθαρισμός, μηρκισμός, οἰωνισμός, ὀρισμός, ὀρκισμός, παροξυσμός, πειρασμός, σταθμός, στεναγμός, φραγμός, χωρισμός.

In -σις, from verbs: ἀναίρεσις, ἀνάμνησις, ἀποκιδάρωσις, ἄφεισις, βεβαίωσις, γόγγυσις, γύμνωσις, δήλωσις, διάβασις, διασάφισις, ἐκδίκησις, ἔκστασις, ἔκχυσις, ἐπερώτησις, κατακάρπωσις, κατάλειψις, κατάσχεσις, κατοίκησις, ὀλοκάρπωσις, ὀλοκαύτωσις, ὁμοίωσις, πληρωσις, πόρευσις, πῶσις, σύγκρασις, συνάντησις, συντίμησις, σύστασις, ταπεινώσις, ὑπερόρασις, ὑπέροψις, ὑπόστασις, φαῦσις, χαράκωσις, χήρευσις.

In -ή, from verbs: ἀλοιφή, ἀναζυγή, ἀποσκευή, ἀποστολή, ἀποστροφή, ἀφή, διασκευή, δοχή, ἐκτριβή, ἐντολή, ἐπαγωγή, ἐπισκοπή, καταφυγή, ὀλή, παραβολή, προνομή, προφυλακή, συναγωγή, τροπή.

In -τής, from verbs (m.): αἰνισματιστής, ἐνταφιασττής, ἐξηγητής, ἐπιθυμητής, ἐρμηνευτής, πολεμιστής, ραφιδευτής, σκιπαστής, σχολαστής.

Adjectives. In -ινος: δειλίνος, δερμάτινος, καρύνος, ὄστράκινος, πρᾶσινος, στυράκινος, φλόγινος.

In -ιος: ἐνιαύσιος, ὁμομήτριος, πολυχρόνιος, ὑποχείριος.

In -ικός: ἀρσενικός, εἰρηνικός, λαμπηνικός, λειτουργικός, λιθουργικός, μυρεψικός, πατρικός, ποικιλτικός, πολεμικός, προφασιστικός.

In -τος: ἀκατασκευάστος, ἄλυσιδωτός, ἄρατος, ἀπερικάθατος, ἐπικατάρατος, εὐλογητός, λαξευτός, μισθωτός, ὀνομαστός, πλεοναστός, φορολογιστός.

(b) Words formed by composition :

Verbs compounded with two prepositions: ἀνθυφαιρεῖν, ἀνταποδοῦναι, ἀποκαθιστᾶν, ἐνκαταλείπειν, ἐν περιπατεῖν, ἐξαναστέλλειν, ἐπισυνιστᾶν, κατεμβλέπειν, παρεμβάλλειν, συναναλαμβάνειν, συνανα-

στρέφεται, συναπολλύειν, συνεκπολεμούν, συνεπακολουθεῖν, συνεπισκέπτειν, συνκατακληρονομείν, συνπαραλαμβάνειν, συνπροπέμπειν.

Nouns. Compounded with nouns: ἀσφαλτόπισσα, δασύπους, ἑτερόζυγος, καμηλοπάρδαλις, κολοβόρις, μακροήμερος, μακροχρόνιος, μικρόθυμος, ὀλόκληρος, ὀλοπόρφυρος, πολυέλεος, πολυχρόνιος, σκληροτραχίλος, χοιρογρύλλιον.

Compounded with a prefix or preposition: ἀντιπρόσωπος, Ἀντιλίβανος, ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ, ἀρχιδεσμώνης, ἀρχιερεύς, ἀρχιμάγειρος, ἀρχαιονοχός, ἀρχισιτοποιός, ἐπίπεμπος, εὐπρόσωπος, κατάλοιπος, κατάξηρος, παράλιος, παρεπίδημος, περιδέξιον, περίλυπος, περίοικος, περίχωρος, ὑπανδρος, ὑπερμήκης.

Compounded with a verb stem, and forming a fresh noun or a verb: ἀνεμοφθόρος, γλωσσούμητος, ἐργοδιώκτης, θανατηφόρος, θηριάλωτος, θηρόβρωτος, ἵπποδρόμος, ἰσχυρόφωνος, κτηνοτρόφος, νυμφαγωγός, σιτοποιός, σφυροκόπος, τελεσφόρος, χαρτοποιός, διχοτομείν, ζωογονεῖν, κλοποφορεῖν, κρεανομείν, λιθοβολεῖν, λιμαγχοεῖν, νευροκοπεῖν, ὀρنيθοσκοπεῖν, συμβολοκοπεῖν, τεκνοποιεῖν, ψωαραγιάν.

(ii.) Declension of nouns:

Declension 1. Nouns in -ρά, -νία, form gen. in ης, dat. η, μαχαίρη, μαχαίρης Gen. xxvii. 40, Exod. xv. 9 ("vielfach bei A, bes. in Jerem.," W.-Schm.), κυνομύις Exod. viii. 17, ἐπιβεβηκύνης 1 Regn. xxv. 20.

Declension 2. Certain nouns in -οὺς end also in -ος, e.g. χεῖμαρρος, ἀδελφιδός. The Attic form in -εὼς disappears; e.g. λαός and ναός are written for λεὼς and νεὼς—the latter however occurs in 2 Macc. (A). Nouns in -αρχος pass occasionally into the first declension, e.g. τοπάρχης Gen. xli. 34, κωμάρχης Esth. ii. 3, γενεσιάρχης Sap. xiii. 3 ὅστέον usu. contr. in nom. acc., uncontr. in gen. dat.

Declension 3. Uncontracted forms are frequent, as βαθία Job xii. 22, πύχων, χεῖλέων, and in the plural nom. and acc. of neuters in -as, as κέρατα, πέρατα. Γῆρας makes gen. γήρους dat. γήρει. Metaplasmus occurs in some words, e.g. δύο, δυσί, πᾶν with masc. noun, πύλη, πύλαιν (3 Regn. xxii. 11, A), σάββατα, σάββασιν, τέσσαρες, τεσσάρους, χεῖρ, χεῖραν. Acc. in -αν for -α, νύκταν Exod. xiii. 21, τίναν Nah. iii. 19, and freq. in ♂ and A¹.

Proper nouns. Many are mere transliterations and indeclinable, e.g. Ἀδάμ, Ἀβραάμ, Ἰωσήφ, Σαμουήλ, Δαυείδ, Ἀχαάβ, Ἡλείου, Ἐλειαίε, Δανιήλ. On the other hand some well-known names receive Greek terminations and are declined, as Μωσῆς or Μωσῆς, Ἰησοῦς, Ἐζεκίας, Ἡσαίας, Ἰερემίας; while some are found in both forms, e.g. we have both Ἡλείου and Ἡλ(ε)ίας, Μανασσή and Μανασσῆς, Σολομών indecl. and Σολομών gen. -μώνος or -μώντος. But in the translated books the indeclinable forms prevail, and there is no appearance of the forms Ἀβραμος, Ἰσράηλος, Ἰώσηπος,

¹ See Thackeray, *Gr. O. T.* pp. 146, 147, "always a vulgarism"; also J. Psichari, *Essai sur le grec de la Septante*, in *Revue des Études Juives*, LV. No. 110, p. 164 ff.

which are familiar to the reader of Josephus. In the case of local names transliteration is usual, e.g. Ἱεροσολήμ, Βηθλέεμ, Βαϊθῆλ, Σειών. A few however have Greek terminations, as Σαμάρεια or Σαμαρία, Ἰόρδανος, and some names of foreign localities are Hellenised, as Βαβυλών, Συρία, ἡ ἔρυθρὰ θάλασσα, Ἰδουμαία, Αἴγυπτος, and the two Egyptian towns Ἡρώων πόλις (Gen. xlvii. 28), Ἡλίου πόλις (Exod. i. 11). The declension of the Hellenised names presents some irregularities; thus we find Μωυσῆς, -σῆ, -σεῖ, -σῆν· Ἰησοῦς, -σοῦ, -σοῖ, -σοῦν· Μανασσῆς, -σῆ.

(iii.) Conjugation of verbs

Augments. Doubled, as in *κεκατήρανται* Num. xxii. 6, xxiv. 9, ἀπεκατέστησεν Gen. xxiii. 16, παρεσυνέβληθη Ps. xlviii. 13, 21 (A). Prefixed to prepositions, e.g. ἐπρονόμουνσαν Num. xxi. 1, Deut. ii. 35, ἐπροφήτευσαν Num. xi. 25 f., ἠνωτίσαντο 2 Esdr. xix. 30 (B). Lengthened, as ἤμελλον Sap. xviii. 4, ἠβουλόμην Isa. i. 29, xiii. 9, ἠδυνήθην, ἠδυνάσθην, 2 Chr. xx. 37, Jer. v. 4. Omitted, as in ἀνέθη Jud. viii. 3, ἀφέθη Isa. xxxiii. 24, αὐτάρκησεν Deut. xxxii. 10, ἐξολόθρευεν 1 Chr. xxi. 15, ἴδεν Gen. i. 4, κατορθώθη 2 Chr. xxxv. 10.

Tenses and Persons. (1) Verbs in -ω. New presents, as ἀμφιάζω, γρηγορῶ, βέννω, κτένω. Futures and aorists¹ with reduplication: κεκράξομαι (Job vi. 5), ἐκέκραξα (Num. xi. 2), ἐπεποιθήσα (Jud. ix. 26 A); cf. ἐκέκραγον, Isa. vi. 3. Contracted futures in -ῶ from -άσω: ἐργᾶ Gen. iv. 2, ἀρπᾶ Lev. xix. 13, ἐκδικᾶται Deut. xxxii. 43, ἐγκαυχᾶ Ps. li. 3, συμβιβᾶ Isa. xl. 13, ἀποδοκιμῶ Jer. xxxviii. (xxxix.) 37. Futures (and aor.) with short vowels, πονέσω, Isa. xix. 10. Irregular futures: ἔδομαι, φάγομαι, χεῶ (Exod. iv. 9). Second aor. forms with termination in -α: εἶδαμεν 1 Regn. x. 14, ἔφυγαν 2 Regn. x. 14, ἐφάγαμεν 2 Regn. xix. 42, ἐλάτῳ Esth. v. 4. Person endings: 2nd p. s. pres. pass. or middle in -σαι: πίεσαι, φάγεσαι (Ezech. xiii. 18, Ruth ii. 9, 14), ἀπεξενούσαι 3 Regn. xiv. 6. 3rd p. pl. imperf. and aor. act. in -σαν: ἐγεννώσαν Gen. vi. 4, ἦλθσαν Exod. xv. 27, κατέλιπον Exod. xvi. 24, κατενοούσαν Exod. xxxiii. 8, ἠνομούσαν Ezech. xxii. 11; cf. the opt. αἰνέσαισαν Gen. xlix. 8, ἔλθοισαν Deut. xxxiii. 16. 3rd p. pl. aor. mid. in -εντο: ἐπελάθεντο Jud. iii. 7 (A), Hos. xiii. 6 (B), Jer. xviii. 15 (B*A), &c. 3rd p. pl. perf. act. in -αν: ἐώρακαν Deut. xi. 7; πέποιθαν, Judith vii. 10. 2nd p. s. 1st aor. and perf. act. in -ες; ἀπέσταλκες Exod. v. 22; ἔδωκες, 2 Esdr. xix. 10, Ezech. xvi. 21. (2) Verbs in -μι. From εἶμι we have ἤμην, ἦσθα. From κάθημαι, κάθου Ps. cix. (cx.) 1. From ἴστημι, ἕστηκέναι, ἕστηκώς. From δίδωμι, ἐδίδοτο Exod. v. 13 (A), Jer. xii. 34; δοῖ, Ps. xli. 3 (B), 2 Regn. iii. 39 (A).

III. SYNTAX.

Many of the irregularities which fall under this head are

¹ See, however, Lightfoot on Clem. Rom. i. 34; Thackeray, *Gr. O. T.*, p. 235.

due to the influence of the Hebrew text or of Semitic habits of thought. These will be treated in the next section. In this place we shall limit ourselves to constructions which appear to be characteristic of the Greek idiom used by the translators.

Cases and Numbers. Nom. for voc., e.g. ὁ θεός for θεέ, Ps. xxi. 2, esp. in the phrase Κύριε ὁ θεός; θυγάτηρ=θύγατερ, Ruth ii. 2, 22, iii. 1, &c. Disuse of the Dual.

Comparison. Use of a preposition with the positive for the comparative, e.g. μέγας παρὰ πάντας, Exod. xviii. 11; ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ δέκα, 1 Regn. i. 8.

Numerals. ἑπτὰ=ἑπτάκις, Gen. iv. 24. Omission of καί when numbers are coupled, e.g. δέκα δύο, δέκα ἕξ, δέκα πέντε, &c.

Verbs. Relative rarity of the optative mood¹, and disappearance of that mood in dependent clauses. Periphrasis with εἰμί, e.g. πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι, 2 Regn. xxii. 3; ἴσθι πεποιθὼς, Prov. iii. 5. Indicative with ἄν: imperf. and aor., ὅταν εἰσῆρχετο, Gen. xxxviii. 9; ὅταν ἐπῆρην, Exod. xvii. 11; ὅταν κατέβη, Num. xi. 9; ἦνίκα ἂν εἰσπορεύετο, Jud. vi. 3; ἐὰν ἔσπειραν, Jud. vi. 2. Coordination of indicative with conjunctive: Exod. viii. 8 ἔξαποστελῶ αὐτούς, καὶ θύσωσι, Lev. vi. 2 ψυχὴ ἐὰν ἀμάρτη καὶ...παρίδη...καὶ ψεύσῃται, ἢ ἠδίκησεν...ἢ εὔρεν...καὶ ψεύσῃται...καὶ ὁμῶς κτλ. Use of infinitive, with or without the article, to express object, purpose, subject, or result¹; e.g. (a) ἐξήτει ἀνελεῖν, Exod. ii. 15; ἤρξατο τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν, 2 Chr. iii. 1; (b) παραγίνεται βοθηῖν, 2 Regn. viii. 5; ἀπέστειλεν τοῦ ἰδεῖν, Gen. viii. 7; (c) συνέβη κρεμασθῆναι, Gen. xli. 13; τὸ προσκολλᾶσθαι ἀγαθόν Ps. lxxii. 28; (d) ὁ θεὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ θανατῶσαι καὶ ζωοποιῆσαι, 4 Regn. v. 7.

Connexion of the sentence. Use of gen. abs. in reference to the subject of the verb: e.g. πορευομένου σου...ὄρα, Exod. iv. 21. Anacoluthon: ἰδὼν δὲ Φαραῶ...ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία Φαραῶ, Exod. ix. 7. Use of the finite verb where the classical language prefers to employ a participle.

9. Besides the non-classical forms and constructions which may fairly be placed to the credit of Alexandrian Greek, the translated books of the Greek Bible naturally exhibit a large

¹ Yet see Job iii. 3 ff., xxiv. 18 f., Ps. cviii. (cix.) 14, Isai. xlix. 15, Ps. lxii. (lxiii.) 6, Prov. xxv. 26, and the exx. quoted on p. 305.

² I follow mainly the classification of C. W. Votaw in his excellent thesis on the subject (Chicago, 1896). Votaw has shewn that in the translated books of the O. T. there is almost an equal number of cases of the anarthrous and the articular inf., whereas in the N. T. the articular inf. is seldom found except in St Luke.

(הַבְּרָכָה...אֲשֶׁר); Prov. iii. 15 ὄν...αὐτῶν. A similar redundancy occurs with relative adverbs: Deut. ix. 28, ὅθεν...ἐκείθεν (הַיְהוּדָה...מִיְהוּדָה); 2 Chr. i. 3, οὐδ'...ἐκεῖ.

Verbs. The following Hebraisms may be specially noted. Various phrases used to represent the Heb. inf. abs. when prefixed to a finite verb, e.g. Exod. iii. 7, ἰδὼν ἴδον (רָאָה רְאִיתִי); Deut. xxxi. 18, ἀποστροφῇ ἀποστρέψω (הִסְתַּרְתָּ אֶסְתַּר); also the Heb. idiom לְיִקְרָא: e.g. Exod. xiv. 13, οὐ προσθήσεσθε ἔτι ἰδεῖν, 1 Regn. iii. 6 προσέθετο καὶ ἐκάλεσεν (cf. v. 8 προσέθ. καλέσαι, Job xxix. 1 προσθεῖς εἶπεν (וַיִּקְרָא...וַיִּבְרָא)). Constructions with prepositions contrary to the Greek idiom: βδελύσσεσθαι ἀπό (מִפְּנֵי), Exod. i. 12; φείδεσθαι ἐπί, Deut. vii. 16; ἐπερωτᾶν ἐν Κυρίῳ (בְּיְהוָה לְשׂוֹאֵל), 1 Regn. x. 22; εὐδοκεῖν ἐν or ἐπί (בְּיְהוָה). Hebrew forms of adjuration as 1 Regn. iii. 14 εἰ (אִם) ἐξίλασθήσεται, ib. 17 τάδε ποιήσει σοι ὁ θεός, ἐάν... A question standing for the expression of a wish: Num. xi. 29 καὶ τίς δόξη πάντα τὸν λαὸν Κυρίου...; Ps. lii. (liii.) 6 τίς δώσει ἐκ Σειῶν τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; Ἐγὼ εἰμι followed by an ind. (Jud. vi. 18 ἐγὼ εἰμι καθίσομαι, 2 Regn. ii. 2 ἐγὼ εἰμι πορεύσομαι)—a construction limited in B to Judges, Ruth, 2—4 Regn. Periphrases such as ἔσομαι διδόναι (Tob. v. 15, BA). Pleonastic use of λέγων = λέω, often solocistically: e.g. Gen. xv. 1 ἐγενήθη ῥῆμα Κυρίου...λέγων, xlv. 16 διεβοήθη ἡ φωνὴ...λέγοντες.

Particles. Pleonastic use of καί and δέ, (1) in an apodosis, e.g. Num. xv. 14, ἐάν...προσγένηται, ..., καὶ ποιήσει κάρπωμα; Prov. i. 28, ἔσται ὅταν...ἐγὼ δέ...; (2) after a participle: Num. xxi. 11, καὶ ἐξάραντες...καὶ παρενέβαλον. Use of καί in a coordinated clause, where a dependent clause might have been expected; e.g. Num. xxxv. 2, συντάξεις τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, καὶ δώσουσιν κτλ.

Prepositions. See under *Verbs*. Peculiar uses of the Heb. prepositions are often reflected in the Greek; e.g. 1 Regn. i. 24, ἀνέβη ἐν μύσῳ (מִפְּנֵי); Lev. xxi. 10, ὁ μέγας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ (הַגָּדוֹל מֵאֶחָיו). A number of new prepositions or prepositional phrases are used to express the Heb. לְפָנַי, e.g. ἐναντι, ἀπέναντι, κατέναντι, ἐνώπιον, κατενώπιον, ἀπό, ἐπί, πρό, προσώπου. Similarly ὀπίσω represents אַחֲרַי; ἐν μέσῳ, ἀνὰ μέσον, διὰ μέσου = בֵּתוּן, ἀπὸ (ἐκ) μέσου = מֵתוּן; διὰ χειρός, εἰς χεῖρας, ἐκ χειρός = מִיַּד, בְּיַד, ὁδόν = דֶּרֶךְ. The use of σύν to express the prefix אַחֲרַי, which is characteristic of Aquila, occurs in codex A six times in 3 Regn., once in Esther (where it probably came from the Hexapla), and frequently in Ecclesiastes, where even

cod. B shews this peculiarity, e.g. Eccl. ii. 17 ἐμίσησα σὺν τὴν ζώην (םיִשְׂתִּי-תִּשָׂא)¹.

10. Both the vocabulary and the syntax of the LXX. exhibit remarkable affinities with the modern language. Mr Geldart (*Modern Greek Language*, p. 101 f.) urges the study of modern Greek upon Biblical students on the ground that "the Greek of the present day affords a better commentary on the language of the LXX. and of the N.T. than the writings of contemporary historians, rhetoricians, grammarians and philosophers²." He adds: "The phraseology of the LXX. is modern to an extent which is quite marvellous...let me mention a few well-known words common to the LXX. and modern Greek: ἐπισκέπτομαι, ἀποκρίνομαι, ἐπιστρέφω, προσκυνῶ, ἐνώπιον, πρόσκομμα, πειράζω, ἀκολουθῶ, κοιμῶμαι, ὄλος, κατοικῶ, καθέζομαι, καθίζω, τὰ ἱμάτια, ὑπάγω... The Greek of the N.T....is by no means so vulgar, so merely a vernacular, as that of the LXX." This estimate is perhaps overdone; certainly there are considerations which suggest caution in the use of modern Greek usage as a key to the meaning of the LXX. But the general similarity of the Alexandrian vocabulary and, to a less extent, of the Alexandrian syntax to those of the spoken language indicates a common affinity to the old colloquial Greek, which ultimately triumphed over the classical standards³. That the resemblance is less marked in the case of the New Testament is due to the different circumstances under which it was written. Bilingual Palestinian writers of the first century naturally possessed a more limited vocabulary and employed a more chastened style than Alexandrian translators of the time of Philadelphus and Euergetes, who had been born in the heart of a great Greek city teeming with a cosmopolitan population.

¹ See above, p. 39, n. 2.

² See Psichari, *op. cit.*, p. 179 ff.; S. Menardos, *The Value of Byzantine and Modern Greek*, Oxford, 1909.

³ Cf. Prof. Jebb in Vincent and Dickson, p. 289: "modern Greek has inherited, not only the ancient literature, but also an oral tradition which preceded that literature, which co-existed with it, and which has survived it."

II. Some of the non-canonical books of the Greek Old Testament, which were either (a) loosely translated or paraphrased from a Hebrew original, or (b) originally written in Greek, need separate treatment in regard to their lexical and grammatical character. Such are (a) 1 Esdras, Daniel (LXX.), (b) Wisdom, 2—4 Maccabees.

The *lexicography* of the 'Apocrypha' has been separately treated by C. A. Wahl (*Clavis libr. V. T. apocryphorum philologica*, Leipzig, 1853), and with the help of the Oxford Concordance it may be studied independently. But, for the sake of the student who has not the necessary leisure to examine the subject in detail, it is desirable to notice here the more conspicuous words in each of the books referred to above.

I ESDRAS.

ἀκολούθως = κατά, dat. (2 Esdr., 2 Macc.)	εὐφύης (Sap., 2 Macc.)
ἀναγνώστῃς = γραμματεὺς, 2 Esdr.	ἱερόδουλος
ἀναμφισβητήτως	ἱεροψάλτης
ἀναπλήρωσις (Dan.)	ἱστορεῖν
ἀνιεροῦν (3 Macc.)	καταλοχισμός (1, 2 Chr.)
ἀντίγραφον (Esth., Ep.-Jer., 1, 2 Macc.)	κολακεύειν (Job ¹ , Sap. ¹)
ἀντιπαρατάσσειν	ληστεύειν
ἀπονοεῖσθαι (2 Macc.)	λωποδοτεῖν
ἀποσημαίνειν	μανιάκη (Dan.)
ἀποστατίς (2 Esdr.)	μεγαλειότης
βιβλιοφυλάκιον	μεριδαρχία
δημαγωγεῖν, -γία	μεταγενέστερος
διαδῆμα (Esth., Sap., Isa., 2, 4 Macc.)	ὀνοματογραφία
δογματίζειν (Esth., Dan., 2, 3 Macc.)	ὀρκωμοσία (Ez.)
δυσσέβεια, -βημα (2 Macc.)	πειθαρχεῖν (Jer., Dan.)
εἰδωλείον (Dan., 1 Macc.)	προκαθηγεῖσθαι (cod. B)
ἐμφυσιούν	προπομπή
ἐπακουστός	προσκεφάλαιον (Ez.)
ἐπιδόξως	συνβραβεύειν
ἐπισπύδειν (Esth. ¹ , Prov. ¹)	σωματοφύλαξ (Judith, 2 Macc.)
ἐρωμένη, ἡ (cod. B)	ὕπομνηματίζειν
εὐθαρσής (1, 2 Macc.)	φορολογία (1 Macc.)
εὐπρεπῶς (Sap.)	χαμαιπετής
	χάσκειν
	χρηματιστήριον
	χρυσοχάλινος (2 Macc.)

DANIEL.

ἀποθανμάζειν (Sir.)	κοπανίζειν (3 Regn.)
ἀποτυμπανίζειν (3 Macc.)	μανιάκης (1 Esdr. ¹)
ἀρχιεύνουχος	μεγαλειότης (1 Esdr., Jer. ¹)
ἀρχιπατριώτης (Jos. ¹)	πρόσοψις (2 Macc.)
δαμάζειν	σαμβύκη
δημύειν	σοφιστής (Exod. ¹)
διαμελίζειν	συναλοᾶν
διάπυρος (3 Macc.)	συνμολύνεσθαι
διοικητής (2 Esdr., Tob.)	σύριγξ
ἐγκύκλιος	ὑπατος
ἐποργίζεσθαι (2 Macc.)	ὑπεραινετός
ἐστιατορία (4 Regn.)	ὑπερένδοξος
εὐκαταφρόνητος	ὑπερμεγέθης (1 Chr.)
εὐσήμως	ὑπερψοῦν (Ps. ²)
θερμασία (Jer. ¹)	ὑπερφερής
κηλιδοῦσθαι (Jer.)	φιλόσοφος (4 Macc.)
κονίαμα	

WISDOM.

This book contains an unusually large vocabulary, consisting in great part of compound words. The following list, taken from c. i.—vi., will suffice to shew its lexical character*.

ἀγερωχία (2, 3 Macc.)	αὐτοσχεδίως
ἀδιάπτωτος	ἀφθόνως
ἀθανασία (4 Macc.)	βασκανία (4 Macc.)
ἀκαταμάχητος	δεκαμηνιαίος
ἀκηλίδωτος (Ps. ¹)	διωρθωτής
ἀκοίμητος	δύσχρηστος (Isa. ¹)
ἀλαζονεύεσθαι (Ps. ¹)	ἐπισφαλῶς
ἀμάραντος	ἐπιτήδειος (1 Chr., 1—3 Macc.)
ἀμόλυντος	ἐπιφημίζειν (Deut. ¹)
ἀναποδισμός	ἐργατεία
ἀνεκλιπής	εὐκλής (Jer. ¹)
ἀνεξικακία	εὐκυκλος
ἀνυπόκριτος	εὐμορφία (3 Macc.)
ἀπήμαντος	εὔστοχος
ἀπολογία	θυμῆρης
ἀπότομος, ἀποτόμως	ιδιότης (3 Macc.)
ἀτέλεστος	κακοπραγία
ἀτίμητος (3 Macc.)	κακότεχνος

* Cf. *supra*, p. 268 f., for some interesting examples from other parts of the book.

καταδαπανᾶν	πολύγονος (4 Macc.)
κατάλυπος	πομπεύειν
κατάχρεως	πρωτόπλαστος
μακρόβιος (Isa. ¹)	στεφανηφορέιν
μονοήμερος	συγγνωστός
ὁμοιοπαθής (4 Macc.)	συλλογισμός (Ex. ¹)
ὄπλοποιεῖν	τεκμήριον (3 Macc.)
παραδόξος (Judith, Sir., 2, 4 Macc.)	φιλόανθρωπος
παραμύθιον	χρησιμεύειν (Sir.)

In 2—4 Maccabees the reader finds himself at length face to face with the full richness of the Alexandrian literary style, as it was written by cultured Hellenists of the second and first centuries B.C. The writers, especially the writer of 4 Maccabees, may be said to revel in the use of compound words, many of which may have been of their own coinage. Specimens follow.

2 MACCABEES.

ἀγορανομία	εὐαπάντητος
ἀκαριαῖος	θεομαχεῖν
ἀκρόπολις	θωρακισμός
ἀκρωτηριάζειν	κατευθεκτεῖν
ἄλλοφυλισμός	λεληθότως
ἀναλημπτέος	λιτανεία
ἀπευθανατίζειν	ὄπλολογεῖν
ἀρχηγενέτης	πατρῶος
ἀσυλία	πολεμοτροφεῖν
αὐθαίρετος	πολυπραγμανεῖν
βαρβαροῦν	προσαναλέγεσθαι
δειλανδριάν	προσυπομνήσκειν
δευτερολογεῖν	σπλαγχνισμός
διάστασις	συμμισοπονηρεῖν
δοξικός	συνεκκεντεῖν
δυσπέτημα	τερατοποιός
ἐπευλαβεῖσθαι	ψυχαγωγία

3 MACCABEES.

ἀλογιστία	ἀνέφικτος
ἀμνησικακία	ἀσινής
ἀνείκαστος	βαρυχηής
ἀνεπίστρεπτος	βυθοτρεφής

γραφικός	νεανικός
δημοτελής	πανόδυρος
δικαιοκρίτης	παραναγινώσκειν
δυσαιάκτος	πολύδακρυς
εὐκατάλλακτος	προκατασκιροῦν
κισσόφυλλον	σιδηρόδεσμος
λαογραφία	ὑπομαστιαῖος
λιβανοῦν	ὑπόφρικος
μεγαλοκράτωρ	φοβεροειδής
μεγαλομερής	χαρτηρία
μιεροφαγία	χειρονομία
μίσυβρις	ψυχουλκείν

4 MACCABEES.

αἰμοβόρος	ἱεροπρεπής
ἀναμοχλεύειν	ἰσόπαλις
ἀποσκυθίζειν	καλλίπαις
ἀρθρεμβύλος	κηρογονία
ἀσθενόψυχος	μαλακοψυχεῖν
ἀσυρής	ξίφηφόρος
αἰτοδέσποτος	ὄροφουτεῖν
γαλακτοποιεῖν	παθοκρατεῖσθαι, -τία
γαλακτοτροφία	παιδοχαρακτήρ
εἰδωλόθυτος	πηδαλιουχεῖν
ἐναγκάλισμα	προσεπικατατείνειν
ἐναποσφραγίζειν	συμπάθεια
ἐπιρωολογείσθαι	συναγελάζειν
ἐπταμήτωρ	φιλομήτωρ
εὐλογιστία	φιλοστοργία
θανατηφόρος	φωταγωγεῖν

In the *style* of the originally Greek books there is little to remind us of the Semitic origin of the writers. The Wisdom of Solomon follows generally the parallelisms of Hebrew poetry, and its language is moulded to some extent by the LXX. of the Psalms and of Proverbs. In 2—4 Maccabees the influence of the canonical books appears in the retention of transliterated names such as Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσραήλ, Δανιήλ. But Ἱερουσαλήμ has become Ἱεροσόλυμα, and Eleazar is usually Ἐλεάζαρος. Of Hebrew constructions or modes of thought there is only an occasional instance, whilst it is obvious

that the writers lose no opportunity of exhibiting their skill in the literary style of contemporary Alexandrian Greek.

LITERATURE. F. W. Sturz, *De dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina* (1808); H. W. J. Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina*, libri iii. (1841); Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (1841); F. W. A. Mullach, *Gramm. d. Vulgarsprache in historischer Entwicklung* (1856); G. v. Zezschwitz, *Profan-gräcität u. hellenist. Sprachgeist* (1859); E. Reuss, art. *Hellenistisches Idiom* (in Herzog-Plitt, vi., 1880); W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus... von Dionysius v. Halikarnass bis auf d. zw. Philostratus* (Stuttgart, 1889—97); K. Meisterhans, *Gramm. d. Attischen Inschriften* (1881); R. C. Jebb, App. to Vincent and Dickson's *Handbook to modern Greek* (1881); E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (1889), pp. 1—130; H. A. A. Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek* (1895); G. A. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien* (1895), and *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897),—also his art., *Hellenistisches Griechisch*, in Hauck, vii. p. 627 ff. (Leipzig, 1899), where a full bibliography will be found. Phrynichus, ed. Lobeck (1820); W. G. Rutherford, *The new Phrynichus* (1881); Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis* (Lyons, 1688); J. C. Biel, *Novus thesaurus philologicus, sive lexicon in LXX.* (The Hague, 1779); J. F. Schleusner, *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus... V. T.* (Leipzig, 1820); E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon for the Roman and Byzantine periods*² (1888); H. Anz, *Subsidia... e Pentateuchi vers. Alex. repetita* (in *Diss. philolog. Hal.* xii. Halle, 1894); J. Viteau, *Étude sur le Grec du N.T. comparé avec celui des Septante* (Paris, 1896); E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint* (1897); Th. Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, i., pp. 24 ff. (1897); *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1892 ff.); *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* (Leipzig, 1899 ff.); G. A. Deissmann, *Die sprachl. Erforschung der griech. Bibel*, and *Die Sprache der griech. Bibel* (*Th. Rundschau* i., p. 463 ff.); A. Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (Strassburg, 1901).

Much information on points of grammar and orthography may also be gleaned from the N.T. grammars—A. Buttmann, *Grammatik d. NTlichen Sprachgebrauchs* (Berlin, 1859); Winer-Moulton, *Treatise on the Greek of the N.T.*⁸ (1877); Winer-Schmiedel, *Grammatik d. NTlichen Sprachidioms*, Theil i.—ii. (1894—8); F. Blass, *Grammatik d. NTlichen Griechisch* (1896, or the same translated by H. St J. Thackeray, 1898); A. R. Jannaris, *Historical Greek Grammar* (1897); and from the Introduction and Appendix to Westcott and Hort's *N. T. in Greek* (*Intr.*, pp. 302—313, *App.*, pp. 148—180). The *Gramm. Untersuchungen über die biblische Gräcität* of K. H. A. Lipsius is limited to such matters as accentuation, punctuation, and the abbreviations used in Biblical Greek MSS.; but within its own scope it is a serviceable book.

CHAPTER V.

THE SEPTUAGINT AS A VERSION.

THE purpose of this chapter is to prepare the beginner for grappling with the problems presented by the Septuagint when it is regarded as a translation of the Hebrew Bible. Almost at the outset of his study of the Alexandrian version he will find himself confronted by difficulties which can only be met by a study of the general purpose and character of the work, the limitations by which the translators were beset, and the principles which guided them in the performance of their task.

I. The reader of the Septuagint must begin by placing before his mind the conditions under which it was produced, and the relation of the original work to our present texts, Hebrew and Greek.

1. (a) Strictly speaking the Alexandrian Bible is not a single version, but a series of versions produced at various times and by translators whose ideals were not altogether alike. Internal evidence¹ of this fact may be found in the varying standards of excellence which appear in different books or groups of books. The Pentateuch is on the whole a close and serviceable translation; the Psalms² and more especially

¹ The external evidence has been briefly stated in Part i. c. i. (p. 23 ff.).

² Cf. R. Sinker, *Some remarks on the LXX. Version of the Psalms*, p. 9 ff.

the Book of Isaiah shew obvious signs of incompetence. The translator of Job was perhaps more familiar with Greek pagan literature¹ than with Semitic poetry; the translator of Daniel indulges at times in a Midrashic paraphrase. The version of Judges which appears in our oldest Greek uncial MS. has been suspected by a recent critic² of being a work of the 4th century A.D.; the Greek Ecclesiastes savours of the school of Aquila³. When we come to details, the evidence in favour of a plurality of translators is no less decisive. A comparison of certain passages which occur in separate contexts distinctly reveals the presence of different hands. The reader can readily form a judgement upon this point if he will place side by side in the Hebrew and the Greek 2 Regn. xxii. 2 ff. and Ps. xvii. (xviii.) 3 ff., 4 Regn. xviii. 17—xx. 19 and Isa. xxxvi. 1—xxxix. 8, or Mic. iv. and Isa. ii.

A single specimen may be given from Ps. xvii. compared with 2 Regn. xxiii.

Ps. xvii. 3—6.

³Κύριος στερέωμά μου καὶ καταφυγή μου καὶ ῥύστης μου· ὁ θεὸς μου βοηθὸς καὶ ἐλπὶς ἐπ' αὐτόν
⁴αἰνῶν ἐπικαλέσομαι Κύριον, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου σωθήσομαι.
⁵περιέσχον με ὠδίνες θανάτου, καὶ χεῖμαρροι ἀνομίας ἐξετάραξάν με· ὠδίνες ἄδου περιεκύκλωσάν με, προέφθασάν με παγίδες θανάτου. ⁷καὶ ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι με ἐπεκαλεσάμην τὸν κύριον, καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεόν μου ἐκέκραξα· ἤκουσεν ἐκ ναοῦ ἁγίου αὐτοῦ φωνῆς μου, καὶ ἡ κραυγή μου [ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ εἰσελεύσεται] εἰς τὰ ὄτα αὐτοῦ.

2 Regn. xxii. 2—6.

²Κύριε πέτρα μου καὶ ὄχρωμά μου καὶ ἐξαιρούμενός με ἐμοί· ³ὁ θεὸς μου φύλαξ ἔσται μου, πεποιθὸς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ
⁴αἰνετὸν ἐπικαλέσομαι Κύριον, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου σωθήσομαι.
⁵ὅτι περιέσχον με συντριμμὸι θανάτου, χεῖμαρροι ἀνομίας ἐθάμβησάν με· ὠδίνες θανάτου ἐκύκλωσάν με, προέφθασάν με σκληρότητες θανάτου. ⁷ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι με ἐπικαλέσομαι Κύριον, καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεόν μου βοήσομαι, καὶ ἐπακούσεται ἐκ ναοῦ αὐτοῦ φωνῆς μου, καὶ ἡ κραυγή μου ἐν τοῖς ὠσίν αὐτοῦ.

¹ Cf. e.g. Job ix. 9, xlii. 14; from the latter passage Theodore of Mopsuestia argued the pagan origin of the book (*D. C. B.* iv. p. 939).

² Moore, *Judges*, p. xlvi.

³ According to M^cNeile (*Introd. to Ecclesiastes*) it is the earlier edition of Aquila's version; cf. Thackeray, *Gr. O. T.* pp. 13, 60.

One of these versions has doubtless influenced the other, but that they are the work of separate hands seems to be clear from the differences of method which appear e.g. in the renderings of עֲלֶיךָ, הִרְוִיבֶיךָ in the first verse, and the use of the aorist and the future in vv. 6, 7.

If further proof is needed it may be found in the diverse renderings of the same Hebrew words in different parts of the Canon. This argument must be used with caution, for (as we shall presently see) such diversities are to be found not only in the same book but in the same context. But after making allowance for variations of this kind, there remain abundant instances in which the diversity can only be attributed to a change of hand. Thus מִיְהוָה is uniformly represented in the Hexateuch by Φυλιστιείμ, but in Judges and the later books by ἀλλόφυλοι; פָּרָע is φάσεκ or φάσεχ in Chronicles⁽¹⁸⁾ and Jeremiah⁽¹⁾, but πάσχα in all other books; מִיָּנִים is δῆλωσις or δῆλοι in the Pentateuch, but in Ezra-Nehemiah φωτίζοντες, φωτίσων; מִיָּנִים is ἀλήθεια in Exodus, but in Ezra τέλειον; in Isaiah מִיָּנִים is σαβαώθ more than 50 times, whilst παντοκράτωρ, which in other books is the almost uniform rendering of the word when it is used as a title of Deity, does not once occur; לְקָרָא is συναγωγή in Gen., Exod., Lev., Num., and again in the Prophets, but ἐκκλησία in Deuteronomy (with one exception) and onwards to the end of the historical books. The singular¹ phrase ἐγώ εἰμι = אֲנִי is limited to Judges, Ruth, and 2—4 Regn.; σύν = שָׁם of the object occurs in the true LXX. only in Ecclesiastes; ἀμήν is peculiar to Chronicles and Ezra, other books which contain the Heb. word (Num., Deut., 1 Regn., Psalms, Jer.) preferring γένοιτο. Similar results may be obtained from a comparison of the forms assumed by the same proper names in different books. Elijah (אֱלִיָּהוּ) is Ἡλειού in the Books of Kings, but Ἡλίας in Malachi and Sirach. The lists in Chronicles use the Hebrew form of Gentile names (Θεκωεί, Ἀναθωθεί, &c.), where other books adopt the Greek (Θεκωείτης,

¹ On Job xxxiii. 31 see Thackeray, *Gramm. O. T.* p. 55.

'Αναθωθείτης, &c.). In Ezra $\Psi\lambda\gamma\psi\pi\lambda\zeta$ becomes 'Ασσοῦηπος, but 'Απραξέρενης is substituted by the translator of Esther, and Ξέρενης by the LXX. translator of Daniel (ix. 1)¹. It is difficult to resist the force of this cumulative evidence in support of a plurality of translators, especially when it is confirmed by what we know of the external history of the Septuagint.

(b) Further it is clear that the purpose of the version in the later books is not altogether that which the translators of the Pentateuch had in view. The Greek Pentateuch, as we have seen, was intended to supply the wants of the Alexandrian Synagogue. The Book of the Twelve Prophets, and the three major Prophets, were probably translated with the same general purpose, but under a diminished sense of responsibility, since the Prophets, even after their admission to the Canon, were not regarded as sharing the peculiar sanctity of the Law. But the Hagiographa, excepting perhaps the Psalter, stood on a much lower level, and such books as Job, Esther, and Daniel were perhaps viewed by the Alexandrians as national literature² which was not yet classical and might be treated with the freedom allowed by custom in such cases to the interpreter and the scribe. Our estimate of the translator's work must clearly take account of his attitude towards the book upon which he is engaged.

(c) It is important also to bear in mind the peculiar difficulties which beset the translators in their attempts to render the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. To translate a Semitic book into the language of the West was a new venture when it was undertaken at Alexandria; the Greek Pentateuch "was the work of pioneers and necessarily had the defects of such work³." No wonder if even in the later books the Hebrew

¹ Theod. has 'Ασσοῦηρον in Daniel.

² Cf. prol. to Sirach: τῶν ἄλλων πατρῶν βιβλίων.

³ A. F. Kirkpatrick in *Expositor*, v. iii. p. 268. Cf. W. R. Smith, *O. T. in Jewish Ch.*, pp. 75 f.

idiom refused to lend itself to the forms even of Hellenistic Greek without losing to some extent its identity, as the translator of Sirach complains¹. Moreover the majority of the translators had probably learnt the sacred language in Egypt from imperfectly instructed teachers, and had few opportunities of making themselves acquainted with the traditional interpretation of obscure words and contexts which guided the Palestinian Jew². The want of a sound tradition is especially manifest in poetical passages and books, and it makes itself felt in the numerous transliterations, and in faulty readings and renderings of the text³. Such things may well make the reader smile at the claim of inspiration which was set up for the LXX., but they ought neither to mislead his judgement, nor to lessen his admiration for the courage and the general success of the Alexandrian translators.

2. The student must also endeavour to realise the condition of the Hebrew text which lay before the Alexandrian translators.

(a) The text of the Hebrew Bible has undergone no material change since the beginning of the second century A.D. A vast store of various readings has been collected from the MSS. by the diligence of Kennicott and De Rossi, but few among them appear to be more than the omissions or corruptions which spring from the accidents of transcription. All existing MSS. belong to one type of text, and it is, in the main, the type which was known to Jerome, to Origen, and to Aquila, and which is reflected in the Targums and the Talmud.

¹ *Prolog.* οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ κτλ.

² Even in Palestine "before the Christian era...the exegetical tradition was still in a rudimentary stage" (Kirkpatrick, *Divine Library*, p. 69).

³ Dr Nestle points out that the mistakes of the LXX. are sometimes due to Aramaic or Arabic colloquialisms, and gives the following examples: Aramaic: Num. xxiv. 7 ἐξελεύσεται. Ps. cxl. 4 προφασίζεσθαι. Hos. ii. 23 (25) ἡγαπημένην, vi. 5 ἀπεθέρισα. Isa. iv. 2 ἐπιλάμψει, liii. 10 καθαρίσαι. Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 13 χαρήσονται. Arabic: Ps. lxxxiii. 7 δώσει. Dan. vii. 22 (LXX.) ἐδόθη.

But it is not that which was possessed by the Alexandrians of the third and second centuries, B.C. At some time between the age of the LXX. and that of Aquila a thorough revision of the Hebrew Bible must have taken place, probably under official direction; and the evidence seems to point to the Rabbinical school which had its centre at Jamnia in the years that followed the fall of Jerusalem as the source from which this revision proceeded¹. The subject, as a whole, will be treated in a later chapter; meanwhile it is sufficient to warn the beginner that in the LXX. he has before him the version of an early text which often differed materially from the text of the printed Hebrew Bible and of all existing Hebrew MSS.

(b) The palaeographical character of the MSS. employed by the translators requires consideration. It will be remembered that the newly discovered fragments of Aquila present the Tetragrammaton in archaic letters². These letters belong to the old Semitic alphabet which was common to the Hebrew, Moabite, Aramaic, and Phoenician languages, and which appears on the Moabite stone and in the Siloam inscription and, with some modifications, in MSS. of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and on coins of the Maccabean period. The transition from this ancient character to the square letters³ which are used in existing Hebrew MSS. and in the printed Bibles must have been practically complete in our Lord's time, since He refers to the *yodh* as the smallest letter, and to the *κερέαι* which are peculiar to the square alphabet (Mt. v. 18). That the change had begun

¹ See W. R. Smith, *O. T. in J. Church*, pp. 56 f.; Driver, *Samuel*, p. xxxix.; Kirkpatrick, *Divine Library of the O. T.*, p. 64. Among the Rabbis of Jamnia were Eleazar, Joshua, and Akiba, the reputed teachers of Aquila; see Edersheim-White, *History of the Jewish Nation*, pp. 132 ff., 174 f.

² See pp. 39 f.

³ *כִּי אֲשׁוּרִית*, or, as the Talmud calls it, *כִּי אֲשׁוּרִית*; see Driver, *Samuel*, pp. ix. ff.

in the MSS. employed by the Alexandrian translators¹ may be gathered from the fact that they repeatedly confuse letters which are similar in the square character but not in the archaic. Professor Driver holds that the alphabet of their MSS. was a transitional one, in which ו and י, כ and מ, ה ה and ם, as well as כ and כ, ך and ך, were more or less difficult to distinguish².

A few examples may be given from Driver's list. (1) 1 Regn. ii. 29 ὁ φθαλμῶ (ו'עין, for עין); xii. 3 ἀποκρίθητε κατ' ἐμοῦ (ב'ענו, for עני); Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 17 ὄρουξαν (כאר, for כארי); Isa. xxix. 13 μάτην δὲ σέβονται με (ותהו יראתם אתי, for ותהי יראתם אתי). (2) 1 Regn. vi. 20 διελθεῖν (לעבר, for לעמד); Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 25 τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς (בנה for מנא)³; 1 Regn. iv. 10 ταγμάτων (דגלי, for דגלי), xxi. 7 Δωῆκ ὁ Σύρος (דאג הארמי, for ד' הארמי).

Another cause of confusion was the *scriptio defectiva* in the case of ו and י where they represent long vowels, e.g. 1 Regn. xii. 8 καὶ κατόκισεν αὐτούς (וישיבם, for ויישיבום); Ps. v. tit. ὑπὲρ τῆς κληρονομώσεως (אל הנחלות, for אל הנחילות); Job xix. 18 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (עלים, for עוילים); Jer. vi. 23 ὡς πῦρ (כאיש, for באיש). Abbreviations, also, probably gave rise to misunderstandings; see the instances in Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. lxiii. f., lxx. note 2, and others collected from Jeremiah by Streane, *Double Text*, p. 20.

In the case of numerals errors appear to have arisen from the use of similar letters as numerical signs: e.g. 2 Regn. xxiv. 13 τρία ἔτη, 𐤀𐤃 'seven years,' where 𐤀 has been read for 𐤁. Here 𐤀 has the support of the Chronicler (1 Chron. xxi. 12): see König in Hastings' *D.B.*, iii. p. 562.

Further, in the MSS. used by the LXX. the words seem not to have been separated by any system of punctuation or spacing. On the Moabite stone⁴ and in the Siloam inscription⁵ a point has been used for this purpose, but the Phoeni-

¹ Except perhaps those which lay before the translators of the Pentateuch; see Driver, *l.c.*

² A specimen of such a script, but of much later date, may be seen in Driver, *op. cit.*, p. lxxv.

³ Cf. Streane *ad loc.* and on Jer. xx. 17.

⁴ See Driver, *op. cit.*, p. lxxxvi., or Hastings' *D.B.* iii. art. *Moab*.

⁵ Driver, *op. cit.*, p. xv.

oldest of our uncial MSS., and the greater number of Greek codices are more or less influenced by the Hexapla. The Lucianic text is subject to another vice, the Antiochian passion for fulness, which encouraged the blending or the accumulation of various renderings and thus created doublets¹. Besides these recensional errors there are the mistakes, itacistic or other, which are incident to the transmission of ancient books. The state of the Greek text has been touched upon already, and will form the subject of a chapter in the third part of this book. Here it is sufficient to notice the presence of mixture and corruption as a factor in the problem which the student of the LXX. must keep in view.

II. We are now prepared to deal with those features of the version which are not incidental but characteristic of the translators' principles and methods.

1. The reader of the Alexandrian Greek Bible is continually reminded that he has before him a translation of a Semitic writing.

(a) As a whole the version aims at fidelity, and often pursues this aim to the extent of sacrificing the Greek idiom. The first chapter of Genesis will supply instances of extreme literalness, e.g. *v.* 4 ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ φωτός καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκότους· *v.* 5 ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα μία· *v.* 20 ἐρπετὰ ψυχῶν ζωσῶν. As we proceed, we are still conscious of moving in an atmosphere which is Hebrew and not Greek. Hebrew constructions meet us everywhere; such phrases as ἀφικέσθαι ἕως πρὸς τινα, παρασιωπᾶν ἀπὸ τινος, προστιθέναι (τοῦ) ποιεῖν, λαλεῖν ἐν χειρὶ τινος, ἐχθὲς καὶ τρίτην, ἀπὸ γενεῶν εἰς γενεάς (ἕως γενεᾶς καὶ γενεᾶς, εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεάν), may be found in the Prophets and Hagiographa as well as in the Pentateuch. Occasionally the translators set the sense at defiance in their

¹ Cf. Driver, *op. cit.*, p. lviii.

desire to be true to what they conceive to be the meaning of the Hebrew, as when in 1 Regn. i. 26 they render פִּי (δέομαι) by ἐν ἐμοί. In some books, especially perhaps in the Psalms and in Isaiah, entire sentences are unintelligible from this cause. Even when the Alexandrians have rightly understood their original they have generally been content to render it into Greek with little regard for rhythm or style, or the requirements of the Greek tongue.

(b) To the same spirit of loyalty may be ascribed in part the disposition to transliterate words which present unusual difficulty. The number of transliterations other than those of proper names is considerable¹, and they are to be found in nearly all the translated books. In some cases they are due to misunderstanding, as in Jud. i. 19 Πῆλαβ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς where ברזל (ה) seems to have been read as הברזל, and רכב consequently treated as a proper name; in others, the Hebrew form is purposely maintained (e.g. ἀλληλουιά, ἀμήν). But in the majority of instances transliteration may be taken for a frank confession of ignorance or doubt; it is clearly such, for example, in Jud. viii. 7 ἐν ταῖς ἀβαρκηνεῖν, 4 Regn. ii. 14 ἀφφώ (אף הוא), Jer. xxxviii. (xxxix.) 40 πάντες ἀσαρημὸθ. ἕως νάχαλ Κεδρών. As in the first and third of these specimens, the article is often included; and when a proper name is transliterated, the name is sometimes for this reason not easily recognised; thus Ramathaim (1 Regn. i. 1) becomes Ἀρμαθαίμ (הרמתים)². Similarly the ה local is taken over in the transliteration, as in Gen. xxxv. 6 εἰς Λοῦζα = הלוז. Sometimes two words are rolled into one, as in Οὐλαμμαῦς = לוז אולם (Gen.

¹ Thus Hatch and Redpath take note of 39 transliterations, exclusive of proper names, under A alone. They are thus distributed: Pentateuch, 4; Histories, 26; Psalms &c., 3; Prophets, 6. The principles by which the LXX. appear to have been guided in these transliterations of Hebrew consonants and vowel-sounds are expounded by Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 107 ff.

² Unless the α is here prothetic, which is however less probable.

xxviii. 19)¹. A doublet is occasionally created by adding a translation to the transliterated Hebrew, e.g. in 1 Regn. vi. 11, 15 τὸ θέμα ἐργάβ, vii. 4 τὰ ἄλση Ἀσταρωθ, xxiii. 14 ἐν Μασερέμ ἐν τοῖς στενοῖς. In the case of a significant proper name, where it is necessary for the reader to be made aware of its meaning, the LXX. sometimes translate without transliterating, e.g. Gen. iii. 20 ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναικὸς Ζωή (זֵהָ); xi. 9 ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Σύγχυσις (שִׁיחַ); xiv. 13 ἀπήγγειλεν Ἀβρὰμ τῷ περάτῃ (אֶרְבֶּל).

2. The Alexandrian translators, however, while loyal to their original, sometimes even to a fault, manifest nothing like the slavish adherence to the letter with which Aquila has been charged. They often amplify and occasionally omit; they interpret, qualify or refine; they render the same Hebrew words by more than one Greek equivalent, even in the same context; they introduce metaphors or grammatical constructions which have no place in the Hebrew text and probably at no time had a place there, or they abandon figures of speech where they exist in the original.

(a) Slight amplifications, which are probably not to be ascribed to a fuller text, occur frequently in all parts of the LXX.; e.g. the insertion of λέγων before a quotation, or of pronouns which are not expressed in the Hebrew, or of single words added in order to bring out the sense, as in Gen. xxxiv. 10 ἰδοὺ ἡ γῆ πλατεῖα ἐναντίον ὑμῶν, xl. 17 ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν γεννημάτων ὧν ὁ βασιλεὺς Φαραὼ ἐσθίει, Deut. vii. 16 φάγη πάντα τὰ σκῦλα τῶν ἐθνῶν (Heb. 'thou shalt eat all the nations'). The translators frequently manifest a desire to supply what the original had omitted or to clear up what was ambiguous: they name the subject or object when the Hebrew leaves it

¹ Cf. Hieron. *Quaest. hebr.* p. 44 (ed. Lagarde), *De situ et nom.* pp. 106, 158. Pearson (*Praef. paraen.* p. 6) endeavours to defend the LXX. even here.

to be understood (Gen. xxix. 9 αὐτὴ γὰρ ἔβοσκει τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς, Heb. 'fed them'; xxxiv. 14 καὶ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς Συμεὼν καὶ Λευὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Δείνας υἱοὶ δὲ Λείας, Heb. 'and they said unto them'), or they add a clause which seems to follow as a necessary consequence (2 Regn. xii. 21 ἀνέστης καὶ ἔφαγες ἄρτον καὶ πέπωκας: xvi. 10 καὶ ἄφετε αὐτὸν καὶ οὕτως καταράσθω = לָלַךְ: (רַחֵם הַב') כִּי), or they make good an apocriosis (Exod. xxxii. 32 εἰ μὲν ἀφείς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῶν ἄφες). Less frequently they insert a whole sentence which is of the nature of a gloss, as in Gen. i. 9 καὶ συνήχθη τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ὤφθη ἡ ξηρά, which is merely an expansion of καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως in the terms of the preceding command συναχθήτω κτλ.; or 1 Regn. i. 5 ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτῇ παιδίον, a reminiscence of v. 2 τῇ Ἄννα οὐκ ἦν παιδίον. On the other hand the LXX. not uncommonly present a shorter text, as compared with M.T., e.g. Gen. xxxi. 21 καὶ διέβη τὸν ποταμόν (Heb. 'he rose up and passed over'), ib. 31 εἶπα γάρ Μὴ ποτε κτλ. (Heb. 'Because I was afraid, for I said...'); 1 Regn. i. 9 μετὰ τὸ φαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν Σηλώ (Heb. 'after they had eaten in Shiloh and after they had drunk').

(δ) The translators frequently interpret words which call for explanation. Hebraisms are converted into Greek phraseology, e.g. אֲלֹלֹגֵי becomes ἀλλογενής (Exod. xii. 43), and עֲבָדֵי-יְהוָה ἐνιαύσιος (Num. vii. 15); עֲבָדֵי-יְהוָה לְעַלְיִנִּי is rendered by ἐγὼ δὲ ἄλογός εἰμι (Exod. vi. 12). A difficult word or phrase is exchanged for one more intelligible to a Greek reader; thus ἡ ἔρημος is used for אֲרָמֹת (Gen. xii. 9); 'Urim and Thummim' become ἡ δῆλωσις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια (Exod. xxviii. 26); in the Psalms ἀντιλήπτωρ is written for אֱלֹהִים (Ps. iii. 4), βοηθός for אֱלֹהִים (xvii. = xviii. 3), and γλῶσσα for לִשָּׁנָה (Ps. xv. = xvi. 9); similarly in Jer. ii. 23 τὸ πολυάνδριον 'the cemetery' stands for אֲבָתֵי, i.e. the valley of Hinnom¹. An effort is made to represent Hebrew money by its nearest Greek equivalent; thus for לֶקֶשׁ we have δίδραχμον (Gen.

¹ Similarly in Prov. xxii. 10, where the LXX. read בַּת דִּין וַיִּשָּׁב, the last two words are rendered ἐν συνεδρίῳ.

xxiii. 15, Deut. xxii. 29, 2 Esdr. xv. 15) as well as *σίκλος*, and for $\Pi\eta$ *ὀβολός*. Occasionally a whole clause is interpreted rather than translated; e.g. Gen. i. 2 ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, Exod. iii. 14 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, Ps. xl. (xxxix.) 7 σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι. A dogmatic interest has been detected in some of these paraphrastic renderings, chiefly where the LXX. have endeavoured to avoid the anthropomorphisms of the original; examples are most frequent in the Pentateuch, e.g. Gen. xviii. 25 μηδαμῶς σὺ ποιήσεις (Heb. 'that be far from thee'); Exod. iv. 16 σὺ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔσῃ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (מִיְהוָה); xxiv. 10 εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστήκει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (Heb. 'they saw the God of Israel,' Aq. εἶδον τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ); ib. 11 τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἰς; Num. xii. 8 τὴν δόξαν (תְּהִלָּתוֹ) Κυρίου εἶδεν; Exod. xv. 3 Κύριος συντριβῶν πολέμους ($\text{מַרְחִיבֵי שָׁנָיִם}$); Deut. xiv. 23 ὁ τόπος ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξῃται Κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου ἐπικληθῆναι (שֵׁם) τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ; Jos. iv. 24 ἡ δύναμις τοῦ κυρίου (קִרְבָּן). Such renderings manifest the same spirit of reverence which led the LXX. to write ὁ κύριος or the anarthrous Κύριος, or not infrequently ὁ θεός, for the Tetragrammaton, just as their Palestinian brethren read for it יְהוָה or יְהוָה . In other places the LXX. appear to be guided by the Jewish *Halacha*, e.g. Gen. ii. 2 συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ (שֵׁשׁ יָמִים , Aq. τῇ ἑβδόμῃ); Lev. xxiv. 7 ἐπιθήσετε ἐπὶ τὸ θέμα λίβανον καθαρὸν καὶ ἄλα²; xix. 7 εἰὰν δὲ βρώσει βρωθῆ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ, ἄθυτόν ἐστιν (Heb. 'an abomination')³. Of *Haggada* also there are clear traces, as in Exod. xii. 40 ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῆ Χανάαν, 1 Regn. i. 14 εἶπεν αὐτῇ τὸ παιδάριον Ἠλεί⁴; v. 6

¹ See W. R. Smith, *O. T. in J. Church*, p. 77. Aquila, as we gather from Origen and now know from his published fragments (p. 39 f.), wrote the word in archaic Hebrew characters, which however were read as Κύριος.

² "Because salt as well as frankincense was used in the actual ritual of their period" (W. R. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 77).

³ On xxiii. 11 see p. 17.

⁴ "An evident attempt to shield the priest from the charge of harshness" (H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, p. 10).

καὶ μέσον τῆς χώρας αὐτῆς ἀνεφύησαν μύες, καὶ ἐγένετο σύγχυσις θανάτου μεγάλη ἐν τῇ πόλει.

(c) The LXX. render the same Hebrew word by more than one Greek equivalent, sometimes even in the same context. In some cases the change appears to be either arbitrary, or due to the desire of avoiding monotony; e.g. in Ps. xxxvi. (xxxvii.) נָשַׁךְ is translated by ἀμαρτωλός in vv. 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 32, 40, but by ἀσεβής in vv. 28, 35, 38. In many others it may be ascribed to the circumstance that certain common Hebrew words take a special colouring from the contexts in which they occur, and must be rendered accordingly. Thus יָתַן , 'give',¹ which belongs to this class has received in the LXX. more than 30 different renderings; sometimes it is translated by a paraphrase, e.g. Jos. xiv. 12 αἰτοῦμαί σε (יָתַן), Deut. xxi. 8 ἵνα μὴ γένηται (יָתַן לֵשׁ); when it is rendered directly, the following Greek verbs (besides δίδοναι and its compounds) are used to represent it: ἄγειν, ἀποστέλλειν, ἀποτίνειν, ἀφιέναι, δεικνύναι, δωρεῖσθαι, ἔαν, ἐκτιθέναι, ἐκτίνειν, ἐκχέειν, ἐλεᾶν, ἐμβάλλειν, ἐγκαταλείπειν, ἐπαίρειν, ἐπιβάλλειν, ἐπιτιθέναι, ἐπιχέειν, ἐφιστάναι, ἰστάναι, καταβάλλειν, καθιστάναι, κατατάσσειν, κρεμάζειν, παρατιθέναι, περιτιθέναι, ποιεῖν, προεκφέρειν, προσιέναι, προσιτιθέναι, στηρίζειν, συνάγειν, φέρειν. This is a somewhat extreme instance, but a glance at Hatch and Redpath will shew that there are many which do not fall far behind it, and that in the majority of cases the ordinary words of the Hebrew Bible have more than one equivalent in the Greek of the LXX. The Alexandrian translators have evidently made an honest endeavour to distinguish between the several connotations of the Hebrew words. Thus, to take a few examples: יָרַח is variously rendered by ἄκρον, ἀρχή, κλίτος, μέρος, πέρασ, τάξις,

¹ The example is suggested by Dr Hatch (*Essays*, p. 18), who gives many of the passages at length. The *index Hebraeus* at the end of Trommius will enable the student to add other instances (besides δίδοναι and its compounds).

a faulty archetype, but chiefly to the misreading or misunderstanding of the archetype by the translators. Letters or clauses have often been transposed; omissions occur which may be explained by homoioteleuton; still more frequently the translation has suffered through an insufficient knowledge of Hebrew or a failure to grasp the sense of the context. It follows that the student must be constantly on his guard against errors which may easily result from too ready an acceptance of the evidence offered by the Alexandrian version. Taken as a whole, and judged in the light of the circumstances under which it was produced, it is a monument of the piety, the skill, and the knowledge of the Egyptian Jews who lived under the Ptolemies, and it is an invaluable witness to the pre-Christian text of the Old Testament. But whether for textual or for hermeneutical purposes it must be used with caution and reserve, as the experience of the Ancient Church shews. With this subject we shall deal in a future chapter; it is sufficient to note the fact here.

III. The beginner, for whose use this chapter is chiefly intended, will now be prepared to open his Septuagint and his Hebrew Bible, and to compare the two in some familiar contexts. The following notes may assist him in a first effort to grapple with the problems which present themselves.

GEN. xv. 1—6.

1. Τὰ ῥήματα...ῥήμα, Heb. דְּבָרַיִם...דְּבָרַיִם. Λέγων = לְאָמַר; cf. *v.* 4, where, as elsewhere, Aq. renders, τῷ λέγειν. Ὑπερασπίζω σου, Heb. 'am a shield to thee'; cf. Deut. xxxiii. 29, Prov. ii. 7, al. Ὁ μισθός σου πολὺς. Vulg., A.V., R.V. connect Heb. with the foregoing, supplying 1. 2. Δεσπότης = יָדָן, as in *v.* 8, and not infrequently in Jer. and Dan. (LXX.). Ἀπολόμαι ἄτεκνος—an interpretation rather than a literal rendering of הִלַּךְ עֲרִירִי¹. Ἰὺδς Μάσεκ τῆς οἰκογενοῦς μου = בֶּן מִשְׁק בַּת בֵּיתִי: cf. Hieron. *quaest.*

¹ Philo has ἀπελεύσομαι (see below).

in Gen. "ubi nos habemus *Et filius Masec vernaculae meae*, in Hebraeo scriptum est בִּיתִי בְּשֵׁרָפִים, quod Aquila transtulit ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ποτιζόντος οἰκίαν μου... Theodotio vero καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας μου." Δαμασκὸς Ἐλιέξερ, a literal rendering of the Heb., leaving the difficulty unsolved. 3. Ἐπειδὴ = יְהִי, and so in xviii. 31, xix. 19; did LXX. read מִן? Οἰκογενής here = תְּבִיבֵיךָ. Κληρονομήσει με—a Hebraism, = κληρονόμος μου ἔσται. 4. Καὶ εὐθύς ... ἐγένετο = הָיָה. Φωνή = קוֹל, as in xi. 1, but apparently not elsewhere. "Ὁς... οὗτος, ἄνθρωπος... ἄνθρωπος." Ἐκ σοῦ, euphemism for Heb. קָרָבִי, unless the LXX. read קָרָבִי. 5. Πρὸς αὐτόν, ἅ Heb. 6. Καὶ ἐπίστευσεν = וַיִּשְׁמַע (cf. Haupt *ad loc.*). Ἀβράμ, ἅ Heb. τῶ θεῷ = הָיָה. Ἐλογίσθη... εἰς δικ., Heb. 'he counted it... for righteousness'; possibly the LXX. read as in Ps. cvi. 31 (M.T.), where they have the same rendering. The N.T. follows LXX. here (Jas. ii. 23, Rom. iv. 3, Gal. iii. 6).

EXOD. xix. 16—24.

16. Ἐγένετο δὲ... καὶ ἐγένοντο = יְהִי... יְהִי. Γενηθέντος πρὸς ὄρθρον = קָרָבִי תְּבִיבֵיךָ. Ἐπ' ὄρους Σειβά, Heb. 'on the mountain.' Φωνή, cod. F with ffl pr. καί. 17. Ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος Σ. (om. Σ. AF), Heb. 'at the nether part (תַּיִתְּבִיבֵיךָ) of the mountain.' 18. Διὰ τὸ καταβεβηκέναι, an idiomatic rendering of יָרַד יְשֻׁרָאֵל מִן־הַר. Τὸν θεόν = הָיָה, cf. 21. Ὁ καπνός, Heb. 'the smoke of it.' Ἐξέστη, Heb. as *v.* 16 where LXX. renders ἐπτοήθη. Ὁ λαός = ἄνθρωποι; M.T., קָרָבִי. 19. Προβαίνουσαι ἰσχυρότεροι = קָרָבִי יְהִי. 20. Ἐκάλεσεν... Μωϋσῆν, Heb. קָרָבִי; the ל after אִרְק is dropt in accordance with Greek idiom¹. 21. Λέγων, ἅ Heb. Ἐγγίσωσιν, a softening of the Heb. 'break forth' (סָרַח); in the next verse ἐγγίζω = שָׁנַי. 22. καί, Heb. 'and also' (וְגַם), usually καί γε, Aq. καὶ καίγε (Burkitt, *Aquila*, p. 13). Κυρίω τῶ θεῷ, a double rendering of הָיָה יְהִי. Ἀπαλλάξῃ ἀπ' αὐτῶν: another instance of euphemism: Heb. 'break forth upon them' (Aq. διακόψῃ ἐν αὐτοῖς). 23. Προσαναβῆναι: the double compound occurs six times in Jos. xi.—xix. Ἀφόρῖσαι: the verb is here as in *v.* 12 the equivalent of בָּלַל *hi.* 'enclose,' but with the added thought of consecration which is latent in ἀφορίζω, ἀφόρῖσμα, ἀφορισμός (cf. Exod. xxix.

¹ Or, as Dr Nestle suggests, it may have been taken as introducing the acc., as in later Hebrew or in Aramaic.

26, Ezech. xx. 40). 24. Ἀπολέση, euphemistic, as ἀπαλλάξῃ in v. 22; Aq. again, διακόψῃ.

NUM. xxiii. 7—10.

7. Παραβολήν: here for the first time = לְפָנַי. Lyons Pent., *parabula*. Μεσοποταμίας, i.e. מִן הַיַּרְדֵּן וְעַד הַיַּרְדֵּן (Gen. xxiv. 10), or מִן הַיַּרְדֵּן (Gen. xxv. 20): here an interpretation of the simple מִן הַיַּרְדֵּן. Ἀπ', λέγων, ἅ Heb. Ἐπικατάρασαί μοι, and καταράσσωμαι in v. 8, represent עָרַו, whilst ἀρασαι answers to רָרַו, and ἀράσσωμαι (v. 8) to קָרַו, an unusual instance of carelessness or poverty of language on the part of the translator; ὀρέων (v. 9) is equally unfortunate as a rendering of מִן הַיַּרְדֵּן, while on the other hand ὄψομαι, προσνοήσω fairly represent the Heb. Προσνοεῖν renders וְשׁוּב again in Job xx. 9, xxiv. 15. 10. Ἐξακριβάεσθαι (Num.¹, Job¹, Dan. LXX.¹), a late form for ἐξακριβοῦν in LXX. and Jos. τὸ σπέρμα, Heb. 'the dust': did LXX. read עָרַו, or have they glossed עָרַו? Καὶ τίς ἐξαριθμήσεται, reading וְכִי יִסְפַּר וְכִי יִסְפַּר. Δήμους Ἰσραήλ, Heb. 'the fourth part of Israel' (Aq. τοῦ τετάρτου Ἰ.). Ἡ ψυχὴ μου, as Heb., whilst the next word is sacrificed to an alliteration (ψυχὴ, ψυχαῖς). τὸ σπέρμα μου is a gloss on תְּהִי־רִיבָה (cf. Brown, *Heb. and Eng. Lex.*, p. 31); ὡς τὸ σπέρμα τούτων, Heb. 'as he.'

This passage illustrates both the greater freedom which the Greek translators allowed themselves in poetical contexts, and their comparative incompetence to deal with them.

DEUT. vi. 1—9.

1. Αὐται αἱ ἐντολαί, Heb. 'this is the commandment.' Ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, Heb. 'your God.' Οὕτως, ἅ Heb. Εἰσπορεύεσθε, Heb. 'go over'; the Greek has lost the local reference, as in iv. 14, 4 Regn. iv. 8. 2. Ἴνα φοβῆσθε... ὑμῶν, Heb. 2nd pers. sing. Σήμερον, ἅ ff. Οἱ υἱοὶ κτλ., Heb. 'thy son and thy son's son.' Ἴνα μακροημερέυσῃτε, Heb. 'and that thy days may be prolonged'; μακροημερεύειν (μακροήμερος γίνεσθαι) represents this or a similar phrase in iv. 40, v. 30, xi. 9, 21, xxxii. 47; μακροχρόνιος, μακροχρονίζειν also occur in iv. 40, v. 16, xvii. 20, xxxii. 27. The group is not found elsewhere in the LXX. except in Exod.¹, Jud.¹, and in Sirach. 3. Δοῦναι ἅ M.T.; perhaps added to complete the sense of the Greek; yet see v. 10 (ἴβ τῆ τῆ). 4. Καὶ ταῦτα... Αἰγύπτου ἅ Heb; perhaps repeated from iv. 45 to form an introduction to Ἄκουε κτλ. 5. Διανοίας... ψυχῆς... δυνάμεως. The readings vary; for διανοίας AF Luc. read καρδίας, and the text of B is here *super rasuram*; for δυνάμεως some texts give ἰσχύος. The N.T. citations (Mt. xxii. 37 = Mc. xii. 29 ff.,

Lc. x. 27) present much diversity, giving both renderings of $\eta\beta\beta\lambda$ and both of $\eta\alpha\alpha\mu$; cf. Dittmar, *V. T. in Novo*, p. 50f. 6. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon$, Λ Heb.; for 'in thy heart' Heb. has 'upon,' "as it were imprinted there (Jer. xxxi. 33)¹." 7. $\Pi\rho\omicron\beta\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, Heb. 'shalt impress them upon'; Aq. $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, as if the root were נשנ . $\text{Ἐν αὐτοῖς} = \text{מפ}$. Καθήμενος κτλ. , Heb. 'in thy sitting &c. '; $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \delta\acute{o}\delta\omega$ are inexact, Heb. 'in thy house,' 'in the way.' 8. Ἀσάλευτον (F, ἀσάλευτα) = תפלת , 'for frontlets,' circlets or tires for the head: Lyons Pent. (reading σαλευτά), *mobilia*. Ἀσάλευτον occurs in the same phrase in Exod. xiii. 16, Deut. xi. 18. Aq. seems to have rendered the Heb. here and in Exod. by νακτά , i.e. 'compressed,' 'tight,' which Field (*Hexapla*, i. 103) explains as the "thecas in quas schedulae membranaceae ...inferiebantur." The LXX. rendering may be an Alexandrian name for the φυλακτήριον , but the whole subject is obscure. 9. $\text{Φλιάς} = \text{לויק}$, as in Exod. xii. 7 ff.

JOS. x. 12—14.

12. $\text{Ἡ ἡμέρα παρέδωκεν... ὑποχείριον}$ —idiomatic rendering of יגגל... תת ביום . The words that follow (ἦν ἱκα... Ἰσραήλ) seem to be a gloss derived from v. 10. Καὶ εἶπεν Ἰησοῦς , Heb. 'and he said in the eyes of Israel.' Στήτω , Heb. 'be still.' Γαβαὼν , גבא 'Gibeon.' Αἰλῶν , אילון 'Aijalon' (אילן); cf. 2 Chron. xi. 10 A, Αἰαλῶν . 13. $\text{Ἐν στάσει} = \text{תקף}$, which is thus distinguished from the verb represented by ἔστη . Ὁ θεός , Heb. יה , Aq. τὸ ἔθνος . Unless a primary error is to be suspected here, the LXX. has glossed its original, from motives of piety. After the stanza גבא inserts a reference to the Book of Jashar, which is wanting in non-Hexaplaric texts of the LXX.; cod. G adds, $\text{* οὐχὶ τοῦτο γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ βιβλίου τοῦ εἰθούς}$ Υ . $\text{Ὁὐ προεπορεύετο κτλ.}$, a loose rendering of Heb. $\text{תקף ביום בלבוץ אף לא}$. 14. $\text{Ἡμέρα τοιαύτη οὐδὲ τὸ πρότερον οὐδὲ τὸ ἔσχατον}$, a good example of a conscientious compromise between idiomatic and literal modes of rendering (cf. Heb.). Ἀνθρώπου, ὡς ἵλκ . $\text{Συνεπολέμησεν τῷ Ἰ.}$, Heb. 'fought for Israel.'

JUD. v. 28—30².

28. B^B here omits the difficult word ותיבב (B^A , καὶ κατεμάν-

¹ Driver, *ad loc.*

² In this passage the text of B in *O.T. in Greek*, i. 489, should be compared with that of A (ed. Brooke and McLean)

θανεν). Ἐκτὸς τοῦ τοξικοῦ, 'forth from the loophole'; cf. Symm. in Ezek. xl. 16 *θυρίδες τοξικαί*: \mathfrak{S}^A διὰ τῆς δικτυωτῆς, 'through the lattice' (cf. 4 Regn. i. 2, Ezek. xli. 16). Ἐπιβλέπουσα... Σισαρά in A appears to be a supplementary gloss. Ἥσχύνθη (B) confuses $\text{שׁשׁ} \text{רֹלַל}$ with $\text{שׁו} \text{כַּל}$; the general sense of the former is given by ἡσχάτισεν A. For ἐσχατίσει cf. 1 Macc. v. 53; has it been suggested here by its similarity to the word used in B? Πόδες: A more literally ἴχνη, but πούς represents $\text{D}\Psi\Xi$ elsewhere, e.g. Ps. lvi. (lvii.) 6, Prov. xxix. 5. 29. Αἱ σοφαὶ ἄρχουσαι: A, again aiming at a literal rendering, σοφαὶ ἀρχουσῶν. On the other hand B's ἀπέστρεψεν λόγους αὐτῆς ἐναντῆ is close and yet idiomatic, while A's ἀπεκρίνατο ἐν ῥήμασιν αὐτῆς goes too far afield; the latter appears to be a Hexaplaric correction (Field, *ad loc.*). 30. Οὐχ εὐρήσουσιν αὐτὸν διαμερίζοντα σκύλα; so \mathfrak{S}^{BA} ; Heb. 'are they not finding, [are they not] dividing booty?' LXX. seem to have read רָלַל for רָלַל . Οἰκτεῖρμων οἰκτερήσει B, φιλιάζων φίλοις A; both, while labouring to keep up the alliteration of the Heb., miss its point through ignorance of a rare use of רָלַל ; for φιλιάζειν cf. xiv. 20 B, 2 Chron. xix. 2. Ποικιλτῶν (A, ποικίλων) misses the dual 'embroidery on both sides' (R. V.), or 'a couple of pieces,' "precisely as $\text{יִמְתְּנָה$ above" (Moore). Βάθη in A seems to be an error for βαφή, which is found in several cursives; see Field, *ad loc.*, and Lagarde's Lucian. Τῷ τραχήλῳ αὐτοῦ σκύλα = apparently לְצוּאָרָיו ; M. T. 'for the necks of the spoil.' \mathfrak{S}^A substitutes the usual ἀνατολή for the spirited and literal rendering of B (cf. Ps. xviii. = xix. 7), and appears to have read בְּנִבְרָתִי ; cf. Ps. xix. (xx.) 7.

This passage is a severe test of the translator's knowledge and skill, and shews him perhaps at his worst.

1 REGN. xvii. 37—43.

37. \mathfrak{H} begins $\text{וַיִּפֶּן אֶל דָּוִד}$, A, Luc. καὶ εἶπεν Δ. Ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ λέοντος... τῆς ἄρκου, an exact rendering; cf. Gen. ix. 5 ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν θηρίων. Luc., Th., ἐκ στόματος τοῦ λ. καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς τῆς ἄρκου. Τοῦ ἀπεριμήτου, repeated from v. 36 (Λ \mathfrak{H}). 38. μανδύαν (Jud. iii. 16, 2 Regn. x. 4): + αὐτοῦ, A, with \mathfrak{H} . Περικεφαλαιάν χ. περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ: Luc. (A), with \mathfrak{H} , π. χ. ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ κτλ., adding, καὶ ἐνέδυσεν αὐτῷ θώρακα. 39. Ἐξώσεν τὸν Δαυεὶδ, sc. Σαούλ (cf. v. 38); Luc., A, follow Heb. in making David the object of the verb (ἐξώσατο Δαυεὶδ). Ἐκοπίασεν περιπατήσας (A, περιπατήσαι) ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς, 'more than once he wearied

¹ "Of the versions only [Vulg.] comes near the true sense" (Moore). Jerome renders *pulcherrima feminarum*.

himself with walking (strove to walk) in them,' reading לָּלְכוּ , as in Gen. xix. 11 לָּלְכוּ , LXX. *παρελύθησαν* (Wellhausen, Driver, H. P. Smith). *Ἀπαξ* και *δὶς* occurs also in Deut. ix. 13 (where, as here, there is nothing in the Heb. to correspond), and in Neh. xiii. 20, where it represents $\text{בְּיָמָיו בְּעָבְרָה}$. *Ἀφαιροῦσιν αὐτὰ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*, reading the verb probably as בְּרָדְוָה , and omitting וַיִּרְוֶה . 40. *λίθους τελείους* in B is obviously wrong, and A scarcely mends matters by omitting the adjective. Correct, with Lucian, *λίθους λείους*. *Ἐν τῷ καδίῳ ποιμενικῷ*: *καδίων*=*καδίσκος*, here only in LXX., and perhaps unknown elsewhere: *ποιμενικός* (בְּעִיבָרָה) again in Zach. xi. 15. *Εἰς συλλογήν*, apparently for $\text{בְּרִבְרִי$ (פֶּלֶל בְּרִבְרִי , Aq. *καὶ ἐν ἀναλεκτηρίῳ*). 41 is wanting in B^B , and probably belongs to the same recension of the story which has supplied the great gaps vv. 12—31, 55—xviii. 5. 42. Heb. 'looked and saw'; so A, Luc. *Πυρράκης* cf. xvi. 12, Gen. xxv. 25. 43. *ᾠσεί*, added by the translators to soften the opprobrious *κύνων*. *Ἐν ῥάβδῳ καὶ λίθοις*, פֶּלֶל 'in (with) staves'; *καὶ λίθοις* is probably intended to make the question correspond to the statement of v. 40. The next words in the LXX. *καὶ εἶπεν Δαυεὶδ Οὐχί, ἀλλ' ἢ χεῖρῳ[ν] κυνός* are evidently of the same character—a "singularly rapid reply" (Driver).

4 REGN. ii. 11—18.

11. *Αὐτῶν πορευομένων ἐπορεύοντο καὶ ἐλάλουν*—an interesting attempt to combine Greek idiom with some reminiscence of the Heb. phrase; Lucian abandons the Heb., and corrects, *αὐτῶν πορευομένων καὶ λαλοῦντων*. *Ἴππος πυρός*, Heb. 'horses of fire'; cf. *ἵππεύς*, Heb. 'horsemen,' v. 12. *Ἀνὰ μέσον* (בְּיָמָיו), cf. Gen. i. 7 *διεχώρισεν... ἀνὰ μέσον*. *Ἀνελήμφθη*, Heb. 'went up'; the Greek verb is apparently repeated from vv. 9, 10, where it = אָרָא . From this passage it has been borrowed by the translator of Sirach (xlviii. 9, 14, xlix. 14, B), and by two writers in the N.T. ('Mc.' xvi. 19, Acts i. 2, 11); on its symbolical use see the writer's *Apostles' Creed*, p. 70 f. *ᾠς*, אֵל Heb.; cf. 1 Regn. xvii. 43 (above). 12. *Πάτερ πάτερ*, Heb. 'my father' *bis*. *Διέρρηξεν... ῥήγματα*, after the Heb.: Lucian omits the noun, probably because of the harshness of the announcement. 13. *Καὶ ὑψώσεν* = וַיִּרְוֶה ; Luc., *καὶ ἀνελάτο*. *Μηλωτήν*, 'sheepskin,' an interpretation of מַלְוָתָה (Vulg. *phallium*) wherever it is used of Elijah's characteristic raiment (3 Regn. xix. 13, 19, 4 Regn. ii. 8 ff.); cf. Heb. xi. 37 *περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς*. *Ἐπάνωθεν*, sc. *αὐτοῦ* (Heb., Luc.). *Ἐλεισαίε*, אֵל Heb.; *καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν Ἐλεισαίε* is Hexaplaric, and wanting in B^* , but

supplied by B^{ab}A Luc. 14. 'Ο θεός, 𐤀𐤋 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀. 'Αφφώ, a transliteration answering to 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀 (𐤀𐤋.); in x. 10 the same form = 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀, which was perhaps the reading before the LXX. in this place. Aq. *καίπερ αὐτός*, but Symm. *καὶ νῦν*, whence Jerome *etiam nunc*. 15. *καὶ οἱ ἐν Ἱερειχώ*: Λ *καί* A Luc. with 𐤀𐤋. 16. 𐤀𐤋 is not represented by 𐤀𐤋^{AB}; Luc. adds *εἰσί. Υἱοὶ δυνάμεως, 𐤀𐤋𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀*. 'Εν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, 'Ελειαίε, Λ Heb., Luc. 18. In A Luc. Aq. Th. 𐤀𐤋 the verse begins 'And they returned to him'; cf. v. 13.

Ps. cix. (cx.) 1—4.

1. [Ὁ] κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, 𐤀𐤋𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀 𐤀𐤋𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀. 'Εκ δεξιῶν, 𐤀𐤋𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀; in v. 5 the same Gr. is used for 𐤀𐤋𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀 𐤀𐤋. 'Υποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου: *ὑποκάτω* is the reading of the best authorities in Mt. xxii. 44, Mc. xii. 36, but *ὑποπ.* keeps its place in Lc.^{ev. act.}, Hebrews. 2. *καὶ κατακυριεύει*=*וררה* apparently. 3. *Μετὰ σοῦ, 𐤀𐤋𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀 (𐤀𐤋𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀)*. 'Η ἀρχή seems to point to a reading *נדיבה* or *נדיבת* (cf. Job xxx. 15, Isa. xxxii. 8); *τῶν ἁγίων (σου)*=*קרשים* (*קרישין*); Symm. *ἐν ὄρεσιν* (*בהררי* for *בהררי*) *ἁγίους*. 'Εκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἐωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε, though not quoted in the N.T., had an important place in post-apostolic Christian teaching from Justin onwards (cf. Justin, *Tryph.* cc. 63, 76, 83; Tert. *adv. Marc.* v. 9; Cypr. *test.* 17, *ep.* 63); in the Arian age it was commonly cited on the Catholic side—see e.g. Cyril. Hierus., *catech.* vii. 2, xi. 5; Athan. *or. c. Arian.* iv. 27 sq.; *de decr.* 3, &c.; Hilar. *de trin.* vi. 16, xii. 8. The O.L. seems to have rendered uniformly *ex utero ante luciferum genui te*, with the variant *generavi* in Tert. *l.c.*; Jerome's 'Hebrew' Psalter reads with 𐤀𐤋 *quasi de vulva orietur tibi ros adolescentiae*. The LXX. appear to have read their Heb. text as 𐤀𐤋𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀 𐤀𐤋𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀, perhaps dropping *לכטל* as unintelligible. 4. *Κατὰ τὴν τάξιν, 𐤀𐤋 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀*, Aq. Symm. *κατὰ λόγον*. Cf. Heb. v. 6 ff., vii. 11, 15 (*κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίότητα*). The translator probably had before him the LXX. of Gen. xiv. 18; he transliterates the unique name *מלכיצר* in the same way.

PROV. viii. 22—25, 30—31.

22. 'Εκτισέν με. So 𐤀𐤋^{BA} etc. O.L. (*condidit, creavit*); codd. 23=V, 252, with Aq. Symm. Th. Vulg. (*possedit*), give *ἐκτήσατο*—both possible meanings of 𐤀𐤋. The former rendering supplied the Arians with one of their stock arguments (cf. Athan. *or. c. Arian.* ii. 44 sqq.). *Εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, a loose and partial translation, probably a confession of inability to understand the Heb.; Th.

πρὸ τῆς ἐργασίας ἀπὸ τότε. 23. Ἐθεμελίωσέν με, reading apparently ידנני where 𐤃𐤁 has 𐤃𐤁𐤓; cf. Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 69. Πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι, a poor rendering of Heb., probably adopted to bring this clause into line with v. 24 with which the LXX. seem to have connected it. 24. LXX. overlook 𐤅𐤋𐤋𐤀 and 𐤎𐤕𐤁𐤓, unless they intend to convey the general sense by ποιῆσαι and προελθεῖν. 25. Πάντων, 𐤀 𐤃𐤁. Γεννᾶ με, 𐤃𐤁 'I was brought forth.' 30. ἀρμόζουσα = 𐤁𐤌𐤓, the word being referred by the translator to 𐤁𐤌𐤓; similarly Symm. Th., ἐστηριγμένη. Ἡ προσέχαιρεν implies the reading 𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃; יום יום is connected by LXX. with the next clause. 31. "Οτε...συντελέσας: Heb. 'rejoicing in the world of his earth.' LXX. seem to have read 𐤕𐤌𐤏𐤏 𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤋, as Lagarde suggests; had 𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤋 stood in their text, οἰκουμένη would have been ready at hand as a rendering (cf. 2 Regn. xxii. 16, Ps. ix. 9, &c.). Εὐφραίνεται, reading 𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃. Υἱὸν ἀνθρώπων = 𐤁𐤌𐤓 𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤋; cf. υἱὸς Ἀδάμ, Deut. xxxii. 8; 𐤁𐤌𐤓 𐤁 is translated by this phrase in Ps. x. (xi.) 4, and repeatedly in the poetical books.

JOB xix. 23—27.

23. Τίς γὰρ ἂν δῶη; See above p. 308; the phrase is repeated in the Hebrew, but the translator contents himself with using it once. 𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤋 is ignored; its usual equivalent in the LXX. is νῦν or οὖν, unless it is transliterated (p. 324). Εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα seems to represent 𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃, which in 𐤃𐤁 belongs to the next verse; Th. translates it εἰς μαρτύριον, reading the word as 𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃. 24. B* omits ἐν πέτραις ἐνγλυφῆναι which appears to be necessary to the sense; in supplying it B^{ab}SA prefix 𐤏, a manifest gloss. 25. Ἀέναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλείει με μέλλων, a paraphrase of Heb. 'my *Goel* lives'; ἀέναος in the LXX. elsewhere = 𐤁𐤌𐤓, and 𐤁𐤌𐤓 is ἀγχιστεύς (Ruth iii. 9, etc.), or λυτρωτής (Ps. xviii. 14, lxxvii. 35). 25—26. Ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναστήσαι or ἀναστήσει appears to correspond with 𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃 𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃 (𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤋), and τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα with 𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤋 𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤋. 𐤃𐤁 points to 𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤋 𐤁𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤋 (Siegfried in Haupt *ad loc.*). But the translator perhaps interprets his text in the light of the doctrine of the Resurrection, which was accepted from Maccabean times (cf. Job xlii. 17^a, and see Dan. xii. 2, 2 Macc. vii. 14, xii. 43); as cited by Clem. R. 1 Cor. 26 (ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρκα μου ταύτην τὴν ἀναντλήσασαν ταῦτα πάντα), the words are brought into still nearer agreement with the faith of the

Church; see *Apostles' Creed*, p. 89 f. Παρὰ γὰρ Κυρίου...συντετέλεσθη corresponds in position with words which פח divides and points as $\text{וּמִבְּצֻרֵי אֲחֻזָּה אֲלֹהֵי}$, but seems to be partly borrowed from the next verse. Ⓞ^A suggests $\text{וּמִבְּצֻרֵי לִי אֲלֹהֵי}$ (Siegfried). 27. Πάντα δέ μοι συντετέλεσται פח , $\text{כָּל־וְיָ לִי אֲלֹהֵי}$.

MICAH v. I (iv. 14)—4 (3).

1. Ἐμφραχθήσεται θυγάτηρ ἐμφραγμῶ, i.e. בת נררי נררי. Ταὶ φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ: LXX. read יְצַחֵל יְצַבְטִי for יְצַבְטִי . 2. Βηθλέεμ οἶκος Ἐφράθα: did LXX. read $\text{בֵּית־לְחֶם בֵּית־אֶפְרָתָה}$? Ὀλιγοστός εἶ τοῦ εἶναι 'art little to be,' as Heb. The passage is quoted in Mt. ii. 6 in a Greek paraphrase¹ which substitutes οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη for 'little to be,' and τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν (אַלְפִּי) for 'thousands' (אַלְפִּי). 3. Ἔως καιροῦ τικτούσης τέξεται, apparently for ἔως καιροῦ οὗ τίκτουσα τέξεται or ἔ. κ. τικτούσης ὅτε τέξεται. 4. Καὶ ὄψεται, τὸ ποιμνιον αὐτοῦ were obelised in Hex. and find no place in פח ; the former has perhaps originated in a misreading of וְרַעַה as וְרַחַי , so that καὶ ὄψ. καὶ ποιμανεῖ is in fact a doublet. Κύριος, subject; Heb. 'in the strength of J.,' the subject being the same as in v. 1. Ἐπάρεξουσιν, וְיִשְׁבּוּ ; the LXX. read יְשַׁבּוּ , connecting the verb with the previous words; for יְשַׁבּוּ = ὑπάρχειν cf. Ps. liv. (lv.) 20 ὁ ὑπάρχων πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων.

JEREM. xxxviii. 31—37 (xxx. 30—36).

Vv. 31—34 are cited in Heb. viii. 8—12, q.v. 31. Διαθήσομαι, in Hebrews συντελέσω, cf. Jer. xli. (xxxiv.) 8 συντελέσαι (כָּרַת) διαθήκη, and ib. 15. Τῷ οἴκῳ βίς, in Hebrews ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον. 32. Διεθέμην, in Hebrews ἐποίησα: the writer appears to dislike the repeated alliteration in διατίθεσθαι διαθήκη. Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου, for the more usual τοῦ ἐπιλαβέσθαι με or ὅτε (הֵן) ἐπελαβόμην. Ὅτι οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν...Heb. 'which...they broke'; ἡμέλησα αὐτῶν, reading נִעְלַחֵי for בַּעֲלַחֵי . 33. ἡ διαθήκη μου, Heb. 'the covenant.' Διδούς δώσω, a Hebraism not represented in פח ; in Hebrews διδούς appears without δώσω, and so AQ in Jer. Eis τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, Heb. 'in their inward parts.' 34. עֵוֶר יוֹ has no equivalent in the Greek; τὸν πολίτην αὐτοῦ, Heb. 'his neighbours' (cf. Prov. xi. 9, 12, xxiv. 43=28), reminds us that we are dealing

¹ The paraphrastic character of the reference appears more distinctly in the second stanza ἐκ σοῦ...Ἰσραὴλ, which blends Mic. v. 1^b, 3^a. It will be observed that cod. A reads ἡγούμενος with Mt.

with an Alexandrian version. Ἀπό...ἔως, עַד...לְ; ἀδικίας... ἁμαρτιῶν, אִי, 'iniquity,' 'sin.' 35—37. In אִי 36, 37 precede 35. 35. Φησὶν Κύριος, Heb. 'thus saith J.' (at the beg. of the verse). Ὑψωθῆ, reading וְיִשְׁׁרְוּ for וְיִשְׁׁרְוּ; ταπεινωθῆ, Heb. 'be searched.' Οὐκ ἀποδοκιμῶ: ἀποδ. is a contracted future (cf. p. 305); οὐκ is inserted, because the drift of the verse has been misunderstood (cf. Streane, p. 156 f.). Τὸ γένος Ἰσραήλ, Heb. 'all the seed of I.'; γένος = עַרְבֵי again in v. 37. 36. Σελήνην, אִי, 'the ordinances of the moon' (but cf. מִקְרָבֵי in v. 35, Heb.). Κρανγῆν, reading perhaps רַגַּל or רַגְלֵי for רַגְלֵי. 37. Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ = תְּהִיָּהוָה הַיְהוָה, as almost invariably in the Prophets¹ from Hosea xii. 5 (6) onwards, with the exception of Isaiah, who transliterates תְּהִיָּהוָה (Κύριος σαβαώθ, Isa. i. 9, al.). See Thackeray, *J. Th. St.* iv. p. 245 ff.; this passage is from his "Jer. β."

DAN. xii. 1—4.

1. Χώραν (LXX.), probably a corruption for ὄραν (cf. Bevan, p. 48); παρελεύσεται (LXX.), reading עָבַר for עָמַר (ἀναστήσεται, Th.). Ὁ ἄγγελος (LXX.), a gloss; Th. literally, ὁ ἄρχων. Ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱούς (LXX., Th.), ...יְבִי עַל. Ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα, LXX., ἔστα καιρός Th.; Th. is again more literal than LXX. Θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέγονεν (cf. Mt. xxiv. 21, Mc. xiii. 19). Th. repeats the subject with the view of preventing ambiguity; in the sequel LXX. (as handed down to us) overlook ἡ γῆ, while Th. adds ἐν τῇ γῇ or ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Ὑψωθήσεται LXX.; Bevan suggests a corruption for ἐκσωθήσεται or some other compound of σωθήσεται; but ὑψ. may be a gloss upon the tamer word which stood in the original. Th. rightly, σωθήσεται. Ὁς ἂν εὐρεθῆ, אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁׁרְוּ—overlooked by Th., unless we accept the reading of A Q, ὁ εὐρεθεὶς [ὁ] γεγραμμένος. 2. Ἐν τῷ πλάτει τῆς γῆς, LXX.; ἐν γῆς χώματι Th., Heb. 'in the ground of dust' (but see Bevan, p. 201 f.). Διασπορὰν καὶ αἰσχύνην, LXX.; διασπ. is perhaps a gloss on αἰσχ.; for the word see Deut. xxviii. 25. 3. Οἱ φωστῆρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, LXX., a reminiscence of Gen. i. 14 (LXX.); cf. Sap. xiii. 2. Οἱ κατισχύοντες τοὺς λόγους LXX., reading מְרַבֵּי מַחֲוִיָּה for מְרַבֵּי יְקִיָּהוָה; Th. translates מְרַבֵּי יְקִיָּהוָה. Τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (LXX.), the ordinary Biblical phrase, used in iii. 36, 63; Heb., Th. have 'the stars.' 4. Ἀπομανῶσιν (LXX.), διδαχθῶσιν (Th.). Both senses have been found in the Heb.; cf. Bevan, *ad loc.* Πλησθῆ ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας, LXX., reading רַעַר or רַעַר for רַעַר.

¹ Zech. xiii. 2, Jer. xxvi. (xlv.) 10 are the only exceptions, and in both cases the MSS. are divided.

The student who has gone through these extracts, or who is able to dispense with help of this kind, is recommended to begin the careful study of some one book or group of books. For several reasons the Books of Samuel (I—2 Regn.) offer a promising field for work of this kind. They are on the whole the part of the Old Testament in which the value of the Septuagint is most manifest and most generally recognised¹, and invaluable help in the study of both the Hebrew text and the versions is at hand in the commentaries of Wellhausen, Driver, and H. P. Smith². But whatever book may be selected, the method and the aims of the reader will be the same. He will read the Greek in the first place as a version, and he will use all the means at his disposal for ascertaining the original text which lay behind it. But he will read it also as a monument of early Hellenistic Greek, and mark with growing interest its use of words and phrases which, originating at Alexandria in connexion with the work of translating the Hebrew Scriptures, eventually became the vehicle of a fuller revelation in the writings of the Apostolic age.

LITERATURE on the general subject of this chapter: *Pearsoni praefatio paraenetica* (Cambridge, 1665; *cum. notulis E. Churton*, 1865); Hody, *De Bibl. textibus originalibus* (Oxford, 1705); Dr T. Brett, *A Letter showing why our English Bibles differ from the Septuagint*, London, 1743 (dated Oct. 17, 1729); *A Dissertation on the Ancient Versions of the Bible*, London, 1760; Thiersch, *De Pent. vers. Alexandrina* (Erlangen, 1841); Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig, 1841); *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinschen Exegese auf die alex. Hermeneutik*, 1857; Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 73 ff. (Berlin, 1875—8); Selwyn, art. *Septuagint* in Smith's *D. B.* ii. (London, 1863); Wellhausen, do. in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (London, 1886);

¹ W. R. Smith, *O. T. in J. Church*, p. 83.

² If the student prefers to begin with Genesis, he will learn much as to the LXX. version from Spurrell's *Notes* (ed. 2, 1898). For more advanced study Proverbs will form a suitable subject, and here he may seek help from Lagarde's *Anmerkungen*, and Professor Toy's commentary in the 'International Critical' series.

W. R. Smith, *Old Testament in Jewish Church* (1881, ed. 2, 1892); Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford, 1889); Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, Intr. (Oxford, 1890; second ed., 1913); Buhl, *Kanon u. Text des O. T.* (Leipzig, 1891); Nestle, *Marginalien* (Tübingen, 1893); Streane, *Double Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge, 1896); Kirkpatrick in *Expositor*, April 1896; Redpath in *A. J. Th.* VII. (1903); the various Introductions to the Old Testament; Commentaries on particular books, esp. those of Dillmann and Spurrell (Genesis), Driver (Deuteronomy), Moore (Judges), Wellhausen, Driver, and H. P. Smith (Samuel), Burney (Kings), Mozley (Psalter), Toy (Proverbs), Ryssel (Micah), Oesterley (Amos), Ottley (Isaiah), Cornill (Ezekiel). A complete commentary on the LXX., or on any of the groups of books which compose it, is still a *desideratum*.

On the Semitic style of the LXX. the reader may consult the *Εισαγωγή* of Adrianus (Migne, *P. G.* xcvi. or ed. F. Gösling).

CHAPTER VI.

TEXT-DIVISIONS: *STICHI*, CHAPTERS, LECTIONS,
CATENAE.

THE Greek Old Testament, as it appears in the editions of the last three centuries, is divided into chapters and verses which correspond generally with those of the printed Hebrew Bible.

The traditional text-divisions of the Hebrew and the Greek Bible are not absolutely identical. Besides the more serious differences described in Part II. c. i., it not unfrequently happens that a Greek chapter is longer or shorter than the corresponding chapter of the Hebrew by a verse or more, and that as a consequence there are two systems of verse-numeration throughout the succeeding chapter¹.

A system of verse-division² is mentioned in the Mishnah (*Meg.* 4. 4, *Kidd.* 30. 1). The Massorets noted the number of verses (פְּסוּקִים) at the end of each book and portion of the canon; thus Deuteronomy is stated to consist of 955 *pesukim*, and the entire Torah of 5888. Of chapter-divisions in the Hebrew Bible there are three kinds. (a) There is a pre-Talmudic division of the canon into sections known as פְּרָשִׁיּוֹת. The parashahs are of two kinds, open and closed, i.e. para-

¹ In such cases both systems are represented in the Cambridge edition of the LXX. (see *O. T. in Greek*, i. p. xiv.).

² For a full account of the divisions of the Hebrew text see Buhl, *Kanon u. Text*, p. 222; Bleek-Wellhausen, p. 574 f.; Ryle, *Canon of the O. T.*, p. 235. Blau, *Massoretic Studies*, iii., in *J. Q. R.*, Oct. 1896.

graphs, which begin a new line, and sub-paragraphs¹, which are preceded only by a space. They are still registered in the printed Bibles by the פ (for פְּתוּחָה, 'open') and ס (for סְּתוּמָה, 'closed') which occur at intervals throughout the Torah². (b) A second system of parashahs breaks up the text into longer sections for the use of the synagogue. The Law was divided into 54 Sabbath lessons according to the Babylonian tradition, but into 154 according to the tradition of Palestine. With few exceptions³ the beginning of a lesson coincides with that of an open or closed parashah; the coincidence is marked in the Torah by a thrice repeated פ or ס. The Prophets were similarly divided for synagogue reading, but the prophetic lections were known as *haphtharoth* (הַפְּטָרוֹת) and were not, like the liturgical parashahs, distinguished by signs inserted in the text. (c) Lastly, the printed Hebrew Bibles are divided into chapters nearly identical with those of the English versions. This system of capitulation is relatively modern, and was applied first to the Latin Vulgate in the thirteenth century, probably by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury († 1228)⁴. It was adapted to the Hebrew Bible in R. Isaac Nathan's Concordance, a work of the fifteenth century, in which use was also made of the older division into verses or *pesukim*.

Of printed editions the Bomberg Hebrew Bible of 1521 was the first to employ the mediaeval system of chapters; the verse-division found a place in the Latin version of Pagnini (1528), and the Latin Vulgate of Robert Stephen (1555), and finally in the Hebrew Bible of Athias (1661). Both chapters

¹ A similar system of paragraphing has been adopted in the English Revised Version, and in the Cambridge LXX.; see R.V. *Preface*, and *O.T. in Greek*, i. p. xv.

² In Baer's edition they are given throughout the Bible.

³ In the Pentateuch there is only one, the lesson (12) which begins at Gen. xlvii. 28 (Ryle, p. 236).

⁴ See Gregory, *prolegg.* p. 167 ff.

and verses were applied to the text of the Septuagint before the sixteenth century; the capitulation appeared in the Complutensian Polyglott and in the Aldine edition of 1518, and the verse-numeration in the Frankfort edition of the Aldine text¹.

Neither the verses nor the chapters of the existing text-division occur in MSS. of the Greek Old Testament, except in relatively later copies², or in older MSS. where the numerals have been supplied by a recent hand. But the student who examines MSS. of the LXX. or their facsimiles finds himself confronted by other systems which are both interesting and in some respects important. To these the present chapter will be devoted.

1. We begin with the shorter divisions, known as *στίχοι*, *κῶλα*, or *κόμματα*.

(a) *Στίχος*, Lat. *versus*, is properly a series of objects placed in a row. The word is used in the LXX. of the stones in the High Priest's breastplate (*στίχος λίθων*, Exod. xxviii. 17 ff.), the pomegranates wrought upon the capitals of the pillars in the Temple (*στίχοι ῥοῶν*, 3 Regn. vii. 6), and the rows of cedar-wood shafts (*τριῶν στίχων στύλων κεδρίνων*, *ib.* 9). When applied to the art of writing, the word signifies a continuous line of letters or syllables. The extent of an author's literary work was measured by the *stichi* he had written; cf. e.g. Diogenes Laertius iv. 24, *Κράντωρ κατέλιπεν ὑπομνήματα εἰς μυριάδας στίχων τρεῖς*: Dionysius Halicarn. vi. 1126 *πέντε ἢ ἕξ μυριάδας στίχων τοῦ ἀνδρὸς* (sc. *Δημοσθένους*) *καταλελοιπότης*. The 'line' might be measured in various ways, as by the limits imposed upon the scribe by the breadth of his papyrus, or in the case of poetry by the number of feet in the metre; or again it might be fixed in each instance by the requirements of

¹ It prints the verse-numbers in the margin, and begins every verse with a capital letter.

² E.g. H.-P. 38 (xv.), 122 (xv.), where the modern chapters are marked.

the sense; or it might depend upon a purely conventional standard. Evidence has been produced¹ to shew that the last of these methods was adopted in the copying of Greek prose writings, and that the length of the prose *stichus* was determined by that of the Homeric hexameter, i.e. it was normally a line of sixteen syllables; in some instances the Iambic trimeter seems to have been the standard preferred, and the line consisted of twelve syllables². The number of letters in the *stichus* was on the average 37—38 in the one case, and 28—29 in the other. Such a system served more than one useful purpose. Besides facilitating reference, it regulated the pay of the scribe, and consequently the price of the book. The number of the lines in a book once determined, it might be written in any form without affecting the cost³. The compiler of the Cheltenham list explains that dishonest scribes at Rome and elsewhere purposely suppressed or mutilated the stichometry⁴. Thus the careful entry of the *στίχοι* in the margins of ancient books, or the computation at the end of the number of *στίχοι* contained in them, was not due to mere custom or sentiment, but served an important practical end.

(b) Besides this conventional measurement there existed another system which regulated the length of the line by the sense. Sense-divisions were commonly known as *κῶλα* or *κόμματα*. The *colon*, according to Suidas, is a line which forms a complete clause (*ὁ ἀπηρτισμένην ἔνοιαν ἔχων στίχος*); the *comma* is a shorter *colon*⁵.

This arrangement was originally used in transcribing poetry, but before Jerome's time it had been applied to the great prose

¹ By Ch. Graux, *Revue de philologie*, II. (1878), p. 97 ff.

² J. R. Harris, *Stichometry*, pp. 8, 15.

³ See E. Maunde-Thompson, *Gr. and Lat. Palaeography*, i. p. 80; Prof. Sanday, in *Studia Biblica*, iii. p. 263 f.; J. R. Harris, *op. cit.* p. 26.

⁴ "Indiculum versuum in urbe Roma non ad liquidum, sed et alibi avariciae causa non habent integrum."

⁵ See Wordsworth-White, *Epilogus*, p. 733, nn. 1, 2.

authors; cf. Hieron. *praef. ad Isa.*¹: "nemo cum prophetas versibus viderit esse descriptos, metro eos aestimet apud Hebraeos ligari, et aliquid simile habere de Psalmis vel operibus Salomonis; sed quod in Demosthene et Tullio solet fieri, ut per cola scribantur et commata, qui utique prosa et non versibus conscripserunt, nos quoque, utilitati legentium providentes, interpretationem novam scribendi genere distinximus"; *praef. in Ezech.*²: "legite igitur et hunc iuxta translationem nostram, quoniam per cola scriptus et commata manifestiorem legentibus sensum tribuit." Cf. Cassiod. *de inst. div. litt.*, praef. Hesychius of Jerusalem († c. 433) treated the Greek text of the Dodecaphropheton in the same way³: ἔστι μὲν ἀρχαῖον τοῦτο τοῖς θεοφόροις τὸ σπούδασμα στιχηδόν, ὡς τὰ πολλά, πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελετωμένων σαφήνειαν τὰς προφητείας ἐκτίθεσθαι. οὕτω τοιγαροῦν ὄψει μὲν τὸν Δαβὶδ κιθαρίζοντα, τὸν Παροιμιαστὴν δὲ τὰς παραβολὰς καὶ τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστὴν τὰς προφητείας ἐκθέμενον. οὕτω συγγραφείσαν τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰώβ βίβλον, οὕτω μερισθέντα τοῖς στίχοις τὰ τῶν Ἀσμάτων ἄσματα...οὐ μάρτην ἐν ταῖς δώδεκα βίβλοις τῶν προφητῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἠκολούθησα.

Specimens of colometry may be seen in Codd. \aleph B, where the poetical books are written in *cola* of such length that the scribe has been compelled to limit himself in this part of his work to two columns instead of dividing his page into three or four.

Among the lists of the books of the O.T. canon printed in an earlier chapter of this book (Part II. c. i.) there are three which are accompanied by a stichometry. We will now collect their measurements and exhibit them in a tabular form.

Book.	Stichometry of Nicephorus.	Stichometry of Cod. Clarom.	Stichometry of Mommson's list.
Genesis	4300	4500	3700
Exodus	2800	3700	3000
Leviticus	2700	2800	2300
Numbers	3530	3650	3000
Deuteronomy	3100	3300	2700
Joshua	2100	2000	1750
Judges	} 2450 }	2000	1750 ⁴
Ruth		250	250

¹ Migne, *P. L.* xxviii. 771.

² Migne, *P. L.* xxviii. 938.

³ Migne, *P. G.* xxiii. 1339 sq.

⁴ Total of first 7 books, '18000.'

Book.	Stichometry of Nicephorus.	Stichometry of Cod. Clarom.	Stichometry of Mommsen's list.	
1 Kingdoms	} 2240 }	2500	2300	
2 Kingdoms		2000	2200	
3 Kingdoms		} 2203 }	2600	2550
4 Kingdoms			2400	2250 ¹
1 Paralip.	} 5500 }		2040	
2 Paralip.			2100	
1 Esdras	} 5500 }	1500		
2 Esdras				
Psalms	5100	5000	5000	
Proverbs	1700	1600		
Ecclesiastes	750	600		
Song	280	300		
Job	1800	1600	1700	
Wisdom	1100	1000		
Sirach	2800	2500		
Esther	350	1000	700	
Judith	1700	1300	1100	
Tobit	700	1000	900	
Hosea		530		
Amos		410		
Micah		310		
Joel		90		
Obadiah		70		
Jonah		150		
Nahum		140		
Habakkuk		160		
Zephaniah		140		
Haggai		110		
Zechariah		660		
Malachi		200		
(Dodecapropheton)	3000	[2970]	3800	
Isaiah	3800	3600	3580	
Jeremiah	4000	4070	4450	
Baruch	700			
Ezekiel	4000	3600	3340	
Daniel	2000 ²	1600	1350	
1 Maccabees	} 7300 }	2300	2300	
2 Maccabees		}	2300	1800
3 Maccabees				
4 Maccabees			1000	

¹ In Mommsen's list the following totals are also given: Ruth and 1—4 Kingdoms, 9500; Salomonic books, 6500; Major Prophets, 15370; the whole canon, 69500.

² Susanna is calculated separately (500).

The figures given above correspond to those in the lists printed in c. i., which follow the text of Preuschen (*Analecta*, pp. 156f., 142ff., 138f.). Some variants and suggested rectifications may be seen in Zahn, *Gesch. d. NTlichen Kanons*, ii., pp. 295 ff., 143 ff., and Sanday, *Studia Biblica*, iii., pp. 266 ff.

Many MSS. of the Greek Bible contain more or less complete stichometries of the several books of the canon. Either the total number of *stichi* is registered at the end of the book, or a record is kept throughout the book by placing a figure or figures in the margin at the end of each centenary of lines. Some of our oldest MSS. reproduce in this form the stichometry of their archetypes; in other cases, a stichometry which has been copied into the margin by a second or later hand. Thus in Cod. B, the margins of 1—4 Regn. and Isaiah present a nearly complete record¹ of *stichi* written *prima manu*, and doubtless transcribed from the MSS. to which the scribe owed his copy of those books. A marginal register of *stichi* is also found in part of Cod. F, beginning with Deuteronomy, and in Cod. Q, where it is due to the hand which has added the Hexaplaric matter. The entries in B and Q agree generally in Isaiah; in both MSS. the last entry occurs at Isa. lxx. 19, where the number of *stichi* reaches 3500. But the famous Chigi MS. of the Prophets (Cod. 87) counts 3820 *stichi* in Isaiah². This approaches the number given by Nicephorus, whilst the total number of *stichi* in BQ, 3600, agrees with the computation of the Claromontane list. The addition of 200 *stichi* in Nicephorus and Cod. 87 is due, Ceriani suggests, to the greater length of the Hexaplaric and Lucianic texts³. There is a similar disparity between the stichometry of Nicephorus and the reckoning of Cod. F in Deuteronomy,

¹ It is printed by Harris, *Stichometry*, p. 59 ff. Cf. Nestle, *Introd. to the Textual Criticism of the N. T.* (E. tr.), p. 4.

² $\overline{\omega\kappa}$, or as Allatius read the MS., $\overline{\Gamma\omega\text{H}}$ (3808); see Cozza, *Sacr. bibl. vet. fragm.* iii. p. xv.

³ *De cod. March.*, p. 23 f.

where in F the *stichi* are 3000¹, but in Nicephorus 3100. On the other hand the later uncial K makes the *stichi* of Numbers to be 3535, which comes very near to the reckoning of Nicephorus².

Stichometrical variation is doubtless chiefly or largely due to divergent types of text. But other causes of disparity were at work. It was easy for scribes to misread the letters which represented the number of the lines, especially when they were mechanically copied from an archetype. The older signs may have been sometimes misunderstood³, or those which were intelligible may have been confused by careless copying. A glance at the comparative table on p. 346 f. will shew that several of the larger discrepancies can only be explained in some such way.

The following stichometry is derived chiefly from Dr E. Klostermann's *Analecta*⁴, giving the result of his researches among cursive MSS., with some additions supplied by the Editors of the larger LXX.

Genesis	4308 ⁵	H.-P. 30, 52, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Vat. gr. 746; Pal. gr. 203; Athos, Pantocr. 24, Laur. γ. 112; Athens, Nat. 44
Exodus	3400	H.-P. 30, 52, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Athens, Nat. 44
Leviticus	2700	H.-P. 30, 52, 54, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Paris, Reg. gr. 2; 2000, Athens, Nat. 44
Numbers	3535 ⁶	H.-P. 30, 52, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Vat. gr. 2122; Athens, Nat. 44; Paris, Reg. gr. 2
Deuteronomy	3100	H.-P. 30, 52, 54, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Vat. gr. 2122; Paris, Reg. gr. 2
Joshua	2100	H.-P. 30, 54, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Paris, Reg. gr. 2

¹ The symbol used is Ϝ, which occurs also in B. On this symbol, see J. Woisin, *De Græcorum notis numeralibus*, n. 67 (Kiel, 1886).

² The numeration of the *stichi* in the poetical books ascribed to the greater uncials in the Cambridge manual LXX. is derived from Dr Nestle's *Supplementum*² (Leipzig, 1887), and rests on an actual counting of the lines, and not on statements in the MSS. themselves.

³ Cf. J. R. Harris, *Stichometry*, p. 31.

⁴ See p. 44 ff. Cf. *J. Th. St.*, ii. p. 238 ff.

⁵ 4400 in H.-P. 54.

⁶ 3530 in H.-P. 54.

Judges	2100 ¹	Barb. iii. 36; 2156, Paris, Reg. gr. 2; Athos, Pantocr. 24
Ruth	300	Barb. iii. 36; Paris, Reg. gr. 2
1 Kingdoms	2500	Barb. iii. 36 (500, Ven. Marc. gr. xvi)
2 Kingdoms	2343	Barb. iii. 36; 2042, Ven. Marc. gr. xvi
3 Kingdoms	2400	Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi
4 Kingdoms	2600	Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi
1 Paralip.	2000	Barb. iii. 36
2 Paralip.	3000	Barb. iii. 36
1 Esdras	1300	Barb. iii. 36
2 Esdras	1800	Barb. iii. 36
Psalms	5100	Barb. iii. 36 ²
Proverbs	1750	H.-P. 161, 248; Barb. iii. 36
Ecclesiastes	750	H.-P. 161, 248; Barb. iii. 36; 753, H.-P. 253
Song	286	H.-P. 161, 248; Barb. iii. 36; 353, H.-P. 253
Job	2200	(including asterisked lines, 1600 without them) H.-P. 161(?), 248; Barb. iii. 36
Wisdom	1250	Barb. iii. 36; Ven. gr. i. 13
Sirach	2650	Barb. iii. 36; Ven. gr. i. 13
Esther	750	Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi, Ven. gr. i. 13
Judith	1300	Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi
Tobit	750	Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi, Ven. gr. i. 13
Hosea	750	H.-P. 86
Joel	210	H.-P. 86
Habakkuk	150	H.-P. 86
Zephaniah	160	H.-P. 86
Haggai	120	H.-P. 86
Zechariah	670	H.-P. 86; 776, H.-P. 231
Malachi	190	H.-P. 86; 204, H.-P. 231 ³
Isaiah	3700	H.-P. 231; 3820, Barb. iii. 36
Jeremiah	4500	H.-P. 231; 3800, Barb. iii. 36
Baruch	514	H.-P. 231; 350, Barb. iii. 36
Lamentations ⁴	$\overline{\text{H}\Phi}$ (?)	H.-P. 86; $\overline{\mu}$ (?) H.-P. 231; 860, Barb. iii. 36
Ep. of Jeremiah	200	Barb. iii. 36
Ezekiel	4500	H.-P. 231; 4000, Barb. iii. 36
Daniel	1800	H.-P. 231; 1720, Barb. iii. 36
Susanna	224	H.-P. 231

¹ 2450 in H. P. 54.² Ecclesiastical Canticles, 600, Barb. iii. 36.³ Total of Minor Prophets variously calculated at 3750, 3500, 3300 (Barb. iii. 36).⁴ Possibly a corruption of $\overline{\text{H}\epsilon}$ (see next page).

2. No complete system of capitulation is found in any of our existing uncial MSS. of the Greek Old Testament. Yet even the Vatican MS., which is written continuously except in the poetical books, bears traces of a system of chapter-divisions which is older than itself¹. It begins with Proverbs, and from that book onwards chapter-numbers appear in the margin of the canonical writings, whilst in some instances there is a double capitulation, as the following table will shew.

Proverbs	61	16	Zephaniah	5
Ecclesiastes	25	7	Haggai	3
Song	40	5	Zechariah	18
Job		33	Malachi	6
Hosea		11	Isaiah	74
Amos		6	Jeremiah	100 98
Micah		7	Baruch	9
Joel		3	Lamentations	85 ²
Obadiah		1	Ep. of Jeremiah	6
Jonah		3	Ezekiel	56
Nahum		3	Daniel	[21] 21 ³
Habakkuk		4		

The figures in the left-hand column are *prima manu*; those on the right are in a hand of perhaps the eleventh century (? that of 'Clement the Monk,' the industrious *instaurator* who has left his name on pp. 238 and 264 of the MS.⁴). In Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song the capitulation of the later hand differs widely, as will be observed, from the system which the original scribe reproduced from his archetype. But in the Prophets the corrector seems simply to have followed the numbers inscribed in the margin by B*; the latter can be detected here and there under the large coarse characters of the later hand, and towards the end of Jeremiah and throughout

¹ Tischendorf (*Mon. sacr. ined. n. c.*, i. prolegg., p. xxvii.) points out that Tertullian recognises a system of chapters in Numbers.

² In this book the chapter-numbers correspond to the divisions indicated in the original by the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and in the recension by transliteration of the Hebrew alphabetic names.

³ This number includes the Greek additions.

⁴ See the pref. to Fabiani and Cozza's facsimile, p. xvii. sqq.

Daniel the two sets of numbers are distinctly visible. In Jeremiah the *instaurator* here and there breaks away from the guidance of the first hand, and the totals are slightly different. But the difference is probably accidental, and it is certainly slight; whereas in the Salomonic books another system is followed, in which the chapters are three or four times as long as those of the older capitulation.

Cod. A is broken into paragraphs throughout the prose books, the beginning of each paragraph being indicated not only by paragraph-marks, but by the use of a capital letter which projects into the margin. Besides the paragraphing certain books—Deuteronomy, Joshua, 3—4 Kingdoms, Isaiah—retain traces of a capitulation imperfectly copied from the archetype. In Deuteronomy chapter-marks occur at cc. i. 1, 9, 19, 40; ii. 1, 7, 14; in Joshua they begin at ix. 1 ($\bar{\iota}\beta$) and proceed regularly (x. 1, 16, 29, 31, 34, 36, 38; xi. 1, &c.) down to xix. 17 ($\bar{\lambda}\eta$); in 3 Regn. the first numeral occurs at c. viii. 22 ($\bar{\kappa}\beta$), and the last at xxi. 17 ($\bar{\nu}\theta$); 4 Regn. returns only one or two numbers (e.g. $\bar{\theta}$ stands opposite to c. iii. 20). In Isaiah, again, the entries are few and irregular; $\bar{\beta}$ appears at c. ii. 1, and $\bar{\theta}$ at xxi. 1.

Cod. \aleph seems to have no chapter-marks *prima manu*, but in Isaiah they have been added by \aleph^{co} throughout the book¹.

Jeremiah, the Epistle of Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are capitulated in cod. Q, and in the two last-named books the capitulation of Q agrees with that of B. In Jeremiah, where the agreement is less complete, the chapters in Q do not proceed beyond c. xxiv., a circumstance which suggests a Hexaplaric origin².

Cod. M like cod. B exhibits two systems of capitulation³,

¹ Tischendorf, notes to facsimile, p. v.

² Ceriani, *de cod. March.*, p. 24 ff.

³ See Montfaucon, *Biblioth. Coisliniana*, p. 4 sqq.

one of which is accompanied by brief headings corresponding in general character to the τίτλοι of the Gospels. The two capitulations, which are represented with more or less of completeness in the Hexateuch and in 1-3 Kingdoms¹, differ considerably, as the following table will shew :

	Marginal Capitulation.	Capitulation accompanied by titles.
Genesis	106	99
Exodus	84	110
Leviticus	54	61
Numbers	53	51
Deuteronomy	65 ²	94 ³

Cod. Sin. I. (x.) is divided into κεφάλαια which number as follows: Genesis, 150; Exodus, 88; Leviticus, 63; Deuteronomy, 69; Joshua, 30; 1 Regn., 66; 2 Regn., 63⁴.

A list of sections quoted by Dr Klostermann⁵ from the cursive MS. cod. Barberini iii. 36 (cent. x. or xi.) exhibits another widely different scheme⁶:

Genesis	26	3 Kingdoms	16	Habakkuk	2
Exodus	8	4 Kingdoms	17	Zephaniah	3
Leviticus	12	Hosea	5	Haggai	3
Numbers	21	Amos	6	Zechariah	13
Deuteronomy	35	Micah	6	Malachi	2
Joshua	8	Joel	4	Isaiah	43
Judges	4	Obadiah	2	Jeremiah	41
1 Kingdoms	15	Jonah	3	Ezekiel	21
2 Kingdoms	11	Nahum	2	Daniel	9

¹ Another Coislin MS. (Coisl. gr. 8) gives the following capitulation for some of the later histories: 1 Chron. 83, 2 Chron. 86, Tobit 21, Judith 34, 1 Esdr. 109, 2 Esdr. 80, Esther 55.

² Beginning at c. iv. 41.

³ In Judges there is no capitulation, but the periods of bondage are distinguished as ΔΟΥΛΕΙΑ Δ, Β, &c., and the exploits of the successive judges by ΚΡΙΤΗΣ Δ, Β and so forth.

⁴ Cf. the numbers in B. M. Add. MS. 35123: Gen., 148; Exod., 84; Lev., 62; Num., 61; Deut., 69; Josh., 30; Jud., 33.

⁵ *Analecta*, p. 80 ff. This division into sections, however, refers not to the text of the books, but to that of the synopsis contained in the MS. Cf. also the κεφάλαια in Hab. iii. found in Barb. v. 45 (86, H.-P.).

⁶ Interesting traces of another old capitulation are to be found in the *ἐκλογή τοῦ νόμου* printed in Cotelerii *Eccl. Gr. Mon.* i. p. 1. The chapters

It is clear that no induction can be drawn from the facts which are at present within our reach; nor can the various systems of capitulation be safely classified until some scholar has collected and tabulated the chapter-divisions of a large number of MSS. of varying ages and provenance¹. It is probable, however, that the systems, which at present seem to be nearly as numerous as the capitulated copies of the LXX., will prove to be reducible to a few types reproduced by the scribes with many variations in detail.

The 'titles' deserve separate consideration. In the few instances where we are able to institute a comparison these headings seem to be independent. In Numbers, e.g., the following table shews little correspondence between those in codd. K, M, even when the chapters coincide.

	Cod. K.	Cod. M.
Num.		
vii. 10.	Τὰ δῶρα τῶν ἀρχόντων.	Περὶ τῶν δώρων ὧν προσήνεγκαν οἱ [ι]β' ἄρχοντες.
viii. 5.	Περὶ τοῦ ἀγνισμοῦ τῶν Λευ[ιτῶν].	Ἀφορισμὸς τῶν Λευειτῶν εἰς τὸ λειτουργεῖν Κυρίῳ.
xi. 16.	Περὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ληψομένων ² τὸ πνεῦμα.	Περὶ ο' πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προφητευσάντων.

here are shorter and therefore more numerous than in any of the lists given above, e.g. Exod. xxii. 1—27 forms part of the 68th chapter and Deut. xxv. 11 ff. of the 93rd in their several books, while Leviticus apparently contains 150 chapters and Numbers 140.

¹ Paragraphs or sections marked by capitals protruding into the margin or written in red ink, or (less frequently) distinguished by numbers, occur perhaps in the majority of cursives; the following list of cursives thus divided is taken from descriptions of MSS. made for the use of the Editors of the larger LXX.: H.-P. x. xi., 16, 17, 18, 29, 38, 46, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 64 (double system of capitulation), 68, 70, 73, 74, 76, 78, 79 (in Gen. χπβ'), 83, 84, 93, 108, 118, 120, 121, 123, 126, 127, 128 (contemporary numbers), 130, 131, 134; B. M. Add. 35123, Lambeth 1214; Paris Ars. 8415; Esc. Ω. i. 13, Σ. i. 16; Munich gr. 454; Grotta Ferrata A. γ. 1; Leipzig gr. 361; Athos, Pantocr. 24 (double system of capitulation, τίτλοι), Vatop. 513, 516; Laur. γ. 112 (both chapters and στίχοι numbered); Athens, nat. gr. 44; Sinai 1, Jerusalem, H. Sep. 2.

² Tischendorf (*Mon. sacr. ined. n. c. i. p. 78*) prints ΔΨΟΜΕΝΩΝ.

	Cod. K.	Cod. M.
Num.		
xii. 1.	Ἄαρὼν καὶ Μαρία κατὰ Μωυσῆν.	Περὶ τῆς λέπρας Μαριάμ ἣν ἔσχεν ὑβρίσασα τὴν γυναῖκα Μωσῆ.
xiii. 1.	Περὶ τῶν κατασκευασμένων τὴν γῆν.	Περὶ τῶν ἀποσταλέντων κατασκοπήσαι τὴν γῆν.
xiv. 23.	Περὶ Χά[λεβ] υἱοῦ [Ἰεφοννή].	
xiv. 34.	Ὅτι ὄσας ἡμέρας κατεσκέψαντο τὴν γῆν, τοσαῦτα ἔτη ἐποίησαν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.	
xvi. 1.	Περὶ Κόρε καὶ Δαθὰν καὶ Ἀβιρῶν καὶ Αὐνάν.	Περὶ τῆς ἐπαναστάσεως τῆς κατὰ Μωσῆν παρὰ τοῦ Κόρε συναγωγῆς.
xvii. 1.	Περὶ τῆς ῥάβδου Ἄαρὼν τῆς βλαστησάσεως.	
xxi. 21.	Περὶ Σηὼν βασιλέως Ἀμορραίων.	Περὶ τῶν ἀποσταλέντων πρὸς Σηὼν, καὶ πῶς ἐνίκησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰσραήλ.
xxxiii. 1.	Ἐπαρσις καὶ σταθμοὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.	Πῶς διώδυσαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ.
xxxiii. 3.	Περὶ τοῦ νυχθήμερον.	
xxxv. 9.	Περὶ τῶν πόλεων τῶν φυγαδευτηρίων.	Περὶ φονέως.

The following τίτλοι for Exod. ii.—viii. are taken from a Vienna MS. (Th. gr. 3):

- a. περὶ τῆς γεννήσεως Μωυσέως.
- β. πρώτη ὄπτασία πρὸς Μωσῆν ἐν τῇ βάτῳ.
- γ. περὶ τῆς συναντήσεως μετ' (?) Ἄαρων.
- δ. εἴσοδος (?) Μωυσέως καὶ Ἄαρων πρὸς Φαραώ.
- ε. περὶ τῶν μαστιγωθέντων γραμματέων.
- ς. περὶ τῆς ῥάβδου τῆς στραφείσης εἰς ὄφιν.
- ζ. πρώτη πληγὴ μεταστροφή τοῦ ὕδατος εἰς αἷμα.
- η. δευτέρα πληγὴ, τῶν βατράχων.
- θ. τρίτη πληγὴ, τῶν σκνιπῶν. Κτλ.

Examples occur of longer headings, which aim at giving a comprehensive summary or a brief interpretation. (a) The preface to Hesychius's colometrical arrangement of the Minor Prophets is followed by a complete set of τίτλοι for the Twelve Prophets and Isaiah¹. The numbers are as follows: Hosea

¹ Migne, *P. G.* xciii., 1345 sqq. The titles for Isaiah with a collection

20, Joel 10, Amos 17, Obadiah 3, Jonah 4, Micah 13, Nahum 5, Habakkuk 4, Zephaniah 7, Haggai 5, Zechariah 32, Malachi 10, Isaiah 88. The titles are with scarcely an exception polemical or dogmatic in character, e.g. Hosea: $\bar{\alpha}$. Εἰκὼν τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῆς, ἐξ ἧς ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα τίκτεται, καὶ λαοῦ τὸ μὲν ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ ἔμεινεν, τὸ δὲ ὕστερον ἐπιστρέφει καὶ σῶζεται. (b) The Syro-hexaplaric Daniel is divided into ten chapters, each headed by a full summary of its contents¹.

3. One class of sections calls for separate treatment. In Part I. c. v. (p. 168 f.) some account has been given of MSS. which consist of lessons taken from the Old Testament. Few of these lectionaries are older than the eleventh century, and only one goes back to the sixth or seventh. But the choice of passages for public reading in the services of the Church must have begun at a much earlier period. The public reading of the O. T. Scriptures was an institution inherited by the Church from the Synagogue (Lc. iv. 16 ff., Acts xiii. 15, xv. 21; cf. 1 Tim. iv. 13), and there is evidence that it was prevalent in Christian communities of the second and third centuries². At one great Christian centre provision was made for the liturgical reading of the Bible on certain week-days as well as on Sunday. "At Alexandria (writes Socrates) on Wednesdays and Fridays the Scriptures are read and the clergy expound them...and this is at Alexandria a practice of long standing, for it was on these occasions that Origen appears to have given most of his instructions in the Church³." Turning to Origen's homilies on the Old Testament

of glosses, apparently by the same author, have been edited by M. Faulhaber from cod. Vat. Gr. 347 (*Hesychii Hieros. interpretatio Isaiae*, Freiburg i. Breisgau, 1900).

¹ Bugati, *Daniel*, p. 1. See also the *περιοχαί* (or *ὑποθέσεις*) *εἰς τοὺς ψαλμοὺς* ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea, which precede the Psalter in Cod. A (printed in Migne, *P. G.* xxiii. 67 sqq.).

² See above, p. 168, and cf. Gregory, *Textkritik*, i. p. 337.

³ *H. S. v.* 22 ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τῇ τετράδι καὶ τῇ λεγομένῃ παρασκευῇ γραφαί

we find allusions which shew that they were usually based on the lesson for the day, and we get light upon the length of the selected passages.

In *Hom. in Num.* xv. Origen apologises to his hearers for not keeping strictly to the lesson for the day: "licet non ordo lectionum quae recitantur de illis dicere magis exigat quae lector explicuit, tamen quoniam nonnulli fratrum deprecantur ea potius quae de prophetia Balaam scripta sunt ad sermonem disputationis adduci, non ita ordini lectionum satisfacere aequum credidi ut desiderii auditorum." This homily probably belongs to Origen's life at Caesarea¹, and if so, it is clear that at Caesarea as well as at Alexandria there was a well-defined order of Church lessons before the middle of the third century. In another homily, on the Witch of Endor (*in 1 Sam.* hom. iii.), Origen complains that the O.T. lesson for the day was too long to be expounded at a single sitting: τὰ ἀναγνωσθέντα πλείονά ἐστι καὶ ἐπεὶ χρὴ ἐπιτεμνόμενον εἰπεῖν, δυσὶ περικοπαῖς ἀεγνώσθη τὰ περὶ Ναβάλ...εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο ἡ ἱστορία ἢ περὶ τοῦ κεκρύφθαι τὸν Δαβὶδ...εἶτα τὰ ἐξῆς ἡ ἱστορία ἦν τρίτη, ὅτε κατέφυγεν πρὸς Ἀχάρ...ἐξῆς τούτοις ἦν ἡ ἱστορία ἡ διαβόητος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐγγαστριμύθου...τεσσάρων οὐσῶν περικοπῶν...ὅτι ποτὲ βούλεται ὁ ἐπίσκοπος προτεινάτω. On this occasion the O.T. lesson seems to have extended from 1 Regn. xxv. 1 to xxviii. 25, including four περικοπαί or shorter sections, which, judging from the description, corresponded in length very nearly to our own chapters².

The lections to which Origen refers were doubtless those which were read in the pre-anaphoral portion of the Liturgy in the hearing of the catechumens as well as the faithful. In the liturgy of Apost. Const. ii., the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, the Kingdoms, the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Job, the Salomonic books, and the sixteen Prophets, are all mentioned as books from which the Old Testament lection might be taken; i.e. all the books of the Hebrew Canon, with the exception of the

τε ἀναγινώσκονται, καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ταύτας ἐρμηνεύουσι...καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἔθος ἀρχαίων· καὶ γὰρ Ὁριγένης τὰ πολλὰ ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις φαίνεται ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδάξας.

¹ *D. C. B.* iv. p. 104.

² Cf. the τίτλοι in the Coislin MS. (M), where μῆ', μθ', ν' are nearly identical with cc. xxxi., xxxii., xxxiii. respectively (Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coisl.*, p. 28).

Psalter and perhaps the Book of Esther, were employed for this purpose. The order in Book viii. names only the Law and the Prophets, but probably the scope is the same. The 'Prophet,' i.e. the Old Testament lesson, preceded the 'Apostle' (the Epistle) in the liturgy of Antioch as known to St Chrysostom at the end of the fourth century, and it held its place in the East generally till the seventh¹. In the West the 'prophecy' was read by the North African Church of St Augustine's time, and it still holds its ground in the Mozarabic and Ambrosian rites². In Egypt, as John Cassian tells us, the monastic communities read two lessons from Scripture both at Nocturns and Vespers, and (Saturdays and Sundays excepted) one of the two lessons was from the Old Testament³; and the West generally adopted the custom of reading both the Old and the New Testament in the daily offices.

Before the formation of Lectionaries the liturgical lessons were marked in the margins of Church Bibles by the words ἀρχή, τέλος, written opposite to the beginning and end of the περικοπή⁴. Such traces of adaptation to liturgical use are found even in cod. B, though not *prima manu*⁵. Whether any of the larger chapters which appear in certain MSS. (e.g. the later system in cod. B) are of the nature of lections, must remain doubtful until the whole subject has received the fuller treatment which it demands.

The Psalter obviously needed no capitulation, nor was it ever read by the ἀναγνώστης in the lessons for the day. But special Psalms were recited or sung in the Church, as they had

¹ Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, pp. 470, 476, 527, 580. See Chrys. in *Rom.* xxiv. 3 (cited above, p. 168).

² *D. C. A., Prophecy, Liturgical* (ii. 173^b ff.).

³ *De inst. coenob.* ii. 6.

⁴ On this word see Suicer, *Thesaurus*, ii. 673 sqq. It is used by Justin, *Dial.* 78 and Clem. Al., *Strom.* iii. 38. In Origen (quoted above) the περικοπή is merely a section; at a later time it was used for the ἀνάγνωσμα.

⁵ Fabiani and Cozza, *prolegg.*, p. xix.

been in the Synagogue¹, and in some early monastic communities arrangements were made for a regular recitation of the Psalter both in public and private². The scribe of cod. A has copied into his MS. a list of Psalms for daily use, in which three are appointed to be said at each of the two public services, and one is selected for private use at each hour of the day and night. It is as follows:

ΚΑΝΟΝΕΣ ΗΜΕΡΙΝΩΝ ΨΑΛΜΩΝ.				Κ. ΝΥΚΤΕΡΙΝΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΨΑΛΜΩΝ.			
Ὅρθρινοί ³	γ'	ξβ' αμ'	ρμα'	Λυχνικοί ⁴	γ'	ρκθ' ρκ'	ιβ'
Ὁρ[α]	α'	ψαλμός	η'	Ὁρ[α]	α'	ψαλμός	οδ'
"	β'	"	κθ'	"	β'	"	κθ'
"	γ'	"	α'	"	γ'	"	νδ'
"	δ'	"	μα'	"	δ'	"	ς'
"	ε'	"	ν'	"	ε'	"	δ'
"	ς'	"	ο'	"	ς'	"	μ'
"	ζ'	"	ξθ'	"	ζ'	"	να'
"	η'	"	δ'	"	η'	"	π'
"	θ'	"	ρμα'	"	θ'	"	πζ'
"	ι'	"	ρμ'	"	ι'	"	ζο'
"	ια'	"	ρη'	"	ια'	"	κα'
"	ιβ'	"	ρκ'	"	ιβ'	"	νς'

The existing order of the Orthodox Eastern Church divides the Psalter into 20 sections known as *καθίσματα*, each of which is broken by the recitation of a *Gloria* into three *στάσεις*. The larger sections are i.—viii., ix.—xvi., xvii.—xxiii., xxiv.—xxxi., xxii.—xxxvi., xxxvii.—xlv., xlvi.—liv., lv.—lxiii., lxiv.—lxix., lxx.—lxxvi., lxxvii.—lxxxiv., lxxxv.—xc., xci.—c., ci.—civ., cv.—cviii., cix.—cxvii., cxviii., cxix.—cxxxii., cxxxiii.—cxlii., cxliii.—cl. In the later liturgical Greek Psalter the *cathismata* are divided by an ornamental band or some other mark of separation, and the *staseis* by a marginal ΔΟ^z (δόξα, i.e. the Doxology, which was repeated at the end of each)⁵.

¹ See p. 251.

² Cf. Cassian, *Inst.* iii. 289.

³ Cf. *Const.* viii. 37, μετὰ τὸ ῥηθῆναι τὸν ὄρθρινόν.

⁴ Cf. *Const.* viii. 34, τὸν ἐπιλυχνικὸν ψαλμόν.

⁵ Cf. *O. T. in Gr.*, ii. p. xi.

(1) A few other text-divisions, peculiar to certain contexts or books, may be specified here. In Isaiah it was not unusual to mark in the margin the place where each of the books of Origen's commentary ended (τόμος α'—λς', cf. Eus. *H.E.* vi. 36). Both in Isaiah and in Daniel certain prophetic *δράσεις* were distinguished. Thus cod. Q^{ms} places ὄρασις λ̄ opposite to Isa. vii. 1, and ορασις η' at c. xvii. 1. In Daniel cod. A marks 12 *δράσεις*, which begin respectively at Sus. 1, Dan. i. 1, ii. 1, iii. 1, iii. 98, v. 1, v. 30, vii. 1, viii. 1, ix. 1, xi. 1, Bel 1, and the same method of division is used in codd. QΓ. In Lamentations each stanza is preceded by a representation of the Hebrew letter with which it begins, e.g. ἀλέφ (ἄλφ, ἀλφά'), βήθ, γίμελ (γίμλ), δάλεθ (δέλεθ, δέλτ, δέλθ), and so forth². In the analogous case of Psalm cxviii. (cxix.), there are no signs of this treatment, except in the Graeco-Latin Psalters RT³.

In the Song a marginal enumeration distinguishes the speeches of the interlocutors, and some MSS. (e.g. K and V) add marginal notes after the manner of stage-directions, such as ἡ νύμφη πρὸς τὸν νυμφίον, ταῖς νεανίσιν ἡ νύμφη, αἱ νεανίδες τῷ νυμφίῳ⁴.

Small departures from the continuous or slightly paragraphed writing of the oldest MSS. are found in a few contexts which lend themselves to division. Thus even in cod. B the blessings of the tribes in Gen. xlix. 3—27 are separated and numbered ᾱ—ιβ̄. A similar treatment but without marginal enumeration is accorded to Deut. xiv. 12—18 and 1 Paral. i. 51—54, Eccl. iii. 1—8. The ten words of the Decalogue are numbered in the margins of codd. BA, but not *prima manu*; and the systems of numeration differ to some extent. Thus according to B^a, α' = prologue, β' = i + ii, γ' = iii, δ' = iv, ε' = v, ς' = vii, ζ' = viii, η' = vi, θ' = ix, ι' = x, while A¹ makes γ' = iv, δ' = v, ε' = vi; the other numbers in A are effaced, or were never appended.

(2) It would be interesting, if sufficient materials were available, to pursue the subject of text-division with reference to the daughter-versions of the LXX. On the stichometry and capitulation of the Latin Bible much information has been brought together by M. Berger (*Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 307 ff.) and Wordsworth-White (*Epilogus*, p. 733 ff.); for the stichometry see also Dr Sanday in *Studia Biblica*, iii. p. 264 f. But it remains

¹ The variations in the MSS. are interesting and instructive.

² Greek numerals are sometimes added in the margin; see above, p. 351.

³ R gives the Heb. letters in Greek; T the corresponding Greek numerals.

⁴ In cod. V = 23 these become sometimes lengthy τίτλοι, e.g. at v. 7 ἐξῆλθεν μὴ εὐροῦσα τὸν νυμφίον ἡ νύμφη καὶ ὡς ἐν νυκτὶ εὐρεθεῖσα ἀπὸ τῶν φυλακῶν τῆς πόλεως τραυματίζεται, καὶ αἶρονσιν αὐτῆς τὸ θέριστρον οἱ τειχοφυλακῶντες.

doubtful whether these divisions of the Latin Bible belonged originally to Jerome's version or were transferred to it from the Old Latin¹; or, supposing the latter view to be correct, whether they came from the MSS. of the LXX. which were used by the early African or Italian translators. In referring to the N.T. Tertullian speaks of *capitula* not seldom (*ad uxor.* ii. 2, *de monog.* 11, *de virg. vel.* 4, *de praescr.* 5, *adv. Prax.* 20); but it is not clear that he uses the word to connote definitely marked sections.

On the capitulation of the Coptic versions the student will find something in Wilkins, *Pental. praef., ad fin.*, and Lagarde, *Orientalia*, p. 125 ff.; on the Egyptian lectionary, he may consult the list of authorities collected by Brightman, *Ancient Liturgies*, p. lxxix. For the Ethiopic version, cf. Dillmann's *Ethiopic Pentateuch*, I. ii., pp. 163 f., 173. The stichometry of the Syro-Hexaplaric is discussed by Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, iv. (1891), p. 205 f. A list of Church lessons, taken from the Palestinian-Syriac lectionary recently discovered by Mrs Lewis and Mrs Gibson, is given by Nestle in *Studia Sinaitica*, vi. p. xxix. ff.

4. In connexion with the subject of text-division it will be convenient to mention the expositions which accompany and often break up the text in MSS. of the Greek Bible. The student will have observed that many of the codices enumerated in Part I. c. v. (pp. 148—168) contain commentaries, either original (*comm.*), or compiled (*cat.*). Of the Greek commentators something will be said when we come to consider the use of the LXX. by the Greek fathers; in this place we will limit ourselves to the relatively late compilations which are based on the exegetical works of earlier writers².

Such expositions were formerly described as *ἐκλογαί* or *παραγραφαί*, or as *ἐπιτομαὶ ἐρμηνειῶν*, or *ἐξηγήσεις ἐρανισθεῖσαι ἀπὸ διαφόρων πατέρων*, or *συνόψεις σχολικαὶ ἐκ διαφόρων ὑπομνημάτων συλλεχθεῖσαι*, or by some similar periphrasis. The use of the technical term *catena* (*σειρά*) is of comparatively modern date. *Catena aurea* is a secondary title of the great

¹ Cf. Sanday, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

² *Ch. Q. R.* i. 99, p. 34: "the process of drawing up *Catena*e goes on from the fifth to the fourteenth or fifteenth century."

compendium of comments on the Four Gospels brought together by Thomas Aquinas, and a Greek MS. Psalter of the 16th century (Vat. Gr. 2240) adopts the phrase, translating it by χρυσῆ ἄλυσις. Σειρά is used in this sense by the editor of the Greek catena of Nicephorus, which bears the title Σειρὰ ἐνὸς καὶ πενήκοντα ὑπομνηματιστῶν εἰς τὴν Ὀκτάτευχον καὶ τὰ τῶν Βασιλειῶν. The metaphor so happily expresses the principle on which such commentaries are constructed, that books of this description are now universally known as catenae or σειραί. They are 'chains' in which each link is supplied by some ancient author, scraps of exegesis threaded together by the ingenuity or industry of a collector who usually elects to be anonymous.

The catenists drew their materials from all sources within their reach. They laid under contribution Jewish writers such as Philo and Josephus, heretics like Basileides, Valentinus, and Marcion, suspects like Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinarius, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, as well as the accepted teachers and Saints of the Catholic Church. Their range extended from the first century to the fifth or sixth, and they had access to a number of writers whose works have since disappeared. Hence their value in the eyes of patristic scholars and editors. But they are not without importance for the purposes of the biblical student. The text embedded in the commentary may be late¹, but the commentary itself often preserves the witness of early writers to an old and valuable type.

The catena is usually written in the broad margins which surround the text, or it embodies the text, which in that case is usually distinguished from it by being written in uncials or in coloured ink, or enclosed within marks of quotation. The names of the authors who have been pressed into the service of the catenist are commonly inserted in the margin at the

¹ See, however, the facts collected in *Ch. Q. R.* i. 99, p. 46 f.

place where their contributions begin: thus $\chi\rho\gamma\sigma[\sigma\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\gamma]$, $\omega\rho[\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\gamma\sigma]$, $\epsilon\gamma\sigma[\epsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\gamma]$, $\theta\epsilon\omicron\delta[\omega\rho\omicron\gamma]$ $\lambda\eta\tau[\iota\omicron\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\sigma]$, $\gamma\rho\eta\gamma[\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\gamma]$, $\kappa\gamma\rho[\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma]$. If a second passage from the same author occurs in the same context it is introduced as $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\tau\omicron\upsilon$; an anonymous writer is $\delta\lambda\lambda\omicron\sigma$. Unfortunately in the copying of catenae such attributions have often been omitted or misplaced, or even erroneously inserted, and as to this particular the student must be on his guard against a too unsuspecting acquiescence in the witness of his MS. Nor can he place implicit confidence in the verbal accuracy of the excerpts. The catenists evidently regarded themselves as free, while retaining the substance, to abbreviate and otherwise modify the language of their authors.

The following is a list of the chief Greek catenae of the Old Testament which have appeared in type. *Octateuch, Historical books*: the Catena of Nicephorus, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1772—3; *Psalms*: B. Corderii *expositio Graecorum patrum*, 3 vols., Antwerp, 1643; *Proverbs*: Commentary of Procopius first printed by Mai, and in Migne, *P. G.* lxxxvii.; *Song*: Commentary ascribed to Eusebius and Polychronius (Meursius, Leyden, 1617); *Job*: Catena of Nicetas of Serrae (P. Junius, i.e. Patrick Young, London, 1636); *Isaiah*: Commentary of Procopius (J. Curterius, Paris, 1580); *Jeremiah*, with Lamentations and Baruch: Catena published by M. Ghisler, 3 vols., Leyden, 1623; *Daniel*: Catena published by A. Mai in *Script. vet. nov. coll.* i. On these see *Ch. Q. R.* i. 99, pp. 36—42.

The nineteenth century has added little to our collection of printed Greek catenae on the Old Testament, and the earlier editions do not always adequately represent the witness of the best MSS. Meanwhile a great store of MS. catenae awaits the examination of Biblical scholars. Some of these are at Athos, Athens, Smyrna and Jerusalem, but there is an abundant supply in libraries more accessible to Western students, at St Petersburg, Rome, Paris, and London. Perhaps no corner of the field of Biblical and patristic research offers so much virgin soil, with so good a prospect of securing useful if not brilliant results.

The following LXX. MSS. amongst others contain catenae on one or more of the books which form their text: H.-P. 14, 17, 24, 25, 31, 33, 52, 57, 73, 77, 78, 79, 83, 87, 90, 91, 97, 98, 99, 109, 112, 128, 135, 147, 181, 209, 238, 240, 243, 264, 272, 292, 302, 309; London B.M. Add. 35123, Lambeth 1214; Paris, Coisl. gr. 5, 7, Reg. gr. 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 161; Zurich c. 11; Basle gr. iv. 56, vi. 8; Esc. Σ. i. 16; Leyden, 13; Munich gr. 82; Athos Vatop. 15, Ivér. 15; Athens, nat. 43; Constantinople 224; Smyrna, Ev. sch. 1; Patmos, 216, 217; Sinai 2; Jerusalem H. Sep. 3. Scholia are to be found in H.-P. 14, 16, 38, 52, 56, 64, 70, 77, 79, 93, 128, 130, 131, 135, 159, 256, 310; Paris Ars. 8415, Coisl. gr. 184.

On the Paris O. T. catenae see H. Lietzmann, *Catenen*, p. 37 ff. Some of the Vatican catenae are handled by Pitra, *analecta sacra* 11, Klostermann, *analecta*, passim; a full and valuable account of Roman MS. catenae on the Prophets is given by Faulhaber (*die Propheten-Catenen*). For lists of the catenae in the great libraries of Europe and the East, the student must consult the published catalogues, e.g. Montfaucou, Omont (Paris), Stephenson (Vatican), Lambeccius (Vienna), Lambros (Athos), Papadopulos (Jerusalem). The more important MSS. are enumerated by Harnack-Preuschen, and Heinrici, and in the older work of Fabricius-Harles. A *Catenarum graecarum catalogus* by G. Karo and H. Lietzmann is in progress (*Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (Philologisch-hist. Klasse), 1902 ff.

5. Besides catenae and detached scholia the margins of LXX. MSS. frequently contain notes of various kinds, written oftentimes in perplexing abbreviations. Lists of abbreviations are given by the principal palaeographical authorities, such as Montfaucou's *Palaeographia Graeca*, Gardthausen's *Griechische Paläographie*, and Sir E. Maunde Thompson's *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography*; but the subject can only be mastered by working upon the MSS. themselves or their facsimiles. It may be useful, however, to print here a few of the abbreviated notes and symbols which occur in the *apparatus* of the Cambridge manual LXX., or are of frequent occurrence in the principal codices.

ἀ = Ἀκύλας. ε' , εγ' = Σύμμαχος. θ' , θε' = Θεοδοσίων.

οὐ κ' π' εβρ' = οὐ κείται παρ' Ἑβραίοις. οἱ ωβ' ογ κ' π' εβρ' = οἱ ὠβελισμένοι (στίχοι) οὐ κείνται παρ' Ἑβραίοις. ομς τοις ο' = ὁμοίως τοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα. οἱ ᾠ = οἱ τρεῖς, i.e. Aquila, Sym-

machus, Theodotion. π' = πάντες. λ = Λουκιανός (Field, *Hexapla*, i. lxxxv.). οί λ = οί λοιποί. μο^N = μόνος. Ϝ = ὄραϊον, Ϝ or Ϝ = Ὠριγένης. For πιπι see above, p. 39 f.

⊕ = σημειῶσαι, σημειωτέον, σημείον. ΓΡ = γράψον or γράφεται. ἀρ^X = ἀρχή. τέ' = τέλος. cτι^X = στίχος. κε' = κεφάλαιον. κα^θ = κάθισμα. ἀν^Δ = ἀνάγνωσμα. Ϝ^Δ = διώρθωται (i.e. 'corrected thus far'), a mark inserted by the διορθωτής usually at the end of a book. For further particulars see Field, *op. cit.*, p. xciv. sqq¹.

LITERATURE.

Stichometry, colometry, &c.

Kitto, *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, art. *Verse*; Herzog-Plitt, art. *Stichometrie*; Gregory, i. p. 112 f.; Scrivener-Miller, i., p. 52 ff.; Gardthausen, *Paläographie*, p. 127 ff.; E. M. Thompson, *Handbook*, p. 78 ff.; Zahn, *Gesch. d. Kanons*, ii. p. 295 ff.; Sanday in *Studia Biblica*, iii. p. 261 ff.; J. R. Harris, *Stichometry*, passim; Wordsworth-White, *Epilogus*, p. 733 ff. (Oxford, 1898).

Capitulation.

Schürer, II. ii. 79 ff.; Buhl, *Kanon u. Text d. A. T.*, p. 222; Ryle, *Canon of the O. T.*, p. 235; Morinus, *Exerc. Bibl.* xvii. 3; Dathius, *De ordine pericoparum* (opusc. iv.); Zacagni, *Collectanea*, praef., pp. lxvii., lxxxi.; Montfaucon, *Biblioth. Coisl.*, p. 1 ff.; the Benedictine *Prolegomena in div. S. Hieron. biblioth.* iv. (reprinted in Migne, *P. L.* xxviii. 101 sqq.); Suicer, *Thes. eccl.* s.vv. κεφάλαιον, περικοπή; Herzog-Plitt, art. *Perikopen*; Gregory, i. p. 120 ff.; Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 56 ff.; Thomasii *opp.* i.; Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 323 ff.

Lections.

Suicer, *Thes. eccl.* s.vv. ἀνάγνωσμα, ἀνάγνωσις, γραφή; Brill, *De lectionariis or. et occ. eccl.* (Helmstadt, 1703); Neale, *Hist. of the H. Eastern Church*, i. p. 369; Herzog-Plitt, artt. *Lectionen*, *Perikopen*; *D.C.A.*, art. *Lections*; Burgon, *Last twelve verses of St Mark*, p. 191 ff.; E. Ranke, *Das kirchl. Perikopen-system der röm. Liturgie* (Berlin, 1847).

Acrostics.

P. A. de Lagarde, *Symmicta* i. 107; C. Taylor in Hastings' *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, i. p. 75; G. Bickell, art. *Acrostic* in *Oxford New English Dict.*; I. Abrahams, art. *Acrostics* in *Jewish Encycl.*; Driver, *Introd. to Lit. of O. T.*, ch. vii.

¹ For terms connected with writing and reading which occur in the text of the LXX. see Nestle, *Introd. to the Textual Criticism of the N. T.*, p. 46 f.

Catenae.

T. Ittig, *De bibliothecis et catenis patrum* (Leipzig, 1707); J. C. Wolf, *De catenis Gr. patrum* (Wittenberg, 1742); Fabricius-Harles, viii. p. 637 ff.; J. G. Dowling, *Notitia scriptorum ss. patrum* (Oxford, 1839); Walch-Danz, *Biblioth. patristica* (Jena, 1834), p. 247 ff.; Harnack-Preuschen, *Gesch. d. altchr. Litteratur*, i. p. 835 ff.; G. Heinrich, in Hauck, *Real-Encyklop.* iii., art. *Catenen*; L. Eisenhofer, *Procopius von Gaza*, Freiburg, 1897; P. Batiffol, in Vigouroux' *D. B.* ii., p. 482 ff., art. *Chaînes Bibliques*; Lietzmann, *Catenen* (Freiburg i. B., 1897); M. Faulhaber, *Die Propheten-Catenen nach römischen Handschriften*, in *Biblische Studien*, iv. 2, 3 (Freiburg i. Breisgau, 1899). The two last-named works are indispensable to students who desire to prosecute research in this field. The whole subject is summarised with admirable clearness and precision in the *Church Quarterly Review* for Apr. 1900, pp. 29—48.

PART III.

*LITERARY USE, VALUE, AND TEXTUAL CONDITION
OF THE GREEK OLD TESTAMENT.*

PART III.

CHAPTER I.

LITERARY USE OF THE LXX. BY NON-CHRISTIAN
HELLENISTS.

I. A HAPPY accident has preserved fragments of the lost literature produced by the Hellenised Jews of Alexandria between the inception of the Alexandrian Version and the Christian era. The Greek historiographer, Alexander Cornelius—better known as Polyhistor (*ὁ πολυῆστορ*), from his encyclopaedic learning—wrote a treatise *On the Jews* which contained extracts from Jewish and Samaritan Hellenistic writings¹. Of these a few were copied from Polyhistor's book by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius of Caesarea, in whose pages they may still be read. They consist of fragments of the historians Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus, and Aristeeas, the poets Philo, Theodotus, and Ezekiel, the philosopher Aristobulus, and Cleodemus or Malchas. There is reason to believe that Demetrius flourished c. B.C. 200; for the other writers the date of Polyhistor (c. B.C. 50) supplies a *terminus ad quem*, if we may assume² that he wrote the work attributed to him by Clement and Eusebius.

¹ Cf. Joseph., *ant.* i. 15, Clem. Al. *strom.* i. 130, Eus. *pr. ev.* ix. 17.

² See Schürer³, iii. p. 347 f.

The following references will enable the student to find the fragments: (1) Demetrius: Clem. Al. *strom.* i. 141. Eus. *pr. ev.* ix. 19(?), 21, 29. (2) Eupolemus: Clem. Al. *strom.* i. 141. Eus. *pr. ev.* ix. 17, 26 (= Clem. Al. *strom.* i. 153), 30—34, 39. (3) Artapanus: Eus. *pr. ev.* ix. 18, 23, 27. (4) Aristeeas: Eus. *pr. ev.* ix. 25. (5) Philo the poet: Eus. *pr. ev.* ix. 20, 24, 37 (cf. Clem. Al. *strom.* i. 154). (6) Theodotus: Eus. *pr. ev.* ix. 22. (7) Ezekiel the poet: Eus. *pr. ev.* ix. 28 (= Clem. Al. *strom.* i. 155), 29. (8) Aristobulus: Eus. *pr. ev.* viii. 10; ix. 6 (= Clem. Al. *strom.* i. 22); xiii. 12. (9) Cleodemus or Malchas: Eus. *pr. ev.* ix. 20.

Several of these fragments bear traces of a knowledge and use of the Greek Bible, and this evidence is not the less convincing because, with one exception, the purpose of the writers has kept them from actual quotation. They wished to represent their national history in a form more acceptable to their pagan neighbours; but while avoiding the uncouth phraseology of the Greek Bible they frequently betray its influence. A few extracts will make this plain.

Demetrius: (α) τὸν θεὸν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ προστάξει Ἰσαὰκ τὸν γιόν ὀλοκαρπῶσαι αὐτῷ· τὸν δὲ ἀναγαγόντα τὸν παῖδα ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος πυρὰν νῆσαι καὶ ἐπιθεῖναι τὸν Ἰσαὰκ· σφάζειν δὲ μέλλοντα κωλυθῆναι ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου κριὸν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὴν κάρπωσιν παραστήσαντος¹. (β) ἐκείθεν δὲ ἐλθεῖν εἰς Χαφραθά, ἔνθεν παραγενέσθαι εἰς Ἐφράθα, ἣν εἶναι Βηθλέεμ...καὶ τελευτήσαι Ῥαχὴλ τεκοῦσαν τὸν Βενιαμίν². (γ) φησὶ γὰρ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ παῖδας πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἐπὶ κατοικίαν πέμψαι· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ Ἀαρῶν καὶ Μαριάμ εἰπεῖν ἐν Ἀσχωρῶθ Μωσῆν Αἰθιοπίδα γῆμαι γυναῖκα³ (δ) μὴ ἔχοντα δὲ ὕδωρ ἐκεῖ γλυκὺ ἀλλὰ πικρὸν, τοῦ θεοῦ εἰπόντος, ζῆλον τι ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν πηγὴν, καὶ γενέσθαι γλυκὺ τὸ ὕδωρ. ἐκείθεν δὲ εἰς Ἐλεῖμ ἐλθεῖν, καὶ εὐρεῖν ἐκεῖ δῶδεκα μὲν πηγὰς ὕδατων, ἐβδομήκοντα δὲ στελέχη φοινίκων⁴. (For other coincidences, see above, p. 18.)

Eupolemus: εὔλογητός ὁ θεὸς ὃς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ἔκτισεν, ὃς εἴλετο ἄνθρωπον χρηστὸν ἐκ χρηστοῦ ἀνδρός...καὶ ἀρχιτέκονά σοι ἀπέσταλκα ἄνθρωπον Τύριον ἐκ μητρὸς Ἰουδαίας ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Δάν⁵.

¹ Cf. Gen. xxii. 1 ff.

² Cf. Gen. xxxv. 16.

³ Cf. Gen. xxv. 6; Num. xi. 34—xii. 1.

⁴ Cf. Exod. xv. 23 ff.

⁵ Cf. 2 Chron. ii. 12 ff.

Aristeas: τὸν Ἡσοῦ γήμαντα Βασσάραν ἐν Ἐδῶμ γεννήσαι Ἰώβ· κατοικεῖν δὲ τοῦτον ἐν τῇ Αὔσιτιδι χώρα ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀρίοις τῆς Ἰδογμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας· γενέσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ πολύκτηνον, κτήσασθαι γὰρ αὐτὸν πρόβατα μὲν ἑπτακισχίλια, καμήλοισι δὲ τρισχιλίαις, ζέγγη βοῶν πεντακόσια, ὄνοις θηλείαις νομᾶδας πεντακόσιας¹.

Ezekiel (in his tragedy ἡ Ἐξαγωγή):

Μαριὰμ δ' ἀδελφή μου κατώπτευεν πέλας·
 κάπειτα θυγάτηρ βασιλέως ἄβραϊς ὁμοῦ
 κατῆλθε λουτροῖς, χρῶτα φαιδρῦναι νέον.
 Ἰδοῦσα δ' εὐθύς καὶ λαβοῦσ' ἀνειλετο,
 ἔγνω δ' Ἐβραῖον ὄντα· καὶ λέγει τάδε
 Μαριὰμ ἀδελφή προσδραμοῦσα βασιλίδι·
 Θέλεις τροφόν σοι παιδί τῷδ' εὔρω ταχὺ
 ἐκ τῶν Ἐβραίων; ἡ δ' ἐπέσπευσεν κούρη·
 μολοῦσα δ' εἶπε μητρὶ, καὶ παρῆν ταχὺ
 αὐτὴ τε μήτηρ κἄλαβέν μ' ἐς ἀγκάλας.
 εἶπεν δὲ θυγάτηρ βασιλέως Τοῦτον, γύναι,
 τρόφεγε, κἀγὼ μισθὸν ἀποδώσω σέθεν.

* * * * *

οὐκ εἴλογος πέφυκα, γλῶσσα δ' ἐστὶ μου
 δύσφραστος, ἰσχνόφωνος, ὥστε μὴ λόγους
 ἐμοὺς γενέσθαι βασιλέως ἐναντίον².

Aristobulus: (α) ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ ἐζήραγεν ὁ θεός σε ἐξ Αἰγύπτου³. (β) ἰδοὺ χεὶρ Κυρίου ἔσται⁴ ἐν τοῖς κτήνεσι σοῦ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις θάνατος μέγας.

2. Besides these fragments, some complete books have survived the wreck of the pre-Christian literature of the Jewish colony at Alexandria. They are included in the Alexandrian Greek Bible, but may be employed as separate witnesses of the literary use of the canonical translations. And the evidence supplied by them is ample. Thus the writer of Wisdom knows and uses not only Exodus (Sap. xvi. 22 = Exod. ix. 24,

¹ Cf. Job xlii. 17 b, c, i. 1 ff. Pseudo-Aristeas *ad Philocratem* makes abundant use of the Greek Pentateuch, as the reader may see by referring to the Appendix, where LXX. words and phrases are indicated by the use of small uncials.

² Cf. Exod. ii. 4 ff.; iv. 10, where οὐκ εἴλογος is read by cod. F.

³ Exod. xiii. 9.

⁴ Exod. ix. 3. Ἔσται A, ἐπέσται B. Καὶ ἐν πᾶσι, which is wanting in our MSS., may be due to a slip of memory, or it is a short way of expressing what follows in the text (ἐν τε τοῖς ἵπποις κτλ.).

and perhaps also Sap. xii. 8 = Exod. xxiii. 28) and Deuteronomy (Sap. vi. 7 = Deut. i. 17, Sap. xi. 4 = Deut. viii. 15), but Isaiah (Sap. ii. 12 = Isa. iii. 10, Sap. xv. 10 = Isa. xlv. 20). The translator of Sirach not only recognises the existence of the Greek Pentateuch and Prophets and 'the other books,' but shews everywhere the influence of the Greek phraseology of the LXX.¹ In 2 Maccabees vii. 6 we have a *verbatim* quotation from Deut. xxxii. 36, and in 4 Maccabees xviii. 14 ff. a catena of references to the Greek Bible, including direct citations of Isa. xliii. 2, Ps. xxxiii. 19, Prov. iii. 18, Ezek. xxxvii. 4, Deut. xxxii. 39, xxx. 20—all from the LXX. The picture which the last-named passage draws of a Jewish father reading and teaching his children out of the Greek Bible (cf. 2 Tim. iii. 15) is a suggestive one, but the book, it must be remembered, is of uncertain date, possibly as late as the time of Josephus, to whom it was at one time ascribed².

3. The Jewish portions of the Sibyllines, notwithstanding the epic form in which they are cast, exhibit clear signs of the influence of the LXX. Thus in Sibyll. iii. 312 ἐξέχεας is a reminiscence of Ps. lxxviii. 3, LXX.; *ib.* 606 χειροποίητα... ἐν σχισμαῖς πετρῶν κατακρύψαντες is borrowed from Isa. ii. 19 ff., LXX.; *ib.* 708 ff. is probably modelled on the Greek of Isa. xi. 6 ff.

4. There remains one Alexandrian Jewish writer, the greatest of the succession, whose extant works happily are numerous and throw abundant light on the literary use of the Septuagint at Alexandria.

Philo's literary life probably coincided as nearly as possible with the first forty or five and forty years of the first century

¹ See Edersheim in Wace's *Apocr.* ii. p. 26.

² Cf. A. Deissmann in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen*, p. 150: "als Abfassungszeit wird man den Zeitraum von Pompejus bis Vespasian annehmen dürfen."

A.D.; in 40 A.D. he could speak of himself as already an old man¹, but his literary activity was not yet at an end, as appears from his account of the embassy to Rome in that year. Thus the evidence of his writings belongs to a period just antecedent to the rise of the earliest Christian literature, and his numerous quotations enable us to form a fair idea of the condition of the text of the LXX. in Alexandrian copies shortly before it passed into the hands of the Church.

The following list of Philo's works may be useful for reference. Cohn and Wendland's order is followed so far as their edition has been published.

A. Exegetical works. *De officio mundi* (Gen. i.). *Legum allegoriae* (ii. 1—iii. 19). *De Cherubim etc.* (iii. 24—iv. 1). *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* (iv. 2 f.). *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* (iv. 3—15). *De posteritate Caini* (iv. 16—26). *De gigantibus* (vi. 1—4). *Quod Deus sit immutabilis* (vi. 4—12). *De agricultura* (ix. 20). *De plantatione Noe* (ix. 20). *De ebrietate* (ix. 21—23). *De sobrietate* (ix. 24). *De confusione linguarum* (xi. 1—9). *De migratione Abrahami* (xii. 1—6). *Quis rerum divinarum heres* (xv.). *De congressu eruditionis gratia* (xvi. 1—6). *De fuga et inventione* (xvi. 6—14). *De mutatione nominum* (xvii. 1—22). *De somniis* i., ii. (xxviii. 12 ff., xxxi. 11—13, xxxvii., xl., xli.). *De Abrahamo. De Josepho. De vita Moysis. De decalogo. De circumcissione. De monarchia. De praemiis sacerdotum. De victimis. De sacrificantibus. De mercede meretricis. De specialibus legibus* (3rd—10th commandments of the Decalogue). *De iudice. De iustitia. De fortitudine. De humanitate. De creatione principum. De tribus virtutibus. De poenitentia. De nobilitate. De praemiis et poenis. De execrationibus. Quaestiones et solutiones* (1) *in Genesim, (2) in Exodum*². B. Philosophical works. *De nobilitate. Quod omnis probus liber sit. De vita contemplativa. De incorruptibilitate mundi. De providentia. De ratione animalium. De mundo*. C. Political works. *In Flaccum. De legatione ad Caium*.

In his exegetical writings Philo quotes the LXX. directly, announcing each citation by a formula such as $\phi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}, \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$,

¹ *Leg. ad Cai.* i. 28.

² On these see J. R. Harris, *Fragments of Philo*, p. 11 ff., and F. C. Conybeare, *Expositor*, iv. iv. p. 456 ff.

λέγει, λέγεται, γέγραπται, or some more elaborate phrase¹. In this way he reproduces a considerable portion of the Greek text of the Pentateuch, as well as a few passages from Joshua, Judges, 1, 3 Kingdoms, 1 Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and some of the minor Prophets. His Greek is, on the whole, clearly that of the Alexandrian version, which he regarded as the work of men divinely qualified for their task². Nevertheless his quotations often differ from the Greek of the LXX., as it is found in our extant MSS., or in the oldest and best of them.

5. The task of comparing Philo's quotations with the LXX. has been undertaken in Germany by C. F. Hornemann and C. Siegfried, and in England more recently by Professor Ryle; and from these investigations the student may derive a general acquaintance with the subject, although even the latest of them will need revision when the critical edition of Philo's works, now in course of being published, has reached completion. The following specimens will shew the extent to which Philo departs from the LXX.

Gen. ii. 7 εἰς ψυχὴν ζωῆς (LXX. εἰς ψ. ζώσαν)³. iv. 21 οὗτος ἐστὶ πατήρ ὁ καταδείξας ψαλτήριον καὶ κιθάραν (LXX., ἦν ὁ κ.). vi. 7 ἐθυμώθη (LXX. ἐνεθυμήθη). vi. 14 νοσσιὰς νοσσιὰς ποιήσεις τὴν κιβωτόν (νοσσιὰς *semel* LXX.). ix. 25 παῖς οἰκέτης δούλος δούλων ἔσται (LXX. π. οἰκέτης ἔσται, and so Philo, ii. 225. 20). xv. 18 ἕως τοῦ ποταμοῦ, τοῦ μεγάλου ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου (LXX. om. ποταμοῦ 2⁰)⁴. xviii. 12 οὐπω μοι γέγονε τὸ εὐδαιμονεῖν ἕως τοῦ νῦν (LXX. omit τὸ εὐδ. and so Philo once, iii. 184. 28). Exod. iv. 10 οὐκ εἰμι εὐλογος (so Philo, apparently⁵: LXX. οὐκ ἰκανός εἰμι). xv. 17 ἔδρασμα εἰς καθέδραν σου κατεργάσω (LXX. εἰς ἔτοιμον κατοικητήριόν σου ὃ κατ.). xx. 23 μετ' ἐμοῦ (LXX., ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς). xxiii. 2 μετὰ πολλῶν (LXX., μετὰ πλειόνων). Lev. xix. 23 ξύλον βρώσεως (LXX., ξ. βρώσιμον, and so Philo ii. 152. 8). Deut. viii. 18 ἀλλὰ μνεῖα μνησθήσῃ (LXX. καὶ μνησθ.). xxi. 16 κληροδοτή (LXX., κατακληρονομῆ B, κατακληροδοτή AF, and these readings are found as variants in Phil. i. 209. 4).

¹ Cf. Ryle, *Philo*, p. xlv. f.

² Cf. *vit. Moys.* 6, 7.

³ On this see Nestle, *Zur neuen Philo-Ausgabe in Philologus*, 1900, p. 259. Dr Nestle informs me that cod. 75 often agrees with Philo.

⁴ See Nestle, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

⁵ See above, p. 371.

The student who is at the pains to examine the readings given above, will find that while some of them may be merely recensional, or even due to slips of memory, the greater part imply a different rendering of the Hebrew, or even in some cases a different Hebrew text from that which is presupposed by the LXX. (Gen. vi. 14, Deut. viii. 18), whilst in others we seem to have a conflation of two renderings (Gen. iv. 21, ix. 25), one of which is preserved in all extant MSS. of the LXX., while the other agrees more nearly with the Hebrew. When the MSS. of the LXX. are at variance, Philo inclines on the whole to Cod. B¹, but the preponderance is not strongly marked. Thus in Exodus—Deuteronomy, he agrees with B against one or more of the other uncials sixty times, while in fifty-two places he takes sides against B. It has been observed that in several instances where Philo opposes the combined witness of the uncials, he goes with Lucian; e.g. Lev. xviii. 5 ὁ ποιήσας; Deut. xii. 8 ὅσα, xxxii. 4 + ἐν αὐτῷ.

Besides substantial variants, Philo's quotations shew many departures from the LXX. which may be ascribed to inaccuracy, defects of memory, or the writer's method of citing. Thus (a) he omits certain words with the view of abbreviating; (b) he substitutes for a portion of his text a gloss or other explanatory matter of his own; (c) he exchanges Hebraisms and words or phrases which offend him for others in accordance with a correct literary style; (d) he forms a fresh sentence out of two or more different contexts.

E.g. (a) Gen. xxiv. 20 καὶ δραμοῦσα ἐπὶ τὸ φρέαρ ὑδρεύσατο ταῖς καμήλοις (LXX., καὶ ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἀντλήσαι ὕδωρ καὶ ὕδρ. πάσαις ταῖς καμήλοις). (b) Num. v. 2 ἔξαποστειλάτωσαν ἐκ τῆς ἀγίου ψυχῆς (LXX. ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς) πάντα λεπρόν. (c) Gen. xxviii. 13 ἡ γῆ (v. l. τὴν γῆν) ἐφ' ἧς σὺ καθεύδεις (+ ἐπ' αὐτῆς LXX.)

¹ In Genesis i.—xlvi. 27, where B is wanting, Philo shews on the whole a similar preference for the text represented by D. The figures, which are Dr Ryle's, are based on Mangey's text, but the new edition, so far as examined, gives very similar results.

σοὶ δώσω αὐτήν. (d) Gen. xvii. 1 + xxxv. 11 ἐγὼ εἰμι θεὸς σός· ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς σου· ἀξάνου καὶ πληθύνου (Phil. iii. 161. 4 f.).

The majority of Philo's quotations from the LXX. are modified in one or other of these ways. Philo entertained the highest veneration for the Jewish canon, especially for the law, which he regarded as a body of Divine oracles¹; and his respect for the Alexandrian Version was at least as great as that with which the Authorised Version is regarded in England, and Luther's Version in Germany. Nevertheless he did not scruple to quote his text freely, changing words at pleasure, and sometimes mingling interpretation with citation. This method of dealing with a source, however high its authority, was probably not peculiar to Philo, but a literary habit which he shared with other Jewish writers of his age². We shall have occasion to observe it again when we consider the use of the LXX. by the writers of the New Testament.

6. The Alexandrian Version was also used by the Palestinian Jew, Flavius Josephus, who represents Jewish Hellenistic literature in the generation which followed Philo. He was born at Jerusalem within the lifetime of the great Alexandrian (A.D. 37—8). He was descended from a priestly family³; his early education familiarised him with the learning of the Rabbis, and the opinions of the great schools of Jewish thought; in his nineteenth year he was enrolled a member of the sect of the Pharisees⁴. His earliest work, on the Jewish War, was written in Aramaic⁵, and when he desired to translate it into Greek, he was constrained to seek assistance (*c. Ap.* i. 9 χρησάμενός τισι πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς οὕτως ἐποίησάμην τῶν πράξεων τὴν παράδοσιν). But the *Antiquities of the Jews* (αἱ Ἰωσήπου ἱστορίαι τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀρχαιολογίας),

¹ See Ryle, p. xvi. ff.

² Cf. *D. C. B.* iv. p. 387^a.

³ *Vil.* 1.

⁴ *Ib.* 2.

⁵ *B. J. prooem.* 1 τῇ πατρίῳ [sc. γλώσσῃ] συντάξας.

which appear to have been completed in A.D. 93—4, form an original Greek work which, so far as we know, was composed without material help. In it Josephus professes to interpret the Hebrew records for the benefit of Hellenic readers: *Ant.* i. *proem.* ἡ ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἐγκεχείρισμαι πραγματείαν, νομίζων ἅπασιν φανεῖσθαι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἀξίαν σπουδῆς· μέλλει γὰρ περιέξειν ἅπασαν τὴν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχαιολογίαν καὶ διάταξιν τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν μεθηρμηνευμένην γραμμμάτων. His chief source, therefore, was the Hebrew Bible, with which he was doubtless acquainted from boyhood¹. Nevertheless, there is ample evidence in the *Antiquities* that the writer knew and, for the purpose of his work, used the Alexandrian Greek version. He does not, indeed, like Philo, quote formally either from the Hebrew or from the Greek, but he shews a knowledge of both.

His indebtedness to the LXX. appears in a variety of ways. (a) He interprets proper names as they are interpreted by the LXX. e.g. *Ant.* i. 1. 2 Εὐά...σημαίνει...πάντων μητέρα (Gen. iii. 20); i. 2. 1 Κάϊς...κτίσιν (v. l. κτῆσιν) σημαίνει (Gen. iv. 1); iii. 1. 6 καλοῦσι δὲ Ἑβραῖοι τὸ βρώμα τοῦτο μάννα· τὸ γὰρ μὲν ἐπερώτησις...τί τοῦτ' ἔστιν' ἀνακρίνουσα (Exod. xvi. 15); v. 10. 3 Σαμουὴλον...θεαίτητον ἂν τις εἴποι (1 Regn. i. 20). (b) His narrative frequently follows a Heb. text different from the M.T., but represented by the LXX.; e.g. *Ant.* vi. 4. 1 ἦσαν ἑβδομήκοντα τὸν ἀριθμὸν (1 Regn. ix. 22, **מ** שבעים); vi. 11. 4 ὑποθείσα τοῖς ἐπιβολιαίοις ἦπαρ (כבד) αἰγός (1 Regn. xix. 13, **מ** יבד); vi. 12. 4 Δώγηος δ' ὁ Σύρος ὁ τὰς ἡμιόλους αὐτοῦ βόσκων (1 Regn. xxii. 9, **מ** לואשׁ-רביע-על-צפן נהגה רביעיה נאד); vii. 2. 1 μόνον εὐρόντες...τὸν Ἰέσβωθον καὶ μήτε τοὺς φύλακας παρόντας μήτε τὴν θυρωρὸν ἐγρηγορυῖαν (cf. 2 Regn. iv. 6 LXX. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ θυρωρὸς ἐνύσταξεν καὶ ἐκάθευδεν); vii. 3 ὕστερον ὁ τῶν

¹ He possessed a copy of the sacred books which Titus granted him from the spoils of the Temple: *Vit.* 75 τὴν αἴτησιν ἐποιούμην Τίτον...βιβλίων ἱερῶν [καὶ] ἔλαβον χαρισσάμενον Τίτου.

Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεὺς Σούσακος... ἔλαβε (2 Regn. viii. 7, LXX.; **Λ** **Η**).
 (c) Whilst retailing in his own words the story of the Hebrew records, he falls from time to time into the peculiar phraseology of the Alexandrian version. A few examples will make this evident. *Ant.* i. 1 (Gen. i. 1 ff.), ἐν ἀρχῇ ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν... γενέσθαι φῶς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ θεός... διεχώρισε τὸ τε φῶς καὶ τὸ σκότος... καὶ αὕτη μὲν ἂν εἴη πρώτη ἡμέρα, Μωσῆς δ' αὐτὴν μίαν εἶπε... τὸ τῶν τετραπόδων γένος ἄρρην καὶ θῆλυ ποιήσας. i. 10. 3 (Gen. xv. 9 f.) δάμαλιν τριετίζουσας καὶ αἶγα τριετίζουσας καὶ κριὸν ὁμοίως τριετῆ καὶ τρυγόνα καὶ περιστερὰν κλεύσαντος διείλε, τῶν ὀρνέων οὐδὲν διελὼν. i. 18. 7 (Gen. xxvii. 30) παρῆν Ἡσαῦς ἀπὸ τῆς θήρας. i. 20. 2 (Gen. xxxii. 23 f.) χειμάρρουν τιὰ Ἰάβακχον λεγόμενον διαβεβηκότων Ἰάκωβος ὑπολελειμμένος... διεπάλαιεν. ii. 4. 1 (Gen. xxxix. 1) Ἰώσηφον δὲ πωλούμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμπόρων ὠνησάμενος Πετεφρῆς ἀνὴρ Αἰγύπτιος ἐπὶ τῶν Φαραώθου μαγεύρων. ii. 6. 1 (Gen. xli. 45) προσηγόρευσεν αὐτὸν Ψονθονφάνηχον... ἄγεται γὰρ καὶ Πετεφροῦ θυγατέρα τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἡλιουπόλει ἱερέων... Ἀσέννηθιν ὀνόματι. ii. 7. 5 (Gen. xlv. 28) ἀπαντησόμενος ἕξεισι καὶ καθ' Ἡρώων πόλιν αὐτῷ συνέβαλεν¹. (d) There is evidence to shew that Josephus used 1 Esdras, which is known only in a Greek form, and the Book of Esther with the Greek additions. 1 *Esdras*. *Ant.* xi. 1. 1 (1 Esdr. ii. 3 f.) Κῦρος ὁ βασιλεὺς λέγει Ἐπεὶ με ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγιστος τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπέδειξε βασιλέα, τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομήσω ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ χώρᾳ. xi. 2. 2 (1 Esdr. ii. 21, cf. 2 Esdr. iv. 17) βασιλεὺς Καμβυσῆς Ῥαθύμφ τῷ γράφοντι τὰ προσπίπτοντα καὶ Βεελζέμφ καὶ Σεμελίφ γραμματεῖ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς συντασσομένοις καὶ οἰκοῦσιν ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ Φοινίκῃ τότε λέγει. xi. 3. 2—8 = 1 Esdr. iii.—iv. *Esther*. *Ant.* xi. 6. 6 = Esth. B; xi. 6. 8 ff. = C, D; xi. 6. 12 f. = E. The first Book of Maccabees

¹ For some of these instances I am indebted to a collation made by Mr C. G. Wright for the Editors of the larger LXX.

was also known to Josephus in its Greek form¹, which underlies his account of the Maccabean wars, just as the Greek translation of the canonical books is used in the earlier books of the *Antiquities*.

A recent examination, by A. Mez, of Basle², into the Biblical text presupposed by Josephus' history in *Ant.* v.—vii. has led to the following results, which are important for the criticism of the LXX. (1) The Josephus text of the LXX. has no affinity with the characteristic text of cod. B. (2) In Joshua it generally approximates to the text of **Α**. (3) In Judges it is frequently, but not constantly, Lucianic; in 1, 2 Kingdoms it agrees with Lucian so closely as to fall into the same omissions and misconceptions; only in four instances, other than proper names, does it contravene a Lucianic reading, and three of these are numerical differences, whilst in the fourth 'Lucian' appears to have undergone correction, and the reading of Josephus survives in cod. A. These investigations, so far as they go, point to a probability that in these books the Greek Bible of Palestine during the second half of the first century presented a text not very remote from that of the recension which emanated from Antioch early in the fourth. While Philo the Alexandrian supports on the whole the text of our oldest uncial cod. B, Josephus the Palestinian seems to have followed that of an 'Urlucian.'

LITERATURE. Hellenistic writers before Philo: Text: C. Müller, *Fragmenta historica Graeca* iii. J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien* i., ii. (Breslau, 1875). Cf. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griech. Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, ii. p. 356 ff.; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*³, iii. p. 345 ff.; Oeconomus, ii. 76.

Philo: Text: L. Cohn and P. Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt* (Berlin, vol. i. 1896; vol. ii. 1897; vol. iii. 1898; vol. iv. 1902; vol. v. 1906—in progress). Cf. C. F. Hornemann, *Specimen exercitationum criticarum in versionem*

¹ Bloch, *Die Quellen d. Fl. Josephus*, p. 8 ff.

² *Die Bibel des Josephus*, p. 79 ff.

LXX. interpretum ex Philone (Göttingen, 1773); C. Siegfried, *Philo und der überlieferte Text der LXX.* (in *Z. f. wiss. Theologie*, 1873, pp. 217 ff., 411 ff., 522 ff.); A. Edersheim in *D. C. B.* iv. p. 357 ff.; E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford, 1889), p. 140 ff.; F. C. Conybeare, in *Expositor*, 1891, p. 456 ff.; and *Jewish Q. R.*, 1893, p. 246 ff., 1896, p. 88 ff.; H. E. Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture* (London, 1895); P. Wendland, in *Philologus* 1898, p. 283 ff., 521 ff., 1899, 274 ff.; L. Massebieau, *Le classement des œuvres de Philon* (in *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études* I. pp. 1—91); J. Drummond, in *Hastings' D. B.* suppl. 197; J. H. A. Hart, in *J. Q. R.* xvii. p. 78 ff.; Aug. Schröder, *De Philonis Alexandrini Vet. Test.*, Greifswald, 1907.

Sibyllines. Text: A. Rzach, *Oracula Sibyllina*, Vienna, 1891.

Cf. F. Blass in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen*, p. 177 ff.

Josephus. Text: B. Niese, *Fl. Josephi opera* (Berlin, 1887—1895). Cf. Spittler, 1779, J. G. Scharfenberg, 1780; E. Schürer², *E. T.* I. i. p. 77 ff.; A. Edersheim in *D. C. B.* iii. p. 441 ff.; C. Siegfried in Stade's *Z. f. d. Altliche Wissenschaft*, 1883, p. 32 ff.; H. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus in seiner Archäologia* (Leipzig, 1879); A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch v.—vii. der Archäologia* (Basle, 1895).

CHAPTER II.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE LXX. IN THE NEW
TESTAMENT.

1. THE writings of the New Testament were the work of some nine authors, of different nationalities and antecedents. Six of them, according to the traditional belief, were Palestinian Jews; a seventh, though 'a Hebrew of Hebrew parentage,' belonged by birth to the Dispersion of Asia Minor; of the remaining two, one was possibly a Gentile from Antioch, and the other a 'Hellenist with Alexandrian proclivities.' Some diversity of practice as to the literary use of the Greek Old Testament may reasonably be expected in a collection of books having so complex an origin.

With few exceptions, the books of the New Testament abound in references to the Old Testament and in quotations from it. An exhaustive list of these may be seen at the end of Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek* (Text, p. 581 ff.), and in their text the corresponding passages are distinguished by the use of a small uncial type. But this device, though otherwise admirable¹, does not enable the student to distinguish direct citations from mere allusions and reminiscences; and as the distinction is important for our present purpose, we will begin by placing before him a table of passages in the Old Testament which are formally quoted by New Testament writers.

¹ See below, p. 403.

By passages formally cited we understand (1) those which are cited with an introductory formula, such as *τοῦτο γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν* (Mt.), *οὕτως* or *καθὼς γέγραπται*, or *γέγραπται* simply (Mt., Mc., Lc., Paul), *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν* (Jo.), *Μωυσῆς* (Δαυεὶδ) *λέγει* or *εἶπεν*, *λέγει* or *εἶπεν ἡ γραφή* (Jo., Paul), or *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα* (Hebrews); (2) those which, though not announced by a formula, appear from the context to be intended as quotations, or agree verbatim with some context in the O. T.

Table of O.T. passages quoted in the N.T.

Gen.	i. 27 (v. 2)	Mt.	xix. 4, Mc. x. 6
	ii. 2	Heb.	iv. 4
	7	1 Cor.	xv. 45
	24	Mt.	xix. 5 f., Mc. x. 7 f., 1 Cor. vi. 16, Eph. v. 31
	v. 24	Heb.	xi. 5
	xii. 1	Acts	vii. 3
	3 ^b (xxii. 18)		iii. 25, Gal. iii. 8
	xv. 5	Rom.	iv. 18
	6	Jas.	ii. 23, Rom. iv. 3, Gal. iii. 6
	13 f.	Acts	vii. 6 f.
	xvii. 5	Rom.	iv. 17
	xviii. 10, 14		ix. 9
	xxi. 10	Gal.	iv. 30
	12	Rom.	ix. 7, Heb. xi. 18
	xxii. 16 f.	Heb.	vi. 13 f.
	xxv. 23	Rom.	ix. 12
	xlvi. 31	Heb.	xi. 21
Exod.	ii. 14	Acts	vii. 27 f.
	iii. 5 ff.	Mt.	xxii. 32, Mc. xii. 26, Lc. xx. 37, Acts vii. 32 ff.
	ix. 16	Rom.	ix. 17
	xii. 46 (Num. ix. 12, Ps. xxxiii. 20)	John	xix. 36
	xiii. 12	Lc.	ii. 23
	xvi. 4, 15 (Ps. lxxvii. 24)	John	vi. 31 ff.
	18	2 Cor.	viii. 15
	xix. 13	Heb.	xii. 20
	xx. 12—17 (Deut. v. 16 ff.)	Mt.	v. 21, 27, xv. 4—6, xix. 18 f., Mc. vii. 10, x. 19, Lc. xviii. 20, James ii. 11, Rom. vii. 7, xiii. 9, Eph. vi. 2 f.
	xxi. 16 (17)		xv. 4, Mc. vii. 10

Exod.	xxi. 24 (Lev. xxiv. 20, Deut. xix. 21)	Mt.	v. 38
	xxii. 28	Acts	xxiii. 5
	xxiv. 8	Heb.	ix. 19 f.
	xxv. 40		viii. 5
	xxxii. 1	Acts	vii. 40
	6	1 Cor.	x. 7
	xxxiii. 19	Rom.	ix. 15
Lev.	xi. 44 f. (xix. 2, xx. 7, 26)	1 Pet.	i. 16
	xii. 6, 8	Lc.	ii. 22 ff.
	xviii. 5 (2 Esdr. xix. 29)	Rom.	x. 5, Gal. iii. 12
	xix. 18	Mt.	v. 43, xix. 19, xxii. 39, Mc. xii. 31, Lc. x. 27, James ii. 8, Rom. xiii. 9, Gal. v. 14
	xxvi. 11 f. (Ezek. xxxvii. 27)	2 Cor.	vi. 16
Num.	xvi. 5	2 Tim.	ii. 19
Deut.	iv. 35	Mc.	xii. 32
	vi. 4 f.	Mt.	xxii. 37 f., Mc. xii. 29— 33, Lc. x. 27
	13, 16		iv. 7, 10, Lc. iv. 8, 12
	viii. 3		iv. 4, Lc. iv. 4
	ix. 19	Heb.	xii. 21 (?)
	xviii. 15, 18 f.	Acts	iii. 22 f., vii. 37
	xix. 15	Mt.	xviii. 16, Jo. viii. 17, 2 Cor. xiii. 1
	xxi. 23	Gal.	iii. 13
	xxiv. 1	Mt.	v. 31, xix. 7, Mc. x. 4
	xxv. 4	1 Cor.	ix. 9, 1 Tim. v. 18
	xxvii. 26	Gal.	iii. 10
	xxix. 4	Rom.	xi. 8
	18	Heb.	xii. 15
	xxx. 12—14	Rom.	x. 6—8
	xxxi. 6, 8 (Jos. i. 5)	Heb.	xiii. 5
	xxxii. 21	Rom.	x. 19
	35		xii. 19, Heb. x. 30
	36 (Ps. cxxxiv. 14)	Heb.	x. 30
	43 (Ps. xcvi. 7)		i. 6
2 Regn.	vii. 8, 14	2 Cor.	vi. 18, Heb. i. 5
3 Regn.	xix. 10, 14, 18	Rom.	xi. 3 f.
Psalms	ii. 1 f.	Acts	iv. 25 f.
	7		xiii. 33, Heb. i. 5, v. 5
	viii. 2	Mt.	xxi. 16
	5—7	1 Cor.	xv. 27, Heb. ii. 6—8
	xiii. 3 (v. 10, ix. 28, xxxv. 2, lii. 1—3, cxxxix. 4, Isa. lix. 7 f.)	Rom.	iii. 10—18

Psalms	xv. 8—11	Acts	ii. 25—28
	xvii. 50	Rom.	xv. 9
	xviii. 5		x. 18
	xxi. 2	Mt.	xxvii. 46, Mc. xv. 34
	9		xxvii. 43
	19	Jo.	xix. 24
	23	Heb.	ii. 12
	xxiii. 1	I Cor.	x. 26
	xxx. 1 f.	Rom.	iv. 6—8
	xxxiii. 13—17	I Pet.	iii. 10—12
	xxxiv. 19 (lxviii. 5)	Jo.	xv. 25
	xxxix. 7—9	Heb.	x. 5—7
	xl. 10	Jo.	xiii. 18
	xliv. 22	Rom.	viii. 36
	xliv. 7 f.	Heb.	i. 8 f.
	l. 6	Rom.	iii. 4
	liv. 23	I Pet.	v. 7
	lxvii. 19	Eph.	iv. 8
	lxviii. 10	Jo.	ii. 17, Rom. xv. 3
	23 f.	Rom.	xi. 9 f.
	26	Acts	i. 20
	lxxvii. 2	Mt.	xiii. 35
	lxxx. 6	Jo.	x. 34
	lxxxviii. 21	Acts	xiii. 22
	xc. 11 f.	Mt.	iv. 6, Lc. iv. 10 f.
	xciii. 11	I Cor.	iii. 20
	xciv. 8—11	Heb.	iii. 7—11
	ci. 26—28		i. 10—12
	ciii. 4		i. 7
	cviii. 8	Acts	i. 20
	cix. 1	Mt.	xxii. 44, Mc. xii. 36, Lc. xx. 42 f.; Acts ii. 34 f., Heb. i. 13
	4	Heb.	v. 6 (vii. 17, 21)
	cx. 9	2 Cor.	ix. 9
	cxv. 1		iv. 13
	cxvi. 1	Rom.	xv. 11
	cxvii. 6	Heb.	xiii. 6
	22 f.	Mt.	xxi. 42, Mc. xii. 10 f., Lc. xx. 17, I Pet. ii. 7
Prov.	iii. 11 f.	Heb.	xii. 5 f.
	34	Jas.	iv. 6, I Pet. v. 5
	xi. 31	I Pet.	iv. 18
	xxv. 21 f.	Rom.	xii. 20
	xxvi. 11	2 Pet.	ii. 22
Job	v. 13	I Cor.	iii. 19
Hos.	i. 10	Rom.	ix. 26

Hos.	ii. 23	Rom.	ix. 25
	vi. 6	Mt.	ix. 13, xii. 7
	xi. 1		ii. 15
	xiii. 14	1 Cor.	xv. 55 f.
Amos	v. 25, 27	Acts	vii. 42 f.
	ix. 11 f.		xv. 15—17
Mic.	v. 2	Mt.	ii. 5 f. (Jo. vii. 42)
Joel	ii. 28—32	Acts	ii. 17—21
Hab.	i. 5		xiii. 41
	ii. 3 f.	Rom.	i. 17, Gal. iii. 11, Heb. x. 37 f.
Zech.	iii. 2	Jude	9
	ix. 9	Mt.	xxi. 5, Jo. xii. 15
	xi. 13		xxvii. 9 f.
	xii. 10	Jo.	xix. 37
	xiii. 7	Mt.	xxvi. 31, Mc. xiv. 27
Mal.	i. 2 f.	Rom.	ix. 13
	iii. 1	Mt.	xi. 10, Mc. i. 2, Lc. vii. 27
Isa.	i. 9	Rom.	ix. 29
	vi. 9 f.	Mt.	xiii. 14 f., Mc. iv. 12, Lc. viii. 10, Jo. xii. 40 f., Acts xxviii. 26 f.
	vii. 14		i. 23
	viii. 14	Rom.	ix. 33, 1 Pet. ii. 8
	17	Heb.	ii. 13
	ix. 1 f.	Mt.	iv. 15 f.
	x. 22 f.	Rom.	ix. 27 f.
	xi. 10		xv. 12
	xxii. 13	1 Cor.	xv. 32
	xxv. 8		54
	xxviii. 11 f.		xiv. 21
	16	Rom.	ix. 33, x. 11, 1 Pet. ii. 6
	xxix. 10		xi. 8
	13	Mt.	xv. 8 f., Mc. vii. 6 f.
	14	1 Cor.	i. 19
	xl. 3—5	Mt.	iii. 3, Mc. i. 3, Lc. iii. 4—6, Jo. i. 23
	6—8	1 Pet.	i. 24 f.
	13 f.	Rom.	xi. 34 f., 1 Cor. ii. 16
	xlii. 1—4	Mt.	xii. 18—21
	xliv. 23	Rom.	xiv. 11
	xliv. 6	Acts	xiii. 47
	8	2 Cor.	vi. 2
	lii. 5	Rom.	ii. 24
	7 (Nah. i. 15)		x. 15
	11	2 Cor.	vi. 17

Isa.	lii. 15	Rom.	xv. 21
	liii. 1	Jo.	xii. 38, Rom. x. 16
	4	Mt.	viii. 17
	5 f.	I Pet.	ii. 24 f.
	7 f.	Acts	viii. 32 f.
	12	Mc.	xv. 28, Lc. xxii. 37
liv. 1		Gal.	iv. 27
	13	Jo.	vi. 45
lv. 3		Acts	xiii. 34
lvi. 7		Mt.	xxi. 13, Mc. xi. 17, Lc. xix. 46
	lix. 20 f.	Rom.	xi. 26 f.
	lxi. 1 f.	Lc.	iv. 18 f.
	lxiv. 4	I Cor.	ii. 9 (?)
	lxv. 1 f.	Rom.	x. 20 f.
	lxvi. 1 f.	Acts	vii. 49 f.
	24	Mc.	ix. 48
Jer.	vii. 11	Mt.	xxi. 13, Mc. xi. 17, Lc. xix. 46
	ix. 23 f. (I Regn. ii. 10)	I Cor.	i. 31, 2 Cor. x. 17
	xxxviii. 15	Mt.	ii. 18
	31—34	Heb.	viii. 8—12
Dan.	xii. 11 (ix. 27, xi. 31)	Mt.	xxiv. 15, Mc. xiii. 14

Thus upon a rough estimate the passages directly quoted from the Old Testament by writers of the New Testament are 160. Of these 51 belong to the Pentateuch, 46 to the Poetical Books, and 61 to the Prophets. Among single books the Psalter supplies 40 and Isaiah 38; i.e. nearly half of the passages expressly cited in the N.T. come from one or other of these two sources.

2. The table already given shews the extent to which the Old Testament is directly cited in the New. In that which follows the comparison is inverted, and the student will be able to see at a glance how the quotations are distributed among the several groups of writings of which the New Testament is made up.

(1) *Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels.*

Mt.	Mc.	Lc.	O. T.
i. 23			Isa. vii. 14
		ii. 23	Exod. xiii. 12

Mt.	Mc.	Lc.	O. T.
ii. 6			Mic. v. 2
15			Hos. xi. 1
18			Jer. xxxviii. 15
iii. 3	i. 3	iii. 4—6	Isa. xl. 3—5
iv. 4		iv. 4	Deut. viii. 3
6		10 f.	Ps. xc. 11 f.
7		12	Deut. vi. 16
10		8	13
15 f.			Isa. ix. 1 f.
v. 21			Exod. xx. 13
27			14
31			Deut. xxiv. 1
33			Num. xxx. 3 (cf. Deut. xxiii. 21)
38			Exod. xxi. 24
43			Lev. xix. 18
viii. 17			Isa. liii. 4
ix. 13 (xii. 7)			Hos. vi. 6
xi. 10	i. 2	vii. 27	Mal. iii. 1
xii. 7			Hos. vi. 6
18—21			Isa. xlii. 1
xiii. 14 f.			vi. 9 f.
35		iv. 18 f.	Ps. lxxvii. 2
xv. 4	vii. 10		Isa. lxi. 1 ff.+lviii. 6
8 f.	6		Exod. xx. 12, xxi. 17
	ix. 48		Isa. xxix. 13
xix. 5 f.	x. 6—8		lxvi. 24
18 f.	x. 19	xviii. 20 f.	Gen. i. 27+ii. 24
xxi. 4 f.			Exod. xx. 12—17
13	xi. 17	xix. 46	Zech. ix. 9+Isa. lxii. 11
16			Isa. lvi. 7+Jer. vii. 11
42	xii. 10	xx. 17	Ps. viii. 2
xxii. 24	19	28	cxvii. 22 f.
			Deut. xxv. 5 (cf. Gen. xxxviii. 8)
32	26	37	Exod. iii. 6
37	29 f.	x. 27 ^a	Deut. vi. 4 f.
39	31	27 ^b	Lev. xix. 18
	32		Deut. iv. 35
44	36	xx. 42 f.	Ps. cix. 1
xxiv. 15	xiii. 14		Dan. xii. 11
		xxii. 37	Isa. liii. 12
xxvi. 31	xiv. 27		Zech. xiii. 7
xxvii. 9 f.			xi. 13
46	xv. 34		Ps. xxi. 1

(2) *Quotations in the Fourth Gospel.*

Jo.	i. 23	Isa.	xl. 3
	ii. 17	Ps.	lxviii. 10
	vi. 31	Exod.	xvi. 4, 15 (Ps. lxxvii. 24f.)
	45	Isa.	liv. 13
	x. 34	Ps.	lxxx. 6
	xii. 15	Zech.	ix. 9
	38	Isa.	liii. 1
	40		vi. 10
	xiii. 16	Ps.	xl. (xli.) 10
	xv. 25		xxxiv. 19 (lxviii. 5)
	xix. 24		xxi. 19
	36	Exod.	xii. 46 (Num. ix. 12, Ps. xxxiii. 21)
	37	Zech.	xii. 10

(3) *Quotations in the Acts.*

Acts	i. 20	Ps.	lxviii. 26 + cviii. 8
	ii. 17—21	Joel	ii. 28—32
	25—28	Ps.	xv. 8—11
	34 f.		cix. 1
	iii. 22 f. (vii. 27)	Deut.	xviii. 15, 18 f.
	25	Gen.	xii. 3 + xxii. 18
	iv. 25 f.	Ps.	ii. 1 f.
	vii. 3	Gen.	xii. 1
	6 f.		xv. 13 f.
	27 f., 35	Exod.	ii. 14
	33 f.		iii. 6—8
	40		xxxii. 23
	42 f.	Amos	v. 25—27
	49 f.	Isa.	lxvi. 1 f.
	viii. 32 f		liii. 7 f.
	xiii. 22	Ps.	lxxxviii. 21 etc.
	33		ii. 7
	34	Isa.	lv. 3
	35	Ps.	xv. 10
	41	Hab.	i. 5
	47	Isa.	xliv. 6
	xv. 16—18	Jer.	xii. 15 + Amos ix. 11 f. + Isa. xlv. 21
	xxviii. 26 f.	Isa.	vi. 9 f.

(4) *Quotations in the Catholic Epistles.*

James	ii. 8	Lev.	xix. 18
	11	Exod.	xx. 13 f.
	23	Gen.	xv. 6
	iv. 6	Prov.	iii. 34
1 Peter	i. 24 f.	Isa.	xl. 6—9
	ii. 6		xxviii. 16
	iii. 10—12	Ps.	xxxiii. 12—17
	iv. 18	Prov.	xi. 31
	v. 7	Ps.	liv. 23
2 Peter	ii. 22	Prov.	xxvi. 11
Jude	9	Zech.	iii. 2

(5) *Quotations in the Epistles of St Paul.*

Rom.	i. 17	Hab.	ii. 4
	ii. 24	Isa.	lii. 5
	iii. 4	Ps.	l. 6
	10—18		xiii. 1—3 ¹
	20		cxlii. 2
	iv. 3, 22	Gen.	xv. 6
	7 f.	Ps.	xxx. 1 f.
	17	Gen.	xvii. 5
	18		xv. 5
	vii. 7	Exod.	xx. 14, 17
	viii. 36	Ps.	xl. 23
	ix. 7	Gen.	xxi. 12
	9		xviii. 10
	12		xxv. 23
	13	Mal.	i. 2 f.
	15	Exod.	xxxiii. 19
	17		ix. 16
	26	Hos.	i. 10
	27	Isa.	x. 22 f.
	29		i. 9
	33		viii. 14 + xxviii. 16
x.	6—9	Deut.	xxx. 11—14
	15	Isa.	lii. 7 (Nah. i. 15)
	16		liii. 1
	18	Ps.	xviii. 5
	19	Deut.	xxxii. 21
	20 f.	Isa.	lxv. 1 f.

¹ See above, p. 251 f.

Rom.	xi. 1 f.	Ps.	xciii. 14
	3 f.	3 Regn.	xix. 10, 14, 18
	8	Isa.	xxix. 10 + Deut. xxix. 4
	9	Ps.	lxviii. 23 f. + xxxiv. 8
	26 f.	Isa.	lix. 20 + xxvii. 9
	34 f.		xl. 13
	xii. 20 f.	Prov.	xxv. 21 f.
	xiii. 9	Exod.	xx. 13 ff., Lev. xix. 18
	xiv. 11	Isa.	xl. 23
	xv. 3	Ps.	lxviii. 10
	9		xvii. 50 (2 Regn. xxii. 50)
	10	Deut.	xxxii. 43
	11	Ps.	cxvi. 1
	12	Isa.	xi. 10
	21		lii. 15
1 Cor.	i. 19		xxix. 14
	31	Jer.	ix. 24
	ii. 9	Isa.	lxiv. 4 + lxv. 17 (f)
	20	Ps.	xciii. 11
	vi. 16	Gen.	ii. 24
	ix. 9	Deut.	xxv. 4
	x. 7	Exod.	xxxii. 6
	26	Ps.	xxiii. 1
	xiv. 21	Isa.	xxviii. 11 f.
	xv. 32		xxii. 13
	45	Gen.	ii. 7
	54 f.	Isa.	xxv. 8 + Hos. xiii. 14
2 Cor.	iv. 13	Ps.	cxv. 1
	vi. 2	Isa.	xliv. 8
	16 ff.	Ezek.	xxxvii. 27 + Isa. lii. 11
	viii. 15	Exod.	xvi. 18
	ix. 9	Ps.	cxv. 9
	x. 17	Jer.	ix. 24
Gal.	ii. 16	Ps.	cxlii. 2
	iii. 6	Gen.	xv. 6
	8		xii. 3
	10	Deut.	xxvii. 26
	11	Hab.	ii. 4
	12	Lev.	xviii. 5
	13	Deut.	xxi. 23
	iv. 27	Isa.	liv. 1
	30	Gen.	xxi. 10
	v. 14	Lev.	xix. 18
Eph.	iv. 8	Ps.	lxviii. 19
	25	Zech.	viii. 16

Eph.	iv. 26	Psa.	iv. 5
	v. 31	Gen.	ii. 24
	vi. 2	Exod.	xx. 12
1 Tim.	v. 18	Deut.	xxv. 4
2 Tim.	ii. 19	Num.	xvi. 5

(6) *Quotations in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

Heb.	i. 5	Psa.	ii. 7 (2 Regn. vii. 14)
	6		xcvi. 7 (Deut. xxxii. 43)
	7		ciii. 4
	8 f.		xliv. 7 f.
	10—12		ci. 26—28
	13		cix. 1
ii.	6—8		viii. 5—7
	12		xxi. 23
	13	Isa.	viii. 17 f.
iii.	7—12	Psa.	xciv. 8—11
iv.	4	Gen.	ii. 2
v.	6 (vii. 17, 21)	Psa.	cix. 4
vi.	13 f.	Gen.	xxii. 16 f.
viii.	5	Exod.	xxv. 40
	8—13, x. 16 f.	Jer.	xxxviii. 31—34
ix.	20	Exod.	xxiv. 8
x.	5—10	Psa.	xxxix. 7—9
	30	Deut.	xxxii. 35 f.
	37 f.	Hab.	ii. 3 f.
xi.	5	Gen.	v. 24
	18		xxi. 12
	21		xlvii. 31
xii.	5 f.	Prov.	iii. 11 f.
	15	Deut.	xxix. 18
	20	Exod.	xix. 12 f.
	26	Hagg.	ii. 6
xiii.	5	Deut.	xxxi. 6, 8
	6	Psa.	cxvii. 6

Some interesting results follow from an inspection of these lists. (1) The Synoptic Gospels have 46 distinct quotations (Mt. 40, Mc. 19, Lc. 17), of which 18 are peculiar to Mt., 3 to Mc., 3 to Lc. There are 10 which are common to the three, 3 common to Mt. and Mc., 4 to Mt. and Lc., but none

which are shared by Mc. and Lc. to the exclusion of Mt. (2) Of the 12 quotations in the Fourth Gospel, 3 only are also in the Synoptists. (3) The 23 quotations in the Acts occur almost exclusively in the speeches. (4) The Johannine Epistles do not quote the O. T. at all, and the other Catholic Epistles contain few direct citations. (5) Of 78 quotations in St Paul, 71 are in the four first Epistles (Romans 42, 1—2 Corinthians 19, Galatians 10); there are none in the Epistles of the Roman captivity, with the exception of Ephesians, which has five. (6) The Epistle to the Hebrews quotes 28 passages, of which 21 are not cited in any other N. T. writing¹. (7) The Apocalypse does not quote, but its language is full of O. T. phraseology to an extent unparalleled in the other books.

3. Hitherto no account has been taken of the relation which the N. T. quotations bear to the Alexandrian version, although for the sake of convenience the references to the O. T. have been given according to the order and numeration of the Greek Bible. We may now address ourselves to this further question; and it may at once be said that every part of the N. T. affords evidence of a knowledge of the LXX., and that a great majority of the passages cited from the O. T. are in general agreement with the Greek version. It is calculated by one writer on the subject that, while the N. T. differs from the Massoretic text in 212 citations, it departs from the LXX. in 185²; and by another that "not more than fifty" of the citations "materially differ from the LXX."³ On either estimate the LXX. is the principal source from which the writers of the N. T. derived their O. T. quotations.

More may be learnt by patiently examining the details of the evidence. This cannot be done here in full, but we may

¹ Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 473.

² Turpie, *O.T. in the N.*, p. 267.

³ Grinfield, *Apology for the LXX.*, p. 37.

point out the method to be pursued in such an investigation, and its chief results.

Each group of the N. T. writings must be interrogated separately. (a) Beginning with the Synoptic Gospels, we observe that the quotations partly occur in narratives or dialogue which are common to the Synoptists or to two of them, and are partly due to the individual writer. Between these two classes of quotations there is a marked contrast. Citations belonging to the common narrative, or to sayings reported by all the Synoptists, or to two of them, with few exceptions adhere closely to the LXX., the differences being only textual or in the way of omission.

Some examples will make this clear. (1) *Citations common to Mt., Mc., Lc.* Mt. xxi. 13=Mc. xi. 17=Lc. xix. 46=LXX., Mc. alone completing the verse. Mt. xxi. 42=Mc. xii. 10=Lc. xx. 17=LXX., Lc. omitting *παρὰ Κυρίου κτλ.* Mt. xxii. 37=Mc. xii. 29 f.=Lc. x. 27^a=LXX., with variants¹. Mt. xxii. 39=Mc. xii. 31=Lc. x. 27^b=LXX. Mt. xxii. 44=Mc. xii. 36=Lc. xx. 42 f., =LXX. with the variant *ἐποκάτω* in Mt., Mc. (2) *Citations common to Mt., Mc.* Mt. xv. 4=Mc. vii. 10=LXX., cod. A. Mt. xv. 8 f.=Mc. vii. 6=LXX., with variants². Mt. xix. 5 f.=Mc. x. 6 ff.=LXX., Mc. omitting *προσκολληθήσεται κτλ.* Mt. xxiv. 15=Mc. xiii. 14=LXX. and Th. Mt. xxvi. 31=Mc. xiv. 27 (omitting *τῆς ποιμνῆς*)=LXX., cod. A, with one important variant not found in any MS. of the LXX.; cod. B has quite a different text³. (3) *Citations common to Mt., Lc.* Mt. iv. 4=Lc. iv. 4=LXX., Lc. omitting the second half of the quotation. Mt. iv. 6=Lc. iv. 10 f.=LXX., except that the clause *τοῦ διαφυλάξαι* is omitted by Mt. and in part by Lc. Mt. iv. 7=Lc. iv. 12=LXX. Mt. iv. 10=Lc. iv. 8=LXX., cod. A.

Thus it appears that of 14 quotations which belong to this class only two (Mt. xv. 8 f., xxvi. 31) depart widely from the LXX. But when we turn from the quotations which belong to the common narrative to those which are peculiar to one of the Synoptists, the results are very different.

¹ On these see Hatch, *Essays*, p. 104, and the writer's *St Mark*, p. 255.

² Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 177 f.

³ *St Mark*, p. 318 f.

In Mt. there are 16 quotations which are not to be found in Mc. or Lc. (Mt. i. 23, ii. 6, 15, 18, iv. 15 f., v. 33, 38, 43, viii. 17, ix. 13=xii. 7, xii. 18 ff., xiii. 14 f., 35, xxi. 4 f., 16, xxvii. 9 f.). Of these 4 (v. 38, ix. 13, xiii. 14 f., xxi. 16) are in the words of the LXX. with slight variants; 4 exhibit important variants, and the remaining 7 bear little or no resemblance to the Alexandrian Greek¹. Neither Mc. nor Lc. has any series of independent quotations; Mc. ix. 48, xii. 32 are from the LXX., but shew affinities to the text of cod. A; Lc. iv. 18 f. differs from the LXX. in important particulars.

It may be asked whether the quotations in the Synoptists which do not agree with our present text of the LXX., or with its relatively oldest type, imply the use of another Greek version. Before an answer to this question can be attempted, it is necessary to distinguish carefully between the causes which have produced variation. It may be due to (*a*) loose citation, or to (*b*) the substitution of a gloss for the precise words which the writer professes to quote, or to (*c*) a desire to adapt a prophetic context to the circumstances under which it was thought to have been fulfilled, or to (*d*) the fusing together of passages drawn from different contexts. Of the variations which cannot be ascribed to one or other of these causes, some are (*e*) recensional, whilst others are (*f*) translational, and imply an independent use of the original, whether by the Evangelist, or by the author of some collection of excerpts which he employed.

The following may be taken as specimens of these types of variation. (*a*) Mt. ii. 18, xxi. 4 f.; (*b*) Mt. ii. 6, xxvii. 9 f.; (*c*) Mt. ii. 15; (*d*) Lc. iv. 18 f.; (*e*) Mt. xii. 18 ff., Mc. xii. 29 f.; (*f*) Mt. xiii. 35^b. But more than one cause of divergence may have been at work in the same quotation, and it is not always easy to decide which is paramount; e.g. in Mt. ii. 15 the substitution of *τὸν υἱὸν μου* for *τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς* may be due either to the Evangelist's desire to adapt the prophecy to the event, or to a correction of the LXX. from the Heb. (יְהוָה?).

The three last-named causes of variation need to be considered at some length.

¹ Cf. Sir J. C. Hawkins, *Hor. Syn.*, p. 123 ff.

(1) A few of the Synoptic quotations are manifestly composite. E.g. Mt. xxi. 4 f., which is mainly from Zech. ix. 9, opens with a clause from Isa. lxii. 11 (εἴπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών Ἰδοὺ κτλ.). Lc. iv. 18 f., which is professedly an extract from a synagogue lesson Isa. lxi. 1 ff., inserts in the heart of that context a clause from Isa. lviii. 6 (ἀποστῆλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει). Still more remarkable is the fusion in Mc. i. 2 f., where, under the heading καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαία τῷ προφήτῃ, we find Mal. iii. 1 + Isa. xl. 3¹. Here the parallel passages in Mt., Lc., quote Isaiah only, using Malachi in another context (Mt. xi. 10, Lc. vii. 27).

(2) There is a considerable weight of evidence in favour of the belief that the Evangelists employed a recension of the LXX. which came nearer to the text of cod. A than to that of our oldest uncial B. This point has been recently handled in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift f. Wissenschaftliche Theologie*², by Dr W. Staerk, who shews that the witness of the N. T. almost invariably goes with codd. \aleph AF and Lucian against the Vatican MS.; and that its agreement with cod. A is especially close³. It may of course be argued that the text of these authorities has been influenced by the N. T.⁴; but the fact that a similar tendency is noticeable in Josephus, and to a less extent in Philo, goes far to discount this objection. Still more remarkable is the occasional tendency in N. T. quotations to support Theodotion against the LXX.⁵ Some instances have been given already; we may add here Mt. xii. 18 = Isa. xlii. 1:

Mt.	LXX.	Th.
ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ὃν ἐὺδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου.	Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου.	ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου ὃν ἐὺδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου.

¹ *St Mark*, p. 2.

³ xxxvi., p. 97 f.

⁵ Cf. p. 48.

² In nos. xxxv., xxxvi., xxxviii., xl.

⁴ Cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. p. 314 ff.

Such coincidences lend some probability to the supposition that Theodotion's version bears a relation to the recension of the Alexandrian Greek which was in the hands of the early Palestinian Church.

(3) Certain quotations in the First Gospel are either independent of the LXX., or have been but slightly influenced by it. These require to be studied separately, and, as they are but few, they are printed below and confronted with the LXX.

Mt. ii. 6

καὶ σύ, Βηθλέεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα,
οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς
ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ
ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις
ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου Ἰσραήλ.

ουδαμως] μη D | εκ σου] ἐξ
ου (B*) \aleph C(D) | om γαρ \aleph^* .

Mic. v. 2, 4

καὶ σύ, Βηθλέεμ, οἶκος
Ἐφράθα, ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι
ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰούδα· ἐξ οὗ μοι
ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα
τοῦ Ἰσραήλ... καὶ ποιμανεῖ...

ἐξ ου] εκ σου B^{b^c}AQ | ἐξε-
λευσεται]+ηγουμενος A

On the relation of the LXX. in this passage to the M. T. see above p. 338. Χιλιάσιν, ἡγεμόσιν answer to different vocalisations of יְשֵׁלַע , but οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ and ἡγούμενος ὅστις π. τὸν λ. μου are paraphrastic. The Evangelist has put into the mouth of the Scribes an interpretation rather than a version of the prophecy.

Mt. iv. 15 f.

γῆ Ζαβουλὼν καὶ γῆ Νεφ-
θαλείμ, ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, πέραν
τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν
ἐθνῶν, ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν
σκοτίᾳ φῶς εἶδεν μέγα· καὶ τοῖς
καθημένοις ἐν χώρα καὶ σκιᾷ
θανάτου φῶς ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς.

οι καθημενοι D | και σκια]
om και D*

Isa. ix. 1 f.

χώρα Ζαβουλῶν, ἡ γῆ Νεφ-
θαλείμ, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν
παραλίαν καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορ-
δάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν. ὁ
λαὸς ὁ πορευόμενος ἐν σκότει,
ἴδετε φῶς μέγα· οἱ κατοικοῦντες
ἐν χώρα σκιᾷ θανάτου, φῶς
λάμπει ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.

Νεφθαλειμ]+οδον θαλασσης
 \aleph^c .^aAQ (Aq. Th.) | παραλιαν]+
κατοικουντες \aleph^c .^aAQ | πορευ-
ομενος A | σκια] p Γ
και \aleph^c .^aAQ Γ

Here Mt. differs widely both from LXX. and M. T., yet he has points of agreement with both. The influence of LXX. is seen in γῆ Ζ., Γ. τῶν ἐθνῶν, χώρα [καὶ] σκιά. On the other hand ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, εἶδεν, αὐτοῖς agree with M.T. The writer quotes from memory, or from a collection of loosely cited *testimonia*.

Mt. viii. 17

αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν
ἔλαβεν καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστα-
σεν.

Isa. liii. 4

οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν
φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται.

Mt.'s version is based upon Heb., from which the LXX. departs. Cf. Symm.: τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνέλαβεν καὶ τοὺς πόνους ὑπέμεινεν.

Mt. xiii. 35

ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ
στόμα μου· ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμ-
μένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.

Ps. lxxvii. 2

ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ
στόμα μου· φθέγξομαι προ-
βλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

καταβολῆς] + κοσμου N*CD

V. 35^a in Mt. follows the LXX. *verbatim*, while 35^b is an independent rendering of the Heb. The departure from the LXX. in the second half of the text is not altogether for the sake of exactness; if ἐρεύξομαι is nearer to פָּתַח מִנִּי than φθέγξομαι, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς introduces a conception which has no place in פָּתַח מִנִּי מֵרֵאשִׁית, and in this sense the Greek phrase is practically limited to the N. T. (see Hort on 1 Pet. i. 20).

Mt. xxvii. 9 f.¹

καὶ ἔλαβον...τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ
τετιμημένου ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ
υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὰ
εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως,
καθὰ συντάξεν μοι Κύριος.

Zach. xi. 13

καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος πρὸς μέ
Κάθες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον
καὶ σκέψομαι εἰ δόκιμόν ἐστιν,
ὃν τρόπον ἐδοκιμάσθη ὑπὲρ
αὐτῶν. καὶ ἔλαβον...καὶ ἐνέ-
βαλον αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον Κυ-
ρίου εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον.

ἔδωκεν A*^{vid} ἔδωκα N

ἐδοκιμασθην B*^{fort} N A Q

Mt. has re-arranged this passage, and given its sense, without regard to the order or construction of the original. In doing this he has abandoned the LXX. altogether, and approximates to the Heb.; cf. Aq. ἡ τιμὴ ἣν ἐτιμήθη ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν.

¹ Mt. ascribes this prophecy to Jeremiah: τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου. The slip is probably due to a confusion between Zach. i. c. and Jer. xviii. 2.

In these five passages the compiler of the first Gospel has more or less distinctly thrown off the yoke of the Alexandrian version and substituted for it a paraphrase, or an independent rendering from the Hebrew. But our evidence does not encourage the belief that the Evangelist used or knew another complete Greek version of the Old Testament, or of any particular book. It is to be observed that he uses this liberty only in quotations which proceed from himself, if we except the references to the O. T. in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. v. 21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43) which are hardly of the nature of strict citations; the formula *ἔρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις* distinguishes them from that class, and suggests that they purport only to give the general sense.

(b) The Fourth Gospel quotes the LXX. *verbatim*, or with slight variants, in cc. ii. 17, x. 34, xii. 38, xix. 24, 36; and more freely in vi. 31, 45, xv. 25. In other places the author takes a more or less independent course: e.g. in i. 23, quoting Isa. xl. 3 he writes *εὐθύνετε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου* for *ἐτοιμάσατε τ. ὁ. Κ.*, *εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν* (cf. Mt. iii. 3, Mc. i. 3, Lc. iii. 4); in xii. 40, Isa. vi. 9, 10 is paraphrased *τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπόρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν*, which agrees neither with the LXX. nor with M.T.; in xix. 37 *ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν* is a non-Septuagintal rendering of Zach. xii. 10, which was perhaps current in Palestine, since *εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν* appears also in Theodotion (cf. Aq., Symm., and Apoc. i. 7)¹.

(c) The quotations from the O. T. in the Acts are taken from the LXX. exclusively. With the exception of the *περιοχή* in c. viii. 32², they occur only in the speeches. A few points deserve special notice. In vii. 43 (= Amos v. 26) the LXX. is followed against M.T. (*Ῥαμφά(ν)* or *Ῥαιφάν*, *𐤓𐤏 𐤓𐤓*). Similarly in xiii. 34 (= Isa. lv. 3) *τὰ ὄσια Δαυεὶδ* is read with the LXX. for *𐤅𐤓𐤕 𐤅𐤓𐤕*. C. xiii. 22 is a conflation of Ps. lxxxviii.

¹ See against this Nestle, *Textual Criticism of the N. T.*, p. 291.

² An exact citation, with one or two variants of the A type.

21 + lxxi. 20 + 1 Regn. xiii. 14 + Isa. xliv. 28. C. xv. 16 ff., which is introduced by the formula *τούτω συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται*, presents a remarkable instance of free citation accompanied by conflation, which calls for separate study.

Acts xv. 16 ff.

μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυεὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, καὶ τὰ κατεστραμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν, ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα * * *

κατεστραμμένα] κατεσκαμ-
μενα ACD

Jer. xii. 15 + Amos ix. 11 f.

μετὰ τὸ ἐκβαλεῖν με αὐτοὺς ἐπιστρέψω ... ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυεὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν.. καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος, ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα.

κατεσκαμμένα] κατεστραμ-
μενα A^bQ*
ὅπως] + αν Α | ἀνθρωπων] +
τον κυριον Α

The combination in this quotation of looseness with close adherence to the LXX. even where it is furthest from the Heb. (e.g. in *ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν κτλ.*) is significant, especially when it is remembered that the speaker is St James of Jerusalem.

(d) The Catholic Epistles use the LXX. when they quote the O.T. expressly, and with some exceptions keep fairly close to the Alexandrian Greek. Thus Jas. ii. 8, 11², 23, iv. 6, 1 Pet. i. 24³, iv. 18, v. 5, are substantially exact. 1 Pet. ii. 6 differs from the LXX. of Isa. xxviii. 16. 1 Pet. iii. 10 ff., an unacknowledged extract from Ps. xxxiii. 12 ff., is adapted to the context by a slight change in the construction, but otherwise generally follows the LXX.: *θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς* for *θέλων ζ., ἀγαπῶν ἰδ. ἡμ. ἀγαθὰς* is probably

¹ On this reading see W. H.², *Notes on select readings*, p. 96.

² Cf. Mc. x. 19, Lc. xviii. 20. Jas. ii. 23, v. 20, 1 Pet. iv. 8, differ from LXX.

³ On the few variants in this passage see Hort, *St Peter*, p. 93.

a slip, shewing that the writer was quoting from memory. In 2 Pet. ii. 22 (= Prov. xxvi. 11) *κῶν ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα* is nearer to the Heb. than *κ. ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἐμετόν*, and appears to be an independent rendering.

(e) More than half of the direct quotations from the O.T. in the Epistles of St Paul are taken from the LXX. without material change (Rom. i. 17, ii. 24, iii. 4, iv. 7 f., 18, vii. 7, viii. 36, ix. 7, 12, 13, 15, 26, x. 6 ff., 16, 18, 19, 20 f., xi. 26 f., 34 f., xii. 20 f., xiii. 9, xv. 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 21; 1 Cor. iii. 20, vi. 16, x. 7, 26, xv. 32; 2 Cor. iv. 13, vi. 2, viii. 15, ix. 9; Gal. iii. 6, 10, 11, 12, iv. 27, v. 14; Eph. iv. 26; 2 Tim. ii. 19). A smaller proportion shew important variants (Rom. iii. 20 = Gal. ii. 16 *πάσα σάρξ* for *πᾶς ζῶν* LXX.; ix. 9 *κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐλεύσομαι, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρα υἱός* for *ἦξω...κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον...καὶ ἔξει υἱὸν Σάρρα* LXX.; ix. 17 *εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε* for *ἔνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης*, and *δύναμιν* for *ἰσχύν* LXX.¹; ix. 27 *ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰ.*, *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*; xiv. 11 *ζῶ ἐγὼ* for *κατ' ἑμαντοῦ ὀμνύω, ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ* for *ὀμνύεται τὸν θεόν* LXX.; 1 Cor. i. 19 *ἀθετήσω* for *κρύψω* LXX.; Gal. iii. 8 *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* for *πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς* LXX.; iii. 13 *ἐπικατάρατος* (cf. v. 20) for *κεκαταραμένος* LXX.; Eph. iv. 8 *ἔδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* for *ἔλαβες δ. ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ*² LXX.; iv. 25 *μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον* for *πρὸς τὸν πλ.* LXX.; v. 31 *ἀντὶ τούτου* for *ἔνεκεν τ.*, *om. αὐτοῦ* 1°, 2°; cf. Mt. xix. 5 f., Mc. x. 7 f.; vi. 3 *καὶ ἔση μακροχρόνιος* for *κ. ἵνα μακροχρ. γένῃ*).

In other passages St Paul departs still further from the LXX., quoting freely, or paraphrasing, or fusing two distinct passages into a single citation, or occasionally deserting the Alexandrian version altogether. Examples of loose quotations or of paraphrases will be found in Rom. ix. 27, xi. 3, 4, 1 Cor. xv. 45, Gal. iv. 30; conflation occurs in Rom. iii. 10 ff.³, ix. 33, xi. 8, 9, 26 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 54 f., 2 Cor. vi. 16 ff.

¹ B^A reads *δύναμιν*.

² *αἰῶνις* B^ANR^A.

³ On this passage, see above, p. 251 f.

The following instances will shew how far reconstruction is carried in cases of conflation.

Rom. ix. 33 ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου· καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχυνθήσεται².

Rom. xi. 8 ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὄτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.

I Cor. ii. 9 ἂ ὀφθαλμοὶ οὐκ εἶδον καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν³.

αγαπῶσιν] υπομενουσιν
Clem. R. i. 34, 8.

I Cor. xv. 54 f. κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος⁴. ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νίκος; ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον;

In some cases a wide departure from the LXX. is probably to be explained by the supposition that the Apostle quotes from memory; e.g.:

Rom. xi. 2 ff.

οὐκ οὔδατε ἐν Ἡλείᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή...Κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ θυσιαστήρια σου κατέσκαψαν, κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος, καὶ ζητοῦσιν τὴν ψυχὴν μου. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; Κατέλιπον ἔμαντῶ ἑπτακισχιλίου ἀνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ.

¹ Aq. καὶ εἰς στερεὸν σκανδάλου.

² Cf. I Pet. ii. 8 (Hort).

³ On this passage see Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 154 ff.

⁴ So Theodotion.

Isa. viii. 14 οὐχ ὡς λίθον προσκόμματος συναντήσεσθε οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι¹.
xxviii. 16 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σειῶν λίθον πολυτελεῖ, ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον, ἔντιμον...καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ κατασχυνθῆ.

Isa. xxix. 10 πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς Κύριος πνεύματι κατανύξεως.
Deut. xxix. 4 καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν καρδίαν εἰδέναι καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς [τοῦ] βλέπειν καὶ ὄτα ἀκούειν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.

Isa. lxiv. 3 οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον θεὸν πλην σου, καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου ἂ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον. lxv. 17 οὐδ' οὐ μὴ ἐπέλη αὐτῶν ἐπὶ καρδίαν.

Isa. xxv. 8 κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας. Hos. xiii. 14 ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου, θάνατε; ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου, ᾄδη;

3 Regn. xix. 14 ff.

καὶ εἶπεν Ἡλείου...τὰ θυσιαστήρια σου καθεῖλαν καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν...καὶ ὑπολέλιμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου...καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν...καταλείψεις ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν, πάντα γόνατα ἃ οὐκ ᾤκλασαν γόνυ τῷ Βάαλ.

The following quotation also is probably from memory¹, but the Apostle's knowledge of the original has enabled him to improve upon the faulty rendering of the LXX.

I Cor. xiv. 21

ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι
Ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χεί-
λεσιν ἑτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ
τούτῳ, καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσ-
ακούσονται μου, λέγει Κύριος.

Isa. xxviii. 11 f.

διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων, διὰ
γλώσσης ἑτέρας· ὅτι λαλήσου-
σιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ... καὶ οὐκ
ἠθέλησαν ἀκούειν.

Jerome, quoting these words from St Paul, rightly adds, "Quod mihi videtur iuxta Hebraicum de praesenti sumptum capitulo." Aquila's rendering is remarkably similar, ὅτι ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέροις λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. Theodotion unfortunately is wanting.

(f) The Ep. to the Hebrews is in great part a catena of quotations from the LXX. "The text of the quotations agrees in the main with some form of the present text of the LXX."² A considerable number of the passages are cited exactly, or with only slight variation (i. 5, 8 f., 13; ii. 6 ff., 13; iv. 4, v. 6, vi. 13 f., viii. 5, xi. 5, 18, 21; xii. 5 f., xiii. 6). The writer usually follows the LXX. even when they differ materially from the Heb. (viii. 8 ff.³, x. 5 ff., σῶμα δὲ κατηρίσω μοι, 37 ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, xi. 21 ῥάβδον, xii. 5 μαστιγοῖ⁴). But he sometimes deserts both version and original, substituting a free paraphrase, or apparently citing from memory (i. 6, ix. 20 ἐνετείλατο, x. 30⁵, xii. 19 f., 26). Some of his readings are interesting: in i. 7 we have πυρὸς φλόγα for πῦρ φλέγον⁶; in i. 12 ὡς ἱμάτιον seems to be a doublet of ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον. Notice also ii. 12 ἀπαγγελῶ for διηγῆσομαι (perhaps after Ps. xxi. 31 f.); iii. 9 ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ for ἐδοκίμασαν (ἐδοκιμασία for ἐδοκιμασᾶ), and iii. 10 τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη διὸ προσώχθισα for

¹ As ἐν τῷ νόμῳ seems to indicate.

² Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 476.

³ Cf. p. 338.

⁴ Yet "he nowhere shews any immediate knowledge of the Hebrew text" (Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 479).

⁵ Cf. Rom. xii. 19. Apparently a stock quotation, current in this form.

⁶ A^b has πυρὸς φλέγα (sic) in Ps. ciii. 4.

τεσσ. ἕτη προσώχθ.; x. 6 εὐδόκησας for ἤτησας B, ἐζήτησας
HART; xii. 15 ἐνοχλῆ for ἐν χολῆ, a corruption supported
even in the LXX. by B*AF*.

In the Epistles, as in the Gospels, the text of the LXX. which is employed inclines to cod. A rather than to cod. B. But its agreement with the A text is not without exception; and there are other elements in the problem which must not be overlooked. As in the Gospels, again, we notice from time to time a preference for Lucianic readings, or for the readings of Theodotion. It has been reasonably conjectured that the writers of the N.T. used a recension which was current in Palestine, possibly also in Asia Minor, and which afterwards supplied materials to Theodotion, and left traces in the Antiochian Bible, and in the text represented by cod. A. We shall revert to this subject in a later chapter; for the present it is enough to notice the direction to which the evidence of the N.T. seems to point.

4. We have dealt so far with direct quotations. But in estimating the influence of the LXX. upon the N.T. it must not be forgotten that it contains almost innumerable references of a less formal character. These are in many cases likely to escape notice, and it is not the least of the debts which we owe to the Westcott and Hort text, that attention is called to them by the use of uncial type. They will be found chiefly (*a*) in the words of our Lord (e.g. Mt. vii. 23 = Lc. xiii. 27, Mc. x. 21, 35 f. = Lc. xii. 52 f., xi. 5 = Lc. vii. 22, xi. 21, 23 = Lc. x. 15, 28 f., xiii. 32 = Mc. iv. 32 = Lc. xiii. 19, xvii. 17 = Lc. ix. 41, xviii. 16, xxi. 33 = Mc. xii. 1 = Lc. xx. 9, xxiv. 29 ff. = Mc. xiii. 24 ff. = Lc. xxi. 25 ff., xxiv. 39 = Lc. xvii. 27, xxvi. 64 = Mc. xiv. 62 = Lc. xxii. 69; Mc. iv. 29, vi. 23, ix. 48, xvi. 19; Lc. xii. 53, xxi. 22, 24, xxiii. 30, 46); (*b*) in the canticles of Lc. i.—ii.; (*c*) in St Stephen's speech, and, though more sparsely, in the other speeches of the Acts; (*d*) in the Epistle

of St James¹ and the First Epistle of St Peter; (*e*) in the Epistles of St Paul; where, though not so numerous as the citations, the allusions to the LXX. are more widely distributed, occurring in 1, 2 Thessalonians, Philippians and Colossians, as well as in the great dogmatic Epistles; (*f*) in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 16, iii. 5 f., vi. 7 f., 19 f., vii. 1 ff., x. 29 f., xi. 12 f., 17 f., 28, xii. 12—21, xiii. 11, 20); and especially (*g*) in the Apocalypse, where references to the Greek Old Testament abound in every chapter.

5. This summary by no means represents the extent of the influence exerted upon the N.T. by the Alexandrian Version. The careful student of the Gospels and of St Paul is met at every turn by words and phrases which cannot be fully understood without reference to their earlier use in the Greek Old Testament. Books which are not quoted in the N.T., e.g. the non-canonical books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees, find echoes there, and not a few of the great theological words which meet us in the Apostolic writings seem to have been prepared for their Christian connotation by employment in the Alexandrian appendix to the Canon². Not the Old Testament only, but the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament, has left its mark on every part of the New Testament, even in chapters and books where it is not directly cited³. It is not too much to say that in its literary form and expression the New Testament would have been a widely different book had it been written by authors who knew the Old Testament only in the original, or who knew it in a Greek version other than that of the LXX.

LITERATURE. F. Junius, *Sacrorum Parallelorum libri iii.* (Heidelberg, 1588); J. Drusius, *Parallela Sacra* (Franeker,

¹ See Mayor, *St James*, pp. lxxviii. ff., cxxxix.

² The facts are collected by Dr Ryle in Smith's D.B.² art. *Apocrypha* (i. pp. 183, 185).

³ See below, c. iv.

1594); H. Hody, *De Bibl. textibus*, p. 243 ff. (Oxford, 1705); W. Surenhusius, ספר הכושיח sive βιβλος καταλλαγῆς (Amsterdam, 1713); H. Owen, *Modes of quotation used by the Evangelical writers explained and vindicated* (London, 1789); H. Gough, *N. T. Quotations* (London, 1855); A. Tholuck, *Das A. T. in N.T.—erste Beilage* (Gotha, 1836); D. M^cC. Turpie, *The Old Testament in the New* (London, 1868); *The New Testament view of the Old* (London, 1872); Kautzsch, *De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo ap. allegatis* (Leipzig, 1869); C. Taylor, *The Gospel in the Law* (Cambridge, 1869); H. Monnet, *Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans les Épîtres de Saint Paul* (Lausanne, 1874); Böhl, *Die ATlichen Citate im N.T.* (Vienna, 1878); C. H. Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York, 1884); E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 131 ff. (Oxford, 1889); W. Staerk, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, xxxv.—xl.; Bp Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, p. 136 ff. (London, 1893); A. Clemen, *Der Gebrauch des A.T. in den NTlichen Schriften* (Gütersloh, 1895); H. Vollmer, *Die ATlichen Citate bei Paulus* (Freiburg in B., 1895); J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 123 ff. (Oxford, 1889); W. Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo i.* (Göttingen, 1899); Th. Zahn, *Einleitung in das N.T.*, ii. p. 313 ff., and elsewhere (see *Sachregister s. ATliche Citate* (Leipzig, 1899)); E. Hühn, *Die ATlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im N.T.* (Tübingen, 1900). See also the commentaries on particular books of the N.T., e.g. Bp Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 469 ff.; J. B. Mayor, *St James*, p. lxxviii. ff.; H. B. Swete, *St Mark*, p. lxx. ff.; *Apocalypse*, p. cxxxix. ff.; G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, pp. liv., lviii. f.

CHAPTER III.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE LXX. IN EARLY
CHRISTIAN WRITINGS.

“THE quotations from the LXX. in the Greek Fathers are an almost unworked field¹.” So wrote Dr Hatch in 1889, and the remark is still true. Indeed, this field can hardly be worked with satisfactory results until the editor has gone before, or a competent collator has employed himself upon the MSS. of the author whose quotations are to be examined. The ‘Apostolic Fathers’ can already be used with confidence in the editions of Lightfoot and Gebhardt-Harnack; the minor Greek Apologists have been well edited in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, and it may be hoped that the Berlin edition of the earlier Greek Fathers² will eventually supply the investigator with trustworthy materials for the Ante-Nicene period as a whole. But for the present the evidence of many Ante-Nicene and of nearly all later Greek Church-writers must be employed with some reserve. In this chapter we shall limit ourselves to the more representative Christian writers before Origen.

1. The earliest of non-canonical Christian writings, the letter addressed c. A.D. 96 by the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth, abounds in quotations from the O.T.; and more than half of these are given substantially in the words of the LXX. with or without variants.

¹ *Biblical Essays*, p. 133.

² *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Hinrichs, Leipzig). The volumes already published contain part of Hippolytus and an instalment of Origen.

The following is a list of the exact or nearly exact quotations of the LXX. in Clem. R. *ad Cor.* Gen. ii. 23 (vi. 3), iv. 3 ff. (iv. 1 ff.), xii. 1 ff. (x. 3), xiii. 14 ff. (x. 4 f.), xv. 5 (x. 6), xviii. 27 (xvii. 2); Exod. ii. 14 (iv. 9); Deut. xxxii. 8 f. (xxix. 2); Ps. ii. 7 f. (xxxvi. 4), xi. 5 f. (xv. 5), xvii. 26 f. (xlvi. 2), xviii. 2 ff. (xxvii. 7), xxi. 7 ff. (xvi. 15 f.), xxiii. 1 (liv. 3), xxx. 19 (xv. 5), xxxi. 1 f. (l. 6), 10 (xxii. 8), xxxiii. 12—20 (xxii. 1 ff.), xxxvi. 35 f. (xiv. 5), xlix. 16 ff. (xxxv. 7 ff.), l. 3 ff. (xviii. 2 ff.), lxi. 5 (xv. 3), lxxvii. 36 (xv. 4), lxxxviii. 21 (xviii. 1), ciii. 4 (xxxvi. 3), cix. 1 (xxxvi. 5), cxvii. 18 (lvi. 3), 19 f. (xlviii. 2), cxxxviii. 7 f. (xxviii. 3), cxl. 5 (lvi. 5); Prov. i. 23 ff. (lvii. 3 ff.), ii. 21 f. (xiv. 4), iii. 12 (lvi. 3 f.), 34 (xxx. 2), xx. 21 (xxi. 2); Job iv. 16 ff. (xxxix. 3 ff.), v. 17 ff. (lvi. 6 ff.), xi. 2 f. (xxx. 4), xix. 26 (xxvi. 2); Sap. xii. 12+xi. 22 (xxvii. 3); Mal. iii. 1 (xxiii. 5); Isa. i. 16 ff. (viii. 4), vi. 3 (xxxiv. 6), xiii. 22 (xxiii. 5), xxix. 13 (xv. 2), liii. 1 ff. (xvi. 3 ff.), lx. 17 (xlii. 5), lxvi. 2 (xiii. 3); Jer. ix. 23 f. (xiii. 1); Ezech. xxxiii. 11 (viii. 2); Dan. vii. 10, Th. (xxxiv. 6).

The variants are often of much interest, as shewing affinities to certain types of LXX. text. The following are specially worthy of notice: Ps. xxi. 7 *ἐξουθένημα*, \aleph AR; xxxi. 1 f. *οὐ*, \aleph^* BA (ag. \aleph^{c-a} ϕ); xxxiii. 14 *χείλη τοῦ*, \aleph^{c-a} AR; 16 *οἶ*, \aleph^{c-a} AR; xxxvi. 36 *ἐξέζητησα* (H.P. 99, 183); xlix. 21 *ἄνομε*, \aleph^* ; 22 *ἄρπ. ὡς λέων*, R; l. 17 *τὸ στόμα...τὰ χεῖλη*; lxxxviii. 21 *ἐλέει*, B*; Prov. ii. 21 *χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς, ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐπ' αὐτῆς*, cf. \aleph^{*c-a} A—a doublet wanting in B, whose reading “appears to shew the hand of an Alexandrian reviser” (Toy, cf. Lagarde); iii. 12 *παιδεύει*, \aleph A; xx. 21 (27) *λύχνος*, a reading found in A as a doublet (*φῶς... ἢ λύχνος*); Job iv. 21 *ἔτελεύτησαν* (for *ἐξηράνθησαν*), A; v. 17 ff. is without the additions of the A text, and nearly as in B; Isa. i. 17 *χῆρα*, B*, ag. B^{ab} \aleph A, *δεῦτε καὶ διελεγχθ. (διαλεχθ. C^{clm})*, \aleph AQ; liii. 5 *ἁμαρτίας...ἀνομίας* tr., \aleph AQ; 6 *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*; 8 *ἦκει* for *ἦχθη*, Q^{mg}, 62, 90 al., Syroh^{mg}; 9 *εὐρέθη δόλος*, \aleph^{c-a} AQ (see Lightfoot's note); *τῆς πληγῆς*, B (A, ἀπὸ τ. πλ.); lx. 17 *ἄρχοντας] ἐπισκόπους | ἐπισκόπους] διακόνους*; Ezech. xxxiii. 11 *ἁμαρτωλοῦ*, A (B, ἀσεβοῦς); Dan. vii. 10 *ἐλειτούργον*, Th. (LXX. ἐθεράπευον)¹.

¹ On Clement's quotations from the Psalms and Isaiah, see Hatch, *Essays*, pp. 175—9.

(a) A few readings imply correction from the Hebrew, or rather perhaps a Greek text with affinities to the translations of the second century; e.g. Ps. cxxxviii. 8 *ἐὰν καταστρώσω*, 'A. Σ. *ἐὰν στρώσω* (LXX. *ἐὰν καταβῶ*); Isa. lxvi. 2 *πρῶτον*, 'A. (LXX. *ταπεινόν*). Others seem to be due to the imperfect memory of the writer, who has not verified his quotations by referring to his papyrus, e.g. Ps. lxxxviii. 21 *ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίου*: Mal. iii. 1 *ὁ ἅγιος*¹ for *ὁ ἄγγελος*.

(b) A large proportion of Clement's quotations are composite²; sixteen passages may be thus described. Some of these consist of citations accurately given from the LXX. and strung together, with or without a *formula citandi* (e.g. lvi. 3—14 = Ps. cxvii. 18 + Prov. iii. 12 + Ps. cxl. 5 (*φησὶν*) + Job v. 17—26 (*καὶ πάλιν λέγει*)). In other cases one of the citations is correctly given, and another quoted loosely (e.g. xiv. 4 = Prov. ii. 21 f. (A) + Ps. xxxvi. 38, confused with 21^b). But more commonly in Clement's conflate quotations, texts are fused together without regard to verbal accuracy; cf. e.g. xxvi. 20 *λέγει γάρ πον Καὶ ἐξαναστήσεις με καὶ ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι· καὶ ἐκοιμήθη καὶ ὑπνώσα· ἐξηγέρθη, ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ*, where fragments of Pss. xxvii. 7, iii. 5, xxii. 4 are blended into an arabesque. Except in this class of quotations Clement is not often guilty of citing loosely; see however xx. 7 (Job xxxviii. 11), xxviii. 3 (Ps. cxxxviii. 7), xxxii. 3 (Gen. xv. 5), xlii. 5 (Isa. lx. 17).

(c) Special interest attaches to Clement's quotations of passages which are also quoted in the N.T. The following are the most instructive instances: (1) Gen. xii. 1 = Acts vii. 3 = Clem. x. 3: Clem. reads *ἄπελθε* for *ἔξελθε* (LXX. and Acts), but rejects *καὶ δεῦρο* with AD against Acts and cod. E.

¹ The Latin version supports the MSS. of the Greek text of Clement in both cases, so that with our present knowledge we are not at liberty to assume a transcriptional error.

² On 'composite' quotations from the LXX. see Hatch, *op. cit.* p. 203 ff.

(2) Exod. ii. 14 = Acts vii. 27 = Clem. iv. 11: Clem. reads κριτήν for ἄρχοντα—"perhaps from confusion with Lc. xii. 14" (Lightfoot). (3) Jer. ix. 23 f. (1 Regn. ii. 10) = 1 Cor. i. 31, (2 Cor. x. 17) = Clem. xiii. 1; here the relation of Clement to the Biblical texts is best shewn by juxtaposition:

Jer. Lc.	1 Regn. Lc.*	Clem. Lc.
<p>μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίεν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.</p>	<p>μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίεν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον, καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς.</p>	<p>μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τῇ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίᾳ καυχᾶσθω, τοῦ ἐκζητεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην.</p>
	<p>* Cf. p. 245.</p>	<p>† 1 Cor. i. 31, 2 Cor. x. 17: see Lightfoot's note <i>ad loc.</i></p>

(4) Ps. xxi. 9 = Matt. xxvii. 43 = Clem. xvi. 15; Clem. agrees with LXX., Mt. substitutes πέποιθεν for ἤλπισεν, τὸν θεόν for Κύριον, and εἰ for ὅτι. (5) Ps. xxxiii. 12 ff. = 1 Pet. iii. 10 ff. = Clem. xxii. 1 ff.; Clem. agrees with LXX. against St Peter, who changes the construction (ὁ θέλων...πανσάτω κτλ.). (6) Ps. cix. 1 = Mt. xxii. 44 (Mc., Lc.), Acts ii. 34 f., Heb. i. 13 = Clem. xxxvi. 5; Clem. reads ὑποπόδιον with Lc., Acts, Hebr., against ὑποκάτω Mt., Mc. (BD). (7) Prov. iii. 12 = Heb. xii. 6 = Clem. lvi. 4: see above, p. 402. (8) Prov. iii. 34 = Jas. iv. 6, 1 Pet. v. 5 = Clem. xxx. 2: Θεός (ὁ θ. Jas., Pet.) against Κύριος LXX.; M.T. ניה, but with reference to ניה in v. 33. (9) Isa. xxix. 13¹ = Mt. xv. 8, Mc. vii. 6 = Clem. xv. 1: again the passages must be printed in full:

¹ See Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 177 f.

Isa. <i>l.c.</i>	Mt., Mc. <i>ll.c.c.</i>	Clem. <i>l.c.</i>
<p>ἐγγίξει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν με, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. om ἐν τῷ στόμ. αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν ΝΑQ.</p>	<p>ὁ λαὸς οὗτος (οὗτος ὁ λαὸς Mc.) τοῖς χεῖλεσιν με τιμᾶ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. ἀπέχει] Mc. ἀφέστη- κεν D ἄπεστιν L 2^{pe}</p>	<p>Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσιν με τιμᾶ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. τοῖς χεῖλεσιν] τῷ στόματι C^{clem.} ἄπεστιν] ἀπέχει C^{clem.}</p>

Through constant citation, the context has taken more than one type; Clement's is close to that of the Evangelists, but has not been borrowed from them in their present form, as ἄπεστιν shews. (10) Isa. liii. 1—12 = Clem. xvi. 3—14; cf. Jo. xii. 38 (Rom. x. 16), Mt. viii. 17, Acts viii. 32 f., 1 Pet. ii. 22, Mc. xv. 28.

The general result of this examination is to shew (*a*) that Clement's text of the LXX. inclines in places to that which appears in the N.T., and yet presents sufficient evidence of independence; (*b*) that as between the texts of the LXX. represented by B and A, while often supporting A, it is less constantly opposed to B than is the New Testament; and (*c*) that it displays an occasional tendency to agree with Theodotion and even with Aquila against the LXX. It seems in fact to be a more mixed text than that which was in the hands of the Palestinian writers of the N.T. These conclusions harmonise on the whole with what we know of the circumstances under which Clement wrote. The early Roman Church was largely composed of Greek-speaking Jews, the freedmen of Roman families; and Clement himself, as Lightfoot has suggested¹, was probably of Jewish descent and a freedman or the son of a freedman of Flavius Clemens, the cousin of Domitian. Under these circumstances it was natural that the text of Clement's copies of Old Testament books,

¹ *Clement of Rome*, p. 61. Dr Nestle (*Z. f. die NTliche Wissenschaft*, i. 2) points out the Semitic style which reveals itself in Clement, e.g. v. 6 ἐπτάκις, xii. 5 γινώσκουσα γινώσκω.

while derived from Palestinian archetypes, should contain readings brought to the capital by Jewish-Greek visitors from other lands.

2. Whatever the history of the so-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, whether it is of Roman or of Corinthian origin, like the genuine Epistle it makes extensive use of the Greek Old Testament. The following quotations occur: Gen. i. 27 (xiv. 2); Mal. iv. 1 (xvi. 3); Isa. xxix. 13 (iii. 5), xxxiv. 4 (xvi. 3), lii. 5 (xiii. 2), liv. 1 (ii. 1), lviii. 9 (xv. 3), lxvi. 18 (xvii. 4 f.), 24 (vii. 6, xvii. 24); Jer. vii. 11 (xiv. 1), Ezech. xiv. 14, 18, 20 (vi. 8). The last of these passages is cited very freely or rather summarised, although introduced by the words λέγει ἡ γραφή ἐν τῷ Ἐζεκιήλ. The writer follows Clement in the form of several of his quotations (iii. 5 = Clem. 1 Cor. xv. 2, xiv. 2 = Clem. 1 Cor. xxxiii. 5; in xiii. 2 he quotes Isa. lii. 5 as it is quoted by Polycarp (see below)).

3. Another second century document, indisputably Roman, the Shepherd of Hermas, contains no quotation from the LXX. But Ps. ciii. 15 LXX. has supplied the writer with a phrase in *Mand.* xii. 3. 4, and *Vis.* iv. 2. 4 supplies evidence that he knew and read a version of Daniel which was akin to Theodotion's. The passage runs: ὁ κύριος ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν θηρίων ὄντα, οὗ τὸ ὄνομά ἐστιν †Σεργί†¹, καὶ ἐνέφραξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἵνα μὴ σε λυμάνῃ. Compare Dan. vi. 22 (23) Th., ὁ θεός μου ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνέφραξεν τὰ στόματα τῶν λεόντων (LXX. σέσωκέ με ὁ θεός ἀπὸ τῶν λεόντων), καὶ οὐκ ἔλυμῆναντό με².

4. The Old Testament is quoted in the Epistle of Barnabas even more profusely than in the Epistle of Clement,

¹ The acute conjecture of Dr J. Rendel Harris, who saw that the name, which appears in the MS. as Θεργί or the like, must be an attempt to reproduce the verb רגל (Dan. i. c.).

² See above, p. 47, n. 4.

but with less precision. The writer is fairly exact in well-known contexts belonging to the Psalter or the Book of Isaiah¹, but elsewhere he appears to trust to memory, and not to concern himself greatly about the words of his author. Even when preceded by a *formula citandi* his citations often wander far from the LXX., although they are clearly based upon it; e.g. Exod. xxxiii. 1—3 is quoted in Barn. vi. 8 after this manner: *τί λέγει ὁ ἄλλος προφήτης Μωσῆς αὐτοῖς; Ἰδοὺ τὰδε λέγει Κύριος ὁ θεός Εἰσέλθατε εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν, ἣν ᾤμοσεν Κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ κατακληρονομήσατε αὐτήν, γῆν ῥέονσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι.* Similar liberties are taken even when the writer mentions the book which he is quoting: x. 2 *Μωσῆς...λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ Καὶ διαθήσομαι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον τὰ δικαιώματά μου*—a sentence which, though it has all the notes of a strict quotation, proves to be a mere summary of Deut. iv. 1—23.

The following analysis of the quotations in Barnabas may be found useful. (a) Exact or nearly exact: Gen. i. 28 (Barn. vi. 12), Exod. xx. 14 (xix. 4), Deut. x. 16 (ix. 5), Ps. i. 1, 3—6 (x. 1, xi. 6 f.), xvii. 45 (ix. 1), xxi. 17, 19 (vi. 6), cix. 1 (xii. 10), cxvii. 12, 22 (vi. 4, 6), Prov. i. 17 (v. 4), Isa. i. 2, 10 ff. (ii. 5, ix. 3, xv. 8), iii. 9 f. (vi. 7), v. 21 (iv. 11), xxviii. 16 (vi. 2 f.), xxxiii. 13 (ix. 1), 16 (xi. 4 f.), xl. 12 (xvi. 2), xlii. 6 ff. (xiv. 7), xlv. 2 f. (xi. 4), xlix. 6 f. (xiv. 8), liii. 5, 7 (v. 2), lxi. 1 f. (xiv. 9), lxvi. 1 f. (xvi. 2). (b) Partly exact, partly free: Gen. xxv. 21 ff. (xiii. 2), xlviii. 9—11, 14 ff. (xiii. 4 f.), Isa. xxviii. 16 (vi. 2), lviii. 4 ff. (iii. 1 f.), Jer. ii. 12 f. (xi. 2). (c) Free: Gen. i. 26 (vi. 12), 28 (vi. 18), Lev. xxiii. 29 (vii. 3), Deut. ix. 12 (iv. 8), x. 16 (ix. 5), Ps. xxi. 21, cxviii. 120, xxi. 17 (v. 13), Zech. xiii. 7 (v. 12), xvi. 1 f. (xi. 3), xl. 3 (ix. 3), Isa. l. 6 ff. (v. 14, vi. 1), lxxv. 2 (xii. 4), Jer. iv. 3 (ix. 5), vii. 2 (ix. 2), ix. 26 (ix. 5), Ezech. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26 (vi. 14). (d) Free, with fusion: Gen. xvii. 23+xiv. 14 (ix. 8), Exod. xx. 8+Ps. xxiii. 4 (xv. 1), Exod. xxxii. 7+Deut. ix. 12 (iv. 8), xxxiv. 28+xxxv. 18 (iv. 7), Ps. xli. 3+xxi. 23 (vi. 15), l. 19+apocryphon (ii. 10), Jer. vii. 22 f.+Zech. vii. 10, viii. 17 (ii. 7 f.). (e) Free summary: Lev. xi., Deut. xiv. (x. 1), Deut. iv. 10 ff. (x. 2), Ezech. xlvii. (xi. 10). (f) Very loose citation: Gen. ii. 2 (xv. 3), xvii. 5 (xiii. 6), Exod. xvii. 14 (xii. 9), xxiv. 18+xxxv. 18 (xiv. 2), xxxiii. 1 ff. (vi. 8), Lev. xvi. 7 ff.

¹ See Hatch, *Essays*, p. 180 ff.

(vii. 6), Deut. xxvii. 15 (xii. 6), Ps. xxxiii. 13 (ix. 2), Sir. iv. 31 (xix. 9), Isa. xlix. 17 (xvi. 3), Dan. vii. 7 f., 24 (iv. 4), ix. 24 (xvi. 6).

As the Epistle of Barnabas is not improbably a relic of the earliest Alexandrian Christianity, it is important to interrogate its witness to the text of the LXX. This can best be done, as we have seen, by examining its quotations from the Psalms and Isaiah.

Ps. i. 1 ἐπὶ καθέδραν, B^N (ag. ἐ. καθέδρα AR), 5 οἱ ἀσεβεῖς, ἀμαρτωλοί, B (ag. ἀσεβεῖς, οἱ ἄμ. A). xvii. 45 ὑπήκουσαν, N^{*} | μου, N^{ca} RU (ag. μοι 1° B^N*A). xxi. 17 περιέσχεν, H.-P. 81, 206. cix. 1 Κύριος, R | ὑποπόδιον (ag. ὑποκάτω, Mc. xii. 36, BD). Isa. iii. 9 ὅτι, AΓ; v. 21 ἐαυτῶν, AQ; xxviii. 16 ἐμβαλῶ, N^AQ; xlii. 7 καὶ ἐξαγαγεῖν | δεδεμένους] πεπεδημένους (as Justin, *Dial.* 26, 65, 122). xlix. 6 τέθεικα, N^AQ* (ag. δέδωκα BQ^{mg}), 7 λυτρωσάμενος (for ῥυσάμενος); liii. 5 ἀνομίας, ἀμαρτίας, N^AQ, 7 τοῦ κείραντος αὐτὸν, N^{ca} AQ; lviii. 5 λέγει Κύριος, Q, 6 ἰδοὺ αὕτη ἡ νηστεία ἦν; lxi. 1 ταπεινοῖς, N^{*}; lxvi. 1 ἡ δὲ γῆ, N^AQ | ἡ (for καὶ 2°), N^A.

The leaning in Isaiah towards the text of Q, especially when found in company with A or N^A, is noteworthy, and it is worth mentioning that in Zech. xiii. 7, where the text of Barnabas does not seem to have been influenced by the Gospels, it agrees with A in adding τῆς ποιμνῆς. Occasionally the text used by Barnabas seems to have been revised from the Heb.; e.g. in Jer. ii. 12 ἐξέστη, ἔφριξεν become ἔκστηθι, φριξάτω in accordance with M.T.; in Gen. ii. 2 Barnabas has with M.T. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ where the LXX. read ἐ. τ. ἡ. τῇ ἔκτῃ¹.

5. The Asiatic Christian writers of the second century, Ignatius of Antioch and Polycarp of Smyrna, afford a striking contrast to Clement of Rome and Barnabas of Alexandria, in the rarity of their appeals to the Old Testament. (a) The genuine Epistles of Ignatius quote it only twice with a *formula citandi* (Prov. iii. 34 = Eph. v. 3, xviii. 17 = Magn. xii. 1);

¹ For further details see Hatch, *op. cit.* p. 180 ff.

two or three allusions (Ps. xxxii. 9 = Eph. xv. 1, Isa. v. 26 = Smyrn. i. 2, lii. 5 = Trall. viii. 2) complete the instances of a direct use of the LXX. by this writer. When he quotes or alludes, he is fairly close to the LXX., unless we may except the last instance, where δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν appears to be changed into οὐαὶ δι' οὗ ἐπὶ ματαιότητι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπὶ τινων βλασφημεῖται—a form which occurs also in Pseudo-Clement (2 Cor. xiii. 2) and Polycarp (Phil. x. 3)¹. (b) Polycarp is no less sparing in his references to the O. T. than Ignatius. He quotes only Isa. lii. 5¹ (x. 3), Tob. iv. 10 = xii. 9 (x. 2), Ps. iv. 5 (xii. 1)—the last-named passage perhaps indirectly, from Eph. iv. 26—and Prov. iii. 4 (vi. 1). In Phil. vi. 1 there is an allusion to Ezech. xxxiv. 4, from which it may be gathered that Polycarp read there ἐπιστρέψατε, with cod. A.

6. Irenaeus may be taken next, for though he belonged to the next generation and his literary activity was connected with the West, his copies of the Old Testament writings were doubtless of Asiatic *provenance*. His method of quotation however differs widely from that of the earlier writers. He is a theologian and a controversialist, and he quotes the Scriptures to refute an antagonist or to support the traditional faith. Accordingly his citations are, with few exceptions, either exact extracts, or but slightly abridged and adapted, and he is almost wholly free from the habit of loose paraphrase. How copiously he cites, especially in *Adv. haereses* iii. iv., will appear from the following list².

Gen. i. 3 (iv. 32. 1), 5 (v. 23. 2), 26 (iii. 23. 2, iv. 20. 1, v. 1. 3);
 ii. 1 f. (v. 28. 3), 5 (iii. 21. 10), 7 (ii. 34. 4, iv. 20. 1, v. 7. 1, v. 15. 2), 8 (iv. 5. 1), 16 f. (v. 23. 1), 23 (iii. 22. 4); iii. 1 ff. (v. 23. 1), 8 (v. 17. 1), 9 (v. 15. 4), 13 (iii. 23. 5), 14 (iii. 23. 3), 15 (iv. 40. 3, v. 21. 1), 19 (v. 16. 1); iv. 7 (iv. 18. 3), 9 (iii. 23. 4), 10 (v. 14. 1);

¹ On this quotation, however, see Nestle in *Exp. Times*, ix., p. 14 f.

² The chapters and sections are those of Stieren.

ix. 5 f. (v. 14. 1); xiii. 14 f., 27 (v. 32. 2); xiv. 22 (iv. 5. 5); xv. 18 (v. 32. 2); xvii. 9 ff. (iv. 16. 1); xix. 24 (iii. 6. 1), 31 ff. (iv. 31. 1); xxvii. 27 ff. (v. 33. 3); xlix. 10 ff. (iv. 10. 2), 18 (iii. 10. 3). Exod. i. 13 f. (iv. 30. 2); iii. 7 f. (iv. 7. 4), 8, 14 (iii. 6. 2), 19 (iv. 29. 2); xiii. 2 (i. 3. 4); xx. 3, 5 (i. 29. 4), 12 (iv. 9. 3); xxiii. 20 (iv. 20. 5); xxv. 40 (iv. 14. 3); xxvi. 16 (ii. 24. 3); xxxi. 13 (iv. 16. 1); xxxiii. 2 f. (iv. 15. 1), 20 (i. 19. 1), 21 ff. (iv. 20. 9); xxxiv. 6 f. (iv. 20. 8). Num. xvi. 15 (iv. 26. 4); xviii. 20 (iv. 8. 3); xxiv. 17 (iii. 9. 2). Deut. iv. 14 (iv. 16. 5), 19 (iii. 6. 5); v. 2 f. (iv. 16. 2), 8 (iii. 6. 5), 22 (iv. 15. 1, 4); vi. 4 ff. (iv. 2. 2, v. 22. 1); viii. 3 (iv. 16. 3); x. 12 (iv. 16. 4), 16 (iv. 16. 1); xvi. 5 f. (iv. 10. 1), 16 (iv. 18. 1); xviii. 1 (iv. 8. 3); xxviii. 66 (iv. 10. 2, v. 18. 3); xxx. 19 f. (iv. 16. 4); xxxii. 1 (iv. 2. 1), 4 (iii. 18. 7), 6 (iv. 10. 2; 31. 2), 8 f. (iii. 12. 9); xxxiii. 9 (iv. 8. 3). 1 Regn. xii. 2 f. (iv. 26. 4); xv. 22 (iv. 17. 1). 2 Regn. xi. 27, xii. 1 ff. (iv. 27. 1). 3 Regn. viii. 27 (iv. 27. 1); xi. 1 ff. (iv. 27. 1); xviii. 21, 24, 36 (iii. 6. 3); xix. 11 f. (iv. 20. 10). Ps. ii. 8 (iv. 21. 3); iii. 6 (iv. 31. 1); vii. 11 (iii. 10. 4); viii. 3 (i. 14. 8); xiii. 3 (i. 19. 1); xviii. 2 (i. 14. 8), 7 (iv. 33. 13); xx. 5 (ii. 34. 3); xxii. 4 f. (v. 31. 2); xxiii. 1 (iv. 36. 6); xxxi. 1 f. (v. 17. 3); xxxii. 6 (i. 22. 1); iii. 8. 2), 9 (ii. 2. 5, iii. 8. 2); xxxiii. 13 ff. (iv. 17. 3, 36. 2), 17 (iv. 28. 1); xxxiv. 9 (iv. 11. 3); xxxix. 7 (iv. 17. 1); xlv. 3 ff. (iv. 33. 11), 7 (iii. 6. 1); xlviii. 13 (iv. 4. 3), 21 (iv. 41. 3), 23 (v. 7. 2); xlix. 1 (iii. 6. 1), 3 f. (v. 18. 3), 9 ff. (iv. 17. 1); l. 14 (iii. 17. 2), 18 ff. (iv. 17. 1); lvii. 4 f. (iii. 10. 1, iv. 41. 3); lxxviii. 27 (iii. 22. 2); lxxv. 2 (iii. 9. 2), 3 (iv. 33. 11); lxxvii. 5 ff. (iii. 16. 3); lxxix. 1 (iii. 11. 8); lxxx. 1, 6 f. (iii. 6. 1, iii. 19. 1); lxxxiv. 12 (iii. 5. 1); lxxxv. 13 (v. 31. 1); xc. 13 (iii. 23. 7); xciv. 4 ff. (iii. 10. 4); xcvi. 1 (iv. 9. 1), 5 (iii. 6. 3); xcvii. 2 (iii. 10. 3); xcviii. 1 (iv. 33. 13); ci. 26 ff. (iv. 3. 1); ciii. 30 (v. 33. 1); cix. 1 (ii. 28. 7, iii. 6. 1); cx. 10 (iii. 23. 5); cxii. 11 (iii. 8. 3); cxxxi. 10 f. (iii. 9. 2); cxlv. 6 (i. 10. 1); cxlviii. 5 f. (ii. 34. 2, iv. 41. 1). Prov. i. 20 f. (v. 20. 1); iii. 19 f. (iv. 20. 3); v. 22 (iii. 9. 3); viii. 15 (v. 24. 1), 22 ff., 27 (iv. 20. 3); xix. 17 (iv. 18. 6); xxi. 1 (v. 24. 1). Sap. vi. 19 (iv. 38. 3). Hos. iv. 1 (i. 19. 1); xii. 10 (iii. 12, 13, iv. 20. 6). Amos i. 2 (iii. 20. 4); viii. 9 f. (iv. 33. 12). Mic. vii. 19 (iii. 20. 4). Joel iii. 16 (iv. 33. 11). Jon. i. 9, ii. 3, iii. 8 f. (iii. 20. 1). Hab. iii. 2 (iii. 16. 7), 3 ff. (iii. 20. 4, iv. 33. 11). Zech. vii. 9 ff. (iv. 17. 3, iv. 36. 2); viii. 16 f. (iv. 17. 3), 17 (iv. 36. 2); xii. 10 (iv. 33. 11). Mal. i. 10 f. (iv. 17. 5), ii. 10 (iv. 20. 2); iv. 1 (iv. 4. 3). Isa. i. 2 (iv. 2. 1, iv. 41. 2), 3 (i. 19. 1), 8 f. (iv. 4. 2, iv. 33. 13), 11 (iv. 17. 1), 16 (iv. 17. 1, iv. 36. 2, iv. 41. 3), 22 (iv. 12. 1), 23 (iv. 2. 6); ii. 3 f. (iv. 34. 4), 17 (iv. 33. 13); v. 6 (iii. 17. 3), 12 (ii. 22. 2, iv. 2. 4); vi. 5 (iv. 20. 8), 11 f. (v. 34. 2, v. 35. 1); vii. 10 ff. (iii. 21. 4); viii. 3 f. (iii. 16. 4, iv. 33. 11); ix. 6 (iii. 16. 3, iv. 33. 11); xi. 1 ff. (iii. 9. 3), 6 ff. (v. 33. 4); xii. 2 (iii. 10. 3); xiii. 9 (v. 35. 1); xxv. 8 (v. 12. 1), 9 (iv. 9. 2); xxvi. 10 (v. 35. 1), 19 (iv. 33. 11, v. 15. 1, v. 34. 1); xxvii. 6 (iv. 4. 1); xxviii. 16 (iii. 21. 7);

xxix. 13 (iv. 12. 4); xxx. 1 (iv. 18. 3), 25 f. (v. 34. 2); xxxi. 9 (v. 34. 4); xxxii. 1 (v. 34. 4): xxxiii. 20 (iii. 20. 4); xxxv. 3 f. (iii. 20. 3; iv. 33. 11); xl. 15, 17 (v. 29. 1); xli. 4 (iv. 5. 1); xlii. 5 (iv. 2. 1, v. 12. 2), 10 ff. (iv. 9. 1); xliii. 5 ff. (iv. 14. 1), 10 (iii. 6. 2, iv. 5. 1), 18 (iv. 33. 14), 23 (iv. 17. 3), xlv. 7 (iv. 40. 1); xlvi. 9 (i. 5. 4), xlviii. 22 (i. 16. 3); xlix. 16 (v. 35. 2); li. 6 (iv. 3. 1), liii. 4 (iv. 33. 11), 8 (ii. 28. 5); liv. 11 ff. (v. 34. 4); lvii. (iv. 34. 4), 16 (v. 12. 2); lviii. 6 ff. (iv. 17. 3), 14 (v. 34. 2); lx. 17; lxi. 1 ff. (iii. 9. 3); lxiii. 9 (iii. 20. 4); lxv. 1 (iii. 6. 1), 17 ff. (iv. 26. 4, v. 35. 2, 34. 4), 21 (v. 35. 1), 22 (v. 15. 1), 25 (v. 33. 4), lxvi. 1 (iv. 2. 5), 2 (iv. 17. 3), 3 (iv. 18. 3), 22 (v. 36. 1). Jer. i. 5 (v. 15. 3); ii. 29 (iv. 37. 7); iv. 22 (iv. 2. 1); v. 8 (iv. 41. 3, v. 7. 2); vi. 17 ff. (iv. 36. 2), 20 (iv. 17. 2); vii. 2 f. (iv. 17. 2), 3 (iv. 36. 2), 21 (iv. 17. 3), 25 (iv. 36. 5), 29 f. (iv. 36. 2); viii. 16 (v. 30. 2); ix. 2 (iv. 25. 3), 24 f. (iv. 17. 3); x. 11 (iii. 6. 3); xi. 15 (iv. 17. 3); xiv. 9 (iv. 33. 12), xvii. 9 (iii. 18. 3; iv. 33. 11); xxii. 17 (iv. 18. 3, iii. 21. 9); xxiii. 7 f. (v. 34. 1), 20 (iv. 26. 1), 23 (iv. 19. 2), 29 (v. 17. 4); xxxi. 10 ff. (v. 34. 3), 26 (iv. 31. 1); xxxv. 15 (iv. 36. 5); xxxvi. 30 f. (iii. 21. 9); xxxviii. 11 (iii. 8. 21). Lam. iv. 20 (iii. 20. 3). Bar. iv. 36—v. fin. (v. 35. 1). Ezech. ii. 1 (iv. 20. 10); xx. 12 (iv. 16. 1), 23 f. (iv. 15. 1), xxviii. 25 f. (v. 34. 1); xxxvi. 26 (iv. 23. 4); xxxvii. 1 ff. (v. 15. 1), 12 (v. 34. 1). Dan. ii. 23 f., 41 ff. (v. 26. 1); iii. 24 ff. (v. 5. 2); vii. 8 (v. 25. 33), 10 (ii. 7. 4), 14 (iv. 20. 11), 20 ff. (v. 25. 3), 27 (v. 34. 2); viii. 11 f., 23 ff. (v. 25. 4); ix. 7 (v. 25. 4); xii. 3 f., 7 (iv. 26. 1), 9 f. (i. 19. 2), xii. 13 (v. 34. 2). Sus. 52 f., 56 (iv. 26. 3). Bel 3 f., 24 (iv. 5. 2).

The Latin version, in which the greater part of these quotations are clothed, appears to be exact where it can be tested (cf. e.g. Isa. xlvi. 9 (i. 5. 4), xlviii. 22 (i. 16. 3), Dan. xii. 9 (i. 19. 2)). Assuming that it is so throughout, it is obvious that in Irenaeus we have an important witness to the LXX. text of the second century. The following variants taken from Books iii., iv., will shew the general tendencies of his text:

Gen. xlix. 10 *cui repositum est* (M^{mg} ϕ ἀπόκειται¹); 18 *in salutem tuam sustinui te, Domine* (cf. F^{corr mg} ap. Field). Exod. xxv. 40 *facies omnia* (F ποιήσεις πάντα, Luc.) *secundum typum eorum quae vidisti*. Num. xxiv. 17 *surget dux in Israel* (cf. Heb. בְּיָשׁוּעַ , Σ. σκηπτρον; LXX. ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰ.). Deut. v. 22 (19) *scripsit ea in duabus tabulis lapideis* (+λιθίνας B^{abA} Luc.); xxxii. 6

¹ Cf. Justin, *Dial.* 120.

et fecit te et creavit te (+καὶ ἔκτισέν σε AF, +καὶ ἔπλασέν σε Luc.). 1 Regn. xv. 22 *auditus bonus super sacrificium* (ἀγαθή Luc.). Ps. xxxix. 7 *aures autem perfecisti mihi* (possibly a correction from the Gallican Psalter, but a few cursives read after the Heb. *ᾠρία* or *ᾠτα*); xlv. 17 *facti sunt tibi filii* (B^bART ἐγενήθησαν, ag. B*^N ἐγενν.); xlix. 10 *bestiae terrae* (ἀγροῦ ^{N^{c.a}A}, δρυμοῦ B^N*), 15 *in die tribulationis tuae* (θλίψεώς σου ^{N^{c.a}AR}); ci. 27 *mutabis eos* (ἀλλάξεις ^{N*}, ἐλίξεις B(^{N^{c.a}}AR(T))); cix. 1 *suppedaneum pedum tuorum* (ὑποπόδιον, not ὑποκάτω); cxiii. 11 om. ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (with ^{N^{c.a}AT}). Mic. vii. 19 *ipse* (αὐτός AQ)... *proiciet* (ἀπορρίψει A(Q), ἀποριφήσονται B), om. πάσας. Hab. iii. 3 *pedes eius* (οἱ πόδες AQ, κατὰ πόδας B). Isa. i. 17 *iustificate viduam* (χήραν B^{a,b}NAΓ ag. χήρα B*Q*); xi. 4 *arguet gloriosos terrae* (τοὺς ἐνδόξους ^{NQ^{cor}}, ag. τ. ταπεινοὺς BAQ*); xxv. 9 om. καὶ σώσει ἡμᾶς... ὑπεμείναμεν αὐτῷ (with ^{NAQ*}, a hexaplaric addition, cf. Field, *ad loc.*); xxix. 13 *populus hic labiis me honorat* (om. with ^{NAQ} ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν); xliii. 23 *non servisti mihi in sacrificiis* = οὐ[δὲ] ἐδούλευσάς μοι ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις [σου] ^{N^{c.a}} (ΑΓ), *fecisti in* (cf. A* ΕΠΟΙΗΣΑΕΕΝ); lxv. 1 *qui me non quaerunt* (ζητοῦσιν ^{NAQ}, ag. ἐπερωτῶσιν B). Jer. xliii. 31 *inferam super eos* (αὐτοὺς ^{NAQ*}, ag. αὐτὸν BQ^{cor}), *locutus sum super eos* (ἐπ' αὐτοὺς AQ, πρὸς αὐτ. B^N). Bar. v. 2 *laetitiae* (LXX. δικαιοσύνης).

A special interest attaches to Irenaeus' extracts from Daniel¹. For the most part they follow the version of Theodotion quite closely, even in the Greek additions. Two exceptions are worth noting: Dan. vii. 10 is quoted by Irenaeus as it is by Clement of Rome, in a form which agrees with neither LXX. nor Th.; Dan. xii. 9 is cited in the form Ἀπότρεχε, Δανιήλ· οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ λόγοι ἐμπεφραγμένοι εἰσίν, ἕως οἱ συνιέντες συνιῶσι καὶ οἱ λευκοὶ λευκανθῶσι, where ἀπότρεχε is a LXX. reading, whilst ἐμπεφραγμένοι is from Th. and the rest of the sentence seems to be suggested by his version (cf. ἕως... ἐκλευκανθῶσιν, Th.). This quotation however is professedly taken from a Valentinian source, which may account for its freedom.

7. Like Irenaeus, Justin quotes profusely, and his aim as an apologist and a controversialist compels him to cite his documents with some regard to verbal accuracy. For the criticism of the LXX his writings afford even richer materials

¹ See above, p. 47.

than those of Irenaeus, since his subject leads him, especially in the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, to quote long extracts without break or interpolated matter; more than once an entire Psalm, or a passage exceeding in length one of our modern chapters, is copied into his pages, presumably as it stood in his text of the Greek Old Testament.

In the following list of Justin's quotations from the LXX. account has been taken only of his undoubted writings. *A.* = the First Apology, *D.* = the Dialogue; the Second Apology contains nothing to our purpose.

Gen. i. 1 ff. (*A.* 59, 64), 26 ff. (*D.* 62); iii. 15 (*D.* 102), 22 (*D.* 62); ix. 24—27 (*D.* 139); xi. 6 (*D.* 102); xv. 6 (*D.* 92); xvii. 14 (*D.* 23); xviii. 2 ff. (*D.* 126), 13 ff. (*D.* 56); xix. 1 ff. (*D.* 56), 23—25 (*D.* 56), 27 f. (*D.* 56); xxvi. 4 (*D.* 120); xxviii. 10—19 (*D.* 58, 120); xxxi. 10—13 (*D.* 58); xxxii. 22—30 (*D.* 58, 126); xxxv. 6—10 (*D.* 58); xlix. 8—12 (*A.* 32, 54; *D.* 52, 120). Exod. ii. 23 (*D.* 59); iii. 2—4 (*D.* 60), 3 ff. (*A.* 63); vi. 2—4 (*D.* 126); xvii. 16 (*D.* 49); xx. 22 (*D.* 75); xxiii. 20 f. (*D.* 75); xxxii. 6 (*D.* 20). Lev. xxvi. 40 f. (*D.* 16). Num. xi. 23 (*D.* 126); xxi. 8 f. (*A.* 60); xxiv. 17 (*A.* 32, *D.* 106). Deut. x. 16 f. (*D.* 16); xxi. 23 (*D.* 96); xxvii. 26 (*D.* 95); xxxi. 2 f. (*D.* 126), 16—18 (*D.* 74); xxxii. 7—9 (*D.* 131), 15 (*D.* 20), 16—23 (*D.* 119), 20 (*D.* 27, 123), 22 (*A.* 60), 43 (*D.* 130); xxxiii. 13—17 (*D.* 91). Jos. v. 2 (*D.* 24); v. 13—vi. 2 (*D.* 62). 2 Regn. vii. 14—16 (*D.* 118). 3 Regn. xix. 10, 18 (*D.* 39). Ps. i. (*A.* 40); ii. (*A.* 40); ii. 7 f. (*D.* 122); iii. 5 f. (*A.* 38, *D.* 97); viii. 3 (*D.* 114); xiii. 2 ff. (*D.* 27); xvii. 44 f. (*D.* 28); xviii. 3 ff. (*A.* 40, *D.* 64); xxi. 1—24 (*D.* 18), 8 f. (*A.* 38), 17 ff. (*A.* 35, 38, *D.* 97); xxiii. (*D.* 36); xxiii. 7 (*A.* 51, *D.* 85); xxxi. 2 (*D.* 141); xlv. (*D.* 38); xlv. 7 ff. (*D.* 56, 63); xlvi. 6—9 (*D.* 37); xlix. (*D.* 22); lxvii. 19 (*D.* 39); lxxi. 1—19 (*D.* 34, 64, 121); lxxi. 17—19 (*D.* 64); lxxxii. (*D.* 124); xc. 1 ff. (*A.* 41), 5 (*D.* 79), 10 (*D.* 73); xcvi. (*D.* 37); xcvi. 1—7 (*D.* 64); cix. (*D.* 32); cix. 1 ff. (*A.* 45, *D.* 56), 3 ff. (*D.* 63), 4 (*D.* 118); cxxvii. 3 (*D.* 110); cxlviii. 1 f. (*D.* 85). Prov. viii. 21—29 (*D.* 129), 24—36 (*D.* 61). Job i. 6 (*D.* 79). Hos. x. 6 (*D.* 103). Amos v. 18—vi. 7 (*D.* 22). Mic. iv. 1—7 (*D.* 109); v. 2 (*A.* 34). Joel ii. 28 f. (*D.* 87). Jon. iv. 4 ff. (*D.* 107). Zech. ii. 6 (*A.* 52), 11 (*D.* 119), 10—iii. 2 (*D.* 115); iii. 1 ff. (*D.* 79); vi. 12 (*D.* 121); ix. 9 (*A.* 35, *D.* 53); xii. 10—12 (*A.* 52), 12 (*D.* 121); xiii. 7 (*D.* 53). Mal. i. 10—12 (*D.* 28, 41). Isa. i. 3 (*A.* 63), 7 (*A.* 47), 9 (*A.* 53, *D.* 140), 11 f. (*A.* 37), 16 ff. (*A.* 44, 61), 23 ff. (*D.* 27, 82); ii. 3 f. (*A.* 39), 5 ff. (*D.* 24, 135); iii. 9 (*D.* 136), 9—11 (*D.* 17), 9—15 (*D.* 133), 16 (*D.* 27); v. 18—25 (*D.* 17, 133), 20 (*A.* 49); vi. 10 (*D.* 12); vii. 10—16

(D. 42, 66), 14 (A. 33); viii. 4 (D. 77); ix. 6 (A. 35); xi. 1—3 (D. 87); xiv. 1 (D. 123); xvi. 1 (D. 114); xix. 24 f. (D. 123); xxv. 2 ff. (D. 24); xxix. 13 f. (D. 27, 32, 78, 123); xxx. 1—5 (D. 79); xxxiii. 13—19 (D. 70); xxxv. 1—7 (D. 69), 4 ff. (A. 48); xxxix. 3 (D. 50); xl. 1—17 (D. 50); xlii. 1—4 (D. 123, 135), 5—13 (D. 65), 6 f. (D. 26), 16 (D. 122), 19 f. (D. 123); xliii. 10 (D. 122), 15 (D. 135); xlv. 23 (A. 52); xlix. 6 (D. 121), 8 (D. 122); l. 4 (D. 102), 6 ff. (A. 38); li. 4 f. (D. 11); lii. 10 f. (D. 13), 13—liii. 8 (A. 50), lii. 15—liii. 1 (D. 118); liii. 1 ff. (D. 42); liii. 8—12 (A. 51), 9 (D. 97); liv. 1 (A. 53); lv. 3 f. (D. 12), 3—13 (D. 14); lvii. 1 ff. (A. 48), 1—4 (D. 16), 1 (D. 110), 2 (D. 97, 118), 5 f. (D. 27); lviii. 1—11 (D. 15), 2 (A. 35), 6 f. (A. 37), 13 ff. (D. 27); lxii. 10—lxiii. 6 (D. 26); lxii. 12 (D. 119); lxiii. 15—lxiv. 12 (D. 25); lxiii. 17 (A. 52); lxiv. 10 ff. (A. 47, 52); lxv. 1 ff. (A. 49, D. 24), 1 (D. 119), 2 (A. 35, 38, D. 97), 8 ff. (D. 136), 9—12 (D. 135), 17—25 (D. 81); lxvi. 1 (A. 37, D. 22), 5—11 (D. 85), 23 f. (D. 44), 24 (A. 52, D. 140). Jer. ii. 12 (D. 114), 13 (D. 19); iv. 3 (D. 28); vii. 21 ff. (D. 22); ix. 25 ff. (D. 28), 26 (A. 53); xxxviii. 15 (D. 78), 27 (D. 123), 31 f. (D. 11). Thren. iv. 20 (A. 55). Ezech. iii. 17—19 (D. 82); xiv. 20 (D. 44, 140); xvi. 3 (D. 77); xx. 19—26 (D. 21); xxxvi. 12 (D. 123); xxxvii. 7 ff. (A. 53). Dan. vii. 9—28 (D. 31), 13 (A. 51).

From the circumstances of Justin's life we are prepared to find in his writings an eclectic text of the LXX. Of Palestinian birth but of Greek parentage, he seems to have divided his maturer life between Ephesus and Rome; and each of these associations may have supplied textual peculiarities. The general result may be gathered from a few specimens of the readings exhibited by Justin's longer extracts from the O.T.

Gen. xxviii. 10—19. 11 ἔθηκε, D^{sil}E 13 ἐστήρικτο ἐπ' αὐτήν· ὁ δὲ εἶπεν | ὁ θεός 1^ο pr Κύριος | om ὁ θεός 2^ο 14 γῆς, DE | ἐπί 1^ο eis | om ἐπί 2^ο, 3^ο, 4^ο (ἐπ') | λιβα] νότον 15 ἐν ὀδῷ πάσῃ ἣ ἄν 18 ὑπέθηκεν, D^{sil} 19 om ἐκείνου | Οὐλαμμασούς, DE* | τὸ ὄνομα. xxxii. 22—30. 24 ἄγγελος μετ' αὐτοῦ, D 26 με εὐλογήσης, D^{sil}E 28 om ἔτι, E | ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα σου, D | τοῦ θεοῦ, E | δυνατός] + ἔση, D^{sil}E 29 om σύ, D 30 ἐσώθη] ἐχάρη (but ἐσώθη, *infra* D. 126). Deut. xxxii. 16—23. 16 ἐξεπύκρναν, AF 17 om καὶ οὐ θεῶ, θεοῖς | ἠδειςαν] οἶδασιν | πρόσφατοι] pr καί, A 20 om ἡμερῶν, AF 21 παρῶξυναν] παρῶργισαν, A 22 καυθήσεται] pr καί | om κάτω. Deut. xxxiii. 13—17. 13 ἐπ'] ἀπό (cf. ἀπ' AF) | οὐρανῶν, δρόσων | ἀβύσσου 14 καθ' ὧραν] καθαρῶν 15 ἀπό] pr καί, AF |

ἀενάων] pr καὶ ποταμῶν 16 καθ' ὥραν] καρπῶν | τῆ βιάτῳ | ἐπ' ἐν, AF 17 τῆς γῆς, AF Jos. v. 13—vi. 2. 13 om καὶ 2^o | ἴδεν] ὄρᾱ | ἐναντίον] κατέναντι | om καὶ ἡ ῥομφαία...αὐτοῦ | ὁ Ἰησοῦς 14 ὁ δέ] καί 15 τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ] τὰ ὑποδήματα | ἐφ' ᾧ | om νῦν (so A, but adding σύ) | ἄγιος] γῆ ἁγία. vi. 1 ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐξέπορ. | om οὐδὲ εἰσπορεύετο 2 om ἐγώ Ps. xxi. 1—24. 4 τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ N^caU 7 ἀνθρώπων, NRU | ἐξουθένημα, NAR 8 καὶ (NU) ἐλάλησαν χεῖλεσιν 11 ἀπὸ γαστρός, N^ca 12 βοηθῶν]+μοι, N^caR* 14 ὁ ἀρπάζων] om ὁ, RU 15 ἐξέχυθη, N^caR 16 ὡσεὶ] ὡς, NARU 17 πόδας]+μου, N^caARU Ps. xlix. 1 om καὶ 2^o, N^caART 3 ἐναντίον] ἐνώπιον, RT 4 διακρίναι] pr τοῦ, N^caART 6 ὁ θεός, NRT 7 διαμαρτυροῦμαι, N^caT 10 δρυμοῦ] ἀγροῦ, N^caA 16 ἐκδιηγῆ, N^caAT 19 δολιότητος, N^caR^a 21 +τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου, B^cN^caT 22 οὐ μὴ, N^caRT 23 τοῦ θεοῦ] μου, N^caT. Prov. viii. 21^a—36. 24 τὰς πηγὰς προελθεῖν (but in *D.* 129 pr. τ. πηγὰς) 25 τῶν βουνῶν (but *D.* 129 omits art.) 26 ὁ θεός 28 καὶ ὡς (1^o)] ἡνίκα, NA 29 καὶ ὡς] ἡνίκα 35 ἠτοίμασται 36 ἀσεβοῦσιν] +εἰς, N^caA. Amos v. 18—vi. 7. 18 τοῦ κυρίου 19 ἐὰν φύγη] ὅταν ἐκφύγη, A | ἄρκτος | ὁ ὄφις 20 αὐτῆ] αὐτοῖς 22 τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα, A | τὰς θυσίας | προσδέξομαι]+αὐτά, AQ^{mg} | σωτηρίου, A 23 ἀπόστησον | ἦχον] πλήθος | ψαλμῶν] ὄργανον 25 om μ' ἔτη | +λέγει Κύριος, AQ 26 Ῥαφάν | om αὐτῶν, AQ*. vi. 1 ἀπετρύγησαν] pr οἱ ὠλομασμένοι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀρχηγοῖς (a doublet for the Greek which follows, ascribed to Symmachus by SH) | om καὶ 2^o | αὐτοῖ] ἐαυτοῖς, Q^a | τοῦ Ἰσρ.] om τοῦ 2 +εἰς Χαλάνην, 22, 36, 42; Heb. | διέλθατε] πορεύθητε | Ἐμὰθ Ῥαββά] Ἀμὰθ τὴν μεγάλην (τὴν μεγ., Symm. "20, 36, 51 al.") | ἀλλοφύλων] pr τῶν | πλείονι, A | om. ἐστίν | ὑμετέρων ὀρίων] ὄρ. ὑμῶν 3 κακὴν] πονηράν 4 καθεύδοντες] κοιμώμενοι | ἐρίφους] ἄρνας 5 ἐστῶτα, AQ 6 τὸν διωλισμένον (a doublet) ἐν φιάλαις (Heb.) 7 δυναστῶν]+ τῶν ἀποικισμένων | καὶ μεταστραφῆσεται οἴκημα κακουργῶν (a doublet of καὶ ἐξαρθ. κτλ.). Zach. ii. 10—iii. 2. 10 τέρπου] χαίρε (cf. Eus. *d.e.*, p. 252) | ὅτι, N 11 καταφεύξονται] προστεθήσονται | κατασκηνώσω | ἐπιγνώσῃ] γνώσονται | Παντοκράτωρ] τῶν δυνάμεων | ἀπέσταλκε 12 τῆ μερίδι] καὶ τὴν μερίδα, N^caA, and, without καί, N*QG | αἰρετιεῖ] ἐκλέξεται "86 in textu ex alio videlicet interprete" (Field). iii. 1 om Κύριος, Κυρίου | τὸν Ἰησοῦν] om τόν, AQG | ὁ διάβολος] om ὁ 2 om ἐπιτίμησαι (1^o)...διάβολε | om ὡς (Heb.). Mal. i. 10—12. 10 θέλημά μου | τὰς θυσίας ὑμῶν 11 ἀπό, AG | om καὶ 1^o, AQ | προσάγεται] προσφέρεται | διότι μέγα] ὅτι τιμᾶται (ὅτι μέγα *D.* 41) | om Παντοκράτωρ. Isa. i. 16—20. 17 χήραν, B^{ab}NAΓ 18 δεῦτε]+ καί, NAGQ | διαλεχθῶμεν¹ | χιόνα, ἔρεον] ἔρεον, χιόνα 19 (*A.* 61 omits καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε...φάγεσθε.)

¹ See above, p. 407.

Isa. lii. 13—liii. 12. lii. 13 ἰδοὺ] ἴδε γὰρ *A.* 14 πολλοὶ ἐπὶ σε *A.D.* 15 θανατοῦσθονται *D.* | om ἐπ' αὐτῷ *A.* 16 om ὄψονται *A.* liii. 2 ἐναντίον] ἐνώπιον *A.* | ἐν. αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδ. *A.D.* 3 τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων] τοὺς ἀνθρώπους *A.* (cf. πάντας ἀνθρώπους, *AQ**) 5 αὐτός | ἀνομίας, ἀμαρτίας *A.*, *NAQ* | om ἡμῶν 3^o *A.* 6 om Κύριος *A.* 7 κείροντος *A.D.*, *B* + αὐτόν *A.*, *N^{ca}AQ* 8 τοῦ λαοῦ μου] αὐτῶν *A.* | ἦχθη] ἦκει *A.D.*, *Q^{ms}* 9 θανάτου] + αὐτοῦ *A.*, *B^{a,b}NAQ* 10 τοῦ πόνου] om τοῦ *A.* 11 αὐτῶν] ἡμῶν *A.D.* 12 παρεδόθη] pr αὐτός *A.* Isa. lxii. 10—lxiii. 6. 11 ταῖς θυγατράσιν | σοὶ ὁ σωτήρ, *NAQ* | om αὐτοῦ 1^o, *AQ** 12 οὐ καταλελειμμένη, (*N*). lxiii. 1 ἐρύθημα, *B* | ἰματίων] + αὐτοῦ | βίβ] pr ἀναβαίωνων (cf. Symm. βαίνων, Heb.) 3 + ληνὸν ἐπάτησα μονώτατος, Symm., Heb. (a doublet of πλ. καταπεπ.) | om μου, *NAQ* | + εἰς γῆν, *B^{a,b}NAQ* 5 οὐδεὶς, *NAQ* | ἀντελάβετο, *N* | om αὐτοῦς | om μου 1^o

To shew Justin's relation to the two recensions of Daniel, it is necessary to place some verses side by side with the corresponding contexts of the LXX. and Theodotion¹.

Justin, <i>Dial.</i> 31.	Dan. vii. 9—14, LXX.	Ibid., Th.
ἐθεώρουν ἕως ὅτου θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν, καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν ἐκάθθητο ἔχων περιβολὴν ὡσεὶ χιόνα λευκὴν, καὶ τὸ τρίχωμα τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἔριον καθαρὸν, ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ φλόξ πυρός, οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον. ποταμὸς πυρὸς εἶλκεν ἐκπορευόμενος ἐκ προσώπου αὐτοῦ· χιλιαὶ χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ· βίβλοι ἀνεφύχθησαν καὶ κριτήριον ἐκάθισεν. ἐθεώρουν τότε τὴν φωνὴν	ἐθεώρουν ἕως ὅτε θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν, καὶ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν ἐκάθθητο ἔχων περιβολὴν ὡσεὶ χιόνα, καὶ τὸ τρίχωμα τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἔριον λευκὸν καθαρὸν· ὁ θρόνος ὡσεὶ φλόξ πυρός, τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ καιόμενον. ποταμὸς πυρὸς ἔλκεν, καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ· ποταμὸς πυρὸς· χιλιαὶ χιλιάδες ἐθεράπευον αὐτὸν καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ· καὶ κριτήριον ἐκάθισεν καὶ βίβλοι ἠνεφύχθησαν. ἐθεώρουν	ἐθεώρουν ἕως ὅτου θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν, καὶ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν ἐκάθθητο, καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ χιῶν λευκόν, καὶ ἡ θριξ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἔριον καθαρὸν· ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ φλόξ πυρός, οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον. ποταμὸς πυρὸς εἶλκεν ἐκπροσθεν αὐτοῦ· χιλιαὶ χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ, καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες παριστήκεισαν αὐτῷ· κριτήριον ἐκάθισεν, καὶ βίβλοι ἠνεφύχθησαν. ἐθεώρουν τότε ἀπὸ φωνῆς τῶν λόγων τῶν μεγάλων ὧν τὸ

¹ Words common to Justin and LXX. but not in Th. are printed in small uncials; those common to Justin and Th. but not to LXX., in thick cursives. Most of the remaining words are to be found in the three texts.

Justin, <i>Dial.</i> 31.	Dan. vii. 9—14, LXX.	Ibid., Th.
<p>τῶν μεγάλων λόγων ὧν τὸ κέρας λαλεῖ, καὶ ΔΠΕΤΥΜΠΑΝΙΣΘΗ τὸ θηρίον, καὶ ἀπώλετο τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐδόθη εἰς καῦσιν πυρός· καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ θηρία μετεστάθη τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν, καὶ χρόνος ζωῆς τοῖς θηρίοις ἐδόθη ἕως καιροῦ καὶ χρόνου. ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτός, καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος, καὶ ἦλθεν ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ παρῆν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον αὐτόν. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία καὶ τιμὴ βασιλική, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα λατρεύουσα· καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ φθαρῆ.</p>	<p>τότε τὴν φωνὴν τῶν λόγων τῶν μεγάλων ὧν τὸ κέρας ἐλάλει· θεωρῶν ἡμῖν, καὶ ΔΠΕΤΥΜΠΑΝΙΣΘΗ τὸ θηρίον, καὶ ἀπώλετο τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐδόθη εἰς καῦσιν πυρός. καὶ τοὺς κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ ἀπέστησε τῆς ἐξουσίας αὐτῶν, καὶ χρόνος ζωῆς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἕως χρόνου καὶ καιροῦ. ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτός, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο, καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν· καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρῆσαν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία καὶ τιμὴ βασιλική, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῷ λατρεύουσα· καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ φθαρῆ.</p>	<p>κέρας ἐκείνο ἐλάλει, ἕως ἀνηρέθη τὸ θηρίον καὶ ἀπώλετο, καὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἐδόθη εἰς καῦσιν πυρός. καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν θηρίων ἡ ἀρχὴ μετεστάθη, καὶ μακρότης ζωῆς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἕως καιροῦ καὶ καιροῦ. ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτός, καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος, καὶ ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔφθασεν· καὶ προσήχθη αὐτῷ. καὶ αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ πάντες οἱ λαοὶ φυλαί, καὶ γλώσσαι δουλεύουσιν αὐτῷ· ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος ἥτις οὐ παρελεύσεται, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ οὐ διαφθαρήσεται.</p>

The student will notice that Justin's O.T. text is a mixed one. (a) In Genesis it contains many readings of D or DE where those later uncials depart from A; (b) in Deuteronomy it occasionally supports A or AF against B, and (c) in the Psalms the group ART, with the concurrence sometimes of \aleph^* , sometimes of \aleph^{c-2} ; (d) in the Prophets it not seldom agrees with Q (AQ, \aleph AQ). In the Minor Prophets it is startling to find in Justin more than one rendering which is attributed to Symmachus; and as it is in the highest degree improbable that

his text has been altered from the text of Symmachus, or at a later time from a Hexaplaric copy of the LXX., we are led to the conclusion that these readings belong to an older version or recension from which both Justin and Symmachus drew. It is at least possible that many of the readings in which Justin appears to stand alone may be attributable to the same origin.

Justin's Daniel text requires separate notice. It will be seen to be in fundamental agreement with the LXX., but not without a fair number of Theodotion's readings. Ἐλειτούργων meets us here, as in Clement of Rome, and the phrases τὰ λοιπὰ θηρία μετεστάθη τῆς ἀρχῆς, μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν ἐρχόμενος, ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ, προσήγαγον αὐτόν, are undoubtedly due to Theodotion, or rather to the version on which he worked. On the other hand ἔχων περιβολήν, τὸ τρίχωμα, πῦρ φλέγον, ἀπετυμπαίνσθη, χρόνος ζωῆς, οἱ παρεστηκότες, and the whole of v. 14 as clearly belong to the Chigi text. That this mixture is not due to an eclectic taste or a fickle memory is clear from the fact that the same text meets us in the Latin version of the passage as given by Tertullian¹.

In a few instances Justin shews a disposition to criticise the LXX. reading. E.g. in Ps. lxxxi. (lxxxii.) 7, he probably proposed to read ὡς ἄνθρωπος (𐤀𐤒𐤍𐤏) for ὡς ἄνθρωποι². Similarly in Deut. xxxii. 8 he realises that the LXX. has substituted ἀγγέλων θεοῦ for לַאֲנֹכִי־יְיָ³. He maintains that in Gen. xlix. 10 the reading of the LXX. is ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται, though according to the Jewish interpreters of his time the words should rather be rendered ἕως ἂν ἔ. τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ. His text of the LXX. contained some remarkable interpolations; thus he quotes Ps. xcvi. (xcv.) 10^a in the form ὁ κύριος

¹ Burkitt, *Old Latin and Itala*, p. 23 ff.

² *Dial.* 124. In the editions ἄνθρωποι occurs twice, but the context appears to shew that the singular should stand in the quotation.

³ *Dial.* 13 f.

ἐβασιλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου¹, and ascribes to Jeremiah the words ἐμνήσθη δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ². He cites also some words which appear to have found a place in his copy after 2 Esdr. vi. 21: καὶ εἶπεν Ἐσδρας τῷ λαῷ Τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὃ σωτήρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν· καὶ ἐὰν διανοηθῆτε καὶ ἀναβῆ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν ὅτι Μέλλομεν αὐτὸν ταπεινοῦν ἐν σημείῳ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐλπίσωμεν (? ἐλπίσητε) ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὐ μὴ ἐρρημωθῆ ὁ τόπος οὗτος εἰς ἅπαντα χρόνον, λέγει ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ πιστεύσητε αὐτῷ μηδὲ εἰσακούσητε τοῦ κηρύγματος αὐτοῦ, ἔσεσθε ἐπίχαρμα τοῖς ἔθνεσι³. These passages appear to be of Christian origin, yet Justin is so sure of their genuineness that he accuses the Jews of having removed them from their copies.

8. Hippolytus of Portus, as we learn from the inscription on the chair of his statue and from other ancient sources, was the author of a large number of Biblical commentaries⁴. These included works on the Hexaemeron and its sequel (τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον); on Exodus, and portions of Numbers and Samuel; on the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs; on Zechariah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, parts of Ezekiel, and the Book of Daniel. Of these exegetical works there remains only the commentary on Daniel⁵,

¹ *Ap.* i. 41, *Dial.* 73. Cf. Tert. *c. Marc.* iii. 19, *adv. Jud.* 10. No existing Greek MS. of the Psalter is known to contain the words except cod. 156 (see p. 160), which gives them in the suspicious form ἀπὸ τῷ ξύλῳ. *A ligno* is found in the Sahidic and in the Latin of R and in some other O. L. texts. Cf. the hymn *Vexilla regis*: "impleta sunt quae concinit | David fideli carmine | dicendo nationibus | Regnavit a ligno Deus" (for the literature see Julian, *Dict. of Hymnology*, p. 1220).

² *Dial.* 72. The same Apocryphon is quoted by Irenaeus (iii. 20. 4, iv. 22. 1, 33. 1, 12, v. 31. 1) and attributed by him to Jeremiah (iv. 31. 1) or to Isaiah (iii. 20. 4). Cf. Lightfoot, *Clement*, ii. p. 40, and the writer's *Apostles' Creed*³, p. 58 f.

³ *Dial.* *ib.*

⁴ On his works see Lightfoot, *Clement of Rome*, ii. pp. 388 ff., 419 ff.

⁵ Edited by G. W. Bonwetsch and H. Achelis in the new Berlin Corpus (*Hippolytus' Werke*, i., Leipzig, 1897).

with fragments of most of the rest. The great treatise *Adversus omnes haereses* yields but little in the way of Scriptural quotations¹, but the minor theological works collected by Lagarde² supply a considerable number of fairly long extracts from the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Prophets. The text of the LXX. which is exhibited in these passages is often of much interest, as a few specimens will shew.

Gen. i. 7 ἐπάνω] ὑπεράνω 28 κατακυριεύσατε] κατακληρονομήσατε.
 xlix. 8 ff. (Lag. 5 (1), 102 (2)) 8 αἰνεσάτωσαν (1) αἰνέσουσιν (2)
 9 ἐκ βλαστοῦ μου νιέ (2) 10 ᾧ ἀπόκειται (1), τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ
 (2) | αὐτός]+ ἔσται (1) 12 χαροποί (cf. Field, *ad loc.*) | ὡς ἀπὸ
 οἴνου: cf. ἀπὸ οἴνου, ADF. Exod. xx. 13 ff. οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύ-
 σεις, οὐ κλέψεις. Deut. xxxii. 34 f. 34 παρ' ἐμοῦ 35 ὅταν]
 pr ἐν καιρῷ, AF. xxxiii. 22 ἐκπηδήσεται, B. Ruth ii. 9
 ὑδρεύονται, A 14 ἐν τῷ ὄξει, B^aB^a. Ps. lxxviii. 1 ff. 4 ἐγγίξειν]
 ἐλπίζειν (B^aB^bNR) με (R) 5 ἤρπαζον 6 ἔγνωσ] οἶδας | ἀπε-
 κρύβησαν, N^ca 8 ἐκάλυψαν ἐντροπῇ 10 κατέφαγε. Prov.
 vi. 27 ἀποδήσει] ἀποδεσμεύει. xxiii. 29 f. 29 ἀγδαί, NA | πελιδ-
 νοί, B^b 30 ἐν οἴνῳ | ἰχθυονόντων] κατασκοπούντων. Job ii. 9^d
 πλανῆτις, N^caA. Am. v. 12 καταπατοῦντες, AQ*. Mic. ii. 7 f.
 7 πορεύονται 8 κατέναντι] κατὰ πρόσωπον | δοράν] δόξαν (sic).
 iii. 5 ἤγειραν] ἠγίασαν, Q^{ms}. v. 5 ἔσται αὕτη ἢ παρ' ἐμοῦ εἰρήνη
 ὅταν ὁ Ἀσσύριος (cf. AQ) ἐπέλθῃ. Mal. iv. 4 ἀποστέλλω] πέμ-
 ψω | πρίν]+ ἡ̄ | ἡμέραν] pr τήν, Γ 5 πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα | ἔλθων
 πατάξω, N^cb. Isa. x. 12 ff. 13 om. ἐν bis, NAQG 14 τῇ
 χειρὶ]+ μου, AQ 16 Κύριος σαβαώθ] ἀδωναὶ Κύριος 17 πυρὶ
 καιομένῳ] φλογί (cf. Symm.). xiv. 4 ff. 11 εἰς ἄδου] εἰς γῆν |
 κατακάλυμμα] κατάλειμμα 12 πρὸς] εἰς, N* 14 νεφελῶν, NAQG
 16 θαυμάσουσιν, NAQG 19 τεθνηκότων] πεπτωκότων 20
 καθαρὸς] κομψὸς | χρόνον] χρόνιος 21 σφαγῆναι] εἰς σφαγῆν.
 xlv. 11 + καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων μου (cf. NAQ) 13 om βασιλεία,
 N^cbAQ 14 ἐν σοὶ προσκυνήσουσιν. lxxvi. 24 τελευτήσει, B^bQ
 (ag. A, τελευτᾶ). Ezech. xxviii. 5 ἐμπορία] ἐμπειρία. Dan.
 ii. 1 ff. 1 βασιλεία]+ Ναβουχοδονοσόρ, A 5 εἰν]+ οὖν, AQ |
 σύγκρισιν]+ αὐτοῦ, Q

The text of Hippolytus, it will be seen, like most of the patristic texts, leans slightly to AF in the Pentateuch, N* or N^ca in the poetical Am, and AQ in the Prophets. At the

¹ The references in the *Index locorum* of Duncker and Schneidewin's edition (Göttingen, 1859) direct the reader for the most part to mere allusions, or citations of only a few consecutive words.

² In *Hippolyti Romani quae feruntur omnia Graece* (Leipzig, 1858).

same time it is full of surprises, and often stands quite alone among existing witnesses.

9. Our last witness is Clement of Alexandria. Clement had learnt the Christian faith during his early travels in Asia Minor and Magna Graecia, and he may have received copies of O.T. writings from his first Christian masters. Hence it must not be too hastily assumed that the text of his O.T. quotations is purely Alexandrian. On the other hand it is reasonable to suppose that during the period of his literary activity he was familiar with the Alexandrian text and used it when he quoted from his MS. On the whole therefore we may expect his quotations to be fairly representative of the Biblical text current at Alexandria during the generation preceding the compilation of the Hexapla.

Clement quotes both the Jewish and the Christian scriptures profusely, but his extracts seldom extend beyond two or three verses, and are often broken by comments or copied with considerable freedom. His purpose was didactic and not polemical; even in the *λόγος προτρεπτικός* he aims to persuade rather than to compel assent, whilst the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromateis* are addressed exclusively to persons under instruction, to whom the Scriptures were a familiar text-book. Hence he is exact only when verbal precision is necessary; often it is sufficient for his purpose to work into his argument a few words from a Scriptural context, giving the sense of the rest in his own words. Still it is possible even in these broken references to catch glimpses of the text which lay before him, and in the dearth of early Christian literature emanating from Alexandria, these are of no little value to the student of the Greek Bible¹. A generally full and accurate index of Clement's

¹ Clement's text of the Gospels has been examined by Mr P. M. Barnard (*Biblical texts of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts*, Cambridge, 1899) with some interesting and important results. His text

Biblical quotations will be found in the edition of Potter; here it must suffice to give some specimens of the text which they exhibit in the Pentateuch, the poetical books, and the Prophets.

(a) Gen. i. 26 (*strom.* v. 29) κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν ἡμετέραν (elsewhere Cl. reads ὁμ. ἡμῶν, or omits the pronoun). xxxvii. 24 (*strom.* v. 54) ὁ δὲ λάκκος κενός, DE. Exod. xx. 13 ff. (*protrept.* 108, *strom.* ii. 33) οὐ φονεύσεις οὐ μοιχεύσεις... οὐ κλέψεις οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, AF. Lev. xviii. 1 ff. (*strom.* ii. 46). 3 ἐν αὐτῇ (ἐπ' αὐτῇ B*, ἐπ' αὐτῆς B^{ab}AF) οὐ ποιήσετε (ποιηθήσεται B*) 4 πορεύεσθε A 5 ὁ ποιήσας αὐτά. Deut. xxxii. 23 ff. (*paed.* i. 68) 23 συντελέσει (συντελέσω AF, συνπολεμήσω, B) 24 ἐπαποστειλῶ, A | τῆς γῆς, A (F) 41 ff. ἀνταποδώσω, AF 42 + καὶ ἡ μάχαιρά μου φάγεται κρέα ἀπὸ αἵματος τραυματιῶν, AF (ὅ) Ps. xxxiii. 12 ff. (*strom.* iv. 111). 13 ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν, NAR 14 χεῖλῃ σου, N^{c.a}AR. xcv. 5 (*protrept.* 62) δαιμονίων εἰσὶν εἰδῶλα (cf. Iren.). cii. 14 (*paed.* i. 62) μνήσθητι, B^{N*} Th. cxl. 5 (*paed.* i. 79) ἐλεγχέτω με δίκαιος καὶ παιδευσάτω. cl. 4 ὄργανον, BNRT. Prov. i. 25 (*paed.* i. 85) ὑπηκούετε, NA | οὐ προσείχετε, NAC (ἡπειθήσατε, B). iii. 5 ff. (*strom.* ii. 4). 6 ἐν πάσαις, A | τὰς ὁδοὺς σου] + ὁ δὲ ποὺς σου οὐ μὴ προσκόπη (cf. N^{c.a}: SH pr ÷) 12 παιδεύει, NA (ἐλέγχει, B). xxiii. 13 μὴ ἀπόσχου (ἀπόσχη LXX.) νῆπιον παιδεύων (A; παιδεύειν, B). Sir. i. 18 (*paed.* i. 68) + φόβος γὰρ Κυρίου ἀπωθείται ἀμαρτήματα (so far 248), ἄφηβος δ' οὐ δυνήσεται δικαιοθῆναι, O.L. ix. 9 (*paed.* ii. 54) μὴ συμβολοκοπήσης] μὴ συμματακλιθῆς ἐπ' ἀγκῶνα, O.L. xxxiv. 25 (*paed.* ii. 31) ἀπόλεσεν] ἠχρεώσε. xxxvi. 6 (*paed.* i. 42) ὡς φίλος μῶκος] ὁ φιλήδονος καὶ μοῖχος (cf. ὡς φιλόμοιχος, 55, 254). xxxviii. 1 (*paed.* ii. 68) om. τιμαῖς, 106, 296, O.L. xxxix. 13 (*paed.* ii. 76) ἀγροῦ (ὑγροῦ NAC)] ὑδάτων. 18 (*paed.* ii. 44) ὅς ἐλαττώσει] ἐλάττωσις eis, Heb. (c) Am. iv. 13 (*protrept.* 79) ἰδοὺ ἐγώ, B^{a.b}AQ (om B*). Nah. iii. 4 (*paed.* i. 81) ἐπίχαρις, B^{a.b}Q. Mal. i. 10 ff. (*strom.* v. 137). 11 om. καὶ 1^o, AQ | θυμίαμα] θυσία | προσάγεται] προσφέρειται (cf. Justin). Isa. ix. 6 (*paed.* i. 24) υἱὸς καὶ ἐδόθη, N^{AQ}Γ | om ἐγενήθη, Γ | ἐκλήθη (καλεῖται, B^{NQI}, καλέσει, A) | + θαυμαστὸς σύμβουλος (N^{c.a}A) θεὸς δυναστῆς πατὴρ αἰώνιος ἄρχων εἰρήνης (N^{c.a}A). 7 μεγάλη ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ] + τῷ πληθύνειν τὴν παιδείαν, Th. | ὄριον] πέρας, Th., Symm. xi. 1 ff. (*paed.* i. 61). xi. 4 ἐλέγξει τοὺς ἀμαρτωλοὺς τῆς γῆς (cf. Iren.). xxix. 13 (*paed.* i. 76) ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσί με, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἐστὶν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· μάτην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσ-

of the LXX. is not likely to be equally instructive, but it ought to reward a patient investigator. [Since this note was written an examination of Clement's LXX. text has been made by Dr O. Stählin (*Clemens Alex. u. die Septuaginta*, Nürnberg, 1901).]

κοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων (cf. Mt. xv., Mc. vii.).
 lxvi. 13 (*paed.* i. 21) ὑμᾶς παρακαλέσω, N. Jer. ix. 23 f. (*paed.*
 i. 37): v. 24 abbreviated as in I Cor. i. 31. xiii. 24 ff. (*strom.*
 iv. 165 f.). 24 διέσπειρα, BNQ (διεφθείρα A) | ὑπό, NAQ (ἀπό,
 B) | φερόμενα] πετώμενα 25 ἀπειθεῖν ὑμᾶς ἐμοί 27 μοιχεία
 anarthr., Q | χρεμετισμός anarthr., B. xxiii. 23 f. (*protrept.* 78).
 24 εἰ ποιήσει τι ἄνθρωπος (εἰ κρυβήσεται τις, B, εἰ κρ. ἄνθρωπος,
 AQ). Bar. iii. 13 (*paed.* i. 92) om χρόνον, B. Thren. i. 1
 (*paed.* i. 80) ἄρχοντα χωρῶν ἐγενήθη εἰς φόρους. Dan. ix. 24 ff.
 (*strom.* i. 125) as in Th. (B*), with the addition καὶ ἡμῖν τῆς
 ἑβδομάδος καταπαύσει θυμίαμα θυσίας καὶ πτερυγίου ἀφανισμοῦ ἕως
 συντελείας καὶ σπουδῆς τάξιν ἀφανισμοῦ (cf. B^{ab}AQ).

10. This examination has been but partial, even within the narrow field to which it was limited. It has dealt only with direct quotations, and in the case of Hippolytus and Clement of Alexandria, only with a few of these. Moreover, the student who wishes to examine the whole of the evidence must not limit himself to the few great writers who have been named. Even if he adds the writings of Aristides, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and the anonymous *Teaching* and *Epistle to Diognetus*, there will still remain the fragments collected in the *Reliquiae Sacrae* and by the researches of Pitra, and the Pseudo-Clementine, apocryphal, and Gnostic literature of the second century. Still more important help may be obtained from Latin Christian writers who quote the O.T. in the Old Latin version, e.g. Cyprian, Lucifer, Vigilius of Thapsus, the Donatist Tyconius, and the author of the *Speculum*¹. This part of the evidence was collected for Holmes and Parsons, and will be presented in a more permanent form, if not at so much length, in the apparatus of the larger Septuagint.

Much useful and interesting work might be done by following the lines of Dr Hatch's attempt to collect and compare the early evidence in reference to particular texts and con-

¹ See above, p. 97, and the art. *Old Latin Versions* in Hastings' *D. B.* iii. (already mentioned, p. 88).

stantly recurring extracts from the LXX.¹ Perhaps however it would be expedient to limit such an investigation to post-apostolic Christian writers, and to carry it beyond Justin. Moreover, Dr Hatch's proposal to estimate the value of MSS., "according as they do or do not agree with such early quotations," seems to be at least precarious. It is conceivable and even probable that the peculiarities of early patristic quotations may be partly due to corruption incident upon the process of citing, whether from memory or from a MS.; and for various other reasons the text of a fourth century MS. may on the whole present a purer text than that which appears in a second century writing. This point, however, must be reserved for fuller consideration in a later chapter².

11. With Origen the science of Christian Biblical criticism and hermeneutics may be said to have begun. In the Old Testament his interest was peculiarly strong; it supplied him with the amplest opportunities of exercising his skill in allegorical interpretation; and his knowledge both of the original and of the Greek versions prepared him to deal with the difficulties of his text. Unhappily there is no class of his writings which has suffered so severely. Of his great commentaries on the Old Testament, only fragments have survived; and the Homilies, with the exception of one on the Witch of Endor, and nineteen on the book of Jeremiah, have reached us only in the Latin translations of Rufinus and Jerome. But even fragments and versions of Origen are precious, and the following list of his O.T. remains³ may be of service to the student of the LXX.

Genesis. Fragments of Commentary (t. i., iii.), and notes from catenae. Homilies (17) in Latin, tr. by Rufinus. *Exodus.* Fragments of Commentary, and notes. Homilies (13) in Latin,

¹ *Essays*, i. p. 129 ff. ("On Early Quotations from the Septuagint.")

² See Part III. c. vi.

³ They are collected in Migne, *P. G.* xi.—xvii.

tr. by Rufinus. *Leviticus*. Fragments and notes from catenae. Homilies (16) in Latin, tr. by Rufinus. *Numbers*. Notes from catenae. Homilies (28) in Latin, tr. by Rufinus. *Deuteronomy*. Notes from catenae, &c. *Joshua*. Fragments and notes from catenae, &c. Homilies (26) in Latin, tr. by Rufinus. *Judges*. Notes from catenae. Homilies (9) in Latin, tr. by Rufinus. *Ruth*. A note on Ruth i. 4. 1—4 *Kingdoms*. Homily ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐγγαστριμύθου. Fragments. Homily in Latin on 1 Regn. i. ff. *Psalms*. Fragments of the Commentaries and Homilies; notes from catenae. Homilies (9) in Latin, tr. by Rufinus [on Pss. xxxvi.—xxxviii.]. *Proverbs*. Fragments and notes, Greek and Latin. *Ecclesiastes*. Notes from catenae. *Canticles*. Fragments and notes. Homilies (2) in Latin, tr. by Jerome. Commentary (prol., tt. i.—iv.) in Latin, tr. by Rufinus. *Job*. Notes from catenae. Fragment of a Homily, in Latin. *The xii. Prophets*. Fragment on Hosea xii. (in *Philocal.* 8). *Isaiah*. Fragments (2) of the Commentaries, in Latin. Homilies (9) in Latin, tr. by Jerome. *Jeremiah*. Homilies (19) in Greek, and notes from catenae. Homilies (2) in Latin, tr. by Jerome. *Lamentations*. Notes from catenae. *Ezekiel*. Fragments, and notes from catenae. Homilies (14) in Latin, tr. by Jerome.

12. It is impossible within the limits of an Introduction to enumerate all the ecclesiastical writers who during the golden age of patristic literature quoted or commented upon the Greek Old Testament. But the student who is not a specialist in this field may be glad to have before him the names and dates of the principal Greek Fathers, with some notice of such of their extant works as are concerned with O.T. exegesis. The Roman numerals in brackets direct him to the volumes of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, in which the authors are to be found; in the case of a few writings which are not included in the *Patrologia* and some others, references are given to other editions.

Acacius of Caesarea, †366. Fragments in catenae.

Ammonius of Alexandria, c. 460. Fragments on Genesis and Daniel. (lxxxv.)

Anastasius of Antioch, †598. (lxxxix.)

Anastasius of Sinai, cent. vi.—vii. (lxxxix.)

Apollinarius of Laodicea (the younger), †c. 393. (xxxiii., cf. Dräseke's edition in *Texte u. Unters.* vii.)

- Apostolical Constitutions, cent. iii.—iv. (ed. Lagarde).
 Asterius of Amasea, c. 400. (xl.)
 Athanasius of Alexandria, †373. On the Psalms; Titles of the Psalms¹, fragments in the catenae. (xxv.—xxviii.)
 Basil of Caesarea, †379. Homilies on the Hexacameron, the Psalms and Isaiah i.—xvi. (xxix.—xxxii.)
 Basil of Seleucia, c. 450. Homilies on the O.T. (lxxxv.)
 Cosmas Indicopleustes, c. 550. (lxxxviii.)
 Cyril of Alexandria, †444. Works on the Pentateuch (*περὶ τῆς ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνήσεως*, and *γλαφυρά*), comm. on saiah, comm. on the xii. Prophets; fragments on Kingdoms, Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, and the minor Prophets. (lxviii.—lxxvii.)
 Cyril of Jerusalem, †386. (xxxiii.)
 Didymus of Alexandria, †395. Fragments on the Psalms and in the catenae. (xxxix.)
 Diodorus of Tarsus, †c. 390. Fragments from the catenae. (xxxiii.)
 Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, cent. v. (iii.—iv.)
 Dorotheus the Archimandrite, cent. vi.—vii. (lxxxviii.)
 Ephraem the Syrian, †373. Fragments of Commentaries on the Pentateuch, the historical and the poetical books. (Rome, 1732 ff.)
 Epiphanius of Salamis, †403. (xli.—xlili.)
 Eusebius of Caesarea, †339. Commentary on the Psalms; notes on Isaiah; fragments of other O.T. commentaries; books *περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θεῖᾳ γραφῇ* and *περὶ τῆς τοῦ βιβλίου τῶν προφητῶν ὀνομασίας*.
 Eusebius of Emesa, †359. Fragments in the catenae of a comm. on Genesis. (lxxxvi.)
 Eustathius of Antioch, †337. On the Witch of Endor, ag. Origen. (xviii.)
 Evagrius of Pontus, †398. Fragments in catenae.
 Gennadius of Constantinople, †471. Fragments on Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms &c. (lxxxv.)
 Gregory of Nazianzus, †389. (xxxv.—xxxviii.)
 Gregory of Neocaesarea, †c. 270. (x.)
 Gregory of Nyssa, †395. (xliv.—xlvi.)
 Hesychius of Jerusalem, †c. 438. (xciii.)
 Isidore of Pelusium, †c. 450. (lxxviii.)
 John Chrysostom, †407. Homilies on 1 Regn., Psalms (iii.—xii., xlvi.—xlix., cviii.—cxl.); a commentary on Isa. i.—viii. 11; various hands. (xlvii.—lxiv.)
 John of Damascus, †c. 760. (xciv.—xcvi.)
 Julianus of Halicarnassus, †536. Fragments in catenae.
 Macarius Magnes, cent. iv. (ed. Blondel).
 Maximus Confessor, †662. (xc.—xci.)

¹ See, however, H. M. Gwatkin, *Arianism*, p. 69 n.

- Methodius of Olympus, cent. iii.—iv. (xviii.)
 Nilus of Sinai, †c. 430. (lxxix.)
 Olympiodorus of Alexandria, †cent. vi. (xciii.)
 Peter of Alexandria, †311. (xviii.)
 Philo of Carpasia, c. 380. Commentary on Canticles. (xl.)
 Photius of Constantinople, †c. 891. (ci.—civ.)
 Polychronius of Apamea, †430. Fragments on the Pentateuch, Job, Proverbs, Canticles, and Daniel; comm. on Ezekiel.
 Procopius of Gaza, cent. vi. Commentaries on Genesis—Judges, 1 Regn.—2 Chr., Prov., Cant., Isaiah. (lxxxvii.)
 Severianus of Gabala, †c. 420. Fragments of commentaries in the catenae. (lxv.)
 Severus of Antioch, †c. 539. Fragments in the catenae.
 Theodore of Heraclea, †c. 355. Fragments of comm. on Isaiah. (xviii.)
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, †428. Fragments of commentaries on Genesis (Syriac and Latin), the rest of the Pentateuch and the historical books: comm. on the Psalms in Syriac and large fragments in Greek: a commentary on the xii. Prophets. (lxvi.)
 Theodoret of Cyrrihus, †c. 458. *Eis τὰ ἄπορα τῆς θείας γραφῆς*, questions on the Pentateuch and historical books. Commentaries on the Psalms, Canticles, the xii. Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah (including Baruch and Lam.), Ezekiel, Daniel. (lxxx.—lxxxiv.)
 Titus of Bostra, †c. 370. (xviii.)
 Victor of Antioch, cent. v.—vi. (?).

LITERATURE. T. Ittig, *De bibliothecis et catenis patrum* (Leipzig, 1707). J. G. Walch, *Bibliotheca patristica*, ed. J. T. L. Danz (Jena, 1834). J. G. Dowling, *Notitia Scriptorum ss. Patrum* (Oxford, 1839). Oeconomus, vol. iv. (Athens, 1849). J. Nirschl, *Lehrbuch der Patrologia u. Patristik* (Mainz, 1881). O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie* (Freiburg i. B., 1894). Fessler-Jungmann, *Institutiones Patrologiae* (1890). H. Hody, *De textibus Bibliorum*, p. 277 ff. Schleusner, *Opuscula critica ad versionem Graecam V.T. pertinentia* (Leipzig, 1812). Credner, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften*, vol. ii. (Halle, 1834). R. Gregory, Prolegomena (*de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, p. 1131 ff.). Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 167 ff. Hatch, *Biblical Essays*, p. 131 ff.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GREEK VERSIONS AS AIDS TO BIBLICAL STUDY.

I. No question can arise as to the greatness of the place occupied by the Alexandrian Version in the religious life of the first six centuries of its history. The Septuagint was the Bible of the Hellenistic Jew, not only in Egypt and Palestine, but throughout Western Asia and Europe. It created a language of religion which lent itself readily to the service of Christianity and became one of the most important allies of the Gospel. It provided the Greek-speaking Church with an authorised translation of the Old Testament, and when Christian missions advanced beyond the limits of Hellenism, it served as a basis for fresh translations into the vernacular¹.

The Septuagint has long ceased to fulfil these or any similar functions. In the West, after the fourth century, its influence receded before the spread of the Latin Vulgate; in the East, where it is still recited by the Orthodox Church in the ecclesiastical offices, it lost much of its influence over the thought and life of the people. On the other hand, this most ancient of Biblical versions possesses a new and increasing importance in the field of Biblical study. It is seen to be valuable alike to the textual critic and to the expositor, and its services are welcomed by students both of the Old Testament and of the New.

¹ See Part I., c. iv.

A. As the oldest version of the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint claims especial attention from Old Testament scholars. It represents a text and, to some extent, an interpretation earlier than any which can be obtained from other sources.

1. (a) The printed Hebrew Bibles give on the whole the Massoretic text, i.e. a text which has passed through the hands of the Massorets, a succession of Jewish scholars who endeavoured to give permanence to the traditional type.

Massora (מסורה, מִסְוֶרֶת, *traditio*) is already mentioned in the saying of R. Akiba, *Pirke Aboth*, iii. 20 מסורה סייג לתורה¹; but the word is used there in reference to halachic rather than to textual tradition. It is probable, however, that Akiba and his contemporaries were concerned with the settling of the text which later generations protected by the 'Massora' technically so called. The work of the Massorets (בעלי-המסרת), who flourished from the sixth century to the tenth, consisted chiefly in reducing to a system of rules the pronunciation of the text which had been fixed by their predecessors. The Massora² embodies the readings which tradition substituted for the written text (קרי, קְרִיב), the corrections known as the תיקון³, and observations on the text tending to stereotype its interpretation in minute points. To the Massorets we also owe the perfecting of the system of vowel-points and accents. The labours of the Massorets culminated in the Western text of R. Ben Asher (cent. x.), and that which appeared about the same time in the East under the auspices of R. Ben Naphtali. The former has been repeated with minor variations in all Western MSS.

The attitude of Christian scholars towards the Jewish traditional text has varied with the progress of Biblical learning.

¹ See Schürer, *E. T.* II. i. p. 329 n.; Dr C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 54 f.

² For the text see the great work of C. D. Ginsburg, *The Massorah, compiled from MSS., alphabetically and lexically arranged*, 3 vols. (London, 1880-5), or the Bible of S. Baer; and for the Massorets and their work, cf. Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, Ginsburg's *Introduction* (London, 1897), and his edition of the *Massoreth ha-massoreth* of Elias Levita, or the brief statements in Buhl, *Kanon u. Text* (p. 96 ff.), and in *Urtext* (p. 20 ff.); or Strack, art. *Text of the O.T.*, in *Hastings, D.B.* iv.

³ On these see Dr W. E. Barnes in *J. Th. St.*, April 1900.

The question of its relation to the text presupposed by the Septuagint was scarcely present to the minds of Christian writers before the time of Origen¹. Origen, when the problem forced itself upon him, adopted, as we have seen², a middle course between the alternatives of rejecting the LXX. and refusing to accept the testimony of his Jewish teachers. Jerome took a bolder line; his new Latin version was based on the 'original Hebrew,' and on textual questions he appealed with confidence to the verdict of contemporary Jewish opinion: *prol. gal.* "quanquam mihi omnino conscius non sim mutasse me quidpiam de Hebraica veritate...interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum cui magis accommodare debeas fidem." Like Origen he indignantly, and on the whole doubtless with justice, repudiated the charge which was laid by some Christians against the Jews of having falsified their MSS.³ But neither Origen nor Jerome entertained a suspicion that the Jewish official text had, whether by accident or design, departed from the archetype.

Mediaeval Europe knew the Old Testament almost exclusively through Jerome's Latin, as the Ancient Church had known it through the LXX.⁴ When at length the long reign of the Vulgate in Western Europe was broken by the forces of the Renaissance and the Reformation, the attention of scholars was once more drawn to that which purported to be the original text of the Old Testament. The printing of the Hebrew text commenced among the Jews with the Psalter of 1477; the *editio princeps* of the Hebrew Bible as a whole appeared in

¹ See C. J. Elliott's art. *Hebrew Learning*, in *D. C. B.* ii., esp. the summary on p. 872 b.

² Above, p. 60 ff.

³ See his comm. on Isaiah vi. 9 (Migne, *P. L.* xxiv. 99).

⁴ A few mediaeval scholars had access to the Hebrew, e.g. the Englishmen Stephen Harding (†1134), Robert Grosseteste (†1253), Roger Bacon (†c. 1292), the Spaniard Raymundus Martini (†c. 1286), and especially the Norman Jew, Nicolaus de Lyra (†1340). On Lyra see Siegfried in *Merx, Archiv*, i. p. 428, ii. p. 28.

1488, and three editions followed before the end of the fifteenth century¹. Meanwhile Christian scholars had once more begun to learn the Hebrew language from Jewish teachers, and in 1506 the publication of John Reuchlin's *Rudiments* placed the elements of Hebrew learning within the reach of the theologians of Europe. Under the circumstances it was not strange that the earlier Reformers, who owed their Hebrew Bible and their knowledge of the language to the Rabbis, should have, like Jerome, regarded the traditional text as a faithful reproduction of the inspired original. In the next century a beginning was made in the criticism of the Hebrew text by the Protestant divine Louis Cappelle (L. Cappellus, † 1658), and the Oratorian Jean Morin (J. Morinus, † 1659), who pressed the claims of the LXX. and the Samaritan Pentateuch. A furious controversy ensued, in the course of which the Swiss Reformed Churches committed themselves to an absolute acceptance not only of the consonantal text, but of the vowel points. This extreme position was occupied not only by theologians, but by experts such as the two Buxtorfs of Basle (†† 1629, 1664), who maintained that the Massoretic text in its present state had come down unchanged from the days of Ezra and the 'Great Synagogue.'

The views of Louis Cappelle were set forth in *Arcanum punctuationis revelatum*, Amsterdam, 1624; *Critica sacra*, Paris, 1650; those of J. Morin in *Exercitationes ecclesiasticae in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum* (Paris, 1631), and *Exercitationes de hebraici graecique textus sinceritate* (Paris, 1633). The younger Buxtorf answered Cappelle in his treatises *De punctorum origine* (1648) and *Anticritica* (1653): see Schnedemann, *Die Controverse des L. Cappellus mit den Buxtorfen* (Leipzig, 1879), Loisy, *Histoire critique*, p. 167 ff. The *formula consensus ecclesiarum Helveticarum* (1675) declared (*can. ii., iii.*): "Hebraicus Veteris Testamenti codex quem ex traditione ecclesiae Iudaicae, cui olim oracula Dei commissa sunt, accepimus hodieque retinemus, tum quoad consonas tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa sive punctorum saltem potestatem, et tum quoad res tum quoad

¹ See De Wette-Schrader, *Lehrbuch*, p. 217 f.

verba θεόπνευστος...ad cuius normam...universae quae extant versiones...exigendae et, sicubi deflectunt, revocandae sunt. Eorum proinde sententiam probare neutiquam possumus, qui lectionem quam Hebraicus codex exhibet humano tantum arbitrio constitutam esse definiunt, quique lectionem Hebraicam quam minus commodam iudicant configere eamque ex LXX. seniorum aliorumque versionibus Graecis...emendare religioni neutiquam ducunt^{1, b}

Reference has been made to the place occupied by the Samaritan Pentateuch in this controversy. A Samaritan recension of the Law was known to Origen, who quoted it in the Hexapla (Num. xiii. 1 ἃ καὶ αὐτὰ ἐκ τοῦ τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν Ἑβραϊκοῦ μετεβάλομεν, xxi. 13 ἃ ἐν μόνοις τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν εὔρομεν: see Field, *Hex.* 1. p. lxxxii. f.), and Jerome (*prol. gal., comm. in Gal.* iii. 10); reference is made to it also by Eusebius (*Chron.* 1. xvi. 7 ff.), and by so late a writer as Georgius Syncellus (cent. viii.), who attaches a high value to its testimony (*Chronogr.* p. 83 διαφωνοῦσι τὰ Ἑβραϊκὰ ἀντίγραφα πρὸς τὸ Σαμαρειτῶν ἀρχαιότατον καὶ χαρακτηῆρσι διαλλάττον· ὃ καὶ ἀληθὲς εἶναι καὶ πρῶτον Ἑβραῖοι καθομολογοῦσιν). In the seventeenth century, after a long oblivion, this recension was recovered by a traveller in the East and published in the Paris Polyglott of 1645. The rising school of textual criticism represented by Morin at once recognised its importance as concurring with the Septuagint in its witness against the originality of the Massoretic text. Few questions, however, have been more hotly discussed than the relation of the Samaritan to the Alexandrian Pentateuch. Scholars such as Selden, Hottinger, and Eichhorn contended that the Greek Pentateuch was based upon Samaritan MSS. Samaritans were undoubtedly to be found among the early Palestinian settlers in Egypt. Of the first Ptolemy Josephus writes: πολλοὺς αἰχμαλώτους λαβῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος καὶ τῶν ἐν Γαριζείν, κατόκισεν ἅπαντας εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀγαγών. It is significant that Σαμάρεια occurs among

¹ Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum* (Leipzig, 1840), p. 731.

the names of villages in the Fayûm¹, and a letter ascribed to Hadrian, and certainly not earlier than his reign, mentions Samaritans as resident at Alexandria. On the other hand the traditional account of the origin of the LXX. directly contradicts this hypothesis, nor is it probable that the Jews of Alexandria would have had recourse to the Samaritans for MSS. of the Law, or that they would have accepted a version which had originated in this manner. Moreover the agreement of the Greek and Samaritan Pentateuchs is very far from being complete. A careful analysis of the Samaritan text led Gesenius to the conclusion, which is now generally accepted, that the fact of the two Pentateuchs often making common cause against the printed Hebrew Bibles indicates a common origin earlier than the fixing of the Massoretic text, whilst their dissensions shew that the text of the Law existed in more than one recension before it had been reduced to a rigid uniformity.

On the Samaritan Pentateuch the reader may consult J. Morinus, *Exercitationes ecclesiasticae in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum*; L. Cappellus, *Critica sacra*, iii. c. 20; Walton, *prolegg.* (ed. Wrangham, Camb. 1828), ii. p. 280ff.; R. Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, i. c. 12; Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, ii. § 383 ff.; Gesenius, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine indole et auctoritate comm.* (Halle, 1815); S. Kohn, *De Pentateucho Samaritano eiusque cum versionibus antiquis nexu* (Leipzig, 1865); *Samareitikon u. Septuaginta*, in *MGJS.*, 1893; E. Deutsch, *Samaritan Pentateuch*, in Smith's *D. B.* iii. 1106ff.; E. König, art. *Sam. Pentateuch*, Hastings' *D. B.* suppl. vol. p. 71; J. W. Nutt, *Introduction to Fragments of a Sam. Targum* (London, 1872); J. Skinner in *J. Q. R.* xiv. 26; P. Glaue and A. Rahlfs, *Mitteilungen des Sept. Unternehmens*, ii. (Berlin, 1911), for fragments of Gr. transl. of Sam. Pentateuch.

The prevalent belief in the originality of the Massoretic text appeared to receive confirmation from the researches of Kennicott² and De Rossi³, which revealed an extraordinary agreement in all existing MSS. of the Hebrew Bible. But as

¹ As early as 255 B.C. (Thackeray); *Petrie Pap.* Series II. iv. (11).

² *Vetus T. Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* (Oxford, 1776—80).

³ *Variae lectiones V. T.* (Parma 1784—8); *Supplementum* (1798).

no MS. of the Hebrew Bible has come down to us which is earlier than the beginning of the tenth century¹, this evidence merely shews the complete success of the Massorets and the Sopherim who preceded them in preserving the traditional text, and the question remains to be answered at what period the tradition was created. It may be traced in the fourth century, when Jerome received substantially the same text from his Jewish teachers in Palestine; and in the third, for Origen's Hebrew text did not differ materially from that of Jerome or of the Massorets. We can go yet another step further back; the version of Aquila, of which considerable fragments have now been recovered, reveals very few points in which the consonantal text of the second century differed from that of our printed Bibles². Other witnesses can be produced to shew that, even if Hebrew MSS. of a much earlier date had been preserved, they would have thrown but little light on textual questions³. On the whole, modern research has left no room for doubting that the printed Hebrew Bible represents a *textus receptus* which was already practically fixed before the middle of the second century. But it is equally clear that no official text held undisputed possession in the first century, or was recognised by the writers of the New Testament. Thus we are driven to the conclusion that the transition from a fluctuating to a relatively fixed text took effect during the interval between the Fall of Jerusalem and the completion of Aquila's version. The time was one of great activity in Palestinian Jewish circles. In the last days of Jerusalem a school had been founded at Jamnia (Jabneh, *Yebna*)⁴, near the Philistine seaboard, by R. Jochanan ben Zaccai. To this

¹ "The earliest MS. of which the age is certainly known bears date A.D. 916" (Pref. to the R.V. of the O.T. p. ix. 2).

² Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Aquila*, p. 16 f.

³ Cf. S. R. Driver, *Samuel*, p. xxxix.: "Quotations in the Mishnah and Gemara exhibit no material variants...the Targums also pre-suppose a text which deviates from (the M. T.) but slightly."

⁴ Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 73 f.

centre the representatives of Judaism flocked after the destruction of the city, and here, until the fresh troubles of the war of Bar-Cochba (A.D. 132—5), Biblical studies were prosecuted with new ardour under a succession of eminent Rabbis. At Jamnia about A.D. 90 a synod was held which discussed various questions connected with the settlement of the Canon. At Jamnia also traditionalism reached its zenith under the teaching of R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, R. Joshua ben Chananya, and their more famous pupil R. Akiba ben Joseph, the author of the dogma that every word, particle and letter in the Hebrew Bible has a meaning, and serves some purpose which can be expressed by hermeneutical methods. From this canon of interpretation to the establishment of an official text is but a single step; a book of which the very letters possess a divine authority cannot be left to the unauthorised revision of scribes or editors. Whether the result was reached by a selection of approved readings, or by the suppression of MSS. which were not in agreement with an official copy, or whether it was due to an individual Rabbi or the work of a generation, is matter of conjecture. But it seems to be clear that in one way or another the age which followed the fall of Jerusalem witnessed the creation of a standard text not materially different from that which the Massorets stereotyped and which all MSS. and editions have reproduced¹.

(*b*) It is the business of the textual critic to get behind this official text, and to recover so far as he can the various recensions which it has displaced. In this work he is aided by the Ancient Versions, but especially by the Septuagint. Of the Versions the Septuagint alone is actually earlier than the fixing of the Hebrew text. In point of age, indeed, it must yield to the Samaritan Pentateuch, the archetype of

¹ See W. Robertson-Smith, *O.T. in Jewish Ch.*, p. 62 f.; A. F. Kirkpatrick, *Divine Library of the O.T.*, p. 63 ff.

which may have been in the hands of the Samaritans in the days of Nehemiah (c. B.C. 432)¹; but the polemical bias of that people, and the relatively late date of the MSS. on which the printed text depends, detract largely from the value of its evidence, which is moreover limited to the Torah.

Some of the difficulties which beset the use of the LXX. as a guide to the criticism of the text have been stated already when its character as a version was discussed²; others, arising out of the present condition of the version, will be noticed in the last chapter of this book. "The use of the Ancient Versions (as Prof. Driver writes³) is not...always such a simple matter as might be inferred.... In the use of an Ancient Version for the purposes of textual criticism, there are three precautions which must always be observed: we must reasonably assure ourselves that we possess the Version itself in its original integrity: we must eliminate such variants as have the appearance of originating merely with the translator; the remainder, which will be those that are due to a difference of text in the MS. (or MSS.) used by the translator, we must then compare carefully, in the light of the considerations just stated, with the existing Hebrew text, in order to determine on which side the superiority lies." "In dealing with the LXX. (Prof. Kirkpatrick reminds us) we have to remember...that the LXX. is not a homogeneous work, but differs very considerably in its character in different books, if not in parts of books⁴." Moreover in the case of the LXX. the task of the textual critic is complicated by the existence of more than one distinct recension of the Greek. He has before him in many contexts a choice of readings which represent a plurality of Hebrew archetypes⁵.

¹ See Ryle, *Canon*, p. 91 f.

² Pt. II., c. v., p. 315 ff.

³ *Samuel*, p. xxxix. f.

⁴ *Expositor* v. iii., p. 273.

⁵ See H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, p. 397 f., and the remarks that follow.

The following list of passages in which the LXX. reflects a Hebrew text different from \mathfrak{H} will enable the student to practise himself in the critical use of the Version.

Gen. iv. 8 \mathfrak{H} does not give the words of Cain, though אָנָךְ leads the reader to expect them. \mathfrak{G} supplies Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον (גַּלְלָהּ הַשָּׂדֶה), and this is supported by Sam., Targ. Jer., Pesh., Vulg. xxxi. 29 אָבִיךָ, \mathfrak{G} אָבִיךָ (τοῦ πατρός σου); so Sam., cf. v. 30. **xli. 56** אֶת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר בָּהֶם, \mathfrak{G} πάντας τοὺς σιτοβολῶνας (אֶת-כָּל-אֲצִרֹת בָּר, cf. Sam., אֶת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר בָּהֶם בָּר). **xlix. 10** \mathfrak{G} ἕως ἄν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ, perhaps reading שָׁלוּ (= אֲשֶׁר לֹא) for \mathfrak{H} שָׁלָה: but see Ball in Haupt, *Sacred Books, ad loc.*, and cf. the Greek variant φ̄ ἀπόκειται. **Exod. v. 9** וַיַּעֲשׂוּ...יִשְׁעוּ, \mathfrak{G} μεριμνάτωσαν...μεριμνάτωσαν (וַיַּעֲשׂוּ...וַיִּשְׁעוּ). **xiv. 25** וַיִּסַּר, \mathfrak{G} καὶ συνέδησεν (וַיִּאסַּר). **xxx. 6** ...לִפְנֵי הַכַּפְּרֹת...לִפְנֵי הַכַּפְּרֹת. \mathfrak{G} omits the second clause: so Sam. **Lev. xiii. 31** וַיַּעַר שָׁחַר, \mathfrak{G} θριξ̄ ξανθίζουσα (שֵׁן צָהֹב). **Num. xxiv. 23** \mathfrak{G} prefixes καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν Ἄγ (וַיִּרְאֵהוּ); cf. vv. 20, 21. **Deut. iv. 37** בְּיָרְעוּ אֲחֵרָיו, i.e. Abraham's posterity (Driver, *ad loc.*); \mathfrak{G} τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν μετ' αὐτοὺς ὑμᾶς, i.e. בְּזִרְעָם אַחֵרִים; so Sam. **Josh. xv. 59** \mathfrak{G} + Θεκῶ...πόλεις ἕνδεκα καὶ αἱ κῶμαι αὐτῶν. The omission of these names in \mathfrak{H} is doubtless due to homoioteleuton. **Jud. xiv. 15** הַשְּׂבִיעִי בַיּוֹם. \mathfrak{G} , as the context seems to require, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τετάρτῃ (הַרְבִּיעִי); but see Moore in Haupt, *Sacred Books, ad loc.* **xvi. 13 f.** \mathfrak{G} supplies a long lacuna in \mathfrak{H} (καὶ ἐνκρούσης...τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ) caused by homoioteleuton; on the two Greek renderings of the passage see Moore in Haupt, *ad loc.* **xix. 18** \mathfrak{G} εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ἐγὼ πορεύομαι (\mathfrak{H} אֶת-בֵּית יְהוָה אֲנִי הֹלֵךְ). The final letter of ביתי has probably been taken by \mathfrak{H} for an abbreviation of יהוה. **1 Sam. i. 24** בְּפָרִים שְׁלֹשָׁה, \mathfrak{G} ἐν μύσχα τριετίζοντι, dividing and pronouncing מִשְׁלֹשִׁים. **ii. 33** \mathfrak{G} supplies בַּחֲרָב (ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ) which \mathfrak{H} seems to have lost. **iii. 13** \mathfrak{G} ὅτι κακο-λογοῦντες θεὸν υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ, reading לַהֵם אֱלֹהִים. **iv. 1.** The first clause in \mathfrak{H} is irrelevant in this place, and must either be connected with iii. 21 or struck out altogether. In place of it \mathfrak{G} has the appropriate introduction, καὶ ἐγενήθη...εἰς πόλεμον (וַיְהִי בִימֵים).

¹ Lagarde (*Symmicta* i., p. 57) suggests a form אישבורא.

את-אֲשֶׁר־דָּוִד וְאֵת (ההם ויקבצו פלשתים למלחמה על ישראל v. 6. For אֵת-אֲשֶׁר־דָּוִד וְאֵת Ḥ has καὶ μέσον τῆς χώρας αὐτῆς ἀνεφύησαν μύες. Cf. vi. 4 f., and see Driver and Budde (in Haupt's *Sacred Books*) *ad loc.* H. P. Smith would strike out the reference to mice in both contexts.

vi. 19 וַיִּבְנוּ בֵּית-אֱשֶׁתֶּשֶׁת. Ḥ καὶ οὐκ ἤσμένισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰεχονίου ἐν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν Βαιθσάμυς, where the first six words represent an original of which Ḥ preserves only three letters. Restoration is complicated by the fact that ἀσμενίζειν is ἀπ. λεγ. in the LXX. Klostermann suggests וַיִּבְנוּ בֵּית-אֱשֶׁתֶּשֶׁת וַיִּבְנוּ בֵּית-אֱשֶׁתֶּשֶׁת. Ḥ, more in harmony with the context, καὶ διέστρωσαν τῷ Σαούλ (וירברו לשאול) ἐπὶ τῷ δώματι, καὶ ἐκοιμήθη (וַיִּשְׁכְּבוּ). x. 21 Ḥ + καὶ προσάγουσιν τὴν φυλὴν Ματταρεὶ εἰς ἄνδρας, a clause necessary to the sense. xii. 3 וַיֵּלֶץ עֲיִנָּיו בּוֹ. Ḥ καὶ ὑπόδημα (cf. Gen. xiv. 23, Am. ii. 6, viii. 6); ἀποκρίθητε κατ' ἐμοῦ (וַיֵּלֶץ עֲיִנָּיו). With Ḥ compare Sir. xlvi. 19 χρήματα καὶ ἕως ὑποδημάτων...οὐκ εἴληφα, where for ὑποδ. the newly recovered Hebrew has נעלים 'a secret gift,' leg. fort. נעלים 'a pair of sandals'; see, however, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, p. lxxvii. xii. 8 Ḥ supplies καὶ ἐταπεινώσεν αὐτοὺς Αἴγυπτος, omitted by Ḥ through homoioteleuton. xiv. 18 הָאֵלֹהִים אֲרֹן הַנִּיֶּשֶׁה, Ḥ προσάγαγε τὸ ἐφούδ. "The Ephod, not the ark, was the organ of divination" (Driver).

xiv. 41 f. Ḥ תְּמִים הָהָה. Ḥ^{Luc}, supplying the lacuna, τί ὅτι οὐκ ἀπεκρίθης τῷ δούλῳ σου σήμερον; εἰ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἢ ἐν Ἰωανθάν τῷ υἱῷ μου ἢ ἀδικία; Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, δὸς δῆλους (דִּמְיָא)· καὶ εἰ τὰδε εἵποις Ἐν τῷ λαῷ ἢ ἀδικία, δὸς ὀσιότητα (דִּמְיָא). Similarly in v. 42 Ḥ preserves the words ὃν ἂν κατακληρώσῃται...τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, which Ḥ has lost through homoioteleuton. See the note in Field, *Hexapla*, i. p. 510. xx. 19 הָאֵלֹהִים הָאֵלֹהִים, Ḥ παρὰ τὸ ἐργάβ ἐκείνο = הָאֵלֹהִים הָאֵלֹהִים, 'beside yonder cairn.' Similarly v. 41 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀργάβ = הָאֵלֹהִים הָאֵלֹהִים. 2 Sam. iv. 6. For the somewhat incoherent sentence in Ḥ, Ḥ substitutes καὶ ἰδὸν ἢ θυρωρὸς τοῦ οἴκου ἐκάθαιρεν πυρούς, καὶ ἐνύσταξεν καὶ ἐκάθευδεν—words which explain the incident that follows. xvii. 3 Ḥ ὃν τρόπον ἐπιστρέφει ἡ νύμφη πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς· πλὴν ψυχὴν ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς σὺ ζητεῖς. In the archetype of Ḥ the eye of the scribe has passed from עֵינָא to אֵינָא, and the sentence thus mutilated has been re-arranged. xxiv. 6 וְאֵל-אֲרָץ תַּחְתִּים חֲדָשִׁי. No 'land of Tahtim Hodshi' is known. Ḥ^{Luc} here preserves the true text, εἰς γῆν Χεττιεὶμ Καδῆς

= קדשה = אל ארץ החתים קדשה, 'to the land of the Hittites, even to Kadesh.' For the last word Ewald, followed by H. P. Smith, preferred הרמונה, 'to Hermon.' 1 Kings xvii. 1 התשבי מותשבי ג. לְעָרָה. Ἐ ὁ Θεοσβείτης ἐκ Θεοσβῶν τῆς Γαλααδ ('ג' מותשבן?). 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19 על דְּבָרַי הוֹיָי. Ἐ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων τῶν ὁρώντων (החוזים). Neh. ix. 17 בְּמִצְרַיִם. Ἐ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ (במצרים). Ps. xvi. (xv.) 2 אָמְרָתָה sc. נִפְשִׁי. Ἐ εἶπα (אָמְרָתִי) is manifestly right, and has been admitted into the text by the English Revisers. xxii. 16 (xxi. 17) כָּאֵרֶץ, Aq. ὡς λέων. Ἐ ὄρυσαν (כרו = כרו). xxvii. (xxvi.) 13 לְיֵלֶא (so א) is apparently read by Ἐ as לו, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*, p. 379, and Abbott, *Essays*, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, *ad loc.*) would retain א without the *puncta extraordinaria*. xlii. 5 (xli. 6) Ἐ + [καὶ] ὁ θεός μου, as א in v. 12. xlix. 11 (xlviii. 12) קָרַבַם בְּתִימוּ לְעֹלָם. Ἐ οἱ τάφοι αὐτῶν οἰκίαι αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. lxix. 26 (lxviii. 27) יִסְפְּרוּ, Ἐ προσέθηκον (יוסיפו). lxxii. (lxxi.) 5 יִירְאוּדָה עִם שְׂמִיטָה. Ἐ καὶ συναπαρμενεί (ויאריך) τῶ ἡλίω. ci. (c.) 5 אֶתוּ לֹא אוֹבֵל. Ἐ τούτω οὐ συνήσθιον (אתו לֹא אֵבֶל). Prov. x. 10^b in א is repeated from v. 8^b which has displaced the true ending of v. 10. Ἐ restores the latter (ὁ δὲ ἐλέγχων μετὰ παρρησίας εἰρηνοποιεῖ), and thus supplies the contrast to 10^a which is required to complete the couplet. Jer. vi. 29 נְתַקֵּנוּ לֹא נְתַקֵּנוּ. Ἐ πονηρία[ι] αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐτάκη[σαν] (ורעם לא נִמְק). xi. 15 הֲרַבִּים. Ἐ μὴ εὐχαί...; (הַנְּדָרִים); see however Streane, *Double text*, p. 133. xxiii. 33 אֶת־מִיָּה פִּינָא. Ἐ ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ λῆμμα (dividing and pronouncing אֶת־מִיָּה פִּינָא). Ezek. xlv. 20 בְּשִׁבְעָה בְּהֻרָשׁ. Ἐ ἐν τῷ ἐβδόμῳ μηνί, μιᾷ τοῦ μηνός (הַשְּׁבִיעִי בְּאַחַד לְחֹדֶשׁ). Mal. ii. 3 הִזְרַע. Ἐ τὸν ὄμῳן = הַזְרֹעַ.

(c) In dealing with such differences between the Greek version and the traditional Hebrew text the student will not start with the assumption that the version has preserved the true reading. It may have been preserved by the official Hebrew or its archetype, and lost in the MSS. which were followed by the translators: or it may have been lost by both. Nor will he assume that the Greek, when it differs from the

Hebrew, represents in all cases another Hebrew text; for the difference may be due to the failure of the translators to understand their Hebrew, or to interpret it aright. His first business is to decide whether the Greek variant involves a different Hebrew text, or is simply another expression for the text which lies before him in the printed Hebrew Bible. If the former of these alternatives is accepted, he has still to consider whether the text represented by the LXX. is preferable to that of the Hebrew Bible and probably original. There is a presumption in favour of readings in which **Γ** and **Μ** agree, but, as we have said, not an absolute certainty that they are correct, since they may both be affected by a deep-seated corruption which goes back to the age of the Ptolemies. When they differ, **Γ** will usually deserve to be preferred when it (*a*) fills up a lacuna which can be traced to homoioteleuton in the Hebrew, or (*b*) removes an apparent interpolation, or (*c*) appears to represent a *bona fide* variant in the original, which makes better sense than the existing text. Its claims in these cases are strengthened if it has the support of other early and probably independent witnesses such as the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Targum, or of Hebrew variants which survive in existing MSS. of the Massoretic text, or in the Q'ri¹.

For guidance as to the principles on which the LXX. may be employed in the criticism of the Hebrew Text the student may consult Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griech. Übersetzung der Proverbien*, p. 1 ff.; Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, p. 1 ff.; Robertson Smith, *O. T. in the Jewish Church*², p. 76 ff.; Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. xlvi. f.; H. P. Smith, *Comm. on Samuel*, pp. xxix. ff., 395 ff.; Toy, *Comm. on Proverbs*, p. xxxii. f. See also below, c. vi.

2. In the field of O.T. interpretation the witness of the LXX. must be received with even greater caution. It is evident that Greek-speaking Jews, whose knowledge of Hebrew

¹ On the relation of the LXX. to the Q'ri, see Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 219 ff.

was probably acquired at Alexandria from teachers of very moderate attainments, possess no prescriptive right to act as guides to the meaning of obscure Hebrew words or sentences. Transliterations, doublets, confused and scarcely intelligible renderings, reveal the fact that in difficult passages they were often reduced to mere conjecture. But their guesses may at times be right; and in much that seems to be guesswork they may have been led by gleams of a true tradition. Thus it is never safe to neglect their interpretation, even if in the harder contexts it is seldom to be trusted. Indirectly at least much may be learned from them; and their wildest exegesis belongs to the history of hermeneutics, and has influenced thought and language to a remarkable degree.

(a) The following specimens will serve to illustrate the exegesis of the LXX. in the historical books.

Gen. iv. 1 ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. iv. 7 οὐκ ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλης, ἥμαρτες; ἡσύχασον. vi. 3 οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας. xxx. 11 καὶ εἶπεν Δεῖα Ἐν τύχη· καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Γάδ. xxxvii. 3 ἐποίησεν δὲ αὐτῷ χιτῶνα ποικίλον (cf. 2 Regn. xiii. 18). xli. 43 ἐκήρυξεν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ κήρυξ. xlvii. 31 προσεκύνησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. xlviii. 14 ἐνάλλαξ [D ἐναλλάξας] τὰς χεῖρας. xlix. 6 ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον. 19 Γάδ, πειρατήριον πειρατεύσει αὐτόν· αὐτὸς δὲ πειρατεύσει αὐτῶν κατὰ πόδας. Exod. i. 16 καὶ ὄσω πρὸς τῷ τίκτειν. iii. 14 ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ὢν. xvi. 15 εἶπαν ἕτερος τῷ ἑτέρῳ Τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο; xvii. 15 ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Κύριος καταφυγή μου. xxi. 6 πρὸς τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. xxxii. 32 καὶ νῦν εἰ μὲν ἀφείς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῶν, ἄφες. Lev. xxiii. 3 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατα ἀνάπαισις κλητῆ ἀγία τῷ κυρίῳ. Num. xxiii. 10^b ἀποθάνοι ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν ψυχαῖς δικαίων, καὶ γένοιτο τὸ σπέρμα μου ὡς τὸ σπέρμα τούτων. xxiv. 24 καὶ κακώσουσιν Ἑβραῖους. Deut. xx. 19 μὴ ἄνθρωπος τὸ ξύλον τὸ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, εἰσελθεῖν...εἰς τὸν χάρακα; xxxii. 8 ἔστησεν ὄρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ. 15 ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἡγαπημένος. Jos. v. 2 ποίησον σεαυτῷ μαχαίρας πετρίνας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου. Jud. i. 35 ἤρξατο ὁ Ἀμορραῖος κατοικεῖν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ὄστρακῶδει (A τοῦ μυρσινῶνος), ἐν ᾧ αἱ ἄρκοι καὶ ἐν ᾧ αἱ ἀλώπεκες, ἐν τῷ μυρσινῶνι καὶ ἐν Θαλαβείν (A om. ἐν τῷ μ. κ. ἐν Θ.). viii. 13 ἐπέστρεψεν Γεδεὼν...ἀπὸ ἐπάνωθεν τῆς παρατάξεως Ἄρες (A ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου ἀπὸ ἀναβάσεως Ἄρες). xii. 6 καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ Εἶπον δὴ Στάχυς (A Σύνθημα). xv. 14 ff. ἦλθον ἕως Σιαγόνοσ...καὶ εὗρεν

σιαγόνα ὄνου...καὶ ἔρρηξεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν λάκκον τὸν ἐν τῇ Σιαγόνῃ...διὰ τοῦτο ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Πηγὴ τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου, ἢ ἔστιν ἐν

Σιαγόνῃ. xviii. 30 υἱὸς Γηρσοῦ υἱὸς (Α υἱοῦ) Μανασσή (מנשה: on the *suspensum* see Moore in comm. on *Sacred Books*, ad loc.). 1 Regn. x. 5 οὐ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ τὸ ἀνάστημα τῶν ἀλλοφύλων· ἐκεῖ Νασειβ ὁ ἀλλοφύλος. xiii. 21 καὶ ἦν ὁ τρυγητὸς ἔτοιμος τοῦ θερίζειν· τὰ δὲ σκευὴ ἦν τρεῖς σίκλοι εἰς τὸν ὀδόντα, καὶ τῇ ἀξίνῃ, καὶ τῷ δρεπάνῳ ὑπόστασις ἦν ἡ αὐτή. xx. 30 υἱὲ κορασίῶν αὐτομολούντων (Luc. + γυναικοτραφῆ). xxvii. 10 κατὰ νότον τῆς Ἰουδαίας. xxxi. 10 ἀνέθηκαν τὰ σκευὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ Ἀσαρτεῖον. 2 Regn. i. 21 θυρεὸς Σαοὺλ οὐκ ἐχρίσθη ἐν ἐλαίῳ. xii. 31 διήγαγεν (Α ἀπήγαγεν) αὐτοὺς διὰ τοῦ πλινθείου (Luc. περιήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐν μαδεββά). xx. 6 μὴ ποτε...σκιάζει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡμῶν. xxiv. 15 ἀπὸ πρωῒθεν [καί] ἕως ὥρας ἀρίστου. 3 Regn. xiii. 12 καὶ δεικνύουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ὁδόν. 4 Regn. i. 2 f. ἐπιζητήσατε ἐν τῷ Βάαλ μύϊαν θεὸν Ἀκκαρῶν (Luc. ἐπερωτήσατε διὰ τοῦ Βάαλ μύϊαν προσόχθισμα θεὸν Ἀκκαρῶν). viii. 13 τίς ἐστιν ὁ δούλος σου, ὁ κύων ὁ τεθηγκῶς, ὅτι ποιήσει τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο; xxiii. 22 f. οὐκ ἐγενήθη [κατὰ] τὸ πάσχα τοῦτο ἀφ' ἡμερῶν τῶν κριτῶν...ὅτι ἀλλ' ἢ τῷ ὀκτωκαιδέκῳ ἔτει τοῦ βασιλείως Ἰωσεία ἐγενήθη τὸ πάσχα [τοῦτο] (cf. 2 Chr. xxxv. 18).

(b) The translated titles of the Psalms form a special and interesting study. The details are collected below, and can be studied with the help of the commentaries, or of Neubauer's article in *Studia Biblica* ii. p. 1 ff.¹

Ψαλμός, מְנוּחָה *passim* (מְנוּחָה in Ps. vii., שִׁיר in Ps. xlv. (xlv.)).

Ῥοδή, שִׁיר *passim* (מְנוּחָה in Ps. iv., מְנוּחָה in Ps. ix. 17).

Ψαλμός ὠδῆς, שִׁיר מְנוּחָה Pss. xxix., xlvii., lxvii., lxxiv., lxxxii., lxxxvi., xc. i., xciii. (A); ὠδὴ ψαλμοῦ, שִׁיר מְנוּחָה or מְנוּחָה שִׁיר (lxv., lxxxii., lxxxvii., cvii.).

Προσευχή, מְנוּחָה (Pss. xvi., lxxxv., lxxxix., ci., cxli.).

Ἀλληλουῖα, מְנוּחָה (Pss. civ.—cvi., cx.—cxiv., cxvi., cxvii., cxxxiv., cxxxv., cxlv., cxlvi., cxlviii.—cl.).

Λῆσεις, מְנוּחָה (Ps. cxliv.).

Στηλογραφία, εἰς στηλογραφίαν, מְנוּחָה (Pss. xv., lv.—lix.). Aq. τοῦ ταπεινόφρονος καὶ ἀπλοῦ, Th. τοῦ ταπ. καὶ ἀμώμου.

Εἰς τὸ τέλος, מְנוּחָה (Pss. iv.—xiii., xvii., xviii., xxi., xxix., xxx., xxxv.—lx. i., lxiii.—lxix., lxxiv.—lxxvi., lxxix., lxxx., lxxxiii.,

¹ The titles which are given in the LXX. but are wanting in **ft**, have been enumerated in Pt. II. c. ii. (p. 250 ff.).

- lxxxiv., lxxxvii., cii., cviii., cxxxviii., cxxxix.). Cf. Aq. τὰ νικοποιῶ, Symm. ἐπινίκιος, Th. eis τὸ νίκος.
- Ἐν ὕμνοις, בְּנִינֹת (Pss. vi., liii., liv., lx., lxvi., lxxv.).
- Ἐν ψαλμοῖς, בְּנִינֹת (Ps. iv.).
- Ἐπὲρ τῆς κληρονομουσίας, (?) לְהַלְהִילֹת (Ps. v.). Aq. ἀπὸ κληροδοσιῶν, Symm. ὑπὲρ κληρουχιῶν.
- Ἐπὲρ τῆς ὀγδόης, עַל־הַיָּמִינִי (Pss. vi., xi.).
- Ἐπὲρ τῶν λόγων Χουσεὶ υἱοῦ Ἰεμενεί, עַל־דְּבָרֵי־כֹהֵן־יְיָ (Ps. vii.). Aq., Symm., Th. περί, κτλ.
- Ἐπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν, עַל־הַגְּתִי (Pss. viii., lxxx., lxxxiii.). Aq., Th. ὑπὲρ τῆς γεθθίδος.
- Ἐπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ, עַל־מַוֹתֵי־לֵבַי (Ps. ix.; cf. xlv.). Aq. ὑπὲρ νεανιότητος τοῦ υἱοῦ, Th. ὑπὲρ ἀκμῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ, Symm. περὶ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ.
- Ἐπὲρ τοῦ ἀντιλήψεως τῆς ἐωθινῆς, עַל־אֲנִילַת־הַשָּׁחַר (Ps. xxi.). Aq. ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλάφου τῆς ὀρθρινῆς. Symm. ὑπὲρ τῆς βοθηείας τῆς ὀρθρ.
- Ἐπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων, עַל־שִׁשְׁבַּיִם (Pss. xlv., lix., lxxviii., lxxix.). Aq. ἐπὶ τοῖς κρίνοις, Symm. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθῶν, Th. ὑπὲρ τῶν κρίνων.
- Ἐπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ (ᾠδὴ), יְיָ־יְדִוּת (רִשׁ) (Ps. xlv.). Aq. ᾄσμα προσφιλίας, Symm. ᾄσμα εἰς τὸν ἀγαπητόν, Th. τοῖς ἡγαπημένοις.
- Ἐπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μεμακρυσμένον, עַל־יוֹנַת־אֱלֹם־רְחֻקִים (Ps. lv.). Aq. ὑπὲρ περιστερᾶς ἀλάλου μακρυσμῶν. Symm. ὑπὲρ τῆς περιστερᾶς ὑπὸ τοῦ φίλου αὐτοῦ ἀπωσμένου. Ε'. ὑπὲρ τῆς π. τῆς μογγυλάλου κεκρυσμένων.
- Ἐπὲρ Ἰδιθούν, עַל־יְדִוּתֹוֹ (Pss. xxxviii., lxi., lxxvi.).
- Ἐπὲρ μαελέθ (τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι), עַל־מַחְלַת־שְׁעָרַי (Pss. lii., lxxxvii.). Aq. ἐπὶ χορεία (Symm. διὰ χοροῦ) τοῦ ἐξάρχειν.
- Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, לְיָזְכִיר (Ps. xxxvii., lxix.).
- Εἰς ἐξομολόγησιν, לְתוֹדָה (Ps. xcix.). Aq. εἰς εὐχαριστίαν.
- Εἰς σύνεσιν, συνέσεως, מִשְׁבִּילִי (Pss. xxxi., xli.—xliv., li.—liii., lxxiii., lxxxvii., lxxxviii., cxli.). Aq. ἐπιστήμονος, ἐπιστήμης, ἐπιστημοσύνης.
- Μὴ διαφθείρης, אַל־תִּפְתְּרֵנִי (Pss. lvi.—lviii., lxxiv.). Symm. (Ps. lxxiv.) περὶ ἀφθαρσίας.

Τοῦ ἐνκαλισμοῦ τοῦ οἴκου, תִּבְנֶה־תִּבְנֶה (Ps. xxix.).

Τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν, תִּלְוַיִּזְוֶה (Pss. cxix.—cxxxiii.). Aq., Symm., Th.
τῶν ἀναβάσεων, εἰς τὰς ἀναβάσεις.

It may be added that הַדֶּשֶׁת¹ (Pss. iii. 3, 5, iv. 3, 5, vii. 6, &c., &c.) is uniformly διάφασμα in the LXX.; Aq. renders it αἰεῖ, Symm. and Th. agree with the LXX. except that in Ps. ix. 17 αἰεῖ is attributed to Th. In the Psalm of Habakkuk (Hab. iii. 3) Symm. renders εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Th. εἰς τέλος, and in v. 13 εἰς τέλος has found its way into copies of the LXX. (cf. S^{c.a}, and Jerome: "ipsi LXX. rerum necessitate compulsi...nunc transtulerunt in finem").

(c) Exegetical help is sometimes to be obtained from a guarded use of the interpretation affixed by the LXX. (1) to obscure words, especially ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, and (2) to certain proper names. Some examples of both are given below.

(1) Gen. i. 2 ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος. 6 στερέωμα. iii. 8 τὸ δειλινόν. 15 τηρήσει...τηρήσεις. vi. 2 οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Deut. xxxii. 8, Job i. 6, ii. 1). 4 οἱ γίγαντες. viii. 21 διανοηθεῖς. xii. 2 τὸν ἀγαπητόν. xlix. 10 ἠγούμενος. Exod. vi. 12 ἄλογος. viii. 21 κυνόμνια. xii. 22 ὕσσωπος. xv. 29 ἄρτοι ἐνώπιοι (cf. ἄ. προκειμένοι cxxix. 18=36, ἄ. τοῦ προσώπου 1 Regn. xxi. 6). xxviii. 15 λόγιον, Vulg. *rationale*. Exod. xxxiv. 13 τὰ ἄλση Vulg. *lucii*, A.V. *groves*. Lev. xvi. 8 ff. ὁ ἀποπομπαῖος, ἡ ἀποπομπή. Deut. x. 16 σκληροκαρδία. Jud. xix. 22 νιοὶ παρανόμων (cf. νιοὶ λοιμοὶ 1 Regn. ii. 12, and other renderings, which employ ἀνομία, ἀνόμημα, ἀποστασία, ἀσεβής, ἄφρων). 2 Regn. i. 18 τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ εὐθούς. 3 Regn. x. 11 ξύλα πελεκητά (cf. 2 Chr. ii. 8, ix. 10f. ξ. πεύκινα). Ps. viii. 6 παρ' ἀγγέλους. xv. 9 ἡ γλῶσσά μου. xvi. 8 κόρα ὀφθαλμοῦ. 1. 14 πνεῦμα ἡγεμονικόν. cxxxviii. 15 ἡ ὑπόστασις μου. 16 τὸ ἀκατέργαστόν σου. Prov. ii. 18 παρὰ τῷ ἄδῃ μετὰ τῶν γηγενῶν (a doublet). Job ix. 9 Πλειάδα καὶ Ἑσπερον καὶ Ἀρκτοῦρον (cf. xxxviii. 31). Zeph. i. 10 ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας (cf. 4 Regn. xxii. 14). Isa. xxxviii. 8 (4 Regn. xxii.) τοὺς δέκα ἀναβαθμούς. Ezech. xiii. 18 προσκεφάλαια, ἐπιβόλαια.

(2) *Abarim*, mountains of, אֲבָרִים הַרְרֵי, τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἐν τῷ πέραν, Num. xxvii. 12 (cf. xxi. 11, xxxiii. 44). *Agagite*, Βουγαῖος, Esth. iii. 1, A 17 (xii. 6); Μακεδών, E (xvi.) 10. *Ararat*, land of, אֲרָרָתְ אֲרָרָת, Ἀρμενία, Isa. xxxvii. 38. *Ash'toreth* אֲשֶׁת־וְיָעִ, Ἀστάρτη

¹ On this word see an article by C. A. Briggs, in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1899, p. 132 ff., and art. *Selah*, in Hastings, *D.B.* iv.

(the Phoenician 'Ashtart), Jud. ii. 13, 4 Regn. xxiii. 13. *Baca*, valley of, אֲשַׁתַּרְתִּי אֲשַׁתַּרְתִּי, ἡ κοιλὰς τοῦ κλαυθμῶνος, Ps. lxxxiii. 7 (cf. Jud. ii. 5, 2 Regn. v. 24, 1 Chr. xiv. 14). *Caphtor*, *Caphtorim*, Καππαδοκία, Καππάδοκες, Deut. ii. 23, Am. ix. 7. *Cherethites*, דְּרָתִים, Κρητες, Zeph. ii. 5, Ezech. xxv. 16. *Dodanim*, דְּדָנִים, Ῥόδιοι (Ῥοῖοι), Gen. x. 4. *Enhakkore* אֲחַכּוֹרֵי, Πηγὴ τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου, Jud. xv. 19. *Ichabod*, אִיכָבֹד, οὐαὶ βαρξαβώθ (?=אוי ברךְבֹּת, Wellh.), 1 Regn. iv. 21. *Favan*, ἡ Ἑλλάς, Isa. lxvi. 19 (cf. Joel iii. 6). *Jehovah-nissi*, Κύριος καταφυγή μου, Exod. xvii. 15. *Keren-happuch*, קֶרֶן הַפְּיָח, Ἀμαθείας κέρας, Job xlii. 14. *Kiriath-sepher*, קִרְיַת סֵפֶר, πόλις γραμμάτων, Jos. xv. 15 f., *Macpelah*, מַכְפֵּלָה, τὸ σπήλαιον τὸ διπλοῦν, Gen. xxiii. 17, 19 (xxv. 9, xlix. 30, 1. 13). *Moriah*, land of, אֶרֶץ מוֹרְיָה, ἡ γῆ ἡ ὑψηλή, Gen. xxii. 2. *Pisgah*, פִּסְגָּה, τὸ λελαξευμένον, Num. xxi. 20, xxiii. 14, Deut. iii. 27 (cf. Deut. iv. 49). *Zaanaim*, plain of, אֶרֶץ צַעֲנַנַיִם, δρῦς πλεονεκτούντων (B), δρ. ἀναπαυομένων (A), Jud. iv. 11 (cf. Moore, *ad loc.*). *Zaphnath-paaneah*, זַפְנַת פָּאֲנֵה, Ψονθομφανήχ, Gen. xli. 45 (Ball, *ad loc.* compares Egypt. sut' a en pa-ānχ). *Pharaoh-Hophra*, פַּרְעֹה הֹפְרָא, ὁ Οὐαφρή, Jer. li. (xliv.) 30 (cf. W. E. Crum in Hastings, *D. B.* ii. p. 413).

B. The Septuagint is not less indispensable to the study of the New Testament than to that of the Old. But its importance in the former field is more often overlooked, since its connexion with the N.T. is less direct and obvious, except in the case of express quotations from the Alexandrian version¹. These, as we have seen, are so numerous that in the Synoptic Gospels and in some of the Pauline Epistles they form a considerable part of the text. But the New Testament has been yet more widely and more deeply influenced by the version through the subtler forces which shew themselves in countless allusions, lying oftentimes below the surface of the words, and in the use of a vocabulary derived from it, and in many cases prepared by it for the higher service of the Gospel.

¹ On the quotations see above p. 392 ff.

1. The influence of the LXX. over the writings of the N.T. is continually shewn in combinations of words or in trains of thought which point to the presence of the version in the background of the writer's mind, even when he may not consciously allude to it.

This occurs frequently (*a*) in the sayings of our Lord, where, if He spoke in Aramaic, the reference to the LXX. is due to the translator: e.g. Mt. v. 3 ff. μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ...οἱ πενθοῦντες... οἱ πραεῖς (Isa. lxi. 1 ff., Ps. xxxvi. 11). vi. 6 εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ ταμεῖόν σου (Isa. xxvi. 20). x. 21, 35 ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς...ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι...θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφην κτλ. (Mic. vii. 6). xxi. 33 ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν κτλ. (Isa. v. 2). Mc. ix. 48 βληθῆναι εἰς γέενναν ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται (Isa. lxvi. 24). Jo. i. 51 ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεωγῶτα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας (Gen. xxviii. 12); (*b*) in the translated evangelical record: Mc. vii. 32 φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μογιάλον...καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμός κτλ. (Isa. xxxv. 5 f., xlii. 7). xv. 29 οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς: cf. Lc. xxiii. 35 ἰσθίκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν· ἐξεμυκτήριζον δὲ κτλ. (Ps. xxi. 8, Isa. li. 23, Lam. ii. 15); (*c*) in the original Greek writings of the N.T., where allusions of this kind are even more abundant; 1 Pet. ii. 9 ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλείου ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε κτλ. (Exod. xix. 5 f., xxiii. 22 f., Isa. xliii. 20). iii. 14 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ παραχθῆτε, κύριον δὲ τὸν χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν (Isa. viii. 12 f.). Rom. xii. 17 προσοῦμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων: cf. 2 Cor. viii. 21 προσοῦμεν γὰρ καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον Κυρίου ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων (Prov. iii. 4; in Rom. *l. c.* this allusion is preceded by another to Prov. iii. 7). 2 Cor. iii. 3 ff.: Exod. xxxi., xxxiv. (LXX.) are in view throughout this context. Eph. ii. 17 εὐηγγελίσασθε εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς (Isa. lvii. 19, cf. lii. 7, lxi. 1). Phil. i. 19 οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι τοῦτό μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν (Job xiii. 16). Heb. vi. 8 γῆ... ἐκφέρουσα... ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους...κατάρas ἐγγύς (Gen. iii. 17).

These are but a few illustrations of a mental habit everywhere to be observed in the writers of the N.T., which shews them to have been not only familiar with the LXX., but saturated with its language. They used it as Englishmen use

the Authorised Version of the Bible, working it into the texture of their thoughts and utterances. It is impossible to do justice to their writings unless this fact is recognised, i.e., unless the reader is on the watch for unsuspected references to the Greek O.T., and able to appreciate its influence upon his author's mind.

2. To what extent the vocabulary of the N.T. has been influenced by the LXX. is matter of keen controversy. In a weighty essay *On the Value and Use of the Septuagint* Dr Hatch has maintained that "the great majority of N.T. words are words which, though for the most part common to Biblical and to contemporary secular Greek, express in their Biblical use the conceptions of a Semitic race, and which must consequently be examined by the light of the cognate documents which form the LXX."¹ This statement, which has been hotly contested, may conveniently form the basis of our discussion of the subject.

(a) "The great majority of N.T. words are...common to Biblical and contemporary secular Greek." This is certainly true. Thus Dr H. A. A. Kennedy² enumerates about 150 words out of over 4800 in the N.T. which are "strictly peculiar to the LXX. and N.T." The list is as follows:

ἀγαθοποιεῖν, ἀγαθωσύνη, ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, ἀγαλλίασις, ἀγιάζειν, ἀγασμός, ἀγωσύνη, αἴνεσις, ἀκρογωνιαίος, αἰχμαλωτεύειν, ἀλίσγημα, ἀλληλουιά, ἀλλογενής, ἀμέθυστος, ἀμήν, ἀμφιάζειν, ἀναζωννύειν, ἀναθεματίζειν, ἀνεξιχνίαστος, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, ἀνταπόδομα, ἀποδεκατοῦν, ἀποκάλυψις, ἀποκεφαλίζειν, ἀποφθέγγεσθαι, βάτος, βδέλυγμα, βεβηλοῦν, βροχή, γέεννα, γνώστης, γογγύζειν, γυμνότης, δεκατοῦν, δεκτός, διαγογγύζειν, δολιοῦν, δότης, δυναμοῦν, ἐβδομηκοντάκις, εἰρηνοποιεῖν, ἐκζητεῖν, ἐκμυκτηρίζειν, ἐκπειράζειν, ἐκπορευεῖν, ἐκριζοῦν, ἐλεγμός, ἐλεγκσις, ἐμπαιγμός, ἐμπαικτής, ἔναντι, ἐνδιδύσκειν, ἐνδοξάζειν, ἐνδυναμοῦν, ἐνευλογεῖν, ἐνκαινίζειν, ἔνταλμα, ἐνταφιάζειν, ἐνώπιον, ἐνωτίζεσθαι, ἐξάπινα, ἐξαστράπτειν, ἐξολεθρεύειν, ἐξουθενοῦν, ἐξυπνίζειν, ἐπαύριον, ἐπισκοπή, ἐπαναπαύειν, ἐπιγαμβρεύειν, ἐπιφαύσκειν, ἐρήμωσις, εὐδοκία, ἐφημερία, ἥττημα,

¹ *Essays*, p. 34.

² *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 88.

θέλῃσις, ἱερατεύειν, ἱεράτευμα, καθαρίζειν, καθαρισμός, κατακαυχᾶσθαι, κατακληρονομεῖν, κατάνυξις, κατανύσσειν, κατενώπιον, κατοικητήριον, καύχῃσις, καύχῃσις, κλυδωνίζεσθαι, κόρος, κραταιοῦν, λαξευτός, λειτουργικός, λύτρωσις, μακροθυμεῖν, μάννα, ματαιότης, ματαιοῦν, μεγαλειότης, μεγαλωσύνη, μετοικεῖν, μίσθιος, μογιλάλος, μοιχαλῖς, νίκος, ὀλεθρεύειν, ὀλιγόψυχος, ὀλοκληρία, ὀπτάνειν, ὀπτασία, ὀρθοτομεῖν, ὀρθρίζειν, ὀρκωμοσία, οὐαί, παγιδεύειν, παραζηλοῦν, παραπικρασμός, παροικία, παροργισμός, πατριάρχης, πειρασμός, περικάθαρμα, περιούσιος, περισσεία, πληροφορεῖν, πρόσκομμα, προσοχθίζειν, πρωινός, ῥαντίζειν, ῥαντισμός, σαβαώθ, σάββατον, σαγήνη, σατανᾶς, σάτον, σητόβρωτος, σίκερα, σκάνδαλον, σκληροκαρδία, σκληροτράχηλος, στήκειν, στυγνάζειν, συνεγείρειν, ταπεινόφρων, ὑπακοή, ὑπάντησις, ὑπολήνιον, ὑπεροψοῦν, ὑστέρημα, φωστήρ, χερουβείμ, ψιθυρισμός, ὦτιον.

Since the publication of Dr Kennedy's book some of these words (e.g. γογγύζειν, λειτουργικός¹) have been detected in early papyri, and as fresh documents are discovered and examined, the number of 'Biblical' Greek words will doubtless be still further diminished. Indeed the existence of such a class of words may be almost entirely due to accidental causes, such as the loss of contemporary Hellenistic literature.

(b) On the other hand it must not be forgotten that the Greek vocabulary of Palestinian Greek-speaking Jews in the first century A.D. was probably derived in great part from their use of the Greek Old Testament. Even in the case of writers such as St Luke, St Paul, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the LXX. has no doubt largely regulated the choice of words. A very considerable number of the words of the N.T. seem to have been suggested by that version, or in any case may be elucidated from it.

E.g.: ἀγαθωσύνη, ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, ἀγνίζειν, ἀγρυπνεῖν, αἰνιγμα, αἰρετίζειν, ἀλαζονεύεσθαι, ἀλλογενής, ἀδιαλείπτως, ἀμάραντος, ἀμείριμος, ἀμφίβληστρον, ἀμφοδον, ἀπελπίζειν, ἀπερίμητος, ἀπλότης, ἀπόκρυφος, βδέλυγμα, γλωσσόκομον, γνωρίζειν, διάδημα, δίδραγμα, δίστομος, διυλίζειν, δωρεάν, ἐναγκαλίζεσθαι, ἐνταφιάζειν, ἐνωπίζεσθαι, ἐορτάζειν, ἐξέφνης, ἐξουδενοῦν, εὐκόλος, εὐδοοῦν, θεοσέβεια, ἱκανοῦσθαι, ἱκανός, ἱκμάς, ἰστορεῖν, καμμύειν, κατάγελως, καταδυναστεύειν, κατακλυσμός, κατακυριεύειν, καταποντίζειν, καταφιλεῖν, καυχᾶσθαι, κλάσμα, κοράσιον, κόφινος, λιθόστρωτος, λικμᾶν, μεσονύκτιον, μογιλάλος, μυκτηρίζειν, νεομηνία, νίκος, νυστάζειν, οἰκουμένη (ἡ), ὀμοθυμα-

¹ Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 106, 138.

δόν, ὑστράκιος, παγιδεύειν, παιδάριον, παραδειγματίζειν, παρακοίειν, παρεπίδημος, πάροικος, περικεφαλαία, περιλυπος, περίχωρος, περίψημα, πηρα, πλεονάζειν, πολυλογία, πολυπραγμονεῖν, προσήλυτος, προσκεφάλαιον, ράπισμα, ρύμη, σαγήνη, σίκερα, σίνδων, σκόλοψ, στενοχωρία, συλλογίζεσθαι, συμβιβάζειν, σύμφυτος, ταμ(ι)εῖον, τετράδραχμον, τρυμαλία, τυμπανίζειν, ὑπογραμμός, φιμοῦν, χορτάζειν, χρηματίζειν, ψευδοπροφήτης. To these may be added a considerable class of words which are based on LXX. words though they do not occur in the LXX. ; e.g. : ἀπροσωπολήμπτως, βάπτισμα (-μός), δαμονίζεσθαι, πνευματικός, σαρκικός, ψευδόχριστος.

(c) The influence of the LXX. is still more clearly seen in the N.T. employment of religious words and phrases which occur in the LXX. at an earlier stage in the history of their use. The following list will supply illustrations of these :

ἀγάπη, ἀγαπητός, ἀγιάζειν, ἁγιασμός, ἀδελφός, ἀδόκιμος, αἴρεις, αἰσθητήριον, ἀκρογωνιαίος, ἀνάθεμα, ἀναζωπυρεῖν, ἀνακαινίζειν, ἀναστροφή, ἀνατολή, ἀνεξιχνίαστος, ἀπαρχή, ἀπαύγασμα, ἄφεςις, ἀφορίζειν, βαπτίζειν, βεβαίωσις, βλασφημείν, γαζοφυλάκιον, γέεννα, γραμματεὺς, γρηγορεῖν, δαιμόνιον, διαθήκη, δόγμα, ἔθνη, εἰρηνικός, εἰρηνοποιεῖν, ἐκκλησία, ἔκστασις, ἐλεημοσύνη, ἐνέργεια, ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, ἐξουσία, ἐπερώτημα, ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπισυνάγειν, ἐπιφάνεια, ἐπιχορηγεῖν, ἔτοιμασις, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, εὐαρεστεῖν, εὐδοκία, εὐλάβεια, ζηλωτής, ζωγονεῖν, θέλημα, θρησκεία, ἱλασμός, ἱλαστήριον, Ἰουδαϊσμός, καταλλαγή, κατάνυξις, κήρυγμα, κυβέρνησις, Κύριος, λειτουργεῖν, λόγος, λοιμός, λυτροῦσθαι, μεγαλειότης, μεγαλωσύνη, μεταμέλεια, μετεωρίζεσθαι, μονογενής, μορφή, μυστήριον, νεόφυτος, δολόκληρος, ὀρθοτομεῖν, ὀσιότης, παραβολή, παράδεισος, πάροικος, πειρασμός, περιούσιος, περιοχή, περιποιεῖσθαι, πίστις, πληροφοροεῖσθαι, πλήρωμα, πνεῦμα, πρεσβύτερος, προσάγειν, ῥύεσθαι, σάρξ, σκάνδαλον, σκληροτράχηλος, σεμνός, συνείδησις, σφραγίζειν, σωτηρία, τάρταρος, ὑπόστασις, ὑστέρημα, Ὑψιστος, φιλάνθρωπος, φῶς, χαρακτήρ, χειρόγραφον, χριστός. Many of the characteristic phrases of the N.T. also have their roots in the LXX., e.g. εἰκὼν θεοῦ (Gen. i. 26), ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας (viii. 21), πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος (xxiii. 4), πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον (xxxii. 30), λαὸς περιούσιος (Exod. xix. 5), δόξα Κυρίου (xl. 29), θυσία αἰνέσεως (Lev. vii. 2), λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον (xix. 15), ἡ διασπορά (Deut. xxx. 4), γενεὰ διεστραμμένη, σκολιά (xxxii. 5), μὴ γένοιτο (Jos. xxii. 29), ἴλεως σοι (2 Regn. xx. 20), μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον (xxvi. 20), διάβολος (1 Chron. xxi. 1), τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (Ps. xcvi. 3), ᾧδὴ καινὴ, ὄνομα καινόν, and the like (Ps. cxliii. 9, Isa. lxii. 2, &c.), Κύριος ὁ παντοκράτωρ (Am. ix. 5), δοῦλος Κυρίου (Jon. i. 9), τράπεζα Κυρίου (Mal. i. 7), ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς (Isa. x. 3), ἡμέρα Κυρίου (xiii. 6, 9), ὁ παῖς [τοῦ θεοῦ] (xli. 8, &c.), ἐγὼ εἰμι (xliii. 10), ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς

(xliv. 1), τὰ πετεῶνά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Ezech. xxxi. 6), ὁ Γῶγ καὶ Μαγῶγ (xxxviii. 2).

The non-canonical books have their full share in the contribution which the Septuagint makes to the vocabulary of the N.T. Many Biblical words either occur for the first time in the O.T. 'Apocrypha,' or reach there a further stage in the history of their use, or appear in new combinations. The following examples will repay examination: αἰών, ἀπαύγασμα, ἀποκάλυψις, ἀποστολή, ἀσύνετος, ἄφεις, βαπτίζειν, βασιλεία (τοῦ θεοῦ), δαιμόνιον, διακονία, διαπονεῖσθαι, δικαιοῦν, ἔκβασις, ἐκλεκτός, ἐμβατεύειν, ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπιστροφή, ἐπιτιμία, ἐπιφάνεια, εὐσπλαγχνος, εὐχαριστία, ἴδιος, ἰλασμός, ἰλαστήριον, κανών, κλῆρος, κληροῦν, κοινός, κοινοῦν, κόσμος, κτίσις, λειτουργία, λειτουργός, μυστήριον (τοῦ θεοῦ), νόμος, παρουσία, πενήτηκοστή, σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, σκανδαλίζειν, συμπάθεια, συμπάθειν, σωτήρ, χάρις καὶ ἔλεος, χριστός.

(d) "The great majority of N.T. words and phrases express...the conceptions of a Semitic race, and...must consequently be examined by the light of...the LXX." But the connotation will usually be found to have undergone considerable changes, both in ordinary words and in those which are used in a religious sense. In order to trace the process by which the transition has been effected the N.T. student must begin with an investigation into the practice of the LXX. Such an enquiry may be of service in determining the precise meaning which is to be given to the word in the N.T., but it will more frequently illustrate the growth of religious thought or of social life which has led to a change of signification. Dr Hatch indeed laid down as "almost self-evident" canons the two propositions (1) that "a word which is used uniformly, or with few and intelligible exceptions, as the translation of the same Hebrew word, must be held to have in Biblical Greek the same meaning as that Hebrew word"; and (2) that "words which are used interchangeably as translations of the same Hebrew word, or group of cognate words, must be held to have in Biblical Greek an allied or virtually identical meaning¹." These principles led him to

¹ *Essays*, p. 35.

some remarkable departures from the traditional interpretation of N.T. words (e.g. ἀρετή = ἡθῆ or ἡἐθῆ = δόξα, ἔπαινος; διάβολος = ἰφῖψ = 'enemy'; ὁμοθυμαδόν = ἰθῆ, ἑπῆ = 'together'; πτωχοί = πένητες = πραεῖς = ταπεινοί = 'fellahin'; πονηρός, malicious, mischievous; ὑποκριτής, the equivalent of πονηρός, πανούργος, and the like). A searching examination of these views will be found in Dr T. K. Abbott's essay *On N.T. Lexicography*¹. The πρῶτον ψεῦδος of Dr Hatch's canons lies in his use of the term 'Biblical Greek' as inclusive of the pre-Christian Greek of the Alexandrian translators, and the Palestinian Greek of the Apostolic age. While it is evident that the writers of the N.T. were largely indebted to the Alexandrian version for their Greek vocabulary, we cannot safely assume that they attached to the Greek words and phrases which they borrowed from it the precise significance that belonged to them in the older book. Allowance must be made for altered circumstances, and in particular for the influence of the Gospel, which threw new meaning into the speech as well as the life of men. One or two instances will shew the truth of this remark. Ἀγάπη in the LXX. rarely rises above the lower sense of the sexual passion, or at best the affection of human friendship; the exceptions are limited to the Greek Book of Wisdom (Sap. iii. 9, vi. 18²). But in the N.T., where the word is far more frequent, it is used only of the love of God for men, or of men for God or Christ, or for the children of God as such. Ἐκκλησία in the LXX. is the congregation of Israel; in the N.T., except perhaps in Mt. xviii. 17, it is the new community founded by Christ³, viewed in different aspects and with many shades of meaning. Εὐαγγέλιον in the LXX. occurs only in the plural, and perhaps only

¹ *Essays*, p. 65 ff.

² Ἀγάπησις occurs in the sense of Divine love (Hos. xi. 4, Zeph. iii. 17, Jer. xxxi. 3).

³ See Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 9 f.

in the classical sense of 'a reward for good tidings' (2 Regn. iv. 10); in the N.T. it is from the first appropriated to the Messianic good tidings (Mc. i. 1, 14), probably deriving this new meaning from the use of *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* in Isa. xl. 9, lii. 7, lx. 6, lxi. 1.

Thus on the whole it is clear that caution must be used in employing the practice of the LXX. to determine the connotation of N.T. words. On the one hand the interpreter ought not to be led astray by visions of the solidarity of 'Biblical Greek,' for the Greek of the N.T., though in fact largely derived from the Greek of the LXX., has in not a few instances cast off the traditions of its source under the inspiration of another age. On the other hand, the student of the N.T. will make the LXX. his starting-point in examining the sense of all words and phrases which, though they may have been used in classical Greek or by the *κοινή*, passed into Palestinian use through the Greek Old Testament, and in their passage received the impress of Semitic thought and life. Bishop Pearson's judgement on this point is still fully justified: "LXXviralis versio...ad Novum Instrumentum recte intelligendum et accurate explicandum perquam necessaria est...in illam enim omnes idiotismi veteris linguae Hebraicae erant transfusi...multa itaque Graeca sunt in Novo Foedere vocabula quae ex usu Graecae linguae intelligi non possunt, ex collatione autem Hebraea et ex usu LXX. interpretum facile intelliguntur¹."

II. The Greek versions of the second century A.D. are in many respects of less importance to the Biblical student than the Septuagint. Not only are they later by two to four centuries, but they exist only in a fragmentary state, and the text of the fragments is often insecure. But there are services which they can render when rightly employed, and which the careful student will not forget to demand.

¹ *Praef. paraen.*, ed. E. Churton, p. 22 f.

1. Each of these versions has characteristics of its own, which must be taken into account in estimating its value.

(a) Aquila represents the official Hebrew text in its earliest stage, and his extreme literalness and habit of translating ἐτυμολογικῶς¹ render it easy to recover the text which lay before him. In the large fragments of 3 and 4 Regn. published by Mr Burkitt, Aquila's Hebrew text differs from that of the printed Bibles only in thirteen readings², an average of one variant in every second verse. Still more important is Aquila's reflexion of the exegetical tradition of the school of Jamnia. Here as in his text he is often in direct opposition to the LXX., and serves as a useful makeweight against the influence of the Alexandrian interpretation. Especially is this the case in regard to the meaning of obscure words, which Aquila translates with a full knowledge of both languages and of other Semitic tongues³, whilst the LXX. too often depended upon guess-work. This merit of Aquila was recognised by Jerome, who makes use of his interpretations in the Vulgate⁴. Moreover the influence which his work has exercised over the text of the LXX. renders it important to the textual critic of the older Greek version⁵. (b) The paraphrasing manner of Symmachus hinders the free use of his version either for textual or hermeneutical purposes. But it is often interesting as revealing the exegetical tendencies of his school, and its fulness serves to correct the extreme literalness of Aquila. Jerome used it for his Vulgate even more freely than he used Aquila; cf. Field, *Hexapla* i., p. xxxiv. "quem tam presse secutus est magnus ille interpres Latinus...ut aliquando nobis successerit ex Hieronymi Latinis Symmachi Graeca...satis probabiliter extricare." (c) Theodotion, besides contributing a whole book to the *textus*

¹ See above, p. 40.

² Cf. *Aquila*, p. 16 f.

³ Field, *Hexapla*, I. p. xxiv.

⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵ See Burkitt, *Aquila*, p. 18 ff.

Σ. προσκυνήσατε καθαρῶς. To these instances may be added others where the later translators substitute a literal rendering for a paraphrase or a gloss; e.g. in Deut. x. 16 'A. has ἀκροβυστίαν καρδίας for the euphemistic σκληροκαρδίαν of the LXX.; in Ps. xv. 9 'A. Σ. Θ. restore δόξα for the interpretative γλώσσα.

(b) Dr Hatch points out¹ that "in a large number of instances the word which one or other of the translators substitutes for the LXX. word is itself used in other passages of the LXX. as the translation of the same Hebrew word"; and he draws the conclusion that "the words which are so interchanged are practically synonymous." But his inference must be received with reserve, for the interchange may not be so free as appears at first sight; so careful a translator as Aquila (e.g.) has probably regulated his use of words which are generally synonymous with a view to the requirements of the particular context.

(c) Many of the words of the N.T. which are not to be found in the LXX. occur in the fragments of the later Greek versions, and receive important illustration from their use of them. Indeed, in not a few instances these versions supply the only or the best explanation of rarer words or connotations. The following are examples. 'Αδημονεῖν, 'A. Job xviii. 20, Σ. Ps. lx. 3, cxv. 2, Eccl. vii. 17, Ezech. iii. 15; ἀποκαραδοκία, cf. 'A. Ps. xxxvi. 7 (ἀποκαραδόκει); δαιμονίζειν, 'A. Ps. xc. 6. ἐγκακεῖν, 'to faint,' Σ. Gen. xxvii. 46; ἐμβριμᾶσθαι, 'A. Ps. vii. 12, Σ. Isa. xvii. 13; ἐνθύμησις, 'thought,' Σ. Job xxi. 27, Ezech. xi. 21; ἐπίβλημα, 'patch,' Σ. Jos. ix. 5; θεομάχος, Σ. Prov. ix. 18, xxi. 16, Job xxvi. 5; καταφέρεσθαι, 'to drop asleep,' 'A. Ps. lxxv. 7; μορφοῦν, 'A. Isa. xlv. 13². Even where the unusual word and meaning occur in the LXX., it will often

¹ *Essays*, p. 28.

² These instances are chiefly from Hatch (*Essays*, p. 25). They might easily be multiplied by an inspection of the Oxford Concordance or of the Lexicon and Hexapla at the end of Trom.

be found that the later versions supply more abundant or more appropriate illustrations. Thus after the Septuagint these fragments, which are happily receiving continual additions from Hexaplaric MSS., offer the most promising field for the investigation of N.T. lexicography and one, moreover, which has been little worked.

On the whole, perhaps, no sounder advice could be given to a student of the language of the N.T., than to keep continually at hand the Septuagint, the remains of the Hexapla as edited by Field, and the Oxford Concordance which forms a complete index to both. It is only when he has made some way with the evidence of the Greek versions of the Old Testament that he will be in a position to extend his researches to non-Biblical literature, such as the papyri, the remains of the Hellenistic writers, and the great monuments of the later Greek.

LITERATURE (on the general subject of the chapter). J. Pearson, *Praefatio Paraenetica* (ed. E. Churton), p. 16 sqq.; H. Hody, *de Bibl. textibus orig.*, III. c. ii., p. 293; J. F. Fischer, *Prolusiones de versionibus Graecis librorum V. T.* (Leipzig, 1772); Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zur Septuaginta* (Leipzig, 1841), p. 263 ff.; E. W. Grinfield, *N. T. Gr., editio Hellenistica* (London, 1843); *Scholia Hellenistica in N. T.* (London, 1848); *An Apology for the Septuagint* (London, 1850); W. R. Churton, *The Influence of the LXX. Version of the O. T. upon the progress of Christianity* (Cambridge, 1861); W. Selwyn, art. *Septuagint*, in *Smith's D.B.*, iii. (London, 1863); W. H. Guillemard, *The Greek Testament, Hebraistic edition* [St Matthew] (Cambridge, 1875); E. Hatch, *Essays on Biblical Greek*, i.—iii. (Oxford, 1889); S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*, Intr., p. xxxvi. ff. (Oxford, 1890); A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Divine Library of the O. T.*, p. 63 ff. (London, 1891); *The Septuagint Version*, in *Expositor*, v. iii., p. 263 ff. (London, 1896); T. K. Abbott, *Essays chiefly on the original texts of the O. and N. Testaments* (London, 1891); A. Loisy, *Histoire critique du texte et des versions de la Bible* (Amiens, 1892); H. A. A. Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek, or the Influence of the LXX. on the vocabulary of the N. T.* (Edinburgh, 1895); H. L. Strack, in *Hastings, D.B.* iv. p. 731.

CHAPTER V.

INFLUENCE OF THE LXX. ON CHRISTIAN
LITERATURE.

1. THE Church inherited from the Hellenistic Synagogue an entire confidence in the work of the Alexandrian translators. It was a treasure common to Jew and Christian, the authorised Greek Bible to which at first both appealed. When after the beginning of the second century a distrust of the LXX. sprang up among the Jews¹, Christian teachers and writers not unnaturally clung to the old version with a growing devotion. They pleaded its venerable age and its use by the Evangelists and Apostles; they accepted and often embellished the legend of its birth², and, following in the steps of Philo, claimed for it an inspiration not inferior to that of the original. When the divergences of the Septuagint from the current Hebrew text became apparent, it was argued that the errors of the Greek text were due to accidents of transmission, or that they were not actual errors, but Divine adaptations of the original to the use of the future Church.

Iren. iii. 21. 3 f. "quum...Deus...servavit nobis simplices scripturas in Aegypto...in qua et Dominus noster servatus est... et haec earum scripturarum interpretatio priusquam Dominus noster descenderet facta sit et antequam Christiani ostenderentur interpretata sit...vere impudorati et audaces ostenduntur qui nunc volunt aliter interpretationes facere, quando ex ipsis

¹ See above, p. 30 f.

² See above, p. 13 f.

scripturis arguantur a nobis...etenim apostoli quum sint his omnibus vetustiores, consonant praedictae interpretationi, et interpretatio consonat apostolicae traditioni. etenim Petrus et Ioannes et Matthaeus et Paulus et reliqui deinceps et horum sectatores prophetica omnia ita annuntiaverunt quemadmodum Seniorum interpretatio continet. unus enim et idem Spiritus Dei qui in prophetis quidem praeconavit...in Senioribus autem interpretatus est bene quae bene prophetata fuerant. Cyril. Hieros. *cat.* iv. 33 f. : ἀναγίνωσκε τὰς θείας γραφάς, τὰς εἴκοσι δύο¹ βίβλους τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης ταύτας, τὰς ὑπὸ τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα δύο ἑρμηνευτῶν ἑρμηνευθείσας...οὐ γὰρ εὐρεσιλογία καὶ κατασκευὴ σοφισμάτων ἀνθρωπίνων ἦν τὸ γινόμενον, ἀλλ' ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἢ τῶν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι λαληθεισῶν θειῶν γραφῶν ἑρμηνεῖα συνετελείτο. Chrys. *in Matt. hom.* v. τῶν ἄλλων μᾶλλον ἀπάντων τὸ ἀξιόπιστον οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα ἔχουεν ἂν δικαίως. οἱ μὲν γὰρ μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν ἠρμήνευσαν, Ἰουδαῖοι μείναντες, καὶ δικαίως ἂν ὑποπτεύοιντο ἅτε ἀπεχθεῖα μᾶλλον εἰρηκότες, καὶ τὰς προφητείας συσκιάζοντες ἐπίτηδες· οἱ δὲ ἑβδομήκοντα πρὸ ἑκατὸν ἢ καὶ πλείωνων ἐτῶν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐλθόντες καὶ τοσοῦτοι ὄντες πάσης τοιαύτης εἰσὶν ὑποψίας ἀπηλλαγμένοι. καὶ διὰ τὸν χρόνον καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ διὰ τὴν συμφωνίαν μᾶλλον ἂν εἶεν πιστεύεσθαι δίκαιοι. Hieron. *ep.* xxxiii. (*ad Pammach.*): “iure LXX. editio obtinuit in ecclesiis vel quia prima fuit et ante Christi facta adventum, vel quia ab Apostolis...usurpata”; *praef. in Paralip.* “si LXX. interpretum pura et ut ab eis in Graecum versa est editio permaneret, superflue me...impelleres ut Hebraea volumina Latino sermone transferrem.” Aug. *de doctr. Chr.* 22 “qui (LXX. interpretes) iam per omnes peritiores ecclesias tanta praesentia Sancti Spiritus interpretati esse dicuntur ut os unum tot hominum fuisse...quamobrem, etiamsi aliquid aliter in Hebraeis exemplaribus invenitur quam isti posuerunt, cedendum esse arbitror divinae dispositioni quae per eos facta est...itaque fieri potest ut sic illi interpretati sint quemadmodum congruere Gentibus ille qui eos agebat...Spiritus S. indicavit.” (Cf. *quaest. in Hept.* i. 169, vi. 19; *in Ps.* cxxxv.; *de civ. Dei* viii. 44.)

2. Under these circumstances the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament necessarily influenced the literature and thought of the Ancient Church in no ordinary degree. How largely it is quoted by Greek Christian writers of the first four centuries has already been shewn². But they were not content to cite it as the best available version of the Old

¹ See above, p. 219 ff.

² Part III. c. 3.

Testament; they adopted without suspicion and with tenacity its least defensible renderings, and pressed them into the service of controversy, dogma, and devotion. This remark applies also in effect to the Latin Christian writers before Jerome, who were generally dependent on a literal translation based upon the Greek Bible¹. To Tertullian and Cyprian, as well as to Clement and Barnabas, Justin² and Irenaeus, the Septuagint was the Old Testament authorised by the Church, and no appeal lay either to any other version or to the original. Nor was this tradition readily abandoned by the few who attained to some knowledge of Hebrew. Origen, while recognising the divergence of the LXX. from the Hebrew, and endeavouring to reconcile the two by means of the Hexapla³, was accustomed to preach and comment upon the ordinary Greek text⁴. He even builds his system of interpretation on the LXX. rendering of Prov. xxii. 20⁵. Jerome was long in reaching his resolve to adopt the Hebrew text as the basis of his new Latin version, and when at length he did so, his decision exposed him to obloquy⁶. Augustine, while sympathising with Jerome's purpose, thought it a doubtful policy to unsettle the laity by lowering the authority of the LXX.⁷

The following examples of Christian interpretation based upon the LXX. will shew how largely that version influenced the

¹ See above, p. 87 ff.

² Justin occasionally adopts a rendering preferred by his Jewish antagonists, or does not press the rendering of the LXX. But he makes this concession only where the alternative does not affect his argument; see *Dial.* 124, 131.

³ See above, p. 60 ff.

⁴ *Comm. in Cant.* i. 344, "tamen nos LXX. interpretum scripta per omnia custodimus, certi quod Spiritus Sanctus mysteriorum formas obiectas inesse voluit in scripturis divinis."

⁵ See below, p. 468.

⁶ See his Preface to the Gospels, addressed to Damasus.

⁷ *Aug. Ep.* ii. 82, § 35. He deprecates the change of *cucurbita* into *hedera* in *Jon.* iii. 6 ff. on the ground that the LXX. doubtless had good reasons for translating the Hebrew word by *κολόκυνθα*: "non enim frustra hoc puto LXX. posuisse, nisi quia et huic simile sciebant."

hermeneutics of the Ancient Church. The exegesis is often obviously wrong, and sometimes it is even grotesque; but it illustrates the extent to which the authority of the LXX. became a factor in the thought and life of the Church both in ante-Nicene and early post-Nicene times. A careful study of these passages will place in the hands of the young student of patristic literature a key which may unlock many of his difficulties.

Gen. i. 2 ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος. Iren. i. 18. 1 τὸν ἀόρατον δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀπόκρυφον αὐτῆς μνηύοντα εἰπεῖν Ἡ δὲ γῆ κτλ. Tert. *bapt.* 3 "(aqua) plurima suppetit, et quidem a primordio... terra autem erat invisibilis et incomposita...solus liquor dignum vectaculum Deo subiciebat." **ii. 2** τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ. Iren. v. 28. 3 φανερὸν οὖν ὅτι ἡ συντέλεια αὐτῶν τὸ 5 ἔτος ἐστὶ. **iv. 7** οὐκ ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς κτλ. Iren. iii. 23. 4 "Cain quum accepisset consilium a Deo uti quiesceret in eo quod non recte divisisset eam quae erga fratrem erat communicationem...non solum non acquievit, sed adiecit peccatum super peccatum"; cf. iv. 18. 3. **xiv. 14** ἠρίθμησεν...δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ καὶ τριακοσίους (cod. D). Barn. 9. 8 μάθετε ὅτι τοὺς δεκαοκτὼ πρώτους, καὶ διάστημα ποιήσας λέγει τριακοσίους· τὸ δεκαοκτὼ (IH) ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν· ὅτι δὲ ὁ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ T ἤμελλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν λέγει καὶ τριακοσίους (T). Cf. Clem. Al. *strom.* vi. 11. Hil. *syn.* 86. Ambr. *de fide* i. *prol.* **xxxii. 13** ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὀφθείς σοι ἐν τόπῳ θεοῦ (*D^{sil}E*). Just. *Dial.* 58 (cf. 60). **xlvi. 14** ἐπέβαλεν...ἐναλλάξ τὰς χεῖρας. Tert. *bapt.* 8 "sed est hoc quoque de veteri sacramento quo nepotes suos...intermutatis manibus benedixerit et quidem ita transversim obliquatis in se, ut Christum deformantes iam tunc portenderent benedictionem in Christum futuram." **xlix. 10** οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰουδα καὶ ἡγούμενος κτλ. Justin *Dial.* 52 οὐδέποτε ἐν τῷ γένει ὑμῶν ἐπαύσατο οὔτε προφήτης οὔτε ἄρχων...μέχρις οὗ οὗτος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἔπιθεν (cf. *ib.* 120). Iren. iv. 10. 2 "inquirant enim... id tempus in quo defecit *princeps et dux* ex Iuda et qui est *gentium spes*...et inventum non alium nisi Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum annuntiatum." Cyr. *test.* i. 21. Eus. *dem. ev.* i. 4. Cyril. H. xii. 17 σημείον οὖν ἔδωκε τῆς Χριστοῦ παρουσίας τὸ παύσασθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων. εἰ μὴ νῦν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους εἰσίν, οὐπω ἦλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς· εἰ ἔχουσι τὸν ἐκ γένους Ἰουδα καὶ τοῦ Δαβίδ, οὐπω ἦλθεν ὁ προσδοκώμενος.

Exod. xvi. 36 τὸ δὲ γόμορ τὸ δέκατον τῶν τριῶν μέτρων ἦν. Clem. Al. *strom.* ii. 11 ἐν ἡμῖν γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρία μέτρα, τρία κριτήρια μνηύεται, αἰσθησις...λόγος...νοῦς. **xvii. 16** ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαία πολεμεῖ Κύριος ἐπὶ Ἀμαλῆκ ἀπὸ γενεῶν εἰς γενεάς. Just. *Dial.* 49 νοήσαι δύνασθε ὅτι κρυφία δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ γέγονε τῷ σταυρωθέντι Χριστῷ. Iren. iii. 16. 4 "occulte quidem sed potenter manifestans, quoniam absconsa manu expugnabat Dominus Amalech." **xxxiii. 19** καλέσω ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου ἐναντίον σου (AF). Amb.

de Sp. s. i. 13 "Dominus ergo dixit quia in nomine suo vocabit Dominum; Dominus ergo et Patris est nomen et Filii."

Lev. iv. 5 ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός. *Tert. bapt.* 7 "Aaron a Moyse unctus est, unde Christus dicitur a chrismate, quod est unctio, quae Domino nomen accommodavit."

Num. xxiii. 19 οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπου ἀπειληθῆναι. *Cypr. test.* ii. 20 [under the heading "Quod cruci illum fixuri essent Iudaei"]. **xxiv. 17** ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ. *Eus. dem. ev. i.* 3, 6. *Cypr. test.* ii. 10 [under the heading, "Quod et homo et Deus Christus," &c.].

Deut. xxviii. 66 ἔσται ἡ ζωὴ σου κρεμαμένη ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου...καὶ οὐ πιστεύσεις τῇ ζωῇ σου. *Tert. (Jud. 11)* quotes this as "*Erit vita tua pendens in ligno ante oculos tuos; et non credes vitae tuae,*" explaining the words of the "signi sacramentum...in quo vita hominibus praestruebatur, in quo Iudaei non essent credituri." Cf. *Cyril H. xiii. 19* ὅτι ἡ ζωὴ ἦν ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου κρεμασθεῖσα Μωσῆς ἀποκλαιόμενός φησι κτλ. **xxxii. 8** ἔστησεν ὄρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ. *Justin (dial. 131)* cites the last three words as κ. ἀριθμοὺς νῶν Ἰσραήλ, adding οἱ ἐβδομήκοντα ἐξηγήσαντο ὅτι Ἐστησεν ὁ. ἐθνῶν κ. ἀριθμὸν ἀγγ. θεοῦ· ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐκ τούτου πάλιν οὐδέν μοι ἑλαττοῦται ὁ λόγος, τὴν ὑμετέραν ἐξήγησιν εἶπον. *Iren. iii. 12. 9,* quoting the LXX., comments: "populum autem qui credit Deo iam non esse sub angelorum potestate."

Jos. v. 3 ἐποίησεν Ἰησοῦς μαχαίρας πετρίνας ἀκροτόμους καὶ περιέτεμεν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ. *Tert. Jud. 9* "circumcisis nobis petrina acie, id est, Christi praeceptis (petra enim Christus multis modis et figuris praedicatus est)."

3 Regn. xxii. 38 ἀπένιψαν τὸ αἶμα ἐπὶ τὴν κρήνην Σαμαρείας... καὶ αἱ πόρνοι ἐλούσαντο ἐν τῷ αἵματι: *Amb. de Sp. s. i.* 16 "fidelis ad puteum (Gen. xxiv. 62), infidelis ad lacum (Jer. ii. 13)...meretrices in lacu Jezabel se cruore laverunt."

Ps. ii. 12 δράξασθε παιδείας. *Cypr. test.* iii. 66 "*continente¹ disciplinam*" [under the heading "Disciplinam Dei in ecclesiasticis praeceptis observandam"]. **iv. 7** ἐσημειώθη ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου. *Amb. de Sp. i.* 14 "quod est ergo lumen signatum nisi illius signaculi spiritalis in quo credentes signati (inquit) estis Spiritu promissionis sancto²." **vi. 6** ἐν δὲ τῷ ᾄδει τίς ἐξομολογήσεται σοι; *Cypr. test.* iii. 114 [under the heading "Dum in carne est quis, exhomologesin (cf. *Stud. Bibl.* iv. 282, 290 n.) facere debere"]. **ix. tit.** εἰς τὸ τέλος. *Hil. ad loc.* "intellegendum quotiens qui titulos habent in fine, non praesentia in his sed ultima contineri." **Ib.** ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ. *Orig. ad loc.* κρύφια ἐστι γνῶσις ἀπόρρητος τῶν περὶ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀλη-

¹ v.l. *adprehendite.*

² *Eph. i.* 13.

θινού θεού μυστηρίων. Athan. *ad loc.* λέγει Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀκαταλήπτων μυστηρίων τοῦ υἱοῦ. **xxi.** 7. See under Hab. ii. 11. 30 καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μου αὐτῷ ἔσθι. Iren. v. 7. 1 "tamquam immortalī substantia eius existente." **xxxi.** 6 τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου...τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. See Iren. iii. 8. 3, Tert. *Prax.* 7, Cyr. *test.* ii. 3, Ambr. *de Sp.* s. iii. 11, Hil. *trin.* xii. 39. **xli.** 1 ἐξήρέξαστο ἡ καρδιά μου λόγον ἀγαθόν. Tert. *Prax.* 7 "solus ex Deo genitus, proprie de vulva cordis ipsius secundum quod et Pater ipse testatur Eructavit cor meum sermonem optimum." Marc. ii. 4 "adhibet operi bono optimum etiam ministrum, sermonem suum." Cf. Cyr. *test.* ii. 3. **lxxxvi.** 4 μνησθήσομαι Παύβ. Cyril. H. ii. 9 δ μεγάλης τοῦ θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ πορνῶν μνημονεύουσας ἐν γραφαῖς (the LXX. having transliterated קנה and קנה alike). Cf. Hieron. *comm. in Ps.* ad loc. **Ib.** 5 Μήτηρ Σειῶν ἐρεῖ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐγενήθη ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτὴν ὁ ὕψιστος. Tert. *Prax.* 27 "invenimus illum directo et Deum et hominem expositum, ipso hoc psalmo suggerente quoniam Deus homo natus est in illa, aedificavit eam voluntate Patris"; cf. Marc. iv. 13 "Mater Sion" dicet homo, et 'homo factus est in illa' (quoniam Deus homo natus est)...aedificaturus ecclesiam ex voluntate patris." Hieron. *comm. in Pss.* (ed. G. Morin) *ad loc.*: "pro 'mater Sion' LXX. interpretes transtulerunt: 'numquid Sion (μη τῇ Σ.) dicat homo?'...sed vitiose P littera graeca addita fecit errorem¹." Jerome however retains the interpretation 'homo Christus,' which depends on the LXX. reading ἄνθρωπος. **lxxxvii.** 6 ἐν νεκροῖς ἐλεύθερος. Cyril. H. x. 4 οὐκ ἀπομείνας ἐν νεκροῖς, ὡς πάντες ἐν ἄδῃ, ἀλλὰ μόνος ἐν νεκροῖς ἐλεύθερος. **xc.** 13 δίκαιος ὡς φοινεῖς ἀνθήσει. Tert. *res. carn.* 13 "id est de morte, de funere, uti credas de ignibus quoque substantiam corporis exigi posse" (cf. Clem. R. 1 Cor. 25, Lightfoot, p. 85 n.). **xcv.** 5 πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια. Just. *dial.* 55 οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν...εἶδωλα δαιμονίων εἰσίν, ἀλλ' οὐ θεοὶ (cf. *ib.* 79, 83). Iren. iii. 6. 3. Tert. *idololatr.* 20. Cyr. *test.* iii. 59. **Ib.** 10 ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσε [ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου]. Just. *apol.* i. 41, *Dial.* 73 f.² Tert. *Marc.* iii. 19; *Jud.* 10 "age nunc, si legisti penes prophetam in psalmis: *Deus regnavit a ligno*, expecto quid intelligas, ne forte lignarium aliquem regem significari putetis et non Christum." *ib.* 13 "unde et ipse David regnaturum ex ligno dominum dicebat." Auctor *de montibus Sina et Sion* 9 "Christus autem in montem sanctum ascendit lignum regni sui." Cf. Barn. 8 ἡ βασιλεία Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ξύλου. **xcviii.** 5 προσκυνεῖτε τῷ ὑποποδίῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. Ambr. *de Sp.* s. iii. 11 "per *scabellum* terra intelligitur, per terram autem caro Christi quam hodieque in mysteriis adoramus, et quam Apostoli in Domino Jesu...adorarunt." Cf. Aug. *ad loc.* **cvi.** 20 ἀπέστει-

¹ Cf. the *Tractatus in Psalmos*, p. 402.

² See above, p. 424, n., and cf. Deut. xxviii. 66.

λεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἴασατο αὐτοὺς. *Cypr. test.* ii. 3 [under the heading "Quod Christus idem sit sermo Dei"]. **cix.** 3^b ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐξεγέννησά σε. *Just. apol.* i. 45, *dial.* 32. *Tert. Marc.* v. 9 "nos edimus evangelia...nocturna nativitate declarantia Dominum ut hoc sit *ante luciferum...nec generavi te* edixisset Deus nisi filio vero...cur autem adiecit *ex utero...* nisi quia curiosius voluit intellegi in Christum *ex utero generavi te*, quid est, ex solo utero sine viri semine?" *Cypr. test.* i. 17. *Cyrl. H.* vii. 2 ἄπερ ἐπὶ ἀνθρωπων ἀναφέρειν πάσης ἀγνωμοσύνης ἀνάπλεων. xi. 5 τὸ 'σήμερον' (*Ps.* ii. 7) ἄχρονον, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων· ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου κτλ. Cf. *Athan. or. c. Ar.* iv. 27 f.

Prov. viii. 22 Κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ. *Just. dial.* 61. *Iren.* iv. 20. 3. *Tert. Prax.* 7. *Cypr. test.* ii. 1 [under the heading *Christum...esse sapientiam Dei, per quam omnia facta sunt*]. *Hil. trin.* xii. 45 "quaerendum est quid sit natum ante saecula Deum rursus in initium viarum Dei et in opera creari." Cf. *Athan. or. in Ar.* ii. 16 ff. **xxii.** 20 καὶ σὺ δὲ ἀπόγραψαι αὐτὰ σεαυτῷ τρισσῶς. *Orig. Philoc.* i. 11 (*de princ.* iv.) οὐκοῦν τριχῶς ἀπογράφεσθαι δεῖ εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν τὰ τῶν ἁγίων γραμμάτων νοήματα.

Job xl. 14 πεποιημένον ἐνκαταπαίξεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ. Applied to the Devil by *Cy. H. cat.* viii. 4.

Hos. xii. 4 (A) ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου εὐροσάν με. *Tert. Marc.* iv. 39 "per diem in templo docebat ut qui per Osee praedixerat," &c. (For the reading of B, cf. *Orig. Philoc.* viii. 1.)

Amos ix. 6 ὁ οἰκοδομῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνάβασιν αὐτοῦ. *Tert. Marc.* iv. 34 "aedificantem illis ascensum suum in caelum."

Hab. ii. 11 λίθος ἐκ τοίχου βοήσεται καὶ κάρθαρος ἐκ ξύλου φθέγγεται αὐτά. *Ambr. in Luc.* xxiii. "bonus vermis qui haesit in ligno (*Ps.* xxi. 7), bonus scarabaeus qui clamavit e ligno... clamavit quasi scarabaeus *Deus Deus meus*"; *or. de obitu Theodosii* 46 "[Helena] adoravit illum qui pependit in ligno...illum (inquam) qui sicut scarabaeus clamavit ut persecutoribus suis Pater peccata donaret." *Hieron. in Abac., ad loc.* "quidam e nostris vermem in ligno loquentem illum esse aiunt qui dicit in Psalmo (xxi. 7) *Ego natus sum vermis et non homo.*" **iii.** 2 ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζῶων γνωσθήσῃ. *Tert. Marc.* iv. 22 "in medio duo animalium cognosceris, Moysi et Eliae." *Eus. dem. ev.* vi. 15 δύο ζῶας (reading ζῶων in text) τοῦ προφητειομένου δηλοῦσθαι ἔφαμεν, μίαν μὲν τὴν ἔνθεον, θατέραν δὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην.

Zach. vi. 12 ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ, Ἀνατολὴ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. *Just. dial.* 106, 121. *Tert. Valent.* 3 "amat figura Spiritus sancti orientem, Christi figuram."

Isa. i. 22 οἱ κἀπηλοὶ σου μίσγοῦσι τὸν οἶνον ὕδατι. *Iren.* iv. 12. 1 "ostendens quod austero Dei praecepto miscerent seniores aquatam traditionem." **iii.** 9 f. οὐαὶ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν, διότι βεβοῦ-

λευνται βουλὴν πονηρὰν καθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰπόντες Δήσωμεν (v.l. ap. Justin., al. ἄρωμεν) τὸν δίκαιον, ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστίν. Barn. vi. 7, Just. *dial.* 17, 133, 136 f. Tert. *Marc.* iii. 22. Cyril H. xiii. 12. vii. 14 ἢ παρθένος. Just. *dial.* 43, 67, 71, 84. Iren. iii. 21. 1 ff. Tert. *Marc.* iii. 13, iv. 10. Cypr. *test.* ii. 9. Eus. *dem. ev.* vii. 1. Cyr. H. xii. 21. ix. 6 μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος. Hil. *trin.* iv. 23 "qui Angelus Dei dictus est, idem Dominus et Deus est; est autem secundum prophetam Filius Dei *magni consilii angelus.*" x. 23 λόγιον συντετμημένον ποιήσει Κύριος. Tert. *Marc.* iv. 4 "compendiatum est enim novum testamentum et a legis laciniis oneribus expeditum" (cf. iv. 16). xxx. 4 ὅτι εἰσὶν ἐν Τάνει ἀρχηγοὶ ἄγγελοι πονηροί. Just. *dial.* 79 πονηροὺς ἀγγέλους κατακκηκεῖναι καὶ κατοικεῖν λέγει καὶ ἐν Τάνει, τῇ Αἴγυπτίᾳ χώρᾳ. xlv. 1 οὕτως λέγει Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ χριστῷ μου Κύρω [read as κυρίῳ]. Barn. xii. 11, Tert. *Prax.* 28, *Jud.* 7, Cypr. *test.* i. 21. Ib. 14 καὶ ἐν σοὶ προσεύχονται. Ambr. *de Sp.* s. ii. 8 "in Christo orare nos debere Deus Pater dicit." liii. 3 ἄνθρωπος ἐν πληγῇ ὢν. Tert. *de carne Chr.* 15. Ib. 8 τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγῆσεται; Eus. *h. e.* i. 2. liv. 15 προσήλυτοι προσελεύσονται σοὶ δι' ἐμοῦ. Ambr. *de Sp.* s. ii. 9 "Deus Pater ad Filium dicit: *Ecce proselyti venient ad te per me.*" lx. 17 δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. Iren. iv. 26. 5 τοιοῦτους πρεσβυτέρους ἀνατρέφει ἡ ἐκκλησία, περὶ ὧν καὶ προφήτης φησὶν Δώσω κτλ. Cf. Clem. R. i Cor. 42. lxiii. 1 ἐρύθημα ἱματίων ἐκ Βόσορ. Hieron. *comm. in Isa.* ad loc. "quod multi pro errore lapsi putant de carne (שׁב) Domini intellegi." Ib. 9 οὐ πρέσβυς οὐδὲ ἄγγελος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἔσωσεν αὐτούς. Iren. iii. 20. 4 "quoniam neque homo tantum erit qui salvat nos neque sine carne (sine carne enim angeli sunt)." Tert. *Marc.* iv. 22 "*non legatus, inquit Esaias, nec nuncius, sed ipse Deus salvos eos faciet, ipse iam praedicans et implens legem et prophetas.*"

Jer. xi. 19 δεῦτε καὶ ἐμβάλωμεν ξύλον εἰς τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ. Tert. *Marc.* iii. 19 "utique 'in corpus'...sic enim Deus in evangelio...revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans." Cypr. *test.* ii. 20. xvii. 9 ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν, καὶ τίς γνώσεται αὐτόν; Iren. iii. 18. 3, 19. 2, iv. 33. 11; Tert. *carn. Chr.* 15, *Jud.* 14.

Bar. iii. 38 μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὄφθη καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναεστράφη. Cyril. H. xi. 15 βλέπετε θεὸν μετὰ τὴν Μωσέως νομοθεσίαν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα;

Lam. iv. 20 πνεῦμα προσώπου ἡμῶν χριστὸς Κύριος συνελήμφθη ἐν ταῖς διαφθοραῖς αὐτῶν. Just. *apol.* i. 55. Iren. iii. 10. 11. Tert. *Marc.* iii. 6 "Christum, spiritum scilicet creatoris, sicut propheta testatur" &c. *Prax.* 14 "ergo si Christus personae paternae spiritus est, merito spiritus cuius persona erat (id est Patris) eum faciem suam ex unitate scilicet pronuntiavit." Cyril. H. xiii. 7. Ambr. *de Sp.* s. i. 9 "et Christus spiritus dicitur quia Jeremias dixit," &c.

From these specimens it is clear that the Ancient Church was profoundly influenced by the Greek Old Testament in a variety of ways. Two may be mentioned here. (1) The Alexandrian Greek with its daughter-version, the Old Latin, supplied the basis of a practical interpretation which, notwithstanding numerous errors of text and of treatment, ministered to the religious life of the Christian Society. It was from the LXX. version and not from the official Hebrew of the Synagogue that the pre-Hieronymian Church derived her devotional use of the Old Testament, as it is on the whole the Greek and not the Hebrew Bible which still supplies the Roman Breviary and the Anglican Prayer-book with the substance of their liturgical Psalters. The Alexandrian School based its exegetical work upon the LXX., and the errors and obscurities of the version often yielded materials peculiarly adapted to the requirements of the allegorists; whilst the School of Antioch was no less whole-hearted in its devotion to the old Alexandrian version¹. This spirit of loyalty to the LXX. continued to the age of the later Greek expositors; it is reflected in the *catenae*, and it fundamentally affects the traditional interpretation of the Old Testament throughout the orthodox East. Even in the West, through the spread of the Greek exegesis, and the use of the Old Latin version by the earlier Latin fathers, it has acquired a predominant influence. Thus, for good or for evil, the popular interpretation of the O. T. has been moulded by the LXX. rather than by the Hebrew text. (2) The LXX. supplied the Ancient Church with controversial weapons at two great crises in her history—during the early struggle with the rival forces of Monotheism, Judaism, Marcionism, and the various schools of Gnosticism, and in the long conflict with Arianism. Arians

¹ For Chrysostom's use of the LXX. see F. H. Chase, *Chrysostom: a study in the history of Biblical Interpretation*, p. 28 ff. (Cambridge, 1887); and for Theodore of Mopsuestia, cf. H. Kihn, *Th. v. Mops.*, p. 87 ff. (Freiburg i. B., 1880).

as well as Catholics appealed to the Alexandrian version. Thus Arius did not hesitate to argue from Joel ii. 25, LXX. (ἡ ἀκρὸς καὶ... ἡ κάμπη ἡ δύναμις μου ἡ μεγάλη) that the Son is the Power of God in no higher sense than any other agency by which great effects are wrought upon the face of nature¹. Both parties had recourse to Prov. viii. 22, where the LXX. rendering of יְהוָה by ἔκτισέν με seemed to Arius to justify the statement that the Logos Himself had a beginning of existence, like the created universe². Unconvincing as such arguments are now, they had an overwhelming weight in the fourth century, and Hilary speaks as if the cause of orthodoxy might be saved by wresting this crucial passage out of the hands of the Arians (*de Trin.* xii. "hic hiemis eorum maximus fluctus est, haec tortuosa turbinis gravis unda est, quae excepta a nobis et securo navigio infracta, usque ad ipsum nos tutissimum portum optati litoris prosequetur"). Neither the controversies of the second nor those of the fourth century can be fully understood without an appreciation of the place which the Greek Old Testament occupied in the thought and language of the Ancient Church.

3. Familiarity with the LXX. is not less essential to the student of the devotional life of the Early Church. The Greek Liturgies, especially perhaps in the oldest parts, are steeped in the language of the Greek Old Testament. (a) The prayers of the Psalter are worked into their text, often with little or no change; e.g. *St Clement* (B. 5)³ δὸς αὐτοῖς καρδίαν καινὴν καὶ πνεῦμα εὐθὲς ἐγκαίνισον ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις αὐτῶν (Ps. l. 12); *ib.* (B. 8) καὶ ἀποδώσῃ αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀγαλλίασιν τοῦ σωτηρίου καὶ πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῶ στήρισῃ αὐτοῦς (Ps. l. 14); *St James* (B. 37) σῶσον ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου

¹ Fragment of the *Thalia*, in Athan. *or. c. Ar.* i. 6.

² *Ib.* ἀρχὴν τοῦ κτίζεσθαι ἔσχε καὶ αὐτός.

³ The references are to the pages of Mr Brightman's *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, i. (Oxford, 1896).

(Ps. cxvii. 9)¹; *ib.* (B. 55) ἐπιλαβοῦ ὄπλου καὶ θυρεοῦ καὶ ἀνάστηθι εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου (Ps. xxxiv. 2); *St Mark* (B. 117) ἐξαπόστειλον τὸ φῶς σου καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειάν σου (Ps. xlii. 3)...καὶ ταχὺ προκαταλαβέτωσαν ἡμᾶς οἱ οἰκτειρμοὶ σου, Κύριε (Ps. lxxviii. 8). (b) Many of their magnificent addresses to God and to Christ are from the LXX. e.g. *St Clement* (B. 12) Κύριε παντοκράτωρ, ὕψιστε, ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν, ἅγιε ἐν ἀγίοις ἀπαπνόμενε, ἄναρχε, μόναρχε (Isa. lvii. 15 + 3 Macc. ii. 2); *ib.* (B. 24) ὁ μέγας, ὁ μεγαλόνυμος (Jer. xxxix. 19); *St James* (B. 44) ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν καὶ τὰ ταπεινὰ ἐφορῶν (Ps. cxii. 5 f.); *St Mark* (B. 137) ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίμ (Ps. lxxix. 2); *Sarapion* (J. Th. St. i.) θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας (Ps. xxx. 6); τῶν δυνάμεων (Ps. lviii. 6); τῶν πνευμάτων (Num. xvi. 22). (c) Passing allusions are made to the LXX., sometimes difficult to explain without its aid, e.g. *St Clement* (B. 6) ὁ τὸν ἀνθρωποκτόνον ὄφιν δεσμώτην παραδοὺς ἡμῖν ὡς στρουθίον παιδίον (cf. Job xl. 14); *ib.* (B. 15) λόγον θεὸν ...ἄγγελον τῆς μεγάλης βουλής σου (Isa. ix. 6); *St James* (B. 55) τῶν τὸ ἅγιόν σου θυσιαστήριον κυκλούντων διακόνων (Ps. cxv. 6); *ib.* (B. 57) ἐν χώρᾳ ζώντων (Ps. cxiv. 9); *St Mark* (B. 126) εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους ἡμῶν ἐν πάσῃ εἰρήνῃ κατακόσμησον (1 Regn. xxix. 6 : Ps. cxx. 8); *ib.* (B. 133) ἐξ ἐτοίμου κατοικητηρίου σου (Exod. xv. 17; 3 Regn. viii. 39 ff.); *St Basil* (B. 335) ἡ ἐλπὶς τῶν ἀπηλπισμένων (Judith ix. 11); *Sarapion* : ὁ θανατῶν καὶ ζωογονῶν (1 Regn. ii. 6). (d) Much of the technical phraseology of the Liturgies is from the LXX.: e.g. τὰ ἅγια (Lev. xxii. 2), ἀναφορά (Num. iv. 19), δῶρα (Gen. iv. 4), θυσία (Gen. iv. 3), λειτουργία (Exod. xxxvii. 19), θυσία αἰνέσεως (Lev. vii. 3 f., Ps. xlix. 14, 23), πρόθεσις (Exod. xxxix. 18), προκείμενα (Lev. xxiv. 7), προσφορά (3 Regn. vii. 34), τελειοῦν (Exod. xxix. 9). (e) The same is true with regard to some of the oldest Eucharistic formulae, e.g. the *Preface* and *Sanctus*²

¹ Cf. *St Basil* (B. 311).

² The composite quotation in Clem. R. 1 Cor. xxxiv. (Dan. vii. 10 +

which are based on Isa. vi. 2—3, the *Kyrie eleison* (Psalms, *passim*), the *Gustate* (Cyril H. *myst.* v. 20)¹.

4. The Greek terminology of Christian Doctrine is largely indebted to the Alexandrian translators. It is true that in this case most of the technical language of theology has passed through the New Testament and received there a fuller preparation for the use of the Church: and the influence of Greek philosophy and of Gnostic speculation must also be borne in mind by the student of the language of dogma. But it is perhaps even more important that he should trace it back to its source in the Greek Old Testament, which was far more familiar to Christian teachers of the first three centuries than the writings of Plato or of the schools of Basileides and Valentinus. The patristic use of such terms as ἄδης, ἀνάστασις, εἰκὼν, ἐκκλησία, ἐφόδιον, θυσία, θυσιαστήριον, Κύριος, λόγος, μονογενής, ξύλον, οὐσία, παντοκράτωρ, παντοδύναμος, παράδεισος, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πίστις, προσφορά, σάρξ, σοφία, ὑπόστασις, φύσις, φῶς, χάρις, can best be understood by the student who begins by investigating their use in the Septuagint.

Indirectly, but not less extensively, the earliest Latin theology drew a store of theological language from the LXX. Such words as *aeternalis*, *altare*, *benedictio*, *congregatio*, *converti*, *daemonium*, *eleemosyna*, *exomologesis*, *glorificare*, *hostia*, *iustitia*, *miser cordia*, *oblatio*, *propitiatio*, *sacerdos*, *sacrificium*, *salvare*, *testamentum*, *unicus*, *viaticum*, are examples which might easily be multiplied. In the case of some of these terms (e. g. *sacerdos* = *episcopus*, *sacrificium* = *eucharistia*) the choice contributed largely to the development of doctrine, and it is reasonable to suppose that they entered the vocabulary

Isa. vi. 3) is probably an echo of an early Roman Preface. A reference to Dan. *l.c.* in the same connexion is not uncommon; cf. *St Clement* (B. 18), *St Mark* (B. 131), Sarapion (*J. Th. St.* i. 1, p. 105).

¹ To these may perhaps be added the "Α ὀφθαλμοῦς οὐκ εἶδε (cf. Clem. R. *l.c.*). On *Kyrie eleison* see a paper by Mr Edm. Bishop, in the *Downside Review*, 1899—1900 (published separately by Walters, Weston-super-mare).

of the Western Church through the Latin version of the Septuagint, and not directly from Pagan use. It is noteworthy that Cyprian, whose own style has been said to shew "small respect for the language of the Latin Bible¹," persistently used these O. T. words in reference to the Christian ministry and the Eucharistic offering.

5. One great monument of ancient Christianity, which still exercises a direct influence over the vast Latin communion, seemed at one time likely to serve as a counteracting force to the Septuagint. It was the deliberate purpose of Jerome to set aside in the West the authority of a daughter-version of the LXX., and to establish in its place, by means of his new Latin Bible, that of the official Hebrew text. Nevertheless, through a variety of causes, the Vulgate, as it is now read by the Latin Church, perpetuates many of the characteristic features of the LXX. (a) The Psalter of the Vulgate, as we have seen, is taken from Jerome's second revision of the Old Latin, and not from his *Psalterium Hebraicum*, or translation of the Hebrew text; and the books of Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, and 1, 2 Maccabees, are given in the Old Latin forms². (b) The rest of the Old Testament retains, in the Clementine Vulgate, numerous traces of Septuagint readings and renderings. A few examples may be given: Gen. iii. 15 "tu insidiaberis (τηρήσεις) calcaneo eius"; iv. 8 "dixitque Cain ad Abel fratrem eius Egrediamur foras" (διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον); vi. 5 "non permanebit (οὐ μὴ καταμείνη) Spiritus meus in homine"; xlix. 10 "ipse erit expectatio (προσδοκία) gentium"; Num. xxiv. 24 "vastabuntque Hebraeos"; Isa. vii. 14 "ecce virgo concipiet"; Lam. iv. 20 "Spiritus oris nostri Christus dominus"; Zech. iii. 8 "adducam servum meum Orientem" (Ἀνατολήν). It must indeed

¹ E. W. Watson, in *Studia Biblica*, p. 194 f.

² See above, pp. 98 f., 103.

be remembered that loans from the LXX. are not always of Jerome's borrowing; some of them have made their way into the text of the Vulgate during the course of its transmission (see Vercellone, *Variae lectiones vulgatae Latinae bibliorum editionum*, II. p. viii sqq.). But they hold their place in the authorised Latin Bible of the West, and represent there to this day the influence of the Alexandrian Greek version. (c) Many of the words of the Vulgate are more or less complete transliterations of the Greek words used by the LXX. in the same contexts, survivals in great part from the O. L., where they had familiarised themselves to Latin ears¹. Thus we have *arceuthinus* (2 Chr. ii. 8), *azyma*, *azymi* (Gen. xix. 3, Exod. xii. 8), *blasphemare* (Lev. xxiv. 11), *cartallus* (Deut. xxvi. 2), *cataplasmare* (Isa. xxxviii. 21), *cauma* (Job xxx. 30), *choerogryllus* (Lev. xi. 5), *christus* (1 Regn. ii. 10), *chytropus* (Lev. xi. 35), *cidaris* (Lev. xvi. 4), *creagra* (2 Chr. iv. 11), *doma* (Jer. xix. 13), *ecclesia* (1 Regn. xvii. 47), *gazophylacium* (Ezech. xl. 17), *holocaustum* (Lev. i. 3), *laganum* (Exod. xxix. 23), *latomus* (3 Regn. v. 15), *luter* (3 Regn. vii. 17 = 30), *naulum* (Jon. i. 3), *nycticorax* (Deut. xiv. 17), *sabbatum* (Exod. xvi. 23), *synagoga* (Num. xxvii. 21), *theristrum* (Gen. xxxviii. 14), *thymiama* (Exod. xxx. 1), *zelotes* (Exod. xx. 5), *zelotypia* (Num. v. 15). If we turn to the books which are directly derived from the O. L., such forms are of course even more numerous; it is enough to specify *acediari* (Sir. vi. 26), *acharis* (Sir. xx. 19 = 21), *allophyli* (Ps. lv. 1), *artaba* (Bel 2), *decachordus* (Ps. xci. 4), *diplois* (Ps. cviii. 29), *cleemosyna* (Tob. xi. 14 = 22), *Judaismus* (2 Macc. viii. 1), *neomenia* (Ps. lxxx. 4), *palatha* (Judith x. 5), *pentapolis* (Sap. x. 6), *poderis* (Sap. xviii. 24), *rhomphaca* (Sir. xxi. 4), *tympanistria* (Ps. lxxvii. 26), *zelare* (Ps. lxxii. 3). Several of these words belong to ordinary post-Augustan Latin, but their use in the Vulgate may fairly be

¹ Cf. Kaulen, *Handbuch zur Vulgata* (Mainz, 1870), pp. 83 ff., 130 f., 189 ff.

ascribed to the influence of the LXX., usually through the O. L. The same may be said of many Vulgate reproductions of Hebrew names, e.g. *Moses, Balaam, Gomorrha, Gabaon, Jerusalem, Pharaoh*, where the LXX. spelling or pronunciation has been retained, no doubt because of its familiarity.

The influence of the other Greek versions over Jerome's great work, if less subtle and widely diffused, has been more direct, and in the matter of interpretation more important. Thus it was from Aquila that Jerome borrowed the following readings¹: Exod. ii. 5 *in papyrus* ('A. ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ παπυρεῶνος); Deut. xxxiii. 12 *quasi in thalamo morabitur* ('A. παστῶσει); Job xiv. 12 *donec atteratur caelum* ('A. ἕως ἂν κατατριβῆ ὁ οὐρανός); Amos ii. 13 *ego stridebo subter vos, sicut stridet plastrum* ('A. τριζήσω...τριζει); Jer. xlix. (xxix.) 19 *ad pulcritudinem robustam* ('A. πρὸς εὐπρέπειαν στερεάν). His debts to Symmachus are still more numerous, and only a few can be given here²; Num. xxv. 8 *in lupanar* (Σ. εἰς τὸ πορνεῖον); Jos. x. 42 *uno cepit impetu* (Σ. ἤχμαλώτευσεν μᾶ ὄρμη); Jud. xv. 19 *molarem dentem* (Σ. τὴν μύλην); 1 Regn. ix. 24 *quia de industria servatum est tibi* (Σ. ὅτι ἐπίτηδες τετήρηταί σοι); 4 Regn. ii. 14 *ubi est Dominus deus Eliae etiam nunc?* (Σ. καὶ νῦν); Isa. liv. 8 *in momento indignationis* (Σ. ἐν ἀτόμῳ ὀργῆς); Ezek. viii. 10 *in circuitu per totum* (Σ. κύκλῳ διόλου). It may be added that not a few of the Greek words retained in the Vulgate are from the later versions and not from the LXX.; e.g. *grabatus* (Amos iii. 12, 'A.), *laicus* (1 Regn. xxi. 4, 'A. Σ. Θ.), *lecythus* (3 Regn. xvii. 12 ff.), *tristegum* (Gen. vi. 16, Σ.).

The subject is too large to be adequately handled in a single chapter. But enough has been said to indicate the nature and extent of the influence which the Greek versions and the Septuagint in particular have exercised over Christian thought and letters, both in East and West, and the conse-

¹ Field, *Hexapla*, i., p. xxiv.

² For other exx. see Field, *op. cit.*, p. xxxiv.

quent importance of these translations for the student of ecclesiastical history and literature. Bishop Pearson's judgement as to the serviceableness of the LXX. to patristic students will always remain true: "si Graecos patres consulueris, quis eos de rebus divinis disserentes intelliget, qui normam quam semper in animo dum scriberent habuere non ante cognitam atque perspectam habeat?...sed ad Latinos patres non minus quam Graecos recte intelligendos LXX. viralis versio frequens utilis est, imo necessaria¹." He might have added that in the Latin Christendom of to-day the influence of the Greek versions is not extinct; the echoes of their text, their renderings, and their interpretations are still to be heard in the Bible, the worship, and the theology of the Western Church.

LITERATURE (on the general subject of the chapter). J. Pearson, *Praefatio paraenetica ad V. T. Graecum* (ed. E. Churton, Cambridge, 1855), H. Hody, *de Bibliorum textibus*, III. iii. sqq. J. G. Rosenmüller, *Historia interpretationis librorum sacr. in ecclesia Christiana* (1795—1814). W. R. Churton, *The influence of the Septuagint version upon the progress of Christianity* (Cambridge, 1861). F. W. Farrar, *History of Interpretations* (London, 1886). A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Septuagint Version* (in *Expositor*, v. vi. 1896).

¹ *Praef. paraen.*, ed. E. Churton, p. 25 f.

CHAPTER VI.

TEXTUAL CONDITION OF THE LXX., AND
PROBLEMS ARISING OUT OF IT.

I. WHEN the work of the Seventy-two had been accomplished, the Jews of Alexandria (so the legend goes) were bidden to invoke curses, after their manner, upon any who should dare to add to the version or take from it, or alter it in other ways (Aristeas *ad fin.*: ἐκέλευσαν διαράσασθαι, καθὼς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἐστίν, εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθείς ἢ μεταφέρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιούμενος ἀφαίρεσιν). The imprecation, it has been acutely observed, may point to an early deterioration of the text of the Greek Pentateuch, which the Pseudo-Aristeas desired to check. This inference is insecure, for the story is sufficiently explained by a reference to such passages as Deut. iv. 2, xii. 32¹; but it is certain that textual corruption began before the Christian era. There are traces of it in the writings of Philo, which cannot be due to blunders in Philo's own text.

E.g. in *quis rer. div. her.* 56 Philo quotes Gen. xv. 15 in the form now universal in MSS. of the LXX. (μετ' εἰρήνης τραφεῖς ἐν γῆρει καλῶ), adding the comment: οὐκοῦν...τὸ τέλειον γένος... εἰρήνη καὶ ἐλευθερία βεβαιωτάτη ἐν τρεφόμενον κτλ. This is perhaps the most convincing example, but we may add Gen. xvi. 14 Βαράδ=ἐν κακοῖς (*de fug.* 38), i.e. Βαράκ (Luc.); xxi. 6 οὐ χαριεῖται μοι (*de mut. nom.* 24, where however, as in *legg. all.* ii. 21, iii. 78, *quod det. pot. insid. sol.* 33, Cohn and Wendland read *συγχ. μοι* with cod. A^{phil}); Exod. xvii. 6 ἔστηκα πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας ἐγχωρεῖν (*de somn.* ii. 32, cf. B πρὸ τοῦ σε²...ἐν

¹ Cf. Apoc. xxii. 18 f.

² Thackeray, however, points out that this may not be textual corruption; cf. Lev. xviii. 30 πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς, Numb. xiii. 23 πρὸ τοῦ Τάνιν Αὐγύπτου.

Χωρήβ, AF πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐλθεῖν... ἐν Χ.). Similar corruptions probably exist in some of the N.T. citations, e.g. σῶμα¹ in Heb. x. 5 (Ps. xxxix. = xl. 7), and ἐνοχλή² for ἐν χολῇ in Heb. xii. 15 (Deut. xxix. 18 (17)). It may be added that double renderings already appear in Philo. E.g. in citing Deut. xix. 14 his MSS. give οἱ πατέρες σου (B) in *de post. Caini* 25, but οἱ πρότεροί σου (A) in *de justitia* 3.

Justin, as we have seen³, charges his Jewish contemporaries with the deliberate excision of numerous passages in the LXX. which were favourable to their Christian antagonists (*dial.* 71 πολλὰς γραφὰς τέλειον περιεῖλον ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξηγήσεων τῶν γεγενημένων ὑπὸ τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαίῳ γεγενημένων πρεσβυτέρων)⁴. But of the four passages produced in proof of his assertion three are mere glosses, probably of Christian origin; while the fourth, a genuine part of the book of Jeremiah (xi. 19), is now found in all MSS. of the LXX. The charge, though made in good faith, seems to have rested on no better foundation than a natural distrust of the Jews, who in Justin's time were active and bitter opponents of the Church. It is equally improbable that the Greek O.T. was wilfully interpolated by Christians, or that, if they attempted this, the existing text has been affected by it to any appreciable extent. A few traces may be found of the accidental influence of N. T. citations, e.g. the interpolation in Ps. xiii. 3, and perhaps also the reading σῶμα in Ps. xxxix.; but apart from these, the Septuagint, during the first two centuries after Christ, suffered little from Christian hands beyond errors of transcription. What Dr Hort has written in reference to the N.T. is doubtless true also of the LXX.: "accusations of wilful tampering with the text are...

¹ As in all our MSS. of Ps. xxxix.

² See codd. B*AF* in Deut. *l.c.*

³ Above, p. 424.

⁴ Cf. *dial.* 120; Iren. iii. 21. 1, 5; Eus. *dem. ev.* vi. p. 257 c, d.

not unfrequent in Christian antiquity...but with a single exception, wherever they can be verified they prove to be groundless, being in fact hasty and unjust inferences from mere diversities of inherited text¹."

Accidental corruptions², however, and variations of reading and rendering grew apace, and in the third century Origen complains of the uncertainty of the Biblical text in both its parts³ (*comm. in Matt.* t. xv. 14 *δηλονότι πολλή γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἴτε ἀπὸ ραθυμίας τινῶν γραφέων εἴτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιρούντων*⁴). Besides intentional changes he notices elsewhere (1) double renderings: *hom. in 1 Regn.*, i. 4 "non me latet...quod in aliquibus exemplaribus habetur *erat vir quidam* (ἄνθρωπος τις ἦν, codd. M, 44, &c.), sed in his exemplaribus quae emendatiora probavimus ita habetur, *erat vir unus* (A, ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος εἷς)"; (2) transpositions: on Jer. xlvii. 4 he has the note *ἡ τῶν ὁ ἐν τισι τόποις μεταθεῖσα ὥστε τὰ πρῶτα ὕστερα καὶ τὰ ὕστερα πρῶτα γενέσθαι*; (3) errors of transcription: in Jer. xv. 10, where most of his copies read, as ours do now, *ὠφέλησα, ὠφέλησεν*, he maintains that this reading is a *γραφικὸν*

¹ *Intr. to N.T. in Greek*, p. 283. The one exception which Dr Hort mentions in connexion with the N.T., the excision practised by Marcion, finds no parallel in the Christian history of the Greek O.T.

² A good example of corruption in the Greek is to be found in Num. iii. 24, where all Greek MSS. and the O.L. (Lyons Pentateuch) read *Δαήλ*

Dael for *Δαήλ* (𐤃𐤏𐤋). The name of Joshua's father in the LXX. is *Νανή* (O. L. *Nave*), probably in the first instance an error for *Ναὺν* (NATH for NATN) = 𐤏𐤃. Another well-known instance is the A text of Jud. v. 8 *σκέπη νεανίδων σιρομαστῶν ἀνήθθη καὶ σιρομάστης*, which, as Ewald pointed out, conceals the doublet (1) *σκέπην ἐὰν ἴδω καὶ σιρομάστην*, (2) *σκέπη ἐὰν ὀφθῆ καὶ σιρομάστης*. In 1 Esdr. v. 34 *Σαφάγ* B is an orthographical error (cf. A).

³ Though he is referring especially to MSS. of the N.T. his next words shew that the remark is meant to include the LXX.: *τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν κτλ.* (see, for the rest, above, p. 60).

⁴ The gravest instance of *ἀφαιρέσεις* was found in the book of Job; see above, p. 255.

ἀμάρτημα for ὠφείλῃσα ὠφείλῃσεν. Such faults were specially common in the case of proper names: in *Joann.* t. vi. 41 τὸ δ' ὅμοιον¹ περὶ τὰ ὀνόματα σφάλμα πολλαχοῦ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ἔστιν ἰδεῖν, ὡς ἠκριβώσαμεν ἀπὸ Ἑβραίων μαθόντες, καὶ τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις αὐτῶν τὰ ἡμέτερα συγκρίναντες.

In these criticisms Origen makes no attempt to distinguish between supposed errors which are properly textual, and those which belong to the translation itself. His sole criterion of error was divergence from the official Hebrew, and he assumed that all divergences were textual only, the translation having been originally exact. Nevertheless there can be little doubt that in the course of four centuries many actual corruptions such as he describes must have accumulated in the MSS. of the LXX. The κοινή ἔκδοσις², as the uncorrected MSS. were called, needed revision, and the literary activity of the third century endeavoured to supply it. At Caesarea in Palestine, at Antioch, in Egypt, independent attempts were made to restore the Septuagint to its primitive purity. But the remedies which were adopted unhappily increased the disease. "The Hexapla, from its very nature, encouraged the formation of mixed texts³"; the Hexaplaric recension, divorced from the rest of the work, accentuated this tendency, and the other recensions had a similar effect, although they aimed at the simpler task of correcting the errors of the κοινή.

2. Of the Hexaplaric, Lucianic, and Hesychian recensions some account has been given already⁴. In this place we have only to consider how far it is possible to employ them in the criticism of the text. Their importance to the critic of the LXX. lies in the fact that they were based upon copies of the κοινή, as it was read in Palestine, Syria, and Egypt during the

¹ In the context Origen refers to the apparent confusion of Γάδαρα and Γέργεσα in the Gospels.

² Ἡ κοινή ἔκδοσις was also used of the LXX. as compared with the Hebrew text and the other Greek versions: see Nestle in Hastings, *D.B.* iv. 438.

³ Driver, *Samucl.*, p. xlvi.

⁴ See above, Part I. c. iii.

third century. But in order to recover from them this unrevised text, two preliminary tasks have to be undertaken. The recensions themselves must first, as far as possible, be restored from existing materials, and we must then proceed to eliminate from them such elements as are recensional, or are due to the reviser's hand.

As to the first of these processes, the materials from which it is proposed to recover the recensions are fairly abundant and varied, but there is much uncertainty as to the attribution of some of them, whilst others present a particular recension only in certain books or portions of books, or with more or less of mixture. The principal authorities for each recension have already been mentioned, but it may be well to collect them here in a compact form.

*Hexaplaric*¹. Codd. G, M, Q; 15, 22, 38, 58, 72, 86, 88, 135, 137, 138, 139, 161, 248, 249, 250, 252, 255, 256, 258, 259, 264, 268, 273; Paris Nat. Reg. gr. 129, 131, 132, Ars. 8415, Escorial Σ. 1. 16, Leipzig gr. 361, Zurich c. 11, Athos Vatop. 516, Pantocr. 24, Protaton. 53, Laur. γ. 112. Versions: Sahidic (in part), Armenian (in part), Syro-hexaplar.

*Lucianic*². Codd. 19, 22, 36, 48, 51, 62, 82, 90, 93, 95, 108, 118, 144, 147, 153, 185, 231, 233, 245, 308; Paris Coisl. gr. 184, Athens bibl. nat. 44. Versions: Old Latin, Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, Armenian (in part), Slavonic. Fathers: Chrysostom, and other writers of the School of Antioch³.

*Hesychian*⁴. Codd. Q, 26, 44, 49, 68, 74, 76, 84, 87, 90, 91, 106, 107, 134, 198, 228⁵, 238, 306. Paris suppl. gr. 609. Versions: Bohairic, Armenian (in part). Cyril of Alexandria; other Egyptian writers.

The fragments of the Hexapla have been collected by the labours of a succession of scholars such as P. Morinus, Drusius, Montfaucon, and especially Field, in whose *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* may be found all the remains of

¹ For fuller information see pp. 78, 112 ff., 118 ff., 137 f., 140, 148 ff.

² See pp. 82 ff., 93, 116 ff., 148 ff.

³ Lagarde would add (*Ankündigung*, p. 27) the writings of the Emperor Julian.

⁴ See pp. 80, 107 ff., 145, 148 ff., and on the recensions generally cf. Ceriani in *Rendiconti d. R. Ist. Lomb.* (18 Feb. 1886).

⁵ 228, and 238 to some extent, fluctuate between Luc. and Hes.; see Oesterley, *Amos*, p. 19 f.

Origen's works which were available in 1875. These editions do not aim at restoring the text of the Hexaplaric LXX. in a connected form. Such a restoration, however, has been attempted in the case of Lucian's recension by Lagarde¹, who desired to see a similar work accomplished for the recension of Hesychius, and an edition in which the two texts should appear facing one another on opposite pages. When this had been done, he proposed (1) to eliminate from these any Hexaplaric matter, by comparing them with the fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; and (2) to collect the readings which departed most widely from the M. T. By this process he hoped that a point of departure would be reached from which the reconstruction of the LXX. might begin².

This scheme is worthy of the great scholar who initiated it, and it was the first serious effort to grasp the problem of scientific reconstruction. But its progress has been checked and perhaps finally stopped by its author's premature death, and its successful accomplishment under any circumstances was at least problematical. So long as no MS. or version presents an unmixed text of either Lucian or Hesychius, and much uncertainty remains as to the exact sources from which they are to be recovered, restorations of this kind cannot be regarded as more than tentative or provisional. Meanwhile, such attempts are not free from danger. Since the publication of Lagarde's edition, there has been a tendency on the part of Biblical students to cite it as 'Lucian,' without reserve. Lagarde himself is careful not to claim finality for his work; he describes it as "editionem...in gravioribus omnibus satis fidam," and looks forward to a more exact

¹ See above, p. 83 f.

² An earlier scheme is set forth in *Genesis Graece*, p. 21: "primum molior librum e codicum uncialium qui hexaplares non sunt...consensu haud raro certa coniectura emendando edendum...deinceps propositum est ...editionem hexaplares curare...tertio loco...adparatum criticum integrum adiungere cogito."

representation of Lucian's text: "conlatis codicibus versionibusque eam praebentibus et patrum ea utentibus excussis efficiendum erit ut etiam in minutioribus adcurate edita dici merito possit¹." But this hope has not been fulfilled, and an edition of Lucian which falls short of exactness in smaller details cannot be directly used for the critical editing of the LXX. It has rendered valuable services in other departments of Biblical study, exhibiting sufficiently the characteristics of this recension, and repeatedly offering, especially in the four books of Kingdoms, renderings of a Hebrew text distinct from \mathfrak{H} ². But in the delicate task of reconstructing the Greek text, recourse must be had to the actual evidence which lies behind Lagarde's work. For this purpose it would seem to be more important to provide texts based upon groups of MSS., somewhat after the manner of the *Collection of four important MSS.* (the Ferrar-group) published by Dr T. K. Abbott. Doubtless such groups would mainly follow the lines of the ancient recensions, but the identification would not be complete, and the student would have before him not only the general result, but the whole of the evidence upon which it was based.

3. Perhaps a more lasting service was rendered to the textual criticism of the Septuagint by the axioms and principles which Lagarde's long study of the problem enabled him to lay down for the guidance of the student and the future editors. His early book *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (1863) starts with the following axioms: (1) Since the MSS. of the LXX. are all directly or indirectly the result of an eclectic process, any attempt to restore the original text must also proceed on eclectic principles; and the critic must chiefly depend upon (a) his acquaintance with the style of the

¹ *Praef.* xv.

² See Driver, *Samuel*, pp. lii. f., lviii.: I. Hooykas, *Iets over de grieksche vertaling van het O. T.*, p. 12 ff.

several translators and (*b*) his faculty of referring readings to a Semitic original or, when they are not of Semitic origin, recognising them as corruptions of the Greek archetype. (2) Where the critic has to make choice between two readings, he will do well to prefer (*a*) a free translation to one which is slavishly exact, and (*b*) a translation based upon another Hebrew text to one which represents the M. T. In the preface to his Lucianic Septuagint, published twenty years later, three principles are asserted: (1) A critical text of the Greek O. T. cannot be based on the authority of any one MS. or without regard to the grouping of MSS.; (2) the restoration of the text common to any one family must not be regarded as more than a step forward in the right direction; (3) even a critical text, when reached by these or other means, will not be free from the element of uncertainty.

Lagarde's own words are as follows: *Anmerkungen*, p. 3: "nur drei axiome schicke ich voraus: I. die manuscrite der griechischen übersetzung des alten testaments sind alle entweder unmittelbar oder mittelbar das resultat eines eklektischen verfahrens: darum muss, wer den echten text wiederfinden will, ebenfalls eklektiker sein. Sein maasstab kann nur die kenntniss des styles der einzelnen übersetzer, sein haupthilfsmittel muss die fähigkeit sein, die ihm vorkommenden lesarten auf ihr semitisches original zurückzuführen oder aber als originalgriechische verderbnisse zu erkennen. II. wenn ein vers oder verstheil in einer freien und in einer sklavisch treuen übertragung vorliegt, gilt die erstere als die echte. III. wenn sich zwei lesarten nebeneinander finden, von denen die eine den masoretischen text ausdrückt, die andre nur aus einer von ihm abweichenden urschrift erklärt werden kann, so ist die letztere für ursprünglich zu halten." *Libr. V. T. can.* i. p. xvi.: "tenenda tria esse aio: [1] editionem veteris testamenti graeci curari non posse ad unius alicuius codicis auctoritatem, sed conlatis integris codicum familiis esse curandam: nam familiis non accedere auctoritatem a codicibus, sed codicibus a familiis: [2] unius alicuius familiae editionem nihil esse nisi procedendi ulterius adminiculum: [3] errare qui si quando ipsa manus veterum interpretum inventa sit, in ea legenda adquiesci debere perhibeant, quum conlatis vetera emendandi periculis omnibus indagandum sit quae explicationis veteris testamenti per quatuor saecula fata

fuering, ut tandem aliquando pateat quam incerta in hoc literarum genere omnia sint, et quam multa nulla alia re nisi coniectura nitantur sciorum, supersticiosorum, desperantium.”

4. These principles have been stated at length, because they are fruitful in themselves, and they mark an important step in the progress of LXX. textual criticism. But it is obvious that they do not form a complete and coherent code of critical canons. Indeed, Lagarde's later axioms to some extent limit and correct the earlier, for the recognition of the principle of grouping the MSS. and taking their evidence according to families evidently serves as a check upon the extreme eclecticism recommended in the first axiom of 1863. Nevertheless the series forms an excellent starting-point for a brief discussion of the problems which lie before the future critical editor of the LXX. and the principles by which he must be guided.

By a singular accident the first two printed editions of the Greek Old Testament exhibit on the whole the Lucianic and Hesychian texts respectively', whilst the Roman edition of 1587 and the Oxford edition of 1707—20 are roughly representative of the two great uncial codices, B and A. Thus the earlier editors anticipated, though imperfectly and (in the case of the Complutensian and Aldine Septuagints) unwittingly, the two methods of editing the Greek O. T. which are still in use. Of the advantages and disadvantages of the recensional method, enough has been said. The other, which consists of printing the text of a single MS., with or without an *apparatus criticus*, is clearly desirable only in the case of a MS. which sufficiently represents an important type of text, and may thus be profitably used as a standard of comparison. Such are the two great uncials already mentioned.

Cod. B, as was pointed out by Dr Hort², “on the whole

¹ Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 79: “ein wunderbar glücklicher Zufall hätte uns somit in der Aldine im Grossen und Ganzen den Hesych gegeben, wie die Complutensis im Grossen und Ganzen den Lucian darstellt.”

² See *O.T. in Greek*, p. xi. f.

presents the version of the Septuagint in its relatively oldest form." Taken as a whole, it is neutral in its relation to the recensions of the third and fourth centuries; its text is neither predominantly Lucianic nor Hesychian¹ nor Hexaplaric. Cornill, indeed, was at one time led by certain appearances in the B text of Ezekiel to believe that in that prophet at least the scribe of B had extracted his text from the fifth column of the Hexapla, or rather, from the edition of Eusebius and Pamphilus². Lagarde, however, at once pointed out the difficulties which beset Cornill's theory³, and Hort, in a letter to the *Academy* (Dec. 24, 1887), dismissed it with the remark, "What Cornill does seem to me to have proved is that in Ezekiel B and the LXX. text of the Hexapla have an element in common at variance with most other texts"; adding, "The facts suggest that B in the Septuagint was copied from a MS. or MSS. partially akin in text to the MS. or MSS. from which Origen took the fundamental text for the LXX. column of his Hexapla⁴." Eventually Cornill withdrew his suggestion, observing that the forms of the proper names in B shew no sign of having been influenced by Origen's corrections⁵.

If we accept Dr Hort's view, which at present holds the field, the Vatican MS. in the O. T. as a whole carries us back to the third century text known to Origen, and possibly to one much earlier. In other words, not only is the Vatican MS. our oldest MS. of the Greek Bible, but it contains, speaking quite generally, the oldest text. But it would be an error to suppose that this is true in regard to every context or even every book,

¹ This however has been doubted; see Nestle, *Introd. to the Textual Criticism of the N. T.*, pp. 61 f., 183 f.

² See his *Ezechiel*, pp. 84, 95. The theory was suggested by an early hypothesis of Lagarde (*Anmerkungen*, p. 3) that the text of B was extracted from a glossed codex.

³ In *Gött. gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1886 (reprinted in *Mittheilungen*, ii. p. 49 ff.).

⁴ On the *provenance* of B and \aleph see Hort, *Intr.*², p. 264 ff., Harris, *Stichometry*, p. 71 ff., Robinson, *Euthaliana*, p. 42 ff., and the summary in Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.*, p. 128.

⁵ *Gött. gelehrte Nachrichten*, xxx. (1888, 8, p. 194 ff.).

and a still graver error to treat the text of B as necessarily representing everywhere the original Septuagint. As Mr Burkitt has pointed out¹, "the O. L. and the Hexaplar text convict B here and there of interpolation, especially in Isaiah." "Certainly (he writes in another place²) in the books of Kings it is free from some of the gross interpolations which have befallen most other MSS. But it cannot claim to transmit to us an *unrevised* text of the κοινή ἑκδοσις. Many of its readings shew marks of irregular revision and the hand of an editor. As a result of this critical process, B sometimes tends to agree with the Massoretic text where other LXX. authorities represent a widely different underlying Hebrew. B also contains a certain number of widely spread corruptions that are of purely Greek origin, which are absent from earlier forms of the LXX. such as the Old Latin³." In certain books the general character of B breaks down altogether, i.e. the archetype of B in those books was of another kind. Thus in Judges B was formerly suspected of representing the Hesychian recension⁴, whilst a living scholar has hinted that it may give the text of a translation not earlier than the fourth century A.D.⁵ The Cambridge editors of the A text of Judges wisely content themselves with "the surmise that [as regards B and A in this book] the true text of the Septuagint is probably contained neither in the one nor in the other exclusively, but must be sought for by comparing in detail, verse by verse, and word by word, the two recensions, in the light of all other available evidence,

¹ *Tyconius*, p. cxvii.

² *Aquila*, p. 19.

³ An interesting and plausible specimen of this class of errors occurs in 4 Regn. iii. 21 B, καὶ εἶπον ὦ (A, with **Α**, καὶ ἐπάνω). The process of corruption is evident (εἶπανω, εἰπανω, εἰπονω). In Sirach instances are especially abundant, e.g. xliii. 17 ὠλέδισεν (A, ὠδλησεν); 23 ἐφύτευσεν αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς (H. P. 248 ἐφ. ἐν αὐτῇ νήσους); 26 εὐδία τέλος (248 εὐδοῖ ὁ ἄγγελος).

⁴ Grabe, *ep. ad Millium* (1705).

⁵ Moore, *Judges*, p. xlvi.

and especially of the extant remains of the Hexapla¹—a remark which is capable of a much wider application².

Cod. A, the great rival of cod. B, “exhibits a text which has been systematically corrected so as to agree more closely with the Hebrew³.” “In all four books of Kings and in some other parts A has been conformed to the Hexaplar text...In fact A is often little more than a transcript of the fourth column of the Hexapla, but without the critical signs by which Origen’s additions were marked off from the rest⁴.” In other words, adaptation to the Hebrew has been effected not by direct use of the official Hebrew text, but through the medium of Origen’s work. Thus, if B represents in part the text which lay before Origen when he began his task, A, at least in the historical books, answers roughly to the result at which he arrived.

Yet A is very far from being, even in the earlier books, a mere reproduction of the Eusebian recension. It has been extensively hexaplarised, but it possesses a large element of ancient readings which are not Hexaplaric, and which it shares, to a great extent, with the Lucianic family. Moreover, as we have already seen, the citations of the LXX. in the N. T. and by Christian writers of the first three centuries, often support the readings of A with a remarkable unanimity⁵. These phenomena point to the presence in A of an underlying text of great antiquity, possibly a pre-Christian recension made in Syria⁶. It must be observed, however, that the text of this MS. is not

¹ A. E. Brooke and N. McLean, *The Book of Judges in Greek acc. to the text of Cod. Alexandrinus* (Cambridge, 1897), p. v.

² On the B text of Sirach and Tobit see above, pp. 271, 274.

³ Driver, *Samuel*, p. 1.

⁴ Burkitt, *Aquila*, p. 19; cf. p. 53 f. Cf. Silberstein, *Über den Ursprung der im cod. Alex. u. Vaticanus des dritten Königsbuches...überlieferten Textgestalt* (Giessen, 1893).

⁵ Above, pp. 395 f., 403, 413, 422.

⁶ It is, however, possible that the readings in B, which have no such support and are indeed almost unique, belong to a still earlier text of the LXX., which had not received Palestinian revision. Cf. p. 429.

homogeneous throughout. The Psalms are evidently copied from a Psalter written for ecclesiastical use, and it is interesting to notice how constantly A here appears in company with the later liturgical Psalters R and T, and with the seventh century corrector of \aleph known as \aleph^{c-a} . In the Prophets \aleph AQ are in frequent coalition against B, and in agreement with the group which is believed to be representative of the Hesychian recension.

As to cod. \aleph it is more difficult to form a judgement. We are still dependent for its text on Tischendorf's facsimiles. Moreover, with the exception of a few fragments of Genesis and Numbers, larger portions of 1 Chronicles and 2 Esdras, and the Books of Esther, Judith and Tobit, 1 and 4 Maccabees, this MS. is known to us only in the poetical and prophetic books. Notes at the end of 2 Esdras and Esther claim for the MS. that in those books it was corrected by the aid of a copy of the Hexaplaric text written under the supervision of Pamphilus¹. But the first hand of \aleph often agrees with A against B, and the combinations \aleph ART in the Psalms, \aleph AC in the other poetical books, and \aleph AQ in the Prophets, are not uncommon. In Tobit, as we have seen, \aleph follows a recension which differs widely from B. On the whole, however, it comes nearer to B than any of the other uncials, often confirming its characteristic or otherwise unique readings. Cod. C is yet more fragmentary and its fragments are limited to the poetical books which follow the Psalter.

Thus if a single uncial MS. is to be adopted as a standard of comparison, it is obvious that either A or B must be chosen for the purpose, and B is to be preferred as being freer from Hexaplaric interpolations and offering generally a more neutral text. The latter MS. has therefore been employed by recent editors, and this course is probably the best that can be

¹ See above, p. 75. The N. T. has now appeared in collotype, with introduction by Prof. K. Lake (Oxford, 1911).

followed. But the method of editing the text of a single MS. leaves much to be desired, for, as Lagarde rightly insists, no single MS. and no single family of MSS. can be regarded as a trustworthy or sufficient representative of the original LXX.

5. There remains the alternative of constructing a critical text. This can only be done by the scientific use of all existing materials¹. The task which lies before the critical editor of the LXX. is partly similar to that of the N. T. editor, and partly *sui generis*. The general principles which will guide him are those which have been expounded by Dr Hort in the second part of *Introduction to the N. T. in Greek*². The documents moreover fall into the same three classes: (1) MSS., (2) versions, (3) literary citations; although in the case of the LXX., the versions are 'daughter-versions' and not based upon an original text, and the citations are not limited to post-apostolic Christian writers, but may be gathered also from Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament. But in the application of the principles of criticism to these documents the critic of the LXX. must strike out a path for himself. Here his course will partly be shaped by the fact that he is dealing with a version and not with an original text³, and by the history of the transmission of the version, which is only to a limited extent identical with that of the transmission of the Greek New Testament.

(a) The first business of the critic of the LXX. is to review the documentary evidence which is available for his use. This has been already described at some length (MSS., pp. 122—170; Versions, pp. 87—121; Citations, pp. 369—432). The preliminary work of preparing these materials for use is still in progress. We now have access to photographic reproductions

¹ Cf. Nestle, *Zur Rekonstruktion der Septuaginta* (in *Philologus*, 1899).

² Ed. 2 (1896), pp. 19—72.

³ The original text may be regarded as the primary document for the text of the version.

of codd. ABGLQ^Θ, facsimiles or printed texts of \aleph CDEFHKO RTUYZ^Π, and collations of the remaining uncials, and of a large number of the cursives. But the facsimiles are more or less inadequate, and the older collations of unpublished MSS. need careful verification. To turn to the versions, the fragments of the Old Latin are now for the most part accessible in carefully edited but scattered texts, and the more important of the Egyptian and Syriac versions have received much attention; but the Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Georgian and Slavonic are still but partially explored. Good progress is being made in the editing of Philo, Josephus, and the Christian fathers, both Greek and Latin. Thus, while much remains to be done in the way of perfecting the *apparatus criticus* of the Greek O. T., there is an abundance of materials ready for immediate use, and every prospect that in a few years the store will be largely increased.

(b) When an editor has been found who is competent to undertake reconstruction, he will probably desire to limit himself to that one task, after the example of the editors of the *New Testament in Greek*¹, and his resources, if not as abundant as those of the N. T. editors, will be both sufficient and trustworthy. But with the materials thus ready to his hand, how is he to proceed? As in the case of the New Testament, he will begin by interrogating the history of his text. Here there are certain landmarks to guide him at starting. As we have seen, the three recensions which in the fourth century had a well-defined local distribution, have been connected with groups of extant documents—two of them quite definitely, the third with some probability. Other groups representing less clearly recognised families have emerged from recent enquiries, such as that which yields the text characteristic of the catenae (H. P. 14, 16, 28, 52, 57, 73,

¹ Cf. Hort, *Intr.*², p. 90.

77, Paris Reg. Gr. 128, and many others), the pair H. P. 54, 75, with which © and 59 may also to some extent be classed, and the codices which correspond more or less closely with cod. A and cod. B respectively. It is probable that as the collation and examination of MSS., versions, and fathers proceed, other groups, or other members of the groups already mentioned, will come to light, leaving an ever diminishing number of documents which present a text either too mixed or too peculiar to be classified.

(c) In operating upon the groups thus obtained the critical editor will possess two chief aids towards the discrimination of ancient elements from those which are later or recensional. (1) While the East in Jerome's time was divided between the Lucianic, Hesychian, and Hexaplaric texts, the great Western dioceses, Carthage, Milan, and Rome, read the LXX. under the guise of a Latin version, beneath which originally lay a Greek text anterior to the Hexapla itself. Consequently, the Old Latin, in its purest types, carries us behind all our existing MSS., and is sometimes nearer to the Septuagint, as the Church received that version from the Synagogue, than the oldest of our uncial MSS. Readings which have disappeared from every known Greek MS. are here and there preserved by the daughter-version, and in such cases the O. L. becomes a primary authority for the Greek text¹. But besides these occasional contributions of a direct nature, this version is of the highest value as enabling the critical editor to detect pre-Origenic readings and to distinguish them from those which are later or recensional. In regard to the latter point the test is not an absolute one, because it is always possible that the reading on which an O.L. rendering is based was one of two or more that were both current in the *κοινή* before Origen's time. (2) But the O. L. is not our only witness to the read-

¹ Burkitt, *Tyconius*, p. cxvii. f.

ings of the *κοινή*. Its evidence may often be checked and confirmed by that of the Syro-Hexaplar and the fragments of the Hexaplaric Greek, where the obeli and asterisks distinguish readings which existed in Origen's MSS. from those which were interpolated from other sources, or rewritten with their aid¹.

(*d*) By such means the critic may often satisfy himself that he has reached the text of the Septuagint as it was found in Christian MSS. of the third, perhaps even of the second century. It is another question how far the *κοινή* *ἔκδοσις* of the Christian Church was identical with the pre-Christian text or texts of Alexandria and Jerusalem. Early citations from the LXX. suggest a diversity of readings and possibly the existence of two or more recensions in the first century, and lead us to believe that many of the variations of our MSS. have come down from sources older than the Christian era.

Here our documentary evidence fails us, and we have to fall back upon the 'internal evidence of readings.' The variants which remain after eliminating Hexaplaric matter, and recensional changes later than the Hexapla, resolve themselves into two classes; viz. (1) readings which affect merely the Greek text, such as (*a*) corruptions obvious or possible, or (*b*) doublets, whether brought together in a conflate text, or existing in different MSS.; and (2) readings which presuppose a difference in the original. In dealing with both classes much help may be obtained from Lagarde's earlier axioms². In detecting corruptions the student must chiefly depend on his faculty of recognising a Semitic original under Greek which does not directly suggest it; in deciding between double renderings, he will set aside that which bears marks of correction or of assimilation to the official Hebrew or to later Greek versions based

¹ On this point see Burkitt, *Aquila*, p. 33 f.

² Above, p. 484 f.

upon it, choosing that which is freer, less exact, and perhaps less grammatical, as being probably nearer to the work of the original translator. Lastly, when the variants imply divergent Hebrew texts, he will prefer, *ceteris paribus*, that which departs from the Massoretic text. The application of these rules, however, calls for knowledge and judgement of no ordinary kind¹.

6. It cannot be doubted that the future will produce a school of critics competent to deal with the whole question of Septuagint reconstruction, and that a critical edition of the Old Testament in Greek will hereafter take its place on the shelves of the scholar's library by the side of the present *New Testament in Greek* or its successor. Meanwhile some immediate wants may be mentioned here. (1) Several important uncial MSS. still need to be reproduced by photography, particularly codd. \aleph , F, R, V, T; and the process might well be extended to some of the weightier cursives. (2) Texts of which photographs have been published, or of which verified transcripts or collations exist, deserve in some cases detailed examination, with the view of determining their precise character in the several books or groups of books, and their relation to one another and to a common standard, such as the text of B. (3) The stores of fresh Hexaplaric matter which have accumulated during the interval of years since the publication of Field's great book², will soon be sufficient to form a supplementary volume, which might also contain the corrections supplied by photography and by the more exact collation of Hexaplaric MSS. (4) Is it too much to hope that the University which has the honour of having issued from its Press the Septuagint of Holmes and Parsons

¹ On the scope for conjecture where evidence fails, see Hatch, *Essays*, p. 281, where some other remarks are to be found which deserve attention but need sifting and safeguarding.

² See the second *fasciculus* of Dr Redpath's Supplement to the Oxford Concordance.

may see fit to reprint at least the apparatus of that monumental work with such emendations and abbreviations as it may be possible to adopt without seriously interfering with the scope and method of the edition? It is improbable that a collection of all the evidence on so vast a scale will ever be attempted again, and until this has been done, Holmes and Parsons cannot be superseded as a storehouse of facts. (5) A proposal was made by Dr Nestle at the London Oriental Congress of 1892 to compile a '*Variorum Septuagint*,' giving the text of B with marginal variants sufficient to correct the errors of that MS. There can be little doubt that such an edition would be serviceable, especially if the scheme could be so far extended as to include a selection from all the variants, after the manner of the English '*Variorum Bible*.' (6) Every student of the Old Testament will wish success to the undertaking which is now in progress at the Cambridge Press. Although the text of the Larger Septuagint will be simply that of the standard MS. employed in the manual edition, its *apparatus* will for the first time present to the critical scholar the essential documentary evidence, verified with scrupulous care, and arranged in a form at once compendious and helpful to research.

LITERATURE. W. Selwyn, art. *Septuagint*, in Smith's D.B. iii. (London, 1863). P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur gr. Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig, 1863); *Genesis Graece* (Leipzig, 1868); *Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der gr. Übersetzung des A. T.* (Göttingen, 1882); *Librorum V. T. canonicorum pars prior* (Göttingen, 1883); review of Cornill's *Ezechiel* in *Gött. gelehrte Anzeigen*, June 1, 1886 (reprinted in *Mittheilungen*, ii. 49 ff., Göttingen, 1887). J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen, 1871); art. *Septuagint* in *Encycl. Brit.*⁹ (London, 1886). C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig, 1886); in *Gött. gelehrte Nachrichten* xxx. (1888, 8, p. 194 ff.). A. Ceriani, *Le recensioni dei LXX. e la versione latina detta Itala* in *Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo* II. xix., xxi. (1883—4); review of the *O.T. in Greek* in *Rendiconti*

II. xxi., xii. (1888); *De codice Marchaliano* (Rome, 1890). W. Sanday and F. J. A. Hort, letters in *Academy*, Dec. 10 and 24, 1887. V. Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt...des Buches Micha*, p. 175 ff. (Leipzig, 1887). I. Hooykas, *Iets over de grieksche vertaling van het Oude Testament* (Rotterdam, 1888). H. Oort, *De Lagarde's plan van eene vitgaaf der Septuaginta* (? 1882). E. Hatch, *Essays on Biblical Greek*, iv.—vii. (Oxford, 1889). S. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, Intr. p. xlvii. ff. (Oxford, 1890). A. Dillmann, *Textkritisches zum Buche Ijob* (in *Sitzungsberichte d. k. P. Akademie d. Wiss. zu Berlin*, 1890, liii.). E. Nestle, *The Variorum Septuagint*, in *Proceedings of Oriental Congress held at London, 1892*; *Urtext* p. 77 f. (1897); *Zur Rekonstruktion der Septuaginta*, in *Philologus*, N. F., xii. 1 (1899) p. 121 ff. E. Klostermann, *De libro Coheleth versione Alexandrina* (Kiel, 1892); review of *The O. T. in Greek* in *Gött. gelehrte Anzeigen* (1895. 4). S. Silberstein, *Über den Ursprung der im Cod. Alex. u. Vat. des dritten Königsbuches überlieferten Textgestalt* (Giessen, 1893). Bleek-Wellhausen, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 549 ff. (Berlin, 1893). F. C. Burkitt, *The Rules of Tyconius*, p. cxlii. ff. (Cambridge, 1894); *The Old Latin and Itala* (Cambridge, 1896); *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila* (Cambridge, 1897). G. Moore, *Commentary on the Book of Judges*, p. xlv. ff. H. P. Smith, *Commentary on the Books of Samuel*, pp. xxx. ff., 402 ff. (Edinburgh, 1899). A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, i.—iii., Göttingen, 1904, 1907, 1911; C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Heb. Text of the Books of Kings*, Oxford, 1903; W. O. E. Oesterley, *Studies in...Amos*, Cambridge, 1902; C. C. Torrey, *Apparatus for the criticism of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah*, in *O. T. and Semitic Studies* (Chicago), xi.; H. St J. Thackeray in *J. Th. St.*, xii. 46; and many of the works named on pp. 27, 28; 104; 191—4; 262—4; 285—8.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

P. 10 ff. The 'Letter of Aristeas' can now be read in Mr H. St J. Thackeray's English translation (*J.Q.R.* xv. April 1903, and separately reprinted by Macmillan, 1904), which is furnished with a short introduction and notes, taking account of Wendland's edition and translation. The *ostensible* date of the writing is about 250 B.C.; or earlier, for Philadelphus is apparently spoken of as still living, and the references to his father (§§ 12, 22) would suggest that his reign was not very far advanced. Nor is anything said to imply the death of Eleazar, whose high priesthood is usually dated 292—277 B.C. (see §§ 125, 321). The writer professes, as a Greek at Philadelphus' court (§ 40, cf. 173), to regard the Jews, their country, and their customs, from an outsider's point of view (§§ 3, 6, 112, etc.). But it remains generally agreed, that he betrays himself to be in reality a Jew, writing at a later time. There is, however, some difference of opinion as to the actual date of writing. Schürer, placing it as early as 200 B.C., is supported by Herriot (*Philon le Juif*); Wendland from 96 to 63, rather towards the earlier date; Willrich (in *Judaica*, 1900) as late as A.D. 33; but this view is not generally accepted. Hart (*Ecclesiasticus in Greek*, 243 ff., 263 ff.) finds evidence that the author knew and used the Prologue to the Greek Sirach; which, however, he dates early, some little time after 247 B.C. Wendland also sees some connexion, but accepts the more usual date of the years following 132 B.C. for Ecclesiasticus. Thackeray, who thinks that Hart makes too much of some identities of language, pronounces, on the strength of some linguistic details, as well as on internal grounds, for a date not earlier than the middle of the second century B.C., and perhaps between 140 or 130 B.C. for the earlier, and 80 B.C. for the later limit. Probably 100—80 B.C. fairly represents the resultant of his view and Wendland's.

On the other hand, Mr I. Abrahams (*J.Q.R.* xiv. p. 321 ff., Jan. 1902) defends a date practically the same as Schürer's. He points out that the writer, though a Jew, draws his historical information, and his description of Palestine, from non-Jewish sources, and his 'Table-discourses,' §§ 187—292, from Greek learning and not from Jewish gnomic wisdom. (On this latter point, however, opinions will still differ, as in the case, e.g., of Ecclesiastes.) He adds further, that, though there may be error, if not fraud, in the part assigned to Demetrius Phalereus, yet the 'Letter' has been exposed, through the additions made to the story by Christian

writers, to some unfair suspicion; and that the story, as Josephus read it, appears to have presented nothing incredible to his mind. This is, perhaps, as far as anyone can now go in rehabilitating the credit of the 'Letter,' in which, however, a considerable substratum of fact is usually allowed to exist. The view of Wendland and Thackeray probably now commands the most general assent; though some adhere to the position of Schürer and Abrahams.

P. 23. That Aristeas speaks only of the Law may be seen in §§ 3, 10, 46, 171, 176; while the statement of Epiphanius is implicitly contradicted by § 302.

P. 24. If the usual dates for Ecclesiasticus and its Prologue are accepted, a little time must be allowed *after* B.C. 132, the date of the writer's arrival in Egypt, before he could produce his work. Nor need the collections of the Prophets and Hagiographa, though in existence, have been finally completed when he wrote. See Thackeray, *Grammar of O.T. in Greek*, pp. 13, 15 ff.; also in *J. Th. Stud.* VIII. 262 ff.

P. 34 f. Besides these portions of Aquila, the Amherst Papyrus, I. iii. c., contains Gen. i. 1—5, Aquila as well as LXX. The Rainer fragments of Ps. lxxviii. 13, 14, 30—33, lxxx. 11—15 (C. Wessely in *Mélanges Chatelain*, 1910) have been shown by P. Capelle (*Revue Benedictine*, 1911, p. 64 ff.) to be certainly not Aquila, and most probably Symmachus. Dr Nestle (*Exp. Times*, May 1911) also pronounced for Symmachus.

P. 39, note 4. On the possible connexion of abbreviations in MSS. with these methods of writing the Divine Name, see L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra* (Munich, 1907): Bd 2 of *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*.

P. 47 f. The appearance of Theodotion's renderings before his reputed time (as in the N.T. quotations) is not yet satisfactorily explained; see Thackeray, *Gramm. O.T. in Greek*, p. 15: 'Critics have...been forced to the conclusion that there must have been, in addition to the loose Alexandrian paraphrase, a third version, resembling that of Θ , but made before his time and in use in Palestine in the first century B.C.' Nestle, in *ZNTW*, Nov. 1907, remarks on Schürer's Dilemma, p. 48, note 3: "entweder...vor Theodotion gegeben" muss dahin ergänzt werden "oder ist das Dilemma falsch gestellt, und hat Theodotion das N.T. benützt, nicht umgekehrt."

P. 55, cf. p. 63. Prof. Burkitt, on 'The so-called Quinta of 4 Kings' (*Proc. Soc. Bibl. Archaeology*, June 1902), says: 'I venture therefore to make the conjecture that the *Quinta* in 4 Kings is... a collection of variants set in the margin of the Hexapla, and that

this collection contained, among other things, some notable readings of the genuine LXX.' And above: '...the fragments of the Hexapla in the Ambrosian Library at Milan preserve just such a collection of detached readings in a *fifth column*.'

P. 66. On Eusebius, and the *Quinta* and *Sexta*, see Mercati, *Studi e Testi* 5, v. p. 51 ff.; on the Hexapla see also Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.*, p. 54 ff., and appendix, p. x, in third edition.

P. 69 ff. For twenty years after Field's great work on the Hexapla appeared, the question of the existence of critical marks in the Hexapla itself remained as he left it. With this is bound up the further question of Origen's actual method; whether the LXX. text in the Hexapla was a revised one, or unrevised. Field pronounced for the former alternative, and for the presence of the critical marks in the Hexapla. His words are (vol. I. p. lii):

'Non desunt quidem qui existiment Origenem priorem viam iniisse: videlicet, ut distinctiones praedictas non in editionem hexaplaem introduceret, sed in aliam seorsim adornatam, qualem hodieque exhibent codex Graecus Sarravianus, et versio P. Telensis Syrohexaplaris. Sed, ut Hieronymi declarationem taceamus, in scholiis Graecis innumera exstant loca, quae contrarium aperte probant; nempe ed. τὸν Ὁ hexaplaem non diversam fuisse ab ea quam in exemplaribus modo memoratis hodie manu terimus.'

(Jerome's words are to be found on page 69, note 3, of this book.)

Of late, however, fresh doubts have arisen, perhaps stimulated by the discovery of the Cairo and Milan fragments of copies of the Hexapla itself. The work was so huge (see p. 74) that it had scarcely been suspected that copies had been made; but it is not proved that the fragments represent more than portions, or single books.

Mercati, the discoverer of the Milan palimpsest, gives the first hint of doubt (1896, *Atti d. Accad. d. Scienze*, Torino, XXXI. p. 656):

'Aggiungasi che Origene l'aveva arricchita di prolegomeni e di scollii, per non dire degli obeli e degli asterischi, coi quali s'ingegnò di rendere anche più visibili le singole parole e particelli crescenti o mancanti nei LXX., rispetto all' Ebraico, se pure questa operazione non fu ristretta alle Tetraple od al testo dei LXX., estratto dall' una delle due collezioni mentovate, secondo che altri ha voluto,' with a note 'E veramente distribuito il testo, come lo è nel palimpsesto Ambrosiano delle Esaple non rimane più tanto necessaria questa aggiunta d' obeli e di asterischi per quanto riguarda l' Esaple, cfr. i prol. dal Field.'

Lietzmann, in his review of the first edition of this work (*G.G.A.* May 1902), raises some similar points; the following is an English rendering of some of his remarks:

'Had the *Urhexapla*, in its LXX. column, the *κοινή* without corrections or additions, or a text already revised, [and] provided with obeli and asterisks; that is, with the additions from Theodotus? One inclines to take the former view as correct, reflecting that the Hexapla was meant to be the foundation for [future] critical work. Swete depends on Field.... Field refers to "innumera loca," but quotes none expressly; and to the difficulty in regard to the transpositions,... which he does not thresh out.... Eusebius and Jerome say nothing about critical marks in the fifth column; Jerome, indeed, says something which points the other way (*praef. Dan.*, ep. 57, 11, and ep. 106). Still the other view may be right... but caution is still imperatively needed.'

The arguments, then, appear to run much as follows:

(1) No critical marks have been found in the fragments discovered; and this though Jerome has them in the 'Gallican' Psalter, and the 'codices hexapl.' have them. (2) Eusebius and Jerome do not mention them. (3) Field gives practically no examples to support his view. (4, Mercati) The marks were less needed in the Hexapla, where the texts could be seen side by side. (5, Lietzmann) The Hexapla, as a foundation for critical labour, should preferably have had the pure text. (6) The variety of numbers named, Tetrapla, Quintupla, etc., up to eight, indicates a variety of works and copies at any rate in *Psalms*. (7) The Milan fragment is not an exact copy; its last column is not Theod., but Quinta. It had, however, notes and a *catena*, descending from Origen himself.

To these arguments it may be replied (1) that critical marks may have disappeared in the copies as they notoriously did in other cases, in course of transmission. But as Jerome certainly knew of them, he might well use them. (2) The passages referred to by Field may be taken as mentioning them. (3) In default of specific quotations, Field's long work at the Hexapla gives great weight to his impressions. As the question was not specially prominent in his day, he may have thought he had said enough; but he can hardly have used a phrase such as 'innumera loca' at random. Lietzmann says he finds only one passage—in the margin of the MS. Vat. 754 on Ps. cxxxi. 4... *ἐν δὲ τῷ ὀκτασελίδῳ παρὰ μόνοις τοῖς ὀΐκειτο ὠβελισμένον*—which appears to support Field; but it would be scarcely safe to assert that no more are forthcoming. (4) Origen's motives, and his judgement, can scarcely be determined. Collection of information was then thought more of than a pure text as we should now consider it, and he may have aimed at massing all the facts he could in his great work. The suggestion that the Tetrapla, or an extracted LXX. text, should have received Origen's critical

treatment, and not the Hexapla, whether right or not, appears arbitrary. (6) The varying number of columns mentioned can be simply explained as on pp. 66, 67: 'Hexapla' was the standing number, and the normal name; the others might be applied when more, or fewer, columns were used. The Psalms can hardly be taken, in any case, as a normal specimen of the O.T. (7) If the Milan fragment is not an exact copy, it affords less certain ground for argument.

On the whole, the arguments against Field's view are not yet completely convincing, even if he based it on impressions rather than definite proof. It may however be well to keep the other possibility in mind, and to suspend judgement, at least until the Milan fragments have been published in full and duly considered.

Perhaps it is worth while to add, that Professor K. Lake, in his Introduction to the photograph of the Sinaitic N.T., suggests that there may have been only one MS., that of Pamphilus, between a corrector of Cod. F—A=Sin and the original Hexapla; in which case the texts of \aleph and B do not bear witness to a purely pre-Hexaplar text in the Hexapla generally.

P. 76. An enlarged edition of the collection of Nobilius was embodied in the Latin translation of the Editio Sixtina (1588), reprinted by P. Morinus, 1624. Montfaucon's work was abridged by Bahrdt (2 vols., Leipzig, 1769). The Oxford concordance, suppl. fasc. ii., takes account of fresh matter available since the appearance of Field's work, which however is not likely, so far as it extends, to be superseded for years to come.

P. 82. On 'Lucian' as the *κοινή* see A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, II. pp. 134, 170 f. Jerome's words (Ep. cvi. 2) are:

'In quo illud breviter admoneo ut sciatis aliam esse editionem quam Origenes et Caesariensis Eusebius omnesque Graeciae tractatores *κοινήν*, id est communem appellant, atque vulgatam, et a plerisque nunc *Δουκιανὸς* dicitur; aliam Septuaginta interpretum quae in *Ἑξαπλῶς* codicibus reperitur et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est, et Ierosolymae atque in Orientis ecclesiis decantatur.'

P. 85. Since the publication of Lagarde's work (see page 188) the Lucianic Text has received much attention. See A. Rahlfs, *Sept.-Studien*, II. III., Göttingen, 1907, 1911; F. C. Burkitt, *Rules of Tyconius*, pp. cviii., cxvif.; *The O.L. and the Itala*, p. 9; art. *Text and Versions in Encycl. Bibl.* vol. IV.; W. O. E. Oesterley, *Studies in...the Book of Amos*; C. F. Burney, *Notes on Heb. Texts of Books of Kings*, 1903.

P. 93, also 104, 107, etc. For references to the symbols used in the larger Cambridge LXX. for materials in the Old Latin and other

versions, see below, on p. 170. Some of these materials may be mentioned under the particular books of the Bible they contain.

P. 96. *L'ancienne Version Latine du Cantique* I—III. 4 is treated by D. A. Wilmart in *Revue Benedictine* XXVIII. 11—36.

P. 97. There has now appeared *Die Konstanz-Weingartener Propheten fragmenta in phototypischen Reproduktion* (W. N. Du Rieu; introd. Paul Lehman), 1912.

P. 100. A discovery of much interest has lately been made at Monte Cassino, where Dom Amelli has found a revised Latin Psalter, of a kind hitherto unknown, and edited it (*Collectanea Biblica Latina cura et studio Monachorum S. Benedicti. Vol. I. Liber Psalmorum iuxta antiquissimam latinam Versionem...ex Casinensi Cod. 557 curante D. Ambrosio M. Amelli O.S.B. Rome, 1912*).

The MS., of the twelfth century, contains the Psalter in four versions (cf. the fourfold Psalters noted below, on p. 165); (i) Jerome's 'Hebrew' Psalter, (ii) the 'Gallican,' and (iv) the 'Roman'; (iii) is the newly discovered revision. It appears to have been made upon an Old Latin or non-Vulgate foundation, with renderings apparently from the Hebrew, and even some transliterations. Professor Burkitt (in *J. Th. St.* XIV. 55) thinks that the various renderings, following in turn Aq., Symm., and especially Theodotion, are best accounted for if the reviser worked from a copy of the Hexapla. In this case the transliterations, if not due to Theodotion, may have been taken from the column containing the Hebrew in Greek characters; and similarly can be explained a few places where the reviser follows the LXX. against the three later versions. Professor Burkitt, indeed, thinks it possible that the work might have been done by one ignorant of the actual Hebrew letters. Perhaps this is rather far to go; but it is pointed out that among the 'readings derived from the Hebrew text' no case of confusion between \daleth and \beth is recorded: certainly an unusual circumstance. It is possible, however, that the reviser may not have been exactly ignorant of Hebrew or the Hebrew script, even though when at work he 'only used the Greek transliteration found in MSS. of the Hexapla.'

P. 107. The store of available Coptic material for the O.T. has been much enriched of late years. *The Coptic Version of certain O.T. books from a Papyrus*, edited by Sir Herbert Thompson (Oxford, 1908), gives a fragment of Job xxxix, and large portions of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom and Sirach. The papyrus (Pap. Or. 5984) was acquired by the British Museum in 1901. The leaves, preserved in 62 frames between glass, are of

large size for papyri in codex form. Slight verbal differences from Lagarde's Turin MS. are found; the British Museum text being considered inferior to it in Wisdom, but superior in Sirach. It is dated sixth to seventh century (or seventh to eighth, according to W. E. Crum in *J. Th. Stud.* April 1910).

A *Coptic Palimpsest*, by the same transcriber and editor (1911), is dated by him in the earlier half of the seventh century. [B.M. Add. 17183, obtained from the Nitrian valley in 1847.] The upper writing is Syriac. This MS., a parchment, was noticed by Lagarde, *Orientalia*, 1879; and small portions had previously appeared. It contains Josh., Judg., Ruth, Judith, Esther; originally 228 leaves, of which 42 are missing. The writing is a plain square uncial. The text in Joshua shows independence: in Judg. and Ruth the text is akin to B.

Dr E. A. Budge has edited and transcribed Pap. Or. 7594 (*Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, 1912) containing Deuteronomy, with gaps, Jonah all but complete, as well as the Acts of the Apostles. There are papyrus fragments in the cover, one of which contains Dan. i. 17, 18, in Theod.'s version. The leaves have been rubbed, making the text illegible in places. The editor considers that Deuteronomy is a copy made for private use; the text of Jonah, apparently by the same hand, agrees in some small points with A^Q. Dr Budge assigns the papyrus to the fourth century; but it is possibly a century later than this. Out of 133 leaves, 24 are missing. The papyrus was acquired by the British Museum in April 1911, and published barely a twelvemonth after.

In the *Catalogue of Coptic MSS. in the British Museum*, by W. E. Crum, Nos. 1—59 and 932—955 contain portions of the O.T. in Sahidic; 59 is Habak. iii, 940 is a complete volume, containing 151 Psalms. Nos. 493—496 are Middle Egyptian O.T., and 712—731 Bohairic. 712 gives 364 leaves of the Pentateuch.

Other works are: P. J. Balestri, *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta Copto-Sahidica Musei Borgiani*, Rome, 1904: J. Goettsberger, *Die Syro-Koptischen Bibel-citate...aus den Scholien des Barhebräus in ZATW.* XXI. (1901) p. 128 ff.; F. E. Brightman in *J. Th. Stud.* II. p. 275 f., and S. Gaselee in *J. Th. Stud.* XI. p. 246 ff. Fragments in Coptic, chiefly of Pss., have also been found on ostraca: see W. E. Crum, *Coptic Ostraca from the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund*, etc. (London, 1902).

P. 108. The earlier editions of this book stated that 'of the Sahidic fragments, those that belong to the book of Job yield a pre-Origenic text': but Professor Burkitt, in the article referred to in note 4, has come to the conclusion that the facts require this to be modified, as it now appears. L. Dieu, however, in *Muséon*, 1912,

p. 147 ff. (*Nouveaux Fragments préhexaplaïres du livre de Job en copte sahidique*) supports the previous view, in opposition to Professor Burkitt and Mr Crum (on No. 939 in his *Catalogue*).

P. 110. To list of books add : F. O. Kramer, *Die aethiopische Übersetzung des Zacharias : Text zum ersten Male herausgegeben, Prolegomena, Kommentar : eine Vorstudie zur Geschichte und Kritik des Septuaginta-textes*, Heft I. Leipzig, 1908.

P. 116. Add : P. A. de Lagarde, *Libri V. T. Apocryphi Syr.*, Leipzig, 1861 ; A. M. Ceriani, *Trans. Syra Pescitto V. T. ex Cod. Ambros.*, Milan, 1876—79.

P. 119. Add : J. Goettsberger, *Die Syro-armenischen...Bibeltate...des Barhebräus*, ZATW. XXI. 1901, pp. 101—127.

P. 125. CODEX ALEXANDRINUS. Professor Burkitt, in *J. Th. Stud.* XI. (p. 603), suggests that there is no reason for identifying the Athanasius who signs the Arabic note at the beginning of the MS. with the Patriarch (III.) of that name, since he does not sign in Patriarchal style. He concludes that the MS. was not necessarily in Egypt before 1616 ; that it came from Athos, and is therefore Constantinopolitan, not Alexandrian. The question must probably be regarded as an open one, until more general attention has been paid to it ; but Professor Burkitt's suggestion is apparently regarded with favour by Professor Souter (see his note in the *Novum Test. Graece*, Oxford, 1910, p. vii.).

P. 130. CODEX SINAITICUS. The N.T. of this MS. has now been issued in collotype reproduction (by H. and K. Lake, Oxford, 1911). Professor K. Lake's Introduction draws attention to several interesting details. According to him, the MS. was at Caesarea between the beginning of the fifth and that of the seventh century A.D. He quotes Harnack's remark on the resemblance of its Psalter to the Psalms in the (Coptic) text of the *Pistis Sophia* : 'Dieser Text steht dem Cod. Sin. wie ein Zwillingbruder nahe.' With regard to the four hands distinguished by Tischendorf in the MS., Professor Lake considers that the corrector A¹ is probably, and A² almost certainly, identical with the scribe D, and that Cod. Vaticanus was not written by this scribe. The corrector, C, of the FA portion of the MS. used, he thinks, a copy corrected by Pamphilus himself, which alone 'intervenes between [him] and the original Hexapla.' See above, on p. 69 ff.

P. 132. CODEX ZUQNINENSIS. Two Syriac MSS., Vat. Syr. 162, at Rome, 122 leaves, and B.M. Add. 14665 foll. 1—7, five leaves, contain, under a valuable chronicle, including that of 'Joshua the

Stylite,' palimpsest fragments which are assigned to six Greek uncial MSS., distinguished by the editor as under :

Z¹, cent. vi, portions of Judges xvi—xxi. The text is Lucianic, to be compared with K 54 59 75 82.

Z², cent. vi, portions of 3 Reg. ii—viii. and xxi. Lucianic, akin to 82 93 rather than 19 108. (Part in Brit. Mus.)

Z³, cent. v, a single leaf, in Brit. Museum, containing 3 Reg. viii. 58—ix. 1. Egyptian, not Lucianic, in text. This is referred to on p. 141 as Z^d. Doubly palimpsest; the liturgical writing above the biblical text and below the Syriac, is, according to Tisserant, not, as was thought, Coptic but Greek.

Z⁴, cent. vi, large portions of Pss. viii—xxxvii. Lucianic? the text is said to be of a character between A and B^{c.a}.

Z⁵, sloping uncials of cent. vii—viii. Large fragments of Ezek. i, iii—ix, xxii—xxvi, xxviii, xxxv—xlvi. Lucianic. (Part in Brit. Mus.)

Z⁶, cent. vi—vii. Fragments of later chapters of Ezek., and Dan. iii. 2—15. Lucianic.

The MSS. are named from Zuknīn, a village near Amid. The Biblical fragments have been transcribed and edited with great care by Eugène Tisserant in *Studi e Testi* 23 (*Cod. Zuqninensis rescriptus Veteris Test.*, Rome, 1911).

P. 141. Θ. WASHINGTON CODEX. For full information, see the Introduction by Professor H. A. Sanders, to the reproduction of the MS. (*University of Michigan Studies*, Humanistic Series, vol. 8).

This is an uncial MS. containing Deuteronomy and Joshua, almost entire. It was bought, on Dec. 19, 1906, by Mr C. L. Freer, at Gizeh, from a dealer named Ali. (Three other MSS. were bought at the same time, containing the Psalms, the Gospels—Gregory's and Souter's W—and the Pauline Epistles.) It is intended that it shall find a home in the Smithsonian Institute at Washington; meantime it remains at Detroit, Michigan. Professor Sanders remarks that many stories have been told of it, which are untrue; that it had not been often shown before the purchase was made. When first examined in America, the desert sand was still in the folds. The vellum is 'moderate'; the hand an upright, square uncial. The size of the leaves varies, from 30 to 31·9 × 25·5 to 26·1 centimetres: average, 30·6 × 25·8, or about 12 × 10 $\frac{1}{8}$ inches. There is a lacuna in Deuteronomy from v. 16 *ὁ θεός σου* to vi. 18 *τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν*, and in Joshua from iii. 3 *τῷ λαῷ λέγοντες* to iv. 10—*λατὸ Κύριος*. Deut. i. 3—5, 17 are fragmentary. There are 102 leaves, with 3 blank pages: two columns on the page, with 31 lines, of 13 to 14 letters in each. The text of Deuteronomy seems to resemble that of the cursives 54 and 75 (see p. 493); in Joshua it is somewhat akin to A. There is a small Hexaplaric

element. Professor Sanders assigns the MS. to the fifth century, probably the first half; Mr Brooke (in *J. Th. Stud.* XIII. 458 ff.) perhaps to the sixth century, at any rate not later. Professor Sanders suggests that this and the three companion MSS. 'perhaps originated in a Greek monastery, were united in a Coptic one, and found in the ruins of one.' Dr A. S. Hunt (*The Year's Work in Class. Studies*, 1908) says that 'in all probability they belong to a group of Greek and Coptic MSS., proceeding eventually from the White Monastery near Sohag, of which another portion has been obtained for Berlin by C. Schmidt. Of the Berlin section the most valuable item seems to be an early copy on papyrus of part of the Book of Genesis....'

P. 141. C. Poetical Books.

Here may be noticed the Leipzig papyrus (Univ. Lib. Pap. 39), called λ by Heinrici (*Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung des N. T.*, IV. Leipzig, 1913), and L by Rahlfs, *Sept.-Studien*, II. p. 5. It comes from Ashmunên, in Middle Egypt, and contains Ps. xxx. 5—xxx. i, xxxii. 18—lv., with gaps in the earlier part. Rahlfs dates it later than A.D. 338, but within the fourth century. It may be compared with U [B.M. Pap. 37], see p. 142. It must not be confused with the Munich MS., Gr. 251, of the Psalter, called L by Lagarde, in his *Novae Psalt. gr. editionis specimen*, which is assigned to the tenth century: Rahlfs, *op. cit.* p. 14; see p. 164, note. Rahlfs mentions some other uncial Psalters, still awaiting complete collation: Paris, Arsenal 8407; Jerusalem, Patr. Lib. 96, containing Ps. xx. 10—cxlviii. 6, six leaves at St Petersburg; Berlin, Royal Lib. Harn. 552 (Graeco-Latin); one at Moscow (Rumjant-zowski Museum), see Tischendorf *V. T. Gr. proleg.* 45; and one at Uspenskoe, dated A.D. 862, described by Amphilochius (Amfilokly, Archimandrite) in his critical edition of the Slavonic Psalter. All these are of the ninth century; later are Trier 7, a Latin text with interlinear Greek version of Ps. i.—liv.; and incomplete Graeco-Latin MSS. at Würzburg, Cues, St Gall, and Essen.

P. 144. In 1904, at Turin, there was destroyed by fire an uncial MS. of the Psalms; which is now represented only by a few photographs, fortunately taken a few weeks before, and now in the possession of Professor Swete and Dr Oesterley (who writes of this 'Lost Uncial Codex' in *Exp. Times*, vol. XVII. p. 353 ff., May 1906). It was a well-written MS. of the eighth or ninth century, with a *catena*, which included passages from Modestus and Cosmas Indicopleustes, but not Cyr., Epiph., Greg. Nyss., Greg. Naz. Its text bore some resemblance to that of Cod. R. A brief description was contained in Pasini's *Codices Manuscripti Bibliothecae Regii Taurinensis Athenaei* (Turin, 1749).

P. 145. Y. CODEX TAURINENSIS.

This MS. has been transcribed by Dr Oesterley, and published with select apparatus (*J. Th. Stud.* VI.—VIII., reprinted by H. Frowde, 1908). It is not an uncial, only the headings being in uncial letters. The body of the MS. is written in a fairly upright cursive hand, many letters not joined; the writing is continuous, with capitals sometimes at the beginning, sometimes in the middle of lines or words. The MS. was damaged in a fire in 1666, but escaped with slight damage in 1904 (see above); it is now said to consist of 93 leaves of fine vellum, with a polished surface. The date is given as the ninth or tenth century.

P. 146. A portion of the same MS. as Γ is at Rome (Vat. Gr. 1658). From this (not palimpsest) come the readings for Zach. iv. 3—viii. 16 in *The O.T. in Greek*, vol. iii.

P. 146 ff. Among the fragments more recently discovered, the following may be noticed: several have been used for the apparatus of the larger Cambridge LXX., see below, on p. 170:

Gen. i. 1—5, LXX. and Aquila: Amh. Pap. i. iii c. U₂. See p. 148, note 2.

Gen. ii. iii. (fragm.). Late third century, fragment of vellum leaf. Oxyrh. 1007. See p. 39, note 4.

Old Latin of Gen. v. 4—13, v. 29—vi. 2. Fourth century, uncial, portion of vellum leaf, with interesting text. Oxyrh. 1073.

Gen. xiv. xv. xix. xx. xxiv. xxvii. About forty-five verses, mostly fragmentary. Parts of four leaves from a papyrus codex. Late second or early third century. Oxyrh. 656. U₄.

Gen. xvi. 8—12. Part of a column of a roll. Third cent. Oxyrh. 1166.

Gen. xxi. xxii. xxiv. Vellum fragments from the binding of Paris, Bibl. Nat. 1397. Δ₂.

Gen. xxv. 19—22, xxvi. 3, 4. Vellum fragments. Strassburg, Pap. 748. Δ₃. An early papyrus, of the time of Constantine, containing parts of the Book of Genesis, in an early cursive hand. Berlin, Royal Library. See C. Schmidt in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1908, No. 12, col. 360; also above, p. 507.

Gen. xxxi. 42—46, 48—54. Papyrus leaf of book. Fourth cent. Oxyrh. 1167.

Gen. xxxvii. 3, 4, 9. Geneva, 99. See *Archiv* II. p. 224 ff. Δ₄.

Exod. xv. Heidelberg.

Exod. xix. 1, 2, 5, 6. Large round uncials, a fragment of a handsome MS. Sixth century? Amh. Pap. 191 (see below). U₅.

Exod. xxxi. 13, 14, xxxii. 7, 8. Fragments, third century. Oxyrh. 1074.

Exod. xl. 26—32. Third century. Oxyrh. 1075.

Deut. ii. 37—iii. 1, iii. 3, 4, 5, 8—10, 12, 13. Lower part of leaf of papyrus book, large rough round uncials, fourth century. Text generally with B against AF. Rylands Pap. 1.

Deut. xxxii. 3—10. Amh. Pap. 192. U₆.

Josh. iv. 23—v. 1. Vellum leaf, fourth century. Oxyrh. 1168.

1 Sam. (1 Regn.) ii. Heidelberg.

2 Sam. (2 Regn.) xv. xvi., fragm. Strassburg. See Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*....

Psalms (LXX. numbering): information largely derived from A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, II.

Ps. xiv. White marble slab. Lapethus, in Cyprus. See Rahlfs, *Sept.-Studien*, II. p. 16. Perdrizet, *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 20, 1896. Fourth century.

Ps. xxvi. Parchment roll. Rahlfs, p. 18. Wessely, *Wiener Studien* 4 (1882), p. 214 ff. Vienna.

Ps. lxxvii. 20—31, 51—61. Greek text with Arabic translation. Eighth or ninth century. Rahlfs, p. 19. Damascus.

Ps. lxxviii. 30—37, lxx. 3—8. Cursive, late fourth or fifth century. Oxyrh. 845.

Ps. lxxviii., lxxx. fragm. Wessely's fragments, see above, on p. 34. Vienna, Rainer Pap.

P. xc. 1, 2. Papyrus, amulet. Fourth century. Rahlfs, p. 17. Heinrici, *Beiträge zur Gesch. u. Erkl. d. N. T.* IV. p. 31. Vienna, Rainer Pap. 8032.

Ps. xc. 5—16. Fifth or early sixth century. Irregular semi-cursive hand. Amulet? Rylands Pap. 3.

Ps. xc. 1—13. Wax tablet, amulet? J. Nicole, Geneva.

Ps. cv. 38—45, cvi. 2—10. Parchment. Rahlfs, p. 17. Fifth century. Berlin, Egypt. Museum.

Ps. cxviii. 27—58, fragm. Rahlfs, p. 14. Heinrici, p. 35 f. Leipzig, Univ. Lib. Pap. 170.

Ps. cxliii. 1—cxliv. 6, fragmentary. Two tattered vellum leaves, palimpsest, uncial, sixth century. *J. Th. Stud.* IV. C. Taylor, p. 130, J. H. A. Hart, p. 215 ff. From the Taylor-Schechter collection.

Prov. x. 11—19. Amh. Pap. 193.

Job i. 15—21, v. 24—vi. 9. Remains of two leaves of a papyrus book, large upright uncial. Sixth or seventh century. There seems no doubt that Amh. Pap. iv. (see page 148, note 2) is the continuation from the first leaf. Rylands Pap. 2.

Tobit ii. 2, 3, 4, 8. Oxyrh. Pap. 1076.

Isai. vi. 10 as quoted in N.T. (Matt. xiii. 15, Acts xxviii. 27). Oxyrh. 405, 406.

Isai. lviii. 11—14. The under side of Amh. Pap. 191 (see above). *Archiv* II. p. 382.

Amos ii. 6—8, 9—12. Sixth century, large heavy uncial. Oxyrh. 846.

P. 154. To (A) add: London, B. M. Curzon 66. Octateuch, *cat.* Petersburg, Imp. Lib. cxxii. Gen. (part), *cat.* and *cant.* Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr. 7. Octateuch, *cat.* Venice, Gr. 15. Octateuch, *cat.* London, Burney 34. Pentateuch, Rome, Reg. Pii II. 20.

P. 158. The cursive 67, Mr Thackeray points out, is a near

relative of 206 (Gonv. and Caius Coll. 348; cf. M. R. James, *Descriptive Catalogue*, I. p. 392). Another MS. by the scribe of 206 is Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 3. 14. See J. Rendel Harris, *Origin of Ferrar group of MSS.*, p. 24. The Trin. Coll. MS. has no titles; 206 has none after Ps. lxxvii. See Holmes and Parsons on Ps. lxxviii.

P. 162. The Barberini MSS. have apparently been renumbered since the time of Holmes and Parsons, who gave their 226 and 227 as Barber. 1 and 2. The present Barber. 1 and 2 are not Psalters; this information comes from Dr Mercati to the Rev. J. Mearns, who suggests that when the collations were received at Oxford, the MSS. were without numbers, and were simply distinguished as 1 and 2 by the editor. He thinks the present Barberini catalogue may date from 1830 or somewhat earlier, but not from as early as 1790.

P. 163. Mr Thackeray notes that 272 ends with Ps. lxxvi. (H.-P. give readings to verse 17), and 287 begins with the following Psalm.

P. 165. To list (C) add Psalms, Rome, Vat. Gr. 754, from Rahlfs, II. p. 23. Also:

Leipzig, Univ. Lib. Tisch. v, complete from Ps. xvii. 35 onward: and five Psalters with Greek text in Roman letters: viz.,

Paris, Bibl. Nat. N. acq. Lat. 2195.

This and the following are akin to W and Z on p. 164, note 1. W contains four texts, viz., Jerome's 'Gallican,' 'Roman,' and 'Hebrew' Psalters, and the Greek; this MS. has them in the same order.

Valenciennes, no. 14. Another fourfold Psalter. Paris, Bibl. Nat. Lat. 15198. Threefold, 'Heb.' 'Rom.' Greek. Paris, Bibl. Nat. Suppl. Gr. 188. Latin interlinear version. Camb., C.C.C. 468. Also a Latin text.

P. 166. 62 and 147 have something in common; they form, in fact, a sub-group, akin to, but distinct from, the Lucianic MSS. of the Prophets generally. See Burkitt, *Tyconius*, p. cviii, and Oesterley, *Studies in...Amos*, pp. 9ff., 17ff. They are also among the four MSS. which give a peculiar version of Habak. iii.; see on p. 247, below.

P. 170. The symbols used by the editors of the larger Cambridge LXX. are here brought together, so far as they are yet published:

I. Uncial MSS.:

- (a) Bibles originally complete, or believed to have been so: AB[C]S, as on p. 124.
- (b) Containing the Octateuch, or parts of it: DEFGHKLMO.

II. Cursives, quoted by small letters:

a = Holmes and Parsons' 15.	n = H.-P. 75.
b' = " " 19.	o = " 82.
b̂ = " " 108.	p = " 106.
[b = agreement of b' + b̂].	q = " 120.
c = H.-P. 38.	r = " 129.
d = " 44.	s = " 131.
e = " 52.	t = " 134.
f = " 53.	u = Jerusalem, Holy Sepulchre, 2
g = " 54.	(p. 154).
h = " 55.	v = Athos, Pantocrator. 24 (p.
i = " 56.	153).
j = " 57.	w = Athens, Bibl. Nat. 44 (p. 154).
k = " 58.	x = London, B. M. Curzon 66.
l = " 59.	y = H.-P. 121.
m = " 72.	z = " 85.

$a_2 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{St Petersburg, Imp. Library, 62 (p. 153)} \\ \text{London, B.M. Add. 20002 (p. 152)} \end{array} \right\}$ continuation of E.
 $b_2 = \text{H.-P. 29.}$
 $c_2 = \text{" 135.}$
 $d_2 = \text{" 61.}$

III. Cursives, quoted occasionally on the authority of H.-P., and by their numbers:

14, 16, 18, 20, 25, 30—32, 37, 64, 68, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77—79, 83, 84, 105, 107, 118, 125—128, 130, 132, 133, 136.

IV. Fragments: generally papyrus, unless otherwise stated:

$U_2 = \text{Amh. Pap. I. iii c. Gen. 1—5, LXX. and Aq.: p. 148, note 2.}$

$U_3 = \text{Brit. Mus. Pap. cxxii. Gen. xiv. 17: p. 146 (1).}$

$U_4 = \text{Oxyrh. Pap. 656. Gen. xiv. xv. xix. xx. xxiv. fragm.: parts of four leaves of a codex.}$

$U_5 = \text{Amh. Pap. cxci. Exod. xix. 1, 2, 5, 6.}$

$U_6 = \text{Amh. Pap. cxcii. Deut. xxxii. 3—6, 8—10.}$

$\Delta_2 = \text{Vellum fragments in binding of Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 1397. Gen. xxi. xxii. xxiv.}$

$\Delta_3 = \text{Strassburg, Pap. Gr. 748: vellum fragm. of Gen. xxv. xxvi.}$

$\Delta_4 = \text{Geneva, 99 vellum fragm. of Gen. xxxvii.}$

$\Delta_5 = \text{Palimpsest fragm. Gen. xl. 3, 4, 7: p. 148, note 2.}$

$\Delta_6 = \text{Vellum fragm. Levit. xxii. 3—xxiii. 22: p. 146 (2).}$

$\Delta_7 = \text{Vellum fragm. from Sinai, Numb. xxxii. 29: p. 147 (3).}$

V. Versions:

$\mathfrak{A} = \text{Armenian: Zohrab's edition, Venice, 1805: p. 119.}$

\mathfrak{A} -ed. = Z.'s text, \mathfrak{A} -cod or -codd variants in his notes.

ℬ = Bohairic: p. 107.

ℬ^l = Lagarde's edition, Leipzig, 1867.

ℬ^w = Wilkins' ed., London, 1731.

ℬ^p = Paris, Bibl. Nat. Copt. 1 (for Genesis).

ℬ^v = Rome, Vat. Copt. 1 (for Deut.).

℄ = Sahidic: p. 107.

℄^c = Ciasca's edition, Rome, 1885.

℄^m = Maspéro's ed., Paris, 1892.

℄-cod = Ciasca's Bodleian MS.

℄^p = Paris, Bibl. Nat. Copt. 1296 (fragm.).

℄^b = B.M. Or. 5287 (fragm.).

℄^t = B.M. Add. 17183 (Thompson, *A Coptic Palimpsest*).

ℤ = Ethiopic: p. 110.

ℤ^c = Dillmann's Codex C.

ℤ^f = " " " " F.

ℤ^p = Paris, Bibl. Nat. Eth. 3 (Zotenberg).

ℒ = Old Latin: pp. 88, 93 ff.

ℒ^b = Vienna palimpsest, ed. I. Belsheim, 1885.

ℒ^r = Lyons octateuch, ed. U. Robert, 1881, 1900.

ℒ^v = *Variae Lectiones*, C. Vercellone, Rome, 1860.

ℒ^w = Würzburg Palimpsest (fragm.), ed. E. Ranke, Vienna, 1871.

ℒ^z = Munich Palimpsest (fragm.), ed. L. Ziegler, 1883.

℘ = Palestinian Aramaic: p. 114.

℘^l = *a Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*, ed. Mrs A. S. Lewis, *Stud. Sin.* vi.

℘^c = *Cod. Clinaei Rescriptus*, ed. Mrs Lewis, *Hor. Sem.* viii.

℘^d = *Christlich-palästinisch-aramaische Texte*, ed. H. Duensing.

℘^g = fragm. in *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (Sem. Series, I. v, ix.), ed. G. H. Gwilliam and J. F. Stenning.

℘^p = St Petersburg fragm. in *Anecdota Syriaca*, ed. J. P. N. Land, 1875.

℘^t = *Palestinian Syriac Texts*, from Palimpsest Fragments in the Taylor-Schechter collection: ed. Mrs A. S. Lewis and Mrs M. D. Gibson.

℘^s = *Christlich-palästinische fragmenta*, ed. F. Schulthess.

℘ = Syro-hexaplar: pp. 113, 116.

℘-ap-Barh = quotations in the Auṣar Rāzē (*Horreum Mysteriorum*) of Bar-hebraeus.

℘^m = readings supplied by A. Masius from his MS.

P. 173. See J. Dahse, *Zur Herkunft des alttestamentlichen Textes der Aldina*, in *ZATW.* xxix. p. 177 ff. (1909).

P. 182. Field's Cambridge edition of 1665 was reissued by John Hayes in 1684, still under Field's name: 'page for page, and

I suppose line for line,' as Dr Brett says in his *Letter* (see p. 340) quoted by Dr Nestle in *Exp. Times*, vol. 17, p. 380. 'By which he put a Cheat upon the World,' Dr Brett continues; but from inquiries made by Dr Bethune-Baker (*J. Th. Stud.* vi. 612 ff.) it would seem that Field's remaining sheets may have been issued without intending 'a Cheat.'

P. 186. The *text* of Holmes and Parsons seems to have been based to some extent on that of Bos; as Nestle in Hastings' *D.B.* (iv. 449) says, 'The text in the work is a reprint of *b* [the Sixtine]; but as it seems, after a copy of Bos, corrected, but not everywhere, according to an original copy.' H. Lietzmann, reviewing the first edition of this *Introduction* in *G.G.A.* May 1902, pleads for a 'friendly word' on Lambert Bos's edition, with its variants from the Aldine and Complutensian, and collection of the Hexaplaric material then known; as useful even now, and 'nicht antiquiert.'

P. 192. Professor Meinhold and Professor Lietzmann have issued *Amos* in Hebrew, a corrected text, side by side with the text of Q (*Materials for Theological Lecturers and Students*, Nos. 15, 16, Cambridge, 1906).

P. 200. Professor A. R. S. Kennedy, in *Exp. Times*, xxii. 9, p. 321 ff. June 1911, points out that a Heb. MS. at Edinburgh, which he regards as important, has the order Jer. Ezek. Isa.

P. 239. Mr Thackeray thinks that 3 Regn. xxii. may have originally been joined to 4 Regn. Thus xx. and xxi. would have been at the end of the book, where transposition might have more easily taken place than in the middle.

P. 242. With regard to the order of Jeremiah's prophecies in **A** and **G**, Mr Thackeray has investigated the Greek text, and finds evidence that the book was divided between two translators (*J. Th. Stud.* iv. 14, p. 253 ff., *Gramm. of O.T. in Gr.*, p. 11 ff.). He places the division between Jer. α and β at the end of chap. xxviii.; and L. Köhler (*Beobachtungen am hebräischen und griech. Text von Jeremia*, Leipzig, 1908) substantially agrees, but places the division about a chapter later. Thackeray also finds signs of division in Ezekiel, and—so far as concerns *transcription*—in Exodus and Leviticus. In the Books of Kingdoms he distinguishes translators of different dates. In Isaiah, on the contrary, he finds no clear trace of division, though Mr Gray (*J. Th. Stud.* xii. 46, p. 286) thinks otherwise. On these questions see also Schäfer in *Theologie und Glaube*, 1909, 3, *Ist das Buch Ezeziel in der Septuaginta von einem oder mehreren Dolmetscher übersetzt?* and Mr Thackeray's other articles in *J. Th. Stud.*, iv. p. 398 ff., 578 ff., viii. p. 262 ff., ix. p. 88 ff.

P. 247. Mr H. St J. Thackeray (in *J. Th. Stud.* xi. 44, July 1910) has closely examined the passage 3 Regn. viii. 53a, and has reconstructed the underlying Hebrew text. Professor Burkitt had already (*J. Th. Stud.* x. 39, April 1909) surveyed it with a like object in view, and decided that Luc. ἔσθησεν was an attempt to correct LXX. ἐγγώρισεν, not, as had generally been said, reading הכין for הבין, but without reference to the Hebrew, which must almost certainly be הודיע. Mr Thackeray, taking this evidence to the letters of the original Hebrew, proposes to divide them differently, and instead of

to read

שמש הודיע בשמים
שמש הוד יעב שמים.

The Lucianic alteration may have been caused by the awkwardness of the preposition which now disappears. Reading ἐκ γρόφου, he takes ἐκ as =ב, preferably meaning 'without,' 'away from'; and the result is a fairly consistent stanza, of a character which modern critics would accept as older in form than that of the M.T. in *v. 12, 13*, and as better placed here:

'Sun, glory beclouds the heaven:
Jahve hath promised to dwell without the thick darkness.
Build Thou my house,
A celestial Palace for Thyself.'

Possibly, according to Mr Thackeray, this represents a development from an original 'popular incantation in times of eclipse,' as Josh. x. 12 from a sun-staying incantation. Further links of connexion appear between these passages, as in the reference in each to the Book of Jashar; referred to also in the lament of David over Saul and Jonathan, 2 Regn. i. 19ff., where 'nature allusions' again appear. These references, however, are differently attested; in Joshua it is a Hexaplar addition to the Greek; probably also in 2 Regn., where it is read by AB, etc. but not, according to H.-P., by N, 64, 71, 92, 106, 119, 242. In 3 Regn. it stands in LXX., but not in M.T. (probably excised, Mr Thackeray thinks).

There remains the difficult line τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος. The link between καινότητος and what might be expected to correspond from the M.T. in *v. 13* (cf. 2 Chron. vi. 2), namely עולמים 'for ever,' is found in עלומים, 'youth'; ἐπί is על; τοῦ κατοικεῖν is לשבת, which can better be rendered 'for the Sabbath'; and emending עלומות to עלומים, in the light of such titles to the Psalms as those of ix. and xlvi. (cf. also the end of xlviii. and 1 Chron. vi. 20), and taking account of renderings by Aquila and other versions, we get, instead of the puzzling close to the stanza, a liturgical or musical direction, לשבת על-עלמות, i.e.:

For the Sabbath. On Alamoth ('for soprano voices').

Mr Thackeray is inclined to connect 'Jasbar' with שִׁיר 'sing' rather than with יָשָׁר 'upright'; in which case the LXX. βιβλίον τῆς φῶδης here is more right than had been supposed. He points to the opening words, 'Then sang...' of Exod. xv., Numb. xxi. 17; this, however, is not material to his general argument.

Another illuminating discovery, by the same writer, on a kindred matter, concerns the difficult 'Psalm of Habakkuk' (Hab. iii.), and appeared in *J. Th. Stud.* XII. 46, Jan. 1911. This is the chapter where alone, outside the Psalter, the word 'Selah,' LXX. διάψαλμα, occurs. Four MSS., namely V (= H.-P. 23), 86 (Rome, Barber. v. 45), and the Oxford MSS. 62 and 147, have in this single chapter a widely different Greek version from that contained in the other MSS. (On 62 and 147 see above, on p. 166.) This text has been commented on by Dr Sinker (*The Psalm of Habakkuk*, Cambridge, 1890) and by Dr E. Klostermann, who prints the texts of the Barberini MS. with variants in his *Analecta* (Leipzig, 1895), p. 50 ff.

In v. 9 of the 'Psalm' occurs a clause so difficult that, it is commonly said, more than a hundred renderings have been proposed: אִמַּר מַטּוֹת מַטּוֹת אִמַּר, A.V. 'According to the oaths of the tribes, even thy word,' R.V. 'The oaths to the tribes were a sure word,' Sinker, Gesenius and others, 'Sworn were the chastisements (rods) of thy word,' etc. The difficulty lies in the shortness of the clause, the absence of construction, and the variety of possible renderings of the three *unpointed* words. The first word may be 'oaths,' 'seven,' 'weeks,' etc.; the second, 'tribes' or 'rods' (not, properly, 'shafts' or 'arrows'); and the third 'saith' (verb) or 'word' (noun). The ordinary text of the LXX. has ἐπὶ [τὰ] σκηπτρα λέγει [κύριος, a gloss]: Sinker, and Nestle (*ZATW.* 1900, p. 167 f.), suggested ἐπὶ τὰ. But the Barberini text, which Mr Thackeray believes to be the oldest Greek version, has ἐχόρτασας [τὰς] βολίδας τῆς φαρέτρας αὐτοῦ.

The details must be sought in his paper; here it can only be pointed out that he shows how ἐχόρτασας (= חֲבִיטִים) and βολίδας (= מַטּוֹת) support the consonants of M.T., while LXX. λέγει suggests אִמַּר. (Κύριος is obelized in Syro-hex.) He deduces that we have here a lectionary note, which has been merged in the text: WEEKS (or SEVEN)—RODS—SAITH. 'Weeks' is the key or catchword for the lesson from the Law, to be read when Hab. iii. was the Haphtarah or Prophetical lesson, namely, Deut. xvi. 9 ff.; 'Rods' similarly directs to Numb. xvii. or 'Tribes' to Numb. xxx. 2; and 'saith' to Gen. xii. Again, τῆς φαρέτρας αὐτοῦ stands for יְהוָה, Job xxx. 11; but it should be *Jethro*, indicating Exod. xviii.-xx. For the Primitive Lessons from the Law, the Triennial Cycle, and the later, Babylonian, annual Cycle of Lessons, see the paper by Dr Adolf Büchler in *J. Q. R.*, v. 424, and *Jewish Encycl.*, vol. XII.

The variety of lessons provided by the catchwords, and the varying length of the lesson from Habakkuk, are thus explained. Having dealt with other readings, and with the Selahs, *v.* 3, 13, 19, Mr Thackeray arrives at the conclusion that Hab. iii., or part of it, besides being used as a canticle, was read from very early times as a lesson at Pentecost, being an integral part of the book perhaps by the third century B.C. The Babylonian cycle had it for a lesson on the second day of the extended Pentecost festival (see the note in printed Hebrew Bibles at Hab. ii. 20). The 'Director of Music,' whose date must be about 250 B.C., adopted it as a canticle, adding the Selahs. In something like this state the text found its way to Egypt, about 200 B.C., and the Barberini version was made from it not long after; but the lectionary notes were not understood by the translator, whose version was intended for use as a lesson at Alexandria. Later, when Ezekiel and the minor Prophets as a whole were translated, the Barberini version was ignored; but as a short lesson, ending *v.* 3, continued to be read in some districts, a conflate text of these verses arose for synagogue interpretation. The result, among other things, is to show that here, at any rate, the consonantal text has come down almost uncorrupted.

P. 251. On the titles of the Psalms, see also F. W. Mozley, *The Psalter of the Church*, p. 46 ff.

P. 256. See Professor Burkitt in *Encycl. Bibl.* on the Sahidic Job, as above, on p. 108. A passage worthy of special attention is xxviii. 21 ff.; cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 6 (673).

P. 258. Willrich would assign the final note to Esther in the LXX. (xi. 1 in A.V.) to B.C. 48—7.

P. 261. See Nestle on *The Song of the Three Holy Children in Greek Bibles* (*Exp. Times*, XII. p. 527 f.); and W. H. Daubney, *The Song of the Three*, *ibid.* 287.

P. 262 ff. The more recent volumes of the 'Westminster Commentaries' and the *International Critical Commentary* are usually worth consulting, but they vary considerably in the amount of attention bestowed on the LXX. Many of the small volumes in the *Century Bible* series deal here and there with the readings of the LXX.; e.g. Professor Bennett's *Genesis* and Professor Skinner's *1 and 2 Kings*. To these should be added:

Joshua. M. Gasten, *Das Buch Josh. in Heb.-Samaritan Rezension. Entdeckt u. zum ersten Male herausgegeben S.A. (aus ZDMG.)* 62, p. 109 ff. *The Samaritan Book of Joshua and the Septuagint*, in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* xxxi., April 1909.

Judges and Ruth. J. S. Black and A. W. Streane, in *Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools*.

3, 4 Kingdoms. A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, I. and III.

1, 2 Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah. C. C. Torrey, *Apparatus for the Criticism of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah*, in *O.T. and Semitic Studies*, XI. p. 55 ff. *Ezra Studies*, Chicago, 1910.

Psalms. F. W. Mozley, *The Psalter of the Church*, Cambridge, 1905.

Ecclesiastes. A. H. McNeile, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastes*, Cambridge, 1904; L. Levy, *Das Buch Qoheleth, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Sadduzäismus, krit. untersucht, übers. u. erklärt*, Leipzig, 1912.

Canticles. W. Riedel, *Auslegung des Hohenliedes*, 1898; W. W. Cannon, *The Song of Songs*, Cambridge, 1913.

Esther. G. Jahn, *Das Buch Ester nach LXX. hergestellt, übers. u. krit. erklärt*, 1901; L. B. Paton, *A Text-crit. Apparatus to the Book of Esther (O.T. and Semitic Studies, XI. p. 3 ff.)*.

Dodecapheton. P. Riessler, *Die Kleinen Propheten oder das Zwölfprophetenbuch*, Rottenburg, 1911; W. O. E. Oesterley, *Codex Taurinensis*, 1908.

Amos. W. O. E. Oesterley, *Studies in the Greek and Latin Versions of the Book of Amos*, Cambridge, 1902; J. Meinhold and H. Lietzmann, *Amos the Prophet (Heb. and Greek texts)*, 1906.

Nahum. A. B. Davidson in *Camb. Bibl. for Schools*.

Habakkuk. W. R. Betteridge, *The Interpretation of Prophecy in Habakkuk*, in *A. J. Th.* VIII. Oct., 1904; H. St J. Thackeray, in *J. Th. Stud.* XII. 46, Jan. 1911; M. L. Margolis, *The Character of the Anonymous Version of Hab. iii.*, in *A. J. Sem. Lit.*, 24, p. 76 ff.

Zephaniah. S. Zandstra, *The Witness of the Vulgate, Peshitta, and Septuagint to the Text of Zephaniah*, New York, 1909.

Isaiah. R. R. Ottley, *Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1904, 1906.

Ezekiel. G. Jahn, *Das Buch Ezechiel nach LXX.*, 1905.

Daniel. G. Jahn, *Das Buch Daniel nach LXX.*, 1904; W. H. Daubney, *The Three Additions to Daniel*, Cambridge, 1906.

P. 267. Sir H. Howorth has expressed his views further in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* 23, 24, and *J. Th. Stud.* v. 19, and holds that Chronicles also is the work of Theodotion. Thackeray is now (*Gramm. of O.T. in Greek*, p. xx) inclined to agree with regard to 2 Esdras, but has his doubts about Chronicles. See, however, Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, p. 66 ff., and *Apparatus for Text. Crit. of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah*. Thackeray is also of opinion that the hand of the writer of 1 Esdras may 'be traced in the

earlier chapters of the Chisian text of Daniel' (*Gramm. O.T.G.* p. 12). Sir H. Howorth's views were to some extent anticipated by Pohlmann in the *Tübingen Quartalschrift*, 1859.

P. 268. On the style of Wisdom, see Thackeray on *Rhythm in Wisdom*, *J. Th. Stud.* vi. p. 232 ff.; with which may be coupled his article on *The Poetry of the Greek Book of Proverbs*, *ibid.* XIII. 49, p. 46 ff. He dates Wisdom, on grounds of spelling, between 132 and 100 B.C. (*Gramm. O.T.G.* p. 62).

P. 270. Mr J. H. A. Hart (*Ecclesiasticus in Greek*, p. 259 ff.) fixes the date of the grandson's arrival in Egypt as 247 B.C., interpreting the Greek phrase as 'in the eight-and-thirtieth year, under King Euergetes'; i.e. in the thirty-eighth year of Philadelphus, in which he had been succeeded by Euergetes I. He urges that under Euergetes II. no Jew could have worked in Egypt. (See above, on p. 10 ff.) Dr Oesterley combats this view in his Introduction to the book in *Camb. Bible for Schools*; but it deserves careful examination. It is curious that the names, which might have been expected to fix the date of composition of the book, admit of alternative explanations.

P. 271. Professor Margoliouth's theory concerning the extant Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus cannot be said to be gaining ground. Yet, on the other hand, there is a tendency to agree that the Hebrew text, as we possess it, is not the original of the Greek, which, assuming it to be translated from Hebrew, must have followed two other recensions. The A.V. follows mainly the text of 248 and the cursives resembling it; the R.V. that of the uncials, which is considerably shorter. The Hebrew now extant comes from four MSS. dating about the eleventh century. They include the greater part of the book, from iii. 6 onward, except xxvii. 6—xxx. 11. Some verses occur in two MSS., a few even in three; there is some variety, and considerable corruption in some places.

P. 273. Mozley, *Psalter of the Church*, p. xii, remarks on Jerome's method: 'So that neither his eyes saw the page of the original, nor his fingers held the pen.' Oxyrh. Pap. 1076, containing Tobit ii. 2, 3, 4, 8, appears to give a third recension. Dr J. Rendel Harris points out a connexion between Tobit and the Book of Jubilees; he holds that whichever borrowed from the other did so in Hebrew or Aramaic. The \aleph text seems to show traces of Aramaic influence in the forms of proper names.

P. 275. Baruch a (i. 1—iii. 8) is 'beyond a doubt,' Thackeray thinks, 'the production of the translator of Jeremiah β ' (*J. Th. Stud.* iv. p. 261 ff.; *Gramm. of O.T.G.* p. 12; cf. p. 276, note 1). Schürer thinks this part was composed in Hebrew, and later trans-

lated, and the second part added. Thus he dates iii. 9—iv. 4 about 70 A.D., while Marshall places it, in its original form, nearly 400 years earlier.

P. 279, note 2. Wendland (*Aristeas*, p. 133) says: 'equidem censeo Πτολεμαϊκά esse Aristeae, qui ex Ptolemaei ephemeridibus se hausisse testatur.'

P. 283. It is possible that the *Odes of Solomon*, of which the Syriac text was discovered by Dr Rendel Harris, and published in 1910 (ed. 2, 1911), have no real title to be mentioned here, as they may be Christian productions of a time which would remove them from any list of O.T. apocryphal writings. In view, however, of their possibly close connexion with the *Psalms of Solomon*, they may receive a passing notice. The Syriac text contained 17 (or 18) Psalms and 42 Odes. These latter have been variously estimated and explained; some, at first, thinking them to be the work of a Jewish Christian, others to be Jewish, but with Christian interpolations. The question turns mainly on the fourth and sixth Odes. The latest published theory is that of the Bishop of Ossory, who holds them to be hymns sung by (Eastern) Christians on the occasion of their public baptism. In this case, the date would be about the end of the first century A.D., while the view that their origin was Jewish admits a date as early, perhaps, as 100 B.C. Dr Bernard's view, which has already gained some adherents, is published in the *Cambridge Texts and Studies*, vol. VIII. no. 3; and the Syriac text of the Odes has also been published separately.

P. 285. To the list in the footnote may be added the *Story of Ahikar* (from the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Greek, and Slavonic Versions, edited by F. C. Conybeare, J. Rendel Harris, and Agnes Smith Lewis, Cambridge, 1898), and *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (or 2 Enoch), though extant only in a Slavonic version. It may be convenient also to refer here to the *Pistis Sophia*, a Gnostic work known from a Coptic MS. in the British Museum (ed. J. H. Petermann, Berlin, 1851; and examined by A. Harnack, in O. von Gebhardt's and A. Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Band VII. 2, Leipzig, 1892); the canonical Psalter is freely quoted in it, with a text bearing marked resemblances to that of Cod. B; and until Dr Rendel Harris's recent discovery, the *Odes of Solomon* were chiefly known from its quotation of them.

LITERATURE of the non-Canonical Books, add:

1 Esdras. P. Riefster, *D. text-krit. Wert des 3 Ezra-buches*, in *Bibl. Zeitung*, 5, p. 146.

Wisdom of Solomon. J. A. F. Gregg, in *Camb. Bible for Schools*.

Wisdom of the Son of Sirach. J. H. A. Hart, *Ecclesiasticus in Greek*, Cambridge, 1909; W. O. E. Oesterley in *Camb. Bible for Schools*, 1912. N. Schmidt in *Temple Bible*; R. Smend, *Griechisch-syrisch-hebräischer Index zur Weisheit d. Jes. Sirach*, 1907. On the Heb. text: J. Knabenbauer, *Comm. in Ecclesiasticum*, Paris, 1902; R. Smend, *Die Weisheit d. Jes. Sir. erklärt*, Berlin, 1906, also a Germ. translation, 1906; H. L. Strack, *Die Sprüche Jesus d. S. Sirachs*, Leipzig, 1903; A. Fuchs, *Textkr. Untersuchungen zum Heb. Ekkl.*, in *Bibl. Studien*, 1907; *Ecclesiasticus Hebraice...*, Freiburg, 1905; articles in *Encycl. Bibl.* and *Jewish Encycl.*

Facsimiles of the Fragments hitherto recovered of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew have been published jointly by the Universities of Oxf. and Camb.

Judith. H. Willrich in *Judaica*, 1900, pp. 1—39.

Tobit. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, 1832; M. Löhr, *Alexandrinus und Sinaiticus zum Buche Tobit*, in *ZATW.* xx. p. 243 ff. (1900); J. H. Moulton, *The Iranian background of Tobit*, in *Exp. Times*, xi. p. 257 ff.; E. Cosquin in *D. B.* iv. p. 785 ff.; also articles in *Revue Biblique*, Jan. 1899, in *Jewish Encycl.* xii. p. 171 (C. H. Toy) and *Encycl. Bibl.* (W. Erbt).

Baruch. A. M. Amelli, *De libri Baruch vetustissima latina versione*, Montecassino, 1902.

1—4 Maccabees. W. Fairweather and J. S. Black, 1 *Maccabees*, in *Camb. Bible for Schools*; B. Niese, *Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher*, Berlin, 1900; R. Laqueur, *Kritische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch*, Strassburg, 1904; G. Mercati, *Frammenti Urbinati d' un' antica versione latina del libro II. de' Maccabei*, in *Revue Biblique*, II. p. 184 ff.; I. Abrahams in *J. Q. R.* 1896, p. 39, 1897, p. 39; H. Willrich, *Jason von Kyrene und das ii Makkabäerbuch*, in *Judaica*, 1900, pp. 131 ff.; A. Schlatter, *Jason von Cyrene*, Munich, 1891; A. Büchler, *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden im II Makkabäerbuch*, Vienna, 1899.

Pseudepigrapha. R. H. Charles and A. Cowley, *An early source of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *J. Q. R.* xix. p. 566 ff.

General. L. E. T. André, *Les Apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament*, Florence, 1903; A. Bertholet, *Apocryphen*, in K. Budde's *Geschichte der alt-hebräischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1906; arts. in *Encycl. Bibl.* and *Schaff-Herzog Encycl.*

In 1913 appeared the two great volumes of the Oxford *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, edited by Prof. R. H. Charles. This contains translations, with critical and explanatory notes and full Introductions, of all the books of the Apocrypha, 3 and 4 Maccabees, 1 and 2 Enoch, 2 and 3 Baruch, The Book of Jubilees, The Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs, The Letter of Aristeas, The Sibylline Oracles, The Story of Aḥikar, and a few other works. The editor has had the assistance of various eminent scholars,

including the producers of the original edition of the Story of Aḥīkar; and the work, from its comprehensive and complete character, promises to be indispensable to students for years to come. It is only possible here to indicate its great importance.

P. 289. During the last ten to twenty years, students have devoted great and increasing attention to the Greek language of those centuries during which the books of the Greek Bible, translated or original, appeared. Large quantities of papyri, literary and familiar, have been discovered and examined; including many Biblical fragments. The Oxyrhynchus, Tebtunis, Amherst, Rylands, and other collections—many of them edited with admirable skill by Drs Grenfell and Hunt—form a rich store, which will doubtless continue to grow. The study of these materials has brought about a certain shifting in the estimate formed of the language of the Greek Bible, to which Professor Deissmann and Professor Moulton have given a strong impulse. They urge that the difference between the language of the Greek Old and New Testaments, and other contemporary Greek, is shown by the study of the papyri to be, lexically and grammatically, almost non-existent; they bring forward parallels from the papyri to almost every construction and phrase formerly termed a 'Hebraism'; and account for them as colloquial, ordinary, or illiterate Greek of the period, rather than as Semiticised, or as specially Egyptian or Alexandrian. They make an exception as regards what they call 'translation Greek'; but the student whose interest lies mainly in the Septuagint may think that so large a portion of it comes under this head, that the exception may carry them further from their main position than they are in fact prepared to go. Against their view Wellhausen (in his *Einleitung in die drei erste Evangelien*, 1905) speaks strongly for Aramaism in the N.T. itself; and others (e.g. G. C. Richards in his review of Moulton's prolegomena to his *Grammar of the New Test. in Greek*, in *J. Th. Stud.* x. 38, p. 283 ff. Jan. 1909) feel the Semitic tone or cast of much of the Greek Bible, and of particular expressions in it, to be so marked, that even the appearance of parallel or identical expressions in the papyri does not entirely convince them that Semitic influence is out of the question as the cause that produces them where they stand, and in the quantity that is present. On the whole, there is a natural tendency for those who are mainly New Testament scholars and Greek philologists to favour what may be called the purely Greek theory, while the Semitic influence is more prominent in the minds of those whose life's study has been chiefly concerned with Hebrew and Aramaic. But a general survey of the question suggests that the difference is rather a matter of terms and of aspect than of real divergence as to the main mass of facts. The balance is very fairly held by the author of the *Grammar of the*

Old Testament in Greek: see pp. 25 ff., 31 ff. He speaks of... 'a general recognition that the basis of the language of the Greek Bible is the vernacular employed throughout the whole Greek-speaking world since the time of Alexander the Great. The number of "Hebraisms" formerly so called has been reduced by phenomena in the papyri, the importance of which Deissmann was the first to recognise': but follows this with a caution: 'the emphasis which has been laid upon the occurrence of certain words and usages in the Egyptian papyri which are exactly equivalent to, or bear a fairly close resemblance to, phrases in the Greek Bible hitherto regarded as "Hebraic" is likely to create a false impression, especially as regards the nature of the Semitic element in the LXX.' He points out the slightness of dialect-differences in the *κοινή*, and dismisses the theory of a "Jewish-Greek" jargon, in use in the Ghettos of Alexandria'; but adds, 'Notwithstanding that certain so-called "Hebraisms" have been removed from that category...it is impossible to deny the existence of a strong Semitic influence in the Greek of the LXX.' He agrees in the main with Dr J. H. Moulton as to 'the *overworking* of...certain correct, though unidiomatic, modes of speech, because they happen to coincide with Hebrew idioms.' Once more: 'The Hebraic character of these books [the Pentateuch and some other of the earlier versions] consists in the *accumulation* of a number of just tolerable Greek phrases, which nearly correspond to what is normal and idiomatic in Hebrew.'

The present writer must content himself with a reference to his *Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, vol. I. p. 35 ff., 'Methods of Rendering,' for a slightly different view of the subject. But it may be of interest to quote a passage from a book published so long ago as 1875 (A. Carr, *Notes on St Luke*, Introduction, p. 9 ff.) to show how far it was possible even then, before the discovery and study of the papyri had made much progress, to estimate the nature of the Greek of the Alexandrian and New Testament periods. Most of the following passages might have been written yesterday.

'When the books of the New Testament were written, Greek had become the literary language of the world.... The Greek dialect which the Evangelists and Apostles adopted or found is a far less exact representative of thought than the Greek that was handled by Thucydides or Euripides—the middle voice is rapidly disappearing, the dual number is never employed, the tenses of verbs are losing their distinctive force, and the aorist is beginning to be used...to the exclusion of the synthetic perfect.... The Attic dialect...was in a sense limited and peculiar. Its fastidious nature made it impatient of foreign intrusion. Hellenistic Greek, on the contrary, was all-embracing in its sympathies.... The purest Attic appears on the same page with an antiquated Aeolic form or a

modern barbarism. The campaigns of Alexander...the luxury of eastern satraps, the schools of Alexandria,...the Homeric enthusiasm of the grammarians,...have contributed to store the rich though barbarous magazine of Hellenistic Greek.

'It will be seen that Hellenistic Greek did not grow degenerate in the lips of natives, but was corrupted by foreigners; and, just as the waters of a stream are coloured by the soil over which they flow, so the Greek language in the New Testament is strongly influenced by Aramaic forms of expression. It is, indeed, often simply Aramaic thinly disguised by a Greek dress. But, on the other hand, there has been, perhaps, too great a tendency to set down every idiom that offends the scholar's ear as a Hebrew mode of expression. This strangeness of idiom is frequently to be referred to other causes. Sometimes it is the influence of Latin; sometimes the idiom will be found to be Greek as well as Hebrew, but Greek of a kind that had been heretofore confined to the speech of the vulgar.'

P. 314. Literature. Add:

G. A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 1907; English trans. by L. R. M. Strachan, London, 1910; *Bible Studies* (including *Bibel-Studien* and *Neue Bibel-Studien*), trans. A. Grieve, Edinburgh, 1901; *Philology of the Greek Bible*, 1908; R. Helbing, *Grammatik der Septuaginta*, i. *Laut- und Wortlehre*, 1907; H. St J. Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Test. in Greek*, vol. I. *Introd., Orthography and Accidence*, Cambridge, 1909; J. Psichari, *Essai sur le Grec de la Septante*, in *Revue des Études Juives*, Tome LV. No. 110, Paris, 1908; R. Meister, *Prolegomena zu einer Grammatik der Septuaginta*, in *Wiener-Studien*, xxvii. 2; *Beiträge zur Lautlehre der LXX.*, Vienna, 1909; G. N. Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1892; A. Thumb, *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular*, trans. S. Angus, Edinburgh, 1912; art. *Hellenistic Greek* in Funk and Wagnall's *American Standard Bible Dictionary*; J. Wackernagel, *Hellenistica*, Göttingen, 1907; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Ueber die Entstehung der griechischen Schriftsprache*, Leipzig, 1879.

On the grammar of the New Testament: J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of N. T. Greek*, Prolegomena, ed. 3, 1908; *N. T. Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery*, in *Camb. Biblical Essays*, 1909; F. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, 1898; J. de Zwaan, *Syntaxis der Wijzen en Tijden in het Griekse Nieuwe Testament*, Haarlem, 1906.

In connexion with Semitism in N. T. Greek: J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, Berlin, 1905; G. C. Richard's review of Moulton's Prolegomena, *Gramm. of N. T. Greek*, in *J. Th. Stud.* x. 38, pp. 283 ff. Monographs and articles on special points extend over a wide range: e.g. H. F. Allen, *The Infinitive in Polybius compared with the Infin.* in *Biblical Greek*, Chicago, 1907; H. A. Redpath on *The Present Position of the Study of the LXX.* and on *The Geography of the LXX.*, in *A. J. Th.* vii. (Jan., Apr. 1903).

The Oxford *Concordance to the Septuagint* was completed in 1906.

Introductory: *Selections from the Septuagint according to the text of Swete*, by F. C. Conybeare and St G. Stock, Boston, 1905.

The publications of papyri have become very numerous; among them are:

British Museum Papyri, ed. F. G. Kenyon, 1893.

Paris Papyri (in *Notices et Extraits*), ed. Brunet de Presle, 1858, 1865.

Berlin, *Griechische Urkunden*, ed. U. Wilcken, 1895, 1898, 1903, ed. W. Schubart, 1911.

Flinders Petrie Papyri, ed. J. P. Mahaffy (in *Proc. R.I.A.*), 1891, etc.

Papyri Graeci Regii Taurinensis Musei Aegyptii, ed. Peyrow, Turin, 1826.

Geneva Papyri, ed. J. Nicole, 1896, 1900.

Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, ed. C. Wessely, Vienna, 1895.

Florence Papyri, ed. Vitelli, Milan, 1905.

Die Septuaginta Papyri...der Heidelberger Papyrus Sammlung, ed. G. A. Deissmann, 1905.

Papyri Graeci Musei antiquarii publici, ed. C. Leemans, Leyden, 1843.

Papyrus Grecs de l'Université de Lille, ed. P. Collart and J. Lesquier, Paris, 1908.

Karans Papyri, ed. E. J. Goodspeed, Chicago, 1900.

Eine Mithras-Liturgie, ed. A. Dieterich, Leipzig, 1903.

Pathyris Papyri, ed. de Ricci (*Archiv* II. p. 514).

Griech. Pap. der k. Bibl. zu Strassburg, ed. F. Preisigke, 1907, 1912.

Griech. Papyri zu Giessen, ed. E. Kornemann and P. M. Meyer, Leipzig and Berlin, 1912.

And the various publications of the Egypt Exploration Fund, chiefly edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt:

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, edited with translations and notes. Nine parts up to 1912.

Fayûm Towns and their Papyri, 1900; *The Amherst Papyri*, 1900, 1901; *The Tebtunis Papyri* (Univ. of California Publications), two parts; the *Hibeh Papyri*, 1906.

Also *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Manchester, ed. A. S. Hunt, 1911.

Here may be mentioned also ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥΥ, from an early Greek Papyrus; *New Sayings of Jesus, and Fragment of a lost Gospel*; *Fragment of an uncanonical Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*; *An Alexandrian erotic Fragment, and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic*; *New Classical Fragments and other Papyri*.

Coptic Ostraca, from the collections of the E. É. Fund, etc.... texts edited...by W. E. Crum, London, 1902.

In connexion with the study of these papyri, various selections and aids have appeared.

S. Witkowski, *Epistolae privatae Graecae quae in papyris aetatis Lagidarum servantur*, Leipzig, 1905; H. Lietzmann, *Greek Papyri (Materials for Theol. Lect. and Students, No. 14)*, Cambridge, 1905; G. Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri*, Cambridge, 1910.

F. G. Kenyon, *Palaeography of Greek Papyri*, 1899; E. Maysner, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, Leipzig, 1906; W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*, Leipzig, 1903; L. Mitteis and U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde*, 4 vols., Leipzig and Berlin, 1912.

The publications on the kindred study of Inscriptions are widely scattered, largely in periodicals, and so numerous that only a small selection can be mentioned here :

E. S. Roberts and E. A. Gardner, *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, vol. 1 (out of print), vol. 2, 1905; W. Larfeld, *Handbuch der Griechischen Epigraphik*, Leipzig, vol. 1, 1908, vol. 2, 1902; E. Schwyzer (formerly Schweizer), *Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1898, and a new edition of K. Meisterhans' *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1900; E. Nachmanson, *Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften*, Upsala, 1903; O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin, 1905; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Inschriften von Priene*, 1906.

The Berlin *Inscriptiones Graecae* now extend to twelve volumes; there are also four vols. of *Inscr. Gr. ad res Romanas pertinentes*, Paris; and the *Recueil d'Inscriptions grecques*, ed. C. Michel (Brussels, 1900, suppl. i. 1911).

(The study of the Inscriptions is important, because they range over the whole of the Greek-speaking territory, while papyri are chiefly confined to Egypt. Hence they are used to establish the position that the *κοινή* was, in the main, homogeneous and free from dialectical differences. Their style is, naturally, more elevated than that of letters and local documents, but they belong to the *κοινή*, and are not altogether remote from the more 'vulgar' Greek which is found in the bulk of papyri.)

P. 317. *γένουτο* also occurs in Isa. xxv. 1, where the Hebrew word has presumably been taken for לִנְסָ by LXX., though M.T. points it differently.

P. 319. The spelling of the Hebrew Bible is perhaps based on that of a MS., no longer extant, of about A.D. 135.

P. 321. Other cases of possible confusions are between :

כ and ג, see 4 Regn. v. 19, where כַּבְּרַת is transliterated δεβραθά.

ג and ו, Isai. xxviii. 10, 13, θλίψις (רצ) for צו.

ג and ה, Isai. viii. 12, σκληρόν = קשה for קשר 'conspiracy.'

ד and ט, Isai. iii. 10, δήσωμεν, root נסד for נט.

Cf. the strong remarks in Driver's *Hebrew Tenses* (p. xiii. in first ed.) on the worthlessness of LXX.'s evidence as between ל and ל', with numerous instances.

P. 324. With ἐν ἐμοί of 1 Regn. i. 26, cf. ἐπ' ἐμοί, Isai. xxi. 2, for לָא, "Go up."

(b). On transliteration, Thackeray (*Gramm. O.T.G.* p. 31) points out that it is rare in the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Jerem. α, and the Minor Prophets; and absent altogether from Ezek. β, Proverbs, Psalms (except in titles, and ἀλληλουιά), and from Job, apart from the Hexaplar additions from Theodotus. In Isaiah, moreover, only two instances occur, of which σωρήχ, v. 2, is possibly a proper name; while νεχωθά, xxxix. 2, is in a passage that runs parallel with 4 Kingdoms; the transliteration occurs in both places in the Greek, and in Isaiah is not impossibly a doublet.

P. 327. The LXX. appear to avoid the familiar metaphor of a 'Rock' in nearly all cases;

See Deut. xxxii. 5, 15, 18, 30, 31, 37; 2 Regn. xxiii. 3; Ps. xvii. 2, 32 (= 2 Regn. xxii. 2, 32), xxx. 3, lx. 2, lxi. 6; Habak. i. 12; Isai. xvii. 10, xxx. 29, xxxii. 2, xliv. 8; but not xxxi. 9. Gen. xlix. 24 is hardly a certain instance, Heb. being different.

P. 330. Gen. xv. 1—6.

1. πολλὸς ἔσται. Heb. has here Hiphil inf. abs., used predicatively.
2. ἀπολύομαι. For this sense of the verb, cf. Soph. *Antig.* 1265, 1314; also in Polybius. Can ἄλυτον have the sense of 'depart this life'? See xxv. 32; Eccles. v. 15; Isai. xxxviii. 10; Ps. xxxviii. 14.
3. κληρονομήσει. This sense is found also in the later literary Greek.
4. Ἐκ σοῦ. Cf. Exod. i. 5.

P. 333. Josh. x. 13. H.-P. give G.'s reading wrongly as ἔθνους.

P. 336. 4 Regn. ii. 14. καὶ διερράγησαν, Luc. καὶ οὐ διηρέθη, Vulg. *et non sunt divisae*.

Consult throughout this passage Burney's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*.

Ps. cix. (cx.) 1—4. See Mozley, *Psalter of the Church*, p. 164.

P. 340. Literature.

Add: M. L. Margolis, *Studien in griech. A.T.*, ZATW., 27, p. 212; H. A. Redpath, *Mytholog. Terms in the LXX.*, in *A. J. Th.* 9, 1, p. 34 (Jan. 1905).

P. 360. It was pointed out by the late Dr C. Taylor that in Lam. ii.—iv., whereas in the Hebrew ב precedes ב , the Greek uncials (except Q^{mg} and sometimes Q^*), while preserving the order of the verses, prefix $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$ and $\phi\eta$ in the order now usual. Conversely, in Prov. xxix. 43, 44 (= Heb. xxxi. 26, 25) NB have the ב verse before the ב verse.

P. 366. Add: E. Lindl, *Die Octateuch-Catene des Prokop von Gaza und die Septuagintaforschung*, Munich, 1902.

P. 380. Add: J. Herriot, *Philon le Juif*, Paris, 1898.

P. 387. The phrase $\chi\lambda\omega\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \chi\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$, Mark vi. 39, is curious. It is not given by Westcott and Hort as a reference to the Old Testament; but, whereas it is peculiar to Mark's account, it is found in the LXX., Gen. i. 30, Isa. xv. 6, xxxvii. 27 A.

P. 398. In Zech. xii. 10 the LXX. verb is $\kappa\alpha\tau\omega\rho\chi\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$, i.e. קקרו for קקרו (see Bp Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 136).

P. 418. Rahlfs (*Sept.-Studien*, II. p. 206) regards Justin's quotations as having been corrected by scribes from texts of the LXX.; as also those of the Fathers, e.g. Theodoret (p. 175) and Clem. Rom. (p. 201). He refers to Hilgenfeld, in Baur and Zeller's *Theolog. Jahrbücher*, 1850, and Bousset, *Die Evangeliencitate Justins d. Märtyrers*, p. 19 ff.: also Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, p. 186 ff.

P. 424. The question has been raised (in correspondence, by Mr R. B. Girdlestone) whether there are to be found any distinctively Jewish, as opposed to Christian, MSS. of the LXX. It is not easy to answer categorically. But, in view of the dates when the translation appears to have been made, and the fact that the latest books to be translated offer, in general, the smallest opportunities for changes to be made by Christian hands, it would seem that the translation, originally purely Jewish, can have suffered very little in this way. (See p. 30 ff.) For instance, the famous addition in Ps. xcv. 10, though widely current in Christian literature, has practically almost no support in MSS. of the LXX.; and the reading $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ in Isa. iii. 10 has actually none, occurring as it does in Justin, *D.* 136, 137. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14, *auferamus Tert. adv. Marc.* III. 22. All existing MSS. give what Justin calls the Jewish reading, $\delta\eta\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$; while, as Hatch, *Essays*, p. 197, points out, neither reading corresponds with the Hebrew as we have it. In Josh. xv. again, the LXX. text after *v.* 59 appears to represent an accidental, and very natural, omission in the Hebrew; cf. xxi. 36, 37. It is not even necessary to suppose that the words $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \text{Βαιθλεέμ}$ are a Greek interpolation.

The just conclusion seems to be that, previous to Origen, the text was scarcely affected, if at all; and Origen's intentions were certainly not such as to impair the *Hebraica veritas*; so that if any Christian additions have slipped here or there into the text, they are probably few and slight; there is no trace of anything that approaches to deliberate Christianising of the text. The times when such a thing might have been possible were not those when the LXX. text passed through its main vicissitudes. See Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, p. 89 ff., and his conclusion that 'the vast majority of the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek throughout the Old Testament could have had no possible partisan motive whatever.'

See also page 479.

P. 427. Mr Thackeray (*J. Th. Stud.* XIII. 49), writing on *The Poetry of the Greek Book of Proverbs*, finds an astonishing number of metrical and quasi-metrical passages. He now adds that 'Clem. Alex.'s text of Proverbs...occasionally preserves the metrical and probably original forms which have disappeared from other texts, e.g.:

Prov. ii. 21. ὅτι εὐθεὶς κατασκευώσουσι γῆν]

Clem. Al. *Strom.* II. 19, 483^P

χρηστοὶ δὲ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς,

?orig. text χρηστοὶ δ' ἔσονται τῆσδε γῆς οἰκήτορες.

Cf. Cod. V, Arm. and Clem. Rom.; also the readings of SA.

vi. 23 b. καὶ ἔλεγχος καὶ παιδεία]

Strom. I. 29, 247^P

ὁδοὺς γὰρ βιότητος ἐλέγχει παιδεία,

?orig. παιδεία γὰρ ὁδοὺς βιότητος ἐλέγχει.

βιότης = βιὸς is else a ἀπαξ λεγ. in Prov. v. 23.

Similarly Chrysostom is possibly right in reading, in Prov. xv. 17b:

ἢ παράθεσις μύσχων μετὰ ἔχθρας
ἢ βοῦς ἀπὸ φάτνης.'

P. 432. Literature: add Constantinus Oikonomus, vol. IV.

P. 442. There is an excursus on Gen. xlix. 10 in the earlier editions (previous to the fourth) of Cheyne's *Prophecies of Isaiah*.

P. 448. Ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ. See Mr Thackeray's paper in *J. Th. Stud.* XI. 44, referred to above, on p. 247.

P. 486. In 1907 Professor Rahlfs developed a provisional plan for a scientific edition of the LXX.: the Academy of Berlin, the Royal Society of Göttingen, and the Prussian Ministerium of Instruction to cooperate. MSS. were to be collated, in Greek, Coptic, Ethiopic, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian and Slavonic. The

Latin MSS. to be left to the Pontifical Commission for the revision of the Vulgate. The Fathers to be examined by various scholars; Dr E. Hautsch taking Theodoret. See *Erster Bericht über das Septuaginta-Unternehmen*, 1908 (*Nachrichten d. k. G. d. W. zu Göttingen*); *Geschäftliche Mitteilungen*, 1909, Heft 1.

See also a brief account by Dr Nestle in *A. J. Th.* XIV. 2 (April 1910); as well as his *Die grosse Cambridger Septuaginta* (Verhandlungen der XIII. Internationalen Orientalistenkongresses, 1902).

P. 490. Both A and B, as has been seen, show here and there signs of considerable Hexaplaric addition. It is therefore fortunate that, owing to the varying character of the books in our great Greek Bibles, this influence seldom affects both MSS. equally in the same passages. On Job, see Burkitt, *O. L. and Itala*, pp. 6 ff., 32 ff. Even within the same book, Rahlfs finds the character of A different in what remains of Psalms xxx.—ciii. and at the beginning and end of the book. On Cod. \aleph see Professor Kirsopp Lake's Introduction to the photograph of the N.T. (cf. above, on p. 130). On the text of the Prophets see O. Procksch, *Stud. z. Geschichte der Sept.* (below). His verdict is in favour of A's text, with Q near to it; \aleph he places next, and B akin to it. This latter text, though inferior to AQ, he considers to be that on which Origen worked. The text underlying the hexaplaric cursives comes, he thinks, between AQ and \aleph B, but nearer to the latter. The pre-hexaplaric cursives approximate to A. The history of the Septuagint is 'the story of its removal from the maximum to the minimum distance from the M.T.' This account is mainly based on an excellent survey in *A. J. Th.* XIV. p. 493.

L. Dieu (*Muséon*, 1912, p. 223 f.) who has investigated the text of Job from various points of view—see above, on p. 108—considers that A in that book is mainly Lucianic. This he deduces from the intrinsic character of its text ('corrections d'après l'hébreu, doublets, remaniements d'après des passages parallèles, corrections destinées à éclaircir le sens ou compléter la phrase, tendances à l'atticisme': cf. Rahlfs, *Sept. Stud.* II. p. 230, 236, III. p. 158, 172, 281 ff.), as well as from its associates, which are here rather curious; an anonymous Arian commentary on ch. i.—iii., known only in a Latin translation; a commentary formerly attributed to Origen, but assigned by Dr H. Usener to Julian of Halicarnassus; and another, in the Laurentian Library at Florence, attributed, though somewhat doubtfully, to Chrysostom. To these are to be added V, in the first, the cursives 249 and 254, in the second, and 55, 68, 106, 261 in the third degree of closeness. Some of these, especially 68 and 106, are held to give a Hesychian text in other books; and in Isaiah, for instance, 106 goes very closely with A, and is, perhaps, the more markedly Hesychian. For 55, see Rahlfs, II. p. 235.

M. Dieu considers that A's text in Job is nearer to the original than that of **NB**; he calls the Sahidic to witness; but see above, on pp. 85, 108. He also adduces in support the marginal readings of Cod. Gothicus Legionensis: see Rahlfs, III. 158, and *Notices et Extraits*, xxxiv. pp. 134 ff.

P. 497. Add:

O. Procksch, *Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta*, in Kittel's *Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom A. T.* Heft 7, Leipzig, 1910; G. Jahn, *Beiträge z. Beurteilung der Septuaginta. Ein Würdigung Wellhausen'scher Textkritik*, 1902; *Ester* (1901), *Daniel* (1904), *Ezechiel* (1905); J. Dahse, *Textkritische Studien*, in *ZATW.* 1908, pp. 18 ff., 161 ff.

APPENDIX.

THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS

INTRODUCTION.

The so-called letter of Aristeas to Philocrates appeared first in print in a Latin translation by Matthias Palmerius of Pisa (Rome, 1471). The editio princeps of the Greek text was not published until 1561, when Simon Schard brought out at Basle a text based on a MS. hitherto supposed to be lost, with a few readings taken from a second (Vatican) MS. Wendland in his recent edition (1900) has made it practically certain that Schard's principal MS. was Codex Monacensis 9, which at that time was at Tübingen and easily accessible to him. As to his second MS., there exists in the Library at Basle (MS. O. IV. 10, no. 21 in Omont's *Catalogue of Swiss MSS.*) a MS. presented to it by Schard, which is beyond a doubt a copy of the Vatican MS. denoted by K in the present text; and a list of readings appended to Schard's edition under the heading 'castigationes in Aristeam juxta exemplar Vaticanæ' appears to be a scanty selection of the readings of K. Schard's edition was followed by others in the seventeenth century based upon his work; but it does not appear that any fresh collation of MSS. was undertaken¹. Until 1870 the latest edition of the text was that which Hody prefixed to his work *De Bibliorum Textibus*, published at Oxford in 1705. This was merely a reprint of the text of Schard, Hody naïvely confessing in his preface that he did not consider the work of collating MSS. of a work of such doubtful authenticity to be worth the trouble. 'Non me fugit servari in Bibliotheca Regia Parisina, aliisque quibusdam, exemplaria istius MSS. Sed de tali opusculo, quod tanquam foetum supposititium penitus rejicio, Amicos sollicitare, et in Partes longinquas mittere, vix operæ pretium existimavi. Eas curas relinquo illis, quibus tanti esse res videbitur.'

The first step towards a critical edition of the text was taken by Moriz Schmidt, who in 1870 brought out in Merx's *Archiv* (Band I.) a text based on a complete collation of two Paris MSS., which he denoted by B and C, and a partial collation of a third, A, which was used to supply the opening of the letter which was missing in B and C. Schmidt's edition, though a valuable beginning, is far from satisfactory. A full use was not made of the evidence for the text afforded by the paraphrase of Josephus and the extracts of Eusebius. Moreover a large number of MSS. of the letter is now known to exist; and fresh light has been thrown on the language by the papyri of the Ptolemaic period which have at various times been discovered in Egypt.

The valuable help which these papyri offer as an illustration of the letter, shewing that the writer possessed an accurate knowledge

¹ The earlier editions are enumerated by Schmidt in his preface to the text (Merx, *Archiv*, Bd. I. 1870).

of the official titles and phraseology of the Ptolemaic court, was first pointed out by Prof. Lumbroso. He says¹, 'Depuis quarante ans, un rayon de lumière inattendu a jailli des inscriptions et des papyrus, qui jette sur elle un jour nouveau; chose frappante: il n'est pas un titre de cour, une institution, une loi, une magistrature, une charge, un terme technique, une formule, un tour de langue remarquable dans cette lettre, il n'est pas un témoignage d'Aristée concernant l'histoire civile de l'époque, qui ne se trouve enregistré dans les papyrus ou les inscriptions et confirmé par eux'². A close examination of the larger evidence from the papyri now available will probably corroborate the opinion, to which other evidence seems to point, that the letter was written under some one of the later Ptolemies. In any case the evidence of the papyri is an important factor to be taken into account in establishing a text.

Another illustration of the text is afforded by a kindred work, also dealing with the history of the Jews of Egypt under the Ptolemaic rule, the third Book of Maccabees³.

Prof. Lumbroso further supplemented Schmidt's work upon the text by collating the Paris MS. A throughout, and also a MS. in the British Museum (F), and one at Venice (G); he also indicated the existence of five MSS. in the Vatican, but it does not appear that he has published any collations of these Roman MSS.

In 1893 the want of an edition of the letter was represented to the present writer, and in a journey to Italy in the autumn of that year he collated the five Vatican MSS. mentioned by Lumbroso (HKLIM), and one in the library of the Barberini palace (P), and revised the collations which had already been made of the MSS. at Venice (G) and Paris (ABC); at Paris he also collated the fragment Q and the MS. D, so far as was necessary to establish the fact that it was a copy of A. He has since collated a MS. at Florence (T) and another at Zurich (Z). On his learning subsequently that Prof. Mendelssohn of Dorpat had for many years been preparing an edition of the letter, which was nearly ready, the work which he had begun was put aside. Prof. Mendelssohn's death postponed the appearance of the expected German edition; a fragment only, consisting of the text of about


¹ *Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, par G. Lumbroso (Turin, 1870), p. xiii.

² Some instances are the titles ἀρχισωματοφύλακες, οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν χρειῶν, χρηματισταί, οἱ ὑπὲρ τῶν ταγμάτων (cf. ταγματικοὶ ὑπηρέταις Wilcken, *Actenstücke Pap.* VIII.), the phrase ἐὰν φωνηθῆται, the correct use of εὐτύχει at the close of a petition from a subordinate to a higher official, the words ἐκατοντάρουρος and παρεύσεις, the phrase παραγενέσθαι εἰς τοὺς τόπους.

³ Cf. especially 3 Maccabees iii. 25—28 (προσ τετάχαμεν—διειλήφαμεν—μηνύειν δὲ τὸν βουλόμενον) with Ar. p. 523. 23 ff. (προσ τετάχαμεν—διειλήφαμεν—τὸν δὲ βουλόμενον προσαγγέλλειν).

a fifth of the letter with commentary but without introduction, was published soon after his death¹. The remainder of his work was placed in the hands of Prof. Wendland, who has now brought out a text on which no pains have been spared, followed by the *testimonia* critically edited, and full and valuable indices². The present writer had, before the appearance of the German edition, been entrusted by Dr Swete with the preparation of a text of the letter from such materials as he had at hand. In this second edition he has made free use of Wendland's work, as also of his translation of the letter in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. The apparatus criticus will show how many obscurities have been cleared up by the acute conjectures of Mendelssohn, Wendland, and their collaborateurs. For one happy emendation (§ 105, p. 538) the writer is indebted to the Rev. H. A. Redpath. For convenience of reference Wendland's sections have been inserted in the margin. It must be added that one early MS. (Cod. Monacensis 9), which stands by itself, and is probably the parent of Schard's edition, is unrepresented in the present text.

The following genealogical table will show approximately how the MSS. which have been used are related to each other.



¹ *Aristeae quae fertur ad Philocratem epistulae initium*, ed. L. Mendelssohn et M. Krascheninnikov (Dorpat, 1897).

² *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistola etc.* Ludovici Mendelssohn schedis usus edidit Paulus Wendland (Leipzig, Teubner, 1900).

The MSS. denoted in the above table are as follows :

H	Vat. 747.	M	Ottobon. 32.
A	Paris 128.	Q	Paris 950.
D	Paris 130.	T	Florence Laur. Acquisti 44.
F	Brit. Mus. Burney 34.	B	Paris 129.
L	Vat. 746.	C	Paris 5.
K	Vat. 383.	P	Barberini IV. 56.
R	Basle O. IV. 10 (Omont 21).	S	Vat. 1668.
G	Venice 534.	Z	Zurich Bibl. de la Ville C. 11
I	Palat. 203.		(Omont 169).

It will be seen that the MSS. fall into two main groups, which may for convenience be described as the A and B groups, the A group again falling into two smaller groups HKA and GIM, and the B group into two smaller groups TB and CPSZ. The real problem in fixing the text is to determine the relative value of the A and B groups. An examination of the readings shows, in the opinion of the present writer, that the B group, which was followed by Schmidt, while presenting a specious text, is in reality based on a recension, although in a few passages it has kept the original readings; in the A group no correction has taken place, and though the text which has here been handed down is by no means free from corruption, yet the true reading is in most cases rather to be looked for here than in the revised B text.

The group HA(DFL)K(R).

H, CODEX VATICANUS. Rome. Vat. Gr. 747, saec. xi. membr. foll. 260.

fol. 1. Aristeas.

12. Letter of Theodoret to Hypatius. *καὶ ἄλλοι μὲν φιλομαθεῖς ἄνδρες—εἰς προοίμιον τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς.*

13. Catena of Theodoret and other patristic writers on the Octateuch.

259. *πῶσαι παραδόσεις εἰσὶ τῆς θείας γραφῆς.*

260. *ποσάκις καὶ ποτε ἐπορθήθησαν οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ.*

A beautiful MS., in clearly written cursive characters, which hang from ruled lines, containing coloured illustrations throughout (five in the Aristeas portion), ornamental red head-pieces and red initial letters in the margin. Single column, 48 lines in a page: size of page $14 \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in., of writing $11\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ in.

The Catena is apparently by the same hand as the Aristeas, the LXX. text being in the same size of writing as the Aristeas, and the marginal Catena in smaller writing (80 lines in a page). There is one large omission in the Aristeas, two leaves of the MS. apparently having been lost. The verso of fol. 3 ends with *τὴν τράπεζαν* (p. 530. 8), and *λείπει* is written in an early hand at the foot of the page; fol. 4 begins with *μὲν πεδυνῶν* (538. 11) and ÷ is written in the margin.

K, CODEX VATICANUS. Rome. Vat. Gr. 383, saec. xii.—xiii. membr. 319 foll.

- fol. 1. Aristeas.
29. Theodoret to Hypatius.
19vo. Catena on Genesis.
187. Catena on Exodus.

Size of page $12\frac{3}{4} \times 9$ in., of writing $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ in.: 38 lines in a page. The leaves at the beginning are soiled and worm-eaten. The words hang from ruled lines: the right-hand margin is irregular, the writing going beyond the perpendicular line in places. The writing is upright with very thick strokes, clear, but rather untidy.

R, CODEX BASILEENSIS. Basle. Codd. Gr. O. iv. 10 (Omont¹ 21). This MS., written in the sixteenth century, apparently for Schard's edition, but only very sparingly used by him in an appendix of readings, is clearly a direct transcript of the preceding MS. This may be shown by the following instances out of many: *ov* KR (*ων* cett.) p. 519. 4, *διαθεσις καθαρα* KR (*καθ. διαθεσις* cett.) p. 519. 8, *κυριωτερον* KR (*κυριωτατον* cett.) p. 519. 9, *οι ανδρες ασφαλως* KR (*ασφ. οι ανδρες* cett.) p. 528. 10, *σαλισγουμενοι* KR (*συναλιση.* cett.) p. 543. 23, *χρωμεθα* KR (*χρωμενα* cett.) p. 544. 10, *om. και περι τουτων—σεμνοτητα* KR p. 548. 16 f. The MS. has the inscription at the end, 'donum Simonis Schardii Magdiburgiensis.'

A, CODEX REGIUS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. Gr. 128, saec. xii. membr. 610 pagg.

- p. 1. Aristeas.
26. Theodoret to Hypatius.
27. Preface to Genesis from Gregory of Nyssa, inc. *επειδηπερ εισα-
γωγιμον προς θεογνωσιαν...*
28. Catena on the Octateuch.
608. On the versions of Holy Scripture, the names of God, etc.

Single column: words hang from ruled lines, 47 lines in a page: a neat writing in brown ink, initial letters in crimson: size of page $14\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{3}{4}$ in., of writing 11×7 in. A hand of the fourteenth century (Lumbroso²) has added some marginal notes (on Theopompus and Theodectes, a saying of Alexander the Great, etc.), many of which are rubbed and almost illegible, but they may be read in D which has copied them. Montfaucon (*Bibl. Bibliothecarum*, II. 725) mentions this MS., and describes it as written 'manu XII. circiter saeculi.' On p. 610 is written a note, *+ισω εν (?) ταυτα εις δοξαν | θυ και της αγιας τριαδος φηλα [? φυλλα] τριακοσια γ ητοι (?) τ̄ γ̄ +.*

¹ *Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs des Bibliothèques de Suisse* (Leipzig, 1886).

² *Atti della R. Accad. di Torino*, vol. iv. 1869.

Descendants of A(DFL).

D, CODEX REGIUS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. Gr. 130, saec. xv. chart. 288 foll.

- fol. 1. Aristeas.
- 26vo. Theodoret to Hypatius.
- 27. Gregory of Nyssa's Preface.
- 28. Catena on Genesis and Exodus, I—12.

The rest of the Catena and the remaining matter contained in A are to be found in MS. Paris 132, written by the same hand as D. Omont's Catalogue describes the MS. as 'copied by George Gregoropoulos'; Omont takes this apparently from the 1740 catalogue which says '*videtur a Gregoropulo exaratus*'; the name of the scribe does not seem to occur in the MS. A clearly written MS. in a hand similar to that of M (of the same century). Page $13\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ in.: writing $9 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. Another hand has underlined in red ink passages where there are clerical errors and has corrected the text to that of A. This MS. was not collated throughout, as it appeared certain from an examination of a few passages that it was a copy of A (see below).

F, CODEX BURNEIENSIS. British Museum. Burney MS. 34, saec. xv. chart. 645 pagg.

Same contents as A, viz.

- p. 1. Aristeas.
- 21. Theodoret to Hypatius.
- 22. Passages from Gregory of Nyssa's book on the six days of creation.
- 25. Catena on the Octateuch.
- 643. *πόσαι παραδόσεις κ.τ.λ.*
- 644. *ποσάκις καὶ ποτε ἐπορθήθησαν οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ.*
- 644. Evagrius Scitensis on the ten names of God.
- 645. Three chronological notes.
- 645. On the works of God in the six days.

L, CODEX VATICANUS. Rome. Vat. Gr. 746, pt. 1., saec. xv. (partim saec. xi.—xii.?) membr. 251 foll.

- fol. 1. Aristeas.
- 12. Theodoret to Hypatius.
- 13. Catena on Genesis and Exodus.

The portion of the MS. containing the Catena is certainly old (eleventh or twelfth century) and possibly a copy of H or of an ancestor of H. There are the same illustrations of O.T. history as in H, better preserved but not so beautifully painted. The writing too is rougher, not so neat as in H, but in the same style. The Aristeas (together with the letter to Hypatius and the first page of the Catena) is supplied by a much later hand on white shiny unruled parchment, the Catena being on a browner parchment, and the letters there hanging from ruled lines. The Aristeas is written in a single column: size of page

13 × 11 in., of writing $11\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$ in., the number of lines in a page varying from 21 to 43. It is written apparently in two different hands; pp. 1—3 are written rather diffusely; from *εἰσι δὲ πρώτης φυλῆς* (p. 528. 10) the writing becomes more compact and neat, with more lines in a page: with the words *τὰ συμβαλόντα τοῖς φίλοις* (p. 565. 14) the diffuse writing comes in again. The beginning of the Aristeas is lost; the MS. begins with *-ματων ω βασιλευ* (p. 521. 24). It ends with *ριστεας ἰλοκρατει* (sic). This ending marks a peculiarity of the MS.; the rubricator has omitted to fill in the initial capital letters, hence we find *αι* for *και*, *ρος* for *προς*, *αμβανειν* for *λαμβανειν*, etc.

HKA. It is clear from their general agreement in readings that these MSS. form one group. Notice the omissions which they have in common:

(1) p. 564. 1. *προς τουτ—ποιησεσιν επιτελοι* (50 letters) om HKA(DFL) ins GIM and B group.

(2) p. 566. 10. *εστιν επιτελεια—διατηρεις την* (53 letters) om HKA(DFL) ins GIM and B group.

(3) p. 559. 19. *καθως υπο—διοικειται κατα* (51 letters) om HKA(DFL)GIM ins B group.

From the first two of these omissions it appears that HKA must be derived from an original (γ) which omitted these lines, an ancestor of γ having probably had lines of the length of 50 letters; from the evidence of GIM we deduce that this group, while connected with the HKA group, is not derived from γ . H and A are more closely connected than H and K; notice 551. 18 *αναπτω* (*σιν* sup lin) H *αναπτω* A*; 562. 20 *απαν* H (τ suprascr H^{corr}) *απαν* A.

ADFL. That these MSS. form a united group within the HKA group is shown by their almost universal agreement. Notice e.g. the readings 536. 1 *χρωμενοι* ADFL (*συγχρωμενοι* cett.), 537. 4 *εισεληλυθεναι* ADFL (*εληλυθεναι* cett.), 547. 3 *ευλογιας* ADFL (*λογιας* cett.), 569. 21 *επαυεπασατο* (sic) ADFL, and the omissions which they have in common:

539. 27.	<i>ουτος δε εξεισιν—Αζωτιων χωραν</i>	} om ADFL.
550. 21.	<i>γαρ ων ανθρωπος—συνεστρωσε δε παντα</i>	
554. 8.	<i>προς ευφροσυνην—ελυθη τη δε</i>	

That D is a direct transcript of A is proved by its omitting exactly a line of A, so that on p. 558. 9 it reads *μεταδορημενα* (sic) *σοι διαμενη*, where the lines in A are divided thus: *μεταδο|τικος ων και μεγαλομερης ουδεποτ αν απολιποι δοξης ινα δε τα προει|ρημενα σοι διαμενη*. Moreover, certain marginal notes in A, which are there almost illegible, have been copied by D, where they are all clear: e.g. on 553. 25 δ *καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος εἶπεν ἐρωτηθεῖς πῶς ἐν ὀλίγῳ*

μεγάλα κατάρθωσεν, ὅτι, φησίν, οὐδέποτε πράγματα ἐπιβαλὼν ἡμελήθη. At 541. II συμβουλευοντῶ of A (the stroke over the ω being very faint) has become συμβουλευοντα in D. That F is a direct transcript of A is proved by its repeating a line of A twice over, reading at 550. 16 *α μὲν ἐτι καὶ νῦν ἐκαστον ἀποτελεῖν· ἦν γὰρ οὕτω διατεταγμενον ὑπο τοῦ βασιλεως α μὲν ἐτι καὶ νῦν ὀρας· ὅσαι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* The lines in A are arranged thus: *ἐκέλευσε τὴν ἐτοιμασιαν εἰς | ἐκαστον ἀποτελεῖν· ἦν γὰρ οὕτω διατεταγμενον ὑπο τοῦ βασιλεως α μὲν ἐτι καὶ νῦν | ὀρας· ὅσαι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* Lastly, that L is a direct transcript of A is made practically certain¹ by 529. 21, where L omits the words *συνιδεῖν πραγμάτων—καλλοῦν ἐκέλευσε* which form exactly a line in A. Just below (530. 1) L negligently inserts in the text (where it is quite unsuitable) after *τοῦ χρυσοῦ* a gloss which occurs in the margin of A, and which is quoted in the apparatus criticus.

These cases appear to put the parentage of these three MSS. beyond a doubt, and their evidence has therefore not been recorded in the apparatus. The few deviations from their parent MS. which they exhibit may be neglected.

The group GIM(Q).

This group presents few substantial variants from the HKA text. It differs chiefly from that text in matters of orthography, the frequent use of itacisms, etc. Its retention of two lines which are omitted by HKA (see above) proves that it is not derived from the immediate parent of those MSS., while its omission of another line in common with HKA is proof that both groups go back to a common ancestor rather higher up in the line.

G, CODEX VENETUS. Venice. Bibl. Marciana, Gr. 534, saec. xi. (circa, Zanetti's catalogue) membr. 296 foll.

- fol. 1. Aristeas.
- 6vo. Theodoret to Hypatius.
- 7. Catena on the Octateuch.
- 296. *πόσαι παραδόσεις εἰσι τῆς θείας γραφῆς.*

Size of page $12\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ in., of writing $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ in. It is written in minuscules hanging from ruled lines in one column containing 67 closely packed and closely written lines, the whole of the Aristeas being compressed into $5\frac{1}{4}$ leaves. The Aristeas with the Theodoret seems to have been tacked on to the MS. later, as there is a second numbering of pages (*α, β, γ, etc.*) beginning on fol. 7, but it is by the same hand as that which wrote, at any rate, the first few lines of the Catena; the text of the Septuagint appears to have been the work of several hands. The Aristeas is very much stained and blotted, especially the first leaf, which has been in parts rewritten, but in places the writing is utterly illegible. In the Venice Catalogue it is placed first in an 'Appendix Graecorum Codicum ex legato Jacobi Contareni, Jo. Bapt.

¹ It should be noted, however, that in 572. 20 L reads *ποιητικως* with HK as against A.

Recanati Aliorumque'; a note in the catalogue adds 'catenam hanc in Bibliotheca Julii Justiniani D. M. Procuratoris vidit Montfauconius et descripsit in Diario Italico¹.'

I, CODEX PALATINUS. Rome. Bibl. Vatic. Pal. Gr. 203, saec. xi. membr. 304 foll.

fol. 1. Aristeas.

22. Theodoret to Hypatius.

23^{vo}. Catena on Genesis and Exodus.

304^{vo}. ends in the middle of Exodus. At the end is written 'deest unum et alterum folium.'

It is written in double columns, the words hanging from ruled lines: the size of page being $14\frac{1}{4} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in., of writing $11\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{2}$ in. The Aristeas and the Catena are by the same hand. The bookplate (apparently common to all the Palatine collection) has the words 'Sum de bibliotheca, quam Heidelbergae capta spoliū fecit et P. M. Gregorio XV trophaeum misit Maximilianus utriusque Bavariae Dux etc. S. R. I. Archidapifer et Princeps Elector, anno Christi MDCXXXIII.'

M, CODEX OTTOBONIANUS. Rome. Bibl. Vatic. Ottobon. Gr. 32, saec. xv. chart. 70 foll.

fol. 1—14. Παλλαδίου περι τῶν τῆς Ἰνδίας ἐθνῶν καὶ τῶν Βραγαμάνων.

15, 16. blank.

17—27. τοῦ φιλοπόνου Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸ ἐπίλοιπον τῆς φυσικῆς ἀκροάσεως.

28. blank.

29—44. τοῦ φιλοσοφώτατου καὶ ῥητορικώτατου Κῦρου Θεοδωρούτου προδρόμου.

45—70^o. Ἀριστέας Φιλοκράτη.

Size of page $14\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ in., of writing $9\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ in.; the writing is in single column, bounded by two vertical lines, but no horizontal lines are visible. The contents are all written by the same neat hand in which the tall τ is the chief characteristic; the Aristeas sheets are rather broader than the rest. On the first leaf is written a list of the contents and the name of a former owner of the MS.: 'Anonymi Geographia, Philosophia anonym., Palladius de rebus et moribus Indicis, Aristeas. Ex codicibus Ioannis Angeli Ducis ab Altaemps².'

¹ See Montfaucon, *Diar. Ital.* (Paris, 1702), 433 ff., where a list of the MSS. in Justinian's library is given, including a Catena on the Octateuch of the eleventh century. This is apparently the MS. referred to in the Venice Catalogue; but Montfaucon does not appear to mention that it contained Aristeas.

² The library of Colonna was bought by Jean Ange duc d'Altemps in 1611; in 1689 part of the collection was transferred to the Ottobonian palace. See Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul III. à Paul V.* (Paris, 1890), pp. 57—59.

GIM agree in almost all cases, including omissions such as 528. 10 om *ασφαλως* GIM, mistakes such as 529. 14 *καταθηκουσας* GIM (*καθηκ.* cett.), 534. 1 *μεγαλοis* GIM (*μεγαλοι* cett.), 552. 26 *δυναμενων* GIM (*δυναμεων* cett.), and peculiarities of spelling and vocalization. They almost always insert *ν* *ἐφέλκυστικόν* before consonants, write iota adscript, interchange *ο* and *ω* (*προτενουσα*, *πασχωμεν* [= *πασχομεν*], *μεταφερον* [= *-ων*]) and *ι* and *η* (*φιλικος*, *δαψηλως*, *τινικαυτα*, *προδιλως*), and use itacisms such as *βουλεσθε* for *βουλεσθαι*, *αιρειν* for *εριν*.

It appears that G and I are copied from one and the same MS.; their contemporary date and a few cases where they are at variance (e.g. 520. 12 *η παιδεια αυτη* G, *η παιδειας διαγωγη* I) make it improbable that either is a transcript of the other.

M is undoubtedly a direct copy of I. With the exception of some slight corrections or blunders on the part of M, they are in entire agreement. Notice e.g. 531. 5 *προς την χρησην την τραπεζαν* IM (*την τραπ. προς την χρ.* cett.), 540. 7 *μετα* IM (*μεταλλα* cett.), 541. 3 *γεγραπται* IM (*γεγραφεναι* cett.), 543. 25 *βρωτων* IM (*βρωτων* cett.), 571. 24 *γραφης* IM (*μεταγραφης* cett.). At 573. 21 M omits the words *και τα ακολουθα παντα*, which form exactly a line in the double-column MS. I. The readings of M have therefore not been recorded in the apparatus.

We may mention here:

Q, CODEX REGIUS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. Gr. 950, saec. xiv. bombycinus, 576 pagg.

This MS. contains a very miscellaneous collection of fragments beginning with (p. 1) an anonymous fragment on the resurrection, (p. 2) a fragment of Athanasius on the heresy of Paul of Samosata, and including (p. 111) a fragment on the ten feasts of the Jews, and (p. 217) an anonymous work on the measurement of the earth. On p. 341 occur the letters of Abgarus and Christ, on p. 343 a fragment of Photius, 'de termino vitae et de Spiritus Sancti processione,' on pp. 351—371 the fragments of Aristeas, followed on p. 371 by the treatise already included *περι των δεκα εορτων* (here given at greater length), and other fragments which need not be enumerated. The Aristeas fragments are not a sixth part of the letter; they are (p. 351) 520. 15 inc. *κατασταθεις επι της*—521. 9 *υποχειρια ποιουμενος*, and (p. 353) 529. 24 inc. *δυο πηχεων το μηκος*—537. 21 *προκαθημενου προς θεωριαν*. They are introduced by the heading *επιστολης Αριστεως προς Φιλοκρατην εκφρασις χρυσης τραπεζης ην εποιησεν ο βασιλευς Πτωλομαιος και απεστειλεν εις Ιερουσαλημ προς τον τοτε αρχιερα Ελεαζαρον*. Omont's catalogue merely calls the fragments 'De Ptolemaeo rege et lege mosaica'; the folio catalogue of 1740 more correctly describes them as 'fragmenta ex Aristeas.'

There are 24 lines in a page; the writing is rough and untidy with thick strokes, and very rough red initial capitals. Some of its readings and spellings connect it with the GIM group, e.g. 532. 28 (*λιαν* for *λειαν*), 534. 8 *αναστασιν* (for *ανατασιν*), 535. 4 *σμιξιν* (for *σμηξιν*), but its text bears a closer relation to that of the otherwise solitary Codex Monacensis. Its evidence has not been recorded in this edition.

The group TBCPSZ.

We now come to a group which presents considerable variations from those which we have considered. The readings of this group are at first sight attractive and have the appearance of representing a purer text. A closer examination will however, show that a certain amount of revision must have gone on here, not only in some common ancestor of the group, but also in the individual members of it. We find that various members of the group have sometimes corrected the text in different ways, that even where they are consistent in their readings, they seldom have the support of Eusebius, who has introduced other slight alterations of his own into the text, and again we find that in places the reading of the HKA and GI groups, which the B text has rejected, is corroborated by the usage of Alexandrian papyri which are contemporary or nearly contemporary with the pseudo-Aristeas. While, then, in some places it is possible that the B text has retained or has successfully restored the right reading, the text of this group is usually to be regarded with suspicion, as an ingenious attempt to remove the obscurities of a Greek which had become unintelligible. The group is here spoken of as the B group, because the MS. B is that on which Schmidt's text was based, and it is also the MS. which exhibits the greatest number of variants; but a far older member of the group and one which exhibits the Aristeas text entire has now come to light, namely the Florence MS. T, which we will describe first.

T, CODEX LAURENTIANUS. Florence. Bibl. Mediceo-Laurent. Acquisti 44.

According to the Catalogue of Rostagno the date of the Aristeas, Pentateuch and Catena is the tenth century, of Joshua and the remaining books about the thirteenth. It seems doubtful whether the former part is earlier than the eleventh century. The material is parchment: number of leaves 384: size of page $14\frac{1}{2} \times 12$ in. There are quires of 8 leaves with signatures of the (?) thirteenth century. To the end of the Pentateuch the writing is in single column with 46 lines in a page; in the latter part there are two columns with 65 lines to a page. The writing hangs from ruled lines.

fol. 1. Aristeas to Philocrates.

11vo. Introduction to O.T. books: τὰ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ βιβλῶν ἀναγεγραμμένα τεύχη..... διατὶ ἕκαστον τούτων οὕτως καλεῖται καὶ ἀπὸ μέρους τί περιέχει ἕκαστον...

14vo. Theodoret, *eis τὰ ἄπορα τῆς θείας γραφῆς*.

15. Pentateuch with Catena.

311. Joshua—Chronicles, Esdras 1—3, Esther, Judith, Maccabees

1—4, Tobit (to 3. 15).

It contains the inscription, 'Codicem e Liguria advectum proponente A. M. Bandinio comparavit Ferdinandus III magnus dux Etruriae et Bibl. Laurent. donavit die 3 Aug. MDCCXCVIII.'

B, CODEX REGIUS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. Gr. 129, saec. xiii. bombycinus, 539 foll.

- fol. 2. Aristeas inc. (522. 12) $\overline{\text{ἀνων}}$ ^{προσ} υποτιθεμενος λογον.
15. Catena on the Octateuch.

It is written in double columns: size of page $13\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$ in., of writing $10\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$ in.; the writing is enclosed by vertical lines, but there are no horizontal lines except at the top and bottom of the page. The Aristeas is in bad condition, being torn and stained. There are a few plain red initial letters. The writing is rather sloping, and fairly large and clear. Schmidt says, 'This MS. has been subsequently collated most carefully with its original by the rubricator, when the writer himself had already performed this duty quite conscientiously. Hence all corrections of the rubricator and of the first hand are equivalent to the authority of the original MS.' A later hand has added a few headings in the margin (*περι τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, etc.). The Catena is apparently by the same hand as the Aristeas, but has more ornamentation and red initials. In some places part of a leaf has been cut or torn away.

C, CODEX REGIUS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. Gr. 5, saec. xiii.—xiv. chart. et bombyc., 402 foll.

- fol. 1. Aristeas fragments.
14. Anonymous introduction to the books of the O.T. (inc. *το μενον βιβλιον*).
45. Catena on the Octateuch.

The Aristeas is written in a single column: the size of page being $12\frac{1}{2} \times 9$ in., of writing varying from 9×7 in. to $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ in. The Aristeas and the introduction to O.T. are by the same hand, a large square upright writing with thick strokes and red initials in the margin: the page is unruled. In the latter part of the MS., foll. 45—60 are written in double columns in a rougher hand; at fol. 61 the first hand begins again, and the remainder is sometimes in single, sometimes in double columns, text and commentary coming alternately and the order of books being confused (Judges, Joshua, Deuteronomy, Numbers). The fragments of Aristeas contained are less than half the letter; they are 528. 17 *Σαββαταιος*—532. 17 *δυο μεν ησαν τη*, 553. 10 *ο δε ειπεν ευχομενος*—563. 16 *ηρωτα*, 567. 7 *-σιλευ κρωτω δε*—end.

P, CODEX BARBERINUS. Rome. Bibl. Barberina Gr. IV. 56, saec. ? xiii. membr., 229 foll.

- fol. 1. Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis (frag.).
inc. *πασα γραφη ημων των Χριστιανων θεοπνευστος εστι*, at end *λειπει*.

2. Fragment of Aristeas inc. (538. 10) *πινοησαντες της γαρ χωρας* expl. (568. 1) *περιβαλλοντας το ζην ως* (note *λειπει*).
 10. Catena on the Octateuch.
 224. Catena on the Apocalypse inc. *δηλει (sic) τον της συντελειας καιρον*.

It is written in double columns in a very minute upright and neat hand, with about 60 lines packed into a column, the words hanging from ruled lines; the size of page is $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ in., of writing $8\frac{1}{4} \times 3\frac{3}{4}$ in. At the bottom of fol. 1 is written 'Caroli Strozzae Thomae filii 1635.'

S, CODEX VATICANUS. Rome. Vat. Gr. 1668, saec. ? xiii. membr., 358 foll.

It is written in single column, with 29 lines in a page, the size of page being $12\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ in., and the writing hanging from ruled lines; there are quires of 8 leaves.

- fol. 1—37vo. Aristeas (complete).
 37vo.—358. Catena on Genesis.

On the recto of the first leaf is the note 'Emptus ex libris ill^{mi} Lelii Ruini epⁱ Balneoregien. 1622.'

This MS. escaped notice when the other Roman MSS. were examined and has consequently not been collated in full; but some collations of selected passages kindly made by Mr N. McLean, Fellow of Christ's College, are sufficient to show that it belongs to this group.

Z, CODEX TURICENSIS. Zurich. Stadtbibliothek C. 11 (169 Omont's catalogue), saec. xiii. bombyc., 736 pagg.¹

- p. 1. Aristeas.
 p. 1 (=21). Catena on the Octateuch.

p. 669. *Ιερωνυμου επιστολη προς Δεξτρον επαρχον πραιτωρι απο ρωμαικ εις ελληνικα μεταβληθεισα* ('S. Hieronymi liber de viris illustribus a Sophronio graece versus,' Omont). It is written in single column, the size of page being $13\frac{1}{2} \times 9$ in., and the writing hangs from ruled lines. The Aristeas portion is badly preserved; a hole passes through the twenty pages which contain it, causing lacunae. There are several marginal readings, some of which are obviously conjectural (e.g. *ισως φιλοφρονησεσι, ισως μαλλον*). The Jerome is not by the hand which has written the remainder of the MS.

That the above MSS. form a single group appears primarily from their omissions. The following lines are omitted by all² the

¹ The greater part of this MS. was collated from the original. The collation of the last few pages has been made from photographs, for which the writer is indebted to the courtesy of the Librarian, Dr Hermann Escher.

² S omits (1), (3), and (7). It has not been tested for the other passages.

members of the group which are extant at the several passages referred to.

- (1) 523. 9 *εγκρατεις εγεγοντο—και την χωραν* (78 letters) om BTZ.
 (2) 529. 11. *βουλευσθαι και—δισταζειν δε* (51 letters) om BCTZ.
 (3) 532. 17. *απο της βασεως—τορεια και* (48 letters) om BTZ.
 (4) 533. 13. *θεσιν ηθελεν—ως αν τις* (41 letters) om BTZ.
 (5) 547. 12. *και κακοποιουσι—τροφην αλλα* (48 letters) om BPTZ.
 (6) 548. 13. *-τας ημερα θυσιαζειν—οι προσφερον-* (46 letters) om BPTZ.
 (7) 552. 13. *γνοιο—τη περι σεαυτον* (47 letters) om BPTZ.
 (8) 564. 25. *θεου δε—τοις αξιους* (45 letters) om BPTZ.
 (9) 566. 24. *ησαν γαρ ικανοι πρεσβεις* (20 letters) om BPTZ.

Also at 533. 4 the words *προς την της αληθειας—τεθεντων* (48 letters) are omitted by T^{MSZ} (C and P do not contain the passage); but they are inserted in the margin of T, apparently by the first hand, and are found in B. These omissions show that an ancestor of the group was written by a careless scribe who dropped several lines (averaging 48 letters) of his archetype. From the last instance quoted, and from numerous other passages, it appears that B and T bear a specially close relationship; indeed it is conceivable that B is a copy of T, but in that case it has introduced several corrections of its own, not found in the parent MS.¹

As to the value of the readings of this group, it appears that the 'singular' readings of B are in nearly all cases due to a correction of the text. Instances of these are 522. 18 the insertion of *εν λογω* before *βραχει*, 525. 12 *εαν ουν φαινηται σοι εννομον* B (*εαν ουν φαινηται* cett., *εαν ουν φαινηται* Eus.). The phrases *εαν φαινηται σοι* and *εαν φαινηται* are abundantly attested by the Alexandrian papyri in petitions of subordinates to high officials, but the insertion of *εννομον* receives no support. Again we have 526. 13 *χαριστηριον* B (*χαριστικον* cett. Eus.), 527. 18 *ανδρες των τετιμημενων παρα σοι* B (*ανδρας και Αριστεας* B (*Ανδρας των τετ. παρα σοι και Αρ.* cett.: B has misunderstood the genitive), 529. 18 *οιδα γαρ ως δαψιλους της υλης αυτοις ουσης* B (*ετι γαρ επι τα της ουσης* cett. Eus.), 538. 1 *σχημα* B (*χυμα*= 'size' cett.: B has removed a characteristic word of Aristeas, cf. 521. 17, 567. 11). The readings of BT, where the other members of the group are opposed to them, are also generally to be rejected: e.g. 525. 25 *νομισματα* BT (*νομισματος* cett. Eus. Jos.), 526. 25 *δυναμενους* BT (*δυνατους* cett. Eus.): they have occasionally corrected the order of words, 551. 19 *διατελοιη εχων* BT (*εχ. διατ.* cett.),

¹ The divergence of the two subdivisions of the B group is seen in the difficult passage (531. 6) where BT omit the words *ωστε κα. την των κυματων θεσιν*, while CSZ retain them and add *πεποισθαι καθ ο αν μερος*.

569. 5 των ιδιωτων τινες BT (τινες τ. ιδ. cett.). Where however the members of the group unite as against the HKA and GI groups, the reading gains in probability, and more especially is this the case where the group has the support of either Eusebius or the GI group. Thus in 526. 2 ανασπαστους BTZGI Eus¹ (αναρπαστους HKA), 526. 6 προοντας B^{cor}TZ Eus. (παροντας cett.), 547. 7 ins και ποτων PZGI Eus¹ (om cett.), the B reading is right. But in some places the whole group has been affected by correction. Thus in 519. 11 TSZ (the only extant members at this point) read εαυτους προεδωκαμεν εις τον προειρημενον ανδρα πρεσβειαν, but the reading εαυτους επεδωκαμεν κ.τ.λ. of the other MSS. is corroborated by the usage of the papyri of the second century B.C. (Paris Pap. 49 καταπειραμα...εις παν το σοι χρησιμον εμαντον επιδιδοναι, Par. Pap. 63 col. 6 προθυμως εαυτους επιδιδοντων, Grenfell, *Erotic Fragment*, etc. XLII. 6 εις τε παν το παραγγελλομενον | προθυμ]ως εαυτους επιδεδωκοτων).

A few instances where correction is seen at work may be quoted. At 550. 10 HKAGI read παντα δυναμιν ειπε παρεσται καθηκοντως, οis συγχηρησησθε (-σεσθε), καμοι μεθ υμων. Παντα δυναμιν, which is clearly wrong, is corrected by BTZ to πασαν δυναμιν, by P to παντ(=πανθ)α δυναμην; παρεσται is further corrected by BT to παρεσταναι and καμοι to καμε, corrections which give a grammatical but hardly an intelligible sentence. The slight alteration of δ υμιν for δυναμιν (a correction of Mendelssohn, which had also suggested itself to the present writer) restores sense to the passage, and the B text is seen to be due to conjecture. Similarly at 555. 1 B and P have corrected in different ways the characteristic word απεφηνατο ('answer'), B reading ειπε and P απεκρινατο: a little before (553. 21) B reads αποκρινεσθαι where the remaining MSS. have αποφαινεσθαι. At 527. 1 BTZ read τον αρχισωματοφυλακα (B at first wrote σωματοφυλακα: των αρχισωματοφυλακων cett.), thus removing an idiomatic use of the genitive, frequently attested by the papyri. The above instances will afford sufficient proof that a good deal of recension has gone on in this group. At the same time it is clear that in other places it has escaped the corruptions which the other groups have undergone, though it is sometimes difficult to say whether a reading of this group is primitive or due to correction. The agreement of the group with Eusebius (where his evidence exists) is, as was said, sometimes a test; but in the majority of cases the B text is not corroborated by Eusebius, and in a few instances where one or two members only of the group agree with Eusebius, this appears to be due to a fortuitous coincidence in emendation. Such a passage is 527. 4 γραφε B¹ Eus. (γραφων cett.). In this instance Eusebius altered the form of the sentence by reading γραφε and inserting γαρ after κεχαρισμενος; in BT the change to γραφε was due to κεχαρισμενος εση having become

corrupted to *και χαρισαμενος εση*; the participle *γραφων* is corroborated by Josephus (*ἐπιστέλλων περὶ ὧν ἂν θέλῃς ποιήσεις κεχαρισμένα*).

The extracts of Eusebius, consisting of about a quarter of the letter, are contained in the eighth and ninth books of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* (VIII. 2—5, 9, IX. 38). The Eusebian MSS. which are to be followed in these books are, as Heikel¹ has shown, I (Codex Venetus Marcianus 341) and O (Codex Bononiensis 3643). The extracts from Aristeas in these two MSS. have been collated for the present text, and their evidence is quoted as Eus¹ and Eus^o. For the other Eusebian MSS. the text of Gaisford (Oxford, 1843) has been used; O was unknown to Gaisford, and his collation of I was incomplete. The Venice MS. by its general agreement with the Aristeas MSS. shows itself to be far the best text of Eusebius; the Bologna MS. or one of its ancestors has been very carelessly copied, and there are numerous omissions which did not always appear worthy of record in the apparatus to the present text. With regard to the value of the Eusebian text, it may be well to quote the verdict of Freudenthal² on the general character of his extracts from earlier writers. He says, 'Eusebius shows himself more reliable in the text (Wortlaute) of his originals than in the names and writings of the excerpted authors. It is true that he occasionally allows himself small alterations in the text, most frequently in the opening words of the extracts. He often abbreviates his originals, drops repetitions (beseitigt Doppelglieder), omits individual words and whole sentences, and no small number of inaccuracies of other kinds are also to be met with. On the other hand it is only in extremely rare cases that he inserts additions of his own, and the cases in which we meet with fundamental alterations of the text are still more uncommon.' This estimate is quite borne out by the Eusebian extracts from Aristeas, where there are frequent instances of slighter alterations and omissions, which the paraphrase of Josephus often helps us to detect. Among omissions we have 520. 16 *ει δυνατόν* om Eus. (ins Jos. Ar. codd.), 525. 10 *και πολιτενομενων* om Eus. (ins Ar. codd.: Jos. however omits the words in his paraphrase, and they may be a gloss). Of alterations we may note out of numerous instances 525. 24 where the strange word *ρισκοφυλακας* is altered to *χρηματοφυλακας* (Jos. paraphrases *τοὺς φύλακας τῶν κιβωτῶν, ἐν αἷς ἐτύγχανον οἱ λίθοι*), 526. 17 *επικρινων κατεστησα* (a bad correction, because

¹ *De Praeparationis Evangelicae Eusebii edendae ratione* (Helsingforsiae, 1888).

² *Hellenistische Studien*, Alexander Polyhistor (Breslau, 1875) p. 7 f. See also the note on p. 203 on Eusebius and Pseudo-Aristeas.

the royal plural used throughout the rest of the letter of Ptolemy is dropped), 572. 9 ακριβως (ηκριβωμεως Ar. codd.), 573. 2 κατα δε την αιτησιν (κατα δε την ανεσιν Jos. Ar. codd.). In a few cases a rather longer addition is made; at 544. 22 before των συγγενικων the words ουτε των υποβεβηκοτων ουτε are possibly, and at 546. 14 the words επι των πολων και οικησεων δια το σκεπαζεσθαι are certainly to be attributed to the hand of Eusebius; just before the last passage (546. 11) συντηρουντας τας αρχας και μεσοτητας και τελεντας is an unintelligible¹ alteration of the correct reading και συντηρουντος. Among passages where Eusebius is certainly right may be mentioned 526. 2 ανασπαστους Eus¹ GIBTZ (αναρπαστους cett.), 542. 10 ενδεικτικως (ενδικως Ar. codd.), 547. 7 the insertion of και ποτων Eus¹ GIPZ, and lastly 541. 21. The readings in this passage are instructive:

- (1) προς τα δι ημων επιζητηθεντα Eus.
- (2) προς δι ημων επιζητηθεντα GIMZ*.
- (3) προς ημων επιζητηθεντα HKADFL.
- (4) προς δε ημων επιζητηθεντων BPTZ^{corr.}

Eusebius preserves the true text; the τα then dropped out, and while in the HKA group the reading was still further corrupted, in the B group sense was restored to the passage by a conjectural emendation. Passages where Eusebius and Josephus unite as against the Aristeas MSS. are 524. 18 αναγραφης (αντιγραφης Ar.), 525. 5 τετυχηκε (τετευχε Ar.), 526. 8 omission of the negative, ? 528. 7 the perfect απεσταλκαμεν (Jos. has the perfect πεπομφαμεν : απεστειλαμεν Ar.), 572. 20 ποιητων Jos. Eus. B (ποιητικων ου ποιητικως Ar. cett.); in such cases the patristic reading should generally be followed. On the whole the Eusebian evidence is of the greatest importance; it tends to show that the GI group, especially if supported by any member of the B group, is nearest to the primitive text.

Lastly, with regard to the evidence of Josephus, he gives in the twelfth book of the *Jewish Antiquities* a paraphrase of about two-fifths of the letter, omitting the central portion, namely the visit to Palestine, the discourse with Eleazar and the seventy-two questions and answers. He has taken the trouble to reshape nearly every sentence, while retaining many of the characteristic words of Aristeas. Under the circumstances it is not always possible to reconstruct his text, and at some of the most difficult passages his evidence is uncertain; in some cases the text was certainly unintelligible to him. He is however often useful in enabling us to detect the alterations which have been introduced into the text

¹ Wendland suggests that the words are an interpolation from Plato, *Legg.* 715 E, ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός, ὡς περ καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος, ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων κ.τ.λ.

by Eusebius or the B group. It is needless to add that Niese's text of Josephus has been followed.

Beside the MSS. of Aristeas above mentioned the following are known to the present writer, which he has not had the opportunity of collating: Codex Monacensis 9 (saec. xi.), quoted in Wendland's edition, Codex Atheniensis 389 (circa saec. xv., chart., foll. 328, Aristeas and Catena)¹, Codex Scorialensis Σ. I. 6 (dated 1586, and written *χειρὶ Νικολάου Τουρριανοῦ καὶ βασιλικῆς ἀντιγραφείως*, Aristeas and Catena on Genesis and Exodus)².

The collations here given are not absolutely complete. Itacisms and other orthographical details have not been generally recorded, neither have all the slight omissions of the Codex O of Eusebius; but apart from these no substantial variants have, it is hoped, been omitted. The dates of the various correctors' hands have not been accurately ascertained; the symbol B¹, T¹ has been used to denote a correction probably by the first hand or a hand nearly contemporary with the date of the MSS. B and T. Words are enclosed within daggers † † where the MS. reading is left in the text, although possibly corrupt: angular brackets < > denote emendations of, or insertions introduced into, the reading of the MSS.; square brackets [] signify that words found in the MSS. are probably to be omitted.

¹ Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς ἐθν. βιβλ. τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου Σακκελίωνος καὶ Ἀλκ. I. Σακκελίωνος (Athens, 1892).

² E. Miller, *Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs de la Bibl. de l'Escorial* (Paris, 1848). An examination of a few pages of this MS. which the Rev. P. M. Barnard, B.D., kindly made for the writer in 1894 shows that it agrees most often with the GI group. Passages where it stands alone are 548. 15 om του, 549. 8 ποσειων, 549. 21 μα φωνη (for υπο μ. φ.), 550. 14 προσκελευσαμενος, 572. 20 om των ιστορικων, 573. 19 κυλινδιον.

ΑΡΙΣΤΕΛΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΕΙ

Ἄξιολόγου διηγήσεως, ὃ Φιλόκρατες, περὶ τῆς γενηθείσης ἡμῖν 1
 ἐντυχίας πρὸς Ἐλεάζαρον τὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχιερέα συνεσταμένης,
 διὰ τὸ σὲ περὶ πολλοῦ πεποιοῦσθαι, παρ' ἕκαστα ὕπομμνησκων†,
 συνακουσαι περὶ ὧν ἀπεστάλημεν καὶ διὰ τί, πεπεύραμαι σαφῶς
 5 ἐκθέσθαι σοι, κατειληφῶς ἦν ἔχεις φιλομαθῆ διάθεσιν, ὅπερ μέ- 2
 γιστόν ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ, προσμανθάνειν αἰεὶ τι καὶ προσλαμβάνειν,
 ἥτοι κατὰ τὰς ἱστορίας, ἥ καὶ κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα πεπειραμένῳ.
 οὕτω γὰρ κατασκευάζεται ψυχῆς καθαρὰ διάθεσις, ἀναλαβοῦσα τὰ
 κάλλιστα· καὶ πρὸς τὸ πάντων κυριώτατον νενευκυῖα τὴν εὐσε-
 10 βειαν ἀπλανεῖ κεχηρημένη κανόνι διοικεῖ. Τὴν προαίρεσιν ἔχοντες 3
 ἡμεῖς πρὸς τὸ περιέργως τὰ θεῖα κατανοεῖν, ἑαυτοὺς ἐπέδωκαμεν εἰς
 τὸν προειρημένον ἄνδρα πρεσβείαν, καλοκαγαθία καὶ δόξῃ προτε-
 τιμημένον ὑπὸ τε τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ κατακεκτημένον
 μεγίστην ὠφέλειαν τοῖς σὺν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους
 15 τόπους πολίταις, πρὸς τὴν ἐρμηνείαν τοῦ θεοῦ νόμου, διὰ τὸ γεγρά-
 φθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν διφθέραις ἐβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν. ἦν δὲ καὶ 4
 ἐποιησάμεθα ἡμεῖς σπουδῆ, λαβόντες καιρὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα περὶ
 τῶν μετοικισθέντων εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς
 τοῦ βασιλέως, πρώτως κεκτημένου τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν
 20 Αἴγυπτον παρεληφότος. Ἄξιόν ἐστι καὶ ταυτὰ σοι δηλώσαι.
 πέπεισμαι γὰρ σε μᾶλλον ἔχοντα πρόσκλισιν πρὸς τὴν σεμνότητα 5
 καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων διάθεσιν τῶν κατὰ τὴν σεμνὴν νομο-
 θεσίαν διεξαγόντων, περὶ ὧν προαιρούμεθα <δηλοῦν, ἀσμένως σε>

2 εντυχίας GZ | συνισταμενης T 3 υπομμνησκειν Wend. (-σκων codd HKAGITZ
 omn) 4 ων] ου K 6 προσμανθανοντι Z 7 om και I | κατ αυτο] κατα
 ταυτο HKAGI | πεπειραμενων HKGIT 8 διαθεσις καθ. K 9 κυριω-
 τερον K 10 διοικ. την προαιρεσιν. Εχοντες codd corr Wend. 11 προε-
 δωκ. TZ | εις] εις την προς Wend. 12 τετιμ. TZ 13 κατακτημ. HAI
 κατακτ. G txt KTZ 16 αυτου T 17 post σπουδη lacunam statuit
 Wend. 19 om τα TZ 21 προσκλησιν codd 23 δηλουντες μεν ως
 σε codd, txt ex conj Schmidt

ἀκούσεσθαι, προσφάτως παραγεγενημένον ἐκ τῆς νήσου πρὸς
 ἡμᾶς, καὶ βουλόμενον συνακούειν ὅσα πρὸς ἐπισκευὴν ψυχῆς
 6 ὑπάρχει. καὶ πρότερον δὲ διεπεμψάμην σοι περὶ ὧν ἐνόμιζον
 ἀξιοληπτικῶν εἶναι τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, ἣν μετελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν
 κατὰ τὴν λογιωτάτην Αἴγυπτον λογιωτῶν ἀρχιερέων περὶ τοῦ 5
 7 γένους τῶν Ἰουδαίων. φιλομαθῶς γὰρ ἔχοντί σοι περὶ τῶν δυνα-
 μένων ὠφελῆσαι διάνοιαν δέον ἐστὶ μεταδιδόναι, μάλιστα μὲν πᾶσι
 τοῖς ὁμοίοις, πολλῶ δὲ μᾶλλον σοὶ γνησίαν ἔχοντι τὴν αἴρεσιν, οὐ
 μόνον κατὰ τὸ συγγενὲς ἀδελφῶ καθεστῶτι τὸν τρόπον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ
 8 πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ὁρμῇ τὸν αὐτὸν ὄντα ἡμῖν. χρυσοῦ γὰρ χάρις ἢ 10
 κατασκευὴ τις ἄλλη τῶν τετιμημένων παρὰ τοῖς κενოდόξοις ὠφέλειαν
 οὐκ ἔχει τὴν αὐτὴν, ὅσον ἢ παιδείας ἀγωγή καὶ ἢ περὶ τούτων
 φροντίς. ἵνα δὲ μὴ περὶ τῶν προλεγομένων μηκύνοντες ἀδόλεσχόν
 τι ποιῶμεν, ἐπὶ τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς διηγήσεως ἐπανήξομεν.

§ Jos Eus 9 ⁵ Κατασταθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως βιβλιοθήκης Δημήτριος ὁ 15
 Φαληρεὺς ἐχρηματίσθη πολλὰ διάφορα πρὸς τὸ συναγαγεῖν, εἰ
 δυνατόν, ἅπαντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην βιβλία· καὶ ποιούμενος
 ἀγορασμοὺς καὶ μεταγραφὰς ἐπὶ τέλος ἤγαγεν, ὅσον ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ, τὴν
 10 τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν. παρόντων οὖν ἡμῶν ἐρωτηθεὶς Πόσαι
 τινὲς μυριάδες τυγχάνουσι βιβλίων; εἶπεν Ἐπεὶ τὰς εἴκοσι, 20
 βασιλεῦ· σπουδάσω δ' ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ πρὸς τὸ πληρωθῆναι πεντή-
 κοντα μυριάδας τὰ λοιπά. προσήγγελται δέ μοι καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
 νόμιμα μεταγραφῆς ἄξια καὶ τῆς παρὰ σοὶ βιβλιοθήκης εἶναι.
 11 Τί τὸ κωλύον οὖν, εἶπεν, ἐστὶ σε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; πάντα γὰρ ὑπο-
 τέτακταί σοι τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν. ὁ δὲ Δημήτριος εἶπεν 25

Ἐρμηνείας προσδεῖται· χαρακτῆρσι γὰρ ἰδίῳις κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίων
 χρῶνται, καθάπερ Αἰγύπτιοι τῇ τῶν γραμμάτων θέσει, καθὸ καὶ
 φωνὴν ἰδίαν ἔχουσι. ὑπολαμβάνονται Συριακῇ χρῆσθαι· τὸ δ'

HKAGITZ
 Jos Eus

3 διεπεμφ. σοι] διεπεμψαμεθα G 6 σοι] μοι conj Schmidt 7 μα-
 λιστα] μαλλον G 8 γνησιως G 9 αλλα και τον τροπον Wend.
 12 παιδεια αυτη G παιδειας διαγ. I 14 ποιουμεν Z παθωμεν G^{vid} | επανη-
 ξωμεν K 16 om ει δυνατον Eus 19 ουν ins Eus om Ar codd
 21 σπουδασω Eus πληρωσω Ar 22 προσηγγελται Eus (cf Jos μεμνησθαι)]
 προσαγγελεται codd | των] pr τα Eus 24 εστι σε] αυτοι G | αποτετακται
 Eus 28 υπολαμβανονται] + δε Eus

οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλ' ἕτερος τρόπος. Μεταλαβὼν δὲ ἕκαστα ὁ βασιλεὺς
 εἶπε γραφῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅπως τὰ προειρημένα
 τελειώσιν λάβη.⁴ Νομίσας δὲ ἐγὼ καιρὸν εἶναι περὶ ὧν πολ- I 2 ¶ Eus
 λάκις ἠξιώκειν Σωσίβιον τε τὸν Ταραντῖνον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, τοὺς
 5 ἀρχισωματοφύλακας, περὶ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῶν μετηγμένων ἐκ
 τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως—ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐπελθὼν
 τὰ κατὰ κοίλην Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην ἅπαντα, συγχρώμενος εὐημερία
 μετὰ ἀνδρείας, τοὺς μὲν μετώκιζεν, οὓς δὲ ἠχμαλώτιζε, φόβῳ πάντα
 ὑποχείρια ποιούμενος· ἐν ὕσῳ καὶ πρὸς δέκα μυριάδας ἐκ τῆς τῶν
 10 Ἰουδαίων χώρας εἰς Αἴγυπτον μετήγαγεν, ἀφ' ὧν ὡσεὶ τρεῖς μυριάδας I 3
 καθοπλίσας ἀνδρῶν ἐκλεκτῶν εἰς τὴν χώραν κατώκισεν ἐν τοῖς
 φρουρίοις (ἤδη μὲν καὶ πρότερον ἰκανῶν εἰσεληλυθότων σὺν τῷ
 Πέρσῃ, καὶ πρὸ τούτων ἐτέρων συμμαχῶν ἐξαπεσταλμένων πρὸς
 15 τοσοῦτοι τῷ πλήθει παρεγενήθησαν, ὅσους Ἰπτολεμαῖος ὁ τοῦ
 Λάγου μετήγαγε)· καθὼς δὲ προείπομεν, ἐπιλέξας τοὺς ἀρίστους I 4
 ταῖς ἡλικίαις καὶ ῥώμῃ διαφέροντας καθώπλισε, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν χύμα
 πρεσβυτέρων καὶ νεωτέρων, ἔτι δὲ γυναικῶν, εἴασεν εἰς τὴν οἰκειάν,
 οὐχ οὕτως τῇ προαιρέσει κατὰ ψυχὴν ἔχων, ὡς κατακρατούμενος
 20 ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν, δι' αἷς ἐπεποιήντο χρείας ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς
 ἀγῶσιν—ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐπεὶ τίνα παρεύρεσιν εἰς τὴν ἀπόλυσιν αὐτῶν
 ἀπελάβομεν, καθὼς προδοδηλώται, τοιοῦτοῖς ἐχρησάμεθα λόγους
 πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Μήποτε ἄλογον ἢ ἐλέγχεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν I 5
 τῶν πραγμάτων, ὧ βασιλεῦ. τῆς γὰρ νομοθεσίας κειμένης πᾶσι
 25 τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἣν ἡμεῖς οὐ μόνον μεταγράψαι ἐπινοοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ
 διερμηνεύσαι, τίνα λόγον ἔξομεν πρὸς ἀποστολήν, ἐν οἰκειάις
 ὑπαρχόντων ἐν τῇ σῆ βασιλείᾳ πληθῶν ἰκανῶν; ἀλλὰ τελεία καὶ
 πλουσία ψυχῇ ἀπόλυσον τοὺς συνεχομένους ἐν ταλαιπωρίαίς,
 κατευθύνοντός σου τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεεικότος αὐτοῖς θεοῦ τὸν
 30 νόμον, καθὼς περιείργασμαι. τὸν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην I 6

4 ἠξίωσα συνεχως τους περι τον Ταρ. G 5 σωματοφυλακας A | εκ] απο HKAGI
 TZ 8 μετοικ. Z | ους] τους G^{vid} 11 εκλελεγμενων T | κατελιπεν G TZ Jos
 12 μεν]+ουν I | ικανως H | συνεληλ. Z | om συν T 14 Αιθ.] Αιγυπττων T
 15 τω πληθ. om TZ 18 νεωτ. και πρεσβ. I | δε]+και K 21 επει] επι
 GI 26 ικεταιιαις K 28 απολυσας G 29 σου] σοι TZ

- θεὸν οὗτοι σέβονται, ὃν καὶ πάντες, ἡμεῖς δέ, βασιλεῦ, προσονομάζοντες ἑτέρως Ζῆνα καὶ Δία· τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἀνοικείως οἱ πρῶτοι διεσήμαναν, δι' ὃν ζωοποιοῦνται τὰ πάντα καὶ γίνεται, τοῦτον ἀπάντων ἡγείσθαι τε καὶ κυριεύειν. ὑπερηρκῶς δὲ σύμπαντας ἀνθρώπους τῇ λαμπρότητι τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπόλυσιν ποιῆσαι τῶν ἐνεχομένων 5
- 17 ταῖς οἰκεταῖαις. Οὐδὲ πολὺν χρόνον ἐπισχῶν, καὶ ἡμῶν κατὰ ψυχὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐχομένων, τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοῦ κατασκευάσαι πρὸς τὸ τοὺς ἅπαντας ἀπολυθῆναι (κτίσμα γὰρ ὃν θεοῦ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ μεταλλοιοῦται καὶ τρέπεται πάλιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διὸ πολλαχῶς καὶ ποικίλως ἐπεκαλούμην τὸν κυριεύοντα κατὰ 10
- 18 καρδίαν, ἵνα συναναγκασθῆ, καθὼς ἠξίου, ἐπιτελέσαι μεγάλην § B γὰρ εἶχον ἐλπίδα, περὶ σωτηρίας ἁνθρώπων προτιθέμενος λόγον, ὅτι τὴν ἐπιτέλειαν ὁ θεὸς ποιήσει τῶν ἀξιουμένων· ὁ γὰρ πρὸς δικαιοσύνην καὶ καλῶν ἔργων ἐπιμέλειαν ἐν ὁσιότητι νομίζουσιν ἄνθρωποι ποιεῖν, κατευθύνει τὰς πράξεις καὶ τὰς ἐπιβολὰς ὁ κυριεύων ἀπάντων 15
- 19 θεός), ὁ δὲ διανακύψας καὶ προσβλέψας ἰλαρῶ τῷ προσώπῳ Πόσας ὑπολαμβάνεις μυριάδας ἔσσει; ἔφη. παρεστῶς δὲ Ἀνδρέας ἀπεφῆναιτο Βραχεῖ πλείον μυριάδων δέκα. ὁ δέ, Μικρόν γε, εἶπεν, Ἄριστεας ἡμᾶς ἀξιοῖ πράγμα. Σωσίβιος δὲ καὶ τῶν παρόντων τινὲς τοῦτ' εἶπον Καὶ γὰρ ἀξίον ἐστὶ τῆς σῆς μεγαλοψυχίας, ὅπως 20
- χαριστήριον ἀναθῆ τῷ μεγίστῳ θεῷ τὴν τούτων ἀπόλυσιν. μεγίστως γὰρ τιμημένος ὑπὸ τοῦ κρατοῦντος τὰ πάντα καὶ δεδοξασμένος ὑπὲρ τοὺς προγόνους, εἰ καὶ μέγιστα ποιήσεις χαριστήρια, καθῆκόν 20
- ἔστί σοι. Διαχυθεὶς δὲ εὖ μάλα τοῖς ὀψωνίοις εἶπε προσθεῖναι, καὶ σώματος ἐκάστου κομίζεσθαι δραχμὰς εἴκοσι, καὶ περὶ τούτων 25
- ἐκθεῖναι πρόσταγμα, τὰς δὲ ἀπογραφὰς ποιεῖσθαι παρ' αὐτά, μεγαλείως χρησάμενος τῇ προθυμίᾳ, τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐπιτελέσαντος ἡμῶν προαίρεσιν, καὶ συναναγκάσαντος αὐτὸν ἀπολυτῶσαι μὴ μόνον τοὺς συνεληλυθότας τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τοῦ πατρός, ἀλλὰ καὶ

HKAGIBT
Z Jos

1 ω βασιλευ TZ 2 ετερως Ar codd] ενμωσ hic hab Jos sed fort pro
ουκ ανοικειωσ | ζηνα' (al ζην' a) και δια τουτο δ codd (δ om T) 3 τουτων Z
5 απολ. ποι.] αποποιησαι I 6 ικεταισ I 8 ον] ων Z 12 om γαρ
TZ | υποτιθεμενοσ B* (προστιθ. B^{corr}) | οτε Z 13 δικαιοσ.] ελεημοσυνη G
15 βουλασ B επιβουλ. T 16 διακυψασ A ανακυψασ G 18 Βραχει] pr
εν λογω B βραχυ K | ενδεκά Jos 19 αξιω G 24 εφη B 25 δραγμασ I

εἴ τινες προῆσαν, ἢ μετὰ ταῦτα παρεισήχθησαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν.
 ὑπὲρ τὰ τετρακόσια τάλαντα τὴν δόσιν ἀπέφαινον εἶναι. καὶ τοῦ 21
 προστάγματος δὲ τὸ ἀντίγραφον οὐκ ἄχρηστον οἶομαι κατακε-
 χωρίσθαι. πολλῶ γὰρ ἢ μεγαλομοιρία φανερωτέρα καὶ εὐδηλος
 5 ἔσται τοῦ βασιλέως, τοῦ θεοῦ κατισχύοντος αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σωτηρίαν
 γενέσθαι πλήθεσιν ἱκανοῖς. ἦν δὲ τοιοῦτο Τοῦ βασιλέως προσ- 22
 τάξαντος—“Ὅσοι τῶν συνεστρατευμένων τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς κατὰ
 Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην τόπους ἐπελθόντες τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων χώραν
 ἐγκρατεῖς ἐγένοντο σωμάτων Ἰουδαϊκῶν καὶ ταῦτα διακεκομίσασιν εἰς
 10 τε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἢ καὶ πεπράκασιν ἑτέροις, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ
 εἴ τινες προῆσαν ἢ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτά εἰσιν εἰσηγμένοι τῶν τοιούτων,
 ἀπολύειν παρὰ χρῆμα τοὺς ἔχοντας, κομιζομένους αὐτίκα ἐκάστου
 σώματος δραχμὰς εἴκοσι, τοὺς μὲν στρατιώτας τῇ τῶν ὀψωνίων
 δόσει, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς τραπέζης. νομίζομεν 23
 15 γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν βούλησιν καὶ παρὰ τὸ καλῶς
 ἔχον ἡχμαλωτεῦσθαι τούτους, διὰ δὲ τὴν στρατιωτικὴν προπέτειαν
 τὴν τε χώραν αὐτῶν κατεφθάρθαι καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων μεταγωγὴν
 εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον γεγονέναι· ἱκανὴ γὰρ ἦν ἢ παρὰ τὸ πεδῖον
 γεγονυῖα ἐκ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὠφέλεια· διὸ παντελῶς ἀνεπιεικῆς
 ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καταδυναστεία. πᾶσιν οὖν ἀνθρώποις τὸ 24
 δίκαιον ἀπονέμειν ὁμολογούμενοι, πολλῶ δὲ μᾶλλον τοῖς ἀλόγως
 καταδυναστευομένοις, καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἐκζητοῦντες τὸ καλῶς ἔχον πρὸς
 τε τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν κατὰ πάντων εὐσέβειαν, προστετάχαμεν ὅσα
 τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἐστὶ σωμάτων ἐν οἰκεταῖς <πανταχῇ> καθ’ ὄντινον
 25 τρόπον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, κομιζομένους τοὺς ἔχοντας τὸ προκείμενον
 κεφάλαιον ἀπολύειν, καὶ μηδένα κακοσχόλως περὶ τούτων μηδὲν
 οἰκονομεῖν· τὰς δ’ ἀπογραφὰς ἐν ἡμέραις τρισίν, ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας
 ἐκκείται τὸ πρόσταγμα, ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τοὺς καθεσταμένους περὶ

2 ὑπερ] Fort deperit aliquid ante hoc verbum | τριακοσια TB (τ) HKAGIBT
 3 κατακεχωρισθαι BT*^{vid} Z (-ησθαι)] κατακεχωρισται cett 6 Του βασ. Z Jos
 προσ. (cum praeced conj codd) ad decretum refert Wend. quasi titulum
 habet Nestle 9 εγκρατεῖς—την χωραν 10 om BTZ 12 κομιζομενου T
 13 δραχμας BTZ | τους]+εχοντας BTZ 17 om των BTZ 21 ομολο-
 γουμενωσ HKAGIT*^{vid} -μενοις ZT^{corr} ^{vid} txt ex corr Schmidt 23 παντα B
 24 ἐστι]+των HAGI | οικεταῖς TZ | πανταχη ex conj] παντι μη HKAITZ
 παντα μη G παντι B παντι και We. | οντινα ουν KBT 28 κατεσταμενουσ
 HKATZ κατεσταλ. GI

- 25 τούτων, καταδεικνύοντας εὐθὺ καὶ τὰ σώματα. διελήφαμεν γὰρ καὶ ἡμῖν συμφέρειν καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τοῦτ' ἐπιτελεσθῆναι. τὸν δὲ βουλόμενον προσαγγέλλειν περὶ τῶν ἀπειθησάντων, ἐφ' ᾧ τοῦ φανέντος ἐνόχου τὴν κυρίαν ἔξειν· τὰ δὲ ὑπάρχοντα τῶν τοιούτων εἰς
- 26 τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀναληφθήσεται. Εἰσδοθέντος τοῦ προστάγ-
ματος, ὅπως ἐπαναγνωσθῆ τῷ βασιλεῖ, τὰ ἄλλα πάντ' ἔχοντος πλὴν τοῦ Καὶ εἴ τινες προῆσαν ἢ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσηγμένοι εἰσι τῶν τοιούτων, αὐτὸς τοῦτο ὁ βασιλεὺς προσέθηκε, μεγαλομοιρία καὶ μεγαλοψυχία χρησάμενος, ἐκέλευσέ τε τῶν διαφόρων δόσιν ἀθρόαν οὔσαν ἀπομερίσαι τοῖς ὑπηρεταῖς τῶν ταγμάτων καὶ βασι- 10
- 27 λικοῖς τραπέζιταις. οὕτω δοχθὲν ἐκεκύρωτο ἐν ἡμέραις ἑπτὰ· πλείον δὲ ταλάντων ἑξακοσίων ἑξήκοντα ἢ δόσις ἐγεγόνει. πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ τῶν ἐπιμαστιδιῶν τέκνων σὺν ταῖς μητράσιν ἐλευθεροῦντο. προσανειεχθέντος εἰ καὶ περὶ τούτων εἰκοσαδραχμία δοθήσεται, καὶ τοῦτ' ἐκέλευσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς ποιεῖν, ὀλοσχερῶς περὶ τοῦ δόξαντος ἅπαντ' 15 ἐπιτελῶν.

- § Eus 28 Ὡς δὲ κατεπράχθη ταῦτα, τὸν Δημήτριον ἐκέλευσεν εἰσδοῦναι περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν βιβλιῶν ἀναγραφῆς. πάντα γὰρ διὰ προσταγμάτων καὶ μεγάλης ἀσφαλείας τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τοῦτοις διωκέτο, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπερριμμένως οὐδ' εἰκῆ. διόπερ καὶ τὸ τῆς 20 εἰσδόσεως καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀντίγραφα κατακεχώρικα, καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀπεσταλμένων πλήθος καὶ τὴν ἐκάστου κατασκευὴν, διὰ τὸ μεγαλομοιρία καὶ τέχνη διαφέρειν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν. τῆς δὲ εἰσδό-
29 σεῶς ἐστὶν ἀντίγραφον τόδε Βασιλεῖ μεγάλῳ παρὰ Δημητρίου. προστάξαντός σου, βασιλεῦ, περὶ τῶν ἀπολιπόντων εἰς τὴν συμπλή- 25 ρωσιν τῆς βιβλιοθήκης βιβλίων, ὅπως ἐπισυναχθῆ, καὶ τὰ διαπεπτωκότα τύχη τῆς προσηκούσης ἐπισκευῆς, πεποιτημένος οὐ παρέργως

HKAGIBT
Z Jos Eus

- 3 εφ ω ex conj (cf 3 Macc 3²⁸)] εφη codd εφην Ivid 5 εισδοθεντος]
+ ουν B + δε Wend. cum cod Mon (Jos) 7 ει και K | η] ει GIZ | εισιν
εισηγ. Wend. cum cod Mon 8 αυτος Wend. cum Jos] αυτο codd
10 ουσαν]+δοσιν B 11 πλειων TZ 12 εξηκ. και τετρακοσ. Jos
13 ηλευθ. B 14 προσανεν.] + δε We. (cod Mon) 15 ολοσχ. ποι. ο β. B
17 τω Δημητριω BT] εκδουσαι Eus¹ et Jos^{codd} alia 18 αναγραφης Jos et
Eus] αντιγραφης Ar codd omn 19 ασφαλ.] ακριβειας Eus 20 διωκετο
Ar codd txt Eus (διωκεται Eus^o) | και ι^o] ins Eus om Ar | το Eus] τα Ar
21 εκδοσεως BTZ Eus^{codd} alia 24 αντιγραφον (-φα B) εστιν ουτως BT
25 προστεταχotos Eus^o | απολειφθεντων Eus 26 της]+δια Eus^o

τὴν ἐν τούτοις ἐπιμέλειαν, προσαναφέρω σοι τάδε. τοῦ νόμου 30
 τῶν Ἰουδαίων βιβλία σὺν ἑτέροις ὀλίγοις τισὶν ἀπολείπει· τυγχάνει
 γὰρ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι καὶ φωνῇ λεγόμενα, ἀμελέστερον δέ, καὶ
 οὐχ ὡς ὑπάρχει, σεσημάνται, καθὼς ὑπὸ τῶν εἰδόντων προσανα-
 5 φέρεται· προνοίας γὰρ βασιλικῆς οὐ τέτευχε. δέον δέ ἐστι καὶ 31
 ταυθ' ὑπάρχειν παρά σοι διηκριβωμένα, διὰ τὸ καὶ φιλοσοφωτέραν
 εἶναι καὶ ἀκέραιον τὴν νομοθεσίαν ταύτην, ὡς ἂν οὔσαν θείαν. διὸ
 πόρρω γεγόνασιν οἱ τε συγγραφεῖς καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἱστορικῶν
 πλήθος τῆς ἐπιμνήσεως τῶν προειρημένων βιβλίων, καὶ τῶν κατ'
 10 αὐτὰ πεπολιτευμένων[καὶ πολιτευομένων] ἀνδρῶν, διὰ τὸ ἀγνήν τινα
 καὶ σεμνὴν εἶναι τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς θεωρίαν, ὡς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος ὁ
 Ἀβδηρίτης. εἰάν οὖν φαίνηται, βασιλεῦ, γραφήσεται πρὸς τὸν 32
 ἀρχιερέα τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ἀποστεῖλαι τοὺς μάλιστα καλῶς
 βεβιωκότας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους ὄντας ἀνδρας, ἐμπείρους τῶν κατὰ
 15 τὸν νόμον τὸν ἑαυτῶν, ἀφ' ἑκάστης φυλῆς ἕξ, ὅπως τὸ σύμφωνον ἐκ
 τῶν πλειόνων ἐξετάσαντες καὶ λαβόντες τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν
 ἀκριβές, ἀξίως καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τῆς σῆς προαιρέσεως, θώμεν
 εὐσήμεως. εὐτύχει διὰ παντός. Τῆς δὲ εἰσδόσεως ταύτης γενο- 33
 μένης, ἐκέλευσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς γραφῆναι πρὸς τὸν Ἑλεάζαρον περὶ
 20 τούτων, σημάναντας καὶ τὴν γενομένην ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν αἰχμα-
 λώτων. ἔδωκε δὲ καὶ εἰς κατασκευὴν κρατήρων τε καὶ φιαλῶν καὶ
 τραπέζης καὶ σπονδείων χρυσοῦ μὲν ὀκτῆς τάλαντα πεντήκοντα
 καὶ ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ λίθων ἰκανόν τι πλήθος—
 ἐκέλευσε δὲ τοὺς ῥισκοφύλακας τοῖς τεχνίταις, ὧν ἂν προαιρῶνται,
 25 τὴν ἐκλογὴν διδόναι—καὶ νομίσματος εἰς θυσίας καὶ ἄλλα πρὸς
 τάλαντα ἑκατόν. δηλώσομεν δέ σοι περὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς, ὡς ἂν 34
 τὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀντίγραφα διέλθωμεν. ἦν δὲ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως
 ἐπιστολὴ τὸν τύπον ἔχουσα τοῦτον Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος 35

1 εν] επι Η | ταδε] τα δε cum seqq conj Ar Eus 5 τετυχηκε Jos HKAGIBT
 Eus | ετι Eus 10 αυτας Ar et Eus¹⁰. Fort βιβλων supra legendum | και Z Jos Eus
 πολιτευομενων om Eus et Jos^{vid} 11 om φησω Eus¹ 12 om ουν Eus^o |
 φαιν. Eus] φανηται Ar codd φανηται σοι εννομον B 14 om οντας Eus
 15 αφ Jos Eus] εφ HAGIBT 18 εκδοσεως Eus¹ 20 σημαναντα Ar
 txt Eus et Jos^{vid} (δηλοντας) | γεναμενην GB^{vid}TZ 23 ικανων I καλον
 Eus¹ 24 χρηματοφυλ. Eus | om τοις Eus¹ | om αν BTZ | προαιρουνται B
 25 νομισματα BT txt codd cett Eus Jos

- Ἐλεαζάρῳ ἀρχιερεῖ χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρῶσθαι. ἐπεὶ συμβαίνει πλείονας τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν χώραν κατωκίσθαι γενηθέντας ἀνασπάστους ἐκ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ὑπὸ Περσῶν, καθ' ὃν ἐπεκράτουν χρόνον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ συνελθυθέναι τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον
- 36 αἰχμαλώτους,—ἀφ' ὧν πλείονας εἰς τὸ στρατιωτικὸν σύνταγμα 5 κατεχώρισεν ἐπὶ μείζοσι μισθοφορίαις, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοὺς προόντας κρίνας πιστοὺς φρούρια κτίσας ἀπέδωκεν αὐτοῖς, ὅπως τὸ τῶν Αἴγυπτίων ἔθνος φόβον [μὴ] ἔχη διὰ τούτων· καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ παραλαβόντες τὴν βασιλείαν φιλανθρωπότερον ἀπαντῶμεν τοῖς πᾶσι, πολὺ δὲ
- 37 μᾶλλον τοῖς σοῖς πολίταις—ὑπὲρ δέκα μυριάδας αἰχμαλώτων ἤλευ- 10 θερώκαμεν, ἀποδόντες τοῖς κρατοῦσι τὴν κατ' ἀξίαν ἀργυρικὴν τιμὴν, διορθούμενοι καὶ εἴ τι κακῶς ἐπράχθη διὰ τὰς τῶν ὄχλων ὀρμάς, διειληφότες εὐσεβῶς τοῦτο πράξαι, καὶ τῷ μεγίστῳ θεῷ χαριστικὸν ἀνατιθέντες, ὃς ἡμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ δόξῃ κρατίστη παρ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην διατετήρηκεν· εἰς τε τὸ στράτευμα τοὺς 15 ἀκμαιοτάτους ταῖς ἡλικίαις τετάχαμεν, τοὺς δὲ δυναμένους καὶ περὶ ἡμᾶς εἶναι, τῆς περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πίστews ἀξίους, ἐπὶ χειρῶν καθεστά-
- 38 καμεν. βουλομένων δ' ἡμῶν καὶ τούτοις χαρίζεσθαι καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίους καὶ τοῖς μετέπειτα, προηγήμεθα τὸν νόμον ἡμῶν μεθερμηνευθῆναι γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἐκ τῶν παρ' 20 ἡμῶν λεγομένων Ἑβραϊκῶν γραμμάτων, ἵν' ὑπάρχη καὶ ταῦτα παρ'
- 39 ἡμῖν ἐν βιβλιοθήκῃ σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις βασιλικῶν βιβλίοις. καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας σπουδῆς ἀξίως ἐπιλεξάμενος ἄνδρας καλῶς βεβιωκότας πρεσβυτέρους, ἐμπειρίαν ἔχοντας τοῦ νόμου, καὶ δυνατοὺς ἐρμηνεῦσαι, ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἕξ, ὅπως ἐκ τῶν πλείονων 25 τὸ σύμφωνον εὔρεθῆ, διὰ τὸ περὶ μειζόνων εἶναι τὴν σκέψιν. οἰόμεθα γὰρ ἐπιτελεσθέντος τούτου μεγάλην ἀποίσεσθαι δόξαν.

HKAGIBT
Z Jos Eus

- 1 ἐπει συμβ. KZ Eus] επισυμβαίνει codd cett 2 κατοικεῖσθαι Ar codd
κατωκίεσθαι Eus txt Jos^{vid} | αναρπαστους HK A Eus^{edd} txt GIBTZ Eusⁱ
4 συνεισελ. G^{vid} I Eusⁱ 5 ὧν]+και Eus 6 προοντας B^{copp} TZ Eus]
παροντας HKAGIB*^{vid} 8 μη hab Ar codd omn om Jos Eus recte ut
videtur | εχει GI 11 ἀργυρ. κατ. αξ. Z 13 πρασσειν Eus | χαριστη-
ριον B txt codd cett Eus 14 δοξη]+τη Eus 16 και om GI 17 της]
pr και Eus | αξιως ZT? | επι χειρων κατεστακαμεν (-ησαμεν B) Ar codd επι-
κρινων κατεστησα Eus txt emend Schmidt 21 υμιν (-ωνⁱ) εβρ. λεγ. Eus
23 επιλεξας Eus txt Ar Jos 25 δυναμενους BT

ἀπεστάλκαμεν δὲ περὶ τούτων Ἀνδρέαν τῶν ἀρχισωματοφυλάκων 40
καὶ Ἀριστέαν, τιμωμένους παρ' ἡμῖν, διαλεξομένους σοι καὶ κομι-
ζοντας ἀπαρχὰς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἀναθημάτων καὶ εἰς θυσιάς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα
ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἑκατόν. γράφων δὲ καὶ σὺ πρὸς ἡμᾶς περὶ ὧν ἐὰν
5 βούλη κεχαρισμένος ἔσῃ, καὶ φιλίας ἀξιόν τι πράξεις, ὡς ἐπιτελεσ-
θησομένων τὴν ταχίστην περὶ ὧν ἂν αἰρή. ἔρρωσο. Πρὸς 41
ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀντέγραψεν ἐνδεχομένως ὁ Ἐλεάζαρος
ταῦτα Ἐλεάζαρος ἀρχιερεὺς βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ φίλῳ
γνησίῳ χαίρειν. αὐτὸς τε ἔρρωσο καὶ ἡ βασίλισσα Ἀρσινόη,
10 ἡ ἀδελφή, καὶ τὰ τέκνα, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι καὶ ὡς βουλόμεθα, καὶ
αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑγιαίνομεν. λαβόντες τὴν παρὰ σοῦ ἐπιστολὴν μεγάλως 42
ἐχάρημεν διὰ τὴν προαίρεσίν σου καὶ τὴν καλὴν βουλήν, καὶ συνα-
γαγόντες τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος παρανέγνωμεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα εἰδῶσιν ἦν ἔχεις
πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν εὐσέβειαν. ἐπεδείξαμεν δὲ καὶ τὰς φιάλας ἃς
15 ἀπέστειλας, χρυσᾶς εἴκοσι καὶ ἀργυρᾶς τριάκοντα, κρατήρας πέντε,
καὶ τράπεζαν εἰς ἀνάθεσιν, καὶ εἰς προσαγωγὴν θυσιῶν καὶ εἰς
ἐπισκευὰς ὧν ἂν δέχται τὸ ἱερὸν ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἑκατόν, ἅπερ 43
ἐκόμισεν Ἀνδρέας τῶν τετιμημένων παρὰ σοὶ καὶ Ἀριστέας, ἄνδρες
καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ παιδεῖα διαφέροντες καὶ τῆς σῆς ἀγωγῆς καὶ
20 δικαιοσύνης ἀξιοὶ κατὰ πάντα· οἱ καὶ μετέδωκαν ἡμῖν τὰ παρὰ σοῦ,
πρὸς ἃ καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀκηκόασιν ἀρμόζοντα τοῖς σοῖς γράμμασι.
πάντα γὰρ ὅσα σοι συμφέροι, καὶ εἰ παρὰ φύσιν ἐστίν, ὑπακουσό- 44
μεθα· τοῦτο γὰρ φιλίας καὶ ἀγαπήσεως σημεῖόν ἐστι. μεγάλη γὰρ
καὶ σὺ καὶ ἀνεπίληστα τοὺς πολίτας ἡμῶν κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους

1 τούτων Jos Eus] τουτου Ar | τον αρχισωματοφυλακα B (αρχι sup lin HKAGIBT
prima manu) TZ Jos txt Ar codd cett Eus¹ (των σωμ.^ο) 2 Αρισταιον Jos Z Jos Eus
Eus^ο (-εαν Eus¹ cum Ar codd) | κομιζοντες Z 4 γραφε BT Eus txt codd
cett et Jos^{vid} | αν B Eus^ο (εαν Eus¹ cum codd cett) 5 κεχαρ.] και χαρι-
σαμενος Ar codd κεχαρισμενος γαρ Eus 7 ταυτ. την επ.] ταυτα Eus^ο
8 ταδε Eus¹ (ουτως^ο) 9 ει αυτος τε ερρωσαι Eus txt (cf 2 Macc 9²⁰, 11²⁸)
Ar codd (-σαι Z) 12 συναγοντες K 13 ανεγνωμεν G^{codd} vid Jos παρεγν.
IG*¹ B* + αυτην Eus^ο Jos 16 προαγωγην Z 17 προσδεχται Eus txt
Ar codd Jos 18 εκομιζον Ar codd -σεν Eus¹ (-ζεν cett) -σαν Jos | Ανδρεας]
ανδρες B | και] pr Ανδρεας B | Αρισταιος Jos Eus^ο (-εας¹) 20 παρεδωκαν
B 21 γραμμασι] πραγμασι Eus 24 και συ BT (σοι G και σοι IZ cf
Jos τας σας ευεργεσιαις)] om codd cett Eus | ανεπιληπτα A | πολλους τροπους
Eus (cf Jos πολυμερως)] πολλοις HA πολυ K πολλους cett

- 45 εὐηργέτηκας. εὐθέως οὖν προσηγάγομεν ὑπὲρ σοῦ θυσίας καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς καὶ τῶν τέκνων καὶ τῶν φίλων· καὶ ἤϊξάτο πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος, ἵνα σοι γένηται καθὼς προαιρῆ διὰ παντός, καὶ διασώζῃ σοι τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ δόξης ὁ κυριεύων ἀπάντων θεός, καὶ ὅπως γένηταί σοι συμφερόντως καὶ μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου νόμου 5
- 46 μεταγραφῆ. παρόντων δὲ πάντων ἐπελέξαμεν ἄνδρας καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, ἀφ' ἑκάστης φυλῆς ἕξ, οὓς καὶ ἀπεστείλαμεν ἔχοντας τὸν νόμον. καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις, βασιλεῦ δίκαιε, προστάξας, ὡς ἂν ἡ μεταγραφὴ γένηται τῶν βιβλίων, ἵνα πάλιν ἀποκαταστα-
- ¶ Jos Eus 47 θῶσι πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀσφαλῶς οἱ ἄνδρες. ἔρρωσο. ¶ Εἰσὶ δὲ πρώτης 10 φυλῆς· Ἰώσηφος Ἐζεκίας Ζαχαρίας Ἰωάννης Ἐζεκίας Ἐλισσαῖος. δευτέρας· Ἰούδας Σίμων Σομόηλος Ἀδαῖος Ματθαίας Ἐσχηλείας. τρίτης· Νεεμίας Ἰώσηφος Θεοδόσιος Βασέας Ὀρνίας Δάκις. 48 τετάρτης· Ἰωνάθας Ἀβραῖος Ἐλισσαῖος Ἀνανίας Χαβρίας... πέμπτης· Ἰσακος Ἰάκωβος Ἰησοῦς Σαββαταῖος Σίμων Λενίς. 15 ἕκτης· Ἰούδας Ἰώσηφος Σίμων Ζαχαρίας Σομόηλος Σελεμίας.
- § C 49 ἑβδόμης· Σαββαταῖος Σεδεκίας Ἰάκωβος Ἰσαχος Ἰησίας Νατθαῖος. ὀγδόης· Θεοδόσιος Ἰάσων Ἰησοῦς Θεόδοτος Ἰωάννης Ἰωνάθας. ἐνάτης· Θεόφιλος Ἀβραμος Ἀρσαμος Ἰάσων Ἐνδεμίας Δανίηλος. 50 δεκάτης· Ἰερεμίας Ἐλεάζαρος Ζαχαρίας Βανέας Ἐλισσαῖος Δαθαῖος. 20 ἐνδεκάτης· Σαμούηλος Ἰώσηφος Ἰούδας Ἰωνάθης Χαβεῦ Δοσίθεος. δωδεκάτης· Ἰσάηλος Ἰωάννης Θεοδόσιος Ἀρσαμος Ἀβιήτης Ἐξε- 51 κῆλος. οἱ πάντες ἑβδομήκοντα δύο. Καὶ τὰ μὲν πρὸς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολὴν τοιαύτης ἐτύγχανεν ἀντιγραφῆς <ὑπό> τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἐλεάζαρον. 25

HKAGIBC
TZ Jos Eus

- 4 om εν ΒΤ | κυριευοντων απαντων ΒΤ 5 om σοι Eus 6 om δε Eus | επελεξαμεν Jos| επιλεξαμεν (sic) Eusⁱ εξελεξαμεν Eus^o επελεξαμεθα (απελ. ΒΤ om Z) Ar codd 7 απεσταλκαμεν Eus Jos^{vid} (πεπομφαμεν) 10 οι ανδρ. ασφ. K om ασφ. GI 11 Ιωσηπος Ιεζεκιας B 12 Ματθιας ΚΑ | Σεχηλειας B^{vid} 13 Ιωσηπος B* vid | Βασιας T Βασβιας Z 14 Αβραιος B | post Χαβριας nomen excidit fort Χελκιας (Eriphan. *De mens. et pond.* 9 vers. Syr.) Wend. 15 Σαββαταιος I 16 Σιμων Ιωσηφος ΗΚΑ 17, 18 om Σεδεκ.—Θεοδοσιος I om Σεδεκ.—Ιησους A^{xt} ins A^{mg} om Ισαχος—Νατθαιος C 17 Ιεισιας GZ | Ματθαιος ΗΚΑ 18 Ιωναθαν B 19 Δανιηλ TZ om C 20 Βαναιας BCTZ | Θαδδαιος Z 22 δωδεκατος C 24 επιβολην AGICT* (-βουλ. T¹) | υπο] υπερ codd

ὡς δὲ ἐπηγγειλάμην καὶ τὰ τῶν κατασκευασμάτων διασαφῆσαι, § Jos
 ποιήσω. πολυτεχνία γὰρ διαφέροντα συνετελέσθη, τοῦ βασιλέως
 πολλὴν ἐπίδοσιν ποιουμένου καὶ παρ' ἕκαστον ἐπιθεωροῦντος τοὺς
 τεχνίτας. διὸ παριδεῖν οὐδὲν ἠδύναντο οὐδὲ εἰκῆ συντελέσαι.
 5 πρῶτον δέ σοι τὰ περὶ τῆς τραπέζης ἐξηγήσομαι. Προεθυ- 52
 μείτο μὲν οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑπέροπλόν τι ποιῆσαι τοῖς μέτροις τὸ
 κατασκευάσμα. προσέταξε δὲ πυθέσθαι τῶν ἀνὰ τὸν τόπον, πηλίκη
 τίς ἐστὶν ἢ προοῦσα καὶ κειμένη κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις.
 ὡς δὲ ἀπεφήναντο τὰ μέτρα, προσετηρώτησεν, εἰ κατασκευάσει 53
 10 μείζονα. τινὲς μὲν οὖν καὶ τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἔλεγον μηδὲν
 ἐπικωλύειν. ὁ δὲ εἶπε βούλεσθαι καὶ πενταπλῆν τοῖς μεγέθεσι
 ποιῆσαι, διστάζειν δὲ μήποτε ἄχρηστος γένηται πρὸς τὰς λειτουρ-
 γίας. οὐ γὰρ αἰρεῖσθαι τὸ κείσθαι μόνον ἐν τῷ τόπῳ <τὰ> παρ' 54
 αὐτοῦ, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον χάριν ἔξειν, ἐὰν τὰς καθηκούσας λειτουργίας
 15 ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατασκευασμένων οἷς καθῆκε ποιῶνται δεόντως.
 οὐ γὰρ ἔνεκεν σπάνεως χρυσοῦ τὰ προσυντετελεσμένα βραχύμετρα 55
 καθέστηκεν, ἀλλὰ φαίνεται πρὸς τινα λόγον, εἶπεν, οὕτως συνεστη-
 κέναι τοῖς μέτροις. ἔτι γὰρ ἐπιταγῆς οὔσης οὐθὲν ἂν ἐσπάνιζε·
 διόπερ οὐ παραβατέον οὐδὲ ὑπερθετέον τὰ καλῶς ἔχοντα. τῇ μὲν 56
 20 οὖν ποικιλίᾳ τῶν τεχνῶν ἐκέλευσεν ὅτι μάλιστα χρῆσασθαι, σεμνῶς
 ἅπαντα διανοούμενος καὶ φύσιν ἔχων ἀγαθὴν εἰς τὸ συνιδεῖν πραγ-
 μάτων ἔμφασιν. ὅσα δ' ἂν ἢ ἄγραφα, πρὸς καλλονὴν ἐκέλευσε
 ποιεῖν· ὅσα δὲ διὰ γραπτῶν, μέτρα αὐτοῖς κατακολουθήσαι.
 Δύο γὰρ πήχεων τὸ μᾶκος, τὸ δὲ ὕφος πήχεος καὶ ἡμίσοις 57
 25 συντελέου, χρῆσιμόν ἐστιν ὅτι στερεὰν πάντοθεν τὴν ποιήσιν ἐργα-

24 Ex 25²² ff

1 τῶν] pr κατα GIC | επισκευασμάτων B σκευασμ. C 2 om ποιήσω HKAGIB
 BT 3 επιθεωροῦντας CTZ 4 ουδεν] ουδε B 6 om ουν C 7 om CTZ Jos
 δε Z 11 κωλυειν BCTZ Jos | βουλεσθαι—δε 12 om BCTZ 12 μη-
 ποτε] μητε GI 13 τα ins Schmidt 14 καταθηκουσας GI 16 ενεκα
 B | προσσυν. A* (προσυν. A^{corr}) προτετ. B (συν suprascr pr man) 18 ετι
 γαρ επιταγης bene conj Mend. cf § 103] οἶδα γαρ ὡς δαψιλοῦς τῆς υλῆς αὐτοῖς
 B ετι γαρ επι τα (τας CT*Z) τῆς codd cett | αν om H supra lin Z 22 εγ-
 γραφα K 24 πηχεων] pr και ημισους Jos qui et post μηκος add (ex LXX
 vid) ενος δε το εγρος

σάμενοι, λέγω δὲ οὐ περί τι περιεπτυγμένου τοῦ χρυσοῦ, τὸν δὲ
 58 ἔλασμον αὐτὸν ἐπιδεδέσθαι. στεφάνην δὲ ἐποίησαν παλαϊκτιαίαν
 κυκλόθεν· τὰ δὲ κγμάτια στρεπτά, τὴν ἀναγλυφὴν ἔχοντα σχοινί-
 δων ἔκτυπον, τῇ τορεία θαυμαστῶς ἔχουσαν ἐκ τῶν τριῶν μερῶν·
 59 ἣν γὰρ τριγωνία. καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον μέρος ἢ διατύπωσις τῆς ἐνεργείας 5
 τὴν αὐτὴν διάθεσιν εἶχεν, ὥστε, καθ' ὃ ἂν μέρος στρέφοιτο, τὴν
 πρόσοψιν εἶναι τὴν αὐτὴν, κειμένου δὲ κατὰ τῆς στεφάνης τὸ μὲν
 ¶ Η εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν τράπεζαν ἠ ἀπόκλιμα τὴν διατύπωσιν ἔχειν τῆς ὠραιό-
 τητος, τὸ δὲ ἐκτὸς κλίμα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ προσάγοντος εἶναι θεωρίαν.
 60 διὸ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν ὀξεῖαν εἶναι τῶν δύο κλιμάτων συνέβαινε, μετέωρον 10
 ἐπικειμένην, ὡς προειρήκαμεν, τριγώνου κατεσκευασμένου, καθ' ὃ ἂν
 μέρος στρέφοιτο. λίθων τε πολυτελῶν ἐν αὐτῷ διαθέσεις ὑπῆρχον
 ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν σχοινίδων· ἕτερος παρὰ ἕτερον πλοκὴν εἶχον ἀμί-
 61 μητον τῇ ποιήσει. πάντες δ' ἦσαν διὰ τρημάτων κατειλημμένοι
 χρυσαῖς περόναις πρὸς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν γωνιῶν αἱ 15
 62 κατακλείδες συνέσφιγγον πρὸς τὴν συνοχὴν. ἐκ πλαγίων δὲ κατὰ
 τὴν στεφάνην κυκλόθεν τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἄνω πρόσοψιν ὤθησιν κατε-
 σκεύαστο διάλιθος, ἡ ἐκτύπωσιν ἔχουσα προσοχῆς ἡ συνεχέσιν ἀνα-
 γλυφαῖς ῥαβδωταῖς, πυκνὴν ἐχούσας τὴν πρὸς ἄλληλα θέσιν περὶ
 63 ὄλην τὴν τράπεζαν. ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν ἐκτύπωσιν τῶν λίθων τῆς 20
 ὤθησιν, στέφανον ἐποίησαν οἱ τεχνῖται πάγκαρπον, ἐν ὑπεροχῇ
 προδήλως ἔχοντα βοτρυῶν καὶ σταχύων, ἔτι δὲ φοινίκων καὶ μήλων
 ἐλαίας τε καὶ ῥοῶν καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων. τοὺς δὲ λίθους ἐργασά-
 μενοι πρὸς τὴν τῶν προειρημένων καρπῶν διατύπωσιν, ἔχοντας

HKAGIB
 CTZ Jos

1 χρυσοῦ] ad hoc A^{corr} in mg add ου κατα τι μέρος της τραπεζης συνε-
 σταλμενου του χρυσοῦ και ουχ ορωμενου· αλλα δια παντων επιλαμποντος· και
 κατα τας σωματικας διαστασεις ητοι κατα βαθος και κατα μηκος και κατα
 πλατος ομοιως εχοντος· στερεα γαρ ην δι ολου του σχηματος. το δε ειδος ως
 φησιν Θεοδώριτος (-ρητ. L) τριγωνος κατα λογον αναγωγης υψηλοτερας και
 θειοτερας. Haec verba L textui inseruit 3, 4 σχοινιδῶν GIBT*¹] σχοι-
 νιδων HKAC -ηδον T¹Z (σχοινοειδη Jos) 4 εκτυπον T¹ εκτοπον cett
 5 τριγωνα Wend. (cf Jos) 7 κειμενου δε κατα] κειμενης δε και B 11 κει-
 μενην BCTZ 12 εν αυτω] εν εαυτω GICZ εαυτω T 13 σχοινιδῶν (-ηδ.
 Z) codd 16 κατακλειδα C | συνεσφιγγον KA]+δε cett 18 εκτυπων B]
 εκτυπων (εκ τυπων GI) cett | Fort legendum προοχης (conj Schmidt) | συν-
 οχεσιν GIBC 19 εχουσας CZ 22 δε]+και A

ἑκάστου γένους τὴν χροάν, ἀνέδησαν τῷ χρυσίῳ κύκλω περὶ ὄλην
 τὴν τῆς τραπέζης κατασκευὴν κατὰ κρόταφον. μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ 64
 στεφάνου διάθεσιν, ὁμοίως κατὰ τὴν τῆς ῥοθισίας διασκευὴν κατε-
 σκεύαστο, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς ῥαβδώσεως καὶ διαγλυφῆς, <διὰ τὸ>
 5 κατ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν τὰ μέρη τὴν τράπεζαν πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν πεποιῆσθαι,
 καθ' ὃ ἂν μέρος αἴρωνται, ὥστε καὶ τὴν τῶν κυμάτων θέσιν καὶ τὴν
 τῆς στεφάνης εἶναι κατὰ τὸ τῶν ποδῶν μέρος. ἔλασμα γὰρ ἐποίη- 65
 σαν καθ' ὅλου τοῦ πλάτους τῆς τραπέζης στερεὸν δακτύλων τεσσάρων,
 ὥστε τοὺς πόδας ἐνίσθαι εἰς τοῦτο, περόνας <σὺν> κατακλείσιν
 10 ἔχοντας ἐσφίγχειν κατὰ τὴν στεφάνην, ἵνα, καθ' ὃ ἂν αἴρωνται
 μέρος, ἢ χρῆσις ἦ· τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ ἐπιφάνειαν θεωρεῖται ἀμφοτε-
 ροδεξίου τῆς κατασκευῆς οὕσης. ἐπ' αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς τραπέζης 66
 μαιάνδρον ἔκτυπον ἐποίησαν, ἐν ὑπεροχῇ λίθους ἔχοντα κατὰ μέσον
 πολυτελεῖς τῶν <πολυειδῶν>, ἀνθράκων τε καὶ σμαράγδων, ἔτι δὲ
 15 ὄνυχος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων γενῶν τῶν διαφερόντων ἐν ὠραιότητι.
 μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ μαιάνδρου διάθεσιν ἐπέκειτο σχιστὴ πλοκὴ, 67
 θαυμασίως ἔχουσα, ῥομβωτὴν ἀποτελοῦσα τὴν ἀνὰ μέσον θεωρίαν·
 ἐφ' ἣ κρυστάλλου λίθος καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον ἤλεκτρον ἐντετύπωτο,
 ἀμίμητον θεωρίαν ἀποτελοῦν τοῖς θεωροῦσι. τοὺς δὲ πόδας ἐποίησαν 68
 20 τὰς κεφαλίδας ἔχοντας κρινωτάς, ἀνάκλασιν κρίνων ὑπὸ τὴν τράπεζαν
 λαμβανόντων, τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐντὸς προσόψεως ὀρθὴν ἔχοντα τὴν πετά-
 λωσιν. ἢ δὲ ἐπ' ἐδάφους ἔρεισις τοῦ ποδὸς ἀνθρακος λίθου πάν- 69
 τοθεν παλιστιαία, κρηπίδος ἔχουσα τάξιν κατὰ τὴν πρόσοψιν, ὀκτώ
 δὲ δακτύλων τὸ πλάτος ἔχουσα· ἐφ' ὃν ἐπίκειται τὸ πᾶν ἔλασμα
 25 τοῦ ποδός. κατεσκευάσαν δὲ ἐκφύοντα κισσὸν ἀκάνθῳ πλεκόμενον 70
 ἐκ τοῦ λίθου, σὺν ἀμπέλῳ περιειλούμενον κυκλόθεν τῷ ποδὶ σὺν

1, 2 ὄλην τὴν] ὄλην T τὴν ὄλην C 3 κατα] pr <κατω τα> Wend. | KAGIBC
 διασκευὴν] κατασκευὴν KBCTZ + η codd omn 4 δια το] και codd ὥστε
 Wend. et om in lin 6 5 πρὸς τὴν χρ. τὴν τρ. I 6 ὥστε—θεσιν om
 BT | θεσιν]+πεποιῆσθαι καθ ο αν μερος CZ 8 στερεων T 9 περονας
 κατα κλεισιν codd περονας <δε εν> κ. Wend. 11 θεωρηται GI
 14 πολυειδων ex Jos (λιθους...αξιολογους ὡσπερ αστερας ποικιλῆς ιδεας) conj
 Lumbroso] πνυλιαδων codd 16 σχιστη] κτιστη B 18 om ηλεκτρον C |
 εντετυπωτο Jos B¹] ενετυπ. KAGIB* ενετετυπ. Z ετετυπωτο C 21 ορθην]
 αρκουντως T 23 παλαισταιου BCTZ 24 ον] ων C 25 κατεσκευασαν
 corr Wend.] -σεν GIC -σε cett | ακανθη BT 26 περιειλημενον G

- τοῖς βότρυσιν, οἱ λιθουργεῖς ἦσαν, μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς. ἡ δ' αὐτὴ διάθεσις ἦν τῶν τεσσάρων ποδῶν, πάντα ἐνεργῶς πεποιημένα καὶ προσηγμένα, τῆς ἐμπειρίας καὶ τέχνης τὰς ὑπεροχὰς ἀπαραλλάκτως ἔχοντα πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὥστε καὶ ριπίζοντος τοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα πνεύματος κίνησιν ἐπιδέχεσθαι τὴν τῶν φύλλων 5 θέσιν, πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας διάθεσιν τετυπωμένων ἀπάντων.
- 71 ἐποίησαν δὲ τριμερὲς τὸ στόμα τῆς τραπέζης, οἰονεὶ τρίπτυχον, πελεκίνοις συναρμοζόμενα γομφωτοῖς πρὸς ἑαυτὰ κατὰ τὸ πάχος τῆς κατασκευῆς, ἀθέατον καὶ ἀνεύρετον τὴν τῶν ἀρμῶν κατασκευάσαντες συμβολήν. ἡμιπηχίου δὲ οὐκ ἐλάσσονος ἦν τὸ πάχος τῆς ὅλης 10
- 72 τραπέζης, ὥστε πολλῶν εἶναι ταλάντων τὴν ὅλην διασκευὴν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ οὐ προήρητο τοῖς μεγέθεσιν οὐδὲν προσθεῖναι ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὅσον ἔδει δαπανηθῆναι κατασκευαζομένων μειζόνων, ταῦτα ἀποδέδωκε πλείονα· καὶ κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐπετελέσθη θαυμασιῶς καὶ ἀξιολόγως ἔχοντα, καὶ ταῖς τέχναις ἀμίμητα, καὶ τῇ 15
- 73 καλλονῇ διαπρεπῆ. Τῶν δὲ κρατήρων δύο μὲν ἦσαν <χρυσο οἶ>
- ¶ C τῇ¹ κατασκευῇ, φολιδωτὴν ἔχοντες ἀπὸ τῆς βάσεως μέχρι τοῦ μέσου τὴν διασκευὴν τῇ τορεΐα, καὶ τὴν τῶν λίθων ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν φολιδῶν
- 74 σύνδεσιν πολυτέχνως ἔχοντες. εἶτα μαϊάνδρος ἐπέκειτο πηχυαῖος ὕψει, τὴν δ' ἐκτύπωσιν ἐνυπήρχε διὰ λιθώσεως ποικίλης, ἐμφαίνων 20 σὺν ὠραιότητι τὸ τῆς τέχνης φιλόπονον. ἐπὶ δὲ τούτου ῥάβδωσις, ἐφ' ἣ διαπλοκὴ ῥόμβων, δικτυωτὴν ἔχουσα τὴν πρόσοψιν ἕως ἐπὶ τὸ
- 75 στόμα. τὸ δ' ἀνὰ μέσον ἀσπιδίσκοι λίθων ἐτέρων παρ' ἐτέροις, τοῖς γένεσι παραλλαγὴν ἔχόντων, τετραδακτύλων οὐκ ἔλαττον, ἀνεπλήρου τὸ τῆς καλλονῆς ἐναργές. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς στεφάνης τοῦ στόματος 25 κρίνων τύπωσις σὺν ἀνθεμίσι καὶ βοτρύων σχοινιαὶ διάπλοκοι
- 76 διετυποῦντο κυκλόθεν. οἱ μὲν οὖν διὰ τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοιαύτην εἶχον τὴν κατασκευὴν, χωροῦντες ὑπὲρ δύο μετρητάς· οἱ δ' ἀργυροὶ λείαν

KAGIBC
TZ Jos

1 οἶ] ο GI 2 ἐναργως BZ 3 προηγμενα Wend. 7 στομα]
 σχημα Jos 8 συναρμοζομενον KA 9 αθετον codd txt ex Jos (αορατον)
 10 ημιπηχυαιου B | ην KB] η cett 12 προειρητο GCTZ | οσων CTZ
 13 om μειζονων C | απεδωκε Wend. cf autem § 173 14 απετελεσθη BCT
 15 την τεχνην C 16 χρυσοι (om codd) ex Jos (χρυσεοι) supplevi
 17, 18 απο της βασ.—τορεια και om BTZ 18 πορεια G 19 συνθεσιν
 GI 25 ? ενεργες 26 σχοινιω codd txt ex Jos conj Schmidt 28 λιαν
 GIZT* fort

εἶχον τὴν διασκευὴν, ἔνοπτρον δὴ γεγонуῖαν πρὸς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θαυμα-
 σίως ἔχουσαν, ὥστε πᾶν τὸ προσαχθὲν ἀπανγάζεσθαι σαφέστερον
 μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν τοῖς κατόπτοις. οὐκ ἐφικτὸν δ' ἐστὶν ἐξηγήσασθαι 77
 τὰ προσυνητελεσθέντα πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἔμφασιν. ὡς γὰρ
 5 ἐπετελέσθη, τεθέντων τῶν κατασκευασμάτων ἐτέρου παρ' ἕτερον—
 λέγω δὲ πρῶτον ἀργυροῦ κρατῆρος, εἶτα χρυσοῦ, πάλιν ἀργυροῦ καὶ
 χρυσοῦ—παντελῶς ἀνεξήγητος ἐγένετο τῆς προσόψεως ἢ διάθεσις,
 καὶ τῶν πρὸς τὴν θεωρίαν προσιόντων οὐ δυναμένων ἀφίστασθαι διὰ
 τὴν περιούγειαν καὶ τὸ τῆς ὄψεως τερπνόν. ποικίλη γὰρ ἦν ἢ τῆς 78
 10 ἐπιφανείας ἐνέργεια. προσορώντων γὰρ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν τοῦ χρυσοῦ
 κατασκευὴν, ψυχαγωγία τις ἦν μετὰ θαυμασμοῦ, συνεχῶς ἐφ' ἕκαστον
 ἐπιβαλλούσης τῆς διανοίας τεχνίτευμα. καὶ πάλιν ὅτε πρὸς τὴν
 τῶν ἀργυρῶν προσβλέψαι τις θέσιν ἤθελεν, ἀπέλαμπε τὰ πάντα
 κυκλόθεν, ὡς ἂν τις ἔστηκε, καὶ διάχυσιν ἐποίει μείζονα τοῖς θεω-
 15 μένοις· ὥστε παντελῶς ἀνεξήγητον εἶναι τῶν ἐνηργημένων τὴν
 πολυτεχνίαν. Τὰς δὲ χρυσᾶς φιάλας διετόρευσαν στεφάνοις 79
 ἀμπέλου κατὰ μέσον, περὶ δὲ τὰ χεῖλη κισσοῦ τε καὶ μυρσίνης ἔτι
 δ' ἐλαίας ἀνέπλεξαν στέφανον ἔκτυπον, πολυτελεῖς ἐνέντες λίθους·
 καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς δὲ τορείας διηλλαγμένως ἐπετέλεσαν, ἅπαντα φιλοτι-
 20 μηθέντες εἰς ὑπεροχὴν δόξης τοῦ βασιλέως ποιῆσαι. καθόλου γὰρ 80
 οὗτ' ἐν τοῖς βασιλικοῖς ὑπῆρχε ῥισκοφυλακίαις τοιαύτη κατασκευὴ
 τῇ πολυτελείᾳ καὶ τεχνουργίᾳ, οὗτ' ἐν τινι ἄλλῳ. πρόνοιαν γὰρ οὐ
 μικρὰν ἐποιεῖτο ὁ βυσιλεύς, φιλοδοξῶν εἰς τὰ καλῶς ἔχοντα.
 πολλάκις γὰρ τὸν δημόσιον χρηματισμὸν παρίει, τοῖς δὲ τεχνίταις 81
 25 παρήδρευεν ἐπιμελῶς, ἵνα καθηκόντως τῷ τόπῳ συντελέσωσιν, εἰς
 ὃν ἀπεστέλλετο τὰ τῶν ἔργων.¹ διὸ πάντα σεμνῶς ἐγεγόνει, καὶ ¶ Jos
 καταξίως τοῦ τε ἀποστέλλοντος βασιλέως καὶ τοῦ προστατοῦντος
 ἀρχιερέως τοῦ τόπου. καὶ γὰρ τὸ τῶν λίθων πλήθος ἀφθουον, καὶ 82

1 δη] δε TZ om BC 2 προσαχεν GI προσταχθεν Z 4 προσυνητ. B KAGIBTZ
 4, 5 προς την—τεθεντων om T^{txt} (ins^{mg}) Z 6 προτερον Z 13 προσ-
 βλεψεται Γ επιβλεψεται B 13, 14 θεσιν—ws αν τις om BTZ
 14 εστηκη Wend. 18 ενεντες BTZ 19 τορειας KA^{corr}] πορειας cett |
 διηλλαγμενας B 22 και τεχν.] της τεχνουργιας B 23 εποιει KAGI
 24 παρει TZ] παρει cett 25 επιτελεσωσιν B*

μεγάλοι τοῖς μεγέθεσιν, οὐκ ἔλαττον πεντακισχιλίων· καὶ ταῖς τέχναις
κρατιστεύοντα πάντα, ὥστε πενταπλασίως τοῦ χρυσοῦ τιμωτέραν
εἶναι τὴν τῶν λίθων δόσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν τεχνῶν ἐνέργειαν.

- 83 Ὑπολαμβάνων οὖν καὶ τούτων τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι,
δεδηλωκά σοι. τὰ δ' ἐξῆς περιέχει τὴν πρὸς τὸν Ἐλεάζαρον ὁδὸν 5
ἡμῖν γενομένην· τὴν δὲ θέσιν τῆς ὄλης χώρας πρῶτον δηλώσω.
Ὡς γὰρ παρεγενήθημεν ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους, ἐθεωροῦμεν τὴν πόλιν μέσσην
κειμένην τῆς ὄλης Ἰουδαίων ἐπ' ὄρους ὑψηλὴν ἔχοντος τὴν ἀνάτασιν.
84 ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κορυφῆς κατεσκεύαστο τὸ ἱερόν ἐκπρεπῶς ἔχον· καὶ οἱ 10
περίβολοι τρεῖς, ὑπὲρ ἑβδομήκοντα δὲ πῆχεις τῷ μεγέθει, καὶ τὸ
πλάτος ἀκόλουθον καὶ τὸ μῆκος τῆς κατὰ τὸν οἶκον διασκευῆς
ὑπῆρχε, μεγαλομοιρία καὶ χορηγία κατὰ πάντα ὑπερβαλλούση
85 διωκοδομημένων ἀπάντων. καὶ τοῦ θυρώματος δὲ καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸ 15
συνδέσμων κατὰ τὰς φλιάς καὶ τῆς τῶν ὑπερθύρων ἀσφαλείας
86 ἔκδηλος ἦν ἡ τῶν χρημάτων γεγυῖα ἀφειδῆς δαπάνη. τοῦ τε 15
καταπετάσματος ἢ διατύπωσης θυρώσει κατὰ πᾶν ὁμοιοτάτη ὑπῆρχε·
καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ὑποδρομὴν ἀδιάλειπτον κίνησει
λαμβάνουσης τῆς διυφῆς, διὰ τὸ ἀπ' ἐδάφους γινομένης τῆς ὑποδρο-
μῆς <κατατείνειν> τὴν κόλπωσιν μέχρι τῆς ἄνω διατάσεως, ἠδεῖάν 20
τινα καὶ δυσαπύλλακτον τὴν θεωρίαν ἔχοντος τοῦ πράγματος.
- 87 Ἡ τε τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κατασκευὴ <συμμέτρως ἔχουσαν> πρὸς τὸν 20
τόπον καὶ τὰ θύματα διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐξαναλούμενα τὴν διοικοδομὴν
εἶχε, τῆς δ' ἀναβάσεως τῆς πρὸς αὐτό, πρὸς τὴν εὐκοσμίαν ἔχοντος
τοῦ τόπου καθηκόντως τὸ κλίμα τῶν λειτουργούντων ἱερέων κεκα-

KAGIBTZ 1 μεγαλοῖς GI | ελαττων]+των KA 5 ημιν οδοῦ B 6 δηλωσον GIZ
-σαι K 7 ἐπι του τοπου BT¹ ἐπι του και τοπους GI et sic cett sed cum
lacuna post του et ὲ pro και posito, ἐπι του...ς (+τους LD) τοπους. Txt ex
papyris confirmatur 8 Ἰουδαιων KAGI] Ἰουδαιας cett | ψιλην K | ανα-
στασιν GI 9 ευπρεπως BT 12 υπερβαλλ. B] υπερβαλουση A^{cott} περι-
βαλουση cett 13 και ιο] κακ conj Schmidt 16 θυρωσι GI -σιν Z
17 αδιαληπτον KGIZ 18 απ] ἐπ B | γενομ. BTZ 19 κατα codd κατα-
τεινειν conj Schmidt 20 εχειν ex εχοντος T*^{vid} 21 om κατασκευη T*
(ins T¹) Z | συμμετρον εχουσα codd txt ex corr Mend. 24 λειτουργουντων
corr Mend.] λειτουργων (-γιων BT) των codd

λυμμένων μέχρι τῶν σφυρῶν ΒΥΣΣΙΝΟΙΣ ΧΙΤΩΣΙΝ. ⁵Ὁ δὲ οἶκος βλέ- 88 § Eus
 πει πρὸς ἔω, τὰ δ' ὀπίσθια αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἐσπέραν· τὸ δὲ πᾶν ἔδαφος
 λιθόστρωτον καθέστηκε καὶ κλίματα πρὸς τοὺς καθήκοντας τόπους
 ἔχει τῆς τῶν ὑδάτων ἐπιφορᾶς ἕνεκεν, ἣ γίνεται διὰ τὴν σμῆξιν τῶν
 5 ἀπὸ τῶν θυσιῶν αἱμάτων. πολλαὶ γὰρ μυριάδες κτηνῶν προσά-
 γονται κατὰ τὰς τῶν ἑορτῶν ἡμέρας. ὕδατος δὲ ἀνέκλειπτός ἐστι 89
 σύστασις, ὡς ἂν καὶ πηγῆς ἔσωθεν πολυρρύτου φυσικῶς ἐπιρρεούσης,
 ἔτι δὲ θαυμασίῶν καὶ ἀδιηγῆτων ὑποδοχείων ὑπαρχόντων ὑπὸ γῆν,
 καθὼς ἀπέφαινον πέντε σταδίων κυκλόθεν τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν κατα-
 10 βολῆς καὶ ἐκάστου τούτων σύριγγας ἀναρίθμους, καὶ ἕκαστον
 μέρος ἑαυτὰ συναπτόντων τῶν ρευμάτων· καὶ πάντα ταῦτα μεμο- 90
 λιβῶσθαι κατ' ἐδάφους καὶ τοῦ τοίχου· ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων κεχύσθαι
 πολὺ τι πλήθος κονιάσεως, ἐνεργῶς γεγενημένων ἀπάντων· [¶] εἶναι [¶] Eus
 δὲ πυκνὰ τὰ στόματα πρὸς τὴν βάσιν, ἀοράτως ἔχοντα τοῖς πᾶσι
 15 πλὴν αὐτοῖς οἷς ἐστὶν ἡ λειτουργία, ὡς ῥοπῆ καὶ νεύματι πάντα
 καθαρίζεσθαι τὰ συναγόμενα παμπληθῆ τῶν θυμάτων αἵματα.
 πεπεισμένος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν τῶν ὑποδοχείων κατασκευὴν δηλώσω 91
 καθὼς ἐπιστώθη. προήγαγον γὰρ πλέον σταδίων τεσσάρων ἐκ τῆς
 πόλεως· καὶ πρὸς τινα τόπον ἐκέλευσαν κατακύψαντα συνακοῦσαι
 20 τοῦ γινομένου ψόφου τῆς ἀπαντήσεως τῶν ὑδάτων· ὥστε συμφανές
 μοι γεγονέναι τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἀγγείων, καθὼς δεδήλωται.
 Τῶν δὲ ἱερέων ἡ λειτουργία κατὰ πᾶν ἀνυπέμβλητός ἐστι τῆ ῥώμη 92
 καὶ τῆ τῆς εὐκοσμίας καὶ σιγῆς διαθέσει. πάντες γὰρ αὐτοκελεύ-
 στως διαπονοῦσι πολλῆς γινομένης κακοπαθείας, καὶ ἐκάστῳ τὸ
 25 διατεταγμένον μέλει. καὶ ἀδιαλείπτως ὑπηρετοῦσιν, οἱ μὲν τὴν
 ξυλείαν, οἱ δὲ ἔλαιον, οἱ δὲ σεμίδαλιν, οἱ δὲ τὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων, ἕτεροι

1 Ex 36³⁵ (cf 28⁸⁹)

1 ἀποβλεπει Eus 2 ἠω Eus 4 ἐπιφορας] ἐπιρροης Eus 6 ἀν- KAGIBTZ
 ἐπιληπτος B txt Eus (-λιπ.ο) ΚΤ ἀνεκληπτος cett 9 ἐπεφαινον Eus
 10 ἐκαστου] ἐκ Eus 11 εαντας Ar codd Eus¹⁰ (-ταις Eus²¹) txt Schmidt |
 ταυτα παντα Eus | μεμολιβουσθαι Ar codd txt Eus¹⁰ B¹ 12 τους τοιχους
 Eus⁹ (των -ων Eus¹) | πολυ τι πληθ. κεχ. K 13 om τι Eus | κονιας εως
 Ar codd Eus⁹ | ενεργων Z 15 ριπη T^{corr} | ρευματι B 16 παμπληθει
 KAB^{corr} 17 πεπεισμενοις (-νωσ A) et αυτοις codd corr Schmidt 19 ἐκε-
 λευσαν B] ἐκέλευσε (-σεν GI) cett 25 μελλει GIBTZ 26 ετερος G

τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ὀλοκαυτοῦντες, ἰσχύι διαφερόντως συγχρώμενοι
 93 διαλαβόντες γὰρ ἀμφοτέραις τῶν μύσχων τὰ σκέλη, πλείον ὄντα
 ταλάντων δύο σχεδὸν ἐκάστου, ἀναρρίπτουσι ἐκατέραις θαυμασίως
 ὕψος ἰκανὸν καὶ οὐχ ἀμαρτάνουσι τῆς ἐπιθέσεως. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ
 τῶν προβάτων ἔτι δ' αἰγῶν τοῖς βάρεσι καὶ πιμελῇ θαυμασίως ἔχει. 5
 κατὰ πᾶν γὰρ ἐκλεγομένων οἷς ἐπιμελές ἐστὶν ἀμώμητα καὶ τῇ
 94 παχύτητι διαφέροντα, τὸ προειρημένον ἐπιτελεῖται. πρὸς δὲ τὴν
 ἀνάπασιν τόπος αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν ἀποτεταγμένος, οὗ καθίζουσιν οἱ
 διαναπαυόμενοι. τούτου δὲ γινομένου, τῶν διαλελοιπότην ἐγείρονται
 95 πρόθυμοι, οὐδενὸς ἐπιτάσσοντος τὰ τῆς λειτουργίας. ἢ τε πᾶσα 10
 σιγῇ καθέστηκεν, ὥστε ὑπολαμβάνειν, μὴθ' ἓνα ἄνθρωπον ἐν τῷ
 τόπῳ παρεῖναι, πρὸς τοὺς ἑπτακοσίους παρόντων τῶν λειτουργῶν—
 καὶ τῶν προσαγόντων δὲ τὰ θύματα πολὺ τι πλήθος—ἀλλὰ φόβῳ
 96 καὶ καταξίως μεγάλης θειότητος ἅπαντ' ἐπιτελεῖται. Μεγάλην
 δὲ ἔκπληξιν ἡμῖν παρέσχεν, ὡς ἔθεασάμεθα τὸν Ἑλεάζαρον ἐν τῇ 15
 λειτουργίᾳ, τὰ τε τοῦ στολισμοῦ καὶ τῆς δόξης, ἣ συνίσταται διὰ
 τὴν ἔνδυσιν οὗ φορεῖ ΧΙΤΩΝΟΣ καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν λίθων· χρυσοῖ
 γὰρ κώδωνες περὶ τὸν ΠΟΔΗΡΗ εἰσὶν αὐτοῦ, μέλους ἦχον ἀνιέντες
 ἰδιάζοντα· παρ' ἐκάτερον δὲ τούτων ἄνθεσι πεποικιλμένοι ῥοῖσκι, 20
 97 τῇ χροᾷ θαυμασίως ἔχοντες. κατέζωστο δὲ διαφόρῳ ζώνῃ δια- 20
 πρεπεῖ, διυφασμένη καλλίστοις χρώμασιν. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ στήθοϋς
 φορεῖ τὸ λεγόμενον ΛΟΓΙΟΝ, ἐν ᾧ συνεσφιγμένοι λίθοι δεκαδύο,
 διαλλάσσοντες τοῖς γένεσι, χρυσῷ κεκολλημένοι, τὰ τῶν φυλάρ-
 χων ὀνόματα κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς διάταξιν γενηθεῖσαν, ἀπαυγά-
 98 ζοντες ἕκαστος ἀνεξήγητον τῆς ιδιότητος τὴν φυσικὴν χροᾶν. ἐπὶ 25
 δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔχει τὴν λεγομένην κίδαριν, ἐπὶ δὲ ταύτης τὴν
 ἀμίμητον μίτραν, τὸ καθηγιασμένον βασιλείον ἐκτυποῦν ἐπὶ

17 ff Ex 28^{4,27-31}20 ib³⁵21 ff ib¹⁵⁻²³26 ff ib^{32ff}

KAGIBTZ 1 χρωμενοι A 2 πλειων BT 3 ταλ. δυο] ταλαντου B 4 υψος]
 pr eis BT | επιθεσ.] επιθυμιας Z (-εσεως sup ras in T) 5 προβ.] πραγμα-
 των Ζιχι (προβ. Z^mg) | βαρέσι codd 6 οἱς τι πιμελες εστιν B 8 om
 αυτοις BT 11 ωστε υπολαμβανειν conj Schmidt] ως τυπον λαμβανειν
 codd | εν] επι A 12 τας επτακοσιας Z 16 η] ης BTZ | συνιστατο KA
 19 τουτον K 21 διυφασμενοι K 27 εκτυπον GI (-πων Z)

πετάλω χργςω γράμμασιν ἀγίοις ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ, κατὰ μέσον τῶν
 ὀφρύων, δόξη πεπληρωμένον, ὁ κριθεὶς ἄξιος τούτων ἐν ταῖς λει-
 τουργίαις. ἡ δὲ συμφάνεια τούτων ἐμποιεῖ φόβον καὶ ταραχήν, 99
 ὥστε νομίζειν εἰς ἕτερον ἐλληλυθέναι ἐκτὸς τοῦ κόσμου· καὶ διαβε-
 5 βαιοῦμαι, πάντα ἄνθρωπον προσελθόντα τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῶν προειρη-
 μένων εἰς ἔκπληξιν ἤξειν καὶ θαυμασμὸν ἀδιήγητον, μετατραπέντα
 τῇ διανοίᾳ διὰ τὴν περὶ ἕκαστον ἀγίαν κατασκευήν. Πρὸς 100
 γὰρ τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν ἀπάντων ἐπὶ τὴν παρακειμένην ἄκραν τῆς πόλεως
 ἀναβάντες ἐθεωροῦμεν· ἡ κείμεναι μὲν ἐν ὑψηλοτάτῳ τόπῳ, πύργους
 10 ἐξησφαλισμένη πλείοσι, μέχρι κορυφῆς εὐμήκεσι λίθοις ἀνωκοδομη-
 μένων αὐτῶν, ὡς μεταλαμβάνομεν, πρὸς φυλακὴν τῶν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν
 τόπων· ἵνα, ἐὰν ἐπιθεσίς τις ἢ νεωτερισμὸς ἢ πολεμίων ἔφοδος 101
 γένηται, μηθεὶς δύνηται ὁδὸν εἰς τοὺς περιβόλους ποιήσασθαι τοὺς
 περὶ τὸν οἶκον· ἐπικειμένων καὶ ὄξυβελῶν ἐπὶ τῶν πύργων τῆς
 15 ἄκρας καὶ ὀργάνων ποικίλων, καὶ τοῦ τόπου κατὰ κορυφὴν ὄντος τῶν
 προειρημένων περιβόλων, ὡσανεὶ φυλασσομένων τῶν πύργων ὑπὸ 102
 τῶν πιστοτάτων ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῇ πατρίδι μεγάλας ἀποδείξεις δεδωκό-
 των· οἷτινες οὐκ εἶχον ἐξουσίαν ἐξιέναι τῆς ἄκρας, εἰ μὴ ταῖς
 ἑορταῖς, καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ μέρους, οὐδὲ εἰσοδεῦειν εἶων οὐδένα· μετὰ 103
 20 ἀκριβείας δὲ πολλῆς εἶχον, εἰ καὶ τις ἐπιταγὴ γένοιτο διὰ τοῦ
 προκαθηγουμένου πρὸς θεωρίαν¹ εἰσδέξασθαι τινας· οἶον καὶ καθ'
 ἡμᾶς ἐγεγόνει. μόλις γὰρ ἀνόπλους ὄντας ἡμᾶς δύο παρεδέξαντο
 πρὸς τὸ κατανοῆσαι τὰ τῶν θυσιῶν. ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ δι' ὄρκων πεπι- 104
 στῶσθαι τὸ τοιοῦτον· τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ὁμωμοκέσαι, κατ' ἀνάγκην
 25 <ἐπιτελουμένους> θείως τὸ κατὰ τὸν ὄρισμὸν πρᾶγμα, ὄντας πεντα-
 κοσίους μὴ παραδέξασθαι πλεῖον ἀνθρώπων πέντε κατὰ τὸ αὐτό·
 τοῦ γὰρ ἱεροῦ τὴν πᾶσαν εἶναι φυλακὴν τὴν ἄκραν· καὶ τὸν κατα-
 βαλλόμενον αὐτὴν τὴν προφυλακὴν τῶν εἰρημένων οὕτως ἡσφαλί-

1 κατα]+το BTZ

2 δοξης BT | post πεπληρ. fort excidit aliquid KAGIBTZ

3 εμφανεια IZ | ποιει B | φοβον] φημην Z 4 εισελ. A | διαβεβαιουται B

6 ηκειν BT | ανεκδιηγ. BT 11 ως μεταλαμβανωσι προφυλακης B

12 τις η η και νεωτ. BT (τις η και ν. Z) 13 δυναται B] δυναται cett

19 εις μερος BT εις μερους Z^{vid} 21 προκαθημενου B*T* txt B¹T¹ cett25 επιτελουμενου codd (τελουμενου Z^{mg}) | του B | ορκισμον conj Mend. |
πραγματος B

- 105 σθαι. Τῆς δὲ πόλεως ἔστι τὸ χύμα συμμετρως ἔχον, οἷον τεσσα-
 ράκοντα σταδίων ὄντος τοῦ περιβόλου, καθόσον εἰκάσαι δυνατόν.
 ἔχει δὲ τὴν τῶν πύργων θέσιν θεατροειδῆ, καὶ φαινομένων διόδων—
 τῶν ὑποκειμένων, τῶν δ' ἐπάνωθεν—<εἰθισμένως>, καὶ τὰς διὰ τούτων
 διεξόδους. ἀνάκλασιν γὰρ ἔχει τὰ τῶν τόπων, ὡς ἂν ἐπ' ὄρους τῆς 5
- 106 πόλεως ᾠκοδομημένης. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ διαβάθραι πρὸς τὰς διόδους. οἱ
 μὲν γὰρ μετέωροι τὴν ὀδείαν, οἱ δ' ὑπ' αὐτὰς ποιοῦνται, καὶ μάλιστα
 διεστηκότες τῆς ὀδείας, διὰ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγνείαις ὄντας, ὅπως μηδενὸς
- 107 θιγγάνωσιν ὧν οὐ δέον ἐστίν. Οὐκ ἀλόγως δὲ τὴν πόλιν
 § P συμμετρία καθηκούση κατεσκευάσαν οἱ πρῶτοι, σοφῶς δὲ ἕπινοή- 10
 § II σαντες. τῆς γὰρ χώρας πολλῆς οὔσης καὶ καλῆς, καὶ τινων ἕμὲν
 πεδινῶν, τῶν κατὰ τὴν Σαμαρείτιν λεγομένην, καὶ τῶν συναπτόντων
 τῇ τῶν Ἰδουμαίων χώρα, τινῶν δὲ ὄρεινῶν, τῶν <συναπτόντων
 τῇ τῶν Ἰουδαίων χώρα, χρη> πρὸς τὴν γεωργίαν καὶ τὴν ἐπιμέ-
 λειαν τῆς γῆς γίνεσθαι συνεχῶς, ἵνα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὗτοι τὴν εὐ- 15
 καρπίαν ἔχωσιν· οὐ καὶ γινομένου γεωργεῖται <πάντα μετὰ> δαψιλείας
- 108 πολλῆς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ προειρημένην χώρα. τῶν δὲ πόλεων ὅσαι
 μέγεθος ἔχουσι καὶ τὴν ἀκόλουθον εὐδαιμονίαν, ταύταις συμ-
 βέβηκεν εὐανδρεῖν, ἀμελεῖσθαι δὲ τῆς χώρας, πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ κατὰ
 ψυχὴν ἰλαροῦσθαι νενεκούτων, καὶ τῇ κατασκευῇ πάντας ἀνθρώπους 20
- 109 ἐπὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς εὐκαταφόρους εἶναι. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο περὶ τὴν
 Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ὑπερβάλλουσαν πάσας τῷ μεγέθει καὶ εὐδαιμονίᾳ
 τὰς πόλεις. οἱ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας εἰς αὐτὴν ἀποξενούμενοι κατα-
- 110 μένοντες ἐφ' ἱκανὸν εἰς ἐλάττωσιν ἦγον τὰ τῆς ἐργασίας. ὅθεν ὁ
 βασιλεὺς, ἵνα μὴ καταμένωσι, προσέταξε μὴ πλέον εἴκοσιν ἡμερῶν 25
 παρεπιδημεῖν· καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν χρεῶν ὁμοίως δι' ἐγγράπτων
 διαστολὰς ἔδωκεν, ἐὰν ἀναγκαῖον ἦ κατακαλέσαι, διακρίνειν ἐν
- 111 ἡμέραις πέντε. πρὸ πολλοῦ δὲ ποιούμενος καὶ χρηματιστὰς καὶ

HKAGIBP
 TZ

1 χυμα] σχημα B 2 οντος] εντος Z 4 ειθισμενως conj Redpath
 (usitato more theatri)] ηθισμενων KGIT*^{vid}Z ειθισμενων cett 5 εξοδους B
 8 διεστηκοτας KGITZ (-κυια edd) | της] τας K | μηδενι BZ 11 πεδινων
 μεν P 12 λεγομενων codd omn 13, 14 των—γεωργιαν] τω προς τη
 γεωργια B των πρ. την γεωργιαν cett verba ex conj addidi 15 om
 και P 16 παντα μετα Mend.] μεν παντα codd 19 ευανδρειν] ευ
 (sequente lacuna) B 20 και] και τω vel δια το conj Schmidt 22 υπερ-
 βαλλουσα HA*GIT*Z 23 επιξενουμενοι BP

τοὺς τούτων ὑπηρέτας ἐπέταξε κατὰ νομούς, ὅπως μὴ πορισμὸν
 λαμβάνοντες οἱ γεωργοὶ καὶ προστάται τῆς πόλεως ἐλαττώσι τὰ
 ταμεία, λέγω δὲ τὰ τῆς γεωργίας πρόσφορα. Παρεξέβημεν 112
 δὲ ταῦτα διὰ τὸ καλῶς ἡμῖν τὸν Ἐλεάζαρον ὑποδεδεχέναι τὰ
 5 προειρημένα. μεγάλη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν γεωργουμένων φιλοπονία.
 καὶ γὰρ ἐλαϊκοῖς πλήθεσι σύνδενδρός ἐστι καὶ σιτικοῖς καρποῖς
 αὐτῶν ἡ χώρα καὶ ὄσπριοις, ἔτι δὲ ἀμπέλῳ καὶ μέλιτι πολλῶ. τὰ
 μὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἀκροδρύων καὶ φοινίκων οὐδ' ἀριθμείται παρ' αὐτοῖς.
 κτήνη τε πολλὰ παμμυγῆ, καὶ δαψιλῆς ἡ τούτων νομή· διὸ καλῶς 113
 10 ἔβλεψαν, ὅτι πολυανθρωπίας οἱ τόποι προσδέονται, καὶ τὴν κατα-
 σκευὴν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν κωμῶν ἔθεντο κατὰ λόγον. πολὺ δὲ 114
 114 πλήθος καὶ τῶν ἀρωμάτων καὶ λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ χρυσοῦ παρα-
 κομίζεται διὰ τῶν Ἀράβων εἰς τὸν τόπον. ἐργάσιμος γὰρ καὶ πρὸς
 τὴν ἐμπορίαν ἐστὶ κατεσκευασμένη ἡ χώρα, καὶ πολύτεχνος ἡ πόλις,
 15 οὐ σπανίζει δὲ οὐδὲν τῶν διακομιζομένων διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης. ἔχει 115
 γὰρ καὶ λιμένας εὐκαίρους χορηγοῦντας, τὸν τε κατὰ τὴν Ἀσκαλῶνα
 καὶ Ἰόππην καὶ Γάζαν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Πτολεμαίδα τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ
 βασιλέως ἐκτισμένην. μέση δὲ κεῖται πρὸς τοὺς προειρημένους
 τόπους, οὐκ ἀπέχουσα τούτων πολὺ. ἔχει δὲ πάντα δαψιλῆ κάθυγρος
 20 οὔσα πάντοθεν ἡ χώρα καὶ μεγάλην ἀσφάλειαν ἔχουσα. περιρρεῖ 116
 δ' αὐτὴν ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰορδάνης ποταμὸς αἰέρρους. <τῆς δὲ χώρας>
 οὐκ ἐλαττον ἐξακισχιλίων μυριάδων ἀρουρῶν κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον οὔσης
 (μετέπειτα δὲ οἱ γειτνιῶντες ἐπέβησαν αὐτῆς) ἐξήκοντα μυριάδες
 ἀνδρῶν ἔγκληροι καθεισθήκεισαν ἑκατοντάρουροι. πληρούμενος δὲ
 25 ὁ ποταμὸς, καθὼς ὁ Νεῖλος, ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τὸν θερισμὸν ἡμέραις,
 πολλὴν ἀρδεύει τῆς γῆς· ὃς εἰς ἕτερον ποταμὸν ἐκβάλλει τὸ ρεῦμα 117
 κατὰ τὴν Πτολεμαίων χώραν, οὗτος δὲ ἔξεισιν εἰς θάλασσαν.

23 εἴηκ. μυρ. cf Ex 39³ LXX (12³⁷ Num 11²¹)25 cf Jos 3¹⁵

6 ε λαικοις (sic) H εν λαικ. GIT ευλαικ. B εν ελαικ. KAPZ 7 om HKAGIBP
 αυτων BPTZ 9 τε] τα HAGIZ 10 προσδεονται BPTZ] δεονται cett
 14 εστι η χ. κατεσκ. (κατασκ. T*) BPTZ | πολισ] +εστιν P 16 τον B]
 των cett τα edd 17 om του P 18 εκτισμενην] κατεσκευασμενην P |
 ειρημ. BT 19 καθυγρατος GIPZ pr και P 21 verba inserui 23 υπε-
 βησαν P (cod Mon) απεβ. edd pr | μυριαδων T 24 εκατονταρουροις codd
 txt ex papyrus corr Mahaffy 26 πολυν B | εμβαλλει GBPZ 27—2 p 540
 ουτος δε—Αζ. χωραν om A

ἄλλοι δὲ χειμάρροι λεγόμενοι κατίασι, περιλαμβάνοντες τὰ πρὸς
 118 τὴν Γάζαν μέρη καὶ τὴν Ἀζωτίων χώραν. περιέχεται δὲ ἀσφαλείαις
 αὐτοφυεσί, δυσείσβολος οὔσα καὶ πλήθесιν ἀπραγμάτευτος, διὰ τὸ
 στενὰς εἶναι τὰς παρόδους, κρημνῶν παρακειμένων καὶ φαράγγων
 119 βάθων, ἔτι δὲ τραχείας οὔσης πάσης τῆς περιεχούσης πᾶσαν τὴν
 τῆς Ἀραβίας μέταλλα χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου συνίστασθαι πρότε-
 ρον. ἐκλείπεται δὲ ταῦτα, καθ' ὃν ἐπεκράτησαν Πέρσαι χρόνον,
 τῶν τότε προστατούντων ποιησαμένων διαβολήν, ὡς ἄχρηστος ἢ
 120 κατεργασία γίνεται καὶ πολυδάπανος, ὅπως μὴ διὰ τὴν μεταλ-
 λείαν τῶν εἰρημένων συμβῆ καὶ τὴν χώραν καταφθείρεσθαι, καὶ
 σχεδὸν διὰ τὴν ἐκείνων δυναστείαν ἀλλοτριωθῆναι, παρεύρεσιν
 λαβόντων εἰς τοὺς τόπους εἰσόδου, διὰ τὸ τὴν διαβολὴν γεγενέαι
 ταύτην.

Ὅσον οὖν καὶ περὶ τούτων ἔδει, κεφαλαιωδῶς σεσήμαγκά σοι, 15
 ὦ Φιλόκρατες ἀδελφέ· τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐπομένως δηλώσωμεν.
 121 Ἐπιλέξας γὰρ τοὺς ἀρίστους ἄνδρας καὶ παιδείᾳ διαφέροντας, ἅτε δὴ
 γονέων τετευχότας ἐνδόξων, οὔτινες οὐ μόνον τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν
 γραμμάτων ἕξι περιεποίησαν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν
 122 ἐφρόντισαν οὐ παρέργως κατασκευῆς· διὸ καὶ πρὸς τὰς πρεσβείας 20
 εὐθετοὶ καθεστήκεισαν, καὶ τοῦτ' ἐπετέλουν ὅτε δέοι, καὶ πρὸς τὰς
 ὀμιλίας καὶ τὰς ἐπερωτήσεις τὰς διὰ τοῦ νόμου μεγάλην εὐφύιαν
 εἶχον, τὸ μέσον ἐξηλωκότες κατάστημα (τοῦτο γὰρ κάλλιστόν ἐστιν),
 ἀποθεθειμένοι τὸ τραχὺ καὶ βάρβαρον τῆς διανοίας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ
 τὸ κατοίεσθαι καὶ νομίζειν ὑπερφρονεῖν ἑτέρους ὑπερβεβηκότες, τὴν 25
 δ' ὀμιλίαν καὶ τὸ συνακούειν καὶ πρὸς ἕκαστον ἀποκρίνεσθαι δεόντως
 παραδεδεγμένοι, καὶ πάντες ταῦτα συντηροῦντες καὶ μᾶλλον ἐν
 τούτοις βουλόμενοι ὑπερφέρειν ἕτερος ἑτέρου, καὶ τοῦ καθηγουμένου

HKAGIBP
TZ

2 ασφαλес ΗΚΑΓΙ ασφαλως BPTZ txt ex conj Schmidt 5 βραχειας
 I 7 μεταλα GP μετα I 8 Περσαι] pr οι I 11 προειρημενων G
 15 om κεφαλ. P | σεσημακαμεν Z 16 δηλωσωμεν GIPZ 17 γαρ] ουν
 ΗΚΑ 18 τετευχοτως Pvid 19 εαυτοις BT 21 απετελουν B
 22 δια] εκ B 27 παραδεδεγμενοι BPTZ] παραδεδειγμενοι cett 28 υπο-
 φερειν KA | ετερου] ετερω PΓ*vid

πάντες ἄξιοι καὶ τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν ἀρετῆς. νοῆσαι δ' ἦν, ὡς ἠγάπησαν 123
 τὸν Ἐλεάζαρον δυσάποσπαστως ἔχοντες, καὶ ἐκείνος αὐτούς· χωρὶς
 καὶ τοῦ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα γεγραφέναι περὶ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως
 αὐτῶν πολλὰ παρεκάλεσε τὸν Ἀνδρέαν ποιῆσαι, συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι
 5 παρακαλῶν, καθ' ὃν ἂν δυνώμεθα. καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπαγγελιομένων <εὔφρον- 124
 τίσειν> περὶ τούτων, ἔφη καὶ λίαν διαγωνιᾶν· εἰδέναι γάρ, ὅτι
 φιλάγαθος ὢν ὁ βασιλεὺς πάντων μέγιστον ἠγείται τὸ μεταπέμ-
 πεσθαι, καθ' ὃν ἂν τόπον ὀνομασθῆ τις ἄνθρωπος διαφέρων ἀγωγῆ
 καὶ φρονήσει παρ' ἑτέρους. μετείληφα γὰρ καλῶς αὐτὸν λέγειν, ὅτι 125
 10 περὶ ἑαυτὸν ἔχων ἄνδρας δικαίους καὶ σῶφρονας τὴν μεγίστην ἂν
 φυλακὴν τῆς βασιλείας ἔξειν, συμβουλευόντων παρρησία πρὸς τὸ
 συμφέρον τῶν φίλων· ὁ δὲ σύνεστι τοῖς ἀποστελλομένοις ὑπ'
 αὐτοῦ. καὶ δι' ὄρκων ἐπιστοῦτο, μὴ προῖεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, εἰ 126
 15 τισ ἐτέρα χρεῖα πρὸς τὰ κατ' ἰδίαν αὐτῷ κατεπίγοι, πρὸς δὲ τὴν
 127
 γὰρ καλῶς ζῆν ἐν τῷ τὰ νόμιμα συντηρεῖν εἶναι· τοῦτο δὲ ἐπιτε-
 λείσθαι διὰ τῆς ἀκροάσεως πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἢ διὰ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως.
 προτιθέμενος οὖν ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τούτοις παραπλήσια φανερὸς ἦν τὴν
 διάθεσιν, ὅς ἦν πρὸς αὐτούς.

20 ³ Ἄξιον δὲ ἐπιμνησθῆναι <διὰ> βραχέων τῶν ὑποδειχθέντων ὑπ' 128 § Eus
 αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὰ δι' ἡμῶν ἐπιζητηθέντα. νομίζω γὰρ τοὺς πολλοὺς
 περιεργίαν ἔχειν τινὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ νομοθεσίᾳ περὶ τε τῶν βρωτῶν καὶ
 ποτῶν καὶ τῶν νομιζομένων ἀκαθάρτων εἶναι κνωδάλων. πυνθανομένων 129

20 ff Lev II. Deut 14³⁻¹⁹

2 δυσάποσπ.] + αὐτον B | εκεινος] + δηλονοτι ηγαπησεν B | αὐτους] + ος B HKAGIBP
 αὐτος sine puncto sequente Wend. 3 om και P | γεγραπται I 4 τον T'Z Eus
 ἀνδρα B 5 ευ φροντ. Wend.] αφροντισειν codd 6 τουτου P 7 φι-
 λανος BT 9 αυτον καλως BTZ 10 αυτον BT | εχων] + ο Πτολεμαιος B
 11 εξει B 12 συνεστη Z 14 om ιδιαν B (in fin lin fort evanuit) | αυτων
 BT 18 φανερωσ P 20 δια βραχεων ap Eus conj Vigerus] βραχεων
 codd et Eus (bis scr Eus^o) | επιδειχθεντων Eusⁱ 21 προς ημων επι-
 ζητηθεντα HKA προς δι ημων επιζητ. GIZ* προς δε ημων επιζητηθεντων
 BPTZ^{corr} txt Eus | νομιζειν γαρ τοις πολλοις Ar codd (B excepto) Eus
 txt B 22 τινα εχειν BPT | περι] pr λεγω δε Eus | των 2^o) om Eus |
 βρωματων GIBPTZ txt cett Eus 23 om και BPTZ

- γὰρ ἡμῶν, διὰ τί, μιᾶς καταβολῆς οὔσης, τὰ μὲν ἀκάθαρτα νομίζεται
 πρὸς βρώσιν, τὰ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀφῆν (δυσιδαιμόνως γὰρ τὰ
 πλείστα τὴν νομοθεσίαν ἔχειν, ἐν δὲ τούτοις πάντῃ δυσιδαιμόνως)
 130 πρὸς ταῦτα οὕτως ἐνῆρξάτο Θωερῆς, ἔφη, τὰς ἀναστροφὰς
 καὶ τὰς ὀμιλίαις, οἷον ἐνεργάζονται πρᾶγμα, διότι κακοῖς ὀμιλήσαντες 5
 διαστροφὰς ἐπιλαμβάνουσιν ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ταλαίπωροι δι' ὄλου τοῦ
 ζῆν εἰσιν· ἐὰν δὲ σοφοῖς καὶ φρονίμοις συζῶσιν, ἐξ ἀγνοίας ἐπανορ-
 131 θώσεως εἰς τὸν βίον ἔτυχον. διαστειλάμενος οὖν τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας
 καὶ δικαιοσύνης πρῶτον ὁ νομοθέτης ἡμῶν, καὶ διδάξας ἕκαστα περὶ
 τούτων, οὐκ ἀπαγορευτικῶς μόνον ἀλλ' ἐνδεικτικῶς, καὶ τὰς βλάβας 10
 προδῆλους καὶ τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γινομένας ἐπιπομπὰς τοῖς αἰτίοις—
 132 προὔπειδειξε γὰρ πάντων πρῶτον, ὅτι μόνος ὁ θεὸς ἐστὶ, καὶ διὰ
 πάντων ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται, πεπληρωμένου παντὸς
 τόπου τῆς δυναστείας, καὶ οὐθὲν αὐτὸν λανθάνει τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς γινο-
 μένων ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων κρυφίως, ἀλλ' ὅσα ποιεῖ τις αὐτῷ φανερὰ 15
 133 καθέστηκε, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι— ταῦτ' οὖν ἐξεργαζόμενος
 ἀκριβῶς καὶ πρόδηλα θεὸς ἔδειξεν ὅτι, κὰν ἐννοηθῆ τις κακίαν
 ἐπιτελεῖν, οὐκ ἂν λάθοι, μὴ ὅτι καὶ πράξας, διὰ πάσης τῆς νομο-
 134 θεσίας τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δυνατὸν ἐνδεικνύμενος. ποιησάμενος οὖν τὴν
 καταρχὴν ταύτην, καὶ δείξας ὅτι πάντες οἱ λοιποὶ παρ' ἡμᾶς 20
 ἄνθρωποι πολλοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι νομίζουσιν, αὐτοὶ δυναμικώτεροι
 135 πολλῶ καθεστῶτες ὧν σέβονται ματαίως— ἀγάλματα γὰρ ποιήσαντες
 ἐκ λίθων καὶ ξύλων, εἰκόνας φασὶν εἶναι τῶν ἐξευρόντων τι πρὸς τὸ
 ζῆν αὐτοῖς χρήσιμον, οἷς προσκυνοῦσι, παρὰ πόδας ἔχοντες τὴν ἀναι-
 136 σθησίαν. εἴ τι γὰρ κατ' ἐκεῖνό τις <θεὸς εἶη>, κατὰ τὴν ἐξέυρεσιν, 25

HKAGIBP
 TZ Eus

3 τῆς νομοθεσίας B | πανυ] πασι B παλιν πανυ HKA παλιν cett Eus
 5 εργαζονται AIBP Eus^{codd det} 6 δια του ζην Eusⁱ δι ολου την ζωην Eus^o
 8 ενευχον BT | ουν Eus] δε εστι B om cett 9 πρωτον ο νομ. Eus.] ο
 πρωτονομοθετης Ar codd 10 ενδικως Ar codd txt Eus 11 προδηλως I
 ?προδηλωσας | υπο] επι P Eus^{codd} | om του P Eus | γενομ. P Eus^{codd} (γιγν.
 Eusⁱ) 12 πρωτον παντων Eus P | om ο BPTZ | η δυν. αυτ. δια παντ.
 Eus^o 13 δυναμις] + εστιν GIZ | παντος] pr του B 14 ουδεν B | των
 επιγινομενων (-νωμ. Z) PT*Z (γης suprascr T¹) 15 υπ] υπο των B | κρυ-
 φεως GI κρυφαιως Eusⁱ 16 εργαζομενος B εξεργασαμενος Eus^o 17 προ-
 δηλωθεις HKA 18 λανθανοι B λαθη P | δια πασης] δι ολης Eusⁱ εξ ολης
 Eus^o 22 πολλω Eus P] πολλων Ar codd cett 23 και] η Eus 25 ει
 τι HKAG^{vid} I] ειτε cett Eus | θεος ειη ex conj] θειη codd Eus θεωθειη conj
 Wend.

παντελῶς ἀνόητον· τῶν γὰρ ἐν τῇ κτίσει λαβόντες τινὰ συνέθηκαν
καὶ προσυπέδειξαν εὐχρηστοῖς, τὴν κατασκευὴν αὐτῶν οὐ ποιήσαντες
αὐτοί· διὸ κενὸν καὶ μάταιον τοὺς ὁμοίους ἀποθεοῦν. καὶ γὰρ ἔτι 137
καὶ νῦν εὐρεματικώτεροι καὶ πολυμαθέστεροι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν πρὶν
5 εἰσι πολλοί, καὶ οὐκ ἂν φθάνοιεν αὐτοὺς προσκυνοῦντες. καὶ νομί-
ζουσιν οἱ ταῦτα διαπλάσαντες καὶ μυθοποιήσαντες τῶν Ἑλλήνων
οἱ σοφώτατοι καθεστάναι. τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων πολυματαίων τί δεῖ καὶ 138
λέγειν, Αἰγυπτίων τε καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων, οἵτινες ἐπὶ θηρία καὶ
τῶν ἔρπετων τὰ πλείστα καὶ κνωδάλων τὴν ἀπέρισιν πεποιήνται,
10 καὶ ταῦτα προσκυνοῦσι, καὶ θύουσι τούτοις καὶ ζῶσι καὶ τελευ-
τήσασι;— συνθεωρήσας οὖν ἕκαστα σοφὸς ὢν ὁ νομοθέτης, 139
ὑπὸ θεοῦ κατεσκευασμένος εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῶν ἀπάντων, περιέφραξεν
ἡμᾶς ἀδιακόποις χάραξι καὶ σιδηροῖς τείχεσιν, ὅπως μηθενὶ τῶν
ἄλλων ἔθνων ἐπιμισγόμεθα κατὰ μηδέν, ἀγνοὶ καθεστῶτες κατὰ σῶμα
15 καὶ κατὰ ψυχὴν, ἀπολελυμένοι ματαίων δοξῶν, τὸν μόνον θεὸν καὶ
δυνατὸν σεβόμενοι παρ' ὅλην τὴν πᾶσαν κτίσιν. ὅθεν οἱ Αἰγυπτίων 140
καθηγεμόνες ἱερεῖς, ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς πολλὰ καὶ μετεσχηκότες
πραγμάτων, ἀνθρώπους θεοῦ προσονομάζουσιν ἡμᾶς· ὁ τοῖς λοιποῖς
οὐ πρόσεστιν, εἰ μὴ τις σέβεται τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν θεόν, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν
20 ἀνθρώποι βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ σκέπης· ἡ γὰρ πᾶσα διάθεσις 141
αὐτῶν ἐπὶ ταῦτα καταφεύγει. τοῖς δὲ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐν οὐδενὶ ταῦτα λε-
λόγισται, περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυναστείας δι' ὅλου τοῦ ζῆν ἡ σκέψις
αὐτοῖς ἐστίν. ὅπως οὖν μηθενὶ συναλισγοῦμενοι μηδ' ὁμιλοῦν- 142
τες φαύλοις διαστροφὰς λαμβάνωμεν, πάντοθεν ἡμᾶς περιέφραξεν
25 ἀγνεῖαις καὶ διὰ βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ ἀφῶν καὶ ἀκοῆς καὶ ὀράσεως

1 ἀνοητον Eus] ἀνοητοι codd 2 εὐχρηστοτατην (+την Eus^o) κατ. Eus HKAGIBP
3 om αυτοι P 4 ευρημ. AB ευρετικωτεροι Eus 5 φθανοιεν Eus] φθα- TZ Eus
σειαν B (-σοιαν T) φθανοισαν cett 7 των]+μεν Eus | δει] δη HAGI
9 κνωδ.] pr επι Eusⁱ | απερ εισι PT*Z 11 ουν] τοιγαρον Eusⁱ | om
εκαστα P | ο νομ. υπο θ. σοφ. ων P 12 κατεσκευασμενα H (a 3^o sup lin)
Eus^{codd} det 13 μηδενι Eus Z μηθεν HKAGI 14 και σωμα και ψυχην
Eus^o 15 απολελυμενοι Eus P] -μενων cett 16 πασαν την κτ. P | Αι-
γυπτιων οι Eus 18 εις πραγματα I 19 τισ] τι HA (s postea suprascr
H*vidA*vid) KGI 21 ημιν BTZ Eus^o 22 om δε HAGI | om της του
Eusⁱ 23 αυτων B* | ουν Eus] τε εν B εν cett | μηδενι BP Eus | συνα-
λισγομ. T Eus ex quo συμμισγομ. Wend. 24 φαυλω Eus^o γαμοις P |
λαμβανοιμεν Eus | περιεφραξαν Eus^o 25 αφης Eus^o

- 143 νομικῶς. τὸ γὰρ καθόλου πάντα πρὸς τὸν φυσικὸν λόγον ὁμοία
καθέστηκεν, ὑπὸ μιᾶς δυνάμεως οἰκονομούμενα, καὶ καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον
ἔχει λόγον βαθύν, ἀφ' ὧν ἀπεχόμεθα κατὰ τὴν χρῆσιν, καὶ οἷς
συγχρώμεθα. χάριν δὲ ὑποδείγματος ἐν ἧ δεύτερον ἐπιδραμῶν σοι
144 σημαίνῃ. Μὴ γὰρ εἰς τὸν καταπεπτωκότα λόγον ἔλθῃς, ὅτι μῶν 5
καὶ γαλλῆς ἢ τῶν τοιούτων χάριν περιεργίαν ποιούμενος ἐνομοθέτει
ταῦτα Μωϋσῆς· ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀγνὴν ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ τρόπων ἐξαρτισμὸν
145 δικαιοσύνης ἔνεκεν σεμνῶς πάντα ἀνατέτακται. τῶν γὰρ πτηνῶν,
οἷς χρώμεθα, πάντα ἡμέρα καθέστηκε καὶ διαφέρει καθαριότητι,
πυροῖς καὶ ὄσπριόις χρώμενα πρὸς τὴν τροφήν, οἷον περιστερὰ 10
τρυγόνες ἀττακοὶ πέρδικες ἔτι δὲ χῆνες καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα τοιαῦτα.
146 περὶ ὧν δὲ ἀπηγόρευται πτηνῶν, εὐρήσεις ἄγριά τε καὶ σαρκοφάγα
καὶ καταδυναστεύοντα τῇ περὶ ἑαυτὰ δυνάμει τὰ λοιπά, καὶ τὴν
τροφήν ἔχοντα δαπάνησιν τῶν προειρημένων ἡμέρων μετὰ ἀδικίας·
οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄρνας καὶ ἐρίφους ἀναρπάζουσι, 15
147 καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δὲ ἀδικοῦσι νεκροῦς τε καὶ ζῶντας. παράσημον
οὖν ἔθετο διὰ τούτων, ἀκάθαρτα προσονομάσας, ὅτι δέον ἐστὶ κατὰ
ψυχὴν, οἷς ἢ νομοθεσία διατέτακται, δικαιοσύνη συγχρηθῆναι καὶ
μηδένα καταδυναστεύειν, πεποιθότας ἰσχύϊ τῇ καθ' ἑαυτοῦς, μηδὲ
ἀφαιρεῖσθαι μηδέν, ἀλλ' ἐκ δικαίου τὰ τοῦ βίου κυβερνᾶν, ὡς τὰ 20
τῶν προειρημένων πτηνῶν ἡμέρα ζῶα τὰ φνόμενα τῶν ὄσπριων ἐπὶ
γῆς δαπανᾷ, καὶ οὐ καταδυναστεύει πρὸς τὴν ἐπαναίρεσιν τῶν συγ-
148 γενικῶν. διὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὖν παραδέδωκεν ὁ νομοθέτης σημειοῦ-

5 f Lev 11²⁹11 Lev 11²²17 Deut 14¹⁸HKAGIBP
TZ Eus

1 νομικῆς G Eus^o -κοις P | το] τω T Eus¹ 2 δυνάμεως] + οἰκονομικῶς
P | ἕκαστα Eus^o 3 λόγον εχει BT | απεσχομεθα ΚΑΙ 5 εισελθῆς
Eus¹ (ελθῆς^o) 6 περιεργιας Eus περιεργασιαν Z 7 Μωσῆς AP Eus |
τροπων] + εξααιρετον Eus^o 8 παντα] ταυτα BPTZ | πετεινων Eus
9 καθεστηκε και Eus] καθεστηκεν a B καθεστηκε cett | καθαροτητι HKBPTZ
10 χρωμεθα K | om την K Eus^o 11 ατταγοι Eus¹ | om ετι K 12 πε-
τεινων Eus 13 περι] παρ K | αυτα Eus εαυτων GI | τα πολλα Z* (τα λ.
Z^{corr}) των λοιπων B 14 δαπανησιν] pr την Eus 15 αρπαζουσι Eus
17 δεον] δε Eus¹ 19 μηδενι IB μηδενος T | πεποιθοτας Eus] -θοσιν B
-θοτες (-θωτ. P) cett | τη εαυτων Eus^o 20 μηθεν Eus^o | εκ δικαιοτατου
βιου Eus | διακυβερναν Eus^o 21 ζωα ημερα B 22 επαναιρεσιν] + ουτε
των υποβεβηκοτων ουτε Eus¹ (om 20 ως τα—22 συγγεν. Eus^o) 23 των
τοιουτ.] τουτων Eus^o | παρεδωκεν Eus P | ομοιουσθαι BT

σθαι τοῖς συνετοῖς, εἶναι δικαίους τε καὶ μηδὲν ἐπιτελεῖν βία, μηδὲ
 τῇ περὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἰσχύι πεποιθότας ἐτέρους καταδυναστεύειν. ὅπου 149
 γὰρ οὐδ' ἄψασθαι καθῆκε τῶν προειρημένων διὰ τὴν περὶ ἕκαστα διά-
 θεσιν, πῶς οὐ φυλακτέον παντάπασι τοὺς τρόπους εἰς τοῦτο κατακλα-
 5 σθῆναι; πάντα οὖν τὰ τῆς συγχωρήσεως ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τούτων καὶ τῶν 150
 κτηνῶν τροπολογῶν ἐκτέθειται. τὸ γὰρ ΔΙΧΗΛΕΪΕΙΝ καὶ διαστέλλειν
 ὀπλῆς ὄνυχας σημεῖόν ἐστι τοῦ διαστέλλειν ἕκαστα τῶν πράξεων
 ἐπὶ τὸ καλῶς ἔχον· ἢ γὰρ ἰσχύς τῶν ὄλων σωμάτων μετ' ἐνεργείας 151
 ἀπέρεισιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὤμους ἔχει καὶ τὰ σκέλη. μετὰ διαστολῆς οὖν
 10 ἅπαντα ἐπιτελεῖν πρὸς δικαιοσύνην ἀναγκάζει †τὸ σημειοῦσθαι† διὰ
 τούτων· ἔτι δὲ καὶ διότι παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους διεστάλμεθα. οἱ 152
 γὰρ πλείονες τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων ἑαυτοὺς μολύνουσιν ἐπιμισγό-
 μενοι, συντελοῦντες μεγάλην ἀδικίαν, καὶ χῶραι καὶ πόλεις ὄλαι
 15 σεμνύνονται ἐπὶ τούτοις. οὐ μόνον γὰρ <προάγουσι> τοὺς ἄρσειας,
 ἀλλὰ καὶ τεκούσας ἔτι δὲ θυγατέρας μολύνουσιν. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀπὸ
 τούτων διεστάλμεθα. περὶ ὃν δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ προειρημένος τῆς δια- 153
 στολῆς τρόπος, περὶ τοῦτον εἶναι καὶ τὸν τῆς μνήμης κεχαρκτη-
 ρικεν. Πάντα γὰρ ὅσα ΔΙΧΗΛΕΪ καὶ ΜΗΡΓΚΙΣΜὸν ἐνάγει σαφῶς
 τοῖς νοοῦσιν ἐκτίθεται τὸ τῆς μνήμης. ἢ γὰρ ἀναμνηρύξεις οὐθὲν 154
 20 ἕτερον, ἀλλὰ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ συστάσεως ἐπίμνησις. τὸ γὰρ ζῆν διὰ

6 Lev 11³ ff (Deut 14⁶ ff)18 Lev 11³ ff

1 om τε P Eus^o vid 2 αυτους Eus | ετερων BT 4 ου] ουν KAIG^{txt} HKAGIBP
 (corr G^{mg}) 5 παντα ουν Eus] παντων (+δε B) Ar codd | τα Eus] om Ar
 codd | της συγχ. Eusⁱ Ar codd] τα συγχωρηθεντα Eus^o | ημιν] om Eus^o
 ημων ενεκα B txt Eusⁱ Ar cett 6 εκθεθειται Eusⁱ εξεθετο B εκθειται (-τε
 GI) Ar codd cett εκθετικε Eus^o | διχηλιζειν K 7 οπλας B | σημεια B |
 εκαστην P 10 το σημειουσθαι HKAGIZ (το σημ. και Eusⁱ) το ομοιουσθαι
 T (τω ομ. B) τω σημ. Eus^o, pro απαντα 10—μολυνουσιν 12 exhibens βιωσκο-
 μεν' τω σημειουσθαι οτι παρα παντας ανθρωπους διαστελλομεθα· οι γαρ αλλοι
 υολυνουσιν εαυτους. Fortasse legendum ο σημειουται 12 ανθρωπων] om
 Eus 13 ολαι] οσαι B 14 επι τουτ. σεμν. Eus^o | προαγουσι con] j
 Schmidt] προσαγουσι codd et Eus qui legit προς αρσενας (αρρ.^o) προσαγουσιν
 15 δε] + και ΗΚΑ Eus^o 16 εσταλμεθα BPTZ | ον] ων BPT 17 τροπος
 BPT Eus] τοπος cett | τουτων BPT | και τ. τ. μν. ειναι Eus^o | το την μνημην
 P | κεχαρκτηρικεναι (-τηκεναι Z) codd Ar txt Eus 18 παντα] ειπας
 Eusⁱ 19 εκτιθεται Eus] εκτιθεμαι (εκτιθημι P) Ar codd | ουδεν B
 20 αλλ η Eus^o | συστασεως] pr της B | υπομνησις εστι Eus

- 155 τῆς τροφῆς συνεστάναι νομίζει. διὸ παρακελεύεται καὶ διὰ τῆς γραφῆς ὁ λέγων οὕτως· ΜΝΕΙΑ ΜΝΗΣΘΗΣΗ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΠΟΙΗΣΑΝΤΟΣ ἘΝ ΣΟΙ ΤΑ ΜΕΓΑΛΑ ΚΑΙ ΘΑΓΜΑΣΤΑ. κατανοούμενα γὰρ καὶ μεγάλα καὶ ἔνδοξα φαίνεται· πρῶτον μὲν ἢ σύμπηξις τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἢ
- 156 τῆς τροφῆς διοίκησις καὶ ἢ περὶ ἕκαστον μέλος διαστολή· πολλῶν δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ τῶν αἰσθήσεων διακόσμησις, διανοίας ἐνέργημα καὶ κινήσις ἀόρατος, ἢ τε ὀξύτης τοῦ πρὸς ἕκαστόν τι πράσσειν καὶ
- 157 τεχνῶν εὗρεσις ἀπέραστον περιέχει τρόπον. διὸ παρακελεύεται μνεΐαν ἔχειν, ὡς συντηρεῖται τὰ προειρημένα θεία δυνάμει σὺν κατασκευῇ. πάντα γὰρ χρόνον καὶ τόπον ὤρικε πρὸς τὸ διὰ 10
- 158 παντὸς μνημονεύειν τοῦ κρατοῦντος θεοῦ καὶ συντηροῦντος. καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν ἀπαρξαμένους εὐθέως τότε ἴσχυρησθαι κελεύει. καὶ μὴν καὶ ἐκ τῶν περιβολαίων παράσημον ἡμῖν μνεΐας δέδωκεν, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πγλῶν καὶ θυρῶν προστέταχε μὲν ἡμῖν τιθέναι τὰ λόγια, πρὸς τὸ μνεΐαν εἶναι θεοῦ 15
- 159 καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν δὲ διαρρηδὴν τὸ σημεῖον κελεύει περιῆφθαι, σαφῶς ἀποδεικνύς ὅτι πᾶσαν ἐνέργειαν μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ἐπιτελεῖν δεῖ, μνήμην ἔχοντας τῆς ἑαυτῶν κατασκευῆς, ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τὸν περὶ
- 160 θεοῦ φόβον. κελεύει δὲ καὶ ΚΟΙΤΑΖΟΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΝΙΣΤΑΜΕΝΟΥΣ μελετᾶν τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ κατασκευάς, οὐ μόνον λόγῳ, ἀλλὰ διαλήψει 20

2 ff Deut 7¹⁸; 10²¹14 ff Deut 6⁷ ffHKAGIBP
TZ Eus

- 1 om και Eus 2 om ο Eus | κυριου] + του θεου Eus 3 και μεγ. (+ και θαυμαστα P) και ενδ.] και ενδοξα και μεγαλα Eus¹ ενδοξα Eus^o
4 πρωτα Eus^o | η συμπ. η του σ. Eus¹ η του σ. συμπ. Eus^o | και 2^o] om
BPTZ 5 μέρος Eus^o 6 η των BP] η της των cett Eus¹ 8 επε-
ραστον περιεχει K Eus απεραντον παρεχει BPTZ txt HAGI 9 τα
προειρ.] om BT + συνεχομενα Eus¹ | θειας δυναμews P | συν κατασκευη K]
συγκατασκευη (και συγκ. BT¹A^{codd}) codd cett Eus¹ (om Eus^o) 10 τοπον και
χρονον Eus¹ χρονων και τροπον P 11 και συντηρουντος] συντηρουντας και
τας αρχας και μεσοτητας και τελευτας Eus¹ (om και συντηρ.—κελευει 13 Eus^o)
12 ποτων] pr των GI | απαρξ.] αρξαμενους I αρπαζομενους K om BT | συγ-
χρησθαι Eus] συγχωρησαι Ar codd 14 επι] pr επι των πολων και
οικησεων δια τς σκεπαζεσθαι και Eus 15 προστεταχε μεν] προστεταχεν
Eus 16 το σημ. διαρρ. P | περιειληφθαι PZ περι...ηφθαι (ras 3 litt) T
18 της εαυτων κατασκευης Eus] αυτης B τοis P και τοis Z της codd cett
(cum seqq conj) της ημων συστασεως edd pr | om δε Z | περι] του P Eus^o
19 διανισταμενους] + και πορευομενους Eus 20 λογω μονον Eus | αλλα]
+ και KP Eus

θεωροῦντας τὴν κίνησιν καὶ ὑπόληψιν ἑαυτῶν, ὅταν εἰς ὕπνον
 ἔρχωνται, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν, ὡς θεία τίς ἐστι καὶ ἀκατάληπτος τούτων
 ἢ μεταθέσις. Δέδεικται δέ σοι καὶ τὸ περισσὸν τῆς λογίας τῆς 161
 κατὰ τὴν διαστολὴν καὶ μνειάν, ὡς ἐξεθέμεθα τὴν διχηλίαν καὶ τὸν
 5 μηρυκισμὸν. οὐ γὰρ εἰκῆ καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔμπροσθεν εἰς ψυχὴν νενομο-
 θέτηται, πρὸς δ' ἀλήθειαν καὶ σημειώσιν ὀρθοῦ λόγου. διατάξας 162
 γὰρ ἐπὶ βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἀφὰς ἕκαστα, κελεύει
 μηθὲν εἰκῆ μῆτε πράσσειν μῆτε ἀκούειν, μῆτε τῇ τοῦ λόγου
 δυναστείᾳ συγχρωμένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἀδικίαν τρέπεσθαι. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν 163
 10 κνωδάλων δὲ ταῦτόν ἐστιν εὐρεῖν. κακοποιητικὸς γὰρ ὁ τρόπος
 ἐστὶ καὶ γαλῆς καὶ μγῶν καὶ τῶν τούτοις ὁμοίων, ὅσα διηγόρευται.
 πάντα γὰρ λυμαινόνται καὶ κακοποιούσι μύες, οὐ μόνον πρὸς τὴν 164
 ἑαυτῶν τροφήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ παντελῶς ἄχρηστον γίνεσθαι ἀν-
 θρώπῳ, ὃ τι ἂν δὴ ποτ' οὖν ἐπιβάληται κακοποιεῖν. τό τε τῆς γαλῆς 165
 15 γένος ἰδιάζον ἐστὶ· χωρὶς γὰρ τοῦ προειρημένου ἔχει λυμαντικὸν κατὰ-
 στημα· διὰ γὰρ τῶν ὄτων συλλαμβάνει, τεκνοποιεῖ δὲ τῷ στόματι.
 καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ τοιοῦτος τρόπος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀκάθαρτός ἐστιν· 166
 ὅσα γὰρ δι' ἀκοῆς λαβόντες, ταῦτα τῷ λόγῳ σωματοποιήσαντες,
 κακοῖς ἐτέροισ ἐνεκύλισαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν ἐπετέλεσαν,
 20 μιανθέντες αὐτοὶ παντάπασιν τῷ τῆς ἀσεβείας μολυσμῷ. καλῶς δὲ
 ποιῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν τοὺς τοιοῦτους ἀναιρεῖ, καθὼς μεταλαμβά-
 νομεν.—Ἐγὼ δ' εἶπα τοὺς ἐμφανιστὰς οἴομαι σε λέγειν· καὶ γὰρ 167
 αἰκίαις καὶ θανάτοις ἐπαλγέσιν αὐτοὺς περιβάλλει συνεχῶς.—Ὁ δὲ
 τοῦτους γὰρ καὶ λέγω· ἢ γὰρ ἐπαγρύπνησις ἀνθρώπων ἀπωλεία

11 Lev 11²⁹

1 τα κινηματα Eus^o | υποληψιν] πρ την Eus 2 ερχονται GIZ 2 f. η ΗΚΑΓΙΒΡ
 τουτων μεταθεσις Eus 3 ευλογιας fort recte A αλογιας P 4 εξεθεσθαι TZ Eus
 Eus¹ | om τον Eus¹ 5 και Eus] om Ar codd 7 και ποτων GIPZ Eus¹] om Ar codd cett Eus^o 8 τη Eus] om Ar codd 9 χρωμενους I
 10 ff. εστιν ο τροπος Eus^o 12 λυμαινεται B | και κακοπ.—τροφην αλλα (13) om BPTZ 13 εις το Eus¹] om Ar Eus^{codd} cett | γινεται BPZ 14 επι-
 βαλληται Eus^o 17 τουτο] τουτ ουν Eus¹⁰ | τοις ανθρωποις Eus¹ 19 ετε-
 ροις T | ακαθαρσιαν]+τε Eus | απετελεσαν B* Eus¹ 21 ημων T Eus¹⁰ |
 αναιρειν GI 23 επαλγεις (om αυτους) K | παραβαλλει Eus¹ (περιβ. Eus^o)
 24 τουτους—επαγρυπνησις] τουτοις γαρ επαγρ. Eus¹ επαγρυπ. γαρ Eus^o | εις
 ανθρωπων απωλειαν Eus txt (cf Diod 14. 68 επαγρυπνηκωσ τη τουτων απω-
 λεια) ex Ar codd (ἀπώλεια)

- 168 ἀνόσιος. ὁ δὲ νόμος ἡμῶν κελεύει μήτε λόγῳ μήτε ἔργῳ μηδένα
κακοποιεῖν. καὶ περὶ τούτων οὖν, ὅσον ἐπὶ βραχὺ <διεξήλθον,
προσυποδείξας> σοι διότι πάντα κεκανόνισται πρὸς δικαιοσύνην,
καὶ οὐδὲν εἰκῆ κατατέτακται διὰ τῆς γραφῆς οὐδὲ μυθωδῶς, ἀλλ'
ἵνα δι' ὅλου τοῦ ζῆν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν ἀσκῶμεν δικαιοσύνην 5
- 169 πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, μεμνημένοι τοῦ δυναστεύοντος θεοῦ. περὶ
βρωτῶν οὖν καὶ τῶν ἀκαθάρτων ἐρπετῶν καὶ κνωδάλων καὶ πᾶς
λόγος ἀνατείνει πρὸς δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνανα-
170 στροφὴν δικαίαν. Ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν καλῶς ἐνόμιζε περὶ
ἐκάστων ἀπολογεῖσθαι· καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν προσφερομένων ἔλεγε 10
μόσχων τε καὶ κριῶν καὶ χιμάρων, ὅτι δεῖ ταῦτα ἐκ βουκολίων καὶ
ποιμνίων λαμβάνοντας ἡμερα θυσιάζειν, καὶ μηθὲν ἄγριον, ὅπως οἱ
προσφέροντες τὰς θυσίας μηθὲν ὑπερήφανον ἑαυτοῖς συνιστορῶσι,
σημειώσῃ κεχρημένοι τοῦ διατάξαντος. τῆς γὰρ ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆς
τοῦ παντὸς τρόπου τὴν προσφορὰν ποιεῖται ὁ τὴν θυσίαν προσάγων. 15
- 171 καὶ περὶ τούτων οὖν νομίζω τὰ τῆς ὁμιλίας ἄξια λόγου καθεστάναι·
διὸ τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ φυσικὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ ἰόμου προῆγμαί δια-
¶ Eus σαφῆσαι σοι, Φιλόκρατες, δι' ἣν ἔχεις φιλομάθειαν. ¶

- § Jos 172 ὁ δὲ Ἐλεάζαρος ποιησάμενος θυσίαν καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐπιλέξας
καὶ πολλὰ δῶρα τῷ βασιλεῖ κατασκευάσας προέπεμψεν ἡμᾶς μετὰ 20
173 ἀσφαλείας πολλῆς. ὡς δὲ παρεγενήθημεν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, προσ-

HKAGIBP
TZ Eus Jos

- 1 ανοσιον Eus^o | λογω] νομω BTZ 1 f. κακοποιειν μηδενα Eus
2 ουν] δε P | οσον—διεξηλθον] διεξηλθον βραχυ Eus^o | διεξελθειν Ar codd
(-ελθη P) Eus^t 3 προσυποδειξαντα Ar codd Eus^t δεικνυων Eus^o | διοτι] οτι Eus^o 4 μυθωδως B Eus] θυμωδως codd cett | αλλ ινα] αλλα H
6 μεμνημενους BPTZ 7 ουν] ον P | και 3^o] ο Eus 8 αναστροφην P
9 ρενομιζετο 10 υπολογεισθαι G απολελογησθαι Eus | επι Ar codd Eus^t] και περι Eus^o 11 om τε Eus^t | δει Eus] αει Ar codd 12 λαμβανοντες omissis ημερα—προσφεροντες (13) BPTZ | θυσιαζειν] κατασκευαζειν Eus
13 συνιστορουσι P 14 κεχρημενοι Eus] κεχρημενου Ar codd 16 και περι—σεμνοτητα (17) om K | αξιολογου καθ. HAGTZ αξιολγως καθ. P αζια καθεσταναι λογου Eus^o 17 διο] δια Eus | και φνσ. διαν. om Eus | νομου] + ην Eus 18 om σοι BPTZ Eus^o | Φιλοκρατες BT Eus] Φιλοκρατη codd cett
20 παρασκευασας P 21 Αλεξανδ.] + και P | προσαγγελει G (-ελει I -γγελει ATZ) txt HKP (B προσγγελλη)

ηγγέλη τῷ βασιλεῖ περὶ τῆς ἀφίξεως ἡμῶν. <παρειμένοι> δ' εἰς
 τὴν αὐλὴν Ἀνδρέας τε καὶ ἐγώ, φιλοφρόνως ἤσπασάμεθα τὸν βα-
 σιλέα καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἀποδεδώκαμεν τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Ἑλεαζάρου.
 περὶ πολλοῦ δὲ ποιούμενος τοῖς ἀπεσταλμένοις ἀνδράσιν ἐντυχεῖν, 174
 5 ἐκέλευσε τοὺς λοιποὺς πάντας ἀπολύσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν χρειῶν,
 καλεῖν δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. οὗ πᾶσι παραδόξου φανέντος—διὰ τὸ 175
 κατὰ ἔθος εἶναι, πεμπταίους εἰς πρόσωπον ἔρχεσθαι βασιλεῖ τοὺς
 περὶ χρήσιμον ἀφικνουμένους, τοὺς δὲ παρὰ βασιλέων ἢ πόλεων ἐν
 ὑπεροχαῖς μόλις ἐν τριάκοντα εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν παρίεσθαι—τοὺς δὲ
 10 ἦκοντας τιμῆς καταξιῶν μείζονος, καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν κρίνων τοῦ
 πέμψαντος, ἀπολύσας οὓς ἐνόμιζε περισσοὺς, ὑπέμενε περιπατῶν,
 ἕως ἂν παραγινομένους ἀσπάσῃται. παρελθόντων δὲ σὺν τοῖς 176
 ἀπεσταλμένοις δώροις καὶ ταῖς διαφόροις διφθέραις, ἐν αἷς ἡ
 νομοθεσία γεγραμμένη χρυσογραφία τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς γράμμασι, θαι-
 15 μασίως <εἰργασμένου τοῦ ὑμένος>, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἄλληλα συμβολῆς
 ἀνεπαισθήτου κατεσκευασμένης, ὡς εἶδεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς ἀνδρας,
 ἐπηρώτα περὶ τῶν βιβλίων. ὡς δὲ ἀπεκάλυψαν τὰ τῶν ἐνεληγμάτων 177
 καὶ τοὺς ὑμένας ἀνείλιξαν, πολὺν ἐπιστὰς χρόνον καὶ προσκυνήσας
 σχεδὸν ἑπτάκις εἶπεν Εὐχαριστῶ μὲν, ἄνδρες, ὑμῖν, τῷ δ' ἀποστεί-
 20 λαντι μᾶλλον, μέγιστον δὲ τῷ θεῷ, οὐτινός ἐστι τὰ λόγια
 ταῦτα. ὁμοθυμαδὸν δὲ πάντων εἰπόντων ὑπὸ μίαν φωνήν, τῶν 178
 τε παραγεγονότων καὶ τῶν συμπαρόντων, Εὐ βασιλεῦ, προήχθη
 δακρῦσαι τῇ χαρᾷ πεπληρωμένους. ἡ γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἔντασις καὶ τὸ

1 παρειμεν δ H G I Z παρημεν δ K A P T ὡς δε παρημεν B txt ex con] H K A G I B P
 Schmidt 3 ἐπιδεδώκαμεν B Z Fort leg ἀπεδωκ. (ἀπεδοσαν Jos) | τας 2° T Z Jos
 G I P] om cett 4 περι] pr και P T Z | ποιουμινος] + ο βασιλευς B P 5 απαν-
 τας P 7 κατα εθνος H K A G I P T κατα εθνους Z απο εθνους B txt ex Jos
 (παρα το εθος) 8 περι] + τι B | χρησιμον] fort χρηματισμον | om εν H P
 9 υπεροχης P | τριακοντα] λ ημεραις B 10 του] τοις K 11 υπεμενε B
 txt cett cum Jos^{vid} (περιμεμενε) 12 παραγενομενους B T 14 om τοις Z
 15 εργασαμενου K (ειργ. I) ειργασμενης B T^{corr} (-ου T*) εργαμενης P | της
 υμενου H K^{corr} G I B P T^{corr} του υμενου A | της] τοις P | συμπλοκης Z 16 ανε-
 παισθητως B T^{corr} | κατεσκευασμενη H K A G I 17 επερωτα G I B* P | εν-
 ειληματων Jos] ανειληματων (-λημμ. G I P T Z) Ar codd 20 ουτινος B T]
 τινος cett (ου Jos) 21 ειποντων δε παντ. ομ. K 23 της χαρας B T |
 εντασις P Z] εκστασις B ενστασις cett

- τῆς τιμῆς ὑπερτεῖνον δακρύνει ἀναγκάζει κατὰ τὰς ἐπιτυχίας.
 179 κελύσας δὲ εἰς τάξιν ἀποδοῦναι τὰ τεύχη, τὸ τηνικαῦτα ἀσπασά-
 μενος τοὺς ἄνδρας εἶπε Δίκαιον ἦν, θεοσεβείας ἄνδρες, ὧν χάριν ὑμᾶς
 μετεπεμψάμην, ἐκείνοις πρῶτον σεβασμὸν ἀποδοῦναι, μετὰ ταῦτα
 180 τὴν δεξιὰν ὑμῖν προτεῖναι διὸ πεποίηκα τοῦτο πρῶτον. μεγάλην 5
 δὲ τέθειμαι τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην, ἐν ἣ παραγεγόνατε, καὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν
 ἐπίσημος ἔσται πάντα τὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν χρόνον· συντέτυχε γὰρ
 καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπεπτωκέναί τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον
 ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δειπνήσαι σήμερον μεθ' ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι.
 181 πάντα <δ' ὑμῖν>, εἶπε, παρέσται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρήσησθε, 10
 κἀμοὶ μεθ' ὑμῶν. τῶν δὲ ἀσμενισάντων ἐκέλευσε καταλύ-
 ματα δοθῆναι τὰ κάλλιστα πλησίον τῆς ἄκρας αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὰ κατὰ
 τὸ συμπόσιον ἐτοιμάζειν.
 182 Ὁ δὲ <ἀρχεδέατρος> Νικάνωρ Δωρόθεον προσκαλεσάμενος, ὃς
 <ἦν> ἐπὶ τούτων ἀποτεταγμένος, ἐκέλευσέ τὴν ἐτοιμασίαν εἰς ἕκαστον 15
 ἐπιτελεῖν. ἦν γὰρ οὕτω διατεταγμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως, ἃ μὲν ἔτι
 καὶ νῦν ὄρας· ὅσαι γὰρ πόλεις εἰσίν, <αἱ τοῖς αὐτοῖς> συγχρῶνται
 πρὸς τὰ ποτὰ καὶ βρωτὰ καὶ στρωμνάς, τοσοῦτοι καὶ προσετώτες
 ἦσαν· καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐθισμοὺς οὕτως ἐσκευάζετο, ὅταν παραγένοιτο
 πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς, ἵνα κατὰ μῆθῆν δυσχεραίνοντες ἰλαρῶς διεξά- 20
 183 γωσιν· ὃ καὶ περὶ τούτους ἐγεγόνει. προσεχέστατος γὰρ ὢν
 ἄνθρωπος ὁ Δωρόθεος εἶχε τὴν τῶν τοιούτων προστασίαν. συνέ-
 στρωσε δὲ πάντα τὰ δι' αὐτοῦ χειριζόμενα, πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας ὑποδοχὰς
 διαμεμερισμένα. διμερῆ τε ἐποίησε τὰ τῶν κλισιῶν, καθὼς προσέ-

HKAGIBP
TZ Jos

1 τιμῆς] ψυχῆς AZ | υπερ τινων P 4 σεβασμον—πρωτον (5)] om P^{txt}
 ins P^{mg} | μεταδουσαι Z | μετα] pr και B 5 προτειναι] προδουσαι B
 6 τιθειμαι B 8 τα] om PZ hab B^{vid}T*^{sup}lin cett 9 om και B | ημων
 BZ | βουλησωμαι P 10 παντα δ υμιν ex conj Mend.] παντα δυναμιν
 HKAGI παντα δυναμην P πασαν δυναμιν BTZ | παρεσταναι BT | συγχρη-
 σησθε HKGI] συγχρησεσθε (-σεσθαι Z) cett 11 καμε BT 12 τα 2^ο]
 om TZ 14 αρχεδεατρος (cf C. I. G. 4678) conj Letronne (ο επι της των
 ξενων αποδοχης τεταγμενος Jos)] αρχιητρος codd | os ην] os (ωσ P) ων codd
 16 αποτελειν BT επιτελη P txt cett 17 αι τοις αυτοις] αις BT οis cett
 txt ex Jos (οσαι τοις αυτοις χρωνται) correxi (οσ. γαρ πολ. εθεσιν ιδιοις Wend.)
 18 βρωτα και ποτα K | βρωματα BPTZ | στρωμνας BT] στρωμναις cett | το-
 σουταις P τοσουτο Z 19 παραγεωνται BT 20 μηθεν B 21 προσ-
 εχεστατα et om γαρ ων—παντα (23) A 21 f. ων ανθρωπων] ανθρ. ων B ων P
 23 αποδοχας P 24 διαμεμετρημενα BPTZ | διμερη BZT (sed ras ι liit int
 e et ρ in T) Jos] διμετρη P διαμερη cett

ταξεν ὁ βασιλεύς· τοὺς γὰρ ἡμίσεις ἐκέλευσεν ἀνὰ χεῖρα κατακλίνειν, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς μετὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ κλισίαν, οὐδὲν ἑλλιπῶν εἰς τὸ τιμᾶν τοὺς ἄνδρας. Ὡς δὲ κατεκλίθησαν, ἐκέλευσε τῷ 184
 Δωροθέῳ τοῖς ἐθισμοῖς οἷς χρῶνται πάντες οἱ παραγινόμενοι πρὸς
 5 αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, οὕτως ἐπιτελεῖν. διὸ τοὺς ἱεροκῆρυκας
 καὶ θύτας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, οἷς ἔθος ἦν τὰς κατευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι,
 παρητήσατο· τῶν δὲ παραγεγονότων σὺν ἡμῖν Ἐλισσαῖον ὄντα
 τῶν ἱερέων πρεσβύτερον παρεκάλεσε ποιήσασθαι κατευχὴν, ὃς
 ἀξιολόγως στὰς εἶπε Πληρώσαι σε, βασιλεῦ, πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν 185
 10 ὧν ἔκτισεν ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεός· καὶ δῶή σοι ταῦτ' ἔχειν καὶ γυναικὶ
 καὶ τέκνοις καὶ τοῖς ὁμονοοῦσι πάντα ἀνέκλειπτα τὸν τῆς ζωῆς
 χρόνον. Εἰπόντος δὲ ταῦτα τούτου κατερράγη κρότος μετὰ κραυγῆς 186
 καὶ χαρᾶς εὐφροσύνου πλείονα χρόνον· καὶ τὸ τηρικαῦτα πρὸς τὸ
 τέρπεσθαι διὰ τῶν ἡτοιμασμένων ἐτράπησαν, τῶν λειτουργιῶν
 15 ἀπασῶν διὰ τῆς τοῦ Δωροθέου συντάξεως ἐπιτελουμένων· ἐν οἷς καὶ
 βασιλικοὶ παῖδες ἦσαν, καὶ τῶν τιμωμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως.¹ ¶ Jos

Ἵτε δὲ καιρὸν ἔλαβεν ἐκ διαστήματος, ἠρώτησε τὸν ἔχοντα τὴν 187
 πρώτην ἀνάκλισιν (ἦσαν γὰρ καθ' ἡλικίαν τὴν ἀνάπτωσιν πεποιη-
 μένοι) Πῶς ἂν τὴν βασιλείαν μέχρι τέλους ἀπταιστον ἔχων
 20 διατελοῖ; βραχὺ δὲ ἐπισχὼν εἶπεν Οὕτως ἂν μάλιστα διευθύνοις, 188
 μιμούμενος τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ παντὸς ἐπιεικῆς. μακροθυμία γὰρ
 χρώμενος, καὶ βλιμάζων τοὺς ἀξίους ἐπιεικέστερον, καθὼς εἰσιν

1 ἐκέλευσεν] προσεταξεν P | ανα χειρα Jos] αναρχα Aι codd 3 f. τον ΗΚΑΓΙΒΡ
 Δωροθεον Jos 4 τους εθισμους BT | παραγενομενοι BPTZ 6 οἷς] οὖς Η ΤΖ Jos
 7 Ελισσαιον Jos] Ελεαζαρον codd 8 παρεκαλεσε A Jos (-σεν)] παρεκαλε-
 σαν cett | ποιησεσθαι P 9 ειπε] ad hoc add †εὐ† G^{txt} εὐ^X I^{mg} ευχη B^{mg} |
 βασιλευς I 10 και 2^o] om A 11 [ζωης]+σου BPTZ 12 om τουτου
 BTZ 18 γαρ] δε K | αναπτω A* (σιν sup lin in H) 19 απταιστον μ.
 τελους I 19 f εχω διατελοι Η*ΑΓΙ εχων διατελοιη Η^{copp} εχω διατελειν K
 διατελοιη εχων BT txi Z 20 μαλιστα] καλλιστα P | διευθυνει ΗΚ*Α
 -νης P 22 βλημαζων codd (βληζων suprascripto μα P). A* βλημαζων
 habuisse videtur, sed βλημ in ετοιμ^{id} mutatum est. Hinc δοκιμαζων F ετοι-
 μαζων L κριματαζων D¹ (αζων cum lacuna D*) 22 καθως] η καθως con] Schmidt

- 189 ἄξιοι, μετατιθεῖς ἐκ τῆς κακίας καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν ἄξεις. Ἐπαι-
 νέσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸν ἐχόμενον ἠρώτα Πῶς ἂν ἕκαστα πράττοι;
 ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη Τὸ δίκαιον εἰ πρὸς ἅπαντας διατηροῦ, ἑαυτῷ καλῶς
 τὰ ἕκαστα πράξει, διαλαμβάνων ὅτι πᾶν ἐννόημα σαφές ἐστι θεῷ.
 190 καταρχὴν δὲ θείου φόβου λαμβάνων ἐν οὐδενὶ διαπίπτεις. Καὶ 5
 τοῦτον δὲ εὖ μάλα παραδεξάμενος ἕτερον ἐπηρώτα Πῶς ἂν ὁμοίους
 ἑαυτῷ ἔχοι τοὺς φίλους; κἀκεῖνος εἶπεν Εἰ θεωροῖσαν πολλὴν σε
 πρόνοιαν ποιούμενον ὧν ἄρχεις ὄχλων· σὺ δὲ τοῦτο πράξεις ἐπι-
 βλέπων ὡς ὁ θεὸς εὐεργετῇ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, ὁ ὑγίαν
 αὐτοῖς καὶ τροφὴν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ κατὰ καιρὸν παρασκευάζων 10
 191 ἅπαντα. Συναπειμαρτυρήσας δὲ τούτῳ τὸν ἐχόμενον ἠρώτα
 Πῶς ἂν ἐν τοῖς χρηματισμοῖς καὶ διακρίσεσιν εὐφημίας <τυγχάνοι>
 καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποτυγχανόντων; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εἰ πᾶσιν ἴσος γένοιο τῷ
 λόγῳ, καὶ μηδὲν ὑπερηφάνως μηδὲ τῇ περὶ σεαυτὸν ἰσχύϊ πράσσοις
 192 κατὰ τῶν ἀμαρτανόντων. τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσεις τὴν διάταξιν βλέπων 15
 τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ· τὰ γὰρ ἱκετευόμενα συντελεῖσθαι τοῖς ἀξίοις,
 τοῖς δὲ ἀποτυγχάνουσιν ἢ δι' ὀνείρων ἢ πράξεων σημαίνεσθαι τὸ
 βλαβερὸν αὐτοῖς, οὐ κατὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας οὐδὲ <κατὰ> τὴν μεγαλω-
 σύνην τῆς ἰσχύος τύπτοντος αὐτοῦς, ἀλλ' ἐπιεικεία χρωμένου τοῦ
 193 θεοῦ. Εὖ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον κατεπαινέσας ἠρώτα τὸν ἐξῆς Πῶς 20
 ἂν ἐν ταῖς πολεμικαῖς χρεῖαις ἀήττητος εἴη; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εἰ μὴ
 πεποιθὼς ὑπάρχοι τοῖς ὄχλοις μηδὲ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸν θεὸν
 ἐπικαλοῖτο διὰ πάντων, ἵνα τὰς ἐπιβολὰς αὐτῷ κατευθύνῃ δικαίως
 194 διεξάγοντι πάντα. Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τὸν ἕτερον
 ἠρώτα Πῶς ἂν φοβερὸς εἴη τοῖς ἐχθροῖς; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εἰ τῇ τῶν 25
 ὀπλων καὶ δυνάμεων παρασκευῇ πολλῇ χρώμενος <εἰδείη> ταῦτα

HKAGIB
PTZ

- 1 μετατιθεῖς]+τε B μετατιθης A* 2 ἕκαστα <καλλιστα> Wend.
 3 παντας P | διατηρει BPTZ -ροη A^{corr} | εαυτω BPTZ (-το)] εαυτον cett
 4 πραξει K 6 τουτο A | επηρωτα BT] επερρωτα cett | ομοιως B 7 εαυτω]
 εαυτου H om Z 10 κατασκευαζων P 12 διαρισσειν Z^{txt} διαιρεσιν Z^{mg} |
 τυγχανω codd corr Schmidt 13 ισως BPT | γενοιο—σεαυτον (14)] om
 BPTZ 14 πραττει P πρασοις H* (σ altera suprascr) K 18 κατα 2^o]
 om codd 19 αυτοις GI 21 om ταις BPTZ | ειην Z | ο BPTZK^{corr} τω
 cett 22 υπαρχοι K] υπαρχοις HAGI υπαρχεις BPTZ | οχλοις] οπλοισ P
 23 επικαλη B | επιβουλας I 25 τη] τω T 26 οπλων P | και δυναμεων]
 om Z και δυναμενων G | ειδειη ex con]] ειη ει δε ειη (οιει B) codd

ὄντα κενὰ ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον πρὸς τὸ συμπέρασμα δρᾶν τι· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς διδούς ἀνοχὰς καὶ ἐνδεικνύμενος τὸν τῆς δυναστείας φόβον ἐγκατασκευάζει πάσῃ διανοίᾳ. Καὶ τοῦτον δὲ εἰπών 195
 νέσας εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἐχόμενον Τί κάλλιστον αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ ζῆν ἂν εἶη; κἀκείνος ἔφη Τὸ γινώσκειν ὅτι θεὸς δυναστεύει τῶν ἀπάντων, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν καλλίστων πράξεων οὐκ αὐτοὶ κατευθύνομεν τὰ βουλευθέντα· θεὸς δὲ τελειοῖ τὰ πάντων καὶ καθηγεῖται δυναστεύων. Ἐπιφωνήσας δὲ καὶ τούτῳ καλῶς λέγειν τὸν ἕτερον ἠρώτα Πῶς ἂν ἀκέραια συντηρήσας ἅπαντα τοῖς ἐγγόνοις τὴν αὐτὴν παραδιδού 196
 διάθεσιν ἐπὶ τέλει; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εὐχόμενος αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀγαθὰς ἐπινοίας λαμβάνειν πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα πράσσεισθαι, καὶ τοῖς ἐγγόνοις παρακελυόμενος μὴ ἐκπλήττεσθαι τῇ δόξῃ μηδὲ τῷ πλούτῳ· θεὸν γὰρ εἶναι τὸν χαριζόμενον ταῦτα, καὶ οὐ δι' ἑαυτοῦς ἔχειν τὴν ὑπεροχὴν ἀπάντων. Ἐπιμαρτυρήσας δὲ τούτοις 197
 τοῦ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπυνθάνετο Πῶς ἂν τὰ συμβαίοντα μετριῶς φέροι; ἐκείνος δὲ ἔφησεν Εἰ πρόληψιν λαμβάνοις, ὅτι γέγοναν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πάντες ἄνθρωποι μετασχέειν τῶν μεγίστων κακῶν, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἀγαθῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα τούτων ἀμιγῆ γενέσθαι· ὁ θεὸς δὲ τὴν εὐψυχίαν δίδωσιν, ὃν ἰκετεύειν ἀναγκά 20
 καῖον. Φιλοφρονηθεὶς δὲ καὶ τοῦτον καλῶς εἶπεν ἅπαντας ἀποφαίνεσθαι· ἐπερωτήσας δὲ ἔτι ἓνα καταλήξω τὸ νῦν ἔχον, ἵνα καὶ πρὸς τὸ τέρπεσθαι τραπέντες ἠδέως διεξάγωμεν. ἐν δὲ ταῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξ ἑξῆς ἡμέραις καὶ παρὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐξῆς μαθήσομαί τι πλέον. εἴτ' ἐπηρώτα τὸν ἄνδρα Τί πέρας ἀνδρείας ἐστίν; ὁ 199
 δὲ εἶπεν Εἰ τὸ βουλευθὲν ὀρθῶς ἐν ταῖς τῶν κινδύνων πράξεσιν ἐπιτελοῖτο κατὰ πρόθεσιν. τελειοῦται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πάντα σοὶ καλῶς βουλευομένῳ, βασιλεῦ, συμφερόντως. Ἐπιφωνησάντων 200 § Jos
 δὲ πάντων καὶ κρότῳ σημηναμένων πρὸς τοὺς φιλοσόφους εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς (οὐκ ὀλίγοι γὰρ παρήσαν τούτοις) Οἴομαι διαφέρειν τοὺς

2 τον] τα recte ut vid Wend. 8 om και BPTZ | τουτο Z 9 εκγο- ΗΚΑΓΙΒ
 νοις ΑΒΤ 10 επι τελει P] επιτελειν ΒΖ^{corr} επιτελη Τ επιτελοι cett CPTZ Jos
 12 εκγονοις ΑΒ*Γ 13 om ου Β 14 απαντων] πρ των Η | τουτους Ι
 16 φερει Ρ | λαμβανεις ΒΤ | γεγονασιν ΒΡΤ 18 αγαθων] πρ των ΒΤ
 19 om δε C 20 τουτω Ρ 21 αποκρινεσθαι Β | om δε C 23 ημερας
 GI | εξης 2^ο] om BPTZ 24 ειτ επηρωτα ΒCΤΖ (ειτα ΒC) ειτ επερωτα
 cett 27 βουλευομενω ΒΤ] βουλομενω cett 28 σημαναμενων CΤΖ
 29 ολιγοις Ζ

- ἄνδρας ἀρετῇ καὶ συνίεναι πλείον, οἵτινες ἐκ τοῦ καιροῦ τοιαύτας
 ἐρωτήσεις λυμβάνοντες, ὡς δέον ἐστὶν ἀποκέκρινται, πάντες ἀπὸ
 201 θεοῦ τοῦ λόγου τὴν καταρχὴν ποιούμενοι. Μενέδημος δὲ ὁ
 Ἐρετριεὺς φιλόσοφος εἶπε Ναί, βασιλεῦ· προνοία γὰρ τῶν ὅλων
 διοικουμένων, καὶ ὑπειληφότων ὀρθῶς τοῦτο, ὅτι θεόκτιστόν ἐστιν 5
 ἄνθρωπος, ἀκολουθεῖ πᾶσαν δυναστείαν καὶ λόγου καλλονὴν ἀπὸ
 202 θεοῦ κατάρχεσθαι. τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως ἐπινεύσαντος τὰ περὶ τούτων
 ¶ Jos ἔληξεν, ἠ ἐράπησαν δὲ πρὸς εὐφροσύνην. ἐπιλαβούσης δὲ τῆς
 ἐσπέρας τὸ συμπόσιον ἐλύθη.
 203 Τῇ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν διάταξιν τὰ τῆς 10
 ἀναπτώσεως καὶ συμποσίας ἐπετελεῖτο. καθὼ δὲ ἐνόμιζεν ὁ
 βασιλεὺς εὐκαιρον εἶναι πρὸς τὸ πυνθάνεσθαι τι τῶν ἀνδρῶν,
 204 ἐπηρώτα τοὺς ἐξῆς τῶν ἀποκεκριμένων τῇ προτέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ. πρὸς
 τὸν ἐνδέκατον δὲ ἤρξατο τὴν κοινολογίαν ποιεῖσθαι· δέκα γὰρ ἦσαν
 οἱ ἠρωτημένοι τῇ προτέρᾳ. σιγῆς δὲ γενομένης ἐπυνθάνετο Πῶς 15
 205 ἂν πλούσιος διαμένει; βραχὺ δὲ ἐπισχὼν ὁ τὴν ἐρώτησιν ἐκδεχόμενος
 εἶπεν· Εἰ μὴδὲν ἀνάξιον τῆς ἀρχῆς μὴδὲ ἀσελγὲς πράσσοι,
 μὴδὲ δαπάνη εἰς τὰ κενὰ καὶ μάταια συντελοῖ, τοὺς <δὲ> ὑποτεταγμέ-
 νους εὐεργεσία πρὸς εὐνοίαν ἄγοι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς πᾶσιν
 206 αἴτιος ἀγαθῶν ἐστίν, ᾧ κατακολουθεῖν ἀναγκαῖον. Ἐπαι- 20
 νέσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦτον ἕτερον ἐπηρώτα· Πῶς ἂν τὴν ἀλήθειαν
 διατηροῖ; ὁ δὲ πρὸς τοῦτο ἀπεκρίθη· Γινώσκων ὅτι μεγάλην
 αἰσχύνην ἐπιφέρει τὸ ψεῦδος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, πολλῶ δὲ μᾶλλον
 τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν· ἐξουσίαν γὰρ ἔχοντες ὁ βούλονται πράσσειν, τίνος
 ἔνεκεν ἂν ψεύσαιτο; προσλαμβάνειν δὲ δεῖ τοῦτό σε, βασιλεῦ, διότι 25
 207 φιλαλήθης ὁ θεὸς ἐστίν. Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ εὖ μάλα καὶ
 τοῦτον ἐπιβλέψας εἶπεν· Τί ἐστι σοφίας διδαχῆ; ὁ δὲ ἕτερος

HKAGIB
CPTZ Jos

3 om του B | Μενέδημος ΒΤ Βενέδημος Ζ | om δε ΒΤ 8 δε 1° Β] δε
 τα cett | προς ευφροσ.—τη δε (10) om A 13 πρωτη Κ | προς τον ενδεκ.—
 προτερα (15) om Β^{xt} ins Β^{ms} 15 om οι ΚΒ | προτερα] προτερεια Α*
 (-ραια Α^{corr}) + ημερα Β^{ms} 16 διαμελλοι Ρ 18 δαπανη Mend. | συν-
 τελει BCT συντελη Ζ ασυντελει Ρ | δε Mend. (et sic L)] om codd cett
 19 ευεργεσια]+ δε Β | αγει ΒΤ 21 επηρωτα ΒΤ] επερωτα cett 22 δια-
 τηροη ΒΑ^{corr} 23 επιφερει ΚΒ επιφεροι cett 24 εξουσιαν—πρασσειν]
 om C | ο] ων Β 25 αν ενεκεν Ζ | προσλαμβανειν ΒΤ] προλαμβανειν cett |
 σε] σοι Α 26 om ο θεος Ρ 27 post τουτον fort επι τον μετ αυτον vel
 aliquid simile excidit

ἀπεφήνατο Καθὼς οὐ βούλει σεαυτῷ τὰ κακὰ παρεῖναι, μέτοχος δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑπάρχειν ἀπάντων, εἰ πράσσοις τούτο πρὸς τοὺς ὑποταγμένους καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας, εἰ τοὺς καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπεικέστερον νουθετοῖς· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους 208
 5 ἅπαντας ἐπεικέϊα ἄγει. Ἐπαινέσας αὐτὸν τῷ μετ' αὐτὸν 208
 εἶπε Πῶς ἂν φιλάνθρωπος εἴη; καὶ κείνος ἔφη Θεωρῶν ὡς ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ καὶ κακοπαθείαις μεγίσταις αὔξει τε καὶ γενῆται τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος· ὅθεν οὔτε εὐκόπως δεῖ κολάζειν, οὔτε αἰκίαις περιβάλλειν· γινώσκων ὅτι τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ζῆν ἐν ὀδύναίς τε καὶ 10
 τιμωρίαις καθέστηκεν. ἐπινοῶν οὖν ἕκαστα πρὸς τὸν ἔλεον τραπήσῃ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐλεήμων ἐστίν. Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ τοῦτον 209
 ἐπυνθάνετο τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς Τίς ἀναγκαιότατος τρόπος βασιλείας; Τὸ συντηρεῖν, εἶπεν, αὐτὸν ἀδωροδόκητον, καὶ νήφειν τὸ πλείον μέρος τοῦ βίου, καὶ δικαιοσύνην προτιμῶν, καὶ τοὺς τοιοῦτους φιλοποιεῖ- 15
 σθαι· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς φιλοδίκαιός ἐστιν. Ἐπισημήνας καὶ 210
 τοῦτον πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον εἶπε Τί τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐστὶ κατὰστημα; ἐκείνος δὲ ἔφη Τὸ διαλαμβάνειν ὅτι πάντα διὰ παντὸς ὁ θεὸς ἐνεργεῖ καὶ γινώσκει, καὶ οὐθὲν ἂν λάθοι ἄδικον ποιήσας ἢ κακὸν ἐργασάμενος ἄνθρωπος· ὡς γὰρ θεὸς εὐεργετῆ τὸν ὅλον κόσμον, οὕτως καὶ 20
 20 σὺ μιμούμενος ἀπρόσκοπος ἂν εἴης. Ἐπιφωνήσας δὲ τοῦτῳ 211
 πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον εἶπε Τίς ὄρος τοῦ βασιλευῖν ἐστίν; ὁ δὲ ἔφη Τὸ καλῶς ἄρχειν ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μὴ τῷ πλούτῳ καὶ τῇ δόξῃ φερόμενον ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἄσχημόν τι ἐπιθυμῆσαι, εἰ καλῶς λογίζοιο. πάντα γὰρ σοι πάρεστιν ὡς οὐδέν. ὁ θεὸς δὲ ἀπροσδεής ἐστι καὶ ἐπεικίης.

1 ἀπεφηνάτο] εἶπε B ἀπεκρίνατο P | βουλή HGCZ | om τα BCTZ HKAG1B CP1Z
 2 πράσσεις KBCP 2 f ἁμαρτ. καὶ τοὺς ὑποταταγ. P 3 om τοὺς 1° B
 4 νουθετεῖς KBPT 6 om αν Z* ins Z^{corr} 7 om τε I 8 ουτε 1°] ουδε Z | αικίαις (cf 3 Macc 6. 26) BT] αιτιας HKCPZ αιτίας GIA
 9 τον ἄρον HKB | om τε KB 11 δε]+καὶ GI 12 om ἐπυνθανετο K^{xt} ins post εξης K^{wg} | το] τον K | βασιλείας] πρ της P 13 εαυτον P
 14 φιλοπονεῖσθαι H 16 om τον BT | om της B | κατὰστημα ἐστιν Z
 17 om δε K | διαπαντος]+οτι K | ενεργει καὶ γινωσκει ο θσ P 19 θεος] πρ ο P | om ολον P 20 τουτον CPZ 22 εαυτου]+καὶ βασιλευειν ἐστι K
 23 υπερηφανον]+τι BT*[†] (ras 2 litt) | om τι B | ἐπιθυμησαι P] ἐννοησα-
 σθαι B ἐπινοησαιο Z ἐπιθυμησαιο cett 24 ως ουδεν] οσα δεον conj
 Wend.

- καὶ σὺ καθόσον ἄνθρωπος ἐνόει, καὶ μὴ πολλῶν ὀρέγου, τῶν δὲ
 212 ἱκανῶν πρὸς τὸ βασιλεύειν. Κατεπαιέσας δὲ αὐτόν, ἐπηρώτα
 τὸν ἕτερον Πῶς ἂν τὰ κάλλιστα διαλογίζοιτο; ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ἐκείνος
 Εἰ τὸ δίκαιον ἐπὶ παντὸς προβάλλοι συνεχῶς, καὶ νομίζοι τὴν
 ἀδικίαν τοῦ ζῆν στήρησιν εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς διὰ παντὸς τοῖς 5
 213 δίκαιοις ἀγαθὰ προσημαίνει μέγιστα. Τοῦτον δὲ ἐπαιέσας
 εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἐξῆς Πῶς ἂν ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις ἀτάραχος εἴη; ὁ δὲ ἔφη
 Δυσασπολόγητον ἠρώτηκας πρᾶγμα. συναναφέρειν γὰρ οὐ δυνάμεθα
 ἐν τούτοις τοῖς κατὰ τὸν ὕπνον ἑαυτούς, ἀλλὰ περιεχόμεθα ἀλογίστω
 214 κατὰ <τάδε> αἰσθήσει. πᾶσχομεν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς 10
 ὑποπίπτουσι ὡς θεωρουμένοις· ἀλογιστοῦμεν δέ, καθόσον ὑπολαμ-
 βάνομεν καὶ ἐπὶ πέλαγος καὶ ἐν πλοίοις ἢ πολεῖν, ἢ πέτασθαι φερο-
 μένους καὶ διαίρειν εἰς ἑτέρους τόπους, καὶ τοιαῦτα ἕτερα, †καὶ ὁ ταῦθ'
 215 ὑπολαμβάνων μὴ καθεστάναι†. πλὴν ὅσον ἔμοιγε ἐφικτόν, οὕτω
 διείληφα· κατὰ πάντα τρόπον σέ, βασιλεῦ, καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ τὰ 15
 πραττόμενα πρὸς εὐδέβειαν ἐπανάγειν, ὅπως <ἑαυτῷ> συνιστορήσῃς, ὅτι
 τὸ κατ' ἀρετὴν συντηρῶν οὔτε χαρίζεσθαι προαιρῆ παρὰ λόγον, οὐδέ
 216 ἐξουσία χρώμενος τὸ δίκαιον αἶρεις. ἐπὶ πλείον γάρ, ἐν οἷς ἕκαστος
 πράγμασιν ἐγρηγορῶς τὴν διαγωγὴν ποιεῖται, καὶ καθ' ὕπνον ἐν τοῖς
 αὐτοῖς ἢ διάνοια τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ἔχει, †ὡς δὲ† πάντα διαλογισμὸν 20
 καὶ πράξις ἐπὶ τὰ κάλλιστα τρεπομένην κατευθύνει καὶ ἐγρηγορῶς
 217 καὶ ἐν ὕπνῳ. διὸ καὶ περὶ σὲ διὰ παντός ἐστιν εὐστάθεια. Κατε-
 ευφημήσας δὲ καὶ τοῦτον εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον Ἐπεὶ σὺ δέκατος
 τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἔχεις, ὡς ἂν ἀποφῆνῃ, πρὸς τὸ δεῖπνον τραπησομέθα.

HKAGIB
 CPTZ

3 om τα B 4 ει] εις G | προβαλοι P προβαλλει C προβαλοισ G προ-
 βαλλοις I | νομιζει P 5 om του ζην Z 9 τους υπνους P 10 ταδε]
 τηδε HKAPT τι δε GICZ τα τηδε B (τα excurrat in mg sed prima manu) |
 πασχωμεν GIP | om την I 11 υπολαμβανομεν BCPT] υπολαμβανομενοι
 cett 12 και ιο] om B | πολειν KGIBT] πωλειν HCPZ πλειν A (η πολ.)
 περιπολειν Wend.) | πετασθαι]+ημας B 13 και ο ταυθ—βασιλευ (15) om
 B^{xt} ins in mg B^{rubr} | ο] om K το P 14 υπολαμβανειν KGICPZ | καθιστα-
 ναι I Locus perobscurus ? κατα ταυθ υπολαμβανομεν καθεσταται 15 τρο-
 πον παντα Z | σε] σοι KBT 16 εαυτω] εαυτον codd 17 om το B
 18 αιρεις] αναιρεις P αιρης Z ερεις A 19 ποιηται P | η διανοια εν τοις
 αυτοις BT 20 ως δε codd] Fortasse ως δ εχει vel ος δ εχει 21 κατευ-
 θυνεις Z^{corr} 24 τραπησωμεθα GICPZ

ἡρώτα δέ Πῶς ἂν μῆδὲν ἀνάξιον ἑαυτῶν πράσσοιμεν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν 218
 Ἐπίβλεπε διὰ παντὸς εἰς τὴν σεαυτοῦ δόξαν καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν, ἵνα
 τούτοις ἀκόλουθα καὶ λέγῃς καὶ διανοῆ, γινώσκων ὅτι πάντες ὧν
 ἄρχεις περὶ σοῦ καὶ διανοοῦνται καὶ λαλοῦσιν. οὐ γὰρ ἐλάχιστόν 219
 5 σε δεῖ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν φαίνεσθαι· τὸ γὰρ πρόσωπον, <ὃ δέον αὐτοῖς>
 ἔστιν ὑποκρίνεσθαι, τοῦτο συνθεωροῦντες ἀκόλουθα πάντα πράσ-
 σουσι· σὺ δὲ οὐχ ὑπόκρισιν ἔχεις, ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς βασιλεύεις, θεοῦ
 δόντος σοι καταξίως τῶν τρόπων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. Τοῦ δὲ 220
 βασιλέως εὐ μάλα συγκροτήσαντος μετὰ φιλοφροσύνης ἐπὶ πλείονα
 10 χρόνον, τοὺς ἀθρώπους καθυπνοῦν παρεκάλουν. καὶ τὰ μὲν πρὸς
 τούτους ὡς ἔληξεν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξῆς ἐτράπησαν τῆς συμποσίας
 διάταξιν.

Τῇ δὲ ἐχομένῃ, τῆς αὐτῆς διατάξεως γενηθείσης, ὅτε καιρὸν ὑπε- 221
 λάμβανεν ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶναι τοῦ πυνθάνεσθαί τι τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἡρώτα
 15 τὸν πρῶτον τῶν ἀπολιπόντων πρὸς τὴν ἐξῆς ἐρώτησιν Τίς ἐστιν
 ἀρχὴ κρατίστη; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔφη Τὸ κρατεῖν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ μὴ συγκατα- 222
 φέρεσθαι ταῖς ὁρμαῖς. πᾶσι γὰρ ἀθρώποις φυσικὸν εἶναι τὸ πρόσ
 τι τὴν διάνοιαν ῥέπειν· τοῖς μὲν οἷν πολλοῖς ἐπὶ τὰ βρωτὰ καὶ 223
 ποτὰ καὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς εἰκὸς ἐστὶ κεκλίσθαι, τοῖς δὲ βασιλεῦσιν ἐπὶ
 20 χῶρας κατάκτησιν, κατὰ τὸ τῆς δόξης μέγεθος· πλὴν ἐν πᾶσι
 μετριότης καλόν. ἃ δὲ ὁ θεὸς δίδωσι, ταῦτα λαμβάνων σύνεχε·
 τῶν δ' ἀνεφίκτων μὴ ἐπιθύμει. Τοῖς δὲ ῥηθείσιν ἀρεσθεῖς 224
 πρὸς τὸν ἐχόμενον εἶπε Πῶς ἂν ἐκτὸς εἴῃ φθόνου; διαλιπὼν δὲ
 ἐκεῖνος ἔφη Πρῶτον εἰ νοῆσαι, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς πᾶσι μερίζει δόξαν τε
 25 καὶ πλοῦτου μέγεθος τοῖς βασιλεῦσι, καὶ οὐδεὶς περὶ ἑαυτόν ἐστι

1 αυτων CZ 3 λεγεις PZ 5 δει B] δια cett | ο δεον αυτοις conj HKAGIB
 Schmidt] ουδε αυτο (αυτος B) codd 6 τουτο]+γαρ GI | συν (in συνθεω- CPTZ
 ρουντες) sup lin T¹ 8 τον τροπον Z^{xt} | ηγεμονειαν H 10 καθυπνουντας
 C υπνουν GI | παρεκ. καθ. Z 11 τουτοις Z | εληξεν Schar] ελεξεν codd |
 επι]+τουτοις (post ras) Z | ως εληξεν—εχομενη (13)] om H 13 υπελαβεν
 CTZ 14 ηρωτα ex conj] πρωτα codd (επηρωτα Z^{corr}) 15 των απο-
 λιποντων (-λειπ. P)] τον απολιποντα BCTZ +ηγε B | ερωτησιν]+εφη P
 18 om την διαν. Z | βρωματα P 19 κεκλεισθαι PB*^{vid} 20 κατα] και
 Wend. | om το C 21 om ταυτα P | συνεχε λαμβανων B* (corr B¹)
 23 πως] ως Z | διαλειπων I 24 ει νοησαις Z^{corr} P (-ησ.) εννοησας B
 25 πλουτον HGI | παρ εαυτον Wend.

- 225 βασιλεύς· πάντες γὰρ θέλουσι μετασχεῖν ταύτης τῆς δόξης, ἀλλ' οὐ
 δύναται· θεοῦ γὰρ ἐστὶ δόμα. Ἐπαινέσας δὲ τὸν ἄνδρα
 διὰ πλειόνων ἐπηρώτα τὸν ἕτερον Πῶς ἂν καταφρονοῖ τῶν ἐχθρῶν;
 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ἠσκηκῶς πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εὖνοιαν καὶ κατεργα-
 σάμενος φιλίας, λόγον οὐθενὸς ἂν ἔχοις· τὸ δὲ κεχαριτωσθαι πρὸς 5
 πάντας ἀνθρώπους καὶ καλὸν δῶρον εἰληφέναι παρὰ θεοῦ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ
 226 κράτιστον. Συναινέσας δὲ τούτοις τὸν ἐξῆς ἐκέλευσεν
 ἀποκριθῆναι, πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰπὼν Πῶς ἂν δοξαζόμενος διαμένοι; εἶπε
 δὲ Τῇ προθυμίᾳ καὶ ταῖς χάρισι πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους μεταδοτικὸς ὢν
 καὶ μεγαλομερῆς οὐδέποτ' ἂν ἀπολίποι δόξης· ἵνα δὲ τὰ προειρη- 10
 227 μένα σοι διαμένῃ, τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦ διὰ παντός. Εὐφη-
 μήσας δὲ τοῦτον ἕτερον ἠρώτα Πῶς τινα δεῖ φιλότιμον εἶναι;
 ἐκείνος δὲ ἔφη Πρὸς τοὺς φιλικῶς ἔχοντας ἡμῖν οἴονται πάντες ὅτι
 πρὸς τούτους δέον· ἐγὼ δ' ὑπολαμβάνω, πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιδοξοῦντας
 φιλοτιμίαν δεῖν χαριστικὴν ἔχειν, ἵνα τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ μετάγωμεν 15
 αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ καθήκον καὶ συμφέρον ἑαυτοῖς. δεῖ δὲ τὸν θεὸν
 λιτανεύειν, ἵνα ταῦτ' ἐπιτελῆται· τὰς γὰρ ἀπάντων διανοίας
 228 κρατεῖ. Συνομολογήσας δὲ τούτοις τὸν ἕκτον ἐκέλευσεν
 ἀποφῆνασθαι πυνθανόμενος Τίσι δεῖ χαρίζεσθαι; ἐκείνος δ'
 ἀπεκρίθη Γονεῦσι διὰ παντός, καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς πεποιήται ἐντολὴν 20
 μεγίστην περὶ τῆς τῶν γονέων τιμῆς. ἐπομένως δὲ τὴν τῶν φίλων
 ἐγκρίνει διάθεσιν, προσονομάσας Ἰσον τῇ ψυχῇ τὸν φίλον. σὺ
 δὲ καλῶς ποιεῖς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς φιλίαν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καθ-
 229 ιστῶν. Παρακαλέσας δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἐπυνθάνετο καὶ τοῦ
 μετέπειτα Τί καλλονῆς ἀξιόν ἐστιν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εὐσέβεια. καὶ 25
 γὰρ αὕτη καλλονή τίς ἐστὶ πρωτεύουσα. τὸ δὲ δυνατὸν αὐτῆς

22 Deut 13⁶HKAGIB
CPTZ

2 δυνατ αν Z 5 φιλίαν Z 6 om και GI 8 ειπων] ειπειν GIC
 ειπας Z | πως] ως Z 9 προμηθεια K | μεταδοτ. ων προς τους αλλους B
 10 απολειποι P 11 διαμενοι A 12 πως] προς Wend. | δει sup lin scr
 Z*^{vid} 13 οιονται] οιον και K 15 δει BP | εχειν] ειναι B | τροπω]
 προσωπω CZ 17 επιτελειται C 18 συνομολογησασθαι P et (de omissio)
 Z* 19 om δ Z 20 απεκριθη] ειπε Z 21 επομενος P 22 εγκρινειν Z
 23 προς εαυτον] εαυτω P 24 και ιο] om B 26 om τις PZ | προτερευ-
 ουσα H προτενουσα GI | ^βεστιν ^ααυτης B* (corr B¹)

ἐστιν ἀγάπη· αὕτη γὰρ θεοῦ δόσις ἐστίν· ἦν καὶ σὺ κέκτησαι πάντα
 περιέχων ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ ἀγαθὰ. Δίαν δὲ φιλοφρόνως ἐπικρο- 230
 τήσας εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον Πῶς ἂν πταίσας πάλιν τῆς αὐτῆς
 κρατήσαι δόξης; ὁ δὲ ἔφη Σὲ μὲν οὐ δυνατόν ἐστι πταίσαι, πᾶσι
 5 γὰρ χάριτας ἔσπαρκας, αἱ βλαστάνουσιν εὐνοίαν, ἣ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν
 ὀπλων κατισχύουσα περιλαμβάνει τὴν μεγίστην ἀσφάλειαν· εἰ δέ 231
 τινες πταίουσιν, ἐφ' οἷς πταίουσιν, οὐκέτι χρὴ ταῦτα πράσσειν, ἀλλὰ
 φιλίαν κατακτησαμένους δικαιοπραγεῖν. θεοῦ δὲ δῶρον ἀγαθῶν
 ἐργάτην εἶναι καὶ μὴ τῶν ἐναντίων. Συναρσεθεὶς δὲ τούτοις 232
 10 πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον εἶπε Πῶς ἂν ἐκτὸς γένοιτο λύπης; ὁ δὲ ἔφησεν Εἰ
 μηδένα βλάπτοι, πάντας δὲ ὠφελοῖ, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ κατακολουθῶν·
 τοὺς γὰρ ἀπ' αὐτῆς καρποὺς ἀλυπίαν κατασκευάζειν. ἰκετεύειν δὲ 233
 τὸν θεόν, ἵνα μὴ τὰ παρὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν ἡμῶν ἀνακύπτοντα
 βλάβῃ, λέγω δὴ οἷον θάνατοί τε καὶ νόσοι καὶ λῦπαι καὶ τὰ
 15 τοιαῦτα. <αὐτῷ> δὲ σοὶ εὐσεβεῖ καθεστῶτι τούτων οὐδὲν ἂν
 προσέλθοι. Καλῶς δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἐπαινέσας τὸν δέκατον ἠρώτα 234
 Τί μέγιστόν ἐστι δόξης; ὁ δὲ εἶπε Τὸ τιμᾶν τὸν θεόν· τοῦτο δ'
 ἐστὶν οὐ δώροις οὐδὲ θυσίαις, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς καθαρότητι καὶ διαλήψεως
 ὁσίας, καθὼς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πάντα κατασκευάζεται καὶ διοικεῖται
 20 κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ βούλησιν· ἦν καὶ σὺ διατελεῖς ἔχων γνώμην, ἣ
 πάρεστι σημειοῦσθαι πᾶσιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ συντετελεσμένων καὶ
 συντελουμένων. Μετὰ μείζονος δὲ φωνῆς πάντας αὐτοὺς ὁ 235
 βασιλεὺς ἠσπάζετο καὶ παρεκάλει, συνεπιφωνούντων τῶν παρόντων,
 μάλιστα δὲ τῶν φιλοσόφων. καὶ γὰρ ταῖς ἀγωγαῖς καὶ τῷ λόγῳ
 25 πολὺ προέχοντες αὐτῶν ἦσαν, ὡς ἂν ἀπὸ θεοῦ τὴν καταρχὴν ποιού-
 μενοι. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ φιλοφρονεῖσθαι προῆλθε
 διὰ τῶν προπόσεων.

1 γαρ] δε B | θυ δοσις BCPT] θεοδοσιος cett 2 αυτη] ευαυτη K αυτω HKAGIB
 B* εαυτω B¹ txt cett 3 της αυτης παλιν P 5 εσπερκας HA | ευνοιαν CPZ
 +ει δε τινες πταιουσιν εφ οισ πταιουσι K* (del rubricator) 8 κτησα-
 μενους BT | αγαθον CT*Z 9 συναρκεσθεις B 10 εφησεν] εφη AP
 11 βλαπτοι] λυπειται Z^{vid} (fin ex corr) | ωφελει KT οφελοιη P 12 αυτους
 K 13 ομ τα KBCTZ 14 βλαπτοι CPZ | λεγω δη (δε Z)] om P | om
 τε P 15 τοιαυτα δε σοι codd (cum lacuna post τοιαυτα BC) αυτω inserui |
 αυτω—καθεστωτι] ευσεβει δε σοι οντι P 19 καθως—κατα (20)] om
 HKAGI 22 δε μειζονος Z 25 προσεχοντες BZ | αυτω B* | ησαν P]
 om cett 27 προποσεων BTH^{corr}] πραιποσιτων PK^{corr} προποσεων cett

- 236 Τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τῆς διατάξεως τοῦ συμποσίου
γενομένης, καθὼς εὐκαιρον ἐγένετο τῷ βασιλεῖ, τοὺς ἐξῆς ἡρώτα τῶν
προαποκεκριμένων, εἶπε δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ Τὸ φροεῖν εἰ διδακτὸν ἐστίν;
ὃς δ' εἶπε Ψυχῆς ἐστὶ κατασκευὴ διὰ θείας δυνάμεως ἐπιδέχεσθαι
- 237 πᾶν τὸ καλόν, ἀποστρέφεσθαι δὲ τάναντία. Συνομολογήσας 5
δὲ τὸν ἐχόμενον ἡρώτα Τί πρὸς ὑγιάν μάλιστα συντείνει; ἐκείνος
δὲ ἔφη Σωφροσύνη· ταύτης δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶ τυχεῖν, ἐὰν μὴ θεὸς κατα-
- 238 σκευάσῃ τὴν διάνοιαν εἰς τοῦτο. Παρακαλέσας δὲ τοῦτον πρὸς
τὸν ἕτερον ἔφη Πῶς ἂν γονεῦσι τὰς ἀξίας ἀποδώῃ χάριτας; ὃς δὲ
εἶπε Μηδὲν αὐτοὺς λυπήσας· τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ θεὸς τῆς δια- 10
- 239 νοίας ἡγεμῶν γένοιτο πρὸς τὰ κάλλιστα. Προσεπινεύσας δὲ
τούτῳ τὸν ἐξῆς ἡρώτα Πῶς ἂν φιλήκοος εἴῃ; ἐκείνος δὲ εἶπε Δια-
λαμβάνων ὅτι πάντα συμφέρει γινώσκειν, ὅπως ἂν πρὸς τὰ συμ-
βαίνοντα ἐκλεγόμενός τι τῶν ἡκροαμένων ἀνθυποτιθεῖς πρὸς τὰ τῶν
καιρῶν ἢ ἂν ἀντιπράσσηται, σὺν χειραγωγίᾳ θεοῦ· τοῦτο δ' ἐστίν, 15
- 240 αἱ τῶν πράξεων τελειώσεις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Τοῦτον δὲ ἐπαινέσας
πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον εἶπε Πῶς ἂν μηθὲν παράνομον πράσσοι; πρὸς τοῦτο
ἔφησε Γινώσκων ὅτι τὰς ἐπινοίας ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκε τοῖς νομοθετήσασι
πρὸς τὸ σώζεσθαι τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀκόλουθος εἴῃς
- 241 ἂν αὐτοῖς. Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸς ἕτερον εἶπε Τίς 20
ὠφέλεια συγγενείας ἐστίν; ὁ δὲ ἀπεφάνητο Ἐὰν τοῖς συμβαίνουσι
νομίζωμεν ἀτυχοῦσι μὲν ἐλαττοῦσθαι, καὶ κακοπαθῶμεν ὡς αὐτοί,
- 242 φαίνεται τὸ συγγενὲς ὅσον ἰσχυῶν ἐστὶ—τελουμένων δὲ τούτων καὶ
δόξα καὶ προκοπὴ παρὰ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις ὑπάρξει· τὸ γὰρ συνεργές

HKAGIB
CPTZ

2 γενομενου BT | τους] τοις I 3 αποκεκριμενων T 4 δια] και P
6 εκεινο B* εκεινος B¹ 7 εαν] ει A | κατασκευασει HAGCZ* 8 om δε
BCPTZ 9 ειπε Z | αποδων G αποδωση Z | γονευσιν αποδωη τας αξ. χαρ.
B 10 λυπησας P] λυπησαι cett | της διανοιας ηγεμων bis scripsit K
12 om αν C | ειη] pr αν Z | διαλαμβανειν B 13 συμφερειν T 14 ανθυ-
ποπιθης T (Wend.) txt (αντ. GICZ) cett 15 αν αντιπρασσηται] αντιπρασ-
σηται G (αν τι πρασσ.) IB txt (fort recte) cett (αν αντ. Wend.) | συχειρα-
γωγια A*GITZ | εστιν αι] εστι και P 16 η των πρ. τελειωσις T* | ? ειςιν
υπ αυτου 17 πρασσοι παρα τον νομον BCPTZ 18 δεδωκε P 19 ειης]
pr αν BTZ* (post ras) 20 om αν BT | αυτον] τουτον P | ετερον] pr τον
HPZ 22 νομιζωμεν KA^{corr} B^{corr} T] νομιζομεν cett | ατυχοισι KA^{corr} BPT]
ατυχωσι cett | ως αυτοι BC^{corr} T^{corr}] ως αυτον PC* T* vid ως αυτων cett
(ρωσαντως) 23 οσον—συνεργες (24)] om B^{txt} ins B^mg | om και P
24 υπαρχει GI | συγγενες B^{corr} T

- 248 Τῇ δὲ ἐχομένῃ τὸν καιρὸν λαβὼν ἐπῆρώτα τὸν ἐξῆς Τίς ἐστὶν ἀμέλεια μεγίστη; πρὸς τοῦτ' ἔφη Εἰ τέκνων ἀφροντίς τις εἴη, καὶ μὴ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀγαγεῖν <σπεύδοι>· εὐχόμεθα γὰρ αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, οὐχ οὕτως περὶ ἑαυτῶν ὡς περὶ τῶν ἐγγόνων, ἵνα παρῇ πάντα αὐτοῖς τὰ ἀγαθὰ. τὸ δὲ ἐπιδεῖσθαι παιδία σωφροσύνης μετασχεῖν, 5
- 249 θεοῦ δυνάμει τοῦτο γίνεται. Φήσας δὲ εὐλογεῖν ἄλλον ἠρώτα Πῶς ἂν φιλόπατρις εἴη; Προτιθέμενος, εἶπεν, ὅτι καλὸν ἐν ἰδία καὶ ζῆν καὶ τελευτᾶν. ἡ δὲ ξενία τοῖς μὲν πένησι καταφρόνησιν ἐργάζεται, τοῖς δὲ πλουσίοις ὄνειδος, ὡς διὰ κακίαν ἐκπεπτωκόσιν. εὐεργετῶν οὖν ἅπαντας, καθὼς συνεχῶς τοῦτ' ἐπιτελεῖς, θεοῦ διδόντος 10
- 250 σοὶ πρὸς πάντας χάριν, φιλόπατρις φανήσῃ. Τούτου δὲ ἀκούσας τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς ἐπυνθάνετο Πῶς <ἂν> ἀρμόσαι γυναικί; <Γινώσκων> ὅτι μὲν θρασύ ἐστιν, ἔφη, τὸ θῆλυ γένος, καὶ δραστικὸν ἐφ' ὃ βούλεται πρᾶγμα, καὶ μεταπίπτον εὐκόπως διὰ παραλογισμοῦ, καὶ τῇ φύσει κατεσκευάσται ἀσθενές· δέον δ' ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ ὑγιές 15
- 251 χρῆσθαι, καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἕριν ἀντιπράσσειν. κατορθοῦται γὰρ βίος, ὅταν ὁ κυβερνῶν εἰδῆ, πρὸς τίνα σκοπὸν δεῖ τὴν διέξοδον ποιεῖ-
- 252 σθαι. θεοῦ δ' ἐπικλήσει καὶ βίος κυβερνᾶται κατὰ πάντα. Συνανθομολογησάμενος δὲ τούτῳ τὸν ἐξῆς ἠρώτα Πῶς <ἂν> ἀναμάρτητος εἴη; ὁ δὲ ἔφησεν Ὡς ἅπαντα πρᾶστων καὶ μετὰ διαλογισμοῦ 20 καὶ μὴ πειθόμενος διαβολαῖς, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὣν δοκιμαστὴς τῶν λεγομένων καὶ κρίσει κατευθύνων τὰ τῶν ἐντεύξεων καὶ διὰ κρίσεως ἐπιτελῶν ταῦτα ἀναμάρτητος, ἔφησεν, ἂν εἴης, ὧ βασιλεῦ. τὸ δ' ἐπινοεῖν ταῦτα καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀναστρέφεσθαι θείας δυνάμεώς ἐστιν

HKAGIB
CPTZ

2 αφροντις τις ειη P] αφροντις (αφροστις G) τις ει GIK αφροντις τις η cett 3 σπενδοι] σπενυδη B om cett (spat 5 vel 6 litt hab T) 4 εκγονων A | om παρη P 5 επιδεσθαι conj Wend. | παιδια P teste Wend.] παιδειαν cett 7 προστιθεμενος B 8 ξενιτεια Wend. (ξενητια cod Mou) 9 εκπεπτωκασιν C 11 φανησει P | om δε P 12 κατα το (κατα τον II)] om P | om αν codd | αρμωσει P 13 γινωσκων] om codd ex conj supplevi | θρασυ—γενος] φησι θρασυ το θηλυ γενος εστι P | εστιν εφη TB^{rubricator} (εστι B*)] εστι cett 14 om και P | μεταπιπτων GI | ευκολως P 15 και] καιν K | κατεσκευασθη P -σθαι CZ 16 εριν] αιριν GI εριν PZ 17 ο κυβερνων K] om P κυβερνων cett | ηδη H ιδη KA | διεξοδον BCTZ] εξοδον cett 18 κατα] και τα I | παν C | συναντομ. AGICZ 19 τουτω] τουτον PCZ | om αν codd 20 εφησεν Ως] εφη Σεμνωσ conj Mend. | απαν H*A (απαν H^{corr}) | om και P | μετα partim sup ras I 23 om εφησεν P

ἔργον. Διαχυθείς δὲ τοῖς εἰρημένοις τὸν ἕτερον ἡρώτα 253
 Πῶς ἂν ἐκτὸς θυμοῦ γένοιτο; πρὸς τοῦτ' εἶπε Γινώσκων ὅτι πάντων
 ἐξουσίαν ἔχει, καί, εἰ χρήσαιτο θυμῷ, θάνατον ἐπιφέρει· ὅπερ ἀνω-
 φελὲς καὶ ἀλγεινὸν ἔστιν, εἰ τὸ ζῆν ἀφελεῖται πολλῶν, διὰ τὸ κύριον
 5 εἶναι. πάντων δ' ὑπηκόων ὄντων καὶ μηδενὸς ἐναντιουμένου, τίνος 254
 χάριν θυμωθήσεται; γινώσκειν δὲ δεῖ, διότι θεὸς τὸν πάντα κόσμον
 διοικεῖ μετ' εὐμενείας καὶ χωρὶς ὀργῆς ἀπάσης· τούτῳ δὲ κατακο-
 λουθεῖν ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστὶ σε, ἔφησεν, ὦ βασιλεῦ. Καλῶς 255
 δὲ ἀποκεκρίσθαι φήσας τοῦτον ἐπυθάνετο τοῦ μετέπειτα Τί ἐστὶν
 10 εὐβουλία; Τὸ καλῶς ἅπαντα πράσσειν, ἀπεφήνατο, μετὰ διαλογι-
 σμοῦ, κατὰ τὴν βουλήν παρατιθέντα καὶ <τὰ> βλαβερὰ τῶν κατὰ
 τὸ ἐναντίον τοῦ λόγου διάστημα, ἵνα πρὸς ἕκαστον ἐπινοήσαντες
 ὦμεν εὖ βεβουλευμένοι, καὶ τὸ προτεθὲν ἡμῖν ἐπιτελήται. τὸ δ' αὖ
 κράτιστον, θεοῦ δυναστεία πᾶν βούλευμα <τελείωσιν ἕξει> σοι
 15 τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἀσκοῦντι. Κατωρθωκένοι δὲ καὶ τοῦτον εἰπὼν 256
 ἄλλον ἡρώτα¹ Τί ἐστὶ φιλοσοφία; Τὸ καλῶς διαλογίζεσθαι πρὸς ἕκαστον
 ἕκαστον τῶν συμβαινόντων, ἀπεφήνατο, καὶ μὴ ἐκφέρεσθαι ταῖς
 ὀρμαῖς, ἀλλὰ τὰς βλάβας καταμελετᾶν τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐκβαι-
 νούσας, καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν πράσσειν δεόντως μετριοπαθῆ καθε-
 20 στώτα. ἵνα δ' ἐπίστασιν τούτων λαμβάνωμεν, θεραπεύειν δεῖ τὸν
 θεόν. Ἐπισημίνας δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἕτερον ἡρώτα Πῶς ἂν 257
 ἀποδοχῆς <ἐν ξενιτείᾳ> τυγχάνοι; Πᾶσιν ἴσος γινόμενος, ἔφη, καὶ
 μᾶλλον ἡττων ἢ καθυπερέχων φαινόμενος πρὸς οὓς ξενιτεύει.
 κοινῶς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὸ ταπεινούμενον προσδέχεται κατὰ φύσιν, καὶ τὸ
 25 τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος τοὺς ὑποτασσομένους φιλανθρωπεῖ. Ἐπι- 258
 μαρτυρήσας δὲ τούτοις ἄλλον ἡρώτα Πῶς <ἂ> ἂν κατασκευάσῃ καὶ

2 γινωσκειν I 3 εχεις A | χρῆσαι τῷ P | θυμου HKAGICZ | ἐπι- HKAGIB
 φερειν B 6 δε P] om cett | διοτι] οτι KBT 7 τουτο PZ | κατακολου- CPTZ
 θειν] +σε P 8 σε] om P σοι H^{corr} | om εφησεν ω K 10 πραττειν B |
 μετα] +δε Z 11 τα κατα την ιδιαν βουλην παρατιθεντας B | om τα
 codd | om των B 13 επιτελειται CPZ 14 τελειωσιν εξει σοι conj
 Mend.] τews συνεξει σοι B Γ in εξισοι Z τews in (ινα C) εξισοι cett 15 κατ-
 ορθωκεναι HKGICZ | ειπας HGICZ 17 εκαστα BPTZ 19 τα] τας B*
 20 δειν B* δε (pro δεον?) K txt cett 21 επισημανας P (-μειν. Z*)
 22 εν ξενιτ. Mend.] η ξενιτεια codd | τυγχανη PT -νει Z | γινομενος P] γενομ.
 cett 23 ηττων GIZ* | ξενιτευη BT 24 om και B 25 γενος] + και
 B | φιλοφρονει B 26 α αν] αν codd αν Wend.

- μετὰ τοῦτο διαμένη; πρὸς τοῦτ' εἶπεν Εἰ μεγάλα καὶ σεμνὰ ταῖς
ποιήσεσιν ἐπιτελοῖ, πρὸς τὸ φείσασθαι τοὺς θεωροῦντας διὰ τὴν
καλλονήν, καὶ μῆθένα τῶν κατεργαζομένων τὰ τοιαῦτα παραπέμποι,
μηδὲ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀμισθὶ συντελεῖν ἀναγκάζει τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν.
- 259 διανοούμενος γὰρ ὡς θεὸς πολυωρεῖ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, χορη- 5
γῶν αὐτοῖς καὶ ὑγίαν καὶ εὐαισθησίαν καὶ τὰ λοιπά, καὶ αὐτὸς
ἀκόλουθόν τι πράξει τῶν κακοπαθειῶν ἀποδιδούς τὴν ἀντάμειψιν.
- 260 τὰ γὰρ ἐκ δικαιοσύνης τελούμενα, ταῦτα καὶ διαμένει. Εὐ 10
δὲ καὶ τοῦτον εἰρηκέναι φήσας τὸν δέκατον ἠρώτα Τί ἐστι σοφίας
καρπός; ὁ δὲ εἶπε Τὸ μὴ συνιστορεῖν ἑαυτῷ κακὸν πεπραχότι, τὸν 10
261 δὲ βίον ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διεξάγειν. ἐκ τούτων γὰρ κρατίστη χαρὰ καὶ
ψυχῆς εὐστάθειά σοι γίνεται, μέγιστε βασιλεῦ, καὶ ἐλπίδες ἐπὶ θεῷ
καλαῖ κρατοῦντί σοι τῆς ἀρχῆς εὐσεβῶς. Ὡς δὲ συνήκουσαν
πάντες ἐπεφώνησαν σὺν κρότῳ πλείονι. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ
προπιεῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς [λαμβάνειν] ἐτράπη, χαρᾶ πεπληρωμένους. 15
- 262 Τῇ δ' ἐξῆς καθὼς πρότερον ἢ διάταξις ἦν τῶν κατὰ τὸν πότον
ἐπιτελουμένων, καιροῦ δὲ γενομένου τοὺς ἀπολιπόντας ὁ βασιλεὺς
ἐπηρώτα. πρὸς τὸν πρῶτον δὲ ἔφη Πῶς ἂν μὴ τραπήη τις εἰς
263 ὑπερηφανίαν; ἀπεκρίθη δὲ Εἰ τὴν ἰσότητά τηροῖ, καὶ παρ' ἕκαστον
ἑαυτὸν ὑπομιμνήσκει, καθὼς ἄνθρωπος ὢν ἀνθρώπων ἡγείται. καὶ 20
ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ὑπερηφάνους καθαιρεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἐπιεικέας καὶ ταπεινοὺς
264 ὑψοῖ. Παρακαλέσας δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐξῆς ἐπηρώτα Τίσι δεῖ
συμβούλοις χρῆσθαι; τοῖς διὰ πολλῶν, ἔφη, πεπειραμένοις πραγ-
μάτων καὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν συντηροῦσιν ἀκέραιον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν
τρόπων ὅσοι μετέχουσιν αὐτῷ. θεοῦ δὲ ἐπιφάνεια γίνεται πρὸς τὰ 25

HKAGIB
PTZ

1 διαμενει Wend. | προς τουτ—επιτελοι (2)] om HKA 2 επιτελοιη P |
τας θ. Z 3 μηδενα GI | παραπεμπει P 4 αμισθοι Z | αναγκαζει P
6 αυτος] αυτοις A 8 διαμενοι B 11 διεξαγειν P] διαγειν B διεξαγαγειν
cett | χαρα κρατιστη B 13 κρατον Z* 15 πιειν AB | λαμβανειν (-ην
P)] hab codd omn Fort cf πιειν δουναι etc vel προποσιν pro προπιειν legen-
dum | χαρας KBP χαρα τι Z 16 το δ εξης B | καθως]+ και B | κατα των
τοπων Z 17 γινομενου KAGI 18 επηρωτα BPT] επερωτα cett | τρα-
πειη BT] τραποιη PZ τραπη K τραποι cett | om εις P 19 τηρει BPT
20 υπομιμνησκει BPT 21 ο] ως B 22 ηρωτα B επερωτα Z txt cett |
δει ex de vel δη fact in B 23 εφη P] om cett post πραγματων ins
Z^{cort} 24 f τον τροπον H 25 θεου—αξιους (1, pag 565)] om BPTZ

τοιαῦτα τοῖς ἀξίοις. Ἐπαινέσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἄλλον ἡρώτα Τίς 265
 ἐστὶ βασιλεῖ κτῆσις ἀναγκαιοτάτη; Τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων φιλαν-
 θρωπία καὶ ἀγάπησις, ἀπεκρίνατο. διὰ γὰρ τούτων ἄλτος εὐνοίας
 δεσμὸς γίνεται. τὸ δὲ γίνεσθαι κατὰ προαίρεσιν ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς
 5 ἐπιτελεῖ. Κατεπαινέσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐτέρου διεπυθάνετο 266
 Τί πέρας ἐστὶ λόγου; κάκείνος δὲ ἔφησε Τὸ πείσαι τὸν ἀντιλέγοντα,
 διὰ τῆς ὑποτεταγμένης τάξεως τὰς βλάβας ἐπιδεικνύντα· οὕτω γὰρ
 λήψῃ τὸν ἀκροατὴν οὐκ ἀντικείμενος, συγχρώμενος δὲ ἐπαίνῳ πρὸς
 τὸ πείσαι. θεοῦ δὲ ἐνεργεῖα κατευθύνεται πειθῶ. Εὐ δὲ 267
 10 λέγειν φήσας αὐτὸν ἕτερον ἡρώτα Πῶς ἄν, παμμικῶν ὄχλων ὄντων
 ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, τούτοις <ἀρμόσαι>; Τὸ πρόπον ἐκάστῳ συνυποκρινό-
 μενος, εἶπε, καθηγεμόνα λαμβάνων δικαιοσύνην· ὡς καὶ ποιεῖς θεοῦ
 σοι διδόντος εὐ λογιζέσθαι. Φιλοφρονηθεὶς δὲ τούτῳ πρὸς 268
 τὸν ἕτερον εἶπεν Ἐπὶ τίσι δεῖ λυπεῖσθαι; πρὸς ταῦτα ἀπεκρίθη Τὰ
 15 συμβαίνοντα τοῖς φίλοις ὅταν θεωρῶμεν πολυχρόνια καὶ ἀνέκφευκτα
 γινόμενα. τελευτήσασι μὲν γὰρ καὶ κακῶν ἀπολελυμένοις οὐχ
 ὑπογράφει λύπην ὁ λόγος· ἀλλὰ ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς ἀναφέροντες καὶ τὸ
 πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συμφέρον λυποῦνται πάντες ἄνθρωποι. τὸ δ' ἐκφυγεῖν
 πᾶν κακὸν θεοῦ δυνάμει γίνεται. Ὡς ἔδει δὲ φήσας αὐτὸν 269
 20 ἀποκρίνεσθαι πρὸς ἕτερον εἶπε Πῶς ἀδοξία γίνεται; ἐκείνος δὲ
 ἔφησεν Ὅταν ὑπερηφανία καθηγῆται καὶ θράσος ἄληκτον, ἀτιμα-
 σμὸς ἐπιφύεται καὶ δόξης ἀναίρεσις. θεὸς δὲ δόξης πάσης κυριεύει,
 ῥέπων οὐ βούλεται. Καὶ τούτῳ δ' ἐπικυρώσας τὰ τῆς ἀπο- 270
 κρίσεως τὸν ἐξῆς ἡρώτα Τίσι δεῖ πιστεῦειν ἑαυτόν; Τοῖς διὰ τὴν
 25 εὐνοίαν, εἶπε, συνουσί σοι, καὶ μὴ διὰ τὸν φόβον μηδὲ διὰ πολυ-

1 τις] τι I 2 βασιλεῖ] βασιλικῆ A | κτισις GI 4 ταυτα κατα ΗΚΑΓΙΒ
 προαιρεσιν B 5 επιτελοι Z | ετερου] τον ετερον ΒΤΖ | επυθθανετο ΒΖ ΠΤΖ
 7 επιδεικνυντας ΗΓΙΡΖ υποδεικνυντας Κ 8 ληψει ΑΡ ληψ Ζ^{txt} (ληψαι
 Ζ^{mg}) | αντικειμενον ΒΡΤΖ 10 φησας] πεισας Ζ^{txt} ειπας Ζ^{mg} | ετερον] ρΓ
 τον Κ 11 αρμοσει Β* (-ση Β^{corr}) αρμοση cett 13 τουτο ΡΖ^{txt} (τουτση
 Ζ^{mg} fort recte cf 198) txt cett 14 λυπησθαι Ρ 15 ανευφευκτα ΗΓΙ
 ανεκφευκτα Τ ανεφευκτα Ζ ανεκφυκτα Β txt ΚΑΡ 17 f το προς εαυ-
 τους] προς το εαυτοις Ρ 19 δυναμειως ΒΤ 20 αποκρινασθαι
 ΓΙΒ^{vid} Τ^{fort} ex corr 21 καθηγειται ΓΙΑ 22 αναιρεσις ΒΡΤ] αιρεσις
 cett | απασης Ρ 23 τουτο Ζ | τα] τας ΓΙ 25 ειπε] εφη
 ΒΤ

- ωρίαν, ἐπανάγουσι πάντα πρὸς τὸ κερδαίνειν. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀγαπήσεως σημεῖον, τὸ δὲ δυσνοίας καὶ καιροτηρησίας· ὅς γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ πλεονεκτεῖν <ὀρμᾶται> προδότης πέφυκε. σὺ δὲ πάντας εὐνόους
- 271 ἔχεις θεοῦ σοι καλὴν βουλὴν διδόντος. Σοφῶς δὲ αὐτὸν εἰπὼν ἀποκεκρίσθαι, ἐτέρῳ εἶπε Τί βασιλείαν διατηρεῖ; πρὸς τοῦτ' 5 ἔφη Μέριμνα καὶ φροντίς, ὡς οὐδὲν κακουργηθήσεται διὰ τῶν ἀποταγαμένων εἰς τοὺς ὄχλους ταῖς χρεῖαις· καθὼς σὺ τοῦτο πράσσεις
- 272 θεοῦ σοι τὴν σεμνὴν ἐπίνοιαν διδόντος. Θαρσύνας δὲ τοῦτον ἕτερον ἐπηρώτα Τί διαφυλάσσει χάριτα καὶ τιμὴν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ἄρετή. καλῶν γὰρ ἔργων ἐστὶν ἐπιτέλεια, τὸ δὲ κακὸν ἀποτρίβε- 10 ται· καθὼς σὺ διατηρεῖς τὴν πρὸς ἅπαντας καλοκάγαθίαν παρὰ
- 273 θεοῦ δῶρον τοῦτ' ἔχων. Κεχαρισμένως δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἀποδεξάμενος τὸν ἐνδέκατον ἐπηρώτα (διὰ τὸ δύο πλεονάζειν τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα) Πῶς ἂν κατὰ ψυχὴν καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις εἰρηνικῶς ἔχοι; ὁ δὲ ἀπεφίηατο Διαλαμβάνων ὅτι κακὸν οὐδὲν εἴργασται τῶν ὑπο- 15 τεταγαμένων οὐθενί, πάντες δὲ ἀγωνιοῦνται περὶ τῶν εὐεργετημάτων, εἰδότες, κἂν ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν ἀποτρέχουσιν, ἐπιμελητὴν σε τῶν
- 274 βίων. οὐ γὰρ διαλείπεις ἐπανορθῶν ἅπαντας τοῦ θεοῦ σοι καλοφροσύνην δεδωκότος. Ἐπισημήνας δὲ κρότῳ πάντας αὐτοὺς ἀπεδέξατο φιλοφρονούμενος, καὶ προπίνων ἐκάστῳ πλείον τι πρὸς 20 τὸ τερφθῆναι <ἐτραπή>, μετ' εὐφροσύνης τοῖς ἀνδράσι συνῶν καὶ χαρᾶς πλείονος.
- 275 Τῇ ἐβδόμῃ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν, πλείονος παρασκευῆς γενομένης, προσπαραγνομένων πλειόνων ἐτέρων ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων (ἦσαν γὰρ

HKAGIB
PTZ

1 ἐπαναγουσι B] ἐπαναγαγουσι Z^{corr} ἐπαναγων P ἐπαναγοντας cett | παντας P 3 το] τω B* (το B^{corr}) T (ex το fact vid) | ορμᾶται bene Mend.] ορα BT^{corr} οραται cett 4 διδοντος Z* | σοφως BT] σαφως cett 5 εἰπας GIZ | διατηροῖ G 8 θρασυνας KB 9 διαφυλασση I (-λαττει B) 10 καλον γαρ εργων K | ἐστιν—διατηρεις την (11) om HKA 12 κεχαρισμενος AZ* κεχαριτωμενος I 13 των B] τους cett | εβδομηκοντα] ὁ KGIBT. Scholium hab τον ενδεκατον δε ερωτα δια το δυο πλεοναζειν των εβδομηκοντα οπισθεν γαρ ανα δεκα ηρωτα B^{mg} (rubricator) 16 ουθενι KPT] ουδενι B ουθεν ΠΑΓΙ | δε] γαρ B* 17 αποτρεχουσιν GIH (-σι) Z*^{vid} 20 προπινων B] προσπινων cett 21 ετραπη ins Mend. | τ. ανδ. συν. μετ ευφ. Z, 23 δε BPT] om cett 24 προσπαραγενομενων ετ. πλειονων K | om ησαν—πρεσβεις (1, pag 567) BPTZ

ἱκανοὶ πρέσβεις), ἐπηρώτησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς καιροῦ γενομένου τὸν
 πρωτεύοντα τῶν ἀπολιπόντων τῆς ἐρωτήσεως Πῶς ἂν ἀπαραλό-
 γιστος <εἴη>; ἐκείνος δὲ ἔφη Δοκιμάζων καὶ τὸν λέγοντα καὶ τὸ 276
 λεγόμενον καὶ περὶ τίνος λέγει, καὶ ἐν πλείονι χρόνῳ τὰ αὐτὰ δι'
 5 ἑτέρων τρόπων ἐπερωτῶν. τὸ δὲ νοῦν ἔχειν ὄξυν καὶ δύνασθαι
 κρίνειν ἕκαστα θεοῦ δῶρημα καλὸν ἐστίν· ὡς σὺ τοῦτο κέκτησαι,
 βασιλεῦ. Κρότῳ δὲ ἐπισημηνάμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἕτερον 277 § C
 ἐπηρώτα Διὰ τί τὴν ἀρετὴν οὐ παραδέχονται τῶν ἀνθρώπων
 οἱ πλείονες; Ὅτι φυσικῶς ἅπαντες, εἶπεν, ἀκρατεῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς
 10 ἡδονὰς τρεπόμενοι γεγόνασιν· ὧν χάριν ἀδικία πέφυκε καὶ τὸ τῆς
 πλεονεξίας χύμα. τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀρετῆς κατάστημα κωλύει τοὺς ἐπιφε- 278
 ρομένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἡδονοκρασίαν, ἐγκράτειαν δὲ κελεύει καὶ δικαιο-
 σύνην προτιμᾶν. ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάντων ἡγείται τούτων. Εὐ δὲ 279
 ἀποκεκρίσθαι τοῦτον εἰπὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡρώτα Τίσι δεῖ κατακολου-
 15 θεῖν τοὺς βασιλεῖς; ὁ δὲ ἔφη Τοῖς νόμοις, ἵνα δικαιοπραγούντες
 ἀνακτῶνται τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων· καθὼς σὺ τοῦτο πράσσων
 ἀέναον μνήμην καταβέβλησαι σεαυτοῦ, θείῳ προστάγματι κατα-
 κολουθῶν. Εἰπὼν δὲ καὶ τοῦτον καλῶς λέγειν τὸν ἐχόμενον 280
 ἡρώτα Τίνας δεῖ καθιστάνειν στρατηγούς; ὃς δὲ εἶπεν Ὅσοι
 20 μισοπονηρίαν ἔχουσι, καὶ τὴν ἀγωγὴν αὐτοῦ μιμούμενοι, πρὸς τὸ
 διὰ παντὸς εὐδοξίαν ἔχειν αὐτούς, τὰ δίκαια πράσσουσι καθὼς σὺ
 τοῦτο ἐπιτελεῖς, εἶπε, μέγιστε βασιλεῦ, θεοῦ σοι στέφανον δικαιο-
 σύνης δεδωκότος. Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ αὐτὸν μετὰ φωνῆς ἐπὶ τὸν 281
 ἐχόμενον ἐπιβλέψας εἶπε Τίνας δεῖ καθιστάνειν ἐπὶ τῶν δυνάμεων
 25 ἄρχοντας; ὁ δὲ ἀπεφήνατο Τοὺς ἀνδρεία διαφέροντας καὶ δικαιο-
 σύνη, καὶ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιουμένους τὸ σῶζειν τοὺς ἄνδρας ἢ τὸ

1 ἐπερωτησεν Z | γινομενου HAIPIZ | τον] των Z* 2 ἀπολειποντων P HKAGI
 3 ειη ex corr] η codd omn | δοκιμαζοντα Z | το] τον codd omn 4 χρονων BCPTZ
 G 5 ἐπερωτων τροπων A 6 ως] ο HKA | τουτο bis scr T 8 ἐπε-
 ρωτα Z | om ου C | των ανθρωπων BPT] τινες των ανθρωπων cett 9 ειπεν]
 ωςπερ BT ειπερ CZ* 11 διαστημα CPZ (κατα- sup ras T) 12 και
 δικ. κελευει B 14 αποκρινασθαι BPT -εσθαι Z | ειπας GICZ | ηρωτα]
 αλλον ηρ. Η ηρ. ετερον·BT ηρ. τον εξης P txi KAGIC τον μετ αυτον ηρ.
 edd pr 18 ειπας GIC ειπε Z 21 αυτοις H 22 ειπε μεγαστε BT]
 om P ειπεν ο (sic) C ειπε (-πεν Z) cett | δικαιοσυνην C 26 το 2^ο] τω
 ABCT (fort ex το T)

- ¶ P νικᾶν, τῷ θράσει <παραβάλλοντας> τὸ ζῆν. ὡς¹ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς εὖ
 ἐργάζεται πᾶσι, καὶ σὺ τοῦτον μιμούμενος εὐεργετεῖς τοὺς ὑπὸ
 282 σεαυτόν. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκεκρίσθαι φήσας αὐτὸν εὖ, ἄλλον ἠρώτα
 τίνα θαυμάζειν ἀξίον ἔστιν ἀνθρώπων; ὁ δὲ ἔφη Τὸν κεχορηγημένον
 δόξῃ καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ δυνάμει, καὶ ψυχὴν ἴσον πᾶσιν ὄντα· καθὼς 5
 σὺ τοῦτο ποιῶν ἀξιοθαύμαστος εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ σοι διδόντος εἰς ταῦτα
 283 τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν. Ἐπιφωνήσας δὲ καὶ τούτῳ πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον
 εἶπεν Ἐν τίσι δεῖ πράγμασι τοὺς βασιλεῖς τὸν πλείω χρόνον διά-
 γειν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσι καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῶν πορειῶν
 ἀπογραφαῖς διατρίβειν, ὅσαι πρὸς τὰς βασιλείας ἀναγεγραμμέναι 10
 τυγχάνουσι πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν καὶ διαμονὴν ἀνθρώπων. ὁ σὺ
 πρίσσω ἀνέφικτον ἄλλοις δόξαν κέκτησαι θεοῦ σοι τὰ βουλή-
 284 ματα συντελοῦντος. Ἐνεργῶς δὲ καὶ τοῦτον προσειπὼν
 ἕτερον ἠρώτα τίνας δεῖ ποιῆσθαι τὰς διαγωγὰς ἐν ταῖς ἀνέσεσι
 καὶ ῥαθυμίαις; ὁ δὲ ἔφη Θεωρεῖν ὅσα <παίζεται> μετὰ περι- 15
 στολῆς καὶ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν τιθέναι τὰ τοῦ βίου μετ' εὐσχημο-
 σύνης καὶ καταστολῆς γινόμενα <βίῳ συμφέρον καὶ καθῆκον>·
 285 ἔνεστι γὰρ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἐπισκευή τις. πολλάκις γὰρ καὶ ἐκ τῶν
 ἐλαχίστων αἰρετόν τι δείκνυται. σὺ δὲ πᾶσαν ἡσκηκῶς καταστολήν
 διὰ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν φιλοσοφεῖς διὰ καλοκάγαθιαν ὑπὸ θεοῦ τιμώ- 20
 286 μενος. Εὐαρестήσας δὲ τοῖς προειρημένοις πρὸς τὸν ἔνατον
 εἶπε Πῶς δεῖ διὰ τῶν συμποσίων διεξάγειν; ὁ δὲ ἔφησε Παραλαμ-
 βάνοντα τοὺς φιλομαθεῖς καὶ δυναμένους ὑπομιμνήσκειν τὰ <χρήσιμα
 τῇ βασιλείᾳ> καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἀρχομένων βίοις—ἐμμελέστερον ἢ μου-
 287 σικώτερον οὐκ ἂν εὖροις τι τούτων· οὗτοι γὰρ θεοφιλεῖς εἰσι πρὸς τὰ 25
 κάλλιστα πεπαιδευκότες τὰς διανοίας—καθὼς καὶ σὺ τοῦτο πράσσεις,
 288 ὡς ἂν ὑπὸ θεοῦ σοι κατευθυνομένων ἀπάντων. Διαχυθεῖς

HKAGI
BCPTZ

1 τω] τα P | παραβαλλοντας conj Schmidt] περιβαλλοντας codd
 2 πασι] παλιν B 5 ψυχη πασιν ἰσον H 7 τουτο Z 8 δει] δε Z |
 πλειονα A (πλειωι GI) 9 om εν 2^ο BT 12 πρασσω] πρασσων (-σως
 K*) ως K | ανεφικτον Z^{mg}] ουκ εφικτον K εφικτον cett 13 τελουντος H
 συντελουμενος CZ | εναργως B | τουτω AB | προσειπας GICZ 14 ποιειν
 K 15 om ο δε εφη K | οσα παιζεται (corr·Schmidt)] οσα πλιζεται
 ΗΓICTZ* οσα οπλιζεται ΚΑΖ^{mg} ος οπλ. B 16 τιθεμενος B 17 βιω—
 καθηκον bene Wend.] βιοι (βιοις K) σωφρωνων και κατεχων codd 21 εν-
 τον ΗΒ*) εννατον cett 22 om δει C 23 f χρησιμα τη βασιλεια Mend.]
 χρηματα της βασιλειας codd 24 τους των αρχ. βιοις B 27 σου Z^{xi}

δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρημένοις, ἐπυρνάνετο τοῦ μετέπειτα Τί κάλλιστόν ἐστι
 τοῖς ὄχλοις, ἐξ ἰδιώτου βασιλέα κατασταθῆναι <ἐπ'> αὐτῶν, ἢ ἐκ
 βασιλέως βασιλέα; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔφη Τὸ ἄριστον τῇ φύσει. καὶ γὰρ 289
 ἐκ βασιλέων βασιλεῖς γινόμενοι πρὸς τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους ἀνήμε-
 5 ροί τε καὶ σκληροὶ καθίστανται· πολλῶ δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ τινες τῶν
 ἰδιωτῶν καὶ κακῶν πεπειραμένοι καὶ πενίας μετεσχηκότες ἄρξαντες
 ὄχλων χαλεπώτεροι τῶν ἀνοσίων τυράννων ἐξέβησαν. ἀλλὰ ὡς 290
 προεῖπον, ἦθος χρηστὸν καὶ παιδείας κεκοινωνηκὸς δυνατὸν ἄρχειν
 ἐστί· καθὼς σὺ βασιλεὺς μέγας ὑπάρχεις, οὐ τοσοῦτον τῇ δόξῃ τῆς
 10 ἄρχῆς καὶ πλοῦτῳ προσχών, ὅσον ἐπιεικέα καὶ φιλανθρωπία πάντα
 ἀνθρώπους ὑπερῆρκας τοῦ θεοῦ σοι δεδορημένου ταῦτα. Ἐπὶ 291
 πλείονα χρόνον καὶ τοῦτον ἐπαιέσας τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἡρώτα Τί
 μέγιστόν ἐστι βασιλείας; πρὸς τοῦτο εἶπε Τὸ διὰ παντὸς ἐν εἰρήνῃ
 καθεστάναι τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους, καὶ κομίζεσθαι τὸ δίκαιον ταχέως
 15 ἐν ταῖς διακρίσεισι. ταῦτα δὲ γίνεται διὰ τὸν ἡγούμενον, ὅταν 292
 μισοπόνηρος ἦ καὶ φιλάγαθος καὶ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιούμενος ψυχὴν
 ἀνθρώπου σώζειν· καθὼς καὶ σὺ μέγιστον κακὸν ἡγήσαι τὴν
 ἀδικίαν, δικαίως δὲ πάντα κυβερνῶν ἀένναον τὴν περὶ σεαυτὸν δόξαν
 κατεσκευάσας, τοῦ θεοῦ σοι διδόντος ἔχειν ἀγνὴν καὶ ἀμιγῆ παντὸς
 20 κακοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν. Καταλήξαντος δὲ τούτου κατερράγη 293
 κρότος μετὰ φωνῆς καὶ χαρᾶς ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον. ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο,
 ὁ βασιλεὺς λαβὼν ποτήριον ἐπεχέατο καὶ τῶν παρόντων ἀπάντων
 καὶ τῶν εἰρημένων λόγων. Ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ εἶπε Τὰ μέγιστα μοι § Jos
 γέγονεν ἀγαθὰ παραγεννηθέντων ὑμῶν· πολλὰ γὰρ ὠφέλημα, κατα- 294
 25 βεβλημένων ὑμῶν διδαχὴν ἐμοὶ πρὸς τὸ βασιλεύειν. ἐκάστῳ
 δὲ τρία τάλαντα προσέταξεν ἀργυρίου δοθῆναι καὶ τὸν ἀποκαταστή-

1 om δε K 2 επ Mend.] υπ codd 3 τον Schmidt | αρεστον HKAGIB
 HKAGI 4 εκ] pr οι K | βασιλεων] βασιλεως B | om βασιλεις HA | γενο-
 5 μνοι K 5 om δε Z | των ιδιωτων τινες BT 6 ιδιωτικων Z 8 παι-
 7 δειας KB (πειδιας B*) TZ (ex -ειαν)] παιδεια (-δια C) cett 9 βασιλευ T* vid
 11 υπερηρας KB* | επι πλειονα χρονον] cum praecedd conj Schmidt Wend.
 (sic HKΛ). Cf autem §§ 220, 293 13 τουτο GICT*] τουτον HKABT^{corr}
 14 νομιζεσθαι C 17 κακον B] om cett 18 σεαυτου CB^{vid} 19 κατα-
 20 σκευασας HI | om εχειν Z | αμιγην C 22 λαβων cum cod M restitui]
 21 λαλων codd cett 23 τον ειρημενον λογον K | λογον Z^{ms} | μεγιστα] παμ-
 24 μεγιστα A 24 παραγεγεννημεων B | ωφελημα GI | καταβεβληκοτων B

¶ Jos σοντα παῖδα.¶ συνενπιφωνησάντων δὲ πάντων, χαρᾶς ἐπληρώθη τὸ
 συμπόσιον, ἀδιαλείπτως τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς εὐφροσύνην τραπέντος.
 295 Ἐγὼ δὲ <εἰ πεπλεόνακα,> τούτοις, ὦ Φιλόκρατες, συγγνώμην
 ἔχειν. τεθανυμακὸς γὰρ τοὺς ἄνδρας ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ καιροῦ τὰς
 296 ἀποκρίσεις ἐποιοῦντο πολλοῦ χρόνου δεομένας, καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἐρωτῶντος 5
 μεμεριμνηκότος ἕκαστα, τῶν δὲ ἀποκρινομένων καταλλήλως ἐχόντων
 τὰ πρὸς τὰς ἐρωτήσεις, ἄξιοι θαυμασμοῦ κατεφαίνοντό μοι καὶ τοῖς
 παροῦσι, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις. οἶμαι δὲ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς
 297 παραληψομένοις τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ἄπιστον φανέται. ψεύσασθαι μὲν
 οὐκ οὐ καθήκον ἐστὶ περὶ τῶν ἀναγραφομένων· εἰ δὲ καὶ τι παρα- 10
 βαίην, οὐχ ὅσιον ἐν τούτοις· ἀλλ', ὡς γέγονεν, οὕτως διασαφοῦμεν
 ἀφοσιούμενοι πᾶν ἁμάρτημα. διόπερ ἐπειράθην ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτῶν
 τὴν τοῦ λόγου δύναμιν παρὰ τῶν ἀναγραφομένων ἕκαστα τῶν
 γινομένων ἐν τε τοῖς χρηματισμοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ταῖς συμ-
 298 ποσίαις μεταλαβεῖν. ἔθος γάρ ἐστι, καθὼς καὶ σὺ γινώσκεις, ἀφ' 15
 ἧς ἂν [ἡμέρας] ὁ βασιλεὺς ἄρξῃται χρηματίζειν, μέχρις οὗ κατα-
 κοιμηθῆ, πάντα ἀναγράφεσθαι τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ πρᾶσσόμενα, καλῶς
 299 γινομένου καὶ συμφερόντως. τῇ γὰρ ἐπιούσῃ τὰ τῇ πρότερον
 πεπραγμένα καὶ λελαλημένα πρὸ τοῦ χρηματισμοῦ παραναγινώ-
 σκεται, καί, εἴ τι μὴ δεόντως γέγονε, διορθώσεως τυγχάνει τὸ 20
 300 πεπραγμένον. πάντ' οὖν ἀκριβῶς <παρὰ τῶν> ἀναγεγραμμένων, ὡς
 ἐλέχθη, μεταλαβόντες κατακεχωρίκαμεν, εἰδότες ἦν ἔχεις φιλομά-
 θειαν εἰς τὰ χρήσιμα.

§ Jos 301 Ἔμετὰ δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ὁ Δημήτριος παραλαβὼν αὐτούς, καὶ
 διελθὼν τὸ τῶν ἐπτὰ σταδίων ἀνάχωμα τῆς θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν 25
 νῆσον, καὶ διαβὰς τὴν γέφυραν, καὶ προσελθὼν ὡς ἐπὶ τὰ βόρεια

HKAGIB
 CTZ Jos

3 εἰ πεπλεονακα (cf Diod 1. 90. 4) bene Mend.] εἶπα πλεονα και codd
 6 καταλληλως BT] αλληλως cett 7 τα] τας C 8 δε 2°] +ws B
 9 απιστα K 12 αφοσιωμενοι HGICZ (αφωσιωμενοι A) 15 om και I
 16 om αν B | ημερας codd] omittendum vid ημερας ωρας Wend. ωρας Mend. |
 αρξεται B 18 γενομενον I | τη 2°] om H 19 λαλημενα Z | παραναγιν.
 BT] παραγινωσκειται cett 20 δεοντος CZ | γεγоне BT] γεγονος (-ως GI)
 cett | om το πεπραγμενον BT 21 παντ] παντες C | παρα των Wend. |
 παντων codd | παντ—μεταλαβοντες (22)] παντων ουν ακριβως των αναγεγραμ-
 μενων μεταλαβοντες παντες BT 22 ελεγχθη Z | κεχωρηκαμεν CZ κατα-
 κεχωρηκαμεν codd cett 26 διαβας προς την γεφυραν Jos | προελθων Jos |
 om ωs Z

μέρη, συνέδριον ποιησάμενος εἰς κατεσκευασμένον οἶκον παρὰ τὴν
 ἠϊόνα, διαπρεπῶς ἔχοντα καὶ πολλῆς ἡσυχίας ἔφεδρον, παρεκάλει
 τοὺς ἄνδρας τὰ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐπιτελεῖν, παρόντων ὅσα πρὸς τὴν
 χρείαν ἔδει καλῶς. οἱ δὲ ἐπετέλουν ἕκαστα σύμφωνα ποιοῦντες 302
 5 πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς· τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῆς συμφωνίας γινόμενον
 πρεπόντως ἀναγραφῆς οὕτως ἐτύγχανε παρὰ τοῦ Δημητρίου. καὶ 303
 μέχρι μὲν ὥρας ἐνάτης τὰ τῆς συνεδρείας ἐγένετο· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα
 περὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος θεραπείαν ἀπελύοντο γίνεσθαι, χορηγουμένων
 αὐτοῖς δασιλῶς ὧν προηροῦντο πάντων. ἐκτὸς δὲ καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν, 304
 10 ὅσα βασιλεῖ παρεσκευάζετο, καὶ τούτοις ὁ Δωρόθεος ἐπετέλει·
 προστεταγμένον γὰρ ἦν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως. ἅμα δὲ τῇ πρώτῃ
 παρεγίνοντο εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν καθ' ἡμέραν, καὶ ποιησάμενοι τὸν
 ἀσπασμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως, ἀπελύοντο πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτῶν τόπον. ὡς δὲ 305
 ἔθος ἐστὶ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, <ἀπονιψάμενοι> τῇ θαλάσῃ τὰς
 15 χεῖρας, ὡς ἂν εὐξῶνται πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἐτρέποντο πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν
 καὶ τὴν ἐκάστου διασάφισιν.¹ Ἐπρωτόησα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο 306 ¶ Jos
 Τίνος χάριν ἀπονιζόμενοι τὰς χεῖρας τὸ τηρικαῦτα εὐχονται; διεσά-
 φουν δέ, ὅτι μαρτύριόν ἐστι τοῦ μηδὲν εἰργάσθαι κακόν· πᾶσα γὰρ
 ἐνέργεια διὰ τῶν χειρῶν γίνεται· καλῶς καὶ ὁσίως μεταφέροντες ἐπὶ
 20 τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάντα. καθὼς δὲ προειρήκαμεν, 307
 οὕτως καθ' ἐκάστην εἰς τὸν τόπον, ἔχοντα τερπνότητα διὰ τὴν
 ἡσυχίαν καὶ καταύγειαν, συναγόμενοι τὸ προκείμενον ἐπετέλουν.
 συνέτυχε δὲ οὕτως, ὥστε ἐν ἡμέραις ἑβδομήκοντα δυσὶ τελειωθῆναι
 τὰ τῆς μεταγραφῆς, οἷονεὶ κατὰ πρόθεσίν τινα τοιοῦτου γεγενη-
 25 μένου. ¹Τελείωσιν δὲ ὅτε ἔλαβε, συναγαγὼν ὁ Δημήτριος 308 § Jos

1 κατασκευασμενον CZ 2 ηιον (ηιων Z) αδιαπρεπως H*GICZ ηιον ΗΚΑΓΙΒ
 διαπρεπως A 3 τα της] τας BTZ 5 ταις αντιβολαις part sup ras B | C†Z Jos
 γενομενον BCTZ 7 ενατης HC] θ εννατης cett | συνεδριας BCTZ
 9 αυτοις KBT Jos] αυτων cett 10 Δωροθεος C 13 προς] εις BT (sed B
 primum aliud scripsit quod postea erasit) | τον εαυτων KBT] εαυτων codd
 cett τον αυτον Jos 14 απονιψαμενους AIC^{vid}Z απονιψαμενη B* -μενοις
 cett 15 ευξωνται K] ηυξαντο (ευξ- GI) cett 16 επρωτησα CT]
 επρωτα B επρωτησα cett | τουτον G 18 μηθεν K 20 ειρηκαμεν I
 21 τερπνοτητα BTZ (-νωτ.)] τερπω τινα ΗΚΛ*GIC (τερπωλην τινα M τερ-
 ποτητα A^{corr} vid) 23 εβδομηκοντα συν δυσιν K εβδ. και δυσιν Jos εβδομη-
 κοντα δυο T ὀβ BZ 24 γραφης I 25 οτε δε ελαβε τελειωσιν B

- τὸ πλήθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὸν τόπον, οὗ καὶ τὰ τῆς ἑρμηνείας ἐτελέσθη, παρανέγνω πᾶσι, παρόντων καὶ τῶν διερμηνευσάντων, οἵτινες μεγάλης ἀποδοχῆς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ πλήθους ἔτυχον, ὡς ἂν
 309 μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν παραίτιοι γεγονότες. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸν Δημήτριον ἀποδεξάμενοι παρεκάλεσαν μεταδοῦναι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις 5
 § Eus 310 αὐτῶν, μεταγράψαντα τὸν πάντα νόμον. ἵ καθὼς δὲ ἀνεγνώσθη τὰ τεύχη, στάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ τῶν ἑρμηνέων οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολιτεύματος οἳ τε ἡγούμενοι τοῦ πλήθους εἶπον Ἐπεὶ καλῶς καὶ ὁσίως διηρμήνεται καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἡκριβωμένως, καλῶς ἔχον ἐστίν, ἵνα διαμείνῃ ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοντα, καὶ μὴ γένηται 10
 311 μηδεμία διασκευή. πάντων δ' ἐπιφωνησάντων τοῖς εἰρημένοις, ἐκέλευσαν διαράσασθαι, καθὼς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἐστίν, εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθεὶς ἢ μεταφέρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιούμενος ἀφαίρεσιν, καλῶς τοῦτο πράσσοντες, ἵνα διὰ παντὸς ἀένναα καὶ μένοντα φυλάσσηται. 15
 312 Προσφωνηθέντων δὲ καὶ τούτων τῷ βασιλεῖ μεγάλως ἐχάρη τὴν γὰρ πρόθεσιν, ἣν εἶχεν, ἀσφαλῶς ἔδοξε τετελειώσθαι. παρανεγνώσθη δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πάντα, καὶ λίαν ἐξεθαύμασε τὴν τοῦ νομοθέτου διάνοιαν. καὶ πρὸς τὸν Δημήτριον εἶπε Πῶς τηλικούτων συντετελεσμένων οὐδεὶς ἐπεβάλετο τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἢ ποιητῶν ἐπι- 20
 313 μνησθῆναι; ἐκέινος δὲ ἔφη Διὰ τὸ σεμνὴν εἶναι τὴν νομοθεσίαν καὶ διὰ θεοῦ γεγονέναι· καὶ τῶν ἐπιβαλλομένων τινὲς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ
 314 πληγέντες τῆς ἐπιβολῆς ἀπέστησαν. καὶ γὰρ ἔφησεν ἀκηκοέναι Θεοπόμπου, διότι μέλλων τινὰ τῶν προηρμηνευμένων ἐπισφα-

HKAGIB
 CTZ Jos
 Eus

1 και τα] κατα Z* 6 om δε Eus^o | τα] pr ταυτα Eus^o 9 om καλωσ Eusⁱ | και 2^o] om I | ακριβωσ Eus 10 διαμενη Eusⁱ (διαμενει Eus^o vid) txt ex Jos confirmatur (διαμειναι) | om μη Eusⁱ | γινηται Eusⁱ 12 εκελευσαν Jos Eus^{edd}] εκελευσε (-σεν Eus) Ar codd Eus^o | παρασθαι Eus | καθω I καθο A | εστιν αυτοις Eus^o 13 μεταφερον GI | om τι Eus^o 14 πρασσοντος HKCA txt codd cett Jos (πραττ.) Eus 15 και μενοντα] μενοντα Eus^o μενοντες Eusⁱ vid 17 παρανεγνωσθη KBCT Eus] παρεγνωσθη HAGI 19 τηλικουτων]+πραγματων fort recte Eus 20 επεβαλετο IIKBCT Eus] επελαβετο AGI | η] ουδε Eus | ποιητων B Eus Jos] ποιητικωσ HK ποιητικων cett 22 επιβαλομενων Eusⁱ | om του Eus^o 23 επιβουλης H*^{vid} KAGI | εφησαν Eus^o 24 Θεοπεμπτου Ar codd txt Jos Eus | προερμηνευμενων HKGIC

λέστερον ἐκ τοῦ νόμου προσιστορεῖν ταραχὴν λάβοι τῆς διανοίας
 πλείον ἡμερῶν τριάκοντα· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἄνεσιν ἐξιλιάσκεσθαι τὸν
 θεόν, σαφὲς αὐτῷ γενέσθαι, τίνος χάριν τὸ συμβαῖνόν ἐστι. δι' 315
 ὀνείρου δὲ σημανθέντος, ὅτι τὰ θεῖα βούλεται περιεργασάμενος εἰς
 5 κοινούς ἀνθρώπους ἐκφέρειν, ἀποσχόμενον δὲ οὕτως ἀποκαταστήναι.
 καὶ παρὰ Θεοδέκτου δὲ τοῦ τῶν τραγωδιῶν ποιητοῦ μετέλαβον ἐγώ, 316
 διότι παραφέρειν μέλλοντός τι τῶν ἀναγεγραμμένων ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ
 πρὸς τι δρᾶμα τὰς ὄψεις ἀπεγλαυκώθη· καὶ λαβὼν ὑπόνοιαν, ὅτι
 διὰ τοῦτ' αὐτῷ τὸ σύμπτωμα γέγονεν, ἐξίλασάμενος τὸν θεὸν ἐν
 10 πολλαῖς ἡμέραις ἀποκατέστη. Μεταλαβὼν δὲ ὁ βασιλεύς, 317
 καθὼς προεῖπον, περὶ τούτων τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Δημητρίου, προσκυνήσας
 ἐκέλευσε μεγάλην ἐπιμέλειαν ποιῆσθαι τῶν βιβλίων καὶ συντηρεῖν
 ἀγνῶς.¹ παρακάλεσας δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἑρμηνεῖς, ἵνα παραγίνωνται 318 ¶ Eus
 πυκνότερον πρὸς αὐτόν, ἐὰν ἀποκατασταθῶσιν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν,—
 15 δίκαιον γὰρ εἶπε τὴν ἐκπομπὴν αὐτῶν γενέσθαι· παραγενηθέντας δέ,
 ὡς θέμις, ἔξιν αὐτοὺς φίλους, καὶ <πολυωρίας> τῆς μεγίστης τεύξε-
 σθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ. τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐκπομπὴν αὐτῶν ἐκέλευσεν ἔτοι- 319
 μάζειν, μεγαλομερῶς τοῖς ἀνδράσι χρησάμενος. ἐκάστῳ γὰρ στολὰς
 ἔδωκε τῶν κρατίστων τρεῖς καὶ χρυσίου τάλαντα δύο καὶ κυλίκιον
 20 τάλαντου καὶ τρικλίνου πᾶσαν κατάστρωσιν. ἔπεμψε δὲ καὶ τῷ 320
 Ἐλεαζάρῳ μετὰ τῆς ἐκπομπῆς αὐτῶν ἀργυρόποδας κλίνας δέκα καὶ
 τὰ ἀκόλουθα πάντα καὶ κυλίκιον τάλαντων τριάκοντα καὶ στολὰς
 δέκα καὶ πορφύραν καὶ στέφανον διαπρεπῆ καὶ βυσσίνων ὀθονίων

1 προσιστορεῖν HKAGI txt BCT Eus | λαβοι Eus] λαβειν Ar codd HKAGIB
 2 τριακοντα] ᾱ KA | ανεσιν Ar codd Jos] αιτησιν Eus 3 om το Eus^o CTZ Jos
 4 σημανθεντος] μαθοντος Eus 5 δε ουτως] ωσαυτως BT δε αυτως CZ
 8 οψις C | απεγλαυκωθη Eus A^{corr}] απεγλυκωθη HKAGI επεγλυκωθη
 B*CTZ* (-γλαυκ. B^{corr} Z^{mg} γλαυκωθειη Jos) 9 ταυτ Eusⁱ | αυτω BA^{corr}
 Eus] αυτο cett | om το συμπτωμα Eus 11 προειπε Eus^{io} | περι—Δημητριου
 em Cobet] περι τουτων τα περι του Δ. Eus περι των (om των C) του Δ. Ar
 codd (ταυτα παρα του Δ. Jos) 12 συντηρεισθαι Eus^o 13 αγνων CTZ*
 αγνα B | τοις I | παραγινονται GIC 14 αποκαταστωσιν K | Ιουδαιαν]
 ιδιαν A 15 om γαρ B (hab Jos) 16 ως θεμις] ωσαυθις A^{corr} | εξειν
 A^{corr} (cod Mon ap Wend.)] εξεις H εξει cett | πολυωριας (cf 270) Mahaffy]
 πολυδωριας codd et Jos | τευξασθαι BCTZ txt cett Jos 18 μεγαλοπρεπωσ
 K | χαρισαμενος Wend. 19 κυλικιον ABT Jos] κυλιδιον cett κυλικειον hic
 et 22 Wend. 22 τριακοντα] ᾱ KA 23 στεφον T

ἱστοὺς ἑκατὸν καὶ φιάλας καὶ τρυβλία καὶ κρατῆρας χρυσοὺς δύο
 321 πρὸς ἀνάθεσιν. ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ παρακαλῶν, ἵνα, εἴαν τινες τῶν
 ἀνδρῶν προαιρῶνται πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνακομισθῆναι, μὴ κωλύσῃ, περὶ
 πολλοῦ ποιούμενος τοῖς πεπαιδευμένοις συνεῖναι, καὶ εἰς τοιοῦτους
 ¶ Jos τὸν πλοῦτον κατατίθεσθαι δαψιλῶς, καὶ οὐκ εἰς μάταια. ¶

322 Σὺ δέ, καθὼς ἐπηγγειλάμην, ἀπέχεις τὴν διήγησιν, ὦ Φιλόκρατες.
 τέρπειν γὰρ οἶομαί σε ταῦτα ἢ τὰ τῶν μυθολόγων βιβλία. νένευκας
 γὰρ πρὸς περιεργίαν τῶν δυναμένων ὠφελεῖν διάνοιαν, καὶ ἐν τούτοις
 τὸν πλείονα χρόνον διατελεῖς. πειράσομαι δὲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν
 ἀξιολόγων ἀναγράφειν, ἵνα διαπορευόμενος αὐτὰ κομίζῃ τοῦ βουλή- 10
 ματος τὸ κάλλιστον ἔπαθλον.

HKAG1B
 CTZ Jos

1 ιστοὺς Jos] εἰς τοὺς Ag codd | τρυβλία]+καὶ σπονδεια Jos 3 προαι-
 ρουνται Z 4 om καὶ HKGICZ | τοιοῦτοις I 7 σε] om B* ins B¹
 adnotat ἰσως μαλλον Z^{mg} 9 πλειον KGICZ πλειω HA | διατελειω Z |
 λοιπα bis scr C 10 κομίζει GI 11 om το καλλιστον T

INDICES.

- I. *INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES.*
- II. *INDEX OF SUBJECT-MATTER.*

INDEX I.

GENESIS

- i. 1 ff., 378; 2, 327, 449, 459, 465; 4 f., 305, 323; 6, 449, 459; 9, 326; 10, 459; 13 f., 134; 27, 53
 ii. 2, 327, 413, 465; 4, 215; 7, 374
 iii. 8, 449; 15, 449, 474; 20, 325, 377
 iv. 1, 377, 445; 2, 305; 3 f., 472; 7, 446, 465; 8, 243, 442, 474; 21, 374; 24, 306
 v. 2, 57, 329, 449; 3, 446; 4, 305, 449; 5, 474; 14, 374 f.; 19, 307
 vi. 19, 307
 viii. 7, 306; 21, 449
 ix. 25, 374 f.
 x. 13—18, 22—29, 249
 xi. 9, 325
 xii. 1, 408; 9, 41, 326
 xiv. 13, 325; 14, 465; 23, 445
 xv. 1, 308; 1—6, 330 f.; 9 f., 378; 11, 322; 15, 478; 18, 374
 xvi. 14, 478
 xvii. 1, 376
 xviii. 12, 374; 24—26, 134; 25, 52, 327
 xix. 3, 475
 xx. 14 f., 18
 xxi. 6, 478
 xxii. 2, 449
 xxiii. 16, 305
 xxiv. 10 f., 327; 20, 375
 xxv. 6, 324; 27, 329
 xxvi. 18, 329
 xxvii. 30, 378; 46, 460
 xxviii. 13, 307, 375
 xxix. 9, 326
 xxx. 1, 307; 10 ff., 236; 11, 446; 14 f., 18
 xxxi. 21, 326; 29, 442; 46 ff., 234
 xxxii. 23 f., 378; 25, 18
 xxxiv. 10, 325; 14, 326
 xxxv. 6, 324; 11, 376; 16 ff., 234; 17, 27, 307
 xxxvi. 1, 307; 33 ff., 257
 xxxvii. 3, 445
 xxxviii. 9, 306
 xxxix. 1, 378
 xl. 17, 325; 43, 446
 xli. 2 ff., 21; 13, 306; 34, 504; 45, 378; 56, 442
 xliii. 16, 134
 xliv. 2 ff., 21; 10, 442, 449; 19, 322
 xlv. 16, 308; 34, 18
 xlvi. 28, 378, 391
 xlvii. 31, 445; 459
 xlviii. 14, 445, 466; 17 f., 89
 xlix. 3, 305; 3—27, 360; 6, 446; 10, 416, 442, 449, 465, 474; 19, 236, 322, 446

EXODUS

- i. 11, 305; 12, 307 f.; 16, 446
 ii. 5, 476; 14, 307, 409; 15, 306
 iii. 7, 308; 14, 327, 446
 iv. 9, 305; 10, 371, 374; 16, 327; 21, 306
 v. 9, 442; 13, 305, 459
 vii. 2, 326, 449; 16, 69
 viii. 8, 306; 21, 449
 ix. 3, 371; 7, 306; 22, 449
 xii. 8, 475; 23, 329; 26, 449; 40, 327; 43, 326
 xiv. 13, 308; 25, 442

- xv. 1—21, 253 f.; 3, 327; 17, 374,
472; 27, 305
xvi. 15, 377, 446; 23, 475; 24,
305; 36, 465
xvii. 6, 479; 11, 306; 15, 446; 16,
465
xviii. 11, 306
xix. 1, 215; 16 ff., 24, 331 f.
xx. 5, 475; 13—15, 234; 23, 374
xxi. 6, 446
xxiii. 2, 374; 20, 57; 30, 307
xxiv. 10 f., 53, 327
xxv. 29, 449; 40, 416
xxvi. 21, 329
xxviii. 15, 449; 26, 326
xxix. 9, 472; 23, 475
xxx. 1, 475; 6, 442
xxxi. 7, 329
xxxii. 21—24, 90; 32, 326, 446
xxxiii. 1—3, 412; 8, 305; 19, 465
xxxiv. 13, 449
xxxv.—xl., 234 ff.
xxxv. 8, 243
xxxvi. 4, 307; 8—34, 243
xxxvii. 19, 472; 25—28, 243
xxxix. 18, 449, 472
xl. 6—8, 11, 243

LEVITICUS

- i. 3, 475
iv. 5, 466; 27—29, 90
vi. 2, 306
xi. 5, 475; 17, 21; 35, 475
xiii. 31, 442
xvi. 4, 475; 8 ff., 449
xviii. 5, 375
xix. 7, 327; 13, 305; 23, 374
xxi. 10, 308
xxii. 2, 472
xxiii. 3, 446; 11, 15, 17
xxiv. 7, 327, 472; 11, 475

NUMBERS

- i. 2, 215; 24 ff., 236
iii. 24, 480
iv. 19, 472
v. 2, 375; 15, 475; 20, 479
vi. 22 ff., 236
vii. 15, 326
ix. 10, 307

- xi. 2, 305; 9, 306; 25 f., 305; 29,
308
xii. 8, 327
xv. 14, 329
xvi. 5, 322; 21, 472
xxi. 1, 305; 11, 308
xxii. 6, 305
xxiii. 7—10, 332; 19, 466; 21, 459
xxiv. 7, 319 n.; 9, 305; 17, 329,
416, 466; 23, 443; 24, 474
xxv. 8, 476
xxvi. 15 ff., 236
xxvii. 12, 449
xxxv. 2, 308

DEUTERONOMY

- i. 17, 372; 22, 307
ii. 35, 305
iv. 1—23, 412; 37, 442
v. 17—19, 234; 22, 416
vi. 1—9, 332 f.
vii. 13, 40; 16, 308, 325
viii. 15, 372; 18, 375
ix. 5, 329
x. 16, 329, 449, 460
xi. 7, 305; 30, 41
xii. 8, 375
xiv. 12—18, 360; 16, 21; 17, 475;
23, 327
xvii. 18, 215
xix. 4, 479
xx. 19, 446
xxi. 8, 328; 16, 374
xxii. 16, 305; 29, 327
xxvi. 2, 475; 5, 322
xxviii. 35, 2; 66, 466
xxix. 18, 479
xxx. 4, 2; 20, 372
xxxi. 18, 308
xxxii. 1—43, 44, 253 f.; 4, 375; 6,
416 f.; 7, 466; 10, 305; 39, 372;
43, 243, 305
xxxiii. 12, 476

JOSHUA

- iv. 24, 327
v. 2, 446; 3, 466
ix. 3 ff., 236 f.
x. 12—14, 333; 42, 476
xi. 10—14, 73

xiv. 12, 328
 xv. 59, 442
 xix. 47 f., 237, 244
 xx. 4—6, 244
 xxi. 36 f., 42 a—d, 244
 xxiv. 30 a—33 b, 244

JUDGES

i. 19, 324; 35, 446
 v. 8, 480; 15, 45; 16, 459; 28—30, 333 f.
 vi. 2 f., 306; 18, 308
 viii. 3, 305; 7, 324; 13, 446
 ix. 26, 305; 42, 53
 xii. 6, 446
 xiv. 15, 443
 xv. 14 ff., 446 f.; 19, 476
 xvi. 13 f., 443
 xviii. 30, 447
 xix. 18, 443; 22, 449

RUTH

ii. 2, 306; 9, 14, 305; 22, 306
 iii. 1, 306

I KINGDOMS

i. 1, 322, 324; 1 ff., 298; 5, 326; 8, 306; 14, 327; 20, 377; 24, 26, 308, 324, 442; 28, 245
 ii. 1—10, 253 f.; 6, 472; 9 f., 245 f., 409; 12, 449; 29, 321; 33, 442
 iii. 6, 308; 13, 442; 14, 17, 308
 iv. 1, 442; 10, 321
 v. 6, 327 f., 443
 vi. 11, 15, 325; 19, 443; 20, 321
 vii. 4, 325
 ix. 22, 377; 24, 476; 25, 443
 x. 5, 447; 14, 305; 21, 443; 22, 308
 xli. 2, 322; 3, 443; 8, 321, 443
 xliii. 20, 459; 21, 447
 xlv. 18, 41 f., 443
 xv. 22, 417; 23, 41
 xvii.—xviii., 245 f.
 xvii. 37—43, 334 f.; 47, 475
 xix. 13, 377
 xx. 19, 443; 30, 447
 xxi. 7, 321
 xxii. 2 ff., 316; 9, 377

xxiii. 11—12, 246; 14, 325
 xxvii. 10, 447
 xxxi. 10, 447

2 KINGDOMS

i. 18, 449; 21, 447
 ii. 2, 308
 iii. 39, 305
 iv. 6, 377, 443
 vii. 12, 302
 viii. 5, 306; 7, 378
 x. 14, 305
 xii. 21, 446
 xvii. 3, 443
 xix. 42, 405
 xxii. 2—6, 316; 3, 306
 xxiv. 6, 443; 15, 446

3 KINGDOMS

ii. 35 a—o, 46 a—1, 247
 iv. 17 ff., 237
 v. 13, 475
 vii. 17, 475; 48, 475
 viii. 17 f., 237; 39, 472; 53 a, 247, 514
 x. 23—33, 238 f.
 xi. 3—8, 239; 34, 451
 xii. 24 a—z, 248 f.
 xiii. 12, 447
 xiv. 6, 305; 25, 3 f.
 xvi. 7, 11, 26, 43, 51, 253; 28 a—h, 249
 xvii. 1, 444
 xviii. 22—28, 83 f.
 xix. 14 ff., 401
 xx., xxi., 239
 xx. 10, 12, 39 f.
 xxi. 10—13, 35
 xxii. 38, 466

4 KINGDOMS

i. 2 f., 447; 18 a—d, 249
 ii. 11—18, 335 f.; 14, 324, 476
 v. 7, 306
 vi. 5, 253
 viii. 13, 447
 xvi. 9, 41
 xvii. 6, 3; 15, 45; 29, 307
 xviii. 17—xx. 19, 316
 xix. 25, 41

xxiii. 21—24, 36, 39 f.; 22 f., 447;
24—27, 31—33, 249

xxiv. 14 ff., 3

xxv. 11, 21 f., 3; 20 ff., 275

1 CHRONICLES

i. 10—16, 17 b—23, 249; 44 f., 257

lii. 1 f., 299

xxi. 12, 321; 15, 305

2 CHRONICLES

i. 3, 308

ii. 8, 475

iii. 1, 306

iv. 11, 475

xii. 2 f., 3

xx. 37, 305

xxix. 26, 253

xxxiii. 18, 253; 19, 444

xxxv. 10, 305; 19 a—d, 249

xxxvi. 2 a—c, 5 a—d, 249

1 ESDRAS

i. 1, 266

ii. 3 f., 378; 9, 48; 1—25, 266; 21,
378

iii. 1—v. 70, 266

iv. 7—24, 266; 41, ib.

xi. 2—8, 378

2 ESDRAS

xi. 9, 2

xv. 15, 327

xix. 30, 305

xxi., xxii., 249

4 ESDRAS

xxiii. 39 ff., 3

xliv. 44, 221

PSALMS

i. 1—5, 413

ii. 11 f., 459; 12, 466

iii. 4, 326

iv. 7, 466

v. tit., 321; 10, 251

vi. 6, 251, 466

vii. 12, 460

viii. 4, 449

ix.—cxlvii., 239 f.

ix. tit., 466 f.; 17, 251

xiii. 1—3, 3 a—c, 251 f.

xv. 2, 444; 9, 326, 460

xvii. 3 ff., 316 f., 326; 45, 413

xxi. 2, 306; 7, 407, 467; 9, 409;

17, 321, 413, 444; 30, 467

xxv. 6, 472

xxvi. 13, 444

xxvii. 9, 472

xxx. 6, 472

xxxi. 1, 407

xxxii. 6, 467

xxxiii. 12 ff., 399, 407, 409

xxxiv. 2, 472

xxxv. 1, 251

xxxvi. 7, 460; 10 ff., 328; 35, 56;

36, 407

xxxix. 7, 327, 417, 479

xl. 3, 305; 14, 255

xli. 6, 444

xlii. 3, 472

xliii. 5, 322; 16, 52; 24, 53

xliv. 1, 467; 17, 417

xlv. 1—3, 62 f.; 3, 33

xlvi. 12, 444; 13, 21, 305

xlix. 10, 15, 417; 21 f., 407

l., 296; 12, 471; 14, 449, 471; 17, 407

li. 3, 305

lii. 6, 308

lv. 1, 475

lviii. 6, 472

lx. 3, 460

lxvii. 12—14, 18—22, 99; 26, 475

lxviii. 3, 52; 27, 444

lxxi. 5, 444; 18—20, 255

lxxii. 3, 475; 28, 306

lxxv. 7, 460

lxxvii. 2, 397; 70, 253

lxxviii. 2, 25; 3, 372; 8, 472

lxxix. 2, 472

lxxx. 4, 475

lxxxiii. 7, 319 n.

lxxxvi. 4 f., 66, 467

lxxxvii. 6, 467

lxxxviii. 5, 255; 8, 459; 21, 399, 407

xc. 6—13, 37, 40, 460

xc. 4, 475; 5—10, 38, 40; 13, 467

xcv. 5, 10, 467; 10, 424 n.

xcvi. 7, 243

xcviii. 5, 467

c. 5, 444

ci. 27, 417

cv. 48, 255

cvi. 20, 467 f.
 cviii. 29, 475
 cx. 1—4, 305, 336, 409, 413, 417,
 468
 cxii. 5 f., 472
 cxlii. 11, 417
 cxiv. 9, 472
 cxv. 2, 460
 cxvii. 23, 307
 cxx. 8, 472
 cxxxviii. tit., 2; 8, 408; 15 f., 449
 cxxxix. 4, 251
 cxl. 4, 319 n.
 cxlvi. 2, 2
 cli., 252 f.

PROVERBS

i. 28, 308
 ii. 18, 449
 iii. 5, 306; 11, 257; 12, 407, 409;
 15, 308; 16, 255; 22 a, 28 e, 255,
 306
 iv. 27 a—b, 255
 vi. 8 a—c, 255
 vii. 1 a, 255
 viii. 21 a, 255; 22 ff., 57, 336 f.,
 468, 471; 30 f., 336 f.
 ix. 12 a—c, 18 a—c, 255; 18, 460
 x. 10, 444
 xii. 11 a, 13 a, 255
 xv. 18 a, 255, 306
 xvi. 17, 255, 306
 xvii. 6 a, 255
 xviii. 22 a, 255
 xxi. 16, 460; 25, 407
 xxii. 8 a, 255; 20, 468; 28, 61
 xxiv.—xxxii., 240 f.
 xxiv. 22 a—c, 255
 xxvi. 11, 255, 400
 xxvii. 20 a, 21 a, 255
 xxxi. 26, 255

ECCLESIASTES

i. 1, 215
 ii. 17, 309
 iii. 1—8, 360
 iv. 9, 52
 vii. 19, 460

JOB

ii. 9, 256
 iv. 21, 407

v. 17 ff., 407
 vi. 5, 305
 ix. 9, 449
 x. 4, 101
 xiv. 12, 476
 xviii. 20, 460
 xix. 17, 101; 18, 321; 23—27,
 257 f., 337 f.
 xxi. 27, 460
 xxvi. 5, 460; 14, 52
 xxvii. 12, 329
 xxix. 1, 308
 xxx. 13, 329; 30, 475
 xxxviii. 26, 302
 xl. 14, 468, 472
 xlii. 7, 101; 17 a, b—e, 25, 256 f.

WISDOM

ii. 12, 372
 vi. 7, 372
 vii. 24, 268
 viii. 7, 20, 268
 ix. 15, 268
 x. 6, 475
 xi. 4, 372; 17, 263
 xii. 8, 372
 xv. 10, 372
 xvi. 22, 371
 xviii. 4, 305; 24, 475

SIRACH

prol., 217, 269 f.
 vi. 26, 475
 xx. 19, 475
 xxi. 4, 475
 xlix. 10, 217
 l. 27, 269

ESTHER

B, C, D, 378
 v. 4, 305
 E, 378
 F, 258

JUDITH

v. 19, 2
 vii. 10, 305
 viii. 6, 272
 ix. 11, 472
 x. 2 ff., 272; 5, 475
 xi. 13, 272
 xii. 7, 272

- TOBIT
 i. 14 ff., 3
 v. 15, 308
 xi. 14, 475
- HOSEA
 ii. 23, vi 5, 319 n.
 xii. 4, 468
- AMOS
 ii. 13, 476
 v. 26, 398
 ix. 6, 468; 11 f., 399
- MICAH
 iv., 316 f.
 v. 1—4, 91, 338, 396
 vii. 19, 417
- JOEL
 ii. 25, 471
- JONAH
 i. 3, 475
 ii. 3—10, 253
- NAHUM
 iii. 8, 322
- HABAKKUK
 ii. 11, 468
 iii. 1—19, 253; 2, 468; 3, 417, 449;
 9, 515; 13, 56
- ZEPHANIAH
 i. 10, 449
- ZECHARIAH
 iii. 8, 474
 vi. 12, 468
 xi. 7, 322; 13, 397
 xii. 10, 48, 398
 xiii. 7, 413
- MALACHI
 ii. 3, 444; 11, 46; 13, 51
 iii. 1, 395, 408
- ISAIAH
 i. 17, 417; 22, 468; 23, 305
 ii., 316; 19, 372
 iii. 9, 468 f.
- iv. 2, 319 n.
 v. 1—9, 253; 26, 414
 vi. 9 f., 398
 vii. 14, 30, 469, 474
 viii. 14, 401
 ix. 1 f., 396 f.; 6, 469, 472; 8, 322;
 14, 329
 x. 23, 469
 xi. 4, 417
 xiii. 9, 305
 xvii. 13, 460
 xix. 19 f., 4
 xxv. 8, 401; 9, 417
 xxvi. 9—20, 253
 xxviii. 11 f., 402; 16, 399
 xxix. 4, 52; 10, 401; 11, 18, 91; 13,
 321, 409, 417
 xxx. 1 ff., 4; 4, 469
 xxxiii. 24, 305
 xxxvi. 1—xxxix. 8, 316
 xxxviii. 8, 449; 10—20, 253; 21, 475
 xxxix. 6 f., 299
 xl. 2, 395; 3, 395, 398
 xlii. 1, 395; 7, 415
 xliii. 23, 417
 xliv. 28, 399
 xlv. 1, 14, 469
 xlix. 6, 2
 li. 5, 414
 liii. 1—12, 410; 3, 469; 4, 397;
 5, 7, 413; 8, 469; 10, 319 n.
 liv. 8, 476; 15, 469
 lv. 3, 398
 lvii. 15, 472
 lviii. 6, 395
 lix. 7 f., 251
 lx. 17, 469
 lxi. 1 ff., 395; 12, 413
 lxii. 11, 395
 lxiii. 1, 9, 469
 lxiv. 3, 401
 lxv. 1, 417; 15, 319 n.
 lxvi. 2, 408
- JEREMIAH
 ii. 12, 413; 23, 326; 26, 307
 v. 4, 305
 vi. 23, 321; 29, 444
 vii. 16, 302
 ix. 23 f., 245, 409; 29, 479
 xi. 15, 444; 19, 469
 xii. 15, 399

xiii. 14, 2
 xv. 4, 2
 xviii. 15, 305
 xix. 13, 475
 xxiii. 33, 444
 xxv.—li., 241 f.
 xxvi. 15, 322; 25, 321
 xxxiv. 17, 2
 xxxvi. 1, 275
 xxxviii. 13, 319 n.; 31—37, 338 f.;
 37, 305; 40, 324
 xxxix. 19, 472
 xl. 14—26, 44
 xliii. 31, 417
 xlvi. 4—13, 45
 xlix. 19, 476
 li. 1 ff., 4

BARUCH

i. 10, 275; 15—18, 48
 ii. 3, 275; 11—19, 48
 iii. 4, 275; 38, 469
 iv. 36—v. 9, 283
 v. 2, 417; 50, 275

LAMENTATIONS

i. 1, 259
 iv. 20, 469, 474

EZEKIEL

iii. 15, 460
 vii. 3—9, 242
 viii. 10, 476
 ix. 9, 307
 xi. 21, 460
 xiii. 18, 305, 449
 xvi. 21, 305
 xx. 14, 302
 xxii. 11, 305
 xxxiii. 14, 407
 xxxiv. 4, 414
 xl. 17, 475

DANIEL

i. 2, 48
 ii. 35, 48
 iii. 26, 45; 52—90, 253
 v. 23, 48
 vi. 22, 47, 411
 vii. 9 ff., 421 ff.; 9, 48; 10, 417, 497;
 13, 48, 57 f.; 21, 48; 22, 319 n.;
 23, 26 f.

ix. 1, 318
 x. 20, 48
 xii. 1—4, 339; 2, 2; 7, 48; 9, 417

SUSANNA

54 f., 261

BEL

2, 475

1 MACCABEES

i. 4, 276
 vii. 17, 25
 xiii. 30, 277
 xv. 23, 7
 xvi. 23 f., 277

2 MACCABEES

i. 27, 2
 ii. 1 ff., 275; 7, 13; 23, 7
 vi. 19, 30, 277
 vii. 6, 372
 viii. 1, 475

3 MACCABEES

ii. 2, 472
 vi. 18, 280
 vii. 42, 280

4 MACCABEES

i. 18, 280 f.
 ix. 9, 281
 xiii. 15, 281
 xv. 3, 281
 xvii. 5, 281
 xviii. 14 ff., 372; 23, 281

MATTHEW

ii. 6, 396
 iv. 15 f., 396
 v. 3 ff., 451; 18, 320
 vi. 6, 451
 viii. 17, 397
 x. 21, 35, 451
 xii. 18, 395
 xiii. 35, 397
 xv. 8, 440
 xxi. 4, 395; 33, 451
 xxiv. 30, 48
 xxvi. 64, 48
 xxvii. 9 f., 397; 32, 7

MARK

- i. 2 f., 395
 vii. 6, 409 f.; 32, 451
 ix. 48, 451
 xiv. 62, 48
 xv. 29, 451

LUKE

- iv. 18 ff., 356, 395
 vii. 27, 395
 xviii. 20, 234
 xxiv. 44, 217

JOHN

- i. 22, 398; 51, 451
 vii. 35, 2
 xii. 40, 398
 xix. 37, 398

ACTS

- ii. 9, 104; 10, 7; 20, 33, 215
 vi. 9, 7, 104
 vii. 43, 398
 viii. 32 ff., 398
 xi. 20, 7
 xiii. 1, 7; 15, 356; 22, 398; 30,
 215; 34, 398
 xv. 16 ff., 399; 21, 356
 xviii. 24, 104

JAMES

- i. 1, 3
 ii. 11, 234

1 PETER

- i. 24, 399
 ii. 6, 399; 9, 451
 iii. 10 ff., 399; 14, 451

2 PETER

- ii. 22, 400

ROMANS

- iii. 13-18, 252; 20, 400
 ix. 9, 17, 27, 400; 25, 215; 33, 401
 x. 16, 215

- xi. 2 ff., 8, 401
 xii. 17, 451
 xiii. 9, 234
 xiv. 11, 400
 xv. 11, 215

1 CORINTHIANS

- ii. 9, 401
 xiv. 21, 402
 xv. 54 f., 48, 401

2 CORINTHIANS

- iii. 3 ff., 451
 viii. 21, 451

EPHESIANS

- ii. 17, 451
 iv. 8, 25, 400
 v. 31, 400
 vi. 3, 400

PHILIPPIANS

- i. 19, 451

HEBREWS

- i. 7, 12, 402
 ii. 12, 402
 iii. 9, 10, 402 f.
 vi. 8, 451
 viii. 8 ff., 402
 x. 5 ff., 37, 402 f., 479
 xi. 21, 402; 22, 215; 33, 48; 36,
 217
 xii. 15, 402, 479

APOCALYPSE

- i. 7, 398
 ix. 20, 48
 x. 6, 48
 xii. 7, 48
 xiii. 7, 48
 xix. 6, 48
 xx. 4, 11, 48

INDEX II.

- A, cod., 125 f., 202, 219, 252, 254,
282, 352, 354, 364, 454, 480 ff.;
A, 364
- Abbas, Mar, 115
- Abbott, T. K., 144, 456
- Abbreviations in MSS. of LXX.,
126, 364 f.
- Abrahams, I., 498
- Accidence of O.T. Greek, 302 ff.
- Acrostics, 360
- Acts, quotations in the, 388, 398 f.
- Adrianus, 341
- African canons, 219, 397
- African O.L., 91
- Africanus, correspondence of Origen
with, 60 f., 255, 260 f.
- Akhmîm codex, the, 283 ff.: Akh-
mîmic dialect, 106
- Akiba ben Joseph, R., 32, 434,
440
- Alcalà, 171
- Aldine edition of LXX., 173, 486;
editions based on, 174
- Alexander, at Jerusalem, 4; his
policy towards the Jews, 4 f.
- Alexandria, its Church, 104, 413;
dialect, 289 f.; population, 291;
libraries and museums, 10 f., 16 f.,
22 f., 293; writers, 293, 312,
369 ff.
- Alexandrine MS., 125 f., 352, 489 f.,
505, 529
- Ambrosian Octateuch, 135 f., 348
- Amelli, A. M., 503
- Amherst papyri, 499, 508, 509
- Amphilochius, 205
- Andreas Asolanus, 173
- Anonymi *dial. Timothei et Aquilae*,
18, 31 ff., 206
- Anthropomorphisms, 53, 327
- Antioch, school of, 80
- Apocalypse, use of LXX. in, 392;
'Theodotionic readings in, 48
- Apocrypha, 224 f., 265 ff., 281 ff.;
vocabulary of the, 310 ff.; 'apo-
crypha,' 423; Oxford edition,
520
- Apostolic canons, the, 209, 219
- Aquila, 30 ff., 38 ff., 53, 458, 476,
499, 508
- Arabic version, 110 f.; colloquial-
isms in LXX., 319
- Aramaic, 3, 8, 319
- Arian controversy, use of LXX. in
the, 470 f.
- Aristarchus, 69 ff.
- Aristeas, 25, 369 ff.
- 'Aristeas,' letter of, 2, 10 ff., 279,
371, 478; accepted as genuine
in the ancient Church, 13 f.;
introduction to, 533 ff.; text of,
551 ff.
- Aristobulus, 1 f., 12 f., 369 ff.
- Armenian version, 118 ff.
- Artapanus, 369 ff.
- Ashburnham House, fire at, 133
- Asterisk, 70 ff.
- Athanasius, 125, 203 f., 431; see
Pseudo-Athanasius
- Athias, Hebrew Bible of, 343
- Augustine of Hippo, 9, 13, 88 f.,
211, 223, 464

- ἀγάπη, ἀγάπησις, 456
 ἀκρίβασμα, -μός, 45
 ἀλαβάρχης, ἀραβάρχης, 6
 ἀλλθεια, 21, 317
 ἀλληλουιά, 250 f.
 ἄλυσις χρυσοῦ, 362
 ἀμήν, 317
 ἀνάγνωσμα, ἀναγνωστής, 168, 358
 ἀντιβάλλειν, 75, 77
 Ἀριστάρχεια σήματα, 69
 ἀρχή, 358
 ἀρχιμαγειρος, ἀρχιουνοχόος, 21
 ἄχει, 21

 Ⲛ, cod., 75, 77, 129 ff., 201, 219,
 252, 352, 496
 ΠⲚ (σύν), 39, 308, 317
 ΠⲚϣ, 30

 B, cod., 126 ff., 181, 201, 219,
 348 ff., 351 f., 375, 486 ff.
 Baber, H., 126
 Babylonian Targum, 3
 Bacon, Roger, 435
 Barnabas, Ep. of, 48, 411 ff.
 Barnes, W. E., 287
 Baruch, book of, 48, 274 ff.
 Bel, 260 f.
 Ben Asher, R., 434
 Ben Naphtali, R., 434
 Bessarion, Cardinal, his MSS., 132,
 173
 'Biblical Greek,' 456
 Blunders in the version of LXX.,
 329 f.
 Bobbio Sacramentary, 213
 Bodleian Genesis, 134 f.; Psalter,
 141; fragment of Bel, 146; of
 Ezekiel, 148
 Bohairic, 106 f.
 Bomberg Bible, 343
 Brooke, A. E., 135, 189, 489, 507
 Budge, E. A., 504
 Burkitt, F. C., 34, 41, 47, 82, 93,
 111, 488 f., 499, 503 ff., 514
 Burney, C. F., 502, 526
 Buxtorfs, the, 436

 βιβλιογράφοι, 73
 βύσσοις, 21

 C, cod., 128 f., 490
 Caesarea, 74 f., 357
 Caius Psalter, 162
 Cambridge editions of LXX., 188 ff.,
 290, 496, 510 ff.
 Canon of the Hebrew O.T., 198,
 216, 219 f.; non-canonical books
 of the Greek O.T., 265 ff.
 Canticles, the book, 216, 360
 Canticles, the Ecclesiastical, 141 f.,
 253 f.
 Capitulation in MSS. of LXX.,
 351 ff.; in the versions, 360 f.
 Cappellus, L., 436
capsae, 225
 Carafa, Card. Ant., 174 ff.
 Carthage, 88, 214, 493
 Carr, A., 522
 Cassiodorius, 211 f.
catena aurea, 361 f.; *c. Nicephori*,
 362 f., *catenae*, 361 ff.
 Catharine de' Medici, 129
 Catholic Epistles, quotations in,
 389, 399 f.
 Cells, story of the, 14
 Ceriani, A., 39, 80, 108, 113, 496
 Chapter-divisions, 342 ff.
 Chase, F. H., 470
 Cheyne, T. K., 4, 240
 Chigi MS., 47 ff., 166, 348
 'Chronicles,' 216; the book, 249
 Church, use of the LXX. in the
 Ancient, 27, 87, 433, 462 ff.
cistae, 225
 Citation, formulae of, 382, 408, 412;
 citations of LXX. in N.T.: see
New Testament
 Claromontane list, 213 f., 279, 346 ff.
 Clement of Rome, 47, 406 ff.; of
 Alexandria, 13, 369 f., 426 ff.
 Cleodemus, 370
codex, 229
 Coislin Octateuch, 140, 353 f.
collatio Carthaginiensis, 97
 Colometry, 346
 Commentaries, 361, 429 ff.
 Complutensian Polyglott, the, 171 ff.,
 486; editions based on, 173
 Concordance to the LXX., the
 Oxford, 290, 314, 495 n.

- Constantinople, 85
 Controversial use of the LXX., 470 f.
 Conybeare, F. C., 31, 118 f.
 'Coptic,' 105; MSS., 504
 Cornill, C. H., 242, 486 f.
 Corruptions of the text of LXX., early, 478 ff.
 Cotton Genesis, 132 ff.
 Critical text of the LXX., method of arriving at a, 491 ff.
 Criticism (textual) of the O.T., how aided by LXX., 440 ff.
 Crum, W. E., 504
cucurbita, 464
 Cursive MSS., 148 ff.
 Cyprian, 88 ff., 92, 97, 428
 Cyprus, 10
 Cyrene, Jewish settlement at, 7;
 Cyrenian source of 2 Macc., 278
 Cyril of Jerusalem, 203 f.; C. of Alexandria, 231; C. and Methodius, 120; C. Lucar, 125
- χὶ περιστιγμένον, 71
- D, cod., 132 ff.; Δ, 146
 Damascus, John of, 207 f., 223
 Daniel, book of, 43 f., 46 ff., 113 f., 260 ff., 311, 316, 356, 417, 421 ff.
 Decalogue, the, 234 f., 360
 Deissmann, G. A., 21
 Demetrius of Phalerum, 2, 10 f., 18 f., 293; D. the Hellenist, 17 f., 369 f.; D. Ixion, 289
 'Demotic,' 105 f.
Desiderata, 289 f., 495 f.
 Deuteronomy, the book, 215
 Dialect of Alexandria, 289 ff.; dialects of the Egyptian versions, 105 ff.
Dialogue between Timothy and Aquila, 31 f., 216
 Dieu, L., 504, 529
 Dillmann, A., 109
 Dispersion, the Greek, 2 f.; the Eastern, 3; loyalty of the, 7 f.
 Distribution of LXX. MSS., 123 f.
 Doctrine, Christian, its terminology partly derived from LXX., 473 f.
- Dogmatic interest detected in LXX., 327
 Dorotheus, 81
 'Double books,' 220
 Doublets, 325
 Driver, S. R., 68, 234 ff., 246, 321, 335, 341, 439, 441, 481, 489
 Dublin fragments of Isaiah, 144
- Δ, cod., 146
 Δαήλ, 480
 δεκαέξ (έκκαίδεκα), οί, 216
 διασπορά, 2
 δίδραχμον, 21
 διορθούν, διορθοῦσθαι, διορθωτής, 73, 75, 77
 δόξα, 359
 δώδεκα (δεκαδύο), οί, 216
 δωδεκαπρόφητον, τό, 123, 205 f., 216
- E, cod., 134 f.; ε', 53
 Ebedjesu, 208 f.
 Ecclesiastes, the book, 316
 Ecclesiasticus, the book, 269 ff., 518
 Editions of Greek O.T., 171 ff.; of particular books, 190 ff.
 Egypt, early settlements of Jews in, 3 f.; evangelisation of, 104 f.
 Egyptian versions, the, 104 ff.; recension of LXX., 78 ff.; words in LXX., 21
 Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, R., 440
 Emmanuel Psalter, 164
 Enoch, book of, 110, 283 f.
 Ephraemi codex rescriptus, 128 f., 490
 Epiphanius, 31 f., 66 ff., 204 f., 431
 Esdras, the Greek, 48 f., 265 ff., 310; fourth book of, 110, 285
 Esther, the Greek, 20, 25, 75, 77, 229, 257 ff.
 Ethiopic version, the, 109 f.
 Euergetes II., 24, 270, 280
 Eupolemus, 24 f., 369 f.
 'European' O.L., 91
 Eusebius, 64, 66, 73, 77, 125
 Exegesis of LXX., 446 f., 449 f.
 Exodus, book of, 215, 234 ff., 243

- Ezekiel, the poet, 369 ff.
 Ezra-Nehemiah, 25, 220, 265 ff.
- ἐβδόμη ἐρμηνεία, ἡ, 55, 82, 85
 Ἐβραῖος, ὁ, 56
 εἰκοσιδύο, τά, 281
 εἶν, 19
 ἐκκαίδεκαπρόφητον, τό, 123, 216
 ἐκκλησία, 317, 456
 ἐκκλησιαστική ἔκδοσις, 80
 ἐκλογαί, 361
 ἐλληνική διάλεκτος, ἡ, 294
 ἐναλλάττειν, 55
 ἐνδιάθηκα, τά, 281
 Ἐξαγωγή, ἡ, 215
 ἐξαπλᾶ, 66
 ἐξηγήσεις ἐρανισθεῖσαι, 361
 ἔξω, τά, 281
 ἐπικατασκευάζειν, 65
 Ἐπινομίς, ἡ, 215
 ἐπιτομαὶ ἐρμηνειῶν, 361
 εὐαγγέλιον, 456
 Εὐσεβίου, τό, 77
- F, cod., 135 f., 348 f.
 Fathers, the Christian, influence of
 LXX. upon, 462 ff., 464 ff.; their
 estimate of the LXX., 42 ff.
- Fayûm, the, 7, 291
 Festival in commemoration of the
 completion of the LXX., 13
 Field, F., 41, 46, 82 f., 458, 500 ff.
Formula consensus eccl. Helv., 436 f.
 Formulae of citation, 382, 408, 412
 Fourth Gospel, quotations in the,
 388, 398
 Fragments, uncial, still unworked,
 146 ff.
- G, cod., 72 f., 78, 137 f.; \mathfrak{C} , 234,
 485 ff.; I, 146
 Genesis, the book, 215, 234, 243
 Genizah, the Cairo, 34
 Georgian version, the, 120
 Ginsburg, C. D., 431
 Gothic version, the, 117 f.
 Grabe, J. E., 125 f., 183 ff.; edi-
 tions based on his text, 184
 Graeco-Latin MSS., 141 f.
Graecus Venetus, 56 ff.
- Grammar of LXX., proposed, 290
 Grätz, E., 17
 Greek Fathers, list of the, 430 ff.
 Greek, modern, affinity of LXX.
 Greek to, 309
 Greek of LXX., 9, 20 f., 289 ff.,
 452 ff.; of the Ptolemaic *papyri*,
 21, 296 f.
 Greek spoken in the West, 87
 Greek versions of the O.T.: before
 LXX., 1 f.; the LXX., 9 ff.; of cent.
 ii. A.D., 30 ff., 457 ff.; mediaeval,
 56 ff., 58
 Gregory of Nazianzus, 205; the
 Great, 103
 Grinfield, 15, 27
 Grosseteste, Robert, 435
 Grotta Ferrata palimpsest of the
 Prophets, 146
 Grouping of books, 198 ff., 216 ff.;
 internal order of groups, 226 ff.
 Gwynn, J., 48, 50
- Γ , cod., 146
 γειώρας, 19
- הַיָּוֵן, 3
- H, cod., 138 f.
 Hadrian, 31 f.
Haggada, 327 f.
 Hagiographa, date of the Greek,
 24 f.; distribution in the Greek
 Bible, 218, 228 f.; inferior position
 assigned to, 318
Halacha, 327
Haphtaroth, 343
 Harding, Stephen, 435
 Harris, J. R., 146 f., 274, 282, 345 ff.,
 411
 Hârt, J. H. A., 498, 518
 Hatch, E., 256, 328, 406 ff., 428 f.,
 452, 455 ff., 460
 Headings to chapters, 353 ff.
Hebraica veritas, 68, 86, 435
 'Hebraisms,' 521 ff.
 Hebrew Bible, *editio princeps* of
 the, 435 f.
 Hebrew MSS. of the LXX., 22,
 319 ff.; H. column of the Hexapla,

- 65, 67; mediaeval H. scholars, 435;
revival of Hebrew learning, 435 f.;
text, history of the official He-
brew, 319 f., 438 ff.; diverse
renderings of the same H. words,
317, 328 f.; departure of LXX.
from traditional H. text, 440 ff.
- Hebrews, Ep. to the, quotations in,
391, 402
- hedera*, 464
- 'Hellenist,' 'Hellenistic,' 294 f.;
LXX. the Hellenistic Bible, 29,
370 ff.
- Heptapla, the, 66 f., 113
- Heptastadion*, the, 11
- Heptateuchus*, 227
- Hermas, 47, 411
- Hesychius, 78 ff.; Hesychnian text,
80, 107 ff., 144 f., 150 ff., 482, 486
- Hexapla, 61 ff., 64 ff., 74 ff., 113 f.,
482 f., 500 ff.; Hexaplaric recen-
sion, 67 ff., 76 ff., 481 ff.; Hexa-
plaric texts, 78, 108 ff., 111,
112 ff., 119, 138, 140, 148 ff.,
482; Jerome's Hexaplaric Latin
version, 100 ff.
- Hilary of Poitiers, 210, 471
- Hippolytus, 277, 424 ff.
- Hody, H., 15
- Holmes, R., 185 ff., Holmes and
Parsons, 122 f., 185 ff., 511, 513
- Hort, F. J. A., 81, 91 f., 189, 257 f.,
300, 486 ff., 491
- Howorth, H., 267, 517
- Hunt, A. S., 507
- hypolemniscus*, 71 f.
- Hyvernat, H., 106, 111
- local, 324
- I, cod., 141, 353
- Jacob of Edessa, 116
- Jamnia, 320, 439 f.
- Jashar, book of, 246
- Jebb, R. C., 294, 309
- Jeremiah, book of, 241 ff., 259 f.;
Ep. of, 274 f.
- Jerome, 9, 14, 23, 34, 40, 64, 74,
76 f., 78 f., 89, 98 ff., 273, 277,
435, 464, 500, 502
- Jews in Egypt, 3 ff.; bilingual, 8;
their loyalty to Jerusalem, 7, 22;
Jewish order of O.T. Canon, 200,
231; Jews wrongly charged with
corrupting text of LXX., 424, 479
- Ignatius, 413 f.
- Infinitive of purpose, 306
- Innocent I., 211
- Inspiration claimed for LXX., 14,
462 f.
- Interpolations in text of LXX., 423 f.
- Interpretation of O.T., 326 f.; use
of LXX. for the, 445 ff.; patristic
int. based on LXX., 463 ff., 470
- Job, book of, 43 f., 69, 100 f., 108,
228, 255 ff., 318, 337, 480
- John of Damascus, 207 f.
- Josephus, 12 f., 26, 217, 220, 279 f.,
298 f., 376 ff.
- Joshua ben Chananya, R., 32, 440
- Irenaeus, 9, 30, 42, 49, 414 ff.;
I. (Minutius Pacatus), 289
- Isidorus, 212
- Jubilees, book of, 110, 285
- Judges, book of, 215 ff., 316, 333 f.,
488 f.
- Judith, book of, 103, 222 ff., 229,
272 f.
- Junilius, 207
- Justin, 30, 47, 417 ff., 464, 479
- Justinian, 33
- ιβις*, 21
- ιδιόγραφος (ψαλμός)*, 125, 252 f.
- ιστορικόν, τό*, 205
- K, cod., 139, 349, 354 f.
- Kaisariyeh, 75
- Kennedy, H. A. A., 88, 289 ff., 296,
452 f.
- Kenyon, F. G., 73 f., 130, 225,
487, 500, 528
- Kimchi, D., 57
- Kingdoms, books of, 214 ff.; 1 K.,
241 f.; 3 K., 237 ff., 246 ff.; 4 K.,
249
- Kirkpatrick, A. F., 318 ff., 441
- Klostermann, E., 58, 132, 353
- καθίσματα*, 359

- καλλιγράφοι, 73
 κανόνες (ψαλμῶν), 125, 359
 κέραι, 320
 κιβωτοί, κισταί, 225, 229
 Κινῶθ, 199
 κοινή, ἡ, διάλεκτος, 294, 525; ἔκδοσις,
 68 f., 80, 82, 481, 493
 κόμματα, 64, 344 ff.
 κόνδυ, 21
 κῶλα, 64 f., 344 ff.
- כִּי־תִתֵּן, 24
- L, cod., 139
 Lagarde, P. de, 109, 118 f, 121,
 188, 206, 255, 442, 483 ff., 494,
 502
 Lake, K., 502, 505
 Lamentations, book of, 226 ff., 259,
 360
 Langton, Stephen (Archbp), 343
 Laodicene canons, 209, 219, 282
 Latin versions, 88 ff., 493
 Lections, lectionaries, 168 ff., 343,
 356 ff.
 Lee, F., 183
 Leipzig fragments of Octateuch, 139
lemniscus, 71 f.
 Leontius, 207 f., 218
 Leontopolis, 8
 Lexicography, 290, 302 ff., 310;
 lexicon of LXX., proposed, 290
 Libraries of Alexandria, 10 f., 16 ff.,
 22 f., 293
 Library of Pamphilus, 75
 Lietzmann, H., 501, 513
 Lightfoot, J. B. (Bp), 105
 Literature, 10, 27 f., 53, 76, 103 f.,
 108, 111, 117, 119 f., 121, 170,
 194, 230, 262 ff., 285 ff., 314,
 340 f., 365 f., 379 f., 404 f., 432,
 438, 461, 477, 496 f.
 Liturgical notes in titles of the
 Psalms, 250 f.
 Liturgies, the ancient, use of the
 LXX. in, 471 ff.
 London papyrus fragments of Psalter,
 142 f.
 Lucian, 80 ff., 85, 395 f., 483 ff.;
- Lucianic texts, 82 ff., 93, 116 ff.,
 121, 148 ff., 379, 395, 403, 482,
 486
 Ludovicus de Vives, 15
 Lyra, Nicolaus de, 435
- Λουκιανός, 80, 365
- M, cod., 78, 140 f., 352 ff.; **MA**, 234
 Maccabees, books of, 25, 276 ff.,
 312 f., 372
 Macedonian words, 291 f.
magna est veritas, 266
 Mahaffy, J. P., 5 ff., 21 ff., 279 f.,
 292
 Malchas, 370
 Malchion, 81
 Manasseh, Prayer of, 253 f.
 Manetho, 17
 Marchalianus, cod., 77, 80, 108,
 144 f.
 Margoliouth, D. S., 518
 Martini, Raymundus, 435
 Masius, Andreas, 113
 Massora, Massoretic text, 234 ff.,
 322, 434 ff., 438 ff.; non-Masso-
 retic text pre-supposed by LXX.,
 442 ff.
 Materials at the disposal of the
 critical editor, 491 f.
 McLean, N., 110, 119, 135, 189,
 191, 489
 Melito, 203, 221
 Mercati, G., 62, 500 f.
 Mesrop, 118, 120
 Metaphors in LXX., 329
 Methodius and Cyril, 120 f.
Methurgeman, 3, 20
metobelus, 70 ff.
 Minutius Pacatus, 289
 Moabite stone, the, 320 f.
 Mommsen, Th., 5, 8, 212 f., 347
 Montfaucon, B. de, 136
 Morinus, J., 182, 436; P., 181 f.
 Moses, Plato supposed to be in-
 debted to, 1
 Moses bar-Cephas, 111; M. of
 Khoren, 118, 120
 Mozley, F. W., 518
 MSS. of LXX., uncial, 124 ff.;

- cursive, 148 ff.; notation of, 122 ff.; grouping of books in, 123; distribution of, 123 f.; displacements in, 131, 271; recensions in, 78, 80, 82 f., 482
- Muratorian Fragment, 268
- Museum, the Alexandrian, 16 f., 293
- Μακκαβαϊκά, τὰ, 222, 226 ff.; Μακκαβαῖος, 276
- Μωσαϊκά, τὰ, 206
- N, cod., 131 f., 202
- Nathan, R. Isaac, 343
- Nestle, E., 112, 127, 133, 169, 181, 187 f., 274, 319, 331, 410, 499
- New Testament, the: use of LXX., 26, 381 ff.; tables of quotations from LXX., 382 ff.; number of quotations, 386, 391 f.; discussion of passages quoted, 392 ff.; LXX. indispensable to the study of the N.T., 450 ff.; vocabulary of N.T., how far indebted to LXX., 452 ff.
- Nicephorus, stichometry of, 208 r., 346 ff.; catena of, 186, 362 f.
- Nicomedia, 85
- Nicopolis, 54 f.
- Notation of MSS., 122 f.
- Notes at end of Job, 256 f.
- Number of books in O.T. canon, 219 ff.
- Numerals confused, 321
- Ναυή, *Nave*, 480
- נְבִיאִים, 217
- O, cod., 144
- obelus*, 70 ff.
- Octapla, the, 66 f.
- 'Odes,' the nine, 254
- Oesterley, W. O. E., 507, 508
- Old Latin version, the, 88 ff., 493
- Olophernes, 272
- Onkelos, 32
- Order of books in Jewish lists, 200; in uncial Bibles, 201 f.; in patristic lists, 203 ff.; internal order of groups, 226 ff.; order of contents of books, 231 ff.
- Origen, 30, 34, 46 f., 49, 53 f., 59 ff., 77, 203, 222, 242, 356 f., 429 f., 435, 464, 480, 500 f.
- Orthography of LXX., 300 ff.
- Oxyrhynchus papyri, 508 f.
- ὀκταπλᾶ, 66
- ὀκτασέλιδον, τὸ, 66
- ὀκτάτευχος, ἡ, 123
- ὀράσεις (in Isaiah and Daniel), 360
- ὠδαί, 123, 253 f.
- Ὠριγένης, Φ, 72, 77, 365
- P, 124, 164
- Pachymius, 79
- Pagnini, S., 343
- Palaeography, Hebr., 320 f.; Greek, 364
- Palestinian Syriac version, 114 f.
- Palimpsest MSS., 34 ff., 128 f., 138 f., 145 ff.
- Palladius, 50
- Pamphilus, 74 f., 76 f.
- Papyrus MSS., 142, 146, 225, 229, 507 f., 521, 523 ff.; 'transition to vellum,' effect of, 229 f.
- Parashahs, 342 f.
- Paris uncial Psalter, 143
- Parsons, J., 185 f.
- Passages in LXX. discussed, 330 ff.
- Patristic quotations, 406 ff.; texts, editions of, 406, 492; commentaries, 430 ff.
- Paul of Tella, 112 f.
- Pauline Epistles, quotations in, 389 ff., 400 ff.
- Pearson, J. (Bp), 457, 477
- Pentapla, 67
- Pentateuch, Greek, the original LXX., 23; Samaritan, 436 ff.
- Peshitta, the, 112, 116
- Pesukim*, 342
- Peter, Gospel of, 50
- Petersburg, St, palimpsest of Numbers, 138
- Pharisaic influence in LXX., 17, 281, 283
- Pharos, 11

- Philadelphus, 10 f., 16 f., 293
 Phileas of Thmuis, 79
 Philo, 12 f., 25 f., 268, 298, 372 ff.,
 478 f.; the poet, 369
 Philometor, 7, 17, 25
 Philopator, 279
 Philostorgius, 117
 Philoxenus of Mabug, 115; Philox-
 enian version, 115 f.
 Phrynichus, 296 f.
 Pius V., 99
 Points, the Hebrew, 321 f.
 Polycarp of Smyrna, 414; the
 chorepiscopus, 115
 Polyhistor, 369
 Printed editions of LXX., 171 ff.
 Prologue to Sirach, the, 24, 300,
 319
 Procksch, O., 529
 Proper names, 304, 313, 449 f.
 Proverbs, book of, 240 ff., 255,
 366 f.
 Psalms, 25, 98 ff., 191 f., 239 f.,
 250 ff., 316, 336, 358 f., 447 f.;
 titles of the, 250 f., 447 f.; books
 of the Psalter, 254 f.; Psalms of
 Solomon, 282 f.; Jerome's ver-
 sions of the Psalms, 98 f.
 Psalter of English Prayer-book, 99
Psalterium Romanum, Gallicanum,
Hebraicum, 98 ff.
 Pseudepigrapha, 265, 281 f., 519;
 Oxford edition, 521
 Pseudo-Aristeas, see 'Aristeas';
 Pseudo-Athanasius, 82, 85, 207,
 282; Pseudo-Chrysostom, 205;
 Pseudo-Clement, 411; Pseudo-
 Gelasius, 211 f., 282
 Ptolemies, list of the early, 5 f.
 'Ptolemy and Cleopatra,' 25, 258

 Π, cod., 141
 Παλαιστιναῖον, τό, 77
 Πανάρετος, ἡ, 208
 παραγραφαί, 361
 παραινετικά, τά, 208
 Παραλειπόμενα, 214, 216
 παρθένος (in Isa. vii. 14), 30
 πάσχα, φάσκεκ, 317
 περικοπή, 358

 πεντασέλιδον, τό, 67
 πεντάτευχος, ἡ, 123, 204 ff.
 ΠΙΠΙ (𐤀𐤏𐤏𐤏), 39 f.
 προσευχή 'Αζαρίου, 253, 260; προσ-
 ευχή Μαννασσή, 253 f.
 προσήλυτος, ὁ (𐤏𐤃𐤏), 32
 προφητικόν, τό, 205; προφητικά, τά,
 208
 Πτολεμαϊκά, τά, 279, 519
 φρουραί, 258
 ψαλμὸς ιδιόγραφος, 125, 141, 252 f.

 פְּרִשְׁוֹת, פְּרִשְׁוֹת, 342 f.

 Q, cod., 66, 75, 77, 80, 108, 144 f.,
 348
 Quinta, the, 53 ff., 66 f.
 Quotations from LXX. by Jewish
 Hellenists, 369 ff.; in N.T.,
 381 ff.; in early Christian litera-
 ture, 406 ff.

 R, cod., 141 f., 495
 Rahlfs, A., 135, 502, 507, 527 ff.
 Recensions of the LXX., 76 ff., 85 f.,
 481 f.
 Redpath, H. A., 135, 141, 147, 290,
 495
 Reuchlin, J., 436
 Robinson, F., 105
 'Rock,' metaphor of, 526
 Roman edition of LXX., 174 ff., 486;
 editions based on, 182
 Ruffinus, 210, 223
 Ryle, H. E., 25 f., 215, 275, 283,
 342, 374, 404

 S (=Σ), 75, 77, 129 ff., 201, 219,
 252, 352, 490; c', cγ', 364; 5',
 53
 Sabatier, P., 92
 Sahidic, 106 ff., 504
 Samaritans in Egypt, 6, 437 ff.,
 441 f.; Samaritan Pentateuch,
 436 ff.
 Sanday, W., 218 ff., 360
 Sanders, H. A., 506
 Schürer, E., 499
scriptio defectiva, 321

- Scrivener, F. H. A., 189
 Selah, 449
 Semitic words in LXX., 19, 306 ff.;
 Semitic idioms, 323 ff.
 'Septima,' the, 53 ff.
 'Septuagint,' the name, 9 f.; early
 history of the version, 9 ff.; a
 collection of versions, 315 f.; was
 there any version anterior to it? 2;
 Origen labours upon it, 59 ff.;
 recensions, 76 ff.; versions based
 upon the LXX., 87 ff.; MSS. of
 LXX., 122 ff.; printed editions,
 171 ff.; books contained in the
 Greek O.T., 197 ff.; language and
 style, 289 ff.; merits and defects,
 315 ff.; use by pagan writers, 22;
 by Hellenists, 29 f., 369 ff.; in
 the N.T., 381 ff.; in the Fathers,
 406 ff.; influence on Latin Vulgate,
 103; its importance to students,
 433 ff.; relation to Q'ri, 445;
 corruptions in text of, 478 ff.;
 textual problems, 480 ff.; recon-
 struction of the text, 492 ff.
 Sequence, Hebrew and Greek,
 tables of, 231 ff.; discussion of,
 234 ff.
 Serapeion library, 16
 Seventy-two, the number, 15
 'Sexta,' the, 53 ff.
 Shashanq (Shishak), 3 f.
 Sibyllines, the, 372, 380
 Siloam inscription, the, 321
 Sinaitic MS., the, 129 ff., 490, 505
 Sinker, R., 315
 Sirach, 269 ff., 372; prologue to, 20,
 24, 300, 319; the Hebrew, 270 ff.;
 disturbed order of the Greek,
 271 f.; literature, 286
 Sixtine edition, 174 ff., 486; editions
 based on, 182
 Sixtus V., 174 ff.; his letter, 180
 'Sixty books,' the, 209 ff., 220, 281 f.
 Slavonic version, the, 120 f.
 Smith, H. P., 340, 441; W. R., 30f.,
 246, 440
 Solomon, Psalms of, 282 f., 288;
 Wisdom of, 267 ff., 285, 311 f.;
 Odes of, 519
 Soter, 6, 19, 293
Speculum, the, 97, 100
 Stephen, R., 343
 Stichoetry, 344 ff.; of Latin MSS.,
 360 f.; of Coptic MSS., *ib.*
 Stoicism of 4 Macc., 280
 Streane, A. W., 259
 Susanna, 260 f.
 Symmachus, 30, 49 ff., 52 ff., 458 f.,
 476, 483
 Synagogue use of LXX., 29 f.
Synopsis, pseudo-Athanasian, 31, 82,
 205; pseudo-Chrysostom's, 207;
 Lagarde's, 206
 Synoptic Gospels, quotations in,
 386 ff., 391 ff.
 Syntax of O.T. Greek, 305
 Syriac versions, 111 ff.
 Syro-Hexaplar, 77, 112 ff., 356,
 493 f.
σάββατα, 19
σαρβήθ σαβανέ ελ, 277
Σεργί, 411
σειρά, 361
Σειράχ, 269
σελς, 64
σκολιογραφείν, 75
Σουσάννα, *Σωσάννα*, 260
Σοφία, *ή*, 268
στάσεις, 142, 359
στιχηρά, *τά*, 219
στίχος, 344 ff.
συλλουκιανιστάι, 85
συμβουλευτικόν, *τό*, 205, 219
σύν = ΠΝ acc., 39, 308, 317
σύνοψις ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ, 206
Σύρος, *ὁ*, 56, 116
σχίνος, 261
ΝΓΔ, 269
ΠΓΔ, 449
 T, cod., 142, 495; Θ', Θέ', 364
 Talmud, Aquila, quoted in the, 33
 Targum, the Babylonian, 3
 Taylor, C., 33, 41, 67, 271, 286, 527
 Tertullian, 9, 284, 351
Tétragrammaton, the, 39 f., 320, 327

- Tetrapla, the, 65 ff., 73, 113 f.
 Text-division, systems of, 342 ff.
 Thackeray, H. St J., 131, 267, 498 f., 509, 513 ff., 526, 528
 Thecla the martyr, 125
 Theodorus (Egyptian Bishop), 79;
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 112, 115, 316, 432
 Theodotion, 30, 42 ff., 45 f., 260 ff., 339 ff., 395 ff., 403, 417, 421 ff., 458 f., 483, 499
 Theodotus, 369 f.
 Thomas of Harkel, 112 f.
 Thompson, Sir H., 503 f.
Timothy and Aquila, dialogue between, 31 f., 206
 Tischendorf, A. F. C. von, 129 ff., 135, 138 f., 140 ff., 187 f.
 Tisserant, E., 506
 Titles of Psalms, 250 f., 447 ff.; of chapters, 354 ff.; of books, 198 f., 214 ff.
 Tobit, book of, 273 f.
 Transliteration, 46, 67, 324 f., 526
trifaria varietas, 86
 Turin Prophets, 145, 508
 Tyconius, 97
 Θεργη, 411
 ταχυγράφοι, 73
 τέλος, 358
 τέσσαρες, οί, 123
 τετραβασιλειον, τό, 206
 τίτλοι, 354 ff.
 τόμοι (in Isaiah), 360
 תורה, 221
 תקון סופרים, 434
 V, cod., 132, 202, 495; U, 142 f.
 'Variorum' LXX., proposed, 496
 Vatican MS. (B), 126 ff., 486 ff.; do. (N), 131 f.; do. (X), 143
 Venice MS. (V=23), 132
 Verona Psalter, 141 f.
 Versions of the LXX., 87 ff., 493 f.
 Versions of the O.T. (Greek) later than LXX., 29 ff.; their importance, 457 ff., 476
versus, 344
 Vienna Genesis, 139, 185
 Vives, L. de, 15
 Ulfilas, 117
 Uncial MSS. of LXX., 124 ff., 146 ff., 201 f.
 Votaw, C. W., 306
vulgata editio, 68
 Vulgate, Latin, 103, 474 ff., 476
 ὕμνος τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, 261
 W, cod., 143
 Walton's Polyglott, 182
 Washington codex (Θ), 506
 Wendland, P., 498, 519
 Westcott, B. F. (Bp), 60, 131, 252, 278, 402
 Wigan, W., 183
 Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach, 269 f., 286
 Wisdom of Solomon, 267 ff., 285, 311, 371 f.
 Wulfila, 117
 X, cod., 143
 Xenophon, Greek of, 294
 Ximenes de Cisneros, F., 171 ff.
 Y, cod., 145
 Yebna, 439
 Young, P., 183
 Z, cod., 140 f., 144 f.; ζ', 53
 Zugninensis, cod., 505
 Zurich Psalter, 142